

# Moving Beyond Prejudice Reduction

---

Pathways to Positive  
Intergroup Relations

*Edited by*

Linda R. Tropp  
and Robyn K. Mallett

# INTRODUCTION: CHARTING NEW PATHWAYS TO POSITIVE INTERGROUP RELATIONS

LINDA R. TROPP AND ROBYN K. MALLETT

In 1963, Martin Luther King Jr. stood before an enthusiastic crowd of civil rights supporters and described an ideal state of intergroup relations: that one day "little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers" (Washington, 1992, p. 105). His dream was characterized not only by the absence of intergroup strife but also by the presence of connection and friendship across group boundaries. Since his famous speech, the United States has made some progress toward that dream. Generally, intergroup violence is less common, and the call for peaceful relations between groups has grown. Indeed, even following 3 days of riots in 1992 that started after three White Los Angeles police officers were acquitted of beating an African American motorist, Rodney King, he himself pleaded for a halt to the violence:

Can we get along? Can we stop making it, making it horrible for the older people and the kids? . . . It's just not right. . . . It's not going to change anything. We'll, we'll get our justice. . . . Please, we can get along here. We all can get along. I mean, we're all stuck here for a while. Let's try to work it out. (Mydans, 1993)

Still, we can question whether progress has stalled. Though violence between groups has decreased, friendship and integration between groups has not necessarily increased. Beverly Tatum's (1997) book *Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?* notes that, to some extent, King's dream has become a reality—elementary school children frequently interact across racial lines. Yet by the time they reach high school, students' educational and social experiences are often largely segregated (Frankenberg & Orfield, 2007). For example, an analysis of interviews of 59,000 high school students found that of the nearly one million friendship pairs in the sample, only a few hundred were interracial (Hallinan & Williams, 1989). Children and adolescents are still more likely to choose same-race friends than cross-race friends (DuBois & Hirsch, 1990; Hallinan & Teixeira, 1987), and cross-race friendships can be harder to sustain over time (Aboud, Mendelson, & Purdy, 2003). Tatum suggests such segregation occurs because students have become increasingly aware of race and are unsure of how to address the issue with their peers. Uncertainty about how to negotiate interactions with people from different social groups can grow with them into adulthood and pose a formidable barrier to future positive contact.

However, looking back at the history of research on intergroup relations, one might initially think that prejudice is the sole problem. If we could just reduce prejudice, the work suggests, then we should be able to improve intergroup relations. To be sure, the existence and persistence of prejudice are highly problematic. We must continue to build on decades of past research to further our understanding of its genesis and the consequences that prejudice can have for everyday life experiences and outcomes (Ashburn-Nardo, Monteith, Arthur, & Bain, 2007; Dovidio, Glick, & Rudman, 2005; Swim, Hyers, Cohen, Fitzgerald, & Bylsma, 2003).

But the problem of achieving positive intergroup relations is more complex than simply reducing prejudice. Recent studies reveal the multifaceted nature of intergroup relations, such as the benefits of positive attitudes toward other groups, the importance of recognizing differing views of intergroup relationships, the anxieties we may have about cross-group interactions, the discrepancies between our interest in contact and our willingness to reach out across group boundaries, not knowing how others might respond, or whether we would feel that we belong. Indeed, emerging programs of research have begun to converge in identifying the many ways in which our construals, motivations, expectations, and emotional responses impact our intergroup experiences and relationships, far beyond the effects of prejudiced attitudes (e.g., Devine, Evett, & Vasquez-Suson, 1996; Frey & Tropp, 2006; Mendoza-Denton, Downey, Purdie, Davis, & Pietrzak, 2002; Plant & Devine, 2003; Shelton, Richeson, & Vorauer, 2006; Stephan & Stephan, 1985; Vorauer, 2006).

In the present volume, we therefore focus beyond the goal of reducing prejudice to explore what other factors might be necessary to improve relations between groups. This book brings together original contributions from leading scholars in social psychology who have begun to examine the motivations and processes that underlie people's ability to develop positive and meaningful relationships across group boundaries. As one of the earliest researchers to assess intergroup attitudes, Emory Bogardus (1928), stated that

public attention is usually given to racial prejudice rather than to its counterpart, racial good will. But the more spectacular and melodramatic phenomena do not deserve to receive all the attention; the origins and development of racial friendliness also merit consideration. (p. 77)

In line with this view, the present volume compels us to move beyond our field's traditional focus on prejudice reduction, to consider novel approaches to studying intergroup attitudes and strategies that we can use to improve relations between groups.

