European Review of Social Psychology

Another view of "we": Majority and minority group perspectives on a common ingroup identity

John F. Dovidio \(^a\), Samuel L. Gaertner \(^b\), Tamar Saguy \(^c\)

\(^a\) Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA
\(^b\) University of Delaware, Newark, DE, USA
\(^c\) University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, USA

First Published on: 07 January 2008


To link to this article: DOI: 10.1080/10463280701726132
URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10463280701726132

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: http://www.informaworld.com/terms-and-conditions-of-access.pdf

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.
Another view of “we”: Majority and minority group perspectives on a common ingroup identity

John F. Dovidio
Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA

Samuel L. Gaertner
University of Delaware, Newark, DE, USA

Tamar Saguy
University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, USA

Drawing on the evidence of the role of social categorisation and identity in the development and maintenance of intergroup biases, research on the Common Ingroup Identity Model (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000) has investigated how modifying the ways that the self and others are categorised can reduce prejudice and discrimination. In this article, we review more recent research that extends our initial formulation of the model by considering more fully alternative forms of recategorisation (a dual identity as well as a one-group representation), the different preferences of majority and minority groups for these different forms of recategorised representations, and the potential implications of these different preferences on the content of intergroup interaction and on the possibilities for social change towards equality.
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Prejudice and discrimination are pervasive phenomena across time and culture (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Traditional approaches to prejudice focused largely on the biases of individuals, examining the role of...
personality and individual needs and goals (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson & Sanford, 1950; Allport, 1954). However, more recently social psychologists have also recognised the significance of collective identity for intergroup relations (Brewer, 2001; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). One related process, identified in the classic work of Allport (1954) and Tajfel (1969), is the categorisation of people into ingroups and outgroups – “we”s and “they”s. People respond systematically more favourably to others whom they perceive to belong to their group than to different groups, which forms the psychological foundation for prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination.

Drawing on the evidence of the role of social categorisation and identity in the development and maintenance of intergroup biases, we have considered, both theoretically and practically, how modifying the ways in which the self and others are categorised can be an important intervention for reducing prejudice and discrimination (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). Fifteen years ago we presented our initial formulation of this framework, the Common Ingroup Identity Model, in the European Review of Social Psychology (Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachman, & Rust, 1993). In the present chapter we review more recent research that extends our initial formulation of the model by considering more fully alternative forms of recategorisation, the different preferences of majority and minority groups (who may differ in terms of group status, power, and/or size) for these different forms, and the potential implications of these group preferences on the content of intergroup interaction and on the potential for social change towards equality. We explore the potential “darker side of we” for minority group members.

We first briefly review the role of social categorisation in intergroup biases. We then summarise general support for the Common Ingroup Identity Model for improving intergroup relations. After that, we examine the importance of understanding majority and minority perspectives on intergroup relations and how these perspectives relate to differences in group preferences and effectiveness of various group representations, including a second form of recategorisation, a dual identity, in which both the original group boundaries and the superordinate identity are salient. The section that follows explores the implications of the different perspectives and goals of majority and minority groups on the content of intergroup interactions and ultimately for social change. The concluding section discusses practical implications and directions for future research.

SOCIAL CATEGORISATION AND SOCIAL BIAS

Social categorisation and associated psychological processes play a critical role in the formation and perpetuation of intergroup biases and thus are also
particularly important elements of strategies to reduce or eliminate these biases. One important aspect of the social categorisation process involves a basic distinction between the group containing the self, the ingroup, and other groups, the outgroups—between the “we”s and the “they”s (see Social Identity Theory, Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Self-Categorisation Theory, Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher & Wetherell, 1987). Even when the basis for the categorisation of people into ingroups and outgroups is quite trivial (Billig & Tajfel, 1973), the processes of social categorisation and collective identity have systematic consequences that contribute to the development of intergroup bias and competition.

When collective identity is salient, the distinction between ingroup and outgroup members as a consequence of social categorisation has a profound influence on social perception, affect, cognition, and behaviour. Perceptually, when people or objects are categorised into groups, actual differences between members of the same category tend to be minimised (Tajfel, 1969) and often ignored in making decisions or forming impressions, while between-group differences tend to become exaggerated (Turner, 1985). Emotionally, people spontaneously experience more positive affect towards other members of the ingroup than towards members of the outgroup (Otten & Moskowitz, 2000). Cognitively, people have better memory for information about ways in which ingroup members are similar to and outgroup members are dissimilar to the self (Wilder, 1981), remember more positive information about ingroup members (Howard & Rothbart, 1980), see greater connection between other members of the ingroup and the self (Aron et al., 2004), and expect ingroup members to share one’s attitudes and values more than outgroup members (Robbins & Krueger, 2005). In terms of behavioural outcomes, people are more helpful towards ingroup than towards outgroup members (Dovidio et al., 1997). When ingroup–outgroup social categorisations, rather than personal identities, are salient, people also tend to behave in a more greedy and less trustworthy way towards members of other groups than if they were reacting to each other as individuals (Insko et al., 2001), while they perceive outgroup members to be less trustworthy (Voci, 2006).

Social categorisation is a dynamic process, however, and people possess many different group identities and are capable of focusing on different social categories. By modifying a perceiver’s goals, perceptions of past experiences, and/or expectations, there is opportunity to alter the level of category inclusiveness that will be primary or most influential in a given situation. This malleability of the level at which impressions are formed is important because of its implications for altering the way people think about members of ingroups and outgroups, and consequently about the nature of intergroup relations. Attempts to combat these biases can therefore be directed at altering the nature of social categorisation.
THE COMMON INGROUP IDENTITY MODEL

Because categorisation into social groups is a basic process that is fundamental to intergroup bias, social psychologists have targeted this process as a starting point for improving intergroup relations. A variety of different approaches have been employed successfully. For example, decategorisation strategies that emphasise the individual qualities of others (Wilder, 1981) or encourage personalised interactions (Miller, 2002) have been used to decrease the salience of social categories and associated identities.

The approach we have employed, the Common Ingroup Identity Model (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000), draws on the theoretical foundations of Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and Self-Categorisation Theory (Turner et al., 1987). This strategy emphasises the process of recategorisation, whereby members of different groups are induced to conceive of themselves as a single, more inclusive superordinate group rather than as two completely separate groups. With recategorisation, as proposed by the Common Ingroup Identity Model (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000), the goal is to alter systematically the perception of intergroup boundaries, redefining who is conceived of as an ingroup member, to reduce bias. If members of different groups are induced to conceive of themselves as a single more inclusive, superordinate group, rather than just as two completely separate groups, attitudes towards former outgroup members would be expected to become more positive through processes involving pro-ingroup bias, thereby reducing intergroup bias. That is, the processes that lead to favouritism towards ingroup members would now be directed towards former outgroup members (see Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000).

