

Social Psychology of Prejudice:

*Historical and
Contemporary Issues*

Edited by

Christian S. Crandall

University of Kansas

Mark Schaller

University of British Columbia



Lewinian Press

B=F(P,E)

For Charlotte and Jasper

PUBLISHED BY LEWINIAN PRESS
1415 Jayhawk Boulevard
Lawrence, Kansas 66045

Printed in the United States of America.

Cover photo © Doug Hitt, 1996.

This book is based on a conference supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 9910732. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

2004, *All rights reserved.*

These chapters may be reproduced for any non-commercial purpose; *educational reproduction and distribution without fee or waiver is encouraged.* (Distribution of materials for copying cost alone is permitted.) Commercial reproduction by entities other than educational institutions for local classroom use, whether in readers or reprinted volumes or other use, must contact the editors for permission.

Intergroup Contact: Still Our Best Hope For Improving Intergroup Relations

Stephen C. Wright
Simon Fraser University

Salena M. Brody
University of California, Santa Cruz

Art Aron
State University of New York, Stony Brook

This year marks the fiftieth anniversary of both the publication of Allport's (1954) classic volume *The Nature of Prejudice* and of the landmark *Brown v Board of Education* Supreme Court decision that led directly to the end of legalized segregation in American public schools. Thus, it seems especially appropriate to consider an idea that would become one of the most influential aspects of Allport's volume and played a key role in the case that would become a milestone in American civil rights. That idea was to become known as the Intergroup Contact Hypothesis. As part of their influential brief to the *Brown v. Board of Education* case, social psychologists (including Kenneth B. Clark, Isidor Chein, and Stuart Cook) argued that contact between Black and White students would reduce prejudice and improve intergroup relations. That same year, Allport provided a detailed formulation of the hypotheses that would become one of the most enduring and central themes in the social psychological study of intergroup relations.

The basic premise is quite simple: *interaction/contact between individual members of different groups, under a proscribed set of conditions, can lead to a reduction in prejudice towards the other group.* This rather straightforward idea has inspired an enormous volume of research, including hundreds of independent tests spanning five decades and at least two dozen countries, and involving tens of thousands of participants from a broad array of contact groups. As it turns out, the idea is not as straightforward or simple as it may appear at first glance. However, despite considerable variance in the findings and numerous lively controversies, an extensive meta-analytical review (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000) of the literature leads to the general conclusion that Allport was really on to something, and that the authors of the *Brown v. Board of Education* brief were by in large correct in describing cross-group contact as a valuable route to positive attitude change. In fact, Marilyn Brewer and Rupert Brown (1998) conclude their discussion of prejudice reduction in their extensive chapter on *Intergroup*

Relations in the *Handbook of Social Psychology* by saying: "Nonetheless, in the long run, cooperative contact seems to be the key to improving intergroup relations and changing the social psychological processes that underlie prejudice and discrimination." (p. 583). On balance, the resilience and continued influence of the hypothesis appears very well deserved.

History and Developments

While Allport was certainly not the originator of many of the ideas that underlie the contact hypothesis (e.g., Brody, 1946; Horowitz, 1936; Stouffer, 1949; Williams, 1947), his formulation would prove to be key in focusing research and theorizing, and today he is often cited as the originator of hypothesis. Recognizing that the existing research demonstrated that simply bringing members of divergent groups together is just as likely to produce negative interaction that reinforce existing negative stereotypes and heighten prejudice, Allport's model focused on the conditions necessary for contact to lead to prejudice reduction. He proposed four conditions for optimal contact; that is, for contact that is likely to reduce prejudice. According to the model, the contact situation must be structured so that: (1) the members of the two groups hold equal status within the contact situation regardless of the actual distribution of power in the wider social context; (2) they would need to cooperate (3) in an effort to achieve a shared goal; and (4) the contact would be supported by local authorities, customs, and/or norms. Importantly, Allport's model focused attention on how contact can increase or decrease prejudice, depending on situational and structural factors both inside the specific contact situation and in the broader social context.

Much of subsequent work followed Allport's lead and set out to test and clarify the necessary conditions for optimal contact and to document the outcomes of contact between various groups in a variety social contexts. For example, early contact research examined the impact of contact in the military (e.g., Stouffer et al., 1949), in housing (e.g., Wilner, Walkley & Cook, 1955), in places of employment (e.g., Minard, 1952), and in schools (e.g., Dwyer, 1958). As predicted by Allport, many of the contact situations led to reductions in prejudice, while others seemed to increase prejudice. Amir's (1969) review of the contact research during this period described a number of additional variables some of which appeared to interact with Allport's conditions for contact to produce both favorable and unfavorable outcomes. Thus, Amir and others (e.g., Cook, 1984) proposed additions to Allport's list of conditions for optimal contact.

Through the 1970's and 80's tests of the hypothesis proliferated and broadened to focus on a greater variety of groups and contexts (see Pettigrew, 1998 for a review). In addition, a number of important intervention programs were developed with ideas from models of intergroup contact at the heart of their designs. For example, Aronson and his colleagues' (Aronson, Blaney, Stephan, Sikes, & Snapp, 1978;

Aronson & Patnoe, 1997) *Jigsaw Classroom* technique drew on the potential of equal status, cooperative, interdependent contact to produce academic success and positive attitudes towards outgroup members in multi-ethnic classrooms.

For the most part, the evidence continued to support Allport's general model (see Brewer & Gaertner, 2001; Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000). However, by the mid-1980s, the hypothesis was faced with a rather serious problem. Over thirty years of effort focused primarily on necessary conditions meant that Allport's (1954) original short list had grown to the point where the list of provisions and qualifications for successful contact was so extensive that it threatened to undermine the hypothesis all together. Both Pettigrew (1986) and Stephan (1987) pointed out that this large "grocery list" made it unlikely that any contact situation could actually meet all the necessary requirements and threatened to render the theory unfalsifiable. In addition, the focus on necessary conditions resulted in much less attention to the fact that the basic contact hypothesis failed to specify the psychological processes responsible for the observed attitude changes. There was lots of data and speculation about *when* contact would (and would not) produce positive attitude change, but much less about *why* or *how* this attitude change would occur.

Recently, Pettigrew (1998) proposed a rather simple, but elegant, solution to the "grocery list" problem. He proposes that Allport's initial four conditions should be considered essential conditions, while the list of additions should be considered *facilitating* rather than *necessary* conditions. Thus, the more of these conditions that are met the greater the likelihood and the larger the magnitude of positive intergroup attitude change. We have gone further than this and propose that none of the proposed conditions need be considered essential or necessary (see Wright & Van der Zande, 1999). Instead, we propose that most of these conditions can be better understood as conditions that facilitate the development of cross-group friendships and that each contributes to the possibility that contact participants will develop feelings of closeness. None of these conditions ensure that feelings of closeness will arise, nor is any particular condition indispensable in producing closeness. We will discuss this idea in greater detail shortly, but the primary point here is that rather than debating which particular conditions should be given "essential" status, we believe that it would be wiser to describe them all as facilitators of particular underlying processes that mediate the contact/attitude relationship.

This leads us to the second concern raised by Pettigrew and Stephan in the late 1980's—the lack of a strong process model to explain contact effects. Initially, considerable attention was given to the idea of stereotype disconfirmation (see Stephan & Stephan, 1984; Triandis, 1972). Interaction with an outgroup member who disconfirmed negative

stereotypes should serve to undermine these negative beliefs about the outgroup. While there is some evidence for this, effects are comparatively small and inconsistent (see Pettigrew, 1998; Rothbart & John, 1985). The largest positive effects of contact appear to involve general affect, specific emotions, and evaluation. Warmth, liking, empathy, and respect for the outgroup member (Batson et al., 1997; Cook, 1984; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000) and the reduction of anxiety (Islam & Hewstone, 1993; Paolini, Hewstone, Cairns & Voci; in press; Stephan & Stephan, 1985) seem to be key. We will return to the importance of generating positive affective ties as a key mediator of the contact effect, as well as the key role of anxiety later in the chapter. However, suffice to say here that it appears that contact may have much more to do with emotion than with cognition (Pettigrew, 1998; see also Esses & Dovidio, 2002).

