

Chapter 11

Intergroup Relations

Marilynn B. Brewer

In the 1990s, the demise of the Soviet Union brought an end to the Cold War era with its focus on relations between two political superpowers. In its aftermath, an apparent resurgence of ethnic conflict throughout the world gave rise to the idea that local group loyalties and intergroup hostilities were never far below the surface. The media began talking about the “new tribalism” that seemed to be emerging everywhere. As public interest in these issues grew, so did the resurgence of interest in theory and research on intergroup relations within social psychology in Europe and in the United States. By the turn of the millennium, concern about issues of intergroup relations had become even more intense for social scientists and laypersons alike. In addition to organized conflict carried on by nations against nations, states against subgroups within their own populations, and ethnic and religious conflicts within nations, acts of international terrorism by small groups of extremists have riveted attention and concern across the globe. It is more clear than ever that group identities play a major role in human behavior—impelling heroic action on behalf of *ingroups*, as well as horrific atrocities against designated *outgroups*. Social-psychological understanding of these processes has also grown as the study of intergroup relations took center stage within the discipline.

The salience and extremity of intergroup hostility and violence lead to the impression that the study of intergroup relations is equivalent to the study of intergroup conflict. However, although escalation of conflict and hostility between groups is the form of intergroup relationships of most concern in the real world, social-psychological research on intergroup behavior starts with other, more subtle forms of responding that reflect differences in disposition toward others as a function of their group membership. Understanding intergroup relations invokes most areas of social-psychological inquiry—from the study of person perception, social attitudes, aggression, self-esteem, social comparison, equity, cooperation, and competition to conformity and compliance. From research in all of these areas, we have a wealth of information about the cognitive and motivational foundations of intergroup behavior.

Defining Intergroup Relations

It is a basic fact of human existence that people are organized into social groups. We are all members of many different types of groups, ranging from small, face-to-face groupings of family and friends to large

social categories such as gender, religion, and nationality. As a consequence, much of our interaction with others takes place in a group setting, where we are not only individual persons but representatives of our respective social groups. For social psychologists, the classic definition of intergroup situations is that provided by Sherif (1966): "Whenever individuals belonging to one group interact, collectively or individually, with another group or its members in terms of their group identification, we have an instance of intergroup behavior" (p. 12). What this definition implies is that intergroup relations can occur at the level of two persons interacting (the dyadic level) as well as the level of exchanges between groups as a whole (the intergroup level).

The essence of the social-psychological approach to the study of intergroup relations is to understand the causes and consequences of the distinction between ingroups (those groups to which an individual belongs) and outgroups (social groups that do not include the individual as a member)—the apparently universal propensity to differentiate the social world into "us" and "them." In general, feelings, beliefs, and interpersonal behaviors tend to be more positive when they involve members of the same group (ingroup behavior) than when they occur between groups. An intergroup orientation arises when ingroup-outgroup differentiation is engaged in connection with particular social categorizations. Attitudes and behavior toward members of the ingroup and outgroup then follow from the level of the individual's attachment to the ingroup and his or her assessment of the nature of the outgroup *in relation to* the ingroup.

It is this relational aspect of intergroup behavior that distinguishes the study of intergroup relations from the study of prejudice as an individual attitude toward specific groups or social categories (cf. John F. Dovidio & James M. Jones, Chapter 12, this volume). Ingroup-outgroup differentiation involves thinking of social groups or categories in us-them terms. Category membership alone is not sufficient to engage this intergroup orientation. Ingroup activation involves an additional process of *self-categorization* (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987) or social identification whereby the sense of self is extended to the group as a whole. Similarly, a social category becomes an outgroup only when the self is actively disassociated from the group, in a "not-me" sense. Thus, to understand intergroup relations, we first need to understand the processes and motivations underlying an individual's attachment to his or her social groups and the conditions under which ingroup-outgroup differentiation becomes engaged.

Social Identity and Ingroup Bias

Social identity is defined as "that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group . . . together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership" (Tajfel, 1981, p. 255). Social identity theory, as articulated by Tajfel (1978) and Turner (1975), represents the convergence of two traditions in the study of intergroup attitudes and behavior—social categorization (as represented by Doise, 1978; Tajfel, 1969; Wilder, 1986) and social comparison (as exemplified by Lemaine, 1974; Vanneman & Pettigrew, 1972). The theoretical perspective rests on two basic premises:

1. Individuals organize their understanding of the social world on the basis of categorical distinctions that transform continuous variables into discrete classes; categorization has the effect of minimizing perceived differences *within* categories and accentuating intercategory differences.
2. Because individuals are members of some social categories and not others, social categorization carries with it implicit *ingroup-outgroup* (we-they) distinctions; because of the self-relevance of

social categories, the ingroup-outgroup classification is a superimposed category distinction with affective and emotional significance.

These two premises provide a framework for conceptualizing any social situation in which a particular ingroup-outgroup categorization is made salient. In effect, the theory posits a basic *intergroup schema* with the following characteristic features (Turner, 1975):

1. Assimilation within category boundaries and contrast between categories such that all members of the ingroup are perceived to be more similar to the self than members of the outgroup (the *intergroup accentuation* principle).
2. Positive affect (trust, liking) selectively generalized to fellow ingroup members but not outgroup members (the *ingroup favoritism* principle).
3. Intergroup social comparison and perceived competition between ingroup and outgroup for positive value (the *social competition* principle).

Social identity theory in conjunction with self-categorization theory (Turner et al., 1987) provides a comprehensive view of group behavior and the cognitive processes that underlie a range of intergroup and group phenomena. The basic tenet of these theories is that group behaviors derive from cognitive representations of the self in terms of a shared social category membership, in which there is effectively no psychological separation between the self and the group as a whole. This phenomenon is referred to as *depersonalization of self-representation*, whereby the cognitive representation of the self shifts from *personal self* to *collective self* (Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Hogg & Turner, 1987). In self-categorization terms, social identity entails "a shift towards the perception of self as an interchangeable exemplar of some social category and away from the perception of self as a unique person" (Turner et al., 1987, p. 50). As a consequence of this shift in level of self-categorization, self-interest becomes equated with ingroup interests, and the welfare and status of the ingroup become primary motivations.

Mere Categorization and Intergroup Behavior

In a laboratory setting in Bristol, England, Henri Tajfel and his colleagues undertook initial experiments with the so-called minimal intergroup situation (Tajfel, 1970; Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971) in which individuals are assigned to arbitrary social categories. In these experiments, participants chose to allocate higher rewards to members of their own category relative to members of the outgroup category, even in the absence of any personal identification of group members, any past history, or any direct benefit to the self. The results provided a powerful demonstration that merely classifying individuals into arbitrary distinct social categories was sufficient to produce ingroup-outgroup discrimination and bias, even in the absence of any interactions with fellow group members or any history of competition or conflict between the groups.

Since the initial minimal group experiments, hundreds of studies in the laboratory and the field have documented ingroup favoritism in myriad forms (Brewer, 1979; Brewer & Campbell, 1976; Diehl, 1990; Mullen, Brown, & Smith, 1992). In addition to the allocation bias demonstrated by Tajfel, preferential treatment and evaluation of ingroups relative to outgroups appear in evaluations of group products (e.g., Gerard & Hoyt, 1974), application of rules of fairness (Ancok & Chertkoff, 1983; Ng, 1984; Platow, McClintock, & Liebrand, 1990), attributions for positive and negative behavior (Hewstone, 1990; Weber, 1994), and willingness to trust and cooperate (Brewer & Kramer, 1986; Miller, Downs, & Prentice, 1998; Wit & Kerr, 2002; Yuki, Maddux, Brewer, & Takemura, 2005). There is considerable evidence that such

ingroup favoritism is considered normative in its own right (Blanz, Mummendey, & Otten, 1997; Platow, O'Connell, Shave, & Hanning, 1995) and that it is activated automatically when a group identity is salient (Otten & Moskowitz, 2000; Otten & Wentura, 1999).

These studies succeeded in confirming the power of we-they distinctions to produce differential evaluation, liking, and treatment of other persons depending on whether or not they are identified as members of the ingroup category. The laboratory experiments with the minimal intergroup situation demonstrated that ethnocentric loyalty and bias clearly do not depend on kinship or an extensive history of interpersonal relationships among group members but can apparently be engaged readily by symbolic manipulations that imply shared attributes or a common fate. What appears to be critical for ingroup attachment is a distinctive identification of who is "us" and who is "them"—a rule of exclusion as well as inclusion.

Ethnocentrism and Ingroup Positivity

The hallmark of ingroup identification is ingroup positivity, or positive feelings about the ingroup and fellow ingroup members. There is even ample evidence that positive affect and positive evaluation are activated automatically by an ingroup label or whenever a group (even a minimal group) is associated with the self (Farnham, Greenwald, & Banaji, 1999; Otten, 2002; Perdue, Dovidio, Gurtman, & Tyler, 1990; Rudman, Greenwald, & McGhee, 2001).

This idea that ingroups are inevitably positively regarded accords with the concept of "ethnocentrism" as introduced by Sumner (1906) several decades earlier. Ethnocentrism was described by Sumner as a universal characteristic of human social groups whereby

a differentiation arises between ourselves, the we-group, or ingroup, and everybody else, or the others-group, outgroups. The insiders in a we-group are in a relation of peace, order, law, government, and industry, to each other. . . . Ethnocentrism is the technical name for this view of things in which one's own group is the center of everything, and all others are scaled and rated with reference to it. . . . Each group nourishes its own pride and vanity, boasts itself superior, exalts its own divinities, and looks with contempt on outsiders. . . . (Sumner, 1906, pp. 12–13)

This does not mean, however, that ingroup evaluations are indiscriminantly positive on all dimensions of assessment. When there is objective evidence of outgroup achievement or a consensual status hierarchy in which the outgroup is recognized to be of higher status than the ingroup, then some degree of outgroup positivity (relative to the ingroup) is frequently obtained (Jost, 2001). However, ingroup positivity is consistently found on traits or attributes that are self-defining or self-relevant (Otten, 2002) and on traits reflecting basic moral values (e.g., warmth, trustworthiness, cooperativeness) (Leach, Ellemers, & Barreto, 2007). On these basic value dimensions, ingroup positivity appears to be essentially universal (Brewer, 2001; LeVine & Campbell, 1972).