Common identity

The value of creating a one-group representation for reducing intergroup bias has been consistently supported by research over the past 15 years. Laboratory studies have demonstrated that diverse interventions, such as cooperation (Gaertner, Mann, Dovidio, Murrell, & Pomare, 1990), perceptual similarity (e.g., proximity and visual similarity; Gaertner, Mann, Murrell & Dovidio, 1989), induction of positive affect (Dovidio, Gaertner, & Loux, 2000b), that produce more inclusive representations of different groups systematically reduce intergroup bias. These results have been replicated in different cultures (e.g., in Portugal; Rebelo, Guerra, & Monteiro, 2004).

Field studies in a range of settings (e.g., high schools, banking mergers, and blended families; see Gaertner, Bachman, Dovidio, & Banker, 2001), including anti-bias programmes with children (Houlette et al., 2004),
consistently show that stronger perceptions of a common, one-group identity predict more positive intergroup attitudes, supporting the external validity of the model. In addition, creating a common ingroup identity has been found to increase positive forms of behaviour, such as self-disclosure and helping, across original group lines (Dovidio et al., 1997; Nier, Gaertner, Dovidio, Banker, & Ward, 2001), as well as intergroup forgiveness (by Jews towards Germans for the Holocaust; Wohl & Branscombe, 2005). Moreover, the Common Ingroup Model has been applied as an integrative theoretical framework to explain how intergroup contact, along the lines outlined in the Contact Hypothesis (Allport, 1954), operates psychologically to reduce bias and improve intergroup relations (Dovidio, Gaertner, Saguy, & Halabi, 2007; Gaertner, Rust, Dovidio, Bachman, & Anastasio, 1996).

Although our research has generally demonstrated that transformation of social categorisation from members of different groups to members of a common superordinate group is effective for reducing biases in both attitudes and behaviour across both laboratory and real (e.g., racial; Nier et al., 2001) groups, limitations in this approach became apparent. First, a single, common identity tends to be unstable. As Brewer’s (1991) Optimal Distinctiveness Theory suggests, singular inclusive identities may compromise members’ fundamental need for distinctiveness, a need for feeling unique and differentiated from others. In response to such a threat, distinctive subgroup identities may tend to re-emerge over time. Second, research has revealed that interventions intended to create a common identity sometimes arouse resistance and exacerbate bias (e.g., Crisp, Stone, & Hall, 2006a; Crisp, Walsh, & Hewstone, 2006b; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000). These findings, along with other theoretical developments in the field, led us to consider more carefully an alternative form of recategorisation, a dual identity, which we initially identified in Gaertner et al. (1989).

Resistance to a common identity

When group identities and the associated cultural values are central to members’ functioning or when identities are associated with highly visible cues, it would be undesirable or impossible for people to relinquish these group identities or as perceivers to be “colourblind”. Furthermore, attempts to replace highly valued existing group identities with a new superordinate identity can produce identity threat that impedes the development of a common group identity and exacerbates intergroup bias.

Introducing conditions that can challenge the positive distinctiveness of one’s group (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), such as emphasising similarity or overlapping boundaries between the groups (Dovidio et al., 1997; Jetten, Spears, & Manstead, 1997) or shared identity (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000) can
exacerbate intergroup bias as a way of reaffirming positive distinctiveness. Hornsey and Hogg (2000), for instance, found that a condition that emphasised students’ common university membership produced even higher levels of bias between humanities and maths-science students than did a condition that emphasised their separate group identities.

Identity threat is particularly likely to be aroused among people who are more strongly identified with their group (Crisp et al., 2006b). For example, in one condition Crisp et al. made a superordinate identity (student) salient to members of two different groups (students at “traditional universities” compared with the “open university”, a distance-learning institution). The researchers found that, compared to a baseline control condition, this intervention produced positive responses towards students at the other university for students weakly identified with their own university but generated greater differentiation and more negative reactions, presumably because of identity threat, among students strongly identified with their university (see also Crisp et al., 2006a). Thus, interventions that aim to replace a strong subgroup identification with a superordinate identity may arouse strong reactance and result in especially poor intergroup relations.

Recognising the challenges for achieving decategorisation or recategorisation, Hewstone and Brown (1986; see also Brown & Hewstone, 2005) recommended an alternative approach to intergroup contact wherein cooperative interactions between groups are introduced without degrading the original ingroup–outgroup categorisation. More specifically this approach, Mutual Intergroup Differentiation, involves encouraging groups working together to perceive complementarity by recognising and valuing mutual assets and weaknesses within the context of an interdependent cooperative task or common, superordinate goals. In this way, both groups can maintain positive distinctiveness within a cooperative framework.

Alternatively, within the framework of the Common Ingroup Identity Model, we explored the potential role of the development of a second form of recategorisation, a dual identity, on intergroup relations. A dual identity involves the simultaneous activation of original subgroup identities and a common ingroup identity. Specifically, we hypothesise that if people continue to regard themselves as members of different groups but at the same time part of the same superordinate entity, intergroup relations between these subgroups will be more positive than if members only considered themselves as separate groups.

**Dual identity**

Within the Common Ingroup Identity Model, different group representations critically mediate intergroup attitudes and orientations. As depicted by the dual identity representation in our current model (see Figure 1), we
believe that it is possible for members to conceive of two groups (for example, Catholics and Protestants) as distinct entities within the context of a superordinate identity (e.g., Christians).

Functional relationships (e.g., intergroup cooperation, as outlined in the Mutual Intergroup Differentiation Model) may be instrumental in creating a dual identity, but there may be other ways this can be achieved as well. For instance, a dual identity representation can be elicited experimentally by simultaneously emphasising common university affiliation and subgroup identities, as opposed to just the common identity or the different group identities, either in the context of cooperative relations (González & Brown, 2003, 2006) or not (Dovidio et al., 2000b). Thus, although the Mutual Intergroup Differentiation Model and the current Common Ingroup Identity Model are similar and potentially complementary in this respect, they are not conceptually identical.

There is evidence that the intergroup benefits of a strong superordinate identity can be achieved for both majority and minority group members when the strength of the subordinate identity is also high. For example, González and Brown (2003) had two laboratory-created groups interact

---

**Figure 1.** The current Common Ingroup Identity Model.
under conditions that emphasised individual identities, separate group identities (Analytics and Synthetics), only common university memberships (common group identity), and both different subgroup identities and superordinate university identity (dual identities). Although there were no significant differences in attitudes towards the interacting group members in the situation, bias was lower in the dual identity and common groups conditions than in the other two conditions when participants evaluated other members of the groups who were not present in the interaction. Bias against the outgroup was lowest in the dual identity condition, albeit not significantly lower than the common group condition. Nevertheless, these findings demonstrate that a dual identity can be manipulated by emphasising common and distinct identities simultaneously and that this manipulation can effectively reduce intergroup bias.

