STIGMA AND GROUP INEQUALITY

Social Psychological Perspectives

Edited by

Shana Levin
Claremont McKenna College

Colette van Laar
Leiden University

The Claremont Symposium on Applied Social Psychology

LEA
2006
LAWRENCE ERLBAUM ASSOCIATES, PUBLISHERS
Mahwah, New Jersey
London

CHAPTER

9

Stigma and Intergroup Contact Among Members of Minority and Majority Status Groups

Linda R. Tropp
Boston College

For decades, researchers in the social sciences have sought to identify strategies that would be effective in reducing prejudice and promoting positive intergroup relations. In his monograph, *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions*, Williams (1947) suggested that the "mere giving of objective general information" (p. 64) about an outgroup would likely do little to reduce intergroup hostility. Instead, he proposed that certain kinds of contact between groups could facilitate the development of positive intergroup attitudes. Allport (1954) concurred with this view, stating that contact under optimal conditions could reduce intergroup prejudice and improve relations between groups.

Guiding these authors' views was an understanding that intergroup relationships are often marked by some degree of hostility or conflict, and contact therefore holds the potential to either enhance or diminish prejudice between groups (Allport & Kramer, 1946; Williams, 1947). Hence, they focused their attention on positive conditions of the contact situation designed to ensure that intergroup contact would lead to reductions in prejudice. In particular, Williams emphasized that intergroup contact would maximally reduce prejudice when the groups share similar status, interests, and tasks, and the contact situation fosters intimate relations between the groups. Extending the work of Williams, Allport (1954) specified four optimal conditions that would be effective in reducing prejudice when implemented within the contact situation. First, Allport stressed the importance of establishing *equal status between the groups within the contact situation.*

Thus, even though the groups may be accorded different statuses in the larger society, they should be regarded as equal in status within the contact situation. Allport also noted the importance of *authority sanction*, such that the contact—and the equal status nature of that contact—would be supported by institutional authorities, laws, or customs. Additionally, Allport emphasized that the groups should work toward *common goals*, and that they should do so in *cooperation* and not in competition, such that the groups would work together and rely on each other in order to achieve their shared goals.

Since Allport's time, investigations of contact effects have flourished, with hundreds of studies being conducted across a wide range of social groups, contexts, and societies (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000, in press-a). Early field studies showed that equal status contact between racial groups can contribute to more positive intergroup attitudes (Deutsch & Collins, 1951; Wilner, Walkley, & Cook, 1955; Works, 1961). And a half century later, we now have substantial evidence from longitudinal (Levin, van Laar, & Sidanius, 2003), experimental (Wright et al., 2004), and meta-analytic studies (Pettigrew & Tropp, in press-a) suggesting that intergroup contact can lead to significant reductions in intergroup prejudice.

Still, intergroup contact theory has persisted as a fairly general conceptualization of what occurs when members of different groups interact. Indeed, only recently have researchers begun to consider the distinct ways in which members of minority and majority status groups are likely to respond to intergroup contact, given their differing histories of experiences within the broader society (see Devine & Vasquez, 1998). It is the goal of this chapter to link intergroup contact theory to recent perspectives on group differences in status, to evaluate the likely effectiveness of contact for improving relations between members of minority and majority status groups.

A SHIFTING FOCUS FOR CONTACT RESEARCH: OBJECTIVE CONDITIONS TO SUBJECTIVE RESPONSES

In line with Allport's original approach, intergroup contact research has traditionally focused on establishing optimal conditions within the contact situation, toward the ultimate goal of achieving broad-scale reductions in intergroup prejudice (see Cook, 1984; Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Pettigrew, 1998). As such, contact research has highlighted the importance of objective conditions of the contact situation, with relatively little attention to group members' subjective responses to those contact situations. Moreover, with its traditional focus on prejudice reduction, studies of intergroup

contact have overemphasized the perspectives and attitudes of members of majority status groups, to the relative neglect of the perspectives of members of minority status groups (Devine & Vasquez, 1998; Shelton, 2000).

Emerging contact research has begun to address these shortcomings by assessing minority and majority group members' experiences during intergroup contact, along with the beliefs and expectations they bring to the contact situation. This work suggests that members of both minority and majority status groups have challenges with which they must contend as they approach cross-group interactions (see Devine & Vasquez, 1998). Generally, members of minority and majority status groups both have concerns about how they are likely to be perceived by the other groups (Sigelman & Tuch, 1997; Vorauer, Main, & O'Connell, 1998), and they are both likely to feel anxious about engaging in cross-group interactions (Plant & Devine, 2003; W. G. Stephan & C. W. Stephan, 1985; Tropp, 2003). Nonetheless, research suggests that their anxieties may be based in largely different sets of concerns. In particular, members of majority status groups are likely to experience anxiety about being perceived as prejudiced, whereas members of minority status groups tend to be anxious about potentially becoming the target of prejudice (Devine & Vasquez, 1998; W. G. Stephan & C. W. Stephan, 1985).