In addition to focusing perhaps too heavily on cognition, knowledge, and stereotypes, most of the initial attempts to describe psychological processes involved in contact effects lacked connections to a broader model of intergroup relations. Fortunately, in the 1980's, Social Identity Theory (SIT; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) was emerging as an important new perspective in the intergroup relations literature (see Brewer 1979; Brewer & Kramer, 1985; Tajfel, 1978; 1981; 1982; Taylor & Moghaddam, 1988), and this new perspective fueled something of a renaissance in the contact literature. What emerged were three dominant new perspectives, each with roots in SIT and with clear emphasis on the role of categorization—*Decategorization* (Brewer & Miller, 1984), *Mutual Differentiation* (Hewstone & Brown, 1986), and *Recategorization* (Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachman & Rust, 1993). What proved to be the key distinction between the three models was their predictions about what level of identity should be made salient in optimal contact situations.

Brewer and Miller's (1984) *Decategorization* or *Personalization* approach (see also Miller, 2002), proposes that intergroup bias will be most effectively reduced when contact occurs in a context where personal, rather than social, identities are salient. That is, group memberships should be downplayed and individual characteristics should be the focus of the encounter. This assertion is consistent with evidence showing: a) that when social categories are made salient intergroup differentiation, stereotyping, and ingroup bias are common outcomes (see Mullen, Brown & Smith, 1992); b) that general expectations and schemas for intergroup interactions appear to involve greater distrust and more competitive orientations than interpersonal interactions (see Insko & Schopler, 1998); c) that interactions with outgroup members can be fraught with anxiety and other negative emotions (Britt, Boniecki, Vescio, & Biernat, 1996; Stephan & Stephan, 1985; Wilder, 1993); d) and that fears of appearing prejudiced or intolerant can lead to discomfort and self-censorship in intergroup encounters (Wright, Brody & Stout, 2000). All

of these reduce the likelihood that the processes seen to be essential for positive contact will occur.

Brewer and Miller (1984) proposed that situations that focus attention only to the personal characteristics of the participants have the best chance of producing positive "personalized" interactions during which the interactants not only see each other as unique individuals, but also acquire specific, even self-relevant, information about the other. These positive interactions lead to greater differentiation of outgroup members (i.e., recognition that all outgroup members are not the same) and a reduction in the availability and usefulness of the category distinctions. This should lead to reduction in the intergroup bias usually associated with ingroup/outgroup perceptions.

In apparent contradiction with the Decategorization model, Hewstone and Brown's (1986) *Mutual Differentiation* model focuses on the need to emphasize relevant group identities rather than personal identities. This approach acknowledges that positive interpersonal interactions may lead to increased liking for the specific outgroup member with whom the contact occurs. However, Hewstone and Brown argue that in order for there to be generalization of this interpersonal liking from the individual to the outgroup as a whole, group categories must be salient during cross-group interactions. As long as the individuals in the interaction are stripped of their relevant group membership, the positive attitudes generated by the cross-group interaction cannot impact on the participants' *intergroup* attitudes. Thus, the Mutual Differentiation approach focuses on the benefits of contact in which the groups hold separate roles while working on a joint task. Within this framework of cooperative interdependence, group identities can be salient and groups can respect the outgroup's strengths while still maintaining the ingroup's own positive distinctiveness.

Support for the categorization approach can be found in research on stereotype change showing that outgroup exemplars who are otherwise consistent with the outgroup prototype are more likely to produce changes in the outgroup stereotypes (e.g., Weber & Crocker, 1983, Wilder, 1984; Wilder, Simon & Faith, 1996). There is also direct evidence of the value of group salience on generalized intergroup contact effects from a number of studies by Brown, Hewstone and their colleagues (e.g., Brown, Vivian & Hewstone, 1999; Van Oudenhoven, Groenewoud, & Hewstone, 1996). In fact, Brown et al. (1999) criticize the research that provides evidence in support of the decategorization model (e.g. Bettencourt, Brewer, Croak & Miller, 1992; Marcus-Newhall, Miller, Holtz & Brewer, 1993; Miller, Brewer & Edwards, 1985), claiming that in these studies it was not clear that category memberships did not remain salient even in the decategorized conditions.

The most recent addition, Gaertner and Dovidio's *Recategorization* approach is represented in the *Common Ingroup Identity Model* (Gaertner et

al., 1993) and incorporates aspects of both the decategorization and mutual differentiation perspectives. This model proposes that the key to positive intergroup contact is to shift the focus from the level of the two differentiated groups to a higher-order category that subsumes the two groups under a single superordinate identity. This approach builds on the assumption that an individual's social identities can be hierarchically organized, with group memberships at each level embedded in a larger more inclusive categorization. Thus, it may be possible to structure interactions between members of two groups so that categorization is defined at a higher level of inclusiveness. Thus, rather than focusing on the level of group membership that divides the individuals, attention is focused on a group membership that unites them. The overarching goal in the Common Ingroup Identity model is to shift the focus from "us versus them" to a more inclusive "we," and Gaertner, Dovidio and their colleagues have provided considerable evidence for the utility of this approach (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000 for a review).

Each of these perspectives, when considered on its own, provides a convincing logic and when tested independently, each has garnered considerable support. However, when considered together, they appear to provide contradictory prescriptions about what level of identity should be made salient during cross-group contact. Decategorization calls for a focus on personal/individual identities. Mutual differentiation calls for a focus on group/social identities. Recategorization calls for a focus on a superordinate group identity. Despite what appears to be an obvious inconsistency, a number of authors have proposed potential solutions that attempt to describe these approaches as complementary (e.g., Gaertner et al., 2000; Hewstone, 1996; Miller, 2002; Pettigrew, 1998; Wright, Tropp & Ropp, 1998). For example, Gaertner and Dovidio have extended their general model by proposing a "dual identity" model which holds that developing a common ingroup identity may not require that groups entirely forsake their previous identities. Rather, people can identify simultaneously with both the superordinate, shared category and their distinctive subordinate category. However, this proposition has been challenged by Mummendey and her colleagues (e.g., Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999) who find that this type of dual identification may be particularly likely to produce high levels bias towards the ingroup and negative intergroup relations.

In another example, Gaertner and Dovidio (2000) also propose that different models may be differentially effective under different conditions, with different groups, and even across different individuals. That is, high-status group members may easily embrace identification with a more inclusive superordinate category and thus benefit from a recategorization approach. However, members of low status groups may object to their ingroup being ignored in favor of a more inclusive category, perhaps because they suspect that the content of this more

inclusive identity will be much more influenced by the identity of the advantaged group than by their own. Thus, low status group members may be more interested in a mutual differentiation approach. While it may be true that the groups respond better to different foci, there seems a rather significant problem with this solution as well. Given that high- and low-status group members are expected to interact in the same social context, it seems unlikely that this context could be structured so that one of the interactants (the low-status group member) will focus on his/her specific group membership while the other interactant (the high-status group member) will focus on a more inclusive social category. In describing our own work later in the chapter, we will return to the apparent contradiction created by these different perspectives and consider possible solutions that recognize that cross-group contact can (and often does) involve multiple interactions spread over time and that these three approaches might well be strung together in a sequential model.

