

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

COPYRIGHT PERMISSION

The impact of group membership salience during interethnic contact on immediate versus
Generalized concerns regarding evaluation by outgroup members

BY

Yumiko Sakamoto

**A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University of
Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirement of the degree
Master OF Arts**

Yumiko Sakamoto © 2006

Permission has been granted to the Library of the University of Manitoba to lend or sell copies of this thesis/practicum, to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and to University Microfilms Inc. to publish an abstract of this thesis/practicum.

This reproduction or copy of this thesis has been made available by authority of the copyright owner solely for the purpose of private study and research, and may only be reproduced and copied as permitted by copyright laws or with express written authorization from the copyright owner.

Acknowledgement

First, I would like to thank my fantastic advisor, Dr. Jacquie Vorauer, for guiding me through the study. I thank her for incredible patience while reading my paper a few zillion times, and giving me extremely constructive feedback. Without her generosity, insight, and support, I could not have made it through. Thank you! I would also like to thank Dr. Gerald Sande and Dr. Jessica Senchi for being on my committee, and providing valuable suggestions.

Finally, I would also like to thank my beloved husband, Sean Garrity, for proof reading my thesis many many times, and correcting my English at 2:00 am. I believe that you know my study as much as I do now. Your emotional support always motivated me.

Abstract

Evaluative concerns can have a variety of negative cognitive, affective, and behavioral effects, particularly in the context of intergroup interaction. The current study examined the impact of group membership salience during a positive interethnic interaction on both immediate and generalized concerns regarding evaluation by outgroup members. It was hypothesized that lower levels of group membership salience would be beneficial in reducing evaluative concerns during the interaction whereas higher levels of salience would be beneficial in facilitating generalization, which was assessed in terms of more positive expected evaluations from other outgroup members. Forty-six White and forty-six Chinese Canadian participants were randomly assigned to one of three experimental conditions involving a high or low salience interethnic interaction or a high salience intraethnic interaction (control condition). Results indicated that even though salience did not influence participants' evaluative concerns during interethnic interaction, it did have an effect on generalized concerns, but only for Chinese participants. Specifically, Chinese participants' general beliefs about how Chinese people are viewed by White people were most positive in the high salience interethnic interaction condition, whereas there was no parallel pattern for White participants. These different results for White and Chinese participants might have been due to group membership differences generally being more salient to White than Chinese participants in the interethnic interaction conditions. Overall, the beneficial effects of positive interethnic interaction on expected evaluations by outgroup members were stronger than the effects on participants' own views of outgroup members.

Table of Contents	
Acknowledgements.....	i
Abstract.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
List of Tables.....	v
Introduction.....	1
Evaluative Concerns.....	3
Predictors of Evaluative Concerns.....	3
Uncertainty.....	4
Importance.....	4
Consequences of Evaluative Concerns.....	5
Group Membership Salience.....	7
Salience as a Source of Controversy.....	7
Costs and Benefits.....	14
Hypotheses.....	15
Method.....	17
Results.....	23
Immediate effects.....	23
Generalized effects.....	25
Discussion.....	28
Costs and Benefits.....	29

Evaluative Concerns and Salience

Other immediate effects.....30

Other generalized effects.....32

Ethnicity differences.....33

Limitations.....33

Conclusion.....34

References.....37

Appendices.....43

 Appendix A.....43

 Appendix B.....44

 Appendix C.....46

Author Notes.....51

Footnotes.....52

Tables.....53

List of Tables

Table 1: Means of Fears of Rejection.....	53
Table 2: Means of Desire for Future Interaction.....	54
Table 3: Means of Meta-Interest.....	55
Table 4: Means of Meta-Feeling Thermometer.....	56
Table 5: Means of Interest.....	57
Table 6: Pearson Correlation Between Variables during the Immediate Interaction.....	58
Table 7: Pearson Correlation Between Variables for Generalized Effects.....	58

The impact of group membership salience during interethnic interaction on immediate versus generalized concerns regarding evaluation by outgroup members

Numerous researchers have concluded that intergroup contact is crucial in reducing prejudice against different ethnic groups (see Dovidio, Gaertner & Kawakami, 2003; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000). Allport (1954) is among those who originally suggested that interethnic contact can play an important role in reducing prejudice. More specifically, he suggested that interethnic interaction is effective in reducing prejudice when four conditions are met: 1) the status of each group is equal, 2) each group member cooperates, 3) each group member shares the same goals, and 4) the authority (e.g., government or teacher) supports interethnic interaction (Allport, 1954; see also Pettigrew, 1998).

This so-called *contact hypothesis* has been examined extensively. In fact, according to Dovidio, Gaertner, and Kawakami (2003), the number of study abstracts containing the term “contact hypothesis” found on a PsycINFO search at that time was 203. Moreover, 89 out of the 203 studies were published between 2000 and 2002. Clearly, the contact hypothesis is not just studied extensively, but it is also a current topic. Further, according to these studies, it appears that interethnic contact can indeed be helpful in reducing interethnic prejudice. For example, in a meta-analysis of 203 independent studies with 90,000 participants conducted by Pettigrew and Tropp (2000), an inverse relationship between face-to-face interethnic interaction and reduced levels of prejudice was found in 94 % of those 203 studies (see also Dovidio, Gaertner & Kawakami, 2003; Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

Thus far, most studies examining interethnic contact have been focused on questions such as “Is contact really effective in improving interethnic attitudes?” or “How can we maximize the benefits of interethnic contact on interethnic attitudes?”. Only a few studies have examined the effects of prior intergroup contact on how subsequent intergroup exchanges unfold in terms of behavior and interpersonal perceptions.

For example, Vorauer and Sakamoto (2006) examined first meeting situations between White and Chinese students, and found that when White students interacted with Chinese students, they felt that they communicated more interest in being friends with the Chinese students than the Chinese students communicated to them. Further, after White students (erroneously) judged that they were more interested than the Chinese students in becoming friends, the White students became less interested in pursuing friendship with them. This occurrence was not observed in White-White interactions. Importantly, this pattern of misunderstanding also was not evident for White students with higher levels of prior contact with Chinese people. This is an example of an obstacle to smooth interethnic interaction that can be mitigated by prior intergroup contact experience.

One mechanism potentially underlying Vorauer and Sakamoto’s (2006) results is that prior intergroup contact experience reduces the novelty of having an exchange with an outgroup member and therefore also the self-focus and egocentrism that individuals exhibit in such contexts. Essentially, prior practice interacting with outgroup members and greater familiarity with such situations may lead individuals to worry less about how they are coming across in subsequent intergroup interaction situations, particularly if the practice occurs in the context of a positive exchange where acceptance is signaled. However, currently there is no direct evidence that intergroup contact can reduce the

evaluative concerns that individuals experience in intergroup interaction situations. Indeed, consideration of the role played by such concerns in interethnic interaction is relatively recent (e.g., Devine, Evett, & Vasquez-Suson, 1996; Shelton & Richeson, 2005; Vorauer, in press; Vorauer & Turpie, 2004), despite the potential relevance of such concerns to the dynamics of interethnic interaction.

Evaluative Concerns

Individuals are often concerned about the way they are viewed by others and, correspondingly, about the way in which they present themselves to others. For instance, Leary and Downs (1995) argue that individuals monitor their own behavior in order to avoid being excluded, ignored or rejected by others, and many lines of research have examined phenomena such as self-presentation and evaluative concerns within intraethnic interactions (e.g., Baumeister, 1982). Such monitoring can backfire in interactions between people from diverse ethnic groups (i.e., interethnic interaction). I will now describe predictors and consequences of evaluative concerns in interethnic interaction.

Predictors of evaluative concerns

Vorauer (in press) conceptualizes evaluative concerns during interethnic interactions as a joint function of individuals' uncertainty regarding an outgroup member's judgment of them and the importance they attach to that judgment. She uses this conceptualization to predict when and why individuals may be more concerned with evaluation by outgroup members than by ingroup members.

Uncertainty. It is likely that there are generally higher levels of uncertainty during interethnic as opposed to intraethnic interactions. One of the reasons for such uncertainty is the relative infrequency of interethnic interactions. People tend to interact with outgroup members much less than they do with ingroup members. For example, Hallinan and Williams (1989) found a robust tendency for high school students to have more intraethnic than interethnic friendships, at a ratio of six to one. As a function of such lower interaction rates, people may have higher levels of uncertainty in interethnic interactions. For example, they may feel that they do not know how to act or how the outgroup member will react.

Attributional ambiguity also feeds into uncertainty during interethnic interactions (Vorauer, in press). Individuals often try to understand *why* others act the way they do. Such attributions often become more complicated when individuals interact with outgroup as opposed to ingroup others, because group category adds an extra dimension to possible attributions. Due to this extra dimension, when individuals perceive that they are treated differently, they may wonder whether the perceived differential treatment results from their personal qualities or their ethnicity. For example, an individual who is not hired by an outgroup member for a job may wonder if this was due to his or her qualifications or membership in an ethnic minority group (Crocker, Cornwell, & Major, 1993; Major, Carrington, & Carnevale, 1984). In this way, attributional ambiguity adds an extra layer of uncertainty to an interethnic interaction.