EXAMINING CONTACT EFFECTS IN TERMS OF STATUS RELATIONS BETWEEN THE GROUPS

These perspectives offer important advances for our understanding of group members' subjective experiences in intergroup contexts, and the dimensions that are likely to be of concern to minority and majority group members during contact. But beyond these concerns in the immediate contact situation, we must also consider whether there are broader differences in minority and majority group members' views regarding the role that group status plays in defining relations between their groups (see Blumer, 1958; Bobo, 1999). Other work has shown contrasting bases of intergroup prejudice among members of minority and majority status groups, such that majority attitudes are linked to support for their privileged status, while minority attitudes are often based in the anticipation of prejudice from the majority group (see Livingston, Brewer, & Alexander, 2004; Monteith & Spicer, 2000). Additionally, due to their privileged position, members of majority status groups are generally less inclined to reflect on their group's status (Leach, Snider, & Iyer, 2002), or to think of themselves in terms of their group membership (Kim-Ju & Liem, 2003; Pinel, 1999), unless it is required by demands of the immediate social context (W. McGuire, C. McGuire, Child, & Fujioka, 1978). By contrast, members of minority status

groups are often acutely aware of their group's devalued status (Jones et al., 1984) and that they are likely to be seen and evaluated in terms of their devalued group membership (Crocker, Major, & Steele, 1998; Goffman, 1963; Mendoza-Denton, Downey, Purdie, Davis, & Pietrzak, 2002; Pinel, 1999). Consequently, they live with a constant threat of becoming targets of prejudice and discrimination (Crocker et al., 1998), and worse still, they are often confronted with prejudice and discrimination due to their devalued group membership (Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Swim, Cohen, & Hyers, 1998; Swim, Hyers, Cohen, Fitzgerald, & Bylsma, 2003). As such, these regular reminders of their group's devalued status may become concrete features of the intergroup relationship from the perspective of members of minority status groups, while these features may be less likely to be perceived as intrinsic to the intergroup relationship among members of the majority status group.

Recent polls reveal trends that are consistent with this analysis. Overall, Black Americans perceive significantly more racial discrimination against their group than do White Americans (National Conference for Community and Justice, 2000), at the same time as most White Americans believe Blacks in their communities are treated as well as Whites (Gallup Organization, 2001). Correspondingly, relative to White Americans, Black Americans tend to see racial tensions as a bigger problem in our society, and they tend to be more pessimistic about the potential for American race relations to improve in the future (Gallup Organization, 2001; National Conference for Community and Justice, 2000). Thus, concerns about group status and discrimination against one's group may play a more significant role in defining the intergroup relationship among members of minority status groups, relative to the role they play among members of majority status groups.

Given these trends, it is perhaps not surprising that American race relations are typically characterized in terms of racial distrust (Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakami, & Hodson, 2002), particularly so when viewed from the perspective of members of minority status groups. Stigmatization understandably impedes the development of trust (Cohen & Steele, 2002; Kramer & Wei, 1999; Pinel, 2002; see also Inzlicht & Good, chap. 7, this volume; McLaughlin-Volpe, chap. 11, this volume; Mendoza-Denton, Page-Gould, & Pietrzak, chap. 8, this volume). Thus, members of minority status groups may be especially vigilant in their relations with the majority outgroup until they feel outgroup members are worthy of their trust (Brown & Dobbins, 2004; Steele, Spencer, & Aronson, 2002). Cohen, Walton, and Garcia (2004) recently examined these issues among ethnic minority and majority students in a high school context. These authors found that ethnic minority and majority students reported similar levels of concern about their academic abilities, as well as comparable levels of social anxiety. Still, ethnic minority students reported substantially greater racial mistrust and perceptions of bias against their ethnic group relative to ethnic majority students.

Cohen et al.'s (2004) findings reveal that members of both minority and majority status groups are likely to have multiple concerns about how they will be perceived and evaluated in intergroup contexts. Moreover, their findings suggest that a continual recognition of devalued group status and discrimination against one's group may constitute an added negative factor with which minority group members must contend in intergroup contexts, whereas such a factor may not be operating for members of majority status groups. A constant awareness of devaluation could make minority group members especially motivated to avoid intergroup contact to keep from exposing themselves to prejudice and discrimination from the majority group (see Crocker et al., 1998; Goffman, 1963; Mendoza-Denton et al., 2002; W. G. Stephan & C. W. Stephan, 1985). But we can also consider the broader implications of this tendency for achieving positive relations between members of minority and majority status groups. It is likely that long-standing histories of devaluation and discrimination against one's group would seriously inhibit the potential for enhancing positive feelings about intergroup relationships among members of minority status groups, relative to the effects that might be observed among members of majority status groups. This possibility is considered throughout the remainder of this chapter, in reference to samples of data gathered from meta-analytic, survey, and experimental studies on intergroup contact.

CONTACT EFFECTS FOR MINORITY AND MAJORITY STATUS GROUPS: META-ANALYTIC COMPARISONS

These issues are first examined using data from a recent meta-analysis of intergroup contact effects (see Pettigrew & Tropp, in press-a, in press-b; Tropp & Pettigrew, in press). For this analysis, we retrieved hundreds of papers on intergroup contact through intensive searches of multiple research literatures. As we located these papers, we then checked to see whether each met the four criteria we determined for inclusion in the meta-analysis.

First, because our analysis focused on the effects of intergroup contact, we considered only those cases in which intergroup contact could act as an independent variable for predicting intergroup prejudice. These studies included both experimental studies testing for the effects of contact on prejudice, and correlational studies in which contact was used as a correlate or predictor for intergroup prejudice. Second, we included only studies that involved contact between members of clearly defined groups to ensure that we examined intergroup—rather than interpersonal—outcomes. Third, the studies had to involve some degree of direct contact between members of the different groups, which could either be observed by others or reported

by the participants themselves. This criterion excludes studies that attempted to gauge contact using indirect measures such as information about an outgroup, as well as studies in which participants were categorized into groups without opportunities for actual cross-group interactions. Finally, to be included, the outcome measures had to be collected on individuals rather than assessed on an aggregate level, and some type of comparative data had to be available to evaluate variability in prejudice in relation to the contact (see Pettigrew & Tropp, in press-a, for an extended discussion).

From a 5-year search, we uncovered 516 studies (including 715 independent samples) examining relationships between contact and prejudice that met these inclusion criteria. The studies were conducted between the early 1940s through the year 2000, spanning many disciplines and involving contact between members of a wide range of groups. Together, the studies include responses from 250,555 individuals in 38 countries.

