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Contact Hypothesis/Theory

- Williams (1947)/Allport (1954)

- Conditions of Contact
  - Equal Status, Common Goals, Supportive Norms, Cooperation

- Pettigrew & Tropp (2006)
  - 515 reports, 713 samples, n > 25,000

- Beyond the "Black Box"
Common Ingroup Identity Model
(Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachman, & Rust, 1993)

Conditions of Contact

- Intergroup Interdependence (e.g., cooperation)
- Group Differentiation (e.g., similarity)
- Environmental Context (e.g., egalitarian norms)
- Pre-Contact Experience (e.g., affective priming)

Representational Mediators

- One Group Recategorization ("We")
- Two Groups Categorization ("We/They")
- Separate Individuals Decategorization ("Me/You")

Consequences

- Cognitive Effects (e.g., stereotyping)
- Affective Consequences (e.g., empathy)
- Behavioral Effects (e.g., helping)
Cooperation

Gaertner et al. (1990)
Challenges

- Can a common ingroup identity be sustained? (Hewstone, 1996)
- Does a common ingroup identity limit generalizability to the outgroup as a whole? (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000)
Moderation (West, Pearson, Dovidio, et al., 2009)

Cross-Group Dyads

High Respondent Commonality
Low Respondent Commonality

Friendship

Time Point (Bi-Weekly)

White-White
Generalization to the Group as a Whole (Guerra et al., in press)

- Portuguese 4th Grade Elementary School Students (White & Black)
- Recategorization vs. Two-Group Manipulation (Gaertner et al., 1989)
- Evaluative Bias: (a) outgroup members present, (b) outgroup as a whole at the same time, and (c) outgroup as a whole 3-weeks later

Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two-Groups Vs. Recategorization</th>
<th>Outgroup Present (Time 1)</th>
<th>Outgroup as Whole (Time 1)</th>
<th>Outgroup as Whole (3-Weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the functions and consequences of creating a common ingroup identity?

How well does it serve the motivations of majority and minority group members?

What are the consequences, beyond attitudes, of a common identity?
## Comparing the Psychology of Prejudice Reduction & Collective Action (Wright & Lubensky, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prejudice Reduction</th>
<th>Collective Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong> subgroup identification</td>
<td><strong>High</strong> subgroup identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong> salience of subgroup membership</td>
<td><strong>High</strong> salience of subgroup membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceive group boundaries to be <strong>Permeable</strong></td>
<td>Perceive group boundaries to be <strong>Impermeable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong> salience of group-based inequality</td>
<td><strong>High</strong> salience of group-based inequality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally <strong>Positive</strong> characterizations of the outgroup</td>
<td>Generally <strong>Negative</strong> characterizations of the outgroup</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview

- Commonality as Preference
- Commonality as Strategy
- Commonality, Harmony, & Action
  - Advantaged Group
  - Disadvantaged Group
- Conclusions & Implications
### Common Ingroup Identity Model

*Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000*

#### Conditions of Contact

- **Intergroup Interdependence** (e.g., cooperation)
- **Group Differentiation** (e.g., similarity)
- **Environmental Context** (e.g., egalitarian norms)
- **Pre-Contact Experience** (e.g., affective priming)

#### Representational Mediators

- **One Group Recategorization** (*"We"*)
- **Two Subgroups in One Group Recategorization** (*"Us+Them =We"*)
- **Two Groups Categorization** (*"We/They"*)
- **Separate Individuals Decategorization** (*"Me/You"*)

#### Consequences

- Cognitive Effects (e.g., stereotyping)
- Affective Consequences (e.g., empathy)
- Behavioral Effects (e.g., helping)
## Models of Intergroup Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Group Identity</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Decategorization</td>
<td>Recategorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>One Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meritocracy</td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorblind</td>
<td>Colorblind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Categorization</td>
<td>Recategorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separate Groups</td>
<td>Same Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separatism</td>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Representation Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assimilation</strong> (colorblind)</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(High Sup./Low Sub.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiculturalism</strong></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(High Sup./High Sub.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualism</strong> (colorblind)</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Low Sup./Low Sub.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Separatism</strong></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Low Sup./High Sub.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preferences for Contact (Saguy, Dovidio, & Pratto, 2008)

- Talk about Differences
- Talk about Commonalities

Desire to Discuss Topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Power Group</th>
<th>Low Power Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talk about Differences</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk about Commonalities</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preferences for Contact (Saguy, Dovidio, & Pratto, 2008)
Beyond Preference: Whites

Conditions of Contact

Individuals

Different Groups

Same Team

One Group

Satisfaction at Colgate

Dovidio, Gaertner, & Kafati (2000)
Beyond Preference: Minorities

Dovidio, Gaertner, & Kafati (2000)
Commonality and Strategy
(Saguy, 2008)

Focusing on Commonality

Focusing on Differences/Disparities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th>Latino/as</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commonality</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences/Disparities</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whites’ Responses to Commonality/Difference (Dovidio et al., 2009)

To Specific Group Member

(see also Kaiser & Pratt-Hyatt, 2009)
Policy Preferences


Time 1: Low Tension

Time 2: High Tension

Time 3: Low Tension

Support

Whites

Blacks
Attitudes vs. Action (Saguy, Tausch, Dovidio, & Pratto, 2009)

- Focusing on commonality (versus difference) can
  - create more positive attitudes
  - but not translate into social action
Advantage and Disadvantage: Experimental Groups

- Two 3-Person Experimental Groups
- Responsibility for Distribution of Credits (out of 10) Given to One (Advantaged) Group
- Interact with Commonality Focus or Difference Focus
- Intergroup Attitudes, Expectations, Behavior
Talking about Commonalities or Power Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Common Differences</th>
<th>Outgroup Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advantaged Group (Experimental)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged Group (Experimental)</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disadvantaged Group’s Expectations of Out-Group Benevolence

Contact Type
1 = commonality
0 = differences

Attitude Toward Out-Group

b = .76**

Attention to Inequality

b = -.87**

Expectations Of Out-Group Benevolence

b = .67**
Disadvantaged Group’s Expectations of Out-Group Benevolence

Contact Type
1 = commonality
0 = differences

Attitude Toward Out-Group

b = .76**

b = -.87**

Attention to Inequality

b = .67**

b = -.01

b = -.21**

Expectations Of Out-Group Benevolence
Talking about Commonalities or Power Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits Assigned to Disadvantaged Group</th>
<th>Allocated</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantaged Group (Experimental)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged Group (Experimental)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Credits Assigned to Disadvantaged Group

Expected

Common Differences

Advantaged Group (Experimental)

Disadvantaged Group (Experimental)
Assimilation/Multiculturalism and Majority Group Motivation

- Assimilation
  - Maintenance of the Status Quo
  - Complacency
- Multiculturalism
  - Change and Adjustment
  - (Positive) Challenge
- Psychological/Physiological
  - Challenge, Threat, Indifference
• Dutch participants primed with assimilation (one group) or multiculturalism (dual identity)

• Moroccan confederate endorsing one group (assimilation) or dual identity (multiculturalism)
Cultural Context: Intergroup Relations in Portugal (Guerra et al., in press)

Outgroup Attitudes

European Portuguese

African Portuguese

Two Groups
One Group
Dual Identity
Summary

- Benefits of Commonality
- Importance of Perspective and Function
- Commonality as Strategy
- Social Attitudes/Social Action
  - Two Solitudes (Wright & Lubensky 2009)
- Commonality and Intragroup Processes
  - Majority/minority motivation
  - Own and Perceived Group Motivations
- Appreciating the Complexity of “We”
Thank You!