Importance. The other component, the importance placed on an outgroup member's evaluation, is also essential in predicting evaluative concerns. When individuals place a high value on the opinion of another, they will be more concerned

about how they appear to that other person. Vorauer (in press) suggests that members of low status groups and members of high status groups both sometimes attach special importance to outgroup members' views of them, but for different reasons.

When the ingroup differs in status from the outgroup, members of low status groups (LSGs) may perceive outgroup members' views of them as more important because of the outgroup's greater perceived control of resources in society. For example, in Canadian society, First Nations individuals may perceive that there is a connection between White individuals and control over resources when they interact with many more White doctors, police officers, lawyers, and politicians than First Nations ones. Accordingly, LSGs attach special pragmatic importance to knowing higher status groups' (HSGs) views of them.

Meanwhile, members of HSGs may attach importance to outgroup members' views of them for a different, self-evaluative, reason. Particularly when the group status difference is perceived as relatively illegitimate or unjustifiable, LSGs, the potential targets of prejudice and racism, may be perceived essentially as moral authorities. LSGs who have experienced injustice may be perceived as uniquely equipped to evaluate HSGs' moral goodness, a central domain of self and social evaluation (Vorauer, in press). In this way, both HSG and LSG members may attach importance to outgroup members' evaluation of them, for self-evaluative and pragmatic reasons, respectively.

Consequences of evaluative concerns

When individuals are concerned about evaluation by outgroup members, they may activate meta-stereotypes in order to deduce how they are apt to be viewed. Meta-stereotypes are individuals' beliefs about the stereotypes that an outgroup holds about

them. For example, Vorauer, Main, and O'Connell (1998) found that White individuals tend to think that Aboriginal/First Nations people view them as *cruel, cold, and prejudiced*. Further, Vorauer, Main, Hunter, and Roy (2000) found that White individuals activate such meta-stereotypes when they expect or imagine an interaction with an Aboriginal/First Nations person. At the same time, individuals concerned with evaluation by outgroup members may also activate self-knowledge in hopes of deducing how they are viewed (Vorauer, 2001; Vorauer & Claude, 1998; Vorauer & Ross, 1999). Such activation of self-knowledge may result in higher levels of self-focused attention.

Self-focused attention to monitor and regulate one's own behaviors can backfire in interethnic interactions in a number of ways. For instance, Richeson and Shelton (2003) found that following interethnic interaction, White participants who were concerned about how they were viewed by a Black confederate, and who therefore engaged in self-regulation, performed much more poorly on a Stroop color naming task than Whites who were not as concerned. Richeson and Shelton suggest that White people who were concerned about being viewed as prejudiced tried to inhibit behaviors that might reveal prejudice, and such interethnic interaction was thus exhausting and preoccupying for them. This, in turn, impaired their cognitive performance on an executive attentional task (i.e., the Stroop color naming task) following the interaction. This result illustrates one negative consequence of evaluative concerns in interethnic interactions.

Moreover, the results of several studies suggest that heightened attention to self and meta-stereotype activation can have negative consequences for individuals' behavior during interethnic interactions. For example, Vorauer and Turpie (2004) found that when

participants were concerned with evaluation by an outgroup member with whom they were interacting their intimacy-building behaviors (e.g., eye contact and self-disclosure) were disrupted, such that those individuals who would otherwise have behaved in a warm and friendly way instead came across as aloof and distant. This is another clear example of the negative consequences of higher levels of evaluative concern in interethnic interactions.

In sum, evaluative concerns can have variety of significant and negative consequences in interethnic interaction, and can pose an obstacle to smooth exchanges between members of different ethnic groups. Thus, studying possible strategies to reduce evaluative concerns in interethnic interaction would be beneficial in reducing discrimination. Further, Vorauer and Sakamoto's study (2006) suggests that intergroup contact experience may be one way of reducing self-focused attention and egocentrism in subsequent intergroup interactions. However, this link between prior intergroup contact and reduced evaluative concern in subsequent intergroup exchanges has yet to be directly demonstrated. The present research was designed to test this link. Further, I also examined whether contact works more effectively to reduce evaluative concerns when the difference in group membership is made highly salient.

Group Membership Salience

Many researchers focus on group membership salience in intergroup interaction. One of the major reasons for this is that salience plays an important role in generalizing outcomes of a positive interaction onto other interactions with different members of the outgroup. Pettigrew (1998; see also Ensari & Miller 2002; Miller, 2002) described three levels of generalization: 1) generalization that occurs across situations, but with the same

individual, 2) generalization that occurs with other members of the same outgroup, and 3) generalization that occurs with members of different or new outgroups. As the focus has been on the second level of generalization in the area of interethnic interactions, I also focused on this level. Thus, in this study, generalization means the carried-over effect from a positive interaction with a particular outgroup member to other individuals of the same outgroup in different contexts.

Group membership salience, hereafter referred to as salience, refers to the cognitive prominence of the group to which individuals belong. Salience can be manipulated by varying the degree to which differences between groups are emphasized in a given context. In short, one can attain a high level of salience by frequently reminding individuals that they belong to groups that are different from others' groups (Miller, 2002).

Salience can be difficult to distinguish from group typicality, but the distinction is important. Typicality refers to how well individuals typify members of their group, and can be expressed through individuals' appearance or behaviors (e.g., the way they dress or talk). Thus, the more stereotypical the individuals are, the higher the typicality is (e.g., a very tall Chinese woman may be low in typicality or atypical). Ensari and Miller (2002) manipulated both salience and typicality in their (non-interethnic) intergroup study and found that generalization of the positive effects of intergroup contact was facilitated efficiently when typicality and salience were combined. However, I have focused on group membership salience separated from typicality, by controlling the typicality of the interaction partner in the current study.

Group membership salience has been a contentious issue in the study of interethnic interaction. For example, Brewer and Miller (1984, 1988) argue that in order to change attitudes toward outgroup members, it is better to focus exclusively on the interpersonal interaction itself, rather than on the interethnic elements of the interaction, ergo lower levels of salience. However, Hewstone and Brown (1986) argue that emphasizing group membership category in cooperative contact is beneficial, in order to *generalize* the positive effect to other outgroup members. Finally, Gaertner and Dovidio (2000) argue that it is beneficial to engage in recategorization. For instance, when White students interact with Chinese students, it is beneficial that they view each other primarily as students. In this way, both of them are included within the same group. Thus, Gaertner and Dovidio (2000) argue that focus on the original category should be avoided, and focus on the new or recategorized boundaries should be encouraged. In the following section, I will summarize these main models of group salience in interethnic interaction.

Salience as a Source of Controversy

Category-Based, Differentiation, and Personalization Models

According to Brewer and Miller (1984, 1988; see also Miller, 2002), individuals tend to perceive themselves as prototypical of their ingroup and tend to appreciate the uniqueness of different ingroup members. Further, they tend to view ingroup members as relatively different from one another, and they perceive more variability within their group than within an outgroup, a phenomenon referred to as ingroup heterogeneity. In contrast, individuals tend to perceive outgroup members as generally resembling one another, a phenomenon referred to as outgroup homogeneity. Miller argues that such ingroup heterogeneity and outgroup homogeneity are problematic and will further foster

stereotypes (Miller, 2002). He argues that when individuals perceive that they are stereotypical members of the ingroup, and cannot find any remarkable similarities between themselves and an outgroup member, who may appear to be a typical member of the outgroup (since they all look the same), they might simply conclude that their group and the outgroup are quite different. Miller called this the Category-Based Model.

Brewer and Miller (1984; see also Miller, 2002) presented two other models: the Differentiated Model and the Personalization Model. In the Differentiated Model, group boundaries are rather permeable, and perceived variability in both the ingroup and outgroup are higher than in the Category-Based Model. In the Differentiated Model, individuals feel more closeness to the outgroup member than they do in the Category-Based Model and emphasize superordinate categories (e.g., categorizing themselves as “students” instead of “Whites” and “Chinese”). In a nutshell, similarities rather than differences are emphasized in the Differentiated Model and hence more closeness is perceived than in Category-Based Model.

Finally, in the Personalization Model, group boundaries are perceived as the most permeable. The group boundaries even cross over one another, and a certain level of similarity between groups is perceived. Compared to the other two models, group boundaries are the least important in this model. According to Miller (2002), when the personalized state is attained, it will allow individuals to have the most intimate interpersonal communication with outgroup members.