In conducting our analysis, we used two indicators of effect size (Cohen's *d* and Pearson's *r*), with larger effect sizes signifying stronger relationships between intergroup contact and prejudice. We also examined contact–prejudice effects at distinct levels of analysis. Analyses conducted at the level of studies represent the overall effects for all data reported in each paper. Analyses at the level of samples represent the overall effects for each independent sample reported in each paper. Because studies often include multiple samples, analyzing data at the level of samples offers larger numbers of cases for conducting more detailed comparisons of effects (see Pettigrew & Tropp, in press-a).

Overall, results from the meta-analysis reveal that greater levels of intergroup contact are typically associated with lower levels of intergroup prejudice. These patterns of effects are consistent across analyses by studies and samples (in each case, mean $d = -.43$, mean $r = -.21$). Moreover, additional analyses suggest that these results are unlikely to be due to participant selection or publication biases, and the more rigorous research studies also reveal stronger contact–prejudice effects (Pettigrew & Tropp, in press-a).

We then examined patterns of contact–prejudice effects among members of minority and majority status groups. Here, we coded samples as to whether participants in the contact situation belonged to a devalued, lower status group (i.e., minority status), or a dominant, higher status group (i.e., majority status). As a first step in our analysis, we tallied the number of samples that examined relationships between contact and prejudice among members of minority and majority status groups. This comparison clearly reveals the relative scarcity of research on intergroup contact from the perspectives of members of minority status groups (see Devine & Vasquez, 1998; Shelton, 2000). Indeed, of the 715 samples included in our full analysis,

only 142 samples examined contact outcomes among members of minority status groups, whereas an overwhelming 505 samples examined contact outcomes among members of majority status groups.

We then proceeded to compare the magnitudes of the contact–prejudice relationships among members of minority and majority status groups (see Tropp & Pettigrew, in press). Overall, we found that the relationship between contact and prejudice is significantly weaker among members of minority status groups (mean $d = -.38$, mean $r = -.19$) relative to the effects obtained for members of majority status groups (mean $d = -.44$, mean $r = -.22$; $p < .001$ for the difference between effect sizes). Thus, although significant contact–prejudice relationships were observed in both cases, the magnitudes of these relationships still appear to vary among members of minority and majority status groups.

As we interpret these findings, we must recognize that there are several possible reasons for this pattern of results. For example, it could be that because minorities are fewer in number, and are regularly exposed to the majority group, any single contact experience would have less of an impact on their attitudes, thereby producing less change in their feelings toward the majority group as a whole. Additionally, it might be that members of minority status groups generally report lower levels of prejudice than members of majority status groups, which could limit the degree to which their prejudices could be reduced further through intergroup contact.

Alternatively, it could be that these patterns of effects are associated with the different perceptions that group members have about intergroup contact, based on the broader relationships between their groups in the larger society (Bobo, 1999; Livingston et al., 2004; Monteith & Spicer, 2000). Indeed, members of minority status groups are well aware of the devaluation that surrounds their group membership (Pinel, 1999), along with the possibility that they might become the targets of prejudice (Crocker et al., 1998). Thus, with good reason, minority group members' responses to intergroup contact may be colored by a persisting recognition of their group's devaluation, which could inhibit the potential for achieving positive contact outcomes.

SURVEY OF CONTACT–PREJUDICE RELATIONSHIPS AMONG MINORITY AND MAJORITY STATUS GROUPS

To examine these possibilities, we conducted a secondary analysis of survey responses gathered by the National Conference for Community and Justice (2000; see also Tropp, 2005). These survey responses resulted from telephone interviews conducted between January, 2000, and March, 2000,

with a nationally representative sample of approximately 2,500 adults in the continental United States. Oversamples of racial and ethnic minority respondents were drawn, such that the sample included responses from 995 White Americans and 709 Black Americans.

Responses from these participants have been reanalyzed in an attempt to replicate findings from the meta-analysis, and to provide more insights regarding possible interpretations of its results. Testing for replication in a single study that uses identical procedures across all participants offers an important extension of our meta-analytic research, since meta-analyses are often criticized for including comparisons across studies where variables, samples, and testing procedures are not uniform (see Rosenthal, 1991, for an extended discussion).

In this survey, participants were asked to indicate their contact experiences and feelings of intergroup closeness with respect to a wide variety of groups. For the present analysis, reported experiences with and closeness to Blacks were used as measures of intergroup contact and prejudice among White respondents. Similarly, reported experiences with and closeness to Whites were used as measures of intergroup contact and prejudice among Black respondents.

First, respondents provided "yes" or "no" responses to a general contact measure, in which they indicated whether they "now have contact or not with a person who is (White/Black)." Respondents also responded to a general measure of intergroup closeness, by reporting "how close they feel to (Whites/Blacks)" on a 5-point scale, with recoded responses ranging from 1 (*very far*) to 5 (*very close*). Reported feelings of intergroup closeness can be an especially useful indicator of intergroup prejudice, because affective responses to the outgroup typically show stronger relationships with intergroup contact than other sorts of prejudice indicators (see Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005).

As a first step in our analysis, we examined the overall relationships between intergroup contact and prejudice, to see whether we would obtain the same results as what we observed in the meta-analysis (see Tropp, 2005). Here, we conducted bivariate correlations between contact and intergroup closeness, as well as partial correlations controlling for demographic variables such as level of education, socioeconomic status, political ideology, age, and gender. As in the meta-analysis, we found significant overall relationships between contact and closeness both with and without controlling for the demographic variables, $r = .17$, partial $r = .17$, $p < .001$. Moreover, we also found that the relationships between contact and closeness were significantly weaker among Black participants, $r = .08$, partial $r = .06$, $p < .05$, relative to the effects obtained for White participants, $r = .22$, partial $r = .24$, $p < .001$; $p < .01$ for the difference between effect sizes.