## EARLY APPROACHES TO STUDYING INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Early theorists such as Gordon Allport (1945, 1954) and Muzafer Sherif (Sherif & Sherif, 1953; Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, & Sherif, 1954/1961) encouraged psychologists to investigate strategies that could effectively reduce intergroup prejudice. In his landmark book *The Nature of Prejudice*, Allport (1954) wrote what has become the most influential statement of intergroup contact theory, noting that intergroup contact holds the potential either to exacerbate or reduce prejudice. His early research revealed numerous factors, such as unpleasant childhood experiences and social influences, that could heighten intergroup prejudice (Allport & Kramer, 1946). Hence, he emphasized conditions that could be established in the contact situation (e.g., equal status between groups, support of institutional authorities) to effectively reduce intergroup prejudice.

Sherif also recognized the potential for contact between groups to increase or decrease prejudice, and he and his colleagues demonstrated both tendencies in their classic Robbers Cave field study (see Sherif et al., 1954/1961). Situations structured to produce competition between the groups led to intergroup prejudice and hostility and spurred further intergroup competition. By contrast, situations that provided opportunities for the groups to work together cooperatively toward common goals were effective in reversing these tendencies and even in encouraging friendly relations to develop across group boundaries.

Such approaches to understanding the origins of prejudice and the potential for prejudice reduction are well established and well documented in the research literature (see Pettigrew & Tropp, 2005; Stephan & Stephan, 2001). But as we reflect on such strategies and their supportive evidence, we might begin to question whether prejudice reduction has always been the singular goal. Indeed, close inspection of early work on prejudice reveals many examples in which researchers employed a wide range of indicators to assess the nature and tone of intergroup relationships. For example, LaPiere (1934) did not simply ask hotel and restaurant owners to report whether they held prejudiced attitudes toward Chinese people; he also tested whether Chinese clientele would be welcome at their establishments. Though often construed as a measure of "prejudice," Bogardus's (1928) well-known scale actually assesses people's willingness to accept members of other ethnic, religious, and national groups into their neighborhoods, homes, and close friendship circles. Additionally, Deutsch and Collins (1951) examined not only the degree to which White housewives held prejudices against Blacks but also how they felt about living in an integrated housing community. And beyond asking White police officers to report attitudes toward their Black peers, Kephart (1957) examined how these officers would feel about taking orders from Black officers and having Black officers join their formerly all-White police districts.

These early examples demonstrate great variability in how researchers sought to understand multiple dimensions of intergroup relationships, reaching far beyond the goal of prejudice reduction. Yet, somehow, we have perpetually constrained the framing of this work to retain a focus on prejudice and prejudice reduction as the guiding force for our field (for a related discussion, see Devine et al., 1996).

#### CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES TO PREJUDICE AND INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Indeed, most of our research from the past several decades has focused on negative processes and obstacles in intergroup relations (see Fiske, 1998; Shelton et al., 2006; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). For example, extensive social psychological research shows that our tendencies to categorize people on the basis of race, gender, and age are natural and inevitable consequences of social perception (see Macrae & Bodenhausen, 2000). Once categorization occurs, stereotypic beliefs and prejudicial attitudes associated with social categories readily come to mind and subsequently shape our judgments of and behaviors toward others (e.g., Bargh, 1999; Devine, 1989; Dovidio & Gaertner, 2004; Stephan & Stephan, 2000). Research has also revealed a range of motiva-