Motives Underlying Ingroup Attachment and Positivity

Self-Esteem

The motivational concept most associated with social identity theory is that of self-esteem enhancement. To the extent that individuals identify with a social group, they derive benefit from their group's successes and achievements, even when the individual has not contributed directly to the group's accomplishment.

Thus, ingroup status and achievements become a source of self-esteem that goes beyond what can be achieved by the individual alone. This is the basis for the social identity theory idea that group members are motivated to seek *positive distinctiveness* in comparing their ingroups to outgroups (Turner, 1975). However, it is not clear from the social identity literature whether positive self-esteem was being invoked as a motive for social identity itself or as a motive for ingroup favoritism *given that* social identity had been engaged. Whatever the original intent, subsequent research on the role of self-esteem in ingroup bias has generally supported the idea that enhanced self-esteem may be a *consequence* of achieving a positively distinct social identity, but there is little evidence that the need to increase self-esteem motivates social identification in the first place (Rubin & Hewstone, 1998). To the contrary, there is considerable evidence that individuals often identify strongly with groups that are disadvantaged, stigmatized, or otherwise suffer from negative intergroup comparison (e.g., Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999; Crocker, Luhtanen, Blaine, & Broadnax, 1994; Jetten, Branscombe, Schmitt, & Spears, 2001; Turner, Hogg, Turner, & Smith, 1984). Some experimental research indicates that social identification with a group may actually be increased when the group is threatened or stigmatized (Jetten, Branscombe, Schmitt, & Spears, 2001; Turner et al., 1984).

Cognitive Motives: Uncertainty Reduction

Given the inadequacy of self-esteem as an explanation for why social identity is engaged, other motives have been proposed that do not require positive ingroup status as a basis for attachment to groups and self-definition as a group member. One proposal is that group identity meets fundamental needs for reducing uncertainty and achieving meaning and clarity in social contexts (Hogg & Abrams, 1993; Hogg & Mullin, 1999). In support of this hypothesis, Hogg and his colleagues (Grieve & Hogg, 1999; Mullin & Hogg, 1998) have generated compelling evidence that identification and ingroup bias are increased under conditions of high cognitive uncertainty and reduced or eliminated when uncertainty is low. And it is undoubtedly true that one function that group memberships and identities serve for individuals is that of providing self-definition and guidance for behavior in otherwise ambiguous social situations (Deaux, Reid, Mizrahi, & Cotting, 1999; Vignoles, Chryssochoou, & Breakwell, 2000). However, group identity is only one of many possible modes of reducing social uncertainty. Roles, values, laws, etc. serve a similar function without necessitating social identification processes. Thus, uncertainty reduction alone cannot account for the pervasiveness of group identification as a fundamental aspect of human life.

Security and Belonging

Uncertainty reduction as a theory of social identity places the explanation for group identification in a system of cognitive motives that includes needs for meaning, certainty, and structure. An alternative perspective is that the motivation for social identification arises from even more fundamental needs for security and safety. Consistent with this idea, Baumeister and Leary (1995) postulate a universal need for *belonging* as an aspect of human nature derived from our vulnerability as lone individuals who require connection with others to survive. But belonging alone cannot account for the selectivity of social identification, as any and all group memberships should satisfy the belonging motive. The theory of optimal distinctiveness (Brewer, 1991) thus postulates that the need for belonging and inclusion is paired with an opposing motive—the need for differentiation—that together regulate the individual's social identity and attachment to social groups.

The basic premise of the optimal distinctiveness model is that the two identity needs (inclusion/assimilation and differentiation/distinctiveness) are independent and work in opposition to motivate group identification. Optimal identities are those that satisfy the need for inclusion *within* the ingroup and simultaneously serve the need for differentiation through distinctions *between* the ingroup and outgroups.

In effect, optimal social identities involve *shared distinctiveness* (Stapel & Marx, 2007). Individuals will resist being identified with social categorizations that are either too inclusive or too differentiating but will define themselves in terms of social identities that are optimally distinctive. Equilibrium is maintained by correcting for deviations from optimality. A situation in which a person is overly individuated will excite the need for assimilation, motivating the person to adopt a more inclusive social identity. Conversely, situations that arouse feelings of overinclusion will activate the need for differentiation, resulting in a search for more exclusive or distinct identities.

Evidence for competing social motives comes from empirical demonstrations of efforts to achieve or restore group identification when these needs are not met. Results of experimental studies have shown that activation of the need for assimilation or the need for differentiation increases the importance of distinctive group memberships (Pickett, Silver, & Brewer, 2002), and any threat to inclusion enhances self-stereotyping on group-characteristic traits (Brewer & Pickett, 1999; Pickett, Bonner, & Coleman, 2002; Spears, Doosje, & Ellemers, 1997). Furthermore, assignment to distinctive minority group categories engages greater group identification and self-stereotyping than does membership in large, inclusive majority groups (Brewer & Weber, 1994; Leonardelli & Brewer, 2001; Simon & Hamilton, 1994). Thus, there is converging evidence that group attachment is regulated by motives for both inclusion and distinctiveness.

Also consistent with optimal distinctiveness theory, threats to group distinctiveness (e.g., too much similarity to outgroups or ambiguity of group boundaries) arouse concern about restoring ingroup boundaries and intergroup differentiation (Hornsey & Hogg, 1999; Jetten, Spears, & Manstead, 1998; Jetten, Spears, & Postmes, 2004; Roccas & Schwartz, 1993). Research on the ingroup overexclusion effect (Castano, Yzerbyt, Bourguignon, & Seron, 2002; Leyens & Yzerbyt, 1992; Yzerbyt, Leyens, & Bellour, 1995) demonstrates that group members tend to take more time and employ more stringent criteria when deciding whether someone is a potential ingroup member than when deciding whether the person is a potential outgroup member. This overexclusion effect is enhanced when distinctiveness motives have been aroused (Brewer & Pickett, 2002).

Ingroup Positivity and Outgroup Derogation

There is a widespread assumption in the social-psychological literature that high levels of social identification and ingroup positivity are associated with derogation and hostility toward outgroups. However, despite a common belief that ingroup positivity and outgroup derogation are reciprocally related, empirical research demonstrates little consistent relation between the two. Indeed, results from both laboratory experiments and field studies indicate that variations in ingroup positivity and social identification do not systematically correlate with degree of bias or negativity toward outgroups (Brewer, 1979; Hinkle & Brown, 1990; Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989; Struch & Schwartz, 1989).

Experiments with the minimal intergroup situation also provided additional evidence that ingroup favoritism is prior to, and not necessarily associated with, outgroup negativity or hostility. Brewer (1979) reported that most minimal group studies that assessed ratings of the ingroup and outgroup separately found that categorization into groups leads to enhanced ingroup ratings in the absence of decreased outgroup ratings. Furthermore, the ingroup favoritism that is exhibited in the allocation of positive resources in the minimal intergroup situation (Tajfel et al., 1971) is essentially eliminated when allocation decisions involve the distribution of negative outcomes or costs (e.g., Mummendey et al., 1992), suggesting that individuals are willing to differentially benefit the ingroup compared to outgroups but are reluctant to harm outgroups more directly.

Subsequent research in both laboratory and field settings has come to acknowledge the important distinction between ingroup bias that reflects beneficence and positive sentiments toward the ingroup

that are withheld from outgroups (subtle prejudice) and discrimination that reflects hostility, derogation, and intent to harm the outgroup (blatant prejudice; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). This is not to say that ingroup-based discrimination is benign or inconsequential. Indeed, many forms of institutional racism and sexism are probably attributable to discrimination based on ingroup preference rather than prejudice against outgroups (Brewer, 1996). Nonetheless, the absence of positive regard and the lack of trust for outgroups that are characteristic of most ingroup-outgroup differentiation can be conceptually and empirically distinguished from the presence of active hostility, distrust, and hate for outgroups that characterize virulent prejudice. Thus, ingroup identity alone is not sufficient to predict attitudes and behavior toward outgroups, and we must look beyond social identity theory to account for intergroup hostility and conflict.

Theories of Intergroup Conflict

Traditional Theories: Realistic Group Conflict and Relative Deprivation

Traditional theories of intergroup relations trace hostility and conflict with outgroups to the nature of the structural relations between group interests. Realistic group conflict theory (LeVine & Campbell, 1972, Chapter 3) posits that conflict derives from competition between groups for material resources and power. Within social psychology one of the most influential proponents of realistic group conflict theory was Sherif (e.g., Sherif, 1966). In a famous series of field experiments conducted in the context of a boys' summer camp (known as the Robber's Cave experiments), he and his colleagues showed how the behavior of a group of strangers could be predictably transformed by first dividing them into groups and then arranging for those groups to compete with one another for valued resources (Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, & Sherif, 1961). During and after competition, the boys exhibited hostile intergroup behavior and showed marked ingroup favoritism in friendship choices and judgments. Consistent with the conflict of interests approach, when the researchers changed the structural arrangements so that the groups were placed in a series of cooperative encounters (in which group interests were compatible and interdependent), the intergroup behavior became more amicable and the favoritism declined.

Subsequent research largely confirmed these basic findings. In laboratory studies when the interdependence between groups is experimentally controlled to be either negative, neutral, or positive, the results are quite consistent: There is usually more ingroup bias, less intergroup liking, and greater intergroup discrimination when groups are objectively in competition than when they are independent or must cooperate over some common goal (e.g. Kahn & Ryen, 1972; Rabbie & Wilkins, 1971; Rabbie, Benoist, Oosterbaan, & Visser, 1974; Worchel, Andreoli, & Folger, 1977). In field settings, a similar correspondence between objective or perceived goal relationships linking groups and intergroup attitudes has been observed. Evaluative or affective judgments of outgroups are generally correlated with perceptions of groups being positively or negatively interdependent (Brown & Abrams, 1986; Esses, Jackson, & Armstrong, 1998; Struch & Schwartz, 1989).