Of course, there have been numerous other important twists and turns on the road from its inception to the present, but a key feature of the contact hypothesis has been its longevity. Perhaps because it engages one of societies most pressing social problems—intercultural/interethnic/ interracial conflict—perhaps because of its intuitive appeal, the contact hypothesis has sparked the interest and focused the efforts of a generation of researchers across a number of disciplines. In addition, the introduction and maturation of three key new perspectives have recently provided social psychologists with the basis for theory-driven tests of the processes that mediate the impact of contact on intergroup attitude change. Interestingly, it appears that scientific interest in intergroup contact has again intensified. A cursory search of PsychInfo using “intergroup contact” or “contact hypothesis” as keywords produced 157 articles published since 1995 as compared to 72 in the previous 10 years (1985-1994).

In the rest of this chapter, we will consider a number of avenues in our own work that we feel will contribute to this new generation of contact research and theory. In the first section, we will bring into sharper focus an idea that has been raised a number of times in the history of the contact hypothesis—the special role of friendship. Here, we will describe some of our own theorizing and research. In the next section, we will extend this theorizing to consider the motivation behind voluntary participation in intergroup contact and, on the flip side, why people might be motivated to avoid cross-group interactions. Here we propose answers that involve more than the simple presence or absence of prejudice towards the outgroup.

Friendship, Closeness, and the Inclusion of Others in the Self

We mentioned earlier in the chapter that there is growing evidence that the positive effects of contact on intergroup attitudes may have more

to do with changes in affect towards the outgroup than changing stereotypes about the outgroup (although stereotype change is also possible). Consistent with this general focus on positive affect, several researchers have focused on cross-group friendships as the relationship most likely to produce positive attitude change (e.g., Paolini et al, in press; Pettigrew, 1997; Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, & Ropp, 1997). In his influential review of the Contact Hypothesis, Pettigrew (1998) goes so far as to propose that a fifth condition should be added to Allport's original four essential conditions, and that fifth condition is that the contact situation must provide the opportunity for the participants to become friends. This claim arises primarily from the analyses of a large international Western European survey (Pettigrew 1997; see also Hamberger & Hewstone, 1997) that demonstrates that having an outgroup friendship predicted lower levels of subtle and blatant prejudice, greater support for pro-outgroup policies, and even positive attitudes towards other unrelated outgroups. Much smaller effects were found when the individual had an outgroup coworker or neighbor (but not a friend).

While more focused than earlier accounts, Pettigrew's (1998) emphasis on friendship builds on previous discussions. Amir (1976) described the importance of "intimate" as compared to "casual" or "superficial" contact, concluding that casual contact has little impact on prejudice while the impact of intimate contact can be significant. Cook (1984) emphasized the importance of high "acquaintance potential" and described liking and respect for the contact partner as important aspects of successful intergroup contact. Herek and Capitanio (1996) have also demonstrated a strong relationship between cross-group friendships and more positive attitudes towards gays and lesbians among heterosexuals.

While Pettigrew (1998) has described friendship as an additional essential condition to be added to Allport's original four, our own analysis provides an even more forceful case for the role of a *feelings of friendship*.¹ Briefly, we see feelings of friendship or closeness as one of the primary mechanisms for producing positive contact effects. In fact, most of the conditions for optimal contact that have previously been described as necessary or even facilitating can be understood to be conditions that serve to improve the likelihood that feelings of friendship will develop. That is, we are proposing that Allport's oft-described optimal conditions—common goals, cooperation, equal status, and support of authorities and norms—can be seen as factors that will encourage the development of feelings of friendship between contact participants. Further, these four conditions are certainly not the only, nor even the paramount requirements. Under some circumstances, a friendship may develop in the absence of some or even all of these conditions. Thus, from this perspective the primary question concerning the conditions

necessary for contact to reduce prejudice is: "What will lead two people to develop feelings of friendship?"

This change in focus does a number of things. First, it widens the parameters of interest to include not only the intergroup contact literature but also the literature on interpersonal relations. However, this change of research literatures may not lead to significant changes in predictions about the optimal conditions for intergroup contact. An examination of the list of facilitators of friendships formation provided by Fehr (1996) reveals surprising similarities with the conditions for optimal contact found in the intergroup contact literature. For example, all of Allport's four essential conditions have corollaries in the interpersonal attraction literature. Cooperation is more likely than competition to lead to interpersonal liking. Interactions that involve common goals and interdependence also improve the chances of interpersonal liking. Consistent with the contact literatures focus on equal status, discussions of friendship formation also give specific consideration to the importance of perceiving the other as a "peer" (i.e., perceiving each other as equals) and to partners holding similar social status (see Fehr, 1996). In another example, having the opportunity for multiple interactions over time has been recognized as a facilitating condition for positive cross-group contact (e.g., Brewer & Miller, 1996; Cook, 1984; Katz & Zalk, 1978; Pettigrew, 1998; Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood & Sherif, 1961; Worchel, Andreoli, & Folger, 1977). This condition bears strong resemblance to interpersonal relations theorists' focus on proximity and propinquity, which concern the frequency with which two people will come into contact with one another, and with Zajonc's (1968) well-replicated mere exposure effect (e.g., Moreland & Beach, 1992) which shows that the more often we are exposed to a person the greater our attraction to them (Fehr, 1996).

Space considerations prevent us from providing a one-by-one comparison between the many facilitating conditions described in the contact literature and associated concepts in the friendship literature. However, suffice to say that there are surprising consistencies in the two literatures; so much so that Fehr's (1996) framework for organizing the factors that determine interpersonal liking virtually mirrors Pettigrew's (1998) recent organization of the antecedence of positive contact. Pettigrew's model describes: *participants' characteristics* (individual differences), *situational factors*, and *societal factors*. Compare this to Fehr's (1996) framework which includes: *individual factors* or characteristics that the individual brings to the interaction; *dyadic factors*, which involve aspects of the relationship between the partners and the nature of their interactions; and *environmental factors* which are characteristics of the structural environment which influence the likelihood, frequency, and circumstances of the contact.

Thus, the concept of friendship appears to provide a unifying theme for understanding the many conditions described as necessary and facilitating conditions for successful intergroup contact. However, and perhaps more importantly, providing "feelings of friendship" with principal status in a model of intergroup contact also provide insights into the processes that may produce successful cross-group contact effects. More specifically, theory and research in the interpersonal relations tradition may assist in uncovering the underlying processes that produce positive attitude change as a result of intergroup contact.

Specifying a Process Model of Intergroup Contact

The search for a process model of contact necessarily involves two related questions. First, what happens during contact that leads the individual to hold a positive view of their outgroup contact partner? Second, how does interaction, even optimal interaction, with a single member of an outgroup lead to changes in attitudes towards the outgroup as a whole? This second question is the elusive "generalization issue" that remains at the center of much of the remaining controversy about the contact hypothesis (see Brown, Vivian & Hewstone, 1999; Pettigrew, 1998).

What happens during contact? As mentioned earlier, considerable attention has been given to the ideas of "learning about the outgroup" and stereotype disconfirmation, but it appears that undermining stereotypes and learning about the outgroup may not be the primary mechanisms for changing intergroup attitudes through contact. Instead, the largest positive effects of contact appear to involve affect and evaluation -- warmth, liking, empathy, and respect for the outgroup member (see Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000). This is entirely consistent with our own focus on the development of a friendship-like relationship with the outgroup member. In fact, we propose that any "learning about the outgroup" can be seen as a byproduct of interpersonal closeness. Self-disclosure has been described as a key process in the development and maintenance of interpersonal relationships (e.g., Altman & Taylor, 1973; Derlega, Metts, Per-tonio & Margulis, 1993). At times, this self-disclosure could include information about the individual's social identity, his or her group memberships, and thus could provide the partner with new, perhaps stereotype-disconfirming, information about the outgroup.