tional factors that perpetuate people's tendency to harbor biases against other groups, including the need to confirm one's self-worth or the value of one's group (e.g., Fein & Spencer, 1997; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) and the need to reduce uncertainty about who we are and where we stand in the world (e.g., Hogg, 2007). Moreover, other perspectives explore the resilient nature of prejudice, by highlighting how the mere presence of other groups can provoke intergroup biases (e.g., Turner et al., 1987) and the persistence of dominance and hierarchical relations between groups (e.g., Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Yet other work from recent decades has identified the many ways in which intergroup prejudice has evolved into less conspicuous forms. As overt forms of prejudice become increasingly difficult to detect, researchers have set out to create new measures to assess more covert, subtle forms of prejudice (e.g., Henry & Sears, 2002; McConahay, Hardee, & Batts, 1981; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). Rather than simply possessing uniformly negative attitudes toward Blacks, many White Americans who believe they are nonprejudiced egalitarians may hold conflicting positive and negative attitudes of which they may be unaware (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Glick & Fiske, 1996). New procedures have also been developed and studied extensively to identify hidden dimensions of intergroup prejudice and bias, including tests of association and activation of group-based stimuli (e.g., Dovidio, Kawakami, Johnson, Johnson, & Howard, 1997; Fazio, Jackson, Dunton, & Williams, 1995; Greenwald, Poehlman, Uhlmann, & Banaji, 2009).

These bodies of research have greatly enhanced our understanding of prejudice and how the seemingly natural processes that induce prejudice can pose formidable barriers between groups. Further research along these lines has therefore sought to identify strategies that can effectively combat and diminish prejudice, such as by making people aware of their biases (Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006), training people to reduce biased responding (e.g., Kawakami, Dovidio, Moll, Hermsen, & Russin, 2000; Kawakami, Dovidio, & Van Kamp, 2007), and enhancing their cross-group experiences (e.g., Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

#### EMERGING APPROACHES TO PREJUDICE AND INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Nonetheless, it appears that relatively little work has moved beyond the central goal of reducing prejudice, to consider different ways in which we can conceptualize intergroup attitudes and explore strategies that enhance feelings of acceptance and inclusion across group boundaries (see Stephan & Stephan, 2001). We believe it is now time to expand our efforts and take a more positive approach to improving intergroup relations.

Emerging research has begun to shift away from the common focus on prejudice reduction to consider novel approaches to understanding and promoting positive intergroup relations, both in contexts of diverse yet largely segregated societies (see Nagda, Tropp, & Paluck, 2006) and in contexts where groups have long been in conflict (see Nadler, Malloy, & Fisher, 2008). For example, some of this work highlights new ways of conceptualizing intergroup attitudes and the ways in which we resist bias and develop positive feelings toward other groups (Devine, Plant, Amodio, Harmon-Jones, & Vance, 2002; Livingston & Drwecki, 2007; Pittinsky, Montoya, Tropp, & Chen, 2007). Other new work explores the motivations that underlie our interest in relations with other groups (Butz & Plant, 2006; Mallett, Wilson, & Gilbert, 2008), and how forging relationships across group boundaries can facilitate feelings of inclusion and acceptance (Mendoza-Denton & Page-Gould, 2008; Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, Dittmann, & Crosby, 2008; Walton & Cohen, 2007; Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, & Ropp, 1997). New perspectives have also begun to explore processes by which we can begin to achieve reconciliation between conflicting groups, such as by promoting forgiveness and mutual understanding (e.g., Čehajić, Brown, & Castano, 2008; Hewstone, Cairns, Voci, Hamberger, & Niens, 2006; Manzi & González, 2007; Shnabel & Nadler, 2008).

Integrating the best of these emerging perspectives, this book guides psychologists' thinking about how we can extend our work beyond prejudice reduction to enhance our potential for achieving positive intergroup relations. Contributors to this edited volume explore these issues through four primary themes.

## RECONCEPTUALIZING INTERGROUP ATTITUDES

Part I of this volume concerns *reconceptualizations in how we think about and study intergroup attitudes*. Rather than focusing on what makes people biased, Robert W. Livingston (Chapter 1) explores factors that lead people to become nonbiased in evaluations of other groups. He reviews theory and provides empirical evidence to suggest ways in which people vary in their susceptibility to forming negative associations with groups, in relation to individual differences, psychological motivations, and practice in making other kinds of associations. He concludes that, for many people, racial prejudice is not the result of devaluing or disliking people from a different social group. Rather, some individuals are simply more susceptible to negative conditioning. With practice and the proper motivation, people may be able to break those associations and form more positive racial attitudes.