Realistic group conflict theory provides a powerful explanation for many instances of intergroup discrimination and conflict. Moreover, it has the advantage of being able to account for changes in levels of prejudice over time or across different social contexts reflecting changing economic and political relations between the groups concerned. Nevertheless, there are, as Turner (1981) has noted, a number of empirical and theoretical difficulties with the perspective. First, functional interdependence per se may not be sufficient to determine intergroup behavior unless some degree of ingroup identification is also present. Consistent with this conclusion, Struch and Schwartz (1989) found that the correlation between perceived

conflicts of interests among religious groups in Israel and levels of intergroup hostility were higher for those respondents who identified strongly with their religious ingroup than it was for those who identified less strongly.

A more serious issue in realistic group conflict theory concerns whether the negative interdependence that it assumes to underlie hostilities need always be based on real conflicts over concrete things such as land, money, or political power. It could derive from perceived conflicts or competition over some rather less tangible assets such as prestige or "to be the winner." Sherif (1966) was deliberately vague on this point, defining group interests as "a real or imagined threat to the safety of the group, an economic interest, a political advantage, a military consideration, prestige, or a number of others" (p. 15). Allowing perceived conflicts to have causal status similar to actual conflicts poses a theoretical problem. If perceptions of competing goals can underlie intergroup hostility and if such perceptions are not always correlated with the groups' actual material interests, where do they come from? Apart from actual structural relations between groups, there may be additional social-psychological origins for subjective competitive orientations and perceived threats from outgroups.

Realistic Conflict Updated: Integrated Threat Theory

A more recent approach to conceptualizing how perceptions of ingroup-outgroup relations may lead to outgroup negativity is integrated threat theory (Stephan & Stephan, 2000). This model distinguishes four different sources of experienced threat from a specific outgroup: *realistic threats* (threats to the existence, power, or material well-being of the ingroup or ingroup members), *symbolic threats* (threats to the ingroup world view arising from perceived group differences in morals, values, and standards), *intergroup anxiety* (personal fear or discomfort experienced in connection with actual or anticipated interactions with members of the outgroup), and *negative stereotypes* (beliefs about outgroup characteristics that imply unpleasant or conflictual interactions and negative consequences for the self or the ingroup). Field tests of this model have found that ratings of realistic threat, symbolic threat, and intergroup anxiety are significant predictors of negative interracial attitudes and that these threat perceptions mediate the effects of other predictor variables such as ingroup identification, intergroup contact, and status differences (Riek, Mania, & Gaertner, 2006; Stephan et al., 2002).

The nature of symbolic threat is of particular interest because of the role that symbolic threats to group identity apparently play in many intractable intergroup conflicts (Bar-Tal, 2007; Rouhana & Bar-Tal, 1998). Concerns for symbolic threats to group values and icons or lack of respect and recognition are often conceptualized as the subjective, "irrational" bases of intergroup hostility and fear, posed in opposition to concerns for objective, "realistic" threats to material welfare and group existence. But objective assessments of conflict of interest and subjective perceptions of identity threat are inextricably intertwined. Especially in the modern world, competition over resources (e.g., land, power) has as much to do with the identity meaning of those resources as it does actual group survival (e.g., Ledgerwood, Liviatan, & Carnevale, 2007). Many intractable conflicts are characterized by conceptualizations of group identity in which the identities of the groups involved become oppositional, such that a key component of each group's identity is based on negation of the other (Kelman, 1999). The role of such symbolic identity concerns in sustaining intractable conflicts is of particular importance because the costs of extensive and protracted conflict in terms of material resources and human lives defy rational choice theories of group behavior. Members of both groups generally recognize that they would be collectively better off if the conflicts were resolved. Yet deeply held identity concerns stand as a barrier to negotiated resolution (Kelman, 1999, 2001).

Intergroup Comparison, Relative Deprivation, and Social Change

The social identity theory approach to understanding intergroup relations places particular attention on comparisons between the status and outcomes of the ingroup and those of relevant outgroups. Considerable research on social justice supports the idea that individuals' feelings of being deprived or disadvantaged are based on the comparisons they make rather than the absolute value of their own condition. Feelings of resentment and the sense of injustice that arises from perceiving that you have less than what you deserve compared to others are called *relative deprivation*.

The concept of relative deprivation was developed by social scientists during World War II to explain some paradoxical findings that emerged in the study of morale among American soldiers (Stouffer, Suchman, DeVinney, Stat, & Williams, 1949). Researchers found, for instance, that soldiers in air force units, in which rates of promotion were quite high, had more complaints about the promotion system than did soldiers in the military police, where promotions were few and far between. Equally surprising, they found that black soldiers who were stationed in southern states in the United States (where overt discrimination based on race was very visible) had higher morale than black soldiers stationed in the less racist northern states. Stouffer and his colleagues explained these anomalous results in terms of different standards of comparison being used by soldiers in different units. Compared to peers who were advancing at a rapid rate, air force soldiers who had not yet been promoted felt deprived, even though their objective chances of promotion were higher than those of soldiers in other units. Similarly, the high morale of black soldiers stationed in the South may have derived from comparisons with black civilians who fared very poorly; black soldiers in the North, on the other hand, may have felt deprived relative to civilian blacks in that region who were earning higher wages in war-related factory jobs.

Parallel to relative deprivation at the personal level is what Runciman (1966) called *fraternal deprivation*. Fraternal deprivation arises from comparisons between the outcomes of your ingroup as a whole and those of more advantaged groups. Whereas personal deprivation depends on interpersonal comparisons with similar others, fraternal deprivation involves intergroup comparisons between dissimilar groups and becomes a source of resentment and potential conflict with groups perceived as being unjustly more advantaged than the ingroup.

Relative deprivation may be experienced even by those who are objectively advantaged but feel they are losing by comparison to previous expectations. This principle was dramatically illustrated by behavior of young members of the upper castes of India in a series of incidents in 1990. During one period that year, scores of middle-class youths (members of the Brahmin, Kshatriya, and Vaishya castes) committed suicide in protest against government policies that open more jobs to the poor. By any objective standards, the upper castes were doing quite well, even in the presence of government economic reforms designed to benefit the disadvantaged castes. Yet the perception that their own caste was losing position relative to the lower castes created a sense of comparative disadvantage that was sufficient to motivate dramatic protest against the reforms.

Perceptions of unjust ingroup deprivation can spur collective action on the part of disadvantaged group members to improve the status and outcomes of the ingroup. Theories of social identity, social comparison, and relative deprivation all suggest that members of lower-status groups will be discontented with the resources and valuation attached to their collective identity and will be motivated toward social change. Yet it seems to take a great deal more than perceived discrepancies and status differentials to mobilize collective action.

In reviewing the options available to members of low-status social categories to achieve positive distinctiveness, Tajfel and Turner (1986) distinguished three different avenues of responding to negative social identity, each with different implications for collective movements:

1. *Individual mobility.* With this option, individuals dissociate themselves from the lower-status ingroup and seek identification with the higher-status outgroup. This route to achieving positive social identity is most likely in social systems characterized by permeability of group boundaries and high opportunity for upward social mobility.
2. *Social creativity.* Group members may achieve positive distinctiveness by redefining the bases of intergroup comparison, choosing new dimensions on which the ingroup can be assigned higher values than relevant outgroups or changing the valuation attached to existing comparisons. The "Black is beautiful" movement in the United States is an example of this latter strategy. This option essentially leaves the social relationships between groups unchanged but alters the implications for group self-esteem.
3. *Social competition.* Finally, low-status group members may seek to change the structure of intergroup dominance and status differentials by engaging in direct competition with higher-status outgroups. It is only under this condition that perceptions of relative deprivation will lead to intergroup conflict.

Tajfel and Turner (1986) distinguish three different aspects of the status relationships among groups that determine what mode of adaptation disadvantaged group members are likely to pursue. These are the perceived *permeability* of group boundaries and the perceived stability and *legitimacy* of the status differences between groups. Permeability refers to the extent to which group members can expect to be able to move from one group to another, or shift their social identity, on an individual basis. According to social identity theory, under conditions of high permeability, members of lower-status groups will tend to prefer membership in the higher-status outgroup and seek social mobility as a strategy for improving positive social identity (van Knippenberg & Ellemers, 1990). Experimental studies have confirmed that manipulations of perceived permeability interact with group status to affect ingroup identification. Members of low-status groups express more dissatisfaction with their group membership and less ingroup preference when group boundaries are permeable rather than impermeable (Ellemers, van Knippenberg, de Vries, & Wilke, 1988). However, when individuals could potentially change their group affiliation (high permeability), members of high-status groups increase their commitment to their current group membership. Under the risk of losing their attractive group membership, members of permeable high-status groups express significantly stronger ingroup identification than when group membership is fixed (Ellemers, Doosje, van Knippenberg, & Wilke, 1992).

Permeability creates instability of group membership but does not necessarily alter the status relationships between the groups as a whole. More important for social identity is the perceived stability or security of the status or dominance hierarchy itself (Sidanius, 1993; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; van Knippenberg & Ellemers, 1993). When status differentials are perceived to be unstable or illegitimate, members of lower status groups exhibit significantly stronger ingroup identification than when status relationships are stable (Caddick, 1982; Ellemers, van Knippenberg, & Wilke, 1990). Although perceived injustice at the personal level often motivates individuals to dissociate from low-status ingroups, perceived collective injustice enhances group identification and efforts to improve the status position of the group as a whole (Ellemers, Wilke, & van Knippenberg, 1993; Taylor, Moghaddam, Gamble, & Zellerer, 1987; Wright, Taylor, & Moghaddam, 1990).