However, showing that the positive emotions associated with interpersonal friendship are of primary importance does not explain how these feelings towards the friend are generalized to other members of the outgroup or to the outgroup itself. Why should positive affect toward an individual produce warmth, empathy or even identification with the outgroup as a whole? Recently, we (Wright, Aron & Tropp, 2002) have proposed that the deeper analysis of what is involved in the development of feelings of friendship provided by Aron and Aron's (1986; 1996) *self-*

expansion model can provide important insights into the processes that underlie the positive attitude changes associated with cross-group contact.

Aron and Aron propose the notion of *including the other in the self*. The general idea is that when people become close, aspects of the other are included in the self. That is, rather than being perceived as separate beings, self and close other become increasingly overlapped (Aron & Aron, 1996). In fact, interpersonal closeness can be defined as the degree of other/self overlap. In a variety of studies, Aron and his colleagues have demonstrated that close others function cognitively like self, while nonclose others do not (see Aron, Aron & Nelson, 2001 for a review). For example, Aron, Aron, Tudor, and Nelson (1991) proposed that if close others are included in the self, when people are making me/not me decisions about specific characteristics, they should respond more slowly to characteristics that are true of one of the self or the close other but untrue about the other. The idea is that the inconsistency between self and close other on this characteristic should interfere with cognitive processing. Conversely, there should be quicker responding to characteristics on which there is consistency between self and the close other. So, participants rated the extent to which a series of characteristics were descriptive first of themselves and then of their spouse. Then, a reaction time procedure was used to measure the speed of participant's "me/not me" judgments for these characteristics. Indeed, participant's responses were slower for characteristics that produced an inconsistency between self and spouse compared to characteristics for which perceptions of self and spouse were consistent. Similar effects were not found when the other was a famous person or a stranger. Aron and Fraley (1999) have also demonstrated that the degree of interpersonal closeness moderates these self/other consistency effects (see also Smith, Coats & Walling, 1999).

Thus, as closeness increases, self is extended to include more and more aspects of the relationship partner and the lines between personal self and the other become increasingly unclear. The result of this overlap of self and other is that the positive feelings for the self are extended to the partner. The partner is treated increasingly as one does oneself including, showing a positive biases in attribution, feeling pain at their troubles, taking pride in their successes, generously sharing resources, and so on. Thus, the proposal is that when contact between members of different groups leads to a friendships that outgroup member is included in the self.

Generalization: The Inclusion of the Outgroup in the Self Model

This inclusion of other in the self model not only provides a more detailed description of the process that occur in optimal cross-group contact, it also provides the basis for understanding how positive attitudes are generalized from the specific outgroup partner to the outgroup as a whole. That is, inclusion of the other in the self provides an

answer to the generalization issue. The logic is this: when one becomes close to a member of an outgroup, aspects of the outgroup member are included in the self. If (or when) the other's group identity (his or her group membership) is made salient, that group identity may also be included in the self. Thus, through the close friend, the outgroup itself is included in the self, and now this group is accorded some of the benefits usually granted the self (e.g., positive biases in attribution, feelings pain at their troubles, taking pride in their successes, generously sharing resources, etc.).

Implicit in this model of *including the outgroup in the self* (IOGS) is the idea that groups, like individual partners, can be included in the self. A number of studies have shown that ingroups are included in the self in very much the same way as are close individuals (see Otten, 2002, Smith, et al., 1999; Tropp & Wright, 2001), and it appears that when a group is understood to be a unified entities it can be included in the self in a manner that leads to self/group overlap. To date, all of the published research on self/group overlap has focused on ingroups. However, the process of self/ingroup overlap has been explicitly equated with the process of ingroup identification (see Tropp & Wright, 2001), and there is considerable evidence that under the correct conditions people can also demonstrate identification with outgroups (see Branscombe & Ellemers, 1998; Ellemers, van Knippenberg & Wilke, 1990). The inclusion of the outgroup in the self that we are proposing may be similar to this type of identification with an outgroup. Like outgroup identification, inclusion of the outgroup in the self may at times involve a psychological preparation for actual membership in the outgroup. For example, forming a close relationship with someone may give us real entrée into some of her or his groups (e.g., friendship groups, clubs, even their family should we marry). In other cases, (e.g., racial, ethnic, or occupational groups) gaining actual membership in the friend's group may be impossible, or at least highly unlikely. In these cases, the connection is wholly psychological, such that events that effect the outgroup now have personal meaning. In this case, the group is included in the self even though the person may be keenly aware that he or she is not (perhaps cannot) be included in the group.

Research Evidence

With our colleagues, we have carried out a number of studies that provide evidence supporting the hypothesized role of cross-group friendship, and more specifically feelings of interpersonal closeness, in producing positive contact effects. In two questionnaire studies, McLaughlin-Volpe, Aron, Wright and Reis (2001) have shown that having outgroup friends was associated with more positive attitudes about the outgroup. In addition, it was the feelings of closeness and specifically the degree to which the outgroup friend was reported to be included in the self that most strongly predict positive outgroup attitudes. The number of outgroup friends and the quantity of contact with

outgroup members had relatively little predictive value. A third study used a diary procedure (see Reis & Wheeler, 1991) in which 100 participants responded to a series of questions about each of their social interactions. The diary was kept for a full week and included every social interaction of 10 minutes or longer. Again, it was the degree of closeness measured by the reported inclusion of the other in the self that best predicted attitudes about the relevant outgroup. In fact, in all three studies there was a significant interaction in the prediction of intergroup attitudes between number of interactions and inclusion of the other in the self. When inclusion of other in the self was high (strong feelings of closeness), a greater number of interactions was associated with more positive intergroup attitudes. However, when inclusion of other in the self was low (little or no feelings of closeness), more interactions had no impact or actually led to *more negative* attitudes towards the outgroup. That is, social interactions with an outgroup member that did not involve feelings of interpersonal closeness had either no impact on intergroup attitude or were associated with even more negative attitudes.

In another recent study, Brody (2003) investigated the role of inclusion of other in the self as a mediator of intergroup attitude change among participants in a service-learning program—a program where students combine relevant course work with weekly service in a social service agency. This study demonstrated that the degree to which the participants' service experience led to the inclusion of a specific member of the outgroup in the self mediated the relationship between the quantity of contact during the program and positive attitudes toward the outgroup at the end of the service learning program.

In sum, all four of these studies provide support for the important role of including the other in the self in intergroup contact effects. However, all involve correlational analyses and do not provide unambiguous evidence concerning the causal direction. The alternative causal hypothesis, that those holding more positive intergroup attitudes will seek outgroup friends while those high in prejudice avoid outgroup members, is also very reasonable. In the diary study, structural equation modeling analyses did suggest unique causal paths in both directions -- including others in the self led to more positive attitudes, and positive attitudes led to greater inclusion of outgroup others in the self. However, the path from inclusion to attitudes was stronger and more consistent. Nonetheless, this data remains cross-sectional, and in order to draw more definitive conclusions Wright, Van der Zande, Tropp, Ropp, Aron, Zanna & Young (2003) used a laboratory procedure. White women were randomly paired with either a cross-group (Asian-American or Latina) or a same-group (White) partner. The partners met 4 times over the following 8 weeks and engaged in a series of friendship-building activities, including the Aron, Melinat, Aron, Vallone, & Bator (1997) "fast-friends procedure."