In order to attain a personalized state, Miller (2002) argues that individuals need to first attain a differentiation of outgroup members. That is, they need to be able to perceive individual differences within the outgroup (i.e., outgroup heterogeneity), and

only after this differentiation can they achieve personalization. Thus, differentiation is a necessary condition for the occurrence of personalization, whereby individuals perceive outgroup members primarily as individual people rather than merely as members of an outgroup. Along the same lines, Brewer and Miller (1984, 1988) further argue that *interpersonal* interaction is important for both differentiation and personalization to occur. Hence, downplaying the group membership difference (i.e., low salience) is central for the Personalization Model.

Mutual Differentiation Model

In contrast to Brewer and Miller's suggestion, Hewstone and Brown (1986, see also Brown, Vivian, & Hewstone, 1999) suggest that it is preferable to have a higher level of group membership salience in cooperative interethnic interactions. They argue that knowing that outgroup members are different and they make unique contributions towards achieving a mutual goal will lead individuals to positive feelings toward outgroup members in cooperative interactions. Most importantly, they propose that it is more likely for the effect of positive interethnic interaction to be maximized through generalization onto other outgroup members when group membership salience is high.

Several studies have provided evidence that salience does indeed facilitate generalization, although most of these studies have not examined interethnic interaction (e.g., Bettencourt & Dorr, 1998; Brewer & Weber, 1994; Crisp, Stone & Hall, 2006; Gaertner & Schopler, 1998; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000; Gonzalez & Brown, 2003). For example, Brewer and Weber (1998) gave participants a task, and groups were created within the experiment based on the results of the task. Another such example is a study conducted by Crisp, Stone, and Hall (2006; study 4), in which groups were created based

on the participants' university faculty identification. There is an exception, however: Van Oudenhoven, Groenewoud, and Hewstone (1996) examined interethnic cooperative interaction between two Dutch participants and one Turkish confederate. They found that higher salience indeed facilitated a generalization effect. In their study, salience was manipulated through the confederate's reference to his Turkish background during the study. To reinforce their idea regarding the beneficial effects of salience, Brown and colleagues (1999) point out that salience might have been increased in some studies of personalization. For example, Ensari and Miller (2002) cite a study by Bettencourt, Brewer, Rogers-Croak, and Miller (1992) where participants wore badges to indicate their group membership during the intergroup cooperation task (i.e., indicative of heightened level of salience) and found that *interpersonal* cooperative interaction reduced ingroup favoritism. Ensari and Miller cite this study as evidence of a generalized positive effect of *interpersonal* interaction on outgroup members. However, in Bettencourt et al's study, salience was maintained at a high level by the badges worn by the participants throughout the experiment. Thus, Brown and colleagues argue that the generalization may have been accomplished by high salience.

It is important to note that Miller (2002) did not deny that individuals should be aware that they are interacting with an outgroup member. In fact, the author noted that it is logically necessary that the categorical cues be present for generalization to occur. Miller further commented that in many cases it is virtually impossible to be unaware that one is interacting with an outgroup member, given ethnicity and language cues, for example. Thus, the difference between these perspectives can be characterized as centering on whether there are more benefits in relatively lower or in higher salience

levels, as opposed to whether individuals need to be aware of differential group membership.

Common Ingroup Identity Model

Finally, I will briefly summarize another relevant model that revolves around group membership salience. Gaertner and Dovidio (2000) propose a Common Ingroup Identity Model where individuals first decategorize outgroup members, and then recategorize them again. They propose that prejudice toward outgroup members could be reduced by reorganizing group boundaries. That is, by creating a superordinate group, the outgroup members become ingroup members. For example, an East Indian female student could be perceived as an outgroup member by a Caucasian female and the boundaries between them could be described as “us” versus “them.” However, when the boundaries are broken down and recategorized, they could perceive themselves as “women,” which is a superordinate category. In this situation, the description of the relationship becomes “us” and naturally, they become ingroup members. In the Common Identity Model, Gaertner and Dovidio suggest not an increase of the salience of original groups, but rather a focus on the superordinate common identity during the interaction. They further note that (as original group identity is not degraded even after the interaction in their model), maintaining the original group membership is beneficial in terms of generalization, and thus the Common Ingroup Identity Model is compatible with the Mutual Intergroup Differentiation Model (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000).

It is worth mentioning that Gaertner and Dovidio (2000) conceived of a “trade-off hypothesis.” They argue that although a completely degraded subordinate group category is beneficial during the immediate interaction, this interaction will not elicit

generalization effects. On the other hand, with higher levels of salience of “dual identity” during the interaction, generalization can be induced. By dual identity, Gaertner and Dovidio meant individuals’ membership to the superordinate group (e.g., women) as well as to a subgroup (e.g., Caucasian and East Indian). The benefit of this dual identity is that even during the immediate interaction, the attitude towards the outgroup other is positive, as individuals in the interaction share a superordinate identity.

Costs and benefits

Thus far, I have described the current main theories regarding salience. At present, there is no consensus on how the salience of group membership should be treated to enhance the positive effects of interethnic interaction. Therefore, I will now discuss the potential costs and benefits of high group membership salience.

First, the Category-Based, Differentiation, Personalization, and Common Ingroup Identity Models described above suggest a cost of higher levels of salience. When salience is too high, interpersonal interactions may be hindered, and personalization and recategorization may thus be difficult to achieve. However, this cost is a factor only during the interaction. On the other hand, the Mutual Differentiation Model suggests that a beneficial consequence of higher levels of salience is generalization after an interaction. Thus, I examined whether the costs and benefits of salience could be conceptualized as a trade-off between short-term costs and long-term benefits (i.e., generalized positive effects) in an interethnic interaction.

Note that this prediction parallels the trade-off hypothesis that Gaertner and Dovidio (2000) suggest. As previously mentioned, they argue that possessing dual identity will induce generalization but having a dual identity during the interaction is

costly as individuals will be aware of the difference in group membership status. Thus, their argument centers on the trade-off of dual identity. As my argument also centers on the idea that being highly aware of the difference in group membership status is costly during the interaction but beneficial in regards to generalization, it is similar to Gaertner and Dovidio's (2000) trade-off hypothesis. However, Gaertner and Dovidio's hypothesis has not undergone direct empirical examination in interethnic interaction settings.

Moreover, my consideration of the effects of group membership salience on evaluative concerns as well as on feelings toward outgroup members is novel. Although Vorauer (in press) and others (e.g., Shelton & Richeson, in press) have speculated that greater salience enhances evaluative concerns during interethnic interaction, this possibility has not yet undergone direct empirical testing, especially from both majority group and minority group members' perspectives.

Finally, in most studies of salience, and in the Common Ingroup Identity Model studies in particular, salience has not been studied at individual levels. Rather, studies have often had multiple participants within each group (except Ensari & Miller, 2002). In everyday life however, individuals often meet outgroup members on an individual level. Thus, I examined whether salience would be beneficial in terms of general expectations, but costly in the immediate context, at an individual level.

Hypotheses

My main hypothesis was that high salience of group membership during an interethnic exchange would be costly to the immediate interaction but beneficial in terms of generalization. I focused on evaluative concerns and fears of rejection as outcomes. I

also examined evaluations of outgroup members, in terms of liking and desire for future interaction.

There were three experimental conditions. The first two conditions involved interacting with an ostensible partner of a different ethnicity under high or low group membership salience conditions. The third condition involved interacting with an ostensible partner of similar ethnicity under a high group membership salience conditions. The ethnicity of the ostensible ingroup or outgroup member partner (White or Chinese) depended on the participants' own ethnicity (Chinese or White).

The goal in the High Salience Interethnic Interaction condition was to make participants highly aware that they and their partner belonged to different ethnic groups. Hence, their group membership differences were emphasized and the experiment was referred to as an "*Interethnic Interaction Study*" in all materials. In the Low Salience Interethnic Interaction condition, participants were guided to perceive their interaction with an outgroup member as interpersonal but not interethnic. Participants were told that the study was about social interaction and all materials used in Interethnic Low Salience condition referred to the study as a "*Social Interaction Study*." In the High Salience Intraethnic Interaction condition, everything was the same as in the High Salience Interethnic condition, except that the participants were told that they were in the within-group condition (i.e., the study was still referred to as "*Interethnic Interaction Study*"). This third condition was incorporated primarily to examine social desirability effects on the generalization measures potentially triggered by participants' awareness that the researcher was interested in intergroup issues: Participants in the high salience interethnic condition need to report more positive feelings on the generalization measures than those

in the high salience intraethnic condition if we are to conclude that high salience intergroup interaction is key to the positive effects. Without this condition it would be unclear how much of any apparent positive effect for high salience interethnic interaction was due to socially desirable responding induced by the researchers' clear interest in intergroup relations.

In terms of immediate effects, I examined how group membership salience affected participants' current evaluative concerns and fear of being rejected, as well as their liking and desire for future interaction with their interaction partner. Also, I examined whether evaluative concerns would decrease with the exchange of information in the high salience interethnic interaction. Along similar lines, I examined whether individuals' feelings about their partner became more positive after the information exchange, in which they received a positive response from their partner.