At the same time, perceived instability of the status hierarchy threatens the positive distinctiveness of high-status groups. In experiments manipulating both group size and group status, discrimination in intergroup allocations is particularly high for minority high-status groups (Mullen, Brown, & Smith, 1992). Sachdev and Bourhis (1991) argue that this is because when the dominant group is in the minority, the status structure is inherently more unstable than when the majority is dominant. Secure status differentials

may reduce the salience of intergroup comparisons and discrimination, but insecurity heightens the motivation to maintain status distinctions on the part of high-status group members. Thus, conditions of social change increase the motivation for intergroup conflict, distrust, and heightened discrimination for groups in all positions of the status hierarchy.

Intergroup Emotions Theory

The general idea that intergroup attitudes are shaped by the perceived relationship between the ingroup and outgroup (in particular, whether the existence of the outgroup poses a threat to the ingroup) is consistent with recent theories of prejudice as intergroup emotion (Smith, 1993). Emotional reactions to a particular outgroup can include positive emotions (e.g., admiration, respect) as well as a range of negative emotions (e.g., fear, disgust, anxiety, and hate). In Dijker's (1987) examination of the relation between emotions and attitudes toward two minority groups in the Netherlands, although both types of emotion predicted evaluation of the outgroups, positive emotions were more predictive of attitudes toward one group and negative emotions were more predictive of attitudes toward the other. Similarly, in an investigation of the relationship between positive and negative emotional responses toward seven minority groups in the United States, both types of emotion predicted prejudice toward these groups (Stangor, Sullivan, & Ford, 1991, Study 1).

In addition to distinguishing between positive and negative emotions as components of intergroup attitudes, researchers have begun to recognize the importance of distinguishing among different types of negative emotions in intergroup contexts. Distinct emotions reflect different underlying causes and lead to different types of behavior. Smith (1993) has suggested that five specific emotions are most likely to be aroused in intergroup situations: fear, disgust, contempt, anger, and jealousy. Of these, fear and disgust can be distinguished as emotions that imply avoidance or movement away from the outgroup, whereas contempt and anger imply movement against the outgroup (although fear can also elicit the attack response if the perceiver feels trapped or cornered and unable to effectively flee the source of fear). Attitudes that are driven by the former emotional states are likely to have different cognitive contents and behavioral implications than attitudes that are associated with the latter forms of emotion.

Mackie, Devos, and Smith (2000) demonstrated, across three empirical studies, that (a) for groups that are defined by a basic value conflict, anger and fear can be differentiated as distinct negative emotional responses to the outgroup; (b) appraisals of relative ingroup strength determine the degree of reported anger toward the outgroup; and (c) the level of felt anger mediates the relationship between strength appraisals and participants' desire to confront, oppose, or attack members of the outgroup. Based on these findings, Mackie et al. concluded that intergroup attitudes and behavior are channeled by the specific emotions that are elicited in response to appraisals of a particular outgroup in relation to the ingroup.

According to appraisal theories of emotion, the type of emotion directed toward outgroups may be a function of the degree of conflict of interest that is perceived to exist between the outgroup and the ingroup. When the perceived conflict or threat is relatively low, negative emotions toward outgroups are likely to be associated with appraisals of status and legitimacy. The perception that the outgroup is different from the ingroup in ways that are devalued or illegitimate gives rise to feelings of moral superiority, intolerance, and concomitant emotions of contempt and disgust toward relevant outgroups. The emotions associated with moral superiority may justify some negative discrimination against outgroups but do not necessarily lead directly to hostility or conflict. The emotions of contempt and disgust are associated with avoidance rather than attack, so intergroup peace may be maintained through segregation and mutual avoidance. As perceived conflict increases, avoidant emotions such as anxiety and disgust may be replaced by emotions such as anger, which instigate active hostility and aggression. Thus, the nature of the appraisal

of the intergroup situation and the specific emotion that is engaged determine whether outgroup negativity gives rise to intergroup conflict.

Changing Intergroup Relations: Cooperative Contact

Whether realistic or perceived, the idea that an outgroup constitutes a threat to the welfare, values, or position of the ingroup is the primary basis of intergroup negativity and hostility. From that perspective, the route to improved intergroup relations lies in changing the perception of the outgroup vis-à-vis the ingroup. Ever since Sherif's classic Robber's Cave experiments, social psychologists have advocated cooperative intergroup contact as an effective strategy for improving intergroup relations. The key idea behind the "contact hypothesis" (Allport, 1954) is that isolation and segregation perpetuate intergroup hostility and negative attitudes. Interpersonal contact with members of the outgroup provides an opportunity for disconfirming negative expectations and building positive relations that can influence attitudes toward the outgroup as a whole.

Of course, mere contact between members of hostile groups does not always have such benign or positive outcomes. For contact to be an effective means of improving intergroup relations, at least two requirements have to be met. First, the contact must occur under conditions that reduce intergroup anxiety and promote positive interpersonal experiences (Voci & Hewstone, 2003). Second, group membership must be sufficiently salient in the contact situation so that the positive experience generalizes to the group as a whole (Brown, Vivian, & Hewstone, 1999; Ensari & Miller, 2002; Hewstone & Brown, 1986).

To meet the first requirement, the original contact hypothesis was qualified to include a number of preconditions for positive contact. According to Allport (1954), the four most important of these qualifying conditions were (a) integration has the support of authority, fostering *social norms* that favor intergroup acceptance; (b) the situation has high "acquaintance potential," promoting *intimate contact* among members of both groups; (c) the contact situation promotes *equal status* interactions among members of the social groups; and (d) the situation creates conditions of *cooperative interdependence* among members of both groups. Of these qualifiers, personalized contact and cooperation have received the most attention in both field and laboratory research (Pettigrew, 1998).

From Robbers Cave onward, many field studies of intergroup contact have confirmed that intergroup cooperation leads to more friendliness and less ingroup bias than situations that do not promote or require cooperative interaction. Probably the most extensive application of the contact hypothesis has been the implementation of cooperative learning programs in desegregated school classrooms. There is a sizable body of evidence that demonstrates the effectiveness of cooperative learning groups for increasing attraction and interaction between members of different social categories (Aronson et al., 1978; Johnson & Johnson, 1981; Slavin, 1985). Meta-analyses of studies in ethnically mixed classrooms confirm the superiority of cooperative learning methods over individualistic or competitive learning in promoting cross-ethnic friendships and reduced prejudice (Johnson, Johnson, & Maruyama, 1984).

Issues of Generalization

One concern about the validity of the contact hypothesis is whether findings obtained under relatively benign conditions can be generalized to real-world social groups with a history of conflict and hostility, inequalities of status and power, and political struggle. With established groups, resistance to contact and cooperative interdependence may be strong enough to make questions of the conditions of contact moot,

and the history of outcomes of forced desegregation and contact is mixed at best (e.g., Cook, 1985; Gerard, 1983; Gerard & Miller, 1975; Stephan, 1986).

Another issue is whether any positive effects of contact, when they do occur, are generalized from the immediate contact experience to attitudes toward the outgroup as a whole. Many laboratory experiments on contact effects are limited in that they assess only attitudes toward ingroup and outgroup participants within the contact setting. Presumably, however, the ultimate goal of contact interventions is reduction of prejudice toward whole social groups, not simply creation of positive attitudes toward specific group members, so promoting generalization may be as important as conditions of the contact itself.

In what is probably the most comprehensive laboratory test of interracial contact effects, Cook (1971, 1984) conducted a series of experiments in which highly prejudiced White subjects worked with a Black confederate in an ideal contact situation (equal status, cooperative interdependence, with high acquaintance potential and equalitarian social norms) over an extended period of time. Perceptions of the Black co-worker were measured at the completion of the contact experience, and general racial attitudes were assessed before, immediately after, and up to three years following the experimental sessions. Across all variations of this experiment, White participants displayed predominantly positive behaviors toward their Black co-worker and expressed highly favorable evaluations in the postexperimental questionnaires. Whether liking for this individual member of the outgroup resulted in changed attitudes toward Blacks and race-related issues, however, varied across the experiments and for different attitude measures.

One major reason why generalization fails is that the newly positively valued outgroup member is regarded as an exception and not as typical or representative of the outgroup in general (Allport, 1954; Rothbart & John, 1985; Wilder, 1984). In Cook's (1971, 1984) studies, significant differences in postcontact attitude change among those who participated in the contact experience compared to control subjects were obtained only in an initial experiment in which what Cook (1984) referred to as a "cognitive booster" was introduced during the course of the experiment. This added element was a guided conversation (led by a research confederate) in which the negative effects of discriminatory policies and practices were directly connected to the now-liked Black co-worker. This booster served to make salient the co-worker's category membership and to establish a link between feelings toward this individual and members of the group as a whole. In a later, conceptually related experiment, van Oudenhoven, Groenewoud, and Hewstone (1996) found that Dutch students' evaluations of Turkish people in general were more positive after an episode of cooperative interaction with an individual Turkish person when his ethnicity was explicitly mentioned during the cooperative session than when ethnicity remained implicit only. Again, the explicit linkage appears to be a necessary mechanism for generalized contact effects.

Results from a recent meta-analysis of data from years of contact research suggests that, overall, positive contact experiences do generalize to intergroup attitudes (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Collapsing findings across a wide range of field and laboratory studies with different types of groups, the average effect of contact on measures of prejudice toward the outgroup proved to be significant—more contact and less prejudice. Furthermore, consistent with the tenets of the qualified contact hypothesis, contact in the form of interpersonal friendships proved to have a greater effect on average than contact in less personalized contexts (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Thus, contact does seem to have a robust prejudice-reducing effect overall, despite considerable variation in its effects under specific circumstances.