The data from closeness measured taken after each of the 4 meetings showed that cross-group friendships (White/Latina and White/Asian) were somewhat slower to develop than same-group friendships (White/White). However, by the end of the fourth meeting ratings of closeness were equally strong in both types of partnerships. Our procedures were able to produce strong close relationships between randomly assigned partners in a laboratory context. More importantly, a number of measures collected following the final meeting in an apparently unrelated study showed that White women who became close with a Latina or Asian-American held significantly more positive intergroup attitudes than did White women who made friends with another White women. Compared to those making an ingroup friend, those who made an outgroup friend reported lower feelings of anxiety at the prospect of cross-ethnic interactions. They also showed lower endorsement of several "anti-minority" policies -- policies that were the subject of highly publicized electoral propositions in California (where this study was conducted). Finally, in the least obvious and most behavioral measure—the Haddock, Zanna and Esses (1993) "budget-cutting task"—participants were asked (ostensibly by the University administration to advise them on how projected budget cuts should be distributed among 15 student organizations. Those in a cross-group friendship cut significantly less money from the "Latino/Chicano Student Association" and the "Asian & Pacific Islander Student Alliance" than those in a same-group friendship. Thus the results from three very different indicators of intergroup attitudes supported that claim that making an outgroup friend caused improvements in White participants' attitudes towards the outgroup as a whole.

Finally, correlational analyses demonstrated the specific importance of feelings of closeness to the cross-group partner. For participants in the cross-group condition, closeness to one's partner was correlated with more positive intergroup attitudes, supporting the claim that interpersonal closeness mediates the effect of the friendship-making manipulation on intergroup attitudes.

Including the Outgroup in the Self (IOGS) and the Level of Categorization Debate

Earlier in the chapter we described the "debate" between an approach to contact that calls for personalization and a focus on individual identities (the decategorization model) and another that calls for maintaining the salience of group identities (the mutual distinctiveness model). Our IOGS model shares with the decategorization approach the idea that cross-group friends must see each other as unique individuals and form an interpersonal relationship. However, beyond this the focus is quite different. While the decategorization model focuses on breaking down of group distinctions through the acquisition of information about a personalized other, the IOGS model focuses on underlying changes in

self-concept associated with the development of interpersonal closeness. Rather than seeing the primary function of cross-group contact as reducing the utility and importance of group distinctions (as proposed by the decategorization approach), the IOGS model proposes that it is precisely the awareness of the close other's group membership that allows for the formation of a connection between the self and the outgroup. It is not that the other's group membership becomes irrelevant or unimportant. It is that this outgroup is now connected to the self.

Thus, the IOGS model shares with the mutual differentiation approach the view that the other's membership in the outgroup must be made salient. In this way the IOGS model combines the need for interpersonal interactions from the decategorization approach and the importance of salient group memberships from the categorization approach. In so doing, this approach (like the mutual differentiation approach) must face the problem that interactions in which category memberships are highly salient are more likely to involve intergroup differentiation, stereotyping, ingroup bias, and heightened anxiety. All of these are likely to undermine the formation of a friendship. One solution to this dilemma arises from the recognition that, like most relationships, cross-group friendships form over time as a result of repeated interactions. Thus, a complete model of intergroup contact could take a longitudinal approach (see Hewstone, 1996; Pettigrew, 1986; 1998) and consider that the salience of personal versus group categories might change over time and context.

One such longitudinal model (see Pettigrew, 1998; Wright, 1995) proposes that during initial contact attention should be focused on personal identities and especially on interpersonal similarities. Thus, the barriers to interpersonal friendship that arise from a focus on group membership are reduced in initial interaction (see Owen, Wright & Brody, 2001). However, once the other is to some degree included in the self, the intergroup nature of their relationship should be made salient and thus the partner's group membership (the outgroup) made available for inclusion in the self.

Implicit in this model is the recognition that interactions between the same individuals can change from interpersonal to intergroup and back again as the contextual salience of group memberships shifts (Tajfel, 1978). Thus, even intimate friends may find themselves responding to each other on the basis of group memberships when situational cues make social identities salient. In fact, the closer the interpersonal friendship, the more time that the partners are likely to spend together, and the greater the variety of social (i.e. public) contexts they will be interacting in (Berscheid, Snyder & Omoto, 1989). Thus, it is very likely that the cross-group friends will find themselves in situations that heighten the salience of their group differences. The advantage, however, is that now the outgroup is presented not as a foreign and distant

outgroup, but rather as an important aspect of another who is already part of the self. Thus, rather than creating a barrier to positive attitudes, high salience of the other's group membership makes apparent that the outgroup is connected to, even included in, the self. Thus, in this sequential model a period of decategorization followed by mutual differentiation should produce positive change in intergroup attitudes.

Self-Expansion and Seeking Outgroup Friends

While this particular sequential model of contact provides a very strong potential strategy for producing a positive intergroup attitude change, we also recognize that there are very likely circumstances when other patterns or sequences might also be successful (see also Gaertner, et al., 2000). In fact, recently, we (Wright, et al., 2002) we have proposed that under some circumstances forming a relationship with an outgroup member might be very appealing (even more appealing than a friendship with an ingroup member). In these cases, making the other's group membership apparent even before initial interaction may enhance his or her appeal and lead to greater effort and persistence in developing a relationship.

The basis for this claim also derives from Aron and Aron's (1986; 1996) model of interpersonal relations. Not only do they propose that interpersonal closeness involves the inclusion of the other in the self, they theorize that this type of inclusion is motivated by a need for *self-expansion*. The basic premise of the *self-expansion model* is that people seek to enhance their potential efficacy by expanding the self to include material and social resources, perspectives, and identities that will facilitate achievement of goals (see Aron, Norman & Aron, 1998). Self-expansion in pursuit of greater general self-efficacy, they claim, is a central human motivation, and one way to achieve it is to include other people in the self. Thus, forming friendships is seen to be in service of a need for self-expansion. We have extended this perspective to the domain of group processes and intergroup relations (Wright et al., 2002) hypothesizing that another means for self-expansion is through the inclusion of relevant *groups* in the self.

Combining this idea with the proposition that outgroups can be included in the self—our IOGS model—leads to the rather unorthodox prediction that at times outgroup members may be the target of appetitive interest. The logic follows directly from the basic premise of the self-expansion model. If the motive for forming close relations is the acquisition of that person's resources, perspectives, and identities, others who share most of our present perspectives and identities should provide only limited potential for self-expansion. Thus, we should be drawn to others who appear different from ourselves, as their divergent perspectives and identities provide the greatest opportunity for self-expansion. From this perspective, a close relationship with a member of an outgroup that offers a variety of perspective, resources and identities

unavailable to members of one's own group should hold particular appeal.

Research by McLaughlin-Volpe and Wright (2002) provides some support for the first part of this proposition, that making outgroup friends offers a special opportunity for self-expansion. A longitudinal study that followed a group of incoming students at a large Australian University demonstrated that making friends with someone who belonged to a group that was seen to be very different from the self was associated with greater self-complexity and more changes in the self-description than making friends with an ingroup member. That is, making outgroup friends was associated with

We also have some initial evidence that self-expansion may motivate interest in forming cross-group friendships (Wright & McLaughlin-Volpe, 2003). In a laboratory experiment, we temporarily manipulated participants' self-expansion motives by providing bogus feedback from a "personality measure." In our high self-expansion motive condition the feedback described the results of the personality test as indicating that the participant felt that their life had become routine and lacked the usual excitement, change and novelty; that they were feeling rather one-dimensional and unchallenged. In our low self-expansion motive condition the feedback indicated that the test showed the opposite, that the participant felt overextended, challenged and that the immediate complexities of their life felt nearly overwhelming. Following this manipulation, in what participants believed was an unrelated part of the study, they selected from a list of other student people they would be interested in working with in a joint task. Initial results supported our prediction. White participants in the high self-expansion motive condition selected more potential partners with clearly Asian and Latino names than White participants in the low self-expansion motive condition. While continued research is clearly necessary, these results appear to show that heightening self-expansion motives can increase interest in cross-group interactions.