In terms of generalized effects, I examined these same outcomes with respect to a hypothetical future interaction with a different member of the outgroup, as well as general evaluations of the outgroup as a whole and perceptions regarding the outgroup's evaluation of the ingroup. Other measures were included on an exploratory basis and will not be discussed here.

Method

Pretest

A pretest was conducted to obtain demographic information (i.e., ethnicity, age, and sex) about potential participants. This pretest was conducted in the prospective participants' introductory psychology classes.

Participants

Forty-Six White students (22 men and 24 women) and 46 Chinese students (22 men and 24 women) enrolled in Introductory Psychology at the University of Manitoba participated in the current study. Of those 46 Chinese participants, 21 (45.7%) were either born or lived more than 10 years in Canada, 23 (50%) had lived over 2 years in Canada and 2 (4.3%) were unknown. All participants were under 25 years old ($M = 19.30$, $SD = 1.72$) and were randomly assigned to the High Salience Interethnic, Low Salience Interethnic, or High Salience Intraethnic interaction condition, with the constraint of assuring that there were 15 participants of each ethnicity in each condition. Pearsons' chi square tests confirmed that participants' sex and time in Canada were not confounded with their experimental condition. Participants were contacted by phone and asked whether they were interested in participating in the study or not (see Appendix A for the contact script).

Procedure

On the day of the experiment, the Asian female experimenter came to the waiting room to greet the participant and escorted the participant to the room where the experiment was conducted. The participant was told to wait in the experiment room while the experimenter collected his/her partner from the other waiting room and took him/her to a room down the hall. This was to convey that there was another student in the study.

A few minutes later, the experimenter came back to the room to tell the participant that his/her partner was now in the other room, so they could start the session. In the two high salience (i.e., High Salience Interethnic and High Salience Intraethnic) conditions, the partner was referred to as the "White partner" or the "Chinese partner,"

and the study was referred to as an “interethnic interaction study.” In the low salience condition, the partner was referred to simply as the “partner” and the study was referred as a “Social Interaction Study.” The participant was given a brief summary of the procedure orally, and given the consent form. All the participants were told that the current experiment involved “exchanging information with a fellow student” and that communication between themselves and their partner in the study was strictly controlled (see Appendix B for the consent form).

In order to manipulate salience, the ostensible purpose of the study varied depending participants’ experimental condition. The ostensible purpose of the study was to examine “interethnic interactions” in the two high salience conditions, or “social interaction” in the low salience condition. Further, the name of the experiment (i.e., “interethnic interaction study” or “social interaction study”) was indicated on all materials used in the session.

In the first step, participants were asked to fill out their personal information sheet. Participants were asked to write down their first name, sex, age, ethnicity, and answer to some simple questions regarding their opinions. The experimenter gave the information sheet to the participant to fill out and left the room for five minutes.

In the second step, the experimenter collected the participant’s own sheet, ostensibly to take it to his/her partner, and participants were given their partner’s personal information sheet so that the participant would have some information about the partner, including his’/her ethnicity. The partner was described as either a 19 year old male (Marc) or female (Amanda) student, to match the participant’s gender, and described as either Chinese or White depending on the participant’s ethnicity and condition. All of the

partners' responses to the questions were identical, regardless of their sex and ethnicity. Participants were given five minutes to read the partner's information sheet before the experimenter collected it back.

When the experimenter collected the partner's information sheet, she gave the participant a sheet of four questions. Most questions were taken from Aron et al. (1997) in order to generate a higher level of felt closeness between the participant and the partner. Participants were asked to answer the four questions about themselves in ten minutes, and they were told that their partners would read their responses later in the session. After ten minutes had elapsed, the experimenter collected the answers, ostensibly to take them over to the partner.

In the next step, participants were asked to fill out the first questionnaire about their exchange up to this point in this study, and were told that their responses on the questionnaire were completely confidential.

Questionnaire 1. As part of the manipulation, extra questions were included in the high saliency conditions. Participants were asked to indicate their own and their partner's ethnicity, and whether they were in the same or different ethnicity condition. These questions were included in order to heighten the levels of group membership saliency.

A set of three questions ($\alpha = .75$) asked about participants' evaluative concerns (e.g., "I am ____ focused on what my partner thinks of me"), and another set of three questions ($\alpha = .74$) asked about participants' fears of rejection (e.g., "I think that my partner may not like me"). Next, five questions ($\alpha = .71$) asked participants about liking of their partner. These questions were taken from Rubin (1970). Finally, participants' desire for future interaction with their partner was deduced by asking eight questions ($\alpha =$

.87). These questions were taken from Coyne (1976), and modified for this study (e.g., “Would you like to meet your partner outside the experiment?”). All responses were made on 7-point scales.

When they finished the first questionnaire, participants were asked to read their partner’s (apparently positive) responses to the four questions. They had five minutes for this step. The partner’s ostensible answers were designed to convey warmth, liking, acceptance, and positive attributes to the participants in order to create a positive interaction between the participant and the partner.

Questionnaire 2. Questionnaire 2, which was designed to examine shifts in participants’ evaluative concerns and feelings about their partner after receiving positive information about their partner and the interaction, was virtually identical to Questionnaire 1. All α s were $> .70$.¹ Again, participants were told that their responses on the questionnaire were completely confidential.

General Attitude Questionnaire. After participants completed Questionnaire 2, they were asked to fill in the third questionnaire, the General Attitude Questionnaire, which was mainly used in order to examine the generalization effect. Participants were told that the researchers were also interested in “general information about students’ attitudes” and that these questions were included to help us understand participants’ reactions to the first part of the study. Participants were asked to imagine that they were to interact with a White or Chinese student on campus. Confidentiality was promised on the cover page. Since the questions were sensitive, asking participants about their general attitudes toward outgroup others, the instructions encouraged them to answer honestly. Participants read the following on the cover page “There are no right or wrong answers.

We are simply interested in learning about your thoughts and feelings, whatever they may be". On the first page of the questionnaire, participants read the following paragraph before they answered questions, with the ethnicity of the hypothetical partner varying according to participants' own ethnicity (White for Chinese participants and Chinese for White participants):

In this section of the survey, we are interested in learning what you think about and how you feel in your everyday life when you interact with a person who is not a member of your own ethnic group. In particular, we ask you to describe what you would think about and how you would feel if you were paired with a White partner (same sex as you) for your class discussion. For the discussion, you have to have a partner. Imagine that you are each on your own (i.e., without friends present) and that you have never met this student before.

Three questions ($\alpha = .78$) then asked about participants' evaluative concerns (e.g., I would be self-conscious about how I appeared to him or her) by using a 7-point scale where 1 = *Not At All* and 7 = *Very Much*. Next, three questions ($\alpha = .84$) asked about participants' interest in becoming friends with the student they imagined (e.g., "How enthusiastic would you be about getting to know this person?") by using a 7-point scale where 1 = *Not at all* and 7 = *A Great Deal*. One question, "I would feel that we have _____ in common", asked participants' perceived commonality with the imagined student by using a 7-point scale where 1 = *Not At All* and 7 = *Very Much*. Participants' expectations of acceptance versus rejection were investigated by using metaperception versions of three questions regarding interest (e.g., "How enthusiastic do you think the other person would be about getting to know you?"), $\alpha = .84$. Finally, a feeling

"Thermometer" was used to assess participants' liking of the outgroup as well as perceptions regarding the outgroup's evaluation of the ingroup (for the detailed instructions, see Appendix C).

Results

Participants were contacted based on pre-test data regarding their ethnicity, gender and age. In the study however, one Chinese male participant indicated that he was 50% White and 50% Chinese, and one White male participant commented that he was suspicious about the deception (i.e., the existence of his ostensible partner). Thus, the data obtained from these two individuals were excluded from analyses². Correlations between dependent variables for immediate and generalized effects are presented in Tables 6 and 7 respectively.

Immediate Effects

In order to assess the immediate effects of the manipulated variables during and right after the interaction, the data from questionnaires 1 and 2 were analyzed in 2 (participant ethnicity: White vs. Chinese) x 3 (condition: High Salience Interethnic vs. Low Salience Interethnic vs. High Salience Intraethnic interaction) x 2 (time: 1 vs. 2) repeated-measures ANOVAs, with ethnicity and condition as between-subjects factors and time as a within-subjects factor. All significant and marginal effects ($p < .10$) are reported. Overall error terms were used to calculate the significance of the simple effects.

Evaluative concerns and fears of rejection. The analysis of evaluative concerns yielded main effects for participant ethnicity, $F(1, 84) = 8.35, p < .01$, and time, $F(1, 84) = 14.77, p < .001$. Chinese participants reported higher levels of evaluative concern ($M = 3.96, SD = 1.24$) than White participants did ($M = 3.25, SD = 1.27$), and evaluative

concern increased over time (time 1 $M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.20$, and time 2 $M = 3.81$, $SD = 1.39$).