Theoretical Underpinnings of Contact Effects

Although it is encouraging to learn that the effects of contact on intergroup attitudes are more likely to be positive than negative, this result does not indicate how to manage contact situations to ensure such beneficial outcomes. In his review of the current status of contact research, Pettigrew (1998) suggested that the

challenge is to distinguish between factors that are *essential* to the processes underlying positive contact experiences and their generalization and those that merely *facilitate* (or inhibit) the operation of these processes. To make this distinction, contact researchers needed a more elaborate theory of what the underlying processes are and how they mediate the effects of intergroup contact under different conditions. One advance toward a more integrative theory of intergroup relations was achieved when contact research was combined with concepts of social categorization and social identity theory to provide a theoretical framework for understanding the cognitive mechanisms by which cooperative contact is presumed to work (see Brewer & Miller, 1984; Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Gaertner, Mann, Murrell, & Dovidio, 1989; Hewstone, 1996; Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Wilder, 1986).

Based on the premises of social identity theory, three alternative models for contact effects have been developed and tested in experimental and field settings, namely, decategorization, recategorization, and mutual differentiation. The first two models seek to change attitudes and perceptions by altering the salience of ingroup-outgroup social categorization in the contact situation. The third model addresses how intergroup attitudes can be changed while ingroup-outgroup differentiation remains salient.

Decategorization: The Personalization Model

The first model is essentially a formalization and elaboration of the assumptions implicit in the contact hypothesis itself (Brewer & Miller, 1984; Miller 2002). A primary consequence of salient ingroup-outgroup categorization is the deindividuation of members of the outgroup. The personalization perspective on the contact situation implies that intergroup interactions should be structured so as to reduce the salience of category distinctions and promote opportunities to get to know outgroup members as individual persons. Attending to personal characteristics of group members not only provides the opportunity to disconfirm category stereotypes, it also breaks down the monolithic perception of the outgroup as a homogeneous unit (Wilder, 1978). In this scheme, the contact situation encourages attention to information at the individual level that replaces category identity as the most useful basis for classifying participants.

Repeated personalized contacts with a variety of outgroup members should, over time, undermine the value and meaningfulness of the social category stereotype as a source of information about members of that group. This is the process by which contact experiences are expected to generalize—via reducing the salience and meaning of social categorization in the long run (Brewer & Miller, 1988).

A number of experimental studies provide evidence supporting this perspective on contact effects (Bettencourt, Brewer, Croak, & Miller, 1992; Marcus-Newhall, Miller, Holtz, & Brewer, 1993). Miller, Brewer, and Edwards (1985), for instance, demonstrated that a cooperative task that required personalized interaction with members of the outgroup resulted not only in more positive attitudes toward outgroup members in the cooperative setting but also toward other outgroup members shown on a videotape, compared to task-focused rather than person-focused cooperative contact.

The personalization model is also supported by early empirical evidence for the effects of extended, intimate contact on racial attitudes. More recently, extensive data on effects of intergroup friendships have been derived from surveys in Western Europe regarding attitudes toward minority immigrant groups (Hamberger & Hewstone, 1997; Pettigrew, 1997; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). Across samples in France, Great Britain, the Netherlands, and Germany, Europeans with outgroup friends scored significantly lower on measures of prejudice, particularly affective prejudice (Pettigrew, 1998). This positive relationship did not hold for other types of contact (work or residential) that did not involve formation of close personal relationships with members of the outgroup. Although there is clearly a bidirectional relationship between positive attitudes and extent of personal contact, path analyses indicate that the path from friendship to reduction in prejudice is stronger than the other way around (Pettigrew, 1998).

Recategorization: The Common Ingroup Identity Model

The second social categorization model of intergroup contact and prejudice reduction is also based on the premise that reducing the salience of ingroup-outgroup category distinctions is the key to positive effects. In contrast to the decategorization approaches previously described, recategorization is not designed to reduce or eliminate categorization but rather to create group categorization at a higher level of category inclusiveness. Specifically, the "common ingroup identity model" (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachman, & Rust, 1993) proposes that intergroup bias and conflict can be reduced by factors that transform participants' representations of memberships from two groups to one more inclusive group. With common ingroup identity, the cognitive and motivational processes that initially produced ingroup favoritism are redirected to benefit the former outgroup members.

Among the antecedent factors proposed by the common ingroup identity model are the features of contact situations (Allport, 1954) that are necessary for intergroup contact to be successful (e.g., interdependence between groups, equal status, equalitarian norms). From this perspective, cooperative interaction, for example, enhances positive evaluations of outgroup members, at least in part, because cooperation transforms members' representations of the memberships from "us" and "them" to a more inclusive "we." To test this hypothesis directly, Gaertner, Mann, Dovidio, Murrell, and Pomare (1990) conducted a laboratory experiment that brought two 3-person laboratory groups together under conditions designed to vary independently the members' representations of the aggregate as one group or two groups (by varying factors such as seating arrangement) and the presence or absence of intergroup cooperative interaction. Supportive of the hypothesis, the introduction of cooperative interaction increased participants' perceptions of one group and also reduced their bias in evaluative ratings relative to those who did not cooperate during the contact period. In further support for the common ingroup identity model, this effect of cooperation was mediated by the extent to which members of both groups perceived themselves as one group.

Outside of the laboratory, survey studies conducted in natural settings across very different intergroup contexts offered converging support for the proposal that the features specified by the contact hypothesis can increase intergroup harmony in part by transforming members' representations of the memberships from separate groups to one more inclusive group (Gaertner, Dovidio, & Bachman, 1996; Gaertner, Rust, Dovidio, Bachman, & Anastasio, 1994; Gaertner et al., 2000).

Challenges to the Decategorization/Recategorization Models

Although the structural representations of the contact situation advocated by the decategorization (personalization) and recategorization (common ingroup identity) models are different, the two approaches share common assumptions about the need to reduce category differentiation and associated processes. Because both models rely on reducing or eliminating the salience of intergroup differentiation, they involve structuring contact in a way that will challenge or threaten existing social identities. Both cognitive and motivational factors conspire to create resistance to the dissolution of category boundaries or to reestablish category distinctions across time. Although the salience of a common superordinate identity or personalized representations may be enhanced in the short run, these may be difficult to maintain across time and social situations.

Pre-existing social-structural relationships between groups may also create strong forces of resistance to changes in category boundaries. Cognitive restructuring may be close to impossible (at least as a first step) for groups already engaged in deadly hostilities. Even in the absence of overt conflict, asymmetries between social groups in size, power, or status create additional sources of resistance. When one group is substantially numerically smaller than the other in the contact situation, the minority category is especially salient, and minority group members may be particularly reluctant to accept a superordinate category

identity that is dominated by the other group. Another major challenge is created by preexisting status differences between groups, in which members of both high- and low-status groups may be threatened by contact and assimilation (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000a; Riek, Mania, & Gaertner, 2006).

The Mutual Differentiation Model

These challenges to processes of decategorization and recategorization led Hewstone and Brown (1986; Brown & Hewstone, 2005) to recommend an alternative approach to intergroup contact wherein cooperative interactions between groups are introduced without degrading the original ingroup-outgroup categorization. To promote positive intergroup experience, Hewstone and Brown recommended that the contact situation be structured so that members of the respective groups have distinct but complementary roles to contribute toward common goals. In this way, both groups can maintain positive distinctiveness within a cooperative framework. This strategy allows group members to maintain their social identities and positive distinctiveness while avoiding insidious intergroup comparisons. Thus, the intergroup contact model does not seek to change the basic category structure of the intergroup contact situation but to change the intergroup affect from negative to positive interdependence and evaluation.

Evidence in support of this approach comes from the results of an experiment by Brown and Wade (1987) in which work teams composed of students from two different faculties engaged in a cooperative effort to produce a two-page magazine article. When the representatives of the two groups were assigned separate roles in the team task (one group working on figures and layout and the other group working on text), the contact experience had a more positive effect on intergroup attitudes than when the two groups were not provided with distinctive roles (see also Deschamps & Brown, 1983; Dovidio, Gaertner, & Validzic, 1998).

Hewstone and Brown (1986) argued that generalization of positive contact experiences is more likely when the contact situation is defined as an *intergroup* situation rather than an interpersonal interaction. Generalization in this case is direct rather than requiring additional cognitive links between positive affect toward individuals and representations of the group as a whole. This position is supported by evidence that cooperative contact with a member of an outgroup leads to more favorable generalized attitudes toward the group as a whole when category membership is made salient during contact (e.g., Brown, Vivian, & Hewstone, 1999; Hewstone et al., 2005; van Oudenhoven, Groenewoud, & Hewstone, 1996).

Although ingroup-outgroup category salience is usually associated with ingroup bias and the negative side of intergroup attitudes, cooperative interdependence is assumed to override the negative intergroup schema, particularly if the two groups have differentiated, complementary roles to play. The affective component of the model, however, is potentially unstable. Salient intergroup boundaries are associated with mutual distrust (Insko & Schopler, 1987) and intergroup anxiety (Greenland & Brown, 1999; Islam & Hewstone, 1993), which undermine the potential for cooperative interdependence and mutual liking over any length of time. By reinforcing perceptions of group differences, the differentiation model risks reinforcing negative beliefs about the outgroup, and the potential for fission and conflict along group lines remains high.

Hybrid Models: An Integration of Approaches

As reviewed, each of the cognitive-structural models of intergroup contact and prejudice reduction has its weaknesses and limitations, particularly when we seek to generalize beyond small group interactions in laboratory settings. These criticisms have led a number of writers to suggest that some combination of all three models may be necessary to create conditions for long-term attitude change (e.g., Brewer & Gaertner,

2001; Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Gaertner et al., 2000; Hewstone, 1996; Pettigrew, 1998). More integrative models of intergroup contact take advantage of the fact that individuals are members of multiple social groups, which implies different social identities and ingroup loyalties.