Todd L. Pittinsky, Seth A. Rosenthal, and R. Matthew Montoya (Chapter 2) then move beyond typical distinctions in assessment of negative attitudes to examine varying dimensions of positive attitudes toward outgroups, which they refer to as *allophilia*. They present evidence showing that positive and negative intergroup attitudes are not direct opposites and that *allophilia* comprises five dimensions: Affection, Comfort, Kinship, Engagement, and Enthusiasm. They conclude that to understand the range of benefits that result from holding positive attitudes toward outgroups, psychologists must become more precise in our predictions and measurement. Doing so reveals that positive attitudes are stronger predictors of support for charities and assistance programs that help disadvantaged groups than are negative attitudes.

### MOTIVATIONS AND EXPECTATIONS IN CROSS-GROUP RELATIONS

Part II's theme shifts us from our tendency to focus on avoiding other groups to examine the *motivations and expectations that underlie positive relations with members of other groups*. Robyn K. Mallett, Dana E. Wagner, and Patrick R. Harrison (Chapter 3) consider how, although we often expect the worst, our experiences of intergroup contact tend to be more positive than we initially imagine. Building from social psychological research on affective forecasting, these authors show how influential expectations can be in cross-group relations, and they identify strategies for improving people's expectations to promote more successful and enjoyable cross-group interactions. They suggest targeting three factors that contribute to overly negative expectations: reliance on stereotypes, individual differences in sensitivity to group membership, and appreciation of how the situation constrains one's experience. Their research shows that simply considering overly negative expectations smoothed upcoming instances of interracial contact and increased the formation of interracial friendships.

Relatedly, David A. Butz and E. Ashby Plant (Chapter 4) examine why people often attempt to avoid intergroup contact and what predicts their motivations to approach interactions with members of other groups. In so doing, they demonstrate how negative emotional responses, such as anger, hostility, anxiety, and self-efficacy concerns, can curb our motivation for intergroup contact and how, by alleviating such negative responses, we can encourage more positive, approach-oriented intergroup behavior. Differences in internal or external motivations to control prejudice can also affect whether a person frames an interaction with a member of another group as a threat to be avoided or a challenge to be approached. Framing such interactions as a challenge increases the likelihood of actively working through and eventually overcoming even negative expectations.



Katya Migacheva, Linda R. Tropp, and Jennifer Crocker (Chapter 5) then discuss how the motivations and goals one adopts can either enhance or diminish the potential for achieving positive cross-group relations. Using the distinction between egosystem and ecosystem motivations as a guiding framework, they emphasize how focusing on oneself can foster anxieties about intergroup contact, whereas focusing on learning from others and attending to their needs can facilitate more positive contact experiences. The authors consider the extent to which these goals are held independently in everyday contexts and how we can promote goals focused on compassion and learning, even under conditions of conflict.

### FORGING CROSS-GROUP RELATIONSHIPS

Part III explores how *forging relationships across group boundaries* can foster feelings of inclusion and acceptance. Kristin Davies, Stephen C. Wright, and Arthur Aron (Chapter 6) summarize a decade of research on the many benefits of cross-group friendships for creating positive shifts in intergroup attitudes. Describing results from cross-sectional, meta-analytic, and experimental studies of cross-group friendships, they reveal how close cross-group relationships increase the extent to which we include people from different social groups, and therefore the other social group, as part of our self-concept. They examine how self-expansion occurs in certain types of intergroup contact and how it produces positive effects, such as enhancing intergroup liking and empathy and encouraging greater support for disadvantaged groups.

Taking this theme further, Elizabeth Page-Gould and Rodolfo Mendoza-Denton (Chapter 7) discuss processes by which cross-group friendships benefit both majority and minority group members. Cross-group friendships can foster not only interest in intergroup contact but also feelings of institutional acceptance. Feeling that one belongs at an institution is especially critical for members of historically devalued groups because a feeling of belonging can enhance rates of retention and graduation. With longitudinal data and experimental studies, these authors show that cross-group friendships can reduce anxiety about future cross-group interactions and foster a sense of belonging among traditionally devalued groups, along with demonstrating empirically the processes that underlie such positive outcomes of cross-group friendships.

Concluding this section, Valerie Purdie-Vaughns and Gregory M. Walton (Chapter 8) describe how a focus on inclusiveness can promote feelings of trust within diverse institutions, which can have important implications for both academic and intergroup outcomes among historically devalued groups. These authors propose that we should view diversity through the lens of *identity safety*, such that different groups should have the potential to experience

institutional contexts in similar ways, while at the same time acknowledging the varied perspectives and experiences that different groups bring to each context. Thus, provocatively suggesting that not all forms of multiculturalism are equally beneficial, they address common limitations of multicultural ideologies and discuss how the concept of identity safety may usefully be applied in diverse organizations.