The analysis of fears of rejection yielded main effects for ethnicity, $F(1, 84) = 5.60$, $p < .05$, and time, $F(1, 84) = 23.38$, $p < .001$, and a Condition x Time interaction, $F(2, 84) = 3.49$, $p < .05$. Chinese participants reported greater fears of rejection ($M = 3.10$, $SD = .99$) than White participants did ($M = 2.64$, $SD = .99$), and such fears decreased over time (time 1 $M = 3.08$, $SD = 1.04$, and time 2 $M = 2.67$, $SD = 1.00$). Simple effect analyses were conducted to examine the effect of time for each condition and significant time effects were found in the two high salience conditions (see Table 1). Thus, fears of rejection decreased over time in both high salience conditions but not in the low salience condition.

Liking and desire for future interaction. The analysis of participants' liking for their interaction partner yielded main effects of ethnicity, $F(1, 84) = 5.17$, $p < .05$, and time, $F(1, 84) = 51.24$, $p < .001$. Chinese participants reported higher levels of liking ($M = 3.58$, $SD = .95$) than Whites did ($M = 3.22$, $SD = .69$). Contrary to my prediction, participants reported higher levels of liking on the first questionnaire ($M = 3.69$, $SD = .77$) than on the second one ($M = 3.12$, $SD = .93$).

The analysis of desire for future interaction yielded main effects of condition, $F(2, 84) = 4.78$, $p = .01$, and time, $F(1, 84) = 110.5$, $p < .001$. Desire for future interaction was higher at time 2 ($M = 5.04$, $SD = .98$) than at time 1 ($M = 4.41$, $SD = .91$), indicating that after participants had a positive interaction with their ostensible partner, their desire to interact with their partner in the future became stronger. To understand the main effect of condition, simple effects analyses were conducted by comparing the means of each

condition. Results indicated that desire for future interaction was higher in the interethnic than intraethnic conditions (see Table 2). Thus, participants who interacted with a different ethnicity partner indicated higher levels of desire than those interacted with the same ethnicity partner.

Overall, although participants' concerns with evaluation were not affected by salience manipulation, these concerns increased over time while their fears of rejection decreased over time. Further, participants' fears of rejection decreased in the two high salience conditions, but not in the low salience condition. Surprisingly, after an interaction, participants liked their partner less but desired to interact with their partner more, and participants who interacted with a different ethnicity partner indicated higher levels of such desire than those interacted with a same ethnicity partner. Finally, Chinese participants expressed higher levels of evaluative concerns, fears of rejection, and liking towards their ostensible partner, than Whites did.

Generalized Effects

Generalized effects were examined by using a scenario where participants were asked to imagine an interaction with a member of the other ethnic group (i.e., Chinese participants imagined an interaction with a White other, and White participants imagined one with a Chinese other). The data were examined in 2 (participant ethnicity: White vs. Chinese) x 3 (condition: High Salience Interethnic vs. Low Salience Interethnic vs. High Salience Intraethnic) ANOVAs.

Evaluative concerns. The analysis of evaluative concerns yielded a main effect for participant ethnicity, $F(1, 84) = 7.61, p < .01$. Chinese participants indicated higher

levels of evaluative concerns ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 1.22$) than White participants did ($M = 3.59$, $SD = 1.30$).

Meta-interest. Rejection concerns were assessed by "meta-interest," which is participants' beliefs about a different outgroup member's likely interest in being friends with them. A main effect of condition was found, $F(2, 84) = 3.61$, $p < .05$. Simple effects analyses were conducted to examine how the condition means differed from one another (see Table 3). The mean of the High Salience Interethnic Interaction condition was significantly higher than the mean of the High Salience Intraethnic Interaction condition. The mean of the Low Salience Interethnic Interaction condition was also higher than the mean of the High Salience Intraethnic condition. However, the means of the two interethnic conditions did not differ. In sum, participants who experienced a positive interethnic interaction exhibited a more positive perception of the imaginary different ethnicity other's interest in being friends with them.

Meta-feeling thermometer. The analysis of participants' responses to the meta-feeling thermometer question, whereby they indicated their perception of the outgroup's overall feelings toward their own group, yielded a marginal main effect of ethnicity, $F(1, 84) = 3.15$, $p < .10$, as well as a Condition x Ethnicity interaction, $F(2, 84) = 3.21$, $p < .05$. White participants' perceptions ($M = 66.44$, $SD = 21.70$) were marginally more positive than those of the Chinese participants ($M = 59.39$, $SD = 16.68$), $F(1, 88) = 2.99$, $p < .10$. To examine the Condition x Ethnicity interaction, I examined the simple condition effects for Chinese and White participants separately. Because the Levene statistic indicated that the variances were heterogenous across Chinese and White participants, $p < .05$, different error terms (not pooled error) were used in testing the

simple effects for Chinese and White participants. Although there was no effect found for White participants, the condition effect was marginally significant for Chinese participants, $F(2, 42) = 2.97, p < .06$. Further simple effects analyses were conducted for Chinese participants' responses. Results indicated that their perceptions were more positive in the high as compared to low salience interethnic condition but that the contrasts with the intraethnic condition were not significant or marginal (see Table 4). Thus, higher levels of salience regarding interethnic interaction were beneficial for Chinese participants, but not for White participants.

Meta-commonality. Analysis of "meta-commonality" that is, participants' beliefs about how much the outgroup member would feel that they had in common, yielded no effects.

Interest. The analysis of participants' interest in being friends with the imaginary outgroup member yielded a main effect of condition, $F(2, 84) = 4.13, p < .05$. Simple effects analyses were conducted to examine how the means of each condition differed from one another (see Table 5). The mean of the Low Salience Interethnic Interaction condition was significantly higher than the mean of the High Salience Interethnic Interaction, and marginally higher than the mean of the High Salience Intraethnic Interaction condition. However, the means of the High Salience Interethnic Interaction and the High Salience Intraethnic Interaction conditions did not differ. Thus, the Low Salience Interethnic Interaction condition benefited the most regarding participants' interest in the imagined different ethnicity other.

Feeling thermometer and commonality. The analyses of perceived commonality³ and feeling thermometer yielded no effects. Further, I compared the means of the feeling

thermometer with the means of the meta-feeling thermometer and found a significant effect of the type of the thermometer, $F(84, 1) = 67.42, p < .001$, but neither ethnicity nor condition effects were found. Participants felt that their general feeling towards outgroup members were more positive ($M = 72.67, SD = 20.43$) than the outgroup members' general feeling towards them ($M = 60.03, SD = 20.33$).

To summarize the generalized effects, although salience did not affect participants' beliefs about a different outgroup member's likely interest in being friends with them, high levels of salience did lead to more positive beliefs about how the ingroup was viewed by the outgroup, but only in Chinese participants. Further, participants who engaged in an interethnic interaction were less concerned about being rejected by a different outgroup member than those who engaged in intraethnic interaction. Surprisingly, those who were in Low salience Interethnic Interaction condition were more interested in being friends with a different outgroup member, compared with those in the two High Salience Interethnic Interaction conditions.

Chinese participants were more concerned about how they were viewed by the different outgroup member than were White participants. Finally, participants felt that their general feelings toward outgroup members were more positive than the outgroup's general feelings toward them.

Discussion

I examined the costs and benefits of high levels of group membership salience in this study. Specifically, I examined whether high salience of group membership during an interethnic exchange would be costly for the immediate interaction but beneficial for generalization effects. Furthermore, I examined whether evaluative concerns would

decrease with the exchange of personal information, particularly in the high salience interaction. Along similar lines, I examined whether individuals' feelings about their partner would become more positive after a positive information exchange.

Costs and benefits

The predicted costs of higher levels of group membership salience for the immediate interaction, such as higher levels of evaluative concerns, fears of rejection, and less positive feelings toward the outgroup interaction partner, were not found in this study. However, one of the main hypotheses was partially confirmed with respect to long term benefits of higher levels of salience. Chinese participants who were made highly aware that they were interacting with a different ethnicity other during the interaction were more positive in regards to their belief about White people's general feelings towards Chinese people. Interestingly however, this generalization effect was not found among White participants.

In order to understand the reason why high salience was beneficial for Chinese but not for White participants, I speculate that the different results emerged because of Chinese and White participants' different levels of prior experience in interacting with members of the other group, which may have had implications for their baseline experience of group membership salience. Interacting with a Chinese person is generally a more infrequent experience than interacting with a White person in Canada. For this reason, the level of salience might have been high for White participants throughout the ostensible interaction irrespective of the condition they were in. On the other hand, interacting with a White other is a frequent experience for Chinese people living in Canada. Thus, I suggest that it was easier to manipulate Chinese participants' awareness

of group membership salience, but not that of White participants. Thus, different strategies to manipulate ethnic group membership salience may be required, depending on the ethnicity of the groups involved.