Further evidence consistent with the benefits of a dual identity comes from a survey study (Smith & Tyler, 1996, Study 1) that measured the strength of White respondents’ superordinate identity as “American” and also the strength of their racial identification as “White”. Whites who had a strong superordinate American identity, in addition to their White racial identity, were more likely to base their support for affirmative action policies that would benefit Blacks and other minorities on fairness-related concerns (e.g., proportional representation of minorities) than on self-interest (e.g., perceptions of reduced personal employment opportunity). However, for respondents who identified themselves primarily as being White rather than as being American, their position on affirmative action was determined more strongly by concerns regarding the instrumental value of these policies for themselves. Analogously, we found that minority students in a multi-ethnic high school who identified themselves as both American and as a member of their racial or ethnic group (e.g., indicating that they were Korean and American on the survey) reported lower levels of intergroup bias relative to those who only used their ethnic or racial group identity (Gaertner et al., 1996).

Taken together, these findings suggest that both dual identity and a singular common group identity can improve intergroup relations. However, majority and minority group members may have different preferences for these different representations, which can differentially influence the effectiveness of interventions among majority and minority group members.

MAJORITY AND MINORITY GROUP PERSPECTIVES AND PREFERENCES

The experience of being a member of a majority or minority group relates fundamentally to the ways that people perceive and experience intergroup relations. We note that although the terms minority and majority can mean differences in group size, status, and power, which can have independent
effects on intergroup processes (see González, & Brown, 2006; Sachdev, & Bourhis, 1991), difference in power are most pertinent to our approach. By differences in power we mean actual group disparities in economic security, political power, and opportunities for social advancement (e.g., education and occupational mobility) that often, but not always (e.g., the power of Whites in South Africa during apartheid), coincide with group status and size.

Because of their different levels of power and control in the social system, which shape the values of their social identities, members of minority and majority groups typically have different perceptions and motivations regarding their intergroup relations and the status quo. These differences are reflected in perceptions of threat to group values (distinctiveness threat) and in motivations for change in the social system. We next examine these two power-based dimensions of intergroup relations and discuss how they relate to group members’ preferences for different forms of recategorisation.

Group power and distinctiveness threat

As proposed by Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), people derive personal esteem from their membership in groups and thus strive to establish the positive distinctiveness of their group relative to other groups. These motivations may be especially strong when people’s feelings of esteem are challenged (Simon & Brown, 1987), or when people are motivated to reduce uncertainty (Hogg, 2001). In addition, people who identify more strongly with their group are more motivated to maintain their group’s positive distinctiveness. As a consequence, people who identify more highly with their group typically show more ingroup favouritism and often more outgroup prejudice (Mummendey, Klink, & Brown, 2001).

Work from the social identity perspective demonstrates that members of minority groups, particularly when they perceive the disparities between the groups as illegitimate and the group boundaries as impermeable (Bettencourt, Dorr, Charlton, & Hume, 2001), value the distinctive qualities of their group, beyond those that define the status relationship, more than do majority group members (Bettencourt et al., 2001; Mullen, Brown, & Smith, 1992). Consistent with this proposition, members of minority groups tend to identify more strongly with their group than do majority group members (Saguy, Dovidio, & Pratto, in press, Study 2; Simon & Brown, 1987). As a result, minority group members often react more negatively than do majority group members to recategorisation of the groups as one-group, which requires them to abandon their subgroup identity. When mergers involve high- and low-status groups, members of low-status groups perceive less common group identity with the merged entity than do members of majority groups (Fischer, Greitemeyer, Omay, & Frey, 2007) and have less
favourable expectations of the merger and are generally more suspicious that their group will not be adequately represented in the merged organisation (Mottola, 1996).

The response of majority group members is typically quite different. Because majority group members tend to see the qualities of the superordinate group as representing their dominant values and characteristics (Devos & Banaji, 2005; Waldzus, Mummendey, Wenzel, & Boettcher, 2004; see Wenzel, Mummendey, & Waldzus, this volume), and thus do not experience identity threat, they are more apt to endorse recategorisation as a single superordinate group. Superordinate identity essentially promotes their group’s values. Moreover, Boen, Vanbeselaere, Brebels, Hubens, and Millet (2007) demonstrated how level of identification can further moderate these effects. When people believed that the merged organisation would mainly reflect their group’s values, stronger pre-merger group identification predicted more positive reactions to the merger; when people believed that their group’s values and characteristics would not be well represented in a merged organisation, stronger pre-merger group identification predicted more negative responses to the merger.

Emphasising the importance of considering the different perspectives associated with group status, González and Brown (2006, p. 754) observed, “A dual identity approach is especially valuable when one group (the majority) is larger than the other (the minority). Minority group members may resist a superordinate identity if accepting that identity means that their own distinctiveness will be lost. Group diversity is recognised when everyone has dual identities, all within a shared social framework.”

In an empirical test of these ideas, González and Brown (2006) directly manipulated the conditions in which members of groups, which varied in size and status, interacted in ways that emphasised participants’ separate individual identities (e.g., individual performance was stressed and individual identity was emphasised with labels and unique t-shirt colours), one-group identity (e.g., the group solution was stressed and common university identity was emphasised), or dual identity (e.g., the group solution was stressed while emphasising the identities as Analytics and Synthetics for the different tasks they would perform).

In terms of responses to groups beyond the contact situation, González and Brown (2006, Experiment 2) found that the dual identity intervention was the most effective technique for reducing intergroup bias (significantly better than the separate individuals intervention and somewhat better than the superordinate identity intervention) when participants were experiencing threat related to concerns about the representation of their group within the larger group. With a dual identity, group distinctiveness is maintained while a positive connection to the other group is established through the superordinate identity.
Further consistent with the hypothesis that groups varying in power will prefer different group representations, additional research has revealed that majority and minority group members have different preferences for the ultimate outcomes of intergroup relations. Whereas majority group members favour the assimilation of minority groups into one single culture (a traditional “melting pot” orientation)—the dominant culture (Horenczyk, 1996), minority group members often tend to want to retain their cultural identity. Consistent with previous work on identity threat, Blacks with higher levels of racial identification are more resistant to cultural assimilation that fails to recognise their group’s distinctive characteristics and contributions (Worrell & Gardner-Kitt, 2006).

Berry (1997) presents four forms of cultural relations in pluralistic societies that represent the intersection of “yes—no” responses to two relevant questions: (a) Are cultural identity and customs of value to be retained? (b) Are positive relations with the larger society of value, and to be sought? These combinations reflect four adaptation strategies for intergroup relations: (a) integration, when cultural identities are retained and positive relations with the larger society are sought; (b) separatism, when cultural identities are retained but positive relations with the larger society are not sought; (c) assimilation, when cultural identities are abandoned and positive relations with the larger society are desired; and (d) marginalisation, when cultural identities are abandoned and are not replaced by positive identification with the larger society.