Nested Dual Identities

In recent work regarding the development of a common ingroup identity, it has been proposed that embracing a more inclusive superordinate identity does not necessarily require each group to forsake its original group identity completely (Gaertner, Rust, Dovidio, Bachman, & Anastasio, 1994). Instead, group members may simultaneously perceive themselves as members of different groups but also as part of the same team or superordinate entity. For example, in a multiethnic high school, minority students who identified themselves in terms of both their ethnic group and their American identity (e.g., Korean American) had lower intergroup affective bias than minority students who identified themselves only in terms of their ethnicity. Dual identified students were also more likely to endorse the statement "Although there are different groups at school, it feels like we are playing on the same team" (Gaertner et al., 1994).

Other studies indicate that the intergroup benefits of a strong superordinate identity remain relatively stable even when the strength of the subordinate identity is equivalently high (Huo, Smith, Tyler, & Lind, 1996; Smith & Tyler, 1996). This suggests that identification with a more inclusive social group does not require individuals to deny their ethnic identity. In addition, a dual identity can also lead to even more positive outgroup attitudes than those associated with a superordinate identity alone (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000b). In terms of promoting more harmonious intergroup interactions, a dual identity capitalizes on the benefits of common ingroup membership as well those accrued from mutual differentiation between the groups.

On the other hand, dual identities are not always associated with positive relations between subgroups within the superordinate category. Mummendey and Wenzel (1999) make a convincing case that under some circumstances, making a shared superordinate category salient can lead to enhanced derogation of other subgroups when both subgroup and superordinate group identities are strong. This can happen if the values and attributes of the ingroup are projected onto the superordinate group, in which case subgroups that differ from these attributes come to be seen as *deviant* (rather than just "different") and a potential source of symbolic threat to the ingroup and the superordinate group. In studies of national groups in the European Union, Mummendey and Waldzus (2004) demonstrated that individuals who profess dual identification (strong national identity and European identity) also exhibit higher ingroup projection, which in turn is associated with negative attitudes toward other subgroup nations. Thus, ironically, nested dual identities may enhance rather than reduce ingroup bias and discrimination against other subgroups.

Cross-Cutting Identities

Nested categories at different levels of inclusiveness represent only one form of multiple ingroup identities. Individuals may also be members of social categories that overlap only partially, if at all. Many bases of social category differentiation—gender, age, religion, ethnicity, and occupation—represent cross-cutting cleavages. From the standpoint of a particular person, other individuals may be fellow ingroup members on one dimension of category differentiation but outgroup members on another. (For instance, for a woman business executive, a male colleague is an ingroup member with respect to occupation but an outgroup member with respect to her gender identification.) It is possible that such orthogonal social identities are kept isolated from each other so that only one ingroup-outgroup distinction is activated in a particular social context. But there are reasons to expect that simultaneous activation of multiple ingroup identities is possible and has the potential to reduce prejudice and discrimination based on any one category distinction.

Evidence from both anthropology (e.g., Gluckman, 1955) and political sociology (e.g., Coser, 1956) has long suggested that societies characterized by cross-cutting loyalty structures are less prone to schism and internal intergroup conflict than societies characterized by a single hierarchical loyalty structure. More recently, social psychologists have also begun to consider the implications of such multiple cross-cutting social identities for reduction of ingroup bias at the individual level (Brown & Turner, 1979; Deschamps & Doise, 1978; 1979; Marcus-Newhall et al., 1993; Roccas & Brewer, 2002; Vanbeselaere, 1991).

Experimental studies with both natural and artificial categories have demonstrated that adding a cross-cutting category distinction reduces ingroup bias and increases positive attitudes toward crossed category members compared to simple ingroup-outgroup differentiation (Vanbeselaere, 1991) or compared to situations in which category distinctions are convergent or superimposed (Bettencourt & Dorr, 1998; Marcus-Newhall et al., 1993; Rust, 1996). In these studies, cooperative interaction in the context of cross-cutting social identities and roles increases intracategory differentiation and reduces perceived intercategory differences, resulting in less category-based evaluations of individual group members. Furthermore, the benefits of cross-categorization may be enhanced when both category distinctions are embedded in a common superordinate group identity (Gaertner et al., 1999; Rust, 1996). Thus, crossed categorization and recategorization may work together to produce enhanced inclusiveness and reduced intergroup discrimination.

Intergroup Relations Today: Implications for Pluralistic Societies

The principles of social categorization, ingroup favoritism, and outgroup prejudice discussed in this chapter have important implications for promoting positive intergroup relations within a context in which groups must live together interdependently. The same basic principles apply whether we are considering departments or companies combined within an organization, diverse ethnic or religious groups within a nation, or nation-states within an international community. In any of these contexts, the goals of contact and cooperation compete with natural tendencies toward ingroup-outgroup differentiation, separation, and exclusion. Processes that reduce the social meaning of category boundaries and associated us-them distinctions are in tension with pluralistic values that seek to maintain cultural variation and distinct social identities. The tension between differentiation and integration must be recognized and acknowledged in any complex social system. Exclusive focus on either assimilation or separation as the solution to intergroup discrimination and conflict is neither desirable nor realistic (Verkuyten, 2006). New directions in the social psychology of intergroup relations involve putting the study of intergroup processes back into the context of the social and political systems within which they are embedded and the multiple social identities that characterize our complex social world.

References

- Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Ancok, D., & Chertkoff, J. M. (1983). Effects of group membership, relative performance, and self-interest on the division of outcomes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 1256-1262.
- Aronson, E., Blaney, N., Stephan, C., Sikes, J., & Snapp, M. (1978). *The jigsaw classroom*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Bar-Tal, D. (2007). Sociopsychological foundations of intractable conflicts. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50, 1430-1453.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497-529.
- Bettencourt, B. A., Brewer, M. B., Croak, M. R., & Miller, N. (1992). Cooperation and the reduction of intergroup bias: The role of reward structure and social orientation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 28, 301-319.
- Bettencourt, B. A., & Dorr, N. (1998). Cooperative interaction and intergroup bias: Effects of numerical representation and cross-cut role assignment. *Personality and Social Psychology*, 24, 1276-1293.
- Blanz, M., Mummendey, A., & Otten, S. (1997). Normative evaluations and frequency expectations regarding positive and negative outcome allocations between groups. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 27, 165-176.
- Branscombe, N. R., Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1999). The context and content of social identity threat. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity: Context, commitment, content* (pp. 35-58). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Brewer, M. B. (1979). Ingroup bias in the minimal intergroup situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 307-324.
- Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17, 475-482.
- Brewer, M. B. (1996). In-group favoritism: The subtle side of intergroup discrimination. In D. Messick & A. Tenbrunsel (Eds.), *Codes of conduct: Behavioral research into business ethics* (pp. 160-170). New York, NY: SAGE.
- Brewer, M. B. (2001). Ingroup identification and intergroup conflict: When does ingroup love become outgroup hate? In R. Ashmore, L. Jussim, & D. Wilder (Eds.), *Social identity, intergroup conflict, and conflict reduction* (pp. 17-41). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Brewer, M. B., & Campbell, D. T. (1976). *Ethnocentrism and intergroup attitudes: East African evidence*. New York, NY: Halsted.
- Brewer, M. B., & Gaertner, S. L. (2001). Toward reduction of prejudice: Intergroup contact and social categorization. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes* (pp. 451-472). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Brewer, M. B., & Kramer, R. M. (1986). Choice behavior in social dilemmas: Effects of social identity, group size, and decision framing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 543-549.
- Brewer, M., & Miller, N. (1984). Beyond the contact hypothesis: Theoretical perspectives on desegregation. In N. Miller & M. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 281-302). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Brewer, M. B., & Miller, N. (1988). Contact and cooperation: When do they work? In P. Katz & D. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Means and controversies* (pp. 315-326). New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Brewer, M. B., & Pickett, C. A. (1999). Distinctiveness motives as a source of the social self. In T. Tyler, R. Kramer, & O. John (Eds.), *The psychology of the social self* (pp. 71-87). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Brewer, M. B., & Pickett, C. L. (2002). The social self and group identification: Inclusion and distinctiveness motives in interpersonal and collective identities. In J. Forgas & K. Williams (Eds.), *The social self: Cognitive, interpersonal, and intergroup perspectives* (pp. 255-271). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Brewer, M. B., & Weber, J. G. (1994). Self-evaluation effects of interpersonal versus intergroup social comparison. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 268-275.
- Brown, R. J., & Abrams, D. (1986). The effects of intergroup similarity and goal interdependence on intergroup attitudes and task performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 22, 78-92.
- Brown, R. J., & Hewstone, M. (2005). An integrative theory of intergroup contact. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 37, pp. 256-343). New York, NY: Elsevier.
- Brown, R. J., & Turner, J. C. (1979). The criss-cross categorization effect in intergroup discrimination. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 18, 371-383.
- Brown, R. J., Vivian, J., & Hewstone, M. (1999). Changing attitudes through intergroup contact: The effects of group membership salience. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 741-764.