Another plausible explanation for not finding generalization effect for White participants may be due to the lack of typicality in ostensible Chinese partners' personal characteristics. The ostensible partner's personal characteristics were the same across the conditions in order to control typicality, that is, hold it constant. Specifically, Chinese stereotypes were avoided in the ostensible partner's responses. Thus, the Chinese ostensible partner may have been viewed as an exception to White participants' expectations. Gaertner and Dovidio (2000) also suggest that generalization is difficult to achieve mainly because after individuals experience a positive interaction, they consider the outgroup member to be an exception (see also Allport, 1954). On the other hand, by eliminating any Chinese typicality from the responses written by the ostensible partner, I might have automatically created a White ostensible partner with high typicality. This might explain why the generalization effect was found only for Chinese participants.

Other immediate effects

Even though participants had a positive interaction where their ostensible partner exhibited warmth and acceptance, participants became more concerned about how they were evaluated by the partner after the interaction, and these concerns were not affected by levels of salience or by the type of interaction (i.e., interethnic vs. intraethnic). In order to understand this unpredicted finding, I speculate that participants grew to care more about how they were evaluated by their interaction partner mainly because participants disclosed their personal views as well as their positive and negative

personality traits with their partner during the interaction. More specifically, I suggest that participants did not care as much what their partner thought of them at the beginning of the interaction, as information about participants available to the ostensible partner at that time was generic. However, after participants gave more personal or distinctive information to their ostensible partner, participants felt that the partner had enough information to evaluate or judge them. That is, the ostensible partner's evaluation of the participants did not have significant meaning to the participants at the beginning of the experiment, but such meaning was gradually attached after the participants disclosed and received more personal information about each other.

Additionally, participants got to know how warm and accepting their ostensible partner was through the interaction. These positive traits may have also contributed to higher levels of evaluative concerns in terms of their attaching more importance to his/her opinion of them.

In contrast to the increase in evaluative concerns, participants became less concerned about being rejected by their partner after the positive interaction. Here, I speculate that because the ostensible partner was accepting and warm towards the participants, they became less concerned about being rejected by the partner after the ostensible interaction. Thus, although participants were afraid of being rejected by their ostensible partner at the beginning of the interaction, after they received their partner's responses, which were designed to convey warmth and acceptance, participants became less afraid. Moreover, after this positive interaction, participants became more enthusiastic about interacting with their ostensible partner in the future. I suggest that

such results are the consequences of a positive interaction where the participants felt accepted by their ostensible partner.

Regarding liking, quite unexpectedly, participants liked their partner less after a positive interaction. It is important to note, however, that the participants' desire to interact with their partner increased significantly after the interaction. In order to understand this anomalous finding, I speculate that the measurement tool used to assess liking in the present study may have not been suitable for first meeting interactions. The measure included questions such as "I have great confidence in my partner's good judgment," and "I think that my partner is unusually well-adjusted" taken from Rubin's liking scale (1976). As mentioned previously, participants did not know their partners very well. Thus the measurement tool may have been inappropriate for the current context.

Overall, higher levels of group membership salience did not affect participants' concerns about how they were viewed or their fears of being rejected by the outgroup other. However, positive interaction was beneficial in enhancing individuals' desire to interact with their partner and, correspondingly, participants were less worried about being rejected by their partner. As participants' desire for future interaction grew, they cared more about how they appeared to their ostensible partner.

Other generalized effects

A higher level of group membership salience did not induce a generalization effect on participants' concerns regarding how they would be viewed by a different outgroup member. However, the participants who interacted with a different ethnicity

partner indicated more positive beliefs about a different outgroup member's likely interest in being friends with them

Hence, participants who engaged in a positive interethnic interaction exhibited generalized positive effects where they were less concerned about being rejected than those who did not. Thus, although salience did not affect participants' concerns, the experience of a positive interethnic interaction was beneficial in general.

Ethnicity differences

Not unlike numerous other studies, the results of this study indicated that intergroup interaction is complex. It highlighted differences in individuals' experience of intergroup interaction associated with their ethnicity: During a positive interaction, Chinese participants were more concerned about the way they were viewed by the other person, more afraid of being rejected by their interaction partner, and liked the other person more than Whites participants did. Further, when participants imagined an interaction with an outgroup member, again, Chinese participants were more concerned about the way they were viewed than White participants were.

Such differences attached to participant ethnicity might reflect perceived power dynamics between different ethnic groups in Canada. For example, there are more White politicians, teachers, newscasters, and so on than there are Chinese counterparts in Canada, and in general, being White is perceived to be more associated with power over resources than being Chinese. Such perceived dominance might account for some of the effects for participant ethnicity found in this study.

Limitations

I acknowledge the potential limitations of this study. A manipulation check was not done for group membership salience, to ascertain whether the group membership salience manipulation was effective. In fact, as having such a manipulation check before, during, or after the interaction would have increased the level of salience, it was not suitable to incorporate it into this study.

Some might argue that there was not enough of a time lag between the interaction and the completion of the *General Attitude Questionnaire* (i.e., between a positive interaction and generalization). However, I define generalization as the carried-over effect of positive interaction with an outgroup member onto other individuals of the same outgroup in different contexts. Thus, the short time lag is not really a problem given the focus of the current study.

Conclusion

Though evidence of the costs of high salience was not found during the immediate interaction, high salience facilitated Chinese participants' generalization from a positive intergroup experience to broad perceptions of how their ingroup is viewed by the outgroup, but did not do the same for White participants. This finding might be attributable to two factors.

First, as White individuals interact with Chinese people relatively infrequently in everyday life in Canada, salience may always have been high for them during interethnic interaction in this study. Second, as the typicality of their ostensible Chinese partner's responses may have seemed low, White participants may have perceived that their Chinese partner was an exception to the outgroup. Possibly due to these two factors, high salience did not facilitate generalization for White participants.

Thus, I conclude that experiencing a positive intergroup interaction contributes to giving minority group members a more positive perception of the way in which their groups are viewed by majority group members, especially under high group membership salience conditions.

Irrespective of the levels of salience, generalization of a positive interethnic interaction was found. Participants who engaged in an interethnic interaction were more positive in terms of their concerns regarding being rejected by a different outgroup member. I suggest that as individuals are less concerned about being rejected by outgroup others due to a positive prior intergroup interaction, this may lead them to be more open to pursuing additional intergroup interaction experiences.

Finally, I would like to emphasize that the benefits of generalization centered more clearly on participants' metaperceptions (i.e., Chinese participants' beliefs about how their ingroup was viewed by the outgroup in the high salience interethnic condition and beliefs about a different outgroup member's likely interest in them for those who had an interethnic interaction) than on their own perceptions of the outgroup, especially for group-level judgments. I suggest that this positive effect on metaperception could be due to participants' heightened focus on what the outgroup other thinks about them as opposed to their perceptions of the outgroup other during the interethnic interaction. This heightened focus on metaperception may in turn have facilitated generalization more in metaperception than in perceptions of the outgroup.

This finding is especially interesting, as Vorauer and Sakamoto (2006) found that White students (erroneously) judged that they were more interested than the Chinese students in becoming friends, and then White students became less interested in pursuing

friendship with the Chinese students. However, this pattern of misunderstanding was not evident for White students with higher levels of prior contact with Chinese people.

Results of the present study indicate that a prior positive intergroup contact experience improved White participants' beliefs about outgroup members' likely interest in pursuing interaction with them. Thus, I suggest that generalization of a positive interethnic interaction can lead White individuals to smoother future interactions with outgroup members, in which cross-group friendships may develop.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Aron, A., Melinat, E., Aron, E., Vallone, R. D., & Bator, R. J. (1997). The experimental generation of interpersonal closeness: A procedure and some preliminary findings. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*, 363-377.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1982 -a). A self-presentational view of social phenomena. *Psychological Bulletin, 91*(1), 3-26.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1982 -b). Self-esteem, self-presentation, and future interaction: A dilemma of reputation. *Journal of Personality, 50*, 29-45.
- Bettencourt, B. A., Brewer, M. B., Croak, M. R., & Miller, N. (1992). Cooperation and the reduction of interethnic bias: The role of reward structure and social orientation.
- Bettencourt, B. A., & Dorr, N. (1998). Cooperative interaction and intergroup bias: Effects of representation and cross-cut role assignment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24*, 1270-1287.
- Brewer, M. B., & Miller, N. (1984). Beyond the contact hypothesis; Theoretical perspectives on desegregation. In N. Miller & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 281-302). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Brewer, M. B., & Miller, N. (1988). Contact and cooperation: When do they work? In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 315-326). New York: Plenum.
- Brewer, M. B., & Weber, J. G. (1994). Self-evaluation effects of interpersonal versus intergroup social comparison, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66*,

268-275.