It appears that self-expansion may motivate interest in interactions and perhaps even friendships with outgroup members. The social psychology literature is replete with explanations for why we should avoid and persecute outgroups. Proposed mechanisms include evolutionary predisposition, personality characteristics, basic cognitive and motivational processes, justice principles and political orientations, and even existential angst and fear of death. It appears that only abstract, even esoteric, beliefs about justice and equality stand against this multitude of pressures towards intergroup hatred and intolerance. Given these odds we would certainly have to predict that groups should be in near constant conflict; that harmonious cross-group relations and intergroup tolerance should be exceedingly rare. However, this is clearly not the case. While intergroup conflict is conspicuous because of its terrible costs—much

like plane-crashes or other major disasters—most intergroup contexts are much more benign involving placidity, stability, and even tolerance. Perhaps the self-expansion motive and the associated potential for including the outgroup in the self provide one mechanism that can help to explain the positive side of intergroup relations. Outgroup members, precisely *because of their divergence from the present self*, can provide an interesting and appealing opportunity for self-expansion, and thus under some conditions, contact with outgroups will represent an attractive social experience.

But... Considering Contact Avoidance

Despite the much more optimistic lens on intergroup relations that is provided by the self-expansion perspective, we are not unaware of the barriers to intergroup contact. In fact, one of the major holes in the intergroup contact literature has been its failure to focus on the antecedents to contact and to consider when and how people will be interested in, or alternatively avoid, intergroup contact (see Esses & Dovidio, 2002). Perhaps this lack of investigation even of the negative side of this question—why people avoid contact—has resulted from the view that the answer is rather obvious; people avoid contact with other groups because they dislike them; that is, avoidance is the direct result of prejudice. Certainly, it is true that negative feelings towards the outgroup should be associated with lesser interest in, and thus less voluntary participation in, intergroup contact. Earlier in the paper we reported that a number of studies have shown that both the “contact leads to lower prejudice” and the “prejudice leads to lower contact” effects have been supported by cross-sectional data (e.g., McLaughlin-Volpe et al., 2001; Pettigrew, 1997). However, this effect is usually quite small and more generally there is evidence that attitudes about the outgroup are only modest predictors of intergroup behavior (see Dovidio, Brigham, Johnson & Gaertner, 1996). Thus, it is almost certain that the picture is much more complex than this. Here, we will consider just one potential explanation for cross-group contact avoidance that arises directly from the self-expansion model. However, this explanation also points out the potential of an approach that goes beyond simple antipathy as the primary barriers to increased cross-group contact.

Self-Integration and Self-Loss

Despite its unusually positive outlook on intergroup contact the self-expansion model also provides another explanation for contact avoidance. The model recognizes that self-expansion needs are constrained by the need for self-integration and by concerns for possible self-loss (Aron & Aron, 1986; see also McLaughlin-Volpe, Aron, Wright & Lewandowski, in press). Unbridled self-expansion can be stressful, as a large number of new self-aspects are incorporated into the existing self-structure and periods of rapid self-expansion may need to be followed by periods of self-integration. So, outgroups members may be most

appealing when we have not recently experienced significant self-expansion in other domains. For example, if you had just taken on a new and demanding job or fallen in love, you might be relatively uninterested in making new friendships generally and would also prefer interactions with ingroup members over outgroup members. On the other hand, if you were securely entrenched in a relatively predictable and stable social environment, you might find the opportunity to create a cross-group friendship particularly appealing. Thus, the appeal of outgroup members is likely moderated by the amount of ongoing self-expansion in other domains.

Similarly, self-expansion in one domain often is associated with self-loss in another. For example, moving to a new city offers generous opportunities for self-expansion, but simultaneously involves the loss of aspects of the self (relationship, activities, etc.) that are tied to one's old residence. Thus, the individual must perform a kind of mental cost/benefit analysis to determine the net expansion potential. In a very similar way, forming a close relationship with an outgroup member has the potential to create a rift with one's present friends or community, especially if there is general animosity between the groups. Including the outgroup (or an outgroup member) in the self opens one to the possibility of rejection by an ingroup and loss of those self-aspects that are the province of that ingroup. Thus, the potential opportunities for self-expansion offered by the outgroup are likely weighed against the potential losses to self that might result from a close relationship with that group.

Despite the somewhat dampening impact of these opponent processes on one's enthusiasm for the potential of self-expansion to motivate intergroup contact, these opposing concerns—self-integration and possible self-lose—point to an important departure from the usual explanation for contact avoidance. Certainly, prejudicial attitudes towards the outgroup should reduce voluntary cross-group contact. However, these motives propose that contact avoidance need not result from antipathy or negative beliefs or feelings about the outgroup, but instead contact avoidance could involve concerns for the self. We think that the considering the role of self-directed concerns in addition to attitudes towards the other will be particularly fruitful as social psychologists begin to explore more thoroughly the reasons for contact avoidance.

Some Concluding Remarks

Over the past 50 years, there have been many examples in North America and throughout the world of satisfying improvements in civil rights and social justice. However, intergroup hostility, prejudice—in both its blatant and subtle forms—and lingering intergroup inequality remain central and pressing social issues. In fact, successful social movements and efforts to reduce segregation have increased the social mobility of members of traditionally disadvantaged groups. These trends,

combined with dramatic new patterns of immigration, the explosion in the refugee population, as well as globalization and the ever-increasing international travel, have produced unprecedented group-based diversity in many societies. The result is that concerns about how to best ensure that people's thoughts, feelings, judgments, and actions towards members of other groups are at least benign and perhaps even respectful and caring is as important today as it has ever been.

It is perhaps not surprising that our present unprecedented societal diversity coincides with a proliferation of research and theory on stereotyping and prejudice. However, among the hundreds of new and exciting contributions to our understanding of prejudice reduction, the intergroup contact hypothesis commands an impressively enduring presence. Even under the weight of 50 years of research and theorizing, the rather simple idea that the contact between individual members of divergent groups can lead the participants to hold more positive views of each other and the outgroup as a whole remains as elegant and exciting as it was when Allport wrote about it in 1954.

The introduction of theorizing based on social identity theory in the 1980's breathed new life into the hypothesis and set the stage for an exciting new period of theory-driven research. Our own research hollows in a lengthy though scattered tradition in the contact literature that focuses on the particular importance of friendships or interpersonal closeness as an important ingredient in effective intergroup contact. However, we push this perspective further proposing that the psychological process associated with feelings of friendship provide a key to the intergroup attitude change that results from contact across group and we believe that our findings provide some initial support for this. In addition, we propose that extensions of ideas taken from self-expansion theory and the inclusion-of-others-in the self (ideas that have their roots in work on interpersonal closeness) may provide important insights into the processes involved in intergroup contact. The inclusion of the other in the self provide a compelling explanation for why participants in intergroup contact would come to demonstrate more positive thoughts, affect, and behaviors towards the specific interaction partner, and an extension of this idea involving the inclusion of the outgroup in the self, provides a possible mechanism to explain how these positive thoughts, feelings and actions are then extended to the outgroup as a whole.