Although this framework has been applied primarily to the ways in which immigrants acclimate to a new society (van Oudenhoven, Prins, & Buunk, 1998), we propose that it can be adapted to apply to intergroup relations between majority and minority groups more generally (see also Hewstone, Turner, Kenworthy, & Crisp, 2006). Substituting the separate strengths of the subgroup and subordinate group identities for the answers to Berry’s (1997) two questions, the combinations map onto the four main representations considered in the Common Ingroup Identity Model: (a) dual identity (subgroup and superordinate group identities are high, like integration); (b) different groups (subgroup identity is high and superordinate identity is low, like separatism); (c) one-group (subgroup identity is low and superordinate group identity is high, like assimilation; and (d) separate individuals (subgroup and superordinate group identities are low, like marginalisation).

Two of the ideologies that have received the most attention are assimilation and integration in terms of multiculturalism. These two ideologies have often been considered oppositional (Wolsko, Park, & Judd, 2006). Assimilation requires minority group members to conform to dominant values and ideals, often requiring the abandonment of racial or ethnic group values, to achieve full citizenship and be accepted in society.
Multicultural integration, in contrast, strives to be inclusive by recognising, and often celebrating, intergroup differences and their contributions to a common society (Frederickson, 1999; Verkuyten, 2006). Research in the area of immigration suggests that immigrant groups and majority groups have different preferences for assimilation and multicultural integration. Van Oudenhoven et al. (1998) found in the Netherlands that Dutch majority group members preferred an assimilation of minority groups (in which minority group identity was abandoned and replaced by identification with the dominant Dutch culture), whereas Turkish and Moroccan immigrants most strongly endorsed integration (in which they would retain their own cultural identity while also valuing the dominant Dutch culture). Verkuyten (2006) summarised the results of eight studies of adolescents and young adults in Europe, consistently finding that minority group members supported multiculturalism (integration) more than did majority group members. These preferences also apply to the preferences of Whites and racial and ethnic minorities. In particular, in the United States Whites most prefer assimilation, whereas racial and ethnic minorities favour pluralistic integration (Dovidio, Gaertner, & Kafati, 2000a). Moreover, these preferred types of intergroup relations for majority and minority groups, a one-group representation for Whites and dual identity representation for racial and ethnic minorities, may differentially mediate the consequences of intergroup contact for the different groups.

To explore this possibility we examined how different types of cognitive representations might mediate the relationship between more positive perceptions of intergroup contact (ratings on the dimensions of equal status, supportive norms, personal interaction, and cooperative interaction; see Gaertner et al., 1996) and higher levels of institutional commitment among White students and racial and ethnic minority students (Dovidio et al., 2000a). Commitment included items about students’ intentions to complete their education at the institution and their willingness to recommend the institution to others, as well as questions about the academic and social climate. This study examined all four cognitive representations hypothesised within the Common Ingroup Identity Model to represent different models of intergroup relations: (a) dual identity (integration/multiculturalism), (b) separate groups (separatism), (c) one-group (assimilation), and (d) separate individuals (decategorisation/marginalisation). In addition, participants’ identification with their racial or ethnic group was assessed. We hypothesised that the positive relation between perceptions of more favourable intergroup contact and institutional commitment would be mediated by different representations of the groups. Whereas we expected that the relation for Whites would be mediated by one-group representations, reflecting an assimilation perspective, we
anticipated that the relation for racial and ethnic minorities would be mediated by dual identity representations, a multicultural perspective that recognises both one’s racial or ethnic group identity and a superordinate identity.

The results confirmed the hypothesis. For Whites, more positive perceptions of intergroup contact related to stronger perceptions of one-group, a dual identity, and separate individuals, as well as weaker perceptions of different groups. However, when considered simultaneously, only the one-group representation was significantly related to institutional commitment (see Figure 2, top panel). Supportive of the hypothesised mediation, the relationship between perceptions of more favourable conditions of intergroup contact and greater institutional commitment, which was initially significant, was greatly reduced by the inclusion of one-group representations in the equation. Conditions of contact also significantly predicted each of the representations for racial and ethnic minorities. In contrast to the pattern for Whites, however, the dual identity representation (“same team”)—but not the one-group representation—predicted commitment (see Figure 2, bottom panel). These effects were stronger for people higher in racial ethnic identification, both for Whites and members of racial and ethnic minority groups.

Complementing these findings for racial majority and minority students in the US, we have also found that, within a sample predominantly of White students, status moderates the relationship between a dual identity and bias (Johnson, Gaertner & Dovidio, 2001). Among low- and high-status university students (i.e., regular students and students in the prestigious Honors Program, respectively) who expected to perform the same tasks within a superordinate workgroup, the relationship between perceptions of the aggregate as two subgroups within a group (a dual identity) and bias (more positive evaluations of the ingroup relative to the outgroup) depended on the status of the group. For low-status, regular students, stronger perceptions of a dual identity significantly predicted less bias, whereas for higher-status honors students a stronger dual identity predicted greater bias. To the extent that the experience of a dual identity matches the preferred representation of the low-status group, a stronger dual identity reaffirms the value of both separate and common identities, reducing any experience of identity threat while creating positive connections with the other group. However, because the salience of the subgroup identity component of a dual identity may signal a rejection of the high-status group’s preferred superordinate, one-group representation, a stronger dual identity is related to less favourable intergroup attitudes.

Intergroup relations, however, represent more than simply the attitudes of one group to another; they reflect the fact that groups bring different values to their interactions and have different preferences for, and
perspectives on, their interactions (Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakami, & Hodson, 2002; Islam & Hewstone, 1993). For example, in his classic book *The souls of Black folk*, DuBois (1938) observed that whereas Whites in the US form a relatively simple and direct form of social consciousness, because White culture and dominant American culture are synonymous, Black Americans develop a dual form of consciousness in which they are sensitive
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**Figure 2.** Intergroup contact and institutional commitment: Mediating representations for Whites and racial and ethnic minority students (*indicates a statistically significant path, $p < .05$).
to the values and expectations of the majority culture and aware and responsive to the values and expectations of Black culture. In our terms, whereas Whites may generally assume a single identity, in which White and American identities correspond, minority group members may generally experience a dual identity, in which the American superordinate and the racial/ethnic subgroup identity are distinct. Indeed, empirical research 60 years later supports DuBois’ observation: White identity is much more closely aligned with a superordinate American identity than is Black identity (Devos & Banaji, 2005; Sidanius, Feshbach, Levin, & Pratto, 1997).

The expression of an identity that is valued and functional for a member of one group (e.g., a dual identity for a minority group member) may therefore pose a threat to the values and world views of members of another group that holds a different cultural value (e.g., a one-group, assimilationist value held by a majority group member). Although Blacks may prefer to see themselves as possessing a dual identity, Whites may respond negatively to Blacks who express this dual identity because it deviates from their ideal one-group representation, which primarily reflects their racial values.