Subsequent analyses examined the obtained patterns of effects in relation to three possible interpretations growing from our meta-analytic results. First, we considered whether the patterns of effects might be due to a tendency for White and Black respondents to differ in their levels of intergroup contact. Specifically, a chi-square analysis tested whether White and Black respondents were more or less likely to have contact with the outgroup. The chi-square analysis was not significant, $\chi^2(1) = 2.01$, $p > .10$, suggesting that White and Black respondents did not meaningfully differ in the extent to which they had contact with the outgroup. Thus, it seems unlikely that initial differences in the amount of contact with the outgroup would account for the weaker contact–prejudice effects observed among Black respondents in this sample, or among minority status groups in the meta-analysis.

Additional analyses then examined whether White and Black respondents generally differed in the extent to which they reported feeling close to members of the outgroup. Results indicate that White and Black respondents did not significantly differ in their overall feelings of intergroup closeness ($M = 3.63$ and 3.68, respectively), $F(1, 1654) = 1.54$, $p > .10$. Thus, initial differences in levels of intergroup closeness as a measure of prejudice cannot explain the divergent contact–prejudice relationships observed between White and Black respondents in the present sample, and are therefore unlikely to explain the differing contact–prejudice relationships observed between minority and majority status groups in the meta-analysis.

We then sought to test whether the differences in patterns of effects among White and Black participants might be associated with distinct views of the intergroup relationship. Because members of minority groups anticipate being targeted by prejudice and discrimination to a greater extent than members of majority groups (e.g., Cohen et al., 2004), we focused our analysis on group members' perceptions of discrimination against their group. Specifically, we used respondents' answers to a separate item concerning "how much discrimination there is against (Whites/Blacks) in our society today," with reverse-coded responses of 1 (*none at all*), 2 (*only a little*), 3 (*some*), and 4 (*a great deal*).

As might be expected, preliminary analyses showed that Black respondents perceived significantly more discrimination against their group ($M = 3.43$) relative to the discrimination perceived by White respondents against their group ($M = 2.37$), $F(1, 1691) = 619.60$, $p < .001$. More importantly, however, we find that perceiving discrimination bears different relationships with reports of intergroup closeness among White and Black respondents. Specifically, greater perceived discrimination against one's group relates significantly to lower feelings of intergroup closeness among Black respondents, $r = -.12$, partial $r = -.12$, $p < .01$, whereas the relationship between per-

ceived discrimination and intergroup closeness is not significant among White respondents, $r = .03$, partial $r = .03$, $p > .30$.

We also find some evidence that perceived discrimination moderates the relationship between intergroup contact and closeness among Black respondents, whereas such moderation does not occur for White respondents. Table 9.1 presents bivariate and partial correlations between contact and closeness for Black and White respondents who perceive varying degrees of discrimination against their group. These analyses indicate that the relationship between intergroup contact and closeness is consistently strong for White respondents, regardless of the degree to which they perceive discrimination against their group. However, among Black respondents, the relationship between contact and closeness differs substantially depending on the degree to which they perceive discrimination against their group. Specifically, the relationship between contact and closeness is significant among Black respondents who perceive only a moderate amount of discrimination against their group, yet contact and closeness are not significantly related among Black respondents who perceive a great deal of discrimination against their group. It is also important to note that over half of the Black respondents reported that they perceived a great deal of discrimination against their group ($n = 387$, 56.6%), whereas most of the remaining Black respondents perceived a moderate amount of discrimination against their group ($n = 272$, 39.8%). Together, these findings suggest that the more members of minority status groups perceive discrimination against their groups, the weaker their contact–prejudice relationships will tend to be. The one exception to this trend involved the small number of Black respondents who reported absolutely no discrimination against their group ($n = 25$, 3.6%). These respondents reported high feelings of intergroup closeness whether they did ($M = 4.12$) or did not ($M = 4.00$) have contact with the outgroup. Moreover, taken together, their mean reports of intergroup closeness were significantly higher ($M = 4.08$) than those reported

TABLE 9.1
Perceived Discrimination as Moderator for Relationship Between Contact and Intergroup Closeness Among Black and White Respondents

Perceived Discrimination	*Black Respondents*			*White Respondents*		
	r	*partial r*	*n*	*r*	*partial r*	*n*
A Great Deal	.06	.02	387	.34**	.29*	72
Some/Only A Little	.18**	.18**	272	.17***	.19***	664
None At All	.06	−.08	25	.29***	.32***	227

Note. *r* = Pearson correlation coefficient; *partial r* = Pearson correlation coefficient controlling for level of education, socioeconomic status, political ideology, age, and gender; *n* = number of respondents.

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

by all other Black respondents in this sample ($M = 3.66$), $t(682) = 2.52$, $p = .01$. Thus, it could be that because they already have quite positive orientations toward the outgroup, there are limits on the degree to which intergroup contact could further enhance their feelings of intergroup closeness.

Overall, these patterns of findings provide important insights into the nature of contact–prejudice relationships among members of minority and majority status groups, which can aid in our interpretation of results from the meta-analysis. For members of minority status groups, perceiving discrimination against one's group exists as a powerful, negative force that permeates the intergroup relationship, although this force appears to be largely irrelevant to the intergroup relationship from the perspective of members of majority status groups. As such, contact–prejudice relationships are likely to vary depending on the degree to which minority group members perceive discrimination against their groups, although such effects are less likely to be observed among members of majority groups. Thus, although positive intergroup outcomes can often be achieved through intergroup contact (Pettigrew & Tropp, in press-a), the negative presence of discrimination as a feature of the intergroup relationship is likely to restrain the potentially positive effects of contact for members of minority status groups.