- Brown, R. J., & Wade, G. (1987). Superordinate goals and intergroup behaviour: The effect of role ambiguity and status on intergroup attitudes and task performance. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 17, 131-142.
- Caddick, B. (1982). Perceived illegitimacy and intergroup relations. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social identity and intergroup relations* (pp. 137-154). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Castano, E., Yzerbyt, V. Y., Bourguignon, D., & Seron, E. (2002). Who may come in? The impact of ingroup identification on ingroup-outgroup categorization. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 315-322.
- Cook, S. W. (1971). *The effect of unintended interracial contact upon racial interaction and attitude change* (Final report, Project no. 5-1320). Washington, DC: US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- Cook, S. W. (1984). Cooperative interaction in multiethnic contexts. In N. Miller & M. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 155-185). New York: Academic Press.
- Cook, S. W. (1985). Experimenting on social issues: The case of school desegregation. *American Psychologist*, 40, 452-460.
- Coser, L. A. (1956). *The functions of social conflict*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Crocker, J., Luhtanen, R., Blaine, B., & Broadnax, S. (1994). Collective self-esteem and psychological well-being among White, Black, and Asian college students. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 503-513.
- Deaux, K., Reid, A., Mizrahi, K., & Cotting, D. (1999). Connecting the person to the social: The functions of social identification. In T. Tyler, R. Kramer, & O. John (Eds.), *The psychology of the social self* (pp. 91-113). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Deschamps, J.-C., & Brown, R. J. (1983). Superordinate goals and intergroup conflict. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 189-195.
- Deschamps, J.-C., & Doise, W. (1978). Crossed category memberships in intergroup relations. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups* (pp. 141-158). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Diehl, M. (1990). The minimal group paradigm: Theoretical explanations and empirical findings. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 1, 263-292.
- Dijker, A. J. M. (1987). Emotional reaction to ethnic minorities. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 17, 305-325.
- Doise, W. (1978). *Groups and individuals: Explanations in social psychology*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Validzic, A. (1998). Intergroup bias: Status differentiation and a common ingroup identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 109-120.
- Ellemers, N., Doosje, B., van Knippenberg, A., & Wilke, H. (1992). Status protection in high status minority groups. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 123-140.
- Ellemers, N., van Knippenberg, A., de Vries, N., & Wilke, H. (1988). Social identification and permeability of group boundaries. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 18, 497-513.
- Ellemers, N., van Knippenberg, A., & Wilke, H. (1990). The influence of permeability of group boundaries and stability of group status on strategies of individual mobility and social change. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 233-246.
- Ellemers, N., Wilke, H., & van Knippenberg, A. (1993). Effects of the legitimacy of low group or individual status on individual and collective identity enhancement strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 766-778.
- Ensari, N., & Miller, N. (2002). The out-group must not be so bad after all: The effects of disclosure, typicality, and salience on intergroup bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 313-329.
- Esses, V. M., Jackson, L. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (1998). Intergroup competition and attitudes toward immigrants and immigration: An instrumental model of group conflict. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54, 699-724.
- Farnham, S. D., Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1999). Implicit self-esteem. In D. Abrams & M. Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity and social cognition* (pp. 230-248). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Anastasio, P. A., Bachman, B. A., & Rust, M. C. (1993). The Common Ingroup Identity Model: Recategorization and the reduction of intergroup bias. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 4, 1-26.
- Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., & Bachman, B. A. (1996). Revisiting the contact hypothesis: The induction of a common ingroup identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20, 271-290.
- Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Banker, B., Houlette, M., Johnson, K., & McGlynn, E. (2000). Reducing intergroup conflict: From superordinate goals to decategorization, recategorization, and mutual differentiation. *Group Dynamics*, 4, 98-114.
- Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Nier, J. A., Ward, C. M., & Banker, B. S. (1999). Across cultural divides: The value of a superordinate identity. In D. Prentice & D. Miller (Eds.), *Cultural divides: Understanding and overcoming group conflict* (pp. 173-212). New York, NY: SAGE.
- Gaertner, S. L., Mann, J. A., Dovidio, J. F., Murrell, A. J., & Pomare, M. (1990). How does cooperation reduce intergroup bias? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 692-704.
- Gaertner, S. L., Mann, J. A., Murrell, A. J., & Dovidio, J. F. (1989). Reduction of intergroup bias: The benefits of recategorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 239-249.
- Gaertner, S. L., Rust, M. C., Dovidio, J. F., Bachman, B. A., & Anastasio, A. (1994). The contact hypothesis: The role of a common ingroup identity on reducing intergroup bias. *Small Groups Research*, 25, 224-290.
- Gerard, H. B. (1983). School desegregation: The social science role. *American Psychologist*, 38, 869-887.
- Gerard, H. B., & Hoyt, M. (1974). Distinctiveness of social categorization and attitude toward in-group members. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 29, 836-842.
- Gerard, H. B., & Miller, N. (1975). *School desegregation: A long-term study*. New York, NY: Plenum.
- Gluckman, M. (1955). *Customs and conflict in Africa*. London, England: Blackwell.
- Greenland, K., & Brown, R. J. (1999). Categorization and intergroup anxiety in contact between British and Japanese nationals. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 503-521.
- Grieve, P. G., & Hogg, M. A. (1999). Subjective uncertainty and intergroup discrimination in the minimal group situation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 926-940.
- Hamberger, J., & Hewstone, M. (1997). Inter-ethnic contact as a predictor of prejudice: Tests of a model in four West European nations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 173-190.
- Hewstone, M. (1990). The "ultimate attribution error"? A review of the literature on intergroup causal attribution. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 20, 311-335.
- Hewstone, M. (1996). Contact and categorization: Social psychology interventions to change intergroup relations. In C. N. Macrae, C. Stangor, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Stereotypes and stereotyping* (pp. 323-368). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Hewstone, M., & Brown, R. J. (1986). Contact is not enough: An intergroup perspective on the "contact hypothesis." In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters* (pp. 1-44). Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- Hewstone, M., Cairns, Voci, A., Paolini, S., McLernon, F., Crisp, R., . . . Craig, J. (2005). Intergroup contact in a divided society: Challenging segregation in Northern Ireland. In D. Abrams, J. M. Marques, & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *The social psychology of inclusion and exclusion* (pp. 265-292). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Hinkle, S., & Brown, R. (1990). Intergroup comparisons and social identity: Some links and lacunae. In D. Abrams & M. Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity theory: Construction and critical advances* (pp. 48-70). London, England: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (1988). *Social identifications*. London, England: Routledge.
- Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (1993). Towards a single-process uncertainty-reduction model of social motivation in groups. In M. Hogg & D. Abrams (Eds.), *Group motivation: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 173-190). New York, NY: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Hogg, M. A., & Mullin, B.-A. (1999). Joining groups to reduce uncertainty: Subjective uncertainty reduction and group identification. In D. Abrams & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity and social cognition* (pp. 249-279). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

- Hogg, M. A., & Turner, J. C. (1987). Intergroup behaviour, self-stereotyping, and the salience of social categories. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 325-340.
- Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (1999). Subgroup differentiation as a response to an overly-inclusive group: A test of optimal distinctiveness theory. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 543-550.
- Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000a). Assimilation and diversity: An integrative model of subgroup relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4, 143-156.
- Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000b). Subgroup relations: A comparison of mutual intergroup differentiation and common ingroup identity models of prejudice reduction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 242-256.
- Huo, Y., Smith, H., Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1996). Superordinate identification, subgroup identification, and justice concerns: Is separatism the problem; is assimilation the answer? *Psychological Science*, 7, 40-45.
- Insko, C. A., & Schopler, J. (1987). Categorization, competition, and collectivity. In C. Hendrick (Ed.), *Group processes. Review of personality and social psychology* (Vol. 8, pp. 213-251). Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.
- Islam, M. R., & Hewstone, M. (1993). Dimensions of contact as predictors of intergroup anxiety, perceived outgroup variability and outgroup attitude: An integrative account. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19, 700-710.
- Jetten, J., Branscombe, N. R., Schmitt, M. T., & Spears, R. (2001). Rebels with a cause: Group identification as a response to perceived discrimination from the mainstream. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 1204-1213.
- Jetten, J., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1998). Intergroup similarity and group variability: The effects of group distinctiveness on the expression of in-group bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1481-1492.
- Jetten, J., Spears, R., & Postmes, T. (2004). Intergroup distinctiveness and differentiation: A meta-analytic integration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 862-879.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1981). Effects of cooperative and individualistic learning experiences on interethnic interaction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73, 444-449.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R., & Maruyama, G. (1984). Goal interdependence and interpersonal attraction in heterogeneous classrooms: A metaanalysis. In N. Miller & M. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 187-212). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Jost, J. T. (2001). Outgroup favoritism and the theory of system justification: An experimental paradigm for investigating the effects of socio-economic success on stereotype content. In G. Moskowitz (Ed.), *Cognitive social psychology: The Princeton symposium on the legacy and future of social cognition* (pp. 89-102). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kahn, A., & Ryen, A. (1972). Factors influencing the bias towards one's own group. *International Journal of Group Tensions*, 2, 33-50.
- Kelman, H. C. (1999). The interdependence of Israeli and Palestinian national identities: The role of the other in existential conflicts. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 581-600.
- Kelman, H. C. (2001). The role of national identity in conflict resolution. In R. D. Ashmore, L. Jussim, & D. Wilder (Eds.), *Social identity, intergroup conflict, and conflict reduction* (pp. 187-212). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kosterman, R., & Feshbach, S. (1989). Toward a measure of patriotic and nationalistic attitudes. *Political Psychology*, 10, 257-274.
- Leach, C. W., Ellemers, N., & Barreto, M. (2007). Group virtue: The importance of morality (vs. competence and sociability) in the positive evaluation of in-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 234-249.
- Ledgerwood, A., Liviatan, I., & Carnevale, P. (2007). Group-identity completion and the symbolic value of property. *Psychological Science*, 18, 873-878.
- Lemaine, G. (1974). Social differentiation and social originality. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 4, 17-52.
- Leonardelli, G., & Brewer, M. B. (2001). Minority and majority discrimination: When and why. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 468-485.
- LeVine, R. A., & Campbell, D. T. (1972). *Ethnocentrism: Theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes and group behavior*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Leyens, J.-P., & Yzerbyt, V. (1992). The ingroup overexclusion effect: Impact of valence and confirmation on stereotypical information search. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 549-569.
- Mackie, D. M., Devos, T., & Smith, E. R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 602-616.
- Marcus-Newhall, A., Miller, N., Holtz, R., & Brewer, M. B. (1993). Crosscutting category membership with role assignment: A means of reducing intergroup bias. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 125-146.
- Miller, D. T., Downs, J. S., & Prentice, D. A. (1998). Minimal conditions for the creation of a unit relationship: The social bond between birthday mates. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 475-481.
- Miller, N. (2002). Personalization and the promise of contact theory. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58, 387-410.
- Miller, N., Brewer, M. B., & Edwards, K. (1985). Cooperative interaction in desegregated settings: A laboratory analogue. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41(3), 63-79.
- Mullen, B., Brown, R., & Smith, C. (1992). In-group bias as a function of salience, relevance, and status: An integration. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 103-122.
- Mullin, B.-A., & Hogg, M. A. (1998). Dimensions of subjective uncertainty in social identification and minimal intergroup discrimination. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 37, 345-365.
- Mummendey, A., Simon, B., Dietze, C., Grunert, M., Haeger, G., Kessler, S., . . . Schäferhoff, S. (1992). Categorization is not enough: Intergroup discrimination in negative outcome allocations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 28, 125-144.
- Mummendey, A., & Walz, S. (2004). National differences and European plurality: Discrimination or tolerance between European countries. In R. Herrmann, T. Risse, & M. Brewer (Eds.), *Transnational identities: Becoming European in the EU* (pp. 59-72). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Mummendey, A., & Wenzel, M. (1999). Social discrimination and tolerance in intergroup relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3, 158-174.
- Ng, S. H. (1984). Equity and social categorization effects on intergroup allocation of rewards. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 23, 165-172.
- Otten, S. (2002). I am positive and so are we: The self as determinant of favoritism toward novel ingroups. In J. Forgas & K. Williams (Eds.), *The social self: Cognitive, interpersonal, and intergroup processes* (pp. 273-291). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Otten, S., & Moskowitz, G. B. (2000). Evidence for implicit evaluative in-group bias: Affect-biased spontaneous trait inference in a minimal group paradigm. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 36, 77-89.
- Otten, S., & Wentura, D. (1999). About the impact of automaticity in the minimal group paradigm: Evidence from affective priming tasks. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 1049-1071.
- Perdue, C., Dovidio, J., Gurtman, M., & Tyler, R. (1990). Us and them: Social categorization and the process of ingroup bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 475-486.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 173-185.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 65-85.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in Western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 57-75.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 751-783.
- Pickett, C. L., Bonner, B. L., & Coleman, J. M. (2002). Motivated self-stereotyping: Heightened assimilation and differentiation needs result in increased levels of positive and negative self-stereotyping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 543-562.
- Pickett, C. L., Silver, M. D., & Brewer, M. B. (2002). The impact of assimilation and differentiation needs on perceived group importance and judgments of group size. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 546-558.
- Platow, M. J., McClintock, C. G., & Liebrand, W. G. (1990). Predicting intergroup fairness and in-group bias in the minimal group paradigm. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 20, 221-239.