In an experiment by Dovidio, Gaertner, and Johnson (1999), White college students from Colgate University first read a campus newspaper article and then viewed a videotape that portrayed a Black student who had experienced a serious illness that had caused them academic difficulties. The presentation of the Black student, a confederate, was designed to make a positive impression. After the initial presentation of the confederate, an interviewer asked on the videotape, “And how do you see yourself?” The response was constructed to reflect one of the four representations outlined in the Common Ingroup Identity Model: (a) “I see myself primarily as a Colgate student” (one-group), (b) “I see myself primarily as a Black person” (different group), (c) “I see myself primarily as a Black Colgate student [or a Colgate student who is Black]” (dual identity), or (d) “I see myself primarily as a unique individual” (separate individuals). The outcome measure of interest was the attitudes of White participants towards Blacks after this contact with the Black confederate.

The results of this study provide further evidence that the effectiveness of different group representations varies systematically with group status. In this case, the manipulation based on a one-group representation, which was most compatible with an assimilation ideology, was the most effective strategy for improving the racial attitudes of White college students (see Figure 3). Attitudes towards Blacks in general were significantly less prejudiced and more favourable when the Black student described himself or herself solely in terms of common university membership than in the other three conditions. Attitudes in the other three conditions—dual identity, different groups, and separate individuals—did not differ from one another. Indeed, attitudes towards Blacks tended to be the most negative when Black
confederates expressed a dual identity. Thus understanding intergroup 
relations requires a knowledge not only of the separate attitudes and values 
of members of different groups but also an appreciation of the consequences 
of bringing together people with different values and perspectives and who 
may therefore form different impressions of the same interaction (Dovidio 
et al., 1999).

Group power and orientations towards the status quo

In general, members of minority and majority groups have different 
perspectives regarding the fairness of the status quo and, consequently, 
regarding a need for a change in the social system. For example, despite 
considerable evidence of racial discrimination, about 80% of Whites believe 
that Blacks have the same chances as Whites to obtain jobs, education, and 
housing (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999, p. 110), implying that the reason Blacks 
are under-represented in those areas is their own lack of ability or effort 
rather than an unjust system. Furthermore, majority group members often 
actively resist policies (e.g., affirmative action) that they perceive as 
promoting social change that threatens their own advantage (Dovidio & 
Gaertner, 2004). In contrast, members of minority groups display greater 
support for ideologies that de-legitimise hierarchy (e.g., endorsement of 
human rights, humanitarianism) and see social inequalities as more in need 
of change (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Several different theoretical perspectives, such as Social Identity Theory 
(Tajfel & Turner, 1979), Social Dominance Theory (Sidanius & Pratto, 
1999), and other Group Position perspectives (see Bobo, 1999) converge on

![Figure 3. White students’ prejudice toward Blacks as a function of exposure to a Black person who expresses a one group, dual identity, different group, or separate individuals representation.](image-url)
the same conclusion: Members of majority groups are likely to desire the stability of the social system that benefits them, whereas, if they do not endorse system-justifying ideologies that make status differences appear legitimate and stable (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost, Burgess, & Mosso, 2001), members of minority groups are strongly motivated towards social change, which can potentially improve their group position.

From this perspective, the preferred representations of majority group members for a one-group identity and of minority group members for a dual identity (specifically one that reflects both their subgroup identity and common group connection) may have strategic consequences. In particular, if the majority group promotes a one-group ideology, which is ostensibly colourblind but which is synonymous with the values and norms of their group, the dominant group’s values are reinforced while weakening the salience of the original social identities as minority and majority group members. Once separate group identities, and associated social power or status, become less salient, minority group members are less likely to recognise a need for change in the status quo, and to pursue it. Research on processes that facilitate social change indeed demonstrates that minority group members are more likely to challenge the social system when they identify with their group and perceive their disadvantage to be illegitimate (Doosje, Ellemers, & Spears, 1999; Ellemers & Barreto, 2001; Lalonde & Silverman, 1994; Wright, 2001). In order for this perception to come into play, group identities and related power asymmetries must be salient.

With the dual identity, which is preferred by minorities, separate group identities are not only salient but also fostered. Thus group-based inequity and injustice are more likely recognised, and collective action is possible. Emphasising the common group connection may focus these collective efforts on changes within a given society (as opposed to separatism), while at the same time appealing to principles of fairness and justice (Tyler & Blader, 2003) and promoting empathy (Dovidio et al., 1997) among members of the majority group that can reduce the bias of majority group members towards the minority group and motivate them towards action for equality.

Dovidio et al. (2004), for instance, manipulated the Whites’ orientations towards Blacks by having them read a newspaper article describing an Al Qaeda threat in a way that emphasised that Whites were the primary target (Exclusive Threat condition) or all US citizens were the target (Inclusive Threat condition). In the Exclusive Threat condition, in which Whites were the main target, an unidentified terrorist was quoted as saying, “Our focus is the White majority...White Americans are primarily at risk”); in the Inclusive Threat condition, the terrorist remarked, “All Americans are our targets. We do not see race, religion, or ethnicity – only Americans.”

Although perceptions of Blacks as being members of a different group did not differ across conditions, Whites’ feelings of common group membership
with Blacks were significantly stronger in the Inclusive Threat condition than in the Exclusive Threat condition. In addition, when the White participants subsequently viewed segments of a television show portraying incidents of Whites’ discriminating against Blacks, those in the Inclusive Threat condition exhibited somewhat greater empathy for the victimised Blacks and demonstrated stronger feelings of injustice related to the discriminatory incidents; they also showed a significantly stronger reduction in prejudice towards Blacks as a group (relative to a pretest of prejudice weeks earlier).

Furthermore, as illustrated in Figure 4, although the reduction in prejudice towards Blacks was related both to feelings of empathy ($r = .31$) and feelings of injustice ($r = .37$) in response to the television segment, the effect of the Threat manipulation on reduced prejudice was mediated primarily by feelings of injustice. Overall, these results suggest that emphasising common group connections, even while separate majority and minority group categorisations remain salient, can make majority group members more sensitive to injustices towards the minority group, lead them to be more respectful of group differences (Davies, Steele, & Markus, in press), and reduce their bias against the minority group.

However, when the source of threat is tension and conflict between the majority group, rather than shared external threat, the characteristic differences in group-based representation preferences—one-group for the
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**Figure 4.** Mediation of the effect of inclusive or exclusive terrorist threat on the reduced prejudice of Whites toward Blacks: The roles of perceived injustice and empathy ($^{*}p < .05$).
majority group and a dual identity for the minority group—may not only dominate their responses but also become intensified. Exploring this possibility, we examined students’ preferences for university policies three times over an academic year (Dovidio & Kafati, 2003). The first time was at the beginning of the semester, when race relations were perceived to be relatively positive and stable. The second time was near the end of the first semester after a series of racial incidents threatening Blacks (e.g., racial graffiti on campus, several alleged episodes of verbal harassment of Black students). The third time was in the middle of the second semester, when race relations were perceived to be less tense and volatile.