EXPERIMENTAL EFFECTS OF PREJUDICE ON FEELINGS TOWARD CROSS-GROUP INTERACTIONS

In sum, findings from the survey indicate that perceiving discrimination against one's group will likely inhibit feelings of intergroup closeness among members of minority status groups. Thus far, these relationships have been examined using survey data, showing that greater perceptions of discrimination correspond with reduced feelings of closeness toward the majority outgroup as a whole. But some experimental evidence also suggests that exposure to prejudice can lead members of minority status groups to feel less positively about relations with the majority group.

Specifically, studies involving both laboratory and real groups have examined how an expression of prejudice from an outgroup member would affect minority group members' expectations for cross-group interactions (see Tropp, 2003). In one of these studies (Tropp, 2003, Study 2), participants from two ethnic minority groups (Latinos and Asian Americans) were initially informed that the study concerned "communication styles" among members of different ethnic groups. After completing a filler task and a personal information form, participants then learned that they were randomly assigned to interact with a White person, and they were given a photograph and personal information form for a White partner. In actuality, the person

believed to be the White partner was a confederate working with the research team.

To manipulate participants' exposure to an expression of prejudice, participants then overheard one of two scripted dialogues between the confederate and the experimenter while seated on the other side of a partition. In the prejudice condition, participants overheard the confederate ask if he could switch partners because he would rather not be matched with a (Latino/Asian) person. Instead, in the neutral condition, participants overheard the confederate ask a benign question concerning whether the study would take over an hour to complete. It should also be noted that the confederate actually making these comments was a native English-speaking Asian American, rather than the White person who participants believed was their partner. This procedure was used to ensure that, through the debriefing process, participants would be confident that the White person they saw in the photograph did not actually express or endorse prejudice against their ethnic group.

Following these procedures, participants completed a brief questionnaire packet as they anticipated an interaction with their partner. To assess their orientations toward the outgroup, this packet asked participants to report the extent to which they expected to get along with, trust, feel comfortable with, enjoy interacting with, and have a lot in common with their outgroup partner, and with outgroup members in general (αs ranging from .89 to .97). Results from this study revealed that participants exposed to prejudice from an outgroup member had significantly less positive orientations toward the outgroup partner, and they also tended to have less positive orientations toward outgroup members in general.

These findings offer important insights regarding the roles that prejudice and discrimination may play in shaping understandings of intergroup relationships among members of minority status groups. In particular, exposure to even a single instance of prejudice from an outgroup member may lead members of minority status groups to anticipate less trust and closeness in their relations with the outgroup. Given that members of minority status groups are regularly confronted with prejudice in their everyday lives (Swim et al., 1998, 2003), we must consider the broader detrimental effects that repeated exposure to prejudice is likely to have on minority group members' feelings toward relations with the majority outgroup.

The varied research findings presented thus far indicate that devalued group status and discrimination against one's group play important roles in defining the nature of intergroup relationships among members of minority status groups. We have observed that the positive effects of intergroup contact tend to be diminished among members of minority status groups, relative to the effects observed for members of majority status

groups (Tropp & Pettigrew, in press). We also find significant relationships between perceiving discrimination and reduced feelings of intergroup closeness among members of minority status groups, although these relationships are not significant among members of majority status groups; moreover, contact-prejudice relationships tend to be weak among members of minority status groups who perceive a great deal of discrimination against their groups (Tropp, 2005). Experimental findings also suggest that exposure to even a single instance of prejudice can lead minority group members to feel less positively about interacting with members of the majority outgroup (Tropp, 2003). In sum, these collected findings suggest that intergroup contact may generally be a less effective means for promoting positive intergroup outcomes among members of minority status groups, to the extent that prejudice and discrimination act as negative forces curbing contact's positive effects.

EFFECTS OF OPTIMAL CONTACT CONDITIONS AMONG MINORITY AND MAJORITY STATUS GROUPS

Relating these findings to the broader framework of intergroup contact theory (Allport, 1954; Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Pettigrew, 1998), we must therefore question whether establishing Allport's optimal conditions within the contact situation can sufficiently alleviate these negative forces to allow positive contact outcomes to emerge among members of both minority and majority status groups. Indeed, many researchers have noted that conditions of equal status may be defined and interpreted in a number of ways (Cohen, 1982; Foster & Finchilescu, 1986; Riordan, 1978), and members of different status groups may not always agree about the extent to which equal status has been achieved within the contact situation (Robinson & Preston, 1976). Thus, even when objective attempts are made to establish such conditions as equal status, group members' subjective responses to intergroup contact may still vary depending on the perceptions and experiences that inform their understanding of the intergroup relationship (see Cohen, 1982; Livingston et al., 2004). As such, implementing optimal conditions within the contact situation may not necessarily be enough to ensure positive contact outcomes among members of both minority and majority status groups.

We returned to our meta-analytic data to pursue a preliminary test of these ideas (see Tropp & Pettigrew, in press). Specifically, we sought to examine whether samples from minority and majority status groups would still show different patterns of contact–prejudice relationships even in those cases where the contact situation was purposely designed to maxi-

mize positive intergroup outcomes. To guide this investigation, we focused heavily on Allport's proposed conditions for optimal intergroup contact because they have played such a pivotal role in prior contact research. We began by attempting to rate each of Allport's conditions individually for each sample, but this approach proved impossible due to the limited information available in most of the research reports. We therefore shifted our approach and rated each sample as to whether the contact situation was explicitly structured to approximate Allport's conditions for optimal intergroup contact. These global ratings actually offer a more direct test of Allport's contentions than our original approach because Allport held that his four conditions should be implemented together to maximize positive intergroup outcomes.

As a general test of the effectiveness of Allport's conditions, we then compared samples that corresponded with our ratings, such that the contact situation either was or was not explicitly structured in line with Allport's conditions (see Pettigrew & Tropp, in press-a, in press-b). Overall, we found that samples with contact structured in line with Allport's conditions yielded significantly stronger contact–prejudice effects (mean $d = -.58$, mean $r = -.28$) relative to the effects obtained for the remaining samples (mean $d = -.42$, mean $r = -.21$; $p < .0001$ for the difference between effect sizes).