### APPLICATIONS TO POSTCONFLICT RECONCILIATION

Part IV of this volume explores how these themes may be *applied to post-conflict reconciliation* concerns to promote forgiveness and understanding between groups. Hermann Swart, Rhiannon Turner, Miles Hewstone, and Alberto Voci (Chapter 9) consider several psychological processes that serve as cornerstones for both intergroup relations and reconciliation in postconflict societies. In particular, these authors contend that past conflict can perpetuate intergroup hostilities unless the groups involved can learn to forgive each other and foster trusting relationships. Presenting findings from studies in South Africa, Northern Ireland, and the United Kingdom, they show how high-quality contact experiences that include opportunities for reciprocal self-disclosure and empathic responding can facilitate the development of intergroup forgiveness and trust.

Arie Nadler and Nurit Shnabel (Chapter 10) further explore these issues by attending to the psychological needs of each group in the postconflict relationship. They present a needs-based model of reconciliation and results from several studies to demonstrate the importance of addressing the distinct needs for empowerment among victims and acceptance among perpetrators. Because members of disadvantaged and advantaged groups approach reconciliation with different goals, even positive messages of acceptance or empowerment may backfire if they do not address the group's primary need. Properly tailored communication between groups with histories of conflict goes beyond merely reducing conflict to actually increase willingness to cooperate and work against discrimination.

Roberto González, Jorge Manzi, and Masi Noor (Chapter 11) add to this section by discussing how identities and intergroup emotions contribute to processes of forgiveness and reconciliation. Exploring the context of political violence in Chile, these authors describe how, when groups in conflict focus only on their own group identities, conflict is likely to persist and the potential for forgiveness is diminished. But framing group identities at the inclusive, superordinate level (i.e., Chileans) will lead to emotional responses of empathy and trust that support forgiveness and willingness to repair relations.

It is our hope that by bringing these perspectives together in one volume, the field of psychology can begin to chart new directions for research

that emphasize positive pathways to improved intergroup relations. To this end, we have invited two prominent intergroup scholars, Samuel L. Gaertner and John F. Dovidio, to synthesize and comment on the work presented across the four sections of this book. In doing so, they highlight points of connection across the chapters and suggest avenues for future research. They also conclude their chapter with suggestions for how some of the research described in the volume may be used to inform social policy that seeks to build positive relations and more inclusive societies.

Looking back over the progress that we have made toward Martin Luther King Jr.'s dream in the past 40 years, we still have a way to go. As King said, "we must make the pledge that we shall always march ahead. We cannot turn back" (Washington, 1992, p. 103). On this journey, psychological research has primarily taken the well-traveled pathway to prejudice reduction. This road has allowed us to discover important insights about the roots and nature of prejudice and conflict. Yet it has also bypassed potentially important pathways that could take us beyond prejudice reduction to intergroup trust and acceptance. The purpose of this volume is to highlight the bridges and side roads created by recent research that chart new pathways for investigation. Reconceptualizing how we study intergroup attitudes, motivating interest in relations between groups, forging cross-group relations that can encourage feelings of inclusion and acceptance, and promoting intergroup forgiveness and understanding have the potential to change the landscape of intergroup relations. These new pathways can be used to explore intergroup relations that are characterized by subtle disruptions in interpersonal contexts or by the more systemic barriers that pervade our social institutions.

The editors' hope is that staking out these new pathways will allow us to go beyond mere prejudice reduction and take steps forward to realize Martin Luther King Jr.'s dream. That is, rather than simply reducing prejudice and conflict, we may enhance mutual liking, trust, and friendship between groups.

## REFERENCES

- Aboud, F. E., Mendelson, M. J., & Purdy, K. T. (2003). Cross-race peer relations and friendship quality. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 27, 165-173. doi:10.1080/01650250244000164
- Allport, G. W. (1945). Human nature and the peace. *Psychological Bulletin*, 42, 376-378. doi:10.1037/h0054600
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.
- Allport, G. W., & Kramer, B. M. (1946). Some roots of prejudice. *Journal of Psychology*, 22, 9-39.