Across these three time periods we assessed, longitudinally, White and Black students’ support for policies that reflected efforts associated with one-group (assimilationist), dual identity (multicultural integrationalist), and separate groups (separatist) initiatives. These policies, which were developed through pilot testing, were not directly related to the racial incidents that occurred. Examples of one-group policies were “The university should devote more funds to common activities for all students”, and “Students in their first year should be assigned roommates on a random basis”. Examples of dual identity policies were “The university should devote more funds to multicultural activities on campus”, and “Minority students may choose to have a roommate of their same race or ethnicity in their first year, but there should not be separate minority dormitories”. Separatist policies were “The university should devote more money to activities to groups to support their different racial or ethnic identities”, and “Minority students should be allowed to have their own dormitory”.

As illustrated in Figure 5, even before the racial incidents occurred, majority and minority students showed differential support for one-group, dual identity, and separate-group policies. Consistent with the findings reported earlier, Whites exhibited a stronger preference for one-group policies than did minority-group students \((p < .05)\); minority students showed a stronger preference for dual identity policies \((p < .05)\). For both Whites and minorities, separatist policies were least supported, and there were no differences between the groups in level of support. During the second measurement period, when racial tensions were high, these racial differences in support for one-group and dual identity policies were significantly magnified \((ps < .05)\), and Blacks more strongly supported separate-group policies than did Whites \((p < .05)\) and at a level somewhat higher than their support for one-group initiatives. By the third assessment period, when racial tensions had substantially subsided, the pattern of policy preferences approached what it was at the beginning of the year. Whether the different policy-related responses of majority and minority students were conscious strategies or an unconscious reaction to the events is unclear from these data. Nevertheless, the overall pattern is consistent with our hypothesised difference in the goals of the groups.
A second implication of the potential strategic influence of a preferred one-group representation for majority group members and a dual identity representation for minority groups is in the nature and content of their contact. Within the contact situation as well as beyond it, one way that minority groups can promote social change that would improve their group position is to manoeuvre the nature of discourse to bring injustice and inequality into people’s conscious awareness. For example, a major tool used by the civil rights movement in the United States was to explicitly challenge the legitimacy of racial oppression (King, 1964). Similar forms of nonviolent resistance, such as India’s struggle for independence and South Africa’s struggle to throw off apartheid, were aimed at raising public awareness and attention to the illegitimacy of the status quo.

Alternatively, one strategy that majority groups may adopt to help maintain the status quo at a societal level involves promoting ideological messages that obscure and draw attention away from group-based inequality (Jackman, 1994; Ruscher, 2001; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999; van Dijk, 1993). This strategy can take different forms. For example, members of advantaged groups may promote ideologies, such as the Protestant Work Ethic, that emphasise an individual’s motivations and abilities, and thereby reduce attention to processes rooted in group power relations (e.g., unequal opportunities) for explaining success or failure (Christopher & Schlenker, 2005).

Figure 5. Changes in Whites’ and Blacks’ support for assimilation, integration (multicultural), and separatist policies across times of low and high intergroup tensions.
Another possible way to legitimise and stabilise the status quo, which speaks more directly to the different types of recategorisation, is to emphasise aspects that the groups share in common. For example, the emphasis on the benefits of a colourblind society in the United States (i.e., all Americans regardless of skin colour) over issues related to racial disparity reflects a national commonality focus (Verkuyten, 2006). Although the emphasis on commonalities can be functional for promoting a positive shared identity and favourable relations between the groups (Dovidio, Gaertner, Niemann, & Snider, 2001), it may also contribute, perhaps indirectly, to the stability of the status relations by masking group-based identities and privileges (see also Ruscher, 2001). Members of disadvantaged groups, who are motivated to improve their group position when they perceive their disadvantage to be illegitimate (Doosje et al., 1999), may be less motivated to act for change when their group identity is less salient to them (see also Wright, 2001). Similarly, members of advantaged groups, who are likely to support practices promoting social change if they perceive their advantaged position as illegitimate (Iyer, Leach, & Crosby, 2003), may be less likely to endorse these initiatives when distinctions between the groups are obscured by a focus on commonality.

Thus, because a focus on commonalities is likely to render separate group identities and related power differences less salient, one of its by-products may be the stability of the status quo. This indirect way for legitimising power may be also manifested in the way members of majority groups approach intergroup interactions. Majority group members are likely to prefer interaction content that focuses on group commonalities, thereby drawing attention away from group-based power differences and inequalities; minority group members may prefer interaction content that attracts attention to different group identities and resources.

We note, however, that minority group members may not want to avoid addressing commonalities altogether when interacting with majority group members. As we noted earlier, to the extent that promoting social change within a society is the objective, minority group members are likely to desire to emphasise both common social connections and group differences within that shared social identity. This dual emphasis may serve the desire to maintain positive connections with those with higher status and control in the social system while maintaining the potential for social change by not masking group-based disadvantage.

Across both laboratory and field settings we have found converging evidence that majority group members prefer to emphasise commonality over group distinctions whereas minority group desire to have both group differences and commonalities (i.e., dual identities) recognised in intergroup interactions (Saguy et al., in press). One study (Saguy et al., Study 1) directly manipulated the power, or position, of laboratory groups, ostensibly based
on differences in perceptual style, by giving one group control over resources valued by members of both groups. Specifically, the high-power group was designated to decide how to allocate extra course credits to participants in the session; the low-power group had no input with respect to the distribution of credits. Participants expected to engage in an intergroup discussion before the allocation decision would take place. The dependent measures were participants’ desire for a change in group-based power in the study and their desire to talk about topics related to group differences in power within the experimental context (e.g., “Discussing the negative aspects of having only one-group to make the allocation decisions”) or about topics addressing commonalities between the groups in the anticipated intergroup interaction (e.g., “Discussing things I have in common with other people in this study, either underestimators or overestimators”).

We predicted that participants in the low-power group would want to talk about group differences in power more than would participants in the high-power group, and that this effect would be mediated by their greater motivation for change in group-based power. No differences between the groups in the desire to talk about commonalities were expected, but we predicted that high-power group members would want to talk about commonalities more than about power differences between the groups.

The results were generally supportive of these predictions. As illustrated in Figure 6, low-power participants preferred to talk about power differences between the groups more than did high-power group members. Low- and high-power groups showed similar levels of interest in talking about commonalities, and high-power group members preferred to talk about commonalities somewhat more than they wanted to talk about power differences between the groups. Finally, as expected, desire for change in group-based power mediated the effect of group position on the desire to talk about power differences between the groups.

The other study (Saguy et al., Study 2) compared the responses of members of real groups differing in social status and power: Israeli Jews distinguished by their ethnic heritage. Members of the high-status group were Israeli Jews who were born in North America or Europe, or had parents who were born in those continents (referred to as “Ashkenazim” in Hebrew); members of the low-power group were Israeli Jews who were born in Asia or Africa, or had parents who were born in those continents (referred to as “Mizrahim” in Hebrew). This ethnic distinction is the most prominent one among Israeli Jews, and inequality between the groups is well documented in levels of education, average income, and general prestige—all favouring the Ashkenazim (Smooha, 2003).