Perhaps as exciting, self-expansion theory also stands in contrast with the litany of psychological processes that have been uncovered to explain intolerance, avoidance, and mistreatment of outgroups and their members. By proposing that the desire to expand the self leads us to seek out others who can provide new resources, perspectives, and identities, this model provides a boldly optimistic perspective on intergroup contact. It predicts (and our preliminary data would support the claim) that, under the right circumstances, outgroup members can be seen as excellent

sources of self-expansion. Thus, this perspective provides one explanation for intergroup tolerance and harmony, as well as for examples of people who actively seek out interactions with outgroup members. However, it is important to note that the proposed opponent process of self-integration and the possibility of self-loss associated with including the outgroup in the self also provide reasons for contact avoidance. Nonetheless, thinking about these process in terms of their relevance to intergroup relations also leads us to consider the important role that self-directed thoughts and motives might have in conflict avoidance as well.

Our society and our science have changed considerably since the landmark decision of *Brown v Board of Education* and the penning of *The Nature of Prejudice*, yet fighting inequality, reducing prejudice, and improving the state of intergroup relations remains a major societal project and it appears that the intergroup contact hypothesis will remain a key perspective in social psychology's ongoing contribution to that project.

Note

[1] We use the term "feelings of friendship" to reflect the difficulty in finding an objective definition of "friendship" (see Fehr, 1996) and to imply that the outcome of the interaction(s) should be that the other person "feels like" a friend and that interactions with the partner are consistent with how one interacts with one's friends. Thus, rather than presenting a set of predetermined characteristics that would qualify a relationship as a friendship, we define friendship as the psychological experience of the other as friend.

References

- Allport, G.W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Altman, I. & Taylor, D. A. (1973). *Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships*. Oxford, England: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Amir, Y. (1969). Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. *Psychological Bulletin*, 71, 319-342.
- Amir, Y. (1976). The role of intergroup contact in change of prejudice and ethnic relations. In P. A. Katz (Ed.), *Towards the elimination of racism* (pp. 245-308). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.
- Aron, A., & Aron, E. N. (1986). *Love as the expansion of self: Understanding attraction and satisfaction*. New York: Hemisphere.
- Aron, A., & Aron, E. N. (1996). Self and self-expansion in relationships. In G. J. O. Fletcher & J. Fitness (Eds.), *Knowledge structures in close relationships: A social psychological approach* (pp. 325-344). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Aron, A., Aron, E. N. & Norman, C. (2001). Self-expansion model of motivation and cognition in close relationships and beyond. In Clark,

- M. & Fletcher (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology Vol. 2: Interpersonal processes*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Aron, A., Aron, E. N., Tudor, M., & Nelson, G. (1991). Close relationships as including other in the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*, 241-253.
- Aron, A., & Fraley, B. (1999). Relationship closeness as including other in the self: Cognitive underpinnings and measures. *Social Cognition*, *17*, 140-160.
- Aron, A., Melinat, E., Aron, E. N., Vallone, R., & Bator, R. (1997). The experimental generation of interpersonal closeness: A procedure and some preliminary findings. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*, 363-377.
- Aron, A., Norman, C. C., & Aron, E. N. (1998). The self-expansion model and motivation. *Representative Research in Social Psychology*, *22*, 1-13.
- Aronson, E., Blaney, N., Stephan, C., Sikes, J., & Snapp, M. (1978). *The jigsaw classroom*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Aronson, E., & Patnoe, S. (1997). *The jigsaw classroom : Building cooperation in the classroom*. New York: Longman.
- Batson, C. D., Polycarpou, M. P., Harmon-Jones, E., Imhoff, H. J., Mitchener, E. C., Bednar, L. L., Klein, T. R., & Highberger, L. (1997). Empathy and attitudes: Can feelings for a member of a stigmatized group improve feelings towards the group? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*, 105-118.
- Berscheid, E., Snyder, M., Omoto, A. M. (1989). The relationship closeness inventory: Assessing the closeness of interpersonal relationships. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *57*, 792-807.
- 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.
- Branscombe, N. R. & Ellemers, N. (1998). Coping with group-based discrimination: Individualistic versus group-level strategies. In: J. K. Swim & C. Stangor (Eds.), *Prejudice: The target's perspective* (pp. 243-266). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Brewer, M. B. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal intergroup situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *86*, 307-324.
- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love and outgroup hate. *Journal of Social Issues*, *55*, 429-444.
- Brewer, M. B. & Brown, R. J. (1998). Intergroup relations. In D. T. Gilbert & S. T. Fiske, (Eds.). *The handbook of social psychology, Vol. 2 (4th ed.)* (pp. 554-594). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Brewer, M. B. & Gaertner, S. L. (2001). Towards reduction of prejudice: Intergroup contact and social categorization. In R. Brown & S.

- Gaertner (Eds.) *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology (Vol. 4): Intergroup Processes* (pp. 451-472). Oxford: Blackwell Press.
- Brewer, M. B., & Kramer, R. M. (1985). The psychology of intergroup attitudes and behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 36, 219-244.
- Brewer, M. B. & Miller, M.B. (1984). Beyond the contact hypothesis: Theoretical perspectives on desegregation. In N. Miller & M.B. Brewer (Eds.) *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 281-302). Los Angeles, CA: Academic Press.
- Brewer, M. B., & Miller, N. (1996). *Intergroup Relations*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.
- Britt, T. W., Boniecki, K. A., Vescio, T. K., Biernat, M., & Brown, L.M. (1996). Intergroup anxiety: A person x situation approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 11, 1177-1188.
- Brophy, I. N (1946). The luxury of anti-Negro prejudice. *Public opinion quarterly*, 9, 456-466.
- Brody, S.M. (2003). *Serving a higher purpose: How service-learning leads to improved intergroup relations*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Brown, R, Vivian, J, & Hewstone, M. (1999). Changing attitudes through intergroup contact: The effects of group membership salience. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 741-764
- Byrne, D. (1961). Interpersonal attraction and attitude similarity. *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology*, 62, 713-715.
- Cook, S. W. (1984). Cooperative interaction in multiethnic contexts. In N. Miller & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 155-185). London: Academic Press.
- Cook, S.W. & Seltiz, C. (1955). Some factors which influence the attitudinal outcomes of personal contacts. *International Sociological Bulletin*, 7, 51-58.
- Derlega, V. J., Metts, S., & Petronio, S. (1993). *Self-disclosure*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Deutsch, M. & Collins, M.E. (1951). Social norms and social relations within the project. In *Interracial Housing: A Psychological Evaluation of a Social Experiment* (pp.71-77). New York: Russell & Russell.
- Dovidio, J. F., Brigham, J. C., Johnson, B. T., Gaertner, S. L. (1996). Stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination: Another look. In C. N. McRae, C. Stangor & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Stereotypes and stereotyping* (pp. 276-319). New York: Guilford.
- Dwyer, R.J. (1958). A report on patterns of interaction in desegregated schools. *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 31, 253-256.
- 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.