- Platow, M. J., O'Connell, A., Shave, R., & Hanning, P. (1995). Social evaluations of fair and unfair allocations in interpersonal and intergroup situations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 34, 363-381.
- Rabbie, J. M., Benoist, F., Oosterbaan, H., & Visser, L. (1974). Differential power and effects of expected competitive and cooperative intergroup interaction on intragroup and outgroup attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30, 46-56.
- Rabbie, J. M., & Wilkins, G. (1971). Intergroup competition and its effect on intragroup and intergroup relations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1, 215-234.
- Riek, B. M., Mania, E. W., & Gaertner, S. L. (2006). Intergroup threat and outgroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10, 336-353.
- Roccas, S., & Brewer, M. B. (2002). Social identity complexity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6, 88-106.
- Roccas, S., & Schwartz, S. (1993). Effects of intergroup similarity on intergroup relations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 23, 581-595.
- Rothbart, M., & John, O. P. (1985). Social categorization and behavioral episodes: A cognitive analysis of the effects of intergroup contact. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41(3), 81-104.
- Rouhana, N. N., & Bar-Tal, D. (1998). Psychological dynamics of intractable ethnonational conflicts: The Israeli-Palestinian case. *American Psychologist*, 53, 761-770.
- Rubin, M., & Hewstone, M. (1998). Social identity theory's self-esteem hypothesis: A review and some suggestions for clarification. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2, 40-62.
- Rudman, L. A., Greenwald, A. G., & McGhee, D. E. (2001). Implicit self-concept and evaluative implicit gender stereotypes: Self and ingroup share desirable traits. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 1164-1178.
- Runciman, W. C. (1966). *Relative deprivation and social justice: A study of attitudes to social inequality in twentieth century England*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Rust, M. C. (1996). *Social identity and social categorization*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Delaware, Newark, DE.
- Sachdev, I., & Bourhis, R. (1991). Power and status differentials in minority and majority group relations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 21, 1-24.
- Sherif, M. (1966). *In common predicament: Social psychology of intergroup conflict and cooperation*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). *Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The Robbers Cave experiment*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Book Exchange.
- Sidanius, J. (1993). The psychology of group conflict and the dynamics of oppression: A social dominance perspective. In S. Iyengar & W. McGuire (Eds.), *Explorations in political psychology* (pp. 183-219). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Simon, B., & Hamilton, D. H. (1994). Social identity and self-stereotyping: The effects of relative group size and group status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 699-711.
- Slavin, R. E. (1985). Cooperative learning: Applying contact theory in desegregated schools. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41(3), 45-62.
- Smith, E. R. (1993). Social identity and social emotions: Toward new conceptualizations of prejudice. In D. Mackie & D. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition, and stereotyping* (pp. 297-315). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Smith, H. J., & Tyler, T. R. (1996). Justice and power: When will justice concerns encourage the advantaged to support policies which redistribute economic resources and the disadvantaged to willingly obey the law? *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 171-200.
- Spears, R., Doosje, B., & Ellemers, N. (1997). Self-stereotyping in the face of threats to group status and distinctiveness: The role of group identification. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 538-553.
- Stangor, C., Sullivan, M. W., & Ford (1991). Affective and cognitive determinants of prejudice. *Social Cognition*, 9, 359-380.
- Stapel, D. A., & Marx, D. M. (2007). Distinctiveness is key: How different types of self-other similarity moderate social comparison effects. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33, 439-448.
- Stephan, W. G. (1986). The effects of school desegregation: An evaluation 30 years after *Brown*. In M. Saks & L. Saxe (Eds.), *Advances in applied social psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 181-206). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stephan, W. G., Boniecki, K. A., Ybarra, O., Bettencourt, A., Ervin, K. S., Jackson, L. A., . . . Renfro, C. L. (2002). The role of threats in the racial attitudes of Blacks and Whites. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 1242-1254.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 23-45). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stouffer, S., Suchman, E., DeViney, L., Stat, S., & Williams, R. (1949). *The American soldier: Adjustments during Army life* (Vol. 1). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Struch, N., & Schwartz, S. H. (1989). Intergroup aggression: Its predictors and distinctness from in-group bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 364-373.
- Sumner, W. G. (1906). *Folkways*. New York, NY: Ginn.
- Tajfel, H. (1969). Cognitive aspects of prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 25, 79-97.
- Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. *Scientific American*, 223, 96-102.
- Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. London, England: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H., Billig, M., Bundy, R., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1, 149-178.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Taylor, D. M., Moghaddam, F. M., Gamble, I., & Zellerer, E. (1987). Disadvantaged group responses to perceived inequality: From passive acceptance to collective action. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 127, 259-272.
- Turner, J. C. (1975). Social comparison and social identity: Some prospects for intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 5, 5-34.
- Turner, J. C. (1981). The experimental social psychology of intergroup behaviour. In J. Turner & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup behaviour* (pp. 66-101). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M., Oakes, P., Reicher, S., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M., Turner, P., & Smith, P. (1984). Failure and defeat as determinants of group cohesiveness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 23, 97-111.
- Vanbeselaere, N. (1991). The different effects of simple and crossed categorizations: A result of the category differentiation process or of differential category salience? *European Review of Social Psychology*, 2, 247-278.
- van Knippenberg, A., & Ellemers, N. (1990). Social identity and intergroup differentiation processes. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 1, 137-169.
- van Oudenhoven, J. P., Groenewoud, J. T., & Hewstone, M. (1996). Cooperation, ethnic salience and generalisation of interethnic attitudes. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 649-661.
- Vanneman, R. D., & Pettigrew, T. F. (1972). Race and relative deprivation in the urban United States. *Race*, 13, 461-486.
- Verkuyten, M. (2006). Multicultural recognition and ethnic minority rights: A social identity perspective. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 17, 148-184.
- Vignoles, V. L., Chrysoschoou, Z., & Breakwell, G. M. (2000). The distinctiveness principle: Identity, meaning, and the bounds of cultural relativity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4, 337-354.

- Voci, A., & Hewstone, M. (2003). Intergroup contact and prejudice toward immigrants in Italy: The mediational role of anxiety and the moderation role of group salience. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 6, 37–54.
- Weber, J. G. (1994). The nature of ethnocentric attribution bias: In-group protection or enhancement? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 30, 482–504.
- Wilder, D. A. (1978). Reduction of intergroup discrimination through individuation of the outgroup. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 1361–1374.
- Wilder, D. A. (1984). Intergroup contact: The typical member and the exception to the rule. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 20, 177–194.
- Wilder, D. A. (1986). Social categorization: Implications for creation and reduction of intergroup bias. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 19, pp. 291–355). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Wit, A. P., & Kerr, N. L. (2002). "Me versus just us versus us all": Categorization and cooperation in nested social dilemmas. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 616–637.
- Worchel, S., Andreoli, V., & Folger, R. (1977). Intergroup cooperation and intergroup attraction: The effect of previous interaction and outcome of combined effort. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 13, 131–140.
- Wright, S. C., Taylor, D. M., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1990). Responding to membership in a disadvantaged group: From acceptance to collective protest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 994–1003.
- Yuki, M., Maddux, W. W., Brewer, M. B., & Takemura, K. (2005). Cross-cultural differences in relationship- and group-based trust. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 48–62.
- Yzerbyt, V. Y., Leyens, J.-P., & Bellour, F. (1995). The ingroup overexclusion effect: Identity concerns in decisions about group membership. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 1–16.