- Ashburn-Nardo, L., Monteith, M. J., Arthur, S. A., & Bain, A. (2007). Race and the psychological health of African Americans. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 10, 471–491. doi:10.1177/1368430207081536
- Bargh, J. A. (1999). The cognitive monster: The case against the controllability of automatic stereotype effects. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-process theories in social psychology* (pp. 361–382), New York, NY: Guilford.
- Bogardus, E. S. (1928). *Immigration and race attitudes*. Boston, MA: Heath.
- Brown, R., & Hewstone, M. (2005). An integrative theory of intergroup contact. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp. 255–343). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Butz, D. A., & Plant, E. A. (2006). Perceiving outgroup members as unresponsive: Implications for approach-related emotions, intentions, and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 1066–1079. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.91.6.1066
- Čehajić, S., Brown, R., & Castano, E. (2008). Forgive and forget? Antecedents and consequences of intergroup forgiveness in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Political Psychology*, 29, 351–367. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2008.00634.x
- Czopp, A. M., Monteith, M. J., & Mark, A. Y. (2006). Standing up for a change: Reducing bias through interpersonal confrontation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 784–803. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.784
- Deutsch, M., & Collins, M. (1951). *Interracial housing: A psychological evaluation of a social experiment*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 5–18. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.56.1.5
- Devine, P. G., Evett, S. R., & Vasquez-Suson, K. A. (1996). Exploring the interpersonal dynamics of intergroup contact. In R. M. Sorrentino & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition* (Vol. 3, pp. 423–464). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Devine, P. G., Plant, E. A., Amodio, D. M., Harmon-Jones, E., & Vance, S. L. (2002). The regulation of explicit and implicit race bias: The role of motivations to respond without prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 835–848. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.82.5.835
- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2004). Aversive racism. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 36, pp. 1–52). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Dovidio, J. F., Glick, P. S., & Rudman, L. A. (Eds.). (2005). *On the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., Johnson, C., Johnson, B., & Howard, A. (1997). On the nature of prejudice: Automatic and controlled processes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 33, 510–540.

- DuBois, D. L., & Hirsch, B. J. (1990). School and neighborhood friendship patterns of Blacks and Whites in early adolescence. *Child Development*, 61, 524-536. doi:10.2307/1131112
- Fazio, R. H., Jackson, J. R., Dunton, B. C., & Williams, C. J. (1995). Variability in automatic activation as an unobtrusive measure of racial attitudes: A bona fide pipeline? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 1013-1027.
- Fein, S., & Spencer, S. J. (1997). Prejudice as self-image maintenance. Affirming the self through derogating others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 31-44.
- Fiske, S. T. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 357-411). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Frankenberg, E., & Orfield, G. (Eds.). *Lessons in integration: Realizing the promise of racial diversity in American schools*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Frey, F. E., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). Being seen as individuals versus as group members: Extending research on metaperception to intergroup contexts. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10, 265-280. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr1003\_5
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism* (pp. 61-89). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 491-512.
- Greenwald, A. G., Poehlman, T., Uhlmann, E. L., & Banaji, M. R. (2009). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta-analysis of predictive validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97, 17-41.
- Hallinan, M. T., & Teixeira, R. A. (1987). Opportunities and constraints: Black-White differences in the formation of interracial friendships. *Child Development*, 58, 1358-1371. doi:10.2307/1130627
- Hallinan, M. T., & Williams, R. A. (1989). Interracial friendship choices in secondary schools. *American Sociological Review*, 54, 67-78. doi:10.2307/2095662
- Henry, P. J., & Sears, D. O. (2002). The symbolic racism 2000 scale. *Political Psychology*, 23, 253-283.
- Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., Voci, A., Hamberger, J., & Niens, U. (2006). Intergroup contact, forgiveness, and experience of "The Troubles" in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62, 99-120. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00441.x
- Hogg, M. A., (2007). Uncertainty-identity theory. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 69-126). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.
- Kawakami, K., Dovidio, J. F., Moll, J., Hermsen, S., & Russin, A. (2000). Just say no (to stereotyping): Effects of training in the negation of stereotypic associations