We then turned to focus our analysis on whether Allport's conditions would be comparably effective in promoting strong contact–prejudice relationships among members of minority and majority status groups (see Tropp & Pettigrew, in press). We examined this issue by comparing the effect sizes for minority and majority samples that either were or were not structured to meet Allport's conditions. Among majority status groups, the 98 samples with contact structured in line with Allport's conditions showed significantly stronger contact–prejudice effects (mean $d = -.67$, mean $r = -.32$), relative to the remaining majority samples (mean $d = -.43$, mean $r = -.21$; $p < .0001$ for the difference between effect sizes). However, among minority status groups, the 13 samples with contact situations structured in line with Allport's conditions did not show substantially stronger contact–prejudice effects (mean $d = -.46$, mean $r = -.22$), relative to the other minority samples (mean $d = -.38$, mean $r = -.19$; $p > .30$ for the difference between effect sizes). In part, the lack of statistical significance in the minority context could reflect the relatively small number of studies included in this comparison. Nonetheless, given the difference in magnitude of the effects in the minority and majority contexts, these patterns suggest that members of minority and majority status groups may still show different responses to intergroup contact, even when the contact situation is explicitly structured to maximize positive intergroup outcomes. Specifically, it may be that establishing Allport's conditions within the contact situation can enhance the

positive effects of contact among members of majority status groups although these conditions may not significantly enhance the positive effects of contact among members of minority status groups.

As suggested previously, we believe these findings may grow from general differences in perspective regarding the nature of relationships between the groups (see Bobo, 1999; Livingston et al., 2004). Members of minority status groups are likely to perceive prejudice and discrimination as integral to the intergroup relationship, although these may be less prominent features of the intergroup relationship in the minds of members of majority status groups. As such, the effects of positive conditions within the intergroup context may be diluted for members of minority status groups, as their feelings about relations with the majority group are constructed in conjunction with long-standing histories of devaluation. Thus, even when attempts are made to establish positive norms of tolerance and mutual acceptance, these efforts may not be sufficient to fully counter the negative effects of discrimination on minority group members' feelings about relations with the majority group.

Related to this point, we have recently gathered responses to a survey in which we assess ethnic minority and majority group members' perceptions of societal norms, perceptions of discrimination, and orientations toward outgroup members (see Tropp, 2004). To date, our sample includes responses from 153 undergraduate participants (84 ethnic minority, 69 ethnic majority), with ages ranging from 17 to 32 years (mean age = 19.20 years). With these data, we compare how group members' feelings toward relations with outgroup members correspond with perceived norms of tolerance in the broader society and perceived discrimination against their ethnic groups.

To prepare for this analysis, we averaged responses to two items concerning norms of tolerance, in which participants indicated the extent to which they believe "efforts (are) made to establish norms of tolerance and acceptance among different ethnic groups" and "people acknowledge and promote ethnic diversity" in American society ($\alpha = .74$ and .84 among ethnic minority and majority participants, respectively). Using a single item, participants also reported the extent to which they perceive discrimination against their ethnic group as a whole. These items were scored on 7-point scales ranging from 1 (not at all/strongly disagree) to 7 (very much/strongly agree).

As a first step in our analysis, we correlated scores on these measures with an indicator of perceived inclusion of one's ethnic group. Specifically, participants reported the degree to which they perceive their ethnic group as being "included" in American society, with scores ranging from 1 (not included at all) to 7 (completely included). Among ethnic minority participants, perceiving norms of tolerance was positively associated with the

TABLE 9.2
Correlating Perceived Norms of Tolerance and Discrimination With Feelings Toward Intergroup Relationships Among Members of Ethnic Minority and Majority Groups

	Norms of Tolerance		*Discrimination*	
	Minority	*Majority*	*Minority*	*Majority*
Orientations toward Outgroup Members	.23*	.14	−.24*	.24*
Warmth toward Outgroup Members	.24*	.15	−.32**	.11
Proportions of Outgroup Friends	.28**	.11	−.35**	17

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

sense that one's group is included in American society, $r = .28$, $p = .01$, whereas perceiving discrimination was negatively associated with perceived ingroup inclusion, $r = -.26$, $p < .05$. At the same time, neither perceiving norms of tolerance nor perceiving discrimination were significantly related to perceptions of ingroup inclusion among ethnic majority participants, $r = .10$ and $-.11$, respectively, $p > .30$.

We then examined how perceiving norms of tolerance and discrimination related to feelings about relations with the outgroup across a number of indicators. Participants reported their general orientations toward interacting with outgroup members (Tropp, 2003), along with feelings of warmth toward outgroup members and their proportions of outgroup friends. Table 9.2 provides correlations between these indicators and the norms of tolerance and discrimination measures for ethnic minority and majority participants.

Thus far, responses from ethnic minority participants show that perceiving norms of tolerance typically corresponds with more positive orientations toward outgroup members, greater warmth, and greater proportions of outgroup friends. At the same time, perceived discrimination corresponds with significantly less positive orientations toward outgroup members, less warmth, and smaller proportions of outgroup friends among ethnic minority participants. Additionally, when entered simultaneously as predictors, both norms of tolerance and discrimination emerge as significant predictors for each indicator, yet perceived discrimination tends to be a stronger predictor than perceived norms of tolerance.[1] By contrast, among ethnic majority participants, there are no significant relationships between perceiving norms of tolerance and these indicators, and only one

[1]Standardized regression coefficients (β) for perceived discrimination were $-.22$ when predicting orientations toward outgroup members, $p = .05$; $-.30$ when predicting warmth, $p = .005$; and $-.32$ when predicting proportions of outgroup friends, $p = .002$. Standardized regression coefficients for perceived norms of tolerance were .20 when predicting orientations toward outgroup members, $p = .06$; .21 when predicting warmth, $p = .05$; and .25 when predicting proportions of outgroup friends, $p = .02$.

indicator reveals a significant relationship with perceived discrimination; greater perceptions of discrimination correspond with more positive orientations toward outgroup members, $r = .24$, $p < .05$.