- Brown, R., Vivian, J., & Hewstone, M., (1999) Changing attitudes through interethnic contact: The effects of group membership salience. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 741-764. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 28, 301-319.
- Coyne, James. C. (1976). Depression and the response of others. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 85, 186-193.
- Crocker, J., Cornwell, B., & Major, B. (1994). Reactions to stigma: The moderating role of justifications. In Olson, J. M., & Zanna, M. P. (Eds.), *Ontario symposium on personality and social psychology: Vol. 7, The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario symposium* (pp. 315-329). Hillsdale, NJ, England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Crisp, R. J., Stone, C. H., & Hall. N. R. (2006). Recategorization and Subgroup Identification: Predicting and Preventing Threats From Common Ingroups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 230-243.
- Ensari, N., & Miller, N. (2002). The out-group must not be so bad after all: The effects of disclosure, typicality, and salience on interethnic bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 313-329.
- Devine, P. G., Evett, S. R., & Vasquez-Suson, K. A.(1996). Exploring the interpersonal dynamics of interethnic contact. In Higgins, E. T. & Sorrentino, R. M. (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition: Vol. 3. The interpersonal context* (pp. 423-464). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Kawakami, K. (2003). Interethnic contact: The past,

- present, and the future. *Group Processes and Interethnic Relations*, 6, 5-20.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). Reducing interethnic bias: The common ingroup identity model. New York, Psychology Press.
- Gonzalez, R. & Brown, R. (2003) Generalization of positive attitude as a function of subgroup and superordinate group identifications in intergroup contact. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 195-214.
- Hallinan, M. T., & Williams, R. (1990). Students' characteristics and the peer-influence process. *Sociology of Education*, 63, 122-132.
- Hewstone, M., & Brown, R. (1986). Contact is not enough: An interethnic perspective on the "contact hypothesis." In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in interethnic encounters* (pp. 1-44). Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell, Inc.
- Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000). Sub-group relations: Two experiments comparing Subgroup Differentiation and Common Ingroup Identity Models of Prejudice Reduction. *Personality and Social Psychological Bulletin*, 28, 242-256.
- Major, B., Carrington, P. I., & Carnevale, P. J. (1984). Physical attractiveness and self-esteem: Attributions for praise from an other-sex evaluator. *Personality and Social Psychological Bulletin*, 10, 43-50.
- Miller, N. (2002). Personalization and the promise of contact theory. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58, 387-410.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Interethnic contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 65-85.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2000). Does interethnic contact reduce prejudice? Recent meta-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and*

- discrimination: The Claremont symposium* (pp. 93-114). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Richeson, J. A., and J. N. Shelton. (2003). When prejudice does not pay: Effects of interracial contact on executive function. *Psychological Science, 14*, 287-90.
- Rubin, Z. (1970). Measurement of romantic love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16*, 265-273.
- Shelton, J. N. (2003). Interpersonal concerns in social encounters between majority and minority group members. *Group Processes and Interethnic Relations, 6*, 171-185.
- Shelton, J. N., & J. A. Richeson. (2005). Pluralistic ignorance and interethnic contact. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 91-107.
- Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. R. (in press). Interracial interactions: A relational approach. *Advances in experimental social psychology*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Shelton, J. N., J. A. Richeson, & Salvatore, J. (2005). Expecting to be the target of prejudice: Implications for interethnic interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 1189-1202.
- Van Oudenhoven J.P., Groenewoud, J. T., & Hewstone, M. (1996). Cooperation, ethnic salience and generalisation of interethnic attitudes. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 26*, 649- 661.
- Vorauer, J. D. (2001). The other side of the story: Transparency estimation in social interaction. In Moskowitz, G. B. (Ed.), *Cognitive social psychology: The Princeton symposium on the legacy and future of social cognition* (pp. 261-276). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Vorauer, J. D. (in press). An information search model of evaluative concerns in intergroup interaction. *Psychological Review*.

- Vorauer, J. D., & Claude, S. D. (1998). Perceived versus actual transparency of goals in negotiation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 371-385.
- Vorauer, J. D., Hunter, A. J., Main, K. J., & Roy, S. A. (2000). Meta-stereotype activation: Evidence from indirect measures for specific evaluative concerns experienced by members of dominant groups in interethnic interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 690-707.
- Vorauer, J. D., & Kumhyr, S., M. (2001). Is this about you or me? Self- versus other-directed judgments and feelings in response to interethnic interaction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 706-719.
- Vorauer, J. D., Main, K. J., & O'Connell, G. B. (1998). How do individuals expect to be viewed by members of lower status groups? Content and implications of meta-stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 917-937.
- Vorauer, J.D., & Ratner, R.K. (1996). "Who's Going to Make the First Move?: Pluralistic Ignorance as an Impediment to Relationship Formation." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 13, 483-506.
- Vorauer, J. D., & Ross, M. (1999). Self-awareness and feeling transparent: Failing to suppress one's self. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 35, 415-440.
- Vorauer, J. D., & Sakamoto, Y. (2006). I thought we could be friends, but...Systematic miscommunication and defensive distancing as obstacles to cross-group friendship formation. *Psychological Science*, 17, 326-331.
- Vorauer, J. D., & Turpie, C. A. (2004). Disruptive Effects of Vigilance on Dominant Group Members' Treatment of Outgroup Members: Choking Versus Shining Under Pressure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 384-399.

Appendix A

Original Contact:

“Hi, my name is ____ and I am calling to see if you would be interested in participating in a study that I am conducting this semester. This study will get you some participation credits toward your Introductory to Psychology course. Are you interested in hearing some more?”. If the participant is interested, “I obtained your name and phone number from the pretest you did during your class. The name of the pretest was **Ancaster** and you indicated that you were willing to be contacted, in order to participate in future experiments. I am currently conducting a social interaction study. The researchers are interested in first meeting situations. You will be asked to exchange some information with another participant in the study, and to fill out some questionnaires”.

Answer questions that arise, then set up a session and explain the following:

“As I explained, there will be another student in this experiment and since the researchers are interested in the first time interaction situations, each of you has to show up in different waiting rooms so you don’t meet in advance. Please come to P505 Duff Roblin building on (day) at (time). The name of this experiment is _____. Thank you”.

*If the participant is not interested or loses his/her interest at any point, thank them and hang up.

The Day Before the session:

Call participants and remind them of the schedule the day before the session.

“Hi. I am calling to remind you that your ***Social Interaction Study***, (study name) is scheduled for tomorrow. Please come to P505 Duff Roblin building at _____. Please remember that there is another participant in this study, so if you are late or do not show up, that means that the other person cannot participate either. I will make sure that the other person shows up on time, so please make sure that you will be at P505 on time. Thank you.”

Appendix B

Social Interaction Study

Thank-you for your interest in this Social Interaction Study. This study is being conducted by Yumiko Sakamoto, an MA student in the psychology department, under the supervision of Dr. J. Vorauer (Department of Psychology, University of Manitoba).

If you agree to participate in this study, you will have a "controlled interaction" with a fellow student, in which you take turns providing information about your personal qualities, opinions and preferences. You and your partner will exchange such information by answering questions that we will provide (you are free to skip any questions that you would prefer not to answer). You will also fill out questionnaires regarding your thoughts and feelings about the interaction. At the conclusion of your session, you will be given an explanation of our hypotheses and the methods that we used.

We would like to emphasize the fact that your identity will be kept confidential. All records of your name will be discarded at the conclusion of the study, such that your responses will be recorded by your participant number only. There are no plans to destroy the data, which will be stored in a secure location (a locked laboratory room in the Duff Roblin Building) once they are stripped of all identifying information.

The session should take approximately one hour and you will receive 2 credits for your participation. Please feel free to ask any questions you might have about the experimental procedures. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If at any time you do not wish to continue participating, you are free to stop (and you will still receive your credits).

Your signature on this form indicates that you have understood to your satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project and agree to participate as a subject. In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the researchers, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time, and /or refrain from answering any questions you prefer to omit, without prejudice or consequence. Your continued participation should be as informed as your initial consent, so you should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation.

We will post the results of this study outside P506J in the Duff Roblin building by June 2006. You may also obtain the results via e-mail. If you are interested in receiving the results of this study, please provide your e-mail address below. Please note that your e-mail address will not be used for anything other than sending you the results.

This study has been approved by the Psychology/Sociology Research Ethics Board (PSREB), and any concerns and complaints regarding this procedures you may contact Yumiko Sakamoto (474-6936), Dr. J. Vorauer (474-8250), or e-mail .ca; alternatively, you may contact the Human Ethics Secretariat (474-7122), or e-mail .ca. A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.

Appendix C
Script

!!!Note that the passages in brackets { } are relevant only for the High Salience Conditions!!!

HSI = High Salience Interethnic condition

HSW = High Salience Within-ethnic condition

LSI = Low Salience Interethnic condition

[Go to P505 and ask him/her following question]

- Are you here for the **Social Interaction Study, (Study name here)?**

[If the answer is “yes”, then greet the participant and bring him/her to a room. When you reach the room, tell the participant that he/she can wait while you go to collect their partner]

- Please have a seat. I have to go to P205 (the other waiting room) to bring your partner to the other room. Please wait here.