- on stereotype activation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 871–888. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.78.5.871
- Kawakami, K., Dovidio, J. F., & van Kamp, S. (2005). Kicking the habit: Effects of nonstereotypic association training and correction processes on hiring decisions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 41, 68–75.
- Kawakami, K., Dovidio, J. F., & Van Kamp, S. (2007). The impact of counter-stereotypic training and related correction processes on the application of stereotypes. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 10, 139–156. doi:10.1177/1368430207074725
- Kephart, W. M. (1957). *Racial factors and urban law enforcement*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- LaPiere, R. T. (1934). Attitudes vs. actions. *Social Forces*, 13, 230–237.
- Livingston, R. W., & Drwecki, B. B. (2007). Why are some individuals not racially biased? Susceptibility to affective conditioning predicts nonprejudice toward Blacks. *Psychological Science*, 18, 816–823. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01985.x
- Macrae, C. N., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2000). Social cognition: Thinking categorically about others. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, 93–120. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.51.1.93
- Mallett, R. K., Wilson, T. D., & Gilbert, D. (2008). Expect the unexpected: Failure to anticipate similarities leads to an intergroup forecasting error. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 265–277. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.94.2.265
- Manzi, J., & González, R. (2007). Forgiveness and reparation in Chile: The role of cognitive and emotional intergroup antecedents. *Peace and Conflict*, 13, 71–91.
- McConahay, J. B., Hardee, B. B., & Batts, V. (1981). Has racism declined in America? It depends on who is asking and what is asked. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 25, 563–579.
- 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. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.83.4.896
- Mendoza-Denton, R., & Page-Gould, E. (2008). Can cross-group friendships influence minority students' well being at historically White universities? *Psychological Science*, 19, 933–939.
- Mydans, S. (1993, March 9). Jury could hear Rodney King today. *The New York Times*, p. 12.
- Nadler, A., Malloy, T., & Fisher, J. D. (2008). Intergroup reconciliation: Dimensions and themes. In A. Nadler, T. Malloy, & J. D. Fisher (Eds.), *Social psychology of intergroup reconciliation* (pp. 3–13). New York, NY: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195300314.003.0001
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in Western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 57, 57–75.

- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2005). 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* (pp. 262-277). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (2003). The antecedents and implications of interracial anxiety. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 790-801. doi:10.1177/0146167203029006011
- Nagda, B., Tropp, L. R., & Paluck, E. (Eds.). (2006). Reducing prejudice and promoting social inclusion: Integrating research, theory, and practice on intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62, 439-451. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00467.x
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in Western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 57, 57-75.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2005). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 751-783. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751
- Pittinsky, T. L., Montoya, R. M., Tropp, L. R., & Chen, A. (2007). How and when leader behavior affects intergroup liking: Affect, approval, and allophilia. In C. Anderson, B. Mannix, & M. Neale (Eds.), *Affect and groups: Research on managing groups and teams* (Vol. 10, pp. 125-144). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.
- Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (2003). The antecedents and implications of interracial anxiety. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 790-801. doi:10.1177/0146167203029006011
- Purdie-Vaughns, V., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., Dittmann, R., & Crosby, J. R. (2008). Social identity contingencies: How diversity cues signal threat or safety for African Americans in mainstream institutions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 615-630.
- Shelton, J. N., Richeson, J. A., & Vorauer, J. D. (2006). Threatened identities and interethnic interactions. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 17, 321-358. doi:10.1080/10463280601095240
- Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, J. B., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). *Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The Robbers Cave experiment*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Book Exchange. (Original work published 1954)
- Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. W. (1953). *Groups in harmony and tension*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Shnabel, N., & Nadler, A. (2008). A needs-based model of reconciliation: Satisfying the different emotional needs of victim and perpetrator as a key to promoting reconciliation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 116-132. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.94.1.116
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41, 157-175. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1985.tb01134.x

- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 23–46). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2001). *Improving intergroup relations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 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. doi:10.1177/0095798402239228
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–4). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Tatum, B. (1997). *Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?* New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- Vorauer, J. D. (2006). An information search model of evaluative concerns in intergroup interaction. *Psychological Review*, 113, 862–886. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.113.4.862
- Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2007). A question of belonging: Race, social fit, and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 82–96. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.92.1.82
- Washington, J. M. (Ed.). (1992). *I have a dream: Writings and speeches that changed the world: Martin Luther King, Jr.* New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 73–90. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.73.1.73