- Esses, V. M., & Dovidio, J. F. (2002). The role of emotions in determining willingness to engage in intergroup contact. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*, 1202-1214.
- Fehr, B. (1996). *Friendship processes*. London: Sage
- Gaertner, S.L. & Dovidio, J.F. (2000). *Reducing Intergroup Bias: The Common Ingroup Identity Model*. Ann Arbor, MI: Sheridan Books.
- 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. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (Vol. 4, pp. 1-26). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J.F., Banker, B. S., Houlette, M., Johnson, K. M., & McGlynn, E. A. (2000). Reducing intergroup conflict: From superordinate goals to decategorization, recategorization, and mutual differentiation. *Group Dynamics*, *4*, 98-114.
- Haddock, G., Zanna, M. P., Esses, V. M. (1993). Assessing the structure of prejudicial attitudes: The case of attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65*, 1105-1118.
- Hamberger, J., & Hewstone, M. (1997). Inter-ethnic contact as a predictor of blatant and subtle prejudice: Tests of a model in four West European nations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *36*, 173-190.
- Herek, G. M., & Capitanio, J. P. (1996). Some of my best friends: Intergroup contact, concealable stigma, and heterosexuals attitudes towards gay men and lesbians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *22*, 412-424.
- Hewstone, M. (1996). Contact and categorization: Social psychological interventions to change intergroup relations. In C. N. McRae, C. Stangor & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Stereotypes and stereotyping* (pp. 323-368). New York: Guilford.
- Hewstone, M. & Brown, R. (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). New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Horowitz, E. L (1936). The development of attitude toward the Negro. *Archives of psychology*, *47* (194).
- Insko, C. A., & Schopler, J. (1998). Differential distrust of groups and individuals. In C. Sedikides, J. Schopler, & C. A. Insko (Eds.), *Intergroup cognition and intergroup behavior*. (pp. 75-107). NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Islam, M.R. & Hewstone, M. (1993). Dimensions of contact as predictors of intergroup anxiety, perceived out-group variability, and out-group attitude: An integrative model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *19*, 700-710.
- Katz, P. A.& Zalk, S. R. (1978). Modification of children's racial attitudes. *Developmental Psychology*, *14*, 447-461.

- Marcus-Newhall, A., Miller, N., Holtz, R., & Brewer, M. B. (1993). Cross-cutting category membership with role assignment: A means of reducing intergroup bias. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 125-146.
- McLaughlin-Volpe, T., Aron, A., & Wright, S. C. & Lewandowski, G. W. Jr. (in press). Inclusion of the self by close others and by groups: Implications of the self-expansion self expansion model. In D. Abrams, J. Marques, & M. Hogg (Eds.), *Social inclusion and exclusion, diversity and deviance*.
- McLaughlin-Volpe, T., Aron, A., Wright, S. C., & Reis, H. T. (2001). *Intergroup social interactions and intergroup prejudice: Quantity versus quality*. Manuscript.
- McLaughlin-Volpe, T. & Wright, S.C. (2002). *The hidden rewards of cross-group friendship: Self-expansion across group membership*. Paper presented at the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology, San Sebastian, Spain.
- 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, 63-80.
- Minard, R.D. (1952). Race relationships in the Pocohantos coal field. *Journal of Social Issues*, 8, 29-44.
- Moreland, R. L., Beach, S. R. (1992). Exposure effects in the classroom: The development of affinity among students. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 28, 255-276.
- Mullen, B., Brown, R., & Smith, C. (1992). Intergroup bias as a function of salience, relevance, and status: An integration. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 103-122.
- Mummendey, A., Wenzel, M. (1999). Social discrimination and tolerance in intergroup relations: Reactions to intergroup difference. *Personality & Social Psychology Review*, 3, 158-174
- Otten, S. (2002). When "I" turns into "we": The self as a determinant of favoritism towards novel ingroups. In J. P. Forgas & K. Williams (Eds.) *The social self: Cognitive, interpersonal and intergroup perspectives*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Owen, K.I., Wright, S.C. & Brody, S.M. (2001). *Bicultural Friends: When group membership salience matters*. Poster presentation at the 2001 meeting of the Western Psychological Association. Maui, HI.
- Paolini, S., Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., & Vico, A. (in press). Effects of direct and indirect cross-group friendships on judgments of Catholic and Protestants in Northern Ireland: The mediating role of an anxiety-reduction mechanism, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1986). The intergroup contact hypothesis reconsidered. In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact & Conflict in Intergroup Encounters* (pp. 169-195). New York: Basil Blackwell.

- Pettigrew, T. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 173-185.
- Pettigrew, T. (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. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice?: Recent meta-analytic findings. In Stuart Oskamp et al. (Eds.) *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 93-114). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Reis, H. T., & Wheeler, L. (1991). Studying social interaction with the Rochester Interaction Record, In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 24, pp. 269-318). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- 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, 81-104.
- 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.
- Smith, E., Coats, S., & Walling, D. (1999). Overlapping mental representations of self, in-group, and partner: Further response time evidence and a connectionist model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 873-882.
- Stephan, W. G. (1987). The contact hypothesis in intergroup relations. In C. Hendrick, (Ed), *Group processes and intergroup relations. Review of personality and social psychology, Vol. 9.* (pp. 13-40). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Stephan, W.G. & Stephan, C.W. (1984). The role of ignorance in intergroup relations. In N. Miller & M.B. Brewer (Eds.) *Groups in Contact: The Psychology of Desegregation* (pp. 229-255). Los Angeles, CA: Academic Press.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41, 157-176.
- Stouffer, S. A. (1949). *The American soldier*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tajfel, H. (Ed.), (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. New York: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). *Social identity and intergroup relations*, Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W.G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (p. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

- Taylor, D. M., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1988). *Theories of intergroup relations: International and social psychological perspectives*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Triandis, H. C. (1972). *The analysis of subjective culture*. New York: Wiley.
- Tropp, L. R., & Wright, S. C. (2001). Ingroup identification as inclusion of ingroup in the self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 585-600.
- Van Oudenhoven, J. P., Groenewoud, J. T., & Hewstone, M. (1996). Cooperation, ethnic salience and generalization of interethnic attitudes. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 649-661.
- Weber, R., & Crocker, J. (1983). Cognitive processes in the revision of stereotypic beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 961-977.
- 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. (1993). The role of anxiety in facilitating stereotypic judgments of outgroup behavior. In D. M. Mackie & D. Lewis Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception*. (pp. 87-109). San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Inc.
- Wilder, D. A., Simon, A. F., & Faith, M. (1996). Enhancing the impact of counterstereotypic information: Dispositional attributions for deviance. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 71, 276-287.
- Williams, R. M., Jr. (1947). *The reduction of intergroup tensions*. New York: Social Science Research Council.
- Wilner, D.M, Walkley, R.P., & Cook, S.W. (1955). *Human relations in interracial housing: A study of the contact hypothesis*. Minneapolis, MN.: University of Minnesota Press.
- Worchel, S., Andreoli, V. A., & 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. (1995). *The impact of cross-group friendships on intergroup attitudes: An intergroup conflict simulation*. Paper presented at the Society for Experimental Social Psychology, Washington, DC.
- Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 73-90.
- Wright, S. C., Aron, A. & Tropp, L. R. (2002). Including others (and their groups) in the self: Self-expansion theory and intergroup relations. In J. P. Forgas & K. Williams (Eds.) *The social self: Cognitive, interpersonal and intergroup perspectives*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Wright, S.C., Brody, S. M. & Stout, A. (2000). *The avoidance of contact: One explanation for attitude/contact inconsistencies*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Society for Experimental Social Psychology, Atlanta, GA.

- Wright, S. C., & McLaughlin-Volpe, T. (2003). *Priming self-expansion and interest in cross-group contact*. Manuscript.
- Wright, S.C., Ropp, S.A., & Tropp, L.R. (1998, August). *Intergroup contact and the reduction of prejudice: Findings in support of the friendship hypothesis*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Wright, S. C. & Van Der Zande, C. C. (1999). *Bicultural Friends: When Cross-Group Friendships Cause Improved Intergroup Attitudes*. Paper presented at the Society for Experimental Social Psychology, St. Louis, MO.
- Wright, S. C., Van der Zande, C. C., Tropp, L. R., Ropp, S. S., Zanna M. P., Aron, A., & Young K. (2003). *Friendship and cross-group contact effects: An experimental test*. Manuscript.
- Zajonc, R. B. (1968). Attitudinal effects of mere exposure, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 9, 1-27.