[Come back in a few minutes (less than 3 min)]

- Thank you very much for coming in today. Your {**Chinese (or) White; depending on the condition and the participant's ethnicity**} partner is here now so we can start the session. Before we begin, please turn off your cell phone, if you have one, now.
- In this study, as I explained to you on the phone, the researcher is interested in first meetings between {members of different ethnic groups, in this case **Chinese and White**} students. So, for each session, we have scheduled two people {of the **same ethnicity or different ethnicity**} who haven't met before, {“and you are in

different ethnicity condition” in IHS condition, “and you are in the same ethnicity condition” in WHS condition}

- Communication between the two of you will be restricted. The way that it works is that you will have a “controlled interaction” with each other.
- Now, I will explain the procedure to you. If you have any questions, please ask me at any point.
- In the first step, you will be asked to fill out a brief personal information sheet. Your {*Chinese (or) White*} partner will also fill out the same sheet.
- You will exchange sheets with your partner, and then answer four further questions about yourself. You and your partner will have the opportunity to read over each other’s answers. In this session, you will give your answers to your partner first, then you will read your partner’s later.
- Then, I will give you *Questionnaire 1* which asks you to answer some questions regarding your interaction with your {*Chinese (or) White*} partner up to that point.
- Next, you will read your partner’s answers to the 4 questions and you will fill out two different questionnaires, one about the information and one about your general attitudes.

[Answer any questions that arise]

- Finally, you and your {*Chinese (or) White*} partner will meet at the end of the study.
- This is the general procedure of this **Interethnic Interaction Study (in HSI and HSW conditions)**, or **Social Interaction Study (in LSI)**, and I will explain it as it goes.
- At this point, I'd like you to sign this consent form, indicating your agreement to participate. The consent form basically summarizes what I've just told you.

[Give participants the consent form. When the participant completes the form, give the participant the personal information sheet]

- I will come back in five minutes. When I come back, I will bring your information sheet to your partner. Please remember that your {*Chinese (or) White*} partner will read your information sheet.

[Leave the participant for 5 minutes]

- Can I have your personal information sheet please, so I can take it to your partner? I will come back with your partner's information sheet in a few moments.

[Leave the room for a few minutes and come back with the ostensible partner's personal information sheet]

- Now, you have 5 minutes to read your {*Chinese (or) White*} partner's personal information sheet. Here it is. I will come back in 5 minutes.

[Come back in 5 five minutes with the 4 Closeness Generating Questions]

- Can I have your {*Chinese (or) White*} partner's personal information sheet back please?
- The next step is for you to spend 10 minutes writing answers to four questions about yourself. 10 minutes is not a lot of time, so you can use point-form if you'd like. Please read the instructions before you begin. Please note that your {*Chinese (or) White*} partner will be reading your responses.

[Give the sheet of 4 questions and leave the participant for 10 minutes]

[When 10 minutes are up, come back and collect the participant's responses]

- Now, I would bring your responses to your {*Chinese (or) White*} partner. I will be right back.

[Leave the room for a few minutes and come back with the Questionnaire 1.]

- Now I would like you to fill out Questionnaire 1. Your responses will be completely confidential, and will never be shown to your partner. Please read all of the instructions carefully. If you find any of the items confusing, or if you have any questions, please feel free to ask me when I come back. Please take care that you do not skip any items accidentally. I will come back in 10 minutes with your {*Chinese (or) White*} partner's answers to the 4 questions.

[After 10 minutes, come back with the ostensible partner's responses. Collect questionnaire 1 and hand participant their partner's answers to the 4 responses]

- The next step is for you to read over your partner's answers. Please open the door once you are done.

[Do not come back right after the door opens, but wait for a few minutes and come back with the Questionnaire 2]

- O.K., now I would like you to fill out the Questionnaire 2. Again, your responses will be completely confidential, and will never be shown to your {*Chinese (or) White*} partner. Please read all of the instructions carefully. If you find any of the items confusing, or if you have any questions, please feel free to ask when I come back. Please take care that you do not skip any items accidentally. Let me know once you are done by opening the door.

[Do not come back right after the door opens, but wait for a few minutes and come back with the general attitude questionnaire]

- Now, let's move on to the second part of the experiment. Here is the General Attitude questionnaire. We are asking about participants' general attitudes to better understand their responses to first part of study.

- As before, your responses will be completely confidential, and will never be shown to your *{Chinese (or) White}* partner. Please read all of the instructions carefully. If you find any of the items confusing, or if you have any questions, please feel free to ask when I come back. Please take care that you do not skip any items accidentally. Let me know once you are done by opening the door.

[After the participants open the door, debrief and thank them for their participation]

Author Note

Yumiko Sakamoto, Department of Psychology, University of Manitoba.

This manuscript will be submitted in partial fulfillment for the requirements for the Master's year in Psychology under the supervision of Dr. Jacquie Vorauer.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Yumiko Sakamoto, Department of Psychology, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB R3T 2N2, Canada E-mail: ysakamo@cc.umanitoba.ca

Footnotes

1. Cronbach's alpha ranged from .70 to .90 (Evaluative concerns = .90; Fears of rejection = .70; Desire for future interaction = .90; Liking = .77).
2. The impact of participants' gender on evaluative as well as rejection concerns were conducted, and no significant effects were found.
3. One Chinese participant did not answer one commonality question, so N was 89 for this part of the analysis.

Table 1
Means of Fears of Rejection

Conditions	Time 1		Time 2	
	M	SD	M	SD
High Salience Interethnic	2.84 _a *	.99	2.53 _d *	.90
Low Salience Interethnic	3.06 _{ab}	1.00	2.86 _d	1.11
High Salience Intraethnic	3.33 _b **	1.11	2.61 _d **	.98

Note. Seven-point scales were used on which higher numbers indicate greater fear of rejection. Means in each column that do not share the same subscripts differ at $p < .10$. Means in each row that have one asterisk (*) differ at $p < .05$, and two asterisks (**) differ at $p < .001$ level.

Table 2

Means of Desire for Future Interaction

Conditions	M	SD
High Salience Interethnic	4.79 _a	.94
Low Salience Interethnic	5.05 _a	.74
High Salience Intraethnic	4.35 _b	.92

Note. Seven-point scales were used on which higher numbers indicated stronger desire for future interaction. Means that do not share the same subscripts differ at $p < .05$ level.

Table 3

Means of Meta-Interest

Conditions	M	SD
High Salience Interethnic	4.30 _a	.95
Low Salience Interethnic	4.42 _a	.99
High Salience Intraethnic	3.78 _b	.99

Note. Seven-point scales were used, on which higher numbers indicated higher meta-interest. Means that do not share the same subscripts differ at $p < .05$ level.

Table 4

Means of Meta-Feeling Thermometer

	White		Chinese	
	M	SD	M	SD
High Salience Interethnic	66.00 _a	24.43	66.83 _b	14.28
Low Salience Interethnic	73.93 _a	18.69	52.67 _c	17.51
High Salience Intraethnic	59.40 _a	20.49	58.67 _{bc}	15.98

Note. Means in each column that do not share the same subscripts differ at $p < .05$.

Table 5

Means of Interest

Conditions	M	SD
High Salience Interethnic	4.69 _a	.88
Low Salience Interethnic	5.09 _b	.74
High Salience Intraethnic	4.37 _a	1.09

Note. Seven-point scales were used on which higher numbers indicated higher interest.

Means in each column that share the same subscripts do not differ. Means of Low Salience Interethnic and High Salience Intraethnic conditions differed at $p < .01$ level, and means of High Salience Interethnic Interaction and Low Salience Interethnic conditions differed at $p < .10$ level.

Table 6

Pearson Correlation between Variables during the Immediate Interaction

	EC	FEAR	LIKE	DESIRE
Time1				
EC	1	.18	-.14	.25*
FEAR	-	1	.21*	-.14
LIKE	-	-	1	-.22*
DESIRE	-	-	-	1
Time 2				
EC	1	.28**	-.09	.33**
FEAR	-	1	.36**	-.13
LIKE	-	-	1	-.30**
DESIRE	-	-	-	1

Note. Correlation coefficient in each row that have one asterisk (*) is significant at $p < .05$ and two asterisks (**) are significant at $p < .01$ level.

Table 7

Pearson Correlation between Variables for Generalization Effects

	EC	Thermo	Meta-Thermo	Interest	Meta-Interest
EC	1	.21*	.13	.23*	-.06
Thermo	-	1	.76**	.38*	.18
Meta-Thermo	-	-	1	.41**	.19
Interest	-	-	-	1	-.05
Meta-Interest	-	-	-	-	1

Note. Correlation coefficient in each row that have one asterisk (*) is significant at $p < .05$ and two asterisks (**) are significant at $p < .01$ level.