To ensure the salience of power differences between the groups participants, who were tested in terms of level of identification with their
ethnic group, read a newspaper article documenting actual disparities between the two groups in Israel. They then indicated their support for social change in the status of the groups and the extent to which they would like to talk in intergroup dialogue sessions about topics relating to power differences between the groups (e.g., “Discussing ways for allocating more resources to schools in the South of Israel [mostly populated by Mizrahim]”) and commonalities between the groups (e.g., “Discussing the different origins of Israeli music, from East to West.”).

The results of this study, illustrated in Figure 7, were consistent with those of our research with laboratory groups. As expected, members of the low-status group wanted to talk about power differences between the groups significantly more than did members of the high-status group. Group position did not affect the desire to address commonalities. From an alternative perspective, members of the low-status group were equivalently interested in talking about power differences and commonalities, whereas members of the high-status group preferred to discuss commonalities significantly more than power differences. This pattern of means supported the predictions.

Taken together, the studies in this section extend our previous findings on the different preferences of majority and minority group members for
different forms of recategorisation. Specifically, these findings implicate the potentially strategic functions of these orientations. Moreover, they suggest the importance of going beyond a focus on intergroup attitudes to consider how the nature and content of intergroup interaction can impede or facilitate meaningful social change.

**CONCLUSION: IMPLICATIONS, APPLICATIONS, AND FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS**

As we noted at the beginning of this chapter, one of the first integrated presentations of the Common Ingroup Identity Model appeared in the *European Review of Social Psychology* in 1993, over 15 years ago. The more recent research that we have described in the current contribution suggests three important extensions of the model. One is the greater emphasis on two different forms of recategorisation: (a) within a single, superordinate identity in which original group boundaries are not emphasised, and (b) a dual identity in which original group memberships are salient but recognised within the context of a common ingroup identity. The second extension is the recognition that majority (high-power) and minority (low-power) groups may have different preferences for the different forms of recategorisation.

![Figure 7. Low-status (Mizrahim) and high-status (Ashkenazim) group members’ desires to talk power differences between groups and commonalities between groups.](image-url)
The third extension considers the potential strategic and functional effects of dual identity and single, superordinate group forms of recategorisation for minority and majority groups.

Although our earliest publications on the Common Ingroup Identity Model (Gaertner et al., 1989) suggested that recategorisation could occur as a dual identity, only recently has that become a focus of research within the context of the model. Indeed, we did not discuss a dual identity in our earlier presentation of the model that appeared in this journal (Gaertner et al., 1993). The research we have presented in the present chapter provides direct evidence that the dual identity form of recategorisation can, like a single superordinate representation, mediate reductions in intergroup bias—at least for some groups and under some conditions. These findings are also consistent with Brown and Hewstone’s (2005; see also Hewstone & Brown, 1986) formulation of how intergroup contact can reduce bias between groups. Brown and Hewstone emphasise the value of recognising separate group identities in the context of cooperative intergroup relations to reduce bias between the groups generally. Our research illustrates the value of maintaining subgroup identities within the context of an overarching superordinate identity.

Although these findings support the value of developing a dual identity as an alternative to a one-group representation for improving intergroup attitudes and the behavioural orientations of minority group members, we caution that the effectiveness of a dual identity may be substantially moderated by the nature of the intergroup context. In contrast to the consistent, significant effect for the one-group representation across the studies of a multi-ethnic high school (Gaertner et al., 1996), of banking executives who experienced a corporate merger and of stepfamilies (Gaertner et al., 2001), the experience of a dual identity functioned differently across the three intergroup settings. In particular, a stronger sense of a dual identity was related to less bias in the high school study but to more bias in the merger situation between banks and to more conflict within blended families (see Gaertner, Dovidio, Nier, Ward, & Banker, 1999).

As indicated by the second main focus of the current chapter, one potential factor that might moderate the effectiveness of a dual identity is the “cultural ideal” of the social entity. That is, a dual identity may relate to positive attitudes towards members of other groups within the superordinate identity when a dual identity represents a cultural ideal in itself, as with a pluralistic social value, or as an intermediate stage in the movement from separatism to primarily a one-group, superordinate identity (i.e, assimilation). In a national probability sample of Latinos, for example, de la Garza, Falcon, and Garcia (1996) found that ethnic identity was not experienced as in competition with an American identity. In fact stronger ethnic identity
was related to more positive attitudes and adjustment because, as the researchers found, “ethnics use ethnicity to create resources such as group solidarity and political organisations to facilitate their full participation in American society” (p. 337). This research suggests that a dual identity, in which Latino subgroup and American superordinate identities were both valued, was related to more positive orientations to others and to greater personal well-being.

However, when the simultaneous activation of subgroup and superordinate group identities is inconsistent with the dominant cultural value (e.g., assimilation) or is perceived to reflect movement away from that cultural value, a dual identity is hypothesised to be negatively related to intergroup attitudes and to feelings of well-being. Our previous findings can be interpreted as consistent with this proposition. Within the context of a corporate merger, in which maintaining strong identification with the earlier subgroup might threaten the primary goal of the merger, and within the context of a blended family, in which allegiance to one’s former family can be diagnostic of serious problems, a one-group representation would be expected to be—and is—the most important mediator of positive intergroup relations.

Another reason why a dual identity may be problematic in these latter contexts—corporate mergers and blended families—relates to group comparison and projection processes. A series of studies by Mummendey and her colleagues indicates that making a superordinate identity salient while subgroup identities are also salient (e.g., among bikers, teachers, and Germans) frequently increases bias towards the other subgroup (e.g., Waldzus et al., 2004; Wenzel, Mummendey, Weber, & Waldzus, 2003). Mummendey and Wenzel (1999) have proposed that when a common identity is made salient for members of different groups, members of one group or both groups may begin to regard their subgroup’s characteristics (such as norms, values, and goals) as more prototypical of the common, inclusive category compared to those of the other subgroup. Waldzus et al. (2004), for example, found that different types of motor-bikers (chopper-bikers and sports-bikers) and teachers (primary-school and high-school) perceived their group to be more prototypical of the superordinate categories of bikers and teachers, respectively, than the other group. As a consequence of this projection process, people assume that their group is more representative of the inclusive category and therefore is superior to the other subgroup. Members of the other subgroup may be seen not only as inferior exemplars but also as deviants who deserve unequal treatment.