Taken together, these findings suggest that members of minority and majority status groups generally differ in the extent to which they see norms of tolerance and discrimination as relevant to their intergroup relationships. Perceiving norms of tolerance can encourage greater feelings of inclusion and more positive orientations toward cross-group interactions among members of minority status groups. At the same time, however, perceiving discrimination acts as a persisting negative force in the intergroup relationship from the perspective of members of minority status groups, whereas neither norms of tolerance nor perceived discrimination contribute substantially to majority group members' feelings about their intergroup relationships.

It may be that members of majority status groups enjoy the privilege of not having to think about their group's status as they reflect on the broader intergroup relationship (see Leach et al., 2002), unless such reflection is induced by demands of the immediate social context (see Devine & Vasquez, 1998). By contrast, considerations of group status and discrimination appear to be of great importance to members of minority status groups, such that these considerations permeate their feelings about relations with the majority status group. Moreover, given that members of minority status groups are often met with prejudice and discrimination against their groups (Swim et al., 1998), perceived discrimination is likely to operate as a perpetual negative force in their views of the intergroup relationship although such a consistent negative force may not be operating among members of the majority status group.

These patterns of findings appear to diverge somewhat from the traditional emphasis of *intergroup contact theory*, which suggests that positive intergroup attitudes can be enhanced by emphasizing equal status between groups within the contact situation (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998). As such, the results may reflect distinctions between what people report in relatively abstract contexts, as compared to what they would likely experience in actual contact situations (see Levy, Freitas, & Salovey, 2002, for a related discussion). But these findings also point to broader issues we must consider regarding the approaches we use to achieve positive intergroup relations in the larger society.

CONCLUSIONS

Together, these combined findings suggest that our traditional focus on establishing optimal conditions within the intergroup context may not be

enough to promote positive intergroup relations among members of both minority and majority status groups. Beyond emphasizing conditions of the contact situation, we must also recognize that group members have histories of perceptions and experiences that are likely to inform their understanding of the intergroup relationship (Cohen et al., 2004; Livingston et al., 2004), and their responses to cross-group interactions (Devine & Vasquez, 1998; Plant & Devine, 2003; Tropp, 2003). Indeed, even when objective attempts are made to establish optimal conditions within the contact situation, group members' subjective responses to contact may still be guided by their long-standing views of the intergroup relationship (see Cohen, 1982; Robinson & Preston, 1976).

Consistent with this view, the research presented in this chapter indicates that members of minority status groups not only contend with prejudice and discrimination (Crocker et al., 1998; Swim et al., 1998), but these factors can also contribute negatively to their feelings about intergroup relations (Tropp, 2003), in ways beyond those that are likely to be detected among members of the majority group (Tropp & Pettigrew, in press). As such, we must extend our understanding of intergroup contact theory to acknowledge how differing histories of experiences may lead members of minority and majority status groups to show different responses to intergroup contact, and to recognize the important role that prejudice and discrimination can play in shaping minority group members' feelings toward intergroup relationships.

Thus, as we look to future research on intergroup contact, we must look beyond establishing a set of objective conditions within the contact situation to promote positive intergroup outcomes, corresponding to the approach that has commonly been used in the past (see Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998; Williams, 1947). Rather, we must also take into account the subjective perspectives of the different groups involved and attempt to address concerns that are particularly relevant to their conceptions of the intergroup relationship. Because prejudice and discrimination can curb the potentially positive effects of contact, we must work to create environments that members of minority status groups feel they can trust (Cohen & Steele, 2002; Steele et al., 2002), and in which they can feel confident that prejudice and discrimination will not affect how they will be perceived and treated (Crocker et al., 1998). At the same time, we must not only curb the endorsement of prejudice among members of majority status groups, but we must also encourage them to recognize the significance of prejudice and discrimination in minority group members' views of the intergroup relationship. Perhaps through such a sharing of perspectives, we can achieve more common understandings of intergroup relationships among group members on both sides, along with promoting the kinds of mutual trust and

openness that can facilitate positive relations between members of minority and majority status groups.

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Allport, G. W., & Kramer, B. M. (1946). Some roots of prejudice. *Journal of Psychology, 22,* 9–39.

Blumer, H. (1958). Race prejudice as a sense of group position. *Pacific Sociological Review, 1,* 3–7.

Bobo, L. D. (1999). Prejudice as group position: Microfoundations of a sociological approach to racism and intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues, 55,* 445–472.

Brown, L. M., & Dobbins, H. (2004). Students' of color and European American students' stigma-relevant perceptions of university instructors. *Journal of Social Issues, 60,* 157–174.

Cohen, E. G. (1982). Expectation states and interracial interaction in school settings. *Annual Review of Sociology, 8,* 209–235.

Cohen, G. L., & Steele, C. M. (2002). A barrier of mistrust: How negative stereotypes affect cross-race mentoring. In J. Aronson (Ed.), *Improving academic achievement: Impact of psychological factors on education* (pp. 303–327). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Cohen, G., Walton, G. M., & Garcia, J. (2004, January). *The trust gap: The effect of stigmatization on academic experience.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Austin, TX.

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). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Crocker, J., Major, B., & Steele, C. M. (1998). Social stigma. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., pp. 504–553). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Deutsch, M., & Collins, M. (1951). *Interracial housing: A psychological evaluation of a social experiment.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Devine, P. G., & Vasquez, K. A. (1998). The rocky road to positive intergroup relations. In J. L. Eberhardt & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), *Confronting racism: The problem and the response* (pp. 234–262). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., Kawakami, K., & Hodson, G. (2002). Why can't we just get along? Interpersonal biases and interracial distrust. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 8,* 88–102.