This type of projection, which results in greater bias when dual identities are more salient, may be more likely to occur in some situations than in others. Specifically, group projection may be more likely to occur when the common superordinate identity is more relevant to the dimension on which
the subgroup identities reside. This connection between subgroup identity and superordinate identity arouses needs for social comparison and positive distinctiveness (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), and it provides the bridge of comparability for projection to occur. Hall and Crisp (2005) compared intergroup bias between students at one university or another who were asked to think about ways they were similar to students at the other university in ways related to their both being students (i.e., commonality at the same level as the group distinction, students) or in other ways (e.g., common at a different level, such as nationality). Compared to a condition that emphasised only separate university identities, participants who thought about how the groups were similar in ways relevant to their student status showed a somewhat higher level of intergroup bias; participants who focused on commonalities irrelevant to their student groups demonstrated a significantly lower level of bias. These findings help illuminate why in our studies stronger feelings of a dual identity among subgroup families in a blended family and among employees in previously separate companies in a merged organisation—in which the dimension of subgroup and superordinate identity are the same—relate to higher levels of bias (Gaertner et al., 2001), whereas stronger feelings of a dual identity among racial and ethnic group members relate to positive intergroup attitudes when the superordinate identity is on a different dimension, a high school identity (Gaertner et al., 1996).

One practical implication of the findings we have reported about the relative effectiveness of a one-group and a dual identity is that strategies and interventions designed to reduce intergroup bias need to recognise how the relationships between identities and groups can influence effectiveness, often exacerbating rather than reducing bias as intended. With respect to the nature of identities involved, the work of Mummendey and Wenzel (1999) and Hall and Crisp (2005) on group projection suggests that these interventions may be more effective when they emphasise a basis of superordinate categorisation that is less directly relevant to the subgroup identities (e.g., as Europeans rather than as German for East Germans and West Germans).

In terms of relationships between groups, interventions should consider how majority and minority group members may have different ideals and motivations. For instance, because White values and culture have been the traditionally dominant ones in the United States, American Whites may see an assimilation model, in which members of other cultural groups are absorbed into the “mainstream”, as the most comfortable and effective strategy. For Blacks in the US this model, which denies the value of their culture and traditions, may not only be perceived as less desirable but also as threatening to their personal and social identity—particularly for those who strongly identify with their racial group. Thus, efforts to create a single
superordinate identity, although well intentioned, may threaten one's social identity, which in turn can intensify intergroup bias and conflict.

We caution, though, that understanding group relations also requires appreciation of cultural context. Contrasting with our findings for Blacks and Whites in the US, Rebelo, Guerra, and Monteiro (2005) reported that recategorisation as one-group was more effective for reducing intergroup bias for Black children in Portugal, whereas a dual identity tended to reduce bias among European Portuguese children. Moreover, this moderated effect for children present in the interaction generalises to group members outside the contact situation (Guerra et al., 2007). Guerra et al. (2007) proposed that these different patterns of findings may in part be related to the longevity and dynamics of intergroup relations in these countries. Whereas Black-White relations have been important historically in the US, much of the presence of Blacks in Portugal is the result of recent immigration from Africa. A dual identity may not be functional or desirable for second-generation African Portuguese children, who may strive for assimilation and equality with European Portuguese children. However, for European Portuguese children the dual identity representation may offer a degree of positive differentiation from African Portuguese children, ameliorating identity threat, and thus lowering intergroup bias more than recategorisation as one common group. Although the processes that account for these cultural differences have yet to be definitively identified empirically, the practical implication is clear: Interventions need to be tailored to the cultural values of the groups involved.

The third important extension of our analysis of different forms of recategorisation involves the consideration of the potential strategic and functional aspects of dual identity and one-group forms of recategorisation for majority (or high-power) and minority (low-power) groups. In particular, minority group members are typically less satisfied with the nature of intergroup relations and more sensitive to resource disparities and status differences between the groups than are majority group members. Thus, majority and minority groups commonly differ in their desire for social change and their goals for intergroup interactions. For instance, whereas majority group members have the goal of being liked by minority group members, minority group members have the objective of being respected by majority group members (Shelton, Richeson, & Vorauer, 2006).

We further propose that these differences in personal goals in intergroup interaction reflect collective strategies for minority groups, seeking social change, and majority groups, seeking to maintain the status quo. As the research we have presented demonstrates, whether conscious or not, the different motivations of majority and minority group members are manifested in different desires for the content of intergroup interaction.
To the extent that majority group members are able to direct the content of intergroup interaction solely in terms of topics of commonality—a focus on "we"—the conversation may be pleasant, creating a façade of "liking", but superficial with respect to fundamental social change. Lack of recognition of the perspective and needs of minority group members may communicate a lack of respect for and commitment to addressing the needs of minority group members, who are likely to be less satisfied with the intergroup contact.

This interpretation is consistent with three sets of findings in the intergroup literature. One is that majority group members are less supportive of multiculturalism (versus assimilation into a common national group) and minority group rights than are minority group members, and these differences are more pronounced among majority and minority group members more highly identified with their group (Verkuyten, 2006). The second set involves the different concerns that majority and minority group members have in intergroup interactions (Shelton & Richeson, 2006). Majority group members are frequently concerned about violating social norms and personal ideals by appearing prejudiced. Consequently, they will avoid acknowledging race, which can protect them from the personal recognition or from public attributions of racial bias (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2004). However, because minorities are primarily concerned about being treated negatively because of their group membership, different group identities will remain salient even while they engage in activities to improve intergroup relations (Shelton et al., 2006; Vorauer, 2006).

The third set of findings relates to the effectiveness of intergroup contact. In general, Tropp and Pettigrew (2005) found that intergroup contact was significantly more effective at reducing intergroup bias for majority group members (mean $r = -0.23$) than it was for minority group members (mean $r = -0.18$). Moreover, whereas the optimal conditions specified by the Contact Hypothesis moderated the effect of contact for majority group members, the presence or absence of these conditions had no significant effect for minority group members. For minority group members, who may feel vulnerable in the present and that their group was unfairly treated in the past, reconciliation may require direct evidence of empowerment (Shnabel & Nadler, in press). Although intergroup contact may be particularly pleasant and nonconflictual under the conditions specified in the contact hypothesis, these positive experiences are not synonymous with empowerment. Indeed, whereas intergroup contact generally improves the attitudes of majority group members towards the minority group, its effects are less strong and consistent on the majority group’s support for social policies that can directly produce social change towards equality (see Dixon, Durrheim, & Tredoux, 2005).
In conclusion, we continue to see the Common Ingroup Identity Model as a useful and valuable approach for improving intergroup relations. Laboratory and field research continue to support the effectiveness of this general framework. However, we increasingly recognise the complexity and subtlety of intergroup relations, and the work described in this chapter converges on the importance of understanding intergroup contact from the perspective of both majority and minority groups and in terms of both short-term reactions and long-term consequences. Improving intergroup relations and creating more fair and just societies are not necessarily synonymous. Indeed, contentment and comfort can be impediments to fundamental social change. Thus, to fully appreciate the nature and consequences of intergroup relations and to develop truly effective interventions, the social realities, needs, and motivations of both majority and minority groups and their dynamic interplay, in terms of social action as well as social attitudes, need to be considered and understood both in immediate contact and over time.
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