Feagin, J. R., & Sikes, M. P. (1994). *Living with racism: The Black middle class experience.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Foster, D., & Finchilescu, G. (1986). Contact in a "non-contact" society: The case of South Africa. In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters* (pp. 119–136). Cambridge, England: Blackwell.

Gallup Organization. (2001, July). *Black–White relations in the United States: 2001 update.* Washington, DC: Author.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

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). Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.

Jones, E. E., Farina, A., Hastorf, A. H., Markus, H., Miller, D. T., & Scott, R. A. (1984). *Social stigma: The psychology of marked relationships.* New York: Freeman.

Kim-Ju, G. M., & Liem, R. (2003). Ethnic self-awareness as a function of ethnic group status, group composition, and ethnic identity orientation. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 9*, 289–302.

Kramer, R. M., & Wei, J. (1999). Social uncertainty and the problem of trust in social groups: The social self in doubt. In T. R. Tyler, R. M. Kramer, & O. P. John (Eds.), *The psychology of the social self* (pp. 145–168). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Leach, C. W., Snider, N., & Iyer, A. (2002). Poisoning the consciences of the fortunate: The experience of relative advantage and support for social equality. In I. Walker & H. J. Smith (Eds.), *Relative deprivation: Specification, development, and integration* (pp. 136–163). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Levin, S., van Laar, C., & Sidanius, J. (2003). The effects of ingroup and outgroup friendship on ethnic attitudes in college: A longitudinal study. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 6*, 76–92.

Levy, S. R., Freitas, A. L., & Salovey, P. (2002). Construing action abstractly and blurring social distinctions: Implications for perceiving homogeneity among, but also empathizing with and helping, others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 1224–1238.

Livingston, R. W., Brewer, M. B., & Alexander, M. G. (2004, January). *Images, emotions, and prejudice: Qualitative differences in the nature of Black and White racial attitudes.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Austin, TX.

McGuire, W., McGuire, C., Child, P., & Fujioka, T. (1978). Salience of ethnicity in the spontaneous self-concept as a function of one's ethnic distinctiveness in the social environment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36*, 511–520.

Mendoza-Denton, R., Downey, G., Purdie, V. J., Davis, A., & Pietrzak, J. (2002). Sensitivity to status-based rejection: Implications for African American students' college experience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 896–918.

Monteith, M. J., & Spicer, C. V. (2000). Contents and correlates of Whites' and Blacks' racial attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36*, 125–154.

National Conference for Community and Justice. (2000). *Taking America's pulse: NCCJ's survey of intergroup relations in the United States.* New York: Author.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65–85.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Recent meta-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 93–114). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (in press-a). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.*

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (in press-b). Allport's intergroup contact hypothesis: Its history and influence. In J. F. Dovidio, P. Glick, & L. Rudman (Eds.), *On the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Pinel, E. C. (1999). Stigma consciousness: The psychological legacy of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*, 114–128.

Pinel, E. C. (2002). Stigma consciousness in intergroup contexts: The power of conviction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 38*, 178–185.

Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (2003). The antecedents and implications of interracial anxiety. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 790–801.

Riordan, C. (1978). Equal-status interracial contact: A review and revision of the concept. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 2*, 161–185.

Robinson, J. W., & Preston, J. D. (1976). Equal status contact and modification of racial prejudice: A reexamination of the contact hypothesis. *Social Forces, 54*, 911–924.

Rosenthal, R. (1991). *Meta-analytic procedures for social research.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Shelton, J. N. (2000). A reconceptualization of how we study issues of racial prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4*, 374–390.

Sigelman, L., & Tuch, S. A. (1997). Meta-stereotypes: Blacks' perceptions of Whites' stereotypes of Blacks. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 61*, 87–101.

Steele, C. M., Spencer, S. J., & Aronson, J. (2002). Contending with group image: The psychology of stereotype and social identity threat. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 34*, 379–440.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues, 41*, 157–175.

Swim, J. K., Cohen, L. L., & Hyers, L. L. (1998). Experiencing everyday prejudice and discrimination. In J. K. Swim & C. Stangor (Eds.), *Prejudice: The target's perspective* (pp. 37–60). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Swim, J. K., Hyers, L. L., Cohen, L. L., Fitzgerald, D. C., & Bylsma, W. H. (2003). African American college students' experiences with everyday racism: Characteristics of and responses to these incidents. *Journal of Black Psychology, 29*, 38–67.

Tropp, L. R. (2003). The psychological impact of prejudice: Implications for intergroup contact. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 6*, 131–149.

Tropp, L. R. (2004). [*Perceived norms of tolerance, perceived discrimination, and feelings toward intergroup relationships*]. Unpublished raw data, Boston College.

Tropp, L. R. (2005). *Perceived discrimination and interracial contact: Predicting interracial closeness among Black and White Americans.* Manuscript under review.

Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (in press). Responses to intergroup contact among members of minority and majority status groups. *Psychological Science.*

Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005). Differential relationships between intergroup contact and affective and cognitive indicators of prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 1145–1158.

Vorauer, J. D., Main, K. J., & O'Connell, G. B. (1998). How do individuals expect to be viewed by members of lower status groups? Content and implications of meta-stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 917–937.

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: University of Minnesota Press.

Works, E. (1961). The prejudice-interaction hypothesis from the point of view of the Negro minority group. *American Journal of Sociology, 67*, 47–52.

Wright, S. C., Van der Zande, C., Ropp, S. A., Tropp, L. R., Young, K., Zanna, M., & Aron, A. (2004). *Cross-group friendships can reduce prejudice: Experimental evidence of a causal direction.* Manuscript in preparation.