1

Editors' Introduction

Ulrich Wagner, Linda R. Tropp, Gillian Finchilescu, and Colin Tredoux

Wherever humans assemble, we tend to differentiate ourselves into groups, on a wide range of ostensible differences. There are abundant historical and contemporaneous examples of intergroup differentiation along the lines of ethnic, racial, national, gender, and class dimensions, among others. In many cases it can easily be seen that groups are socially created, as in the case of political parties or religious groups. In other cases we consider ourselves to belong to groups that differ on some preexisting attribute or dimension, as in the case of gender groups.

Modern social psychological theories and research have described the basic mechanisms by which we perceive our social environment as composed of different groups. This includes our capacity to perceive and differentiate between social categories, as well as our tendency to identify with categories that are deemed as relevant by society, and which serve as the basis for defining our social identities.

Our everyday experience, as well as scientific documentation, informs us of the significance of these social categories, and how easily attention to categorical differences can breed conflict between groups. Upon distinguishing between members of our own ingroup and outgroups, outgroup members may be negatively stereotyped, devalued, avoided, discriminated against, or even physically attacked and killed. Daily, the news media abound with examples of such events—hate speech and attacks on people or property identified as belonging to "other groups" such as national, ethnic or religious groups; acts of intolerance ranging from avoidance to violence against members of stigmatized groups such as immigrants, homosexuals, and people known to be living with HIV/AIDS; numerous examples of discrimination against women, ethnic groups, and other underrepresented outgroups;

and genocide driven by differences in skin colour, religion, and cultural heritage. Although some of these cases can be explained by conflicts over material resources, social psychological perspectives suggest many other mechanisms and motivations that perpetuate intergroup conflict.

As such, social psychological research and theory on intergroup relations typically strives to understand the processes that can improve relations between groups, in order to make mutual images of the other less negative, to eradicate discrimination, and to find a basis for the elimination of intergroup violence. This emphasis was already evident in Robin Williams' (1947) monograph on *The Reductions of Intergroup Tensions* and Gordon Allport's (1954) influential book, *The Nature of Prejudice*. Following these writings, the contributions of social psychologists to the US civil rights movement (e.g. the impact of Kenneth and Mamie Clark's research in the case Brown vs. Board of Education), and their involvement in numerous court cases since that time, demonstrates on ongoing commitment to socially relevant research that can promote positive social change. Indeed, intergroup research is often closely connected to practical attempts at implementing appropriate interventions and procedures for combating intergroup conflict.

The present book follows in this tradition. It is a book about intergroup relations and the strategies by which these may be improved, based on recent theoretical and empirical advances. Development in science is on the one hand a matter of theory-driven accumulation of knowledge, but it is also influenced by central and outstanding scientific scholars. One of these scholars is Thomas Fraser Pettigrew, certainly one of the most influential social psychologists in the field of intergroup relations. Thus, this is also a book about Thomas F. Pettigrew, whose scientific contributions and influence have made recent developments possible, at the same time as he still actively contributes to them.

The present book is two-fold in character, concerning itself with recent developments in social psychology about the improvement of intergroup relations, and with Thomas F. Pettigrew's influence on this body of knowledge. It is fitting to his legacy that the book is written by many of his former doctoral students, academic colleagues, and scholars influenced by his research. Accordingly, we have asked the authors of the following chapters to describe the current state of their research, and to reflect on the ways in which Thomas F. Pettigrew has influenced their work on intergroup relations.

The book starts with two short introductory chapters. In this first chapter, we outline the organization of the book, and provide

readers with an overview of topics to be addressed in later chapters. In the second, introductory chapter, Frances Cherry guides the reader through important milestones in Pettigrew's academic life and scholarly development.

Exploring the Causes of Prejudice and Discrimination

Attempts to improve negative intergroup relations through interventions need to be grounded in scientific theory and supported by empirical findings. Therefore, chapters in Part I involve the scientific exploration of the causes of prejudice and discrimination. Fiske, Smith, as well as Stephan, Renfro and Davis, focus on broad recent theoretical developments that enhance our understanding of the causes of negative intergroup attitudes and discriminatory behavior, along with identifying approaches by which they might be improved.

Susan T. Fiske starts this section with a review of her theoretical and empirical contributions to understanding the development of group stereotypes. She makes clear how the development of stereotypes depends on the relative power positions of the groups. This gives way to a focus on a special kind of intergroup stereotype, based on the relation of gender groups, and the conception of ambivalent sexism that she has developed together with Peter Glick. She extends this theme with a description of her latest theoretical contribution, the stereotype content model, which was developed together with Amy Cuddy, and which provides a comprehensive theoretical framework for understanding the emergence of stereotypes and the relation of stereotypes to intergroup behavior. Fiske explores the implications of these recent developments for practical interventions, giving examples from testimony against racial segregation that Pettigrew and she herself delivered.

Emerging intergroup research also shows that stereotyping, devaluation, discrimination and violence cannot be described comprehensively on the basis of cognitive processes alone. Eliot R. Smith, often in collaboration with Diane M. Mackie, has contributed substantially to this work, in line with Pettigrew's proposals regarding the significant role that emotions play in intergroup relations. As Smith shows, group members do not experience emotions only if they are affected individually, but also when a group they identify with is affected. Complementing the stereotype content model, individuals also connect distinct emotional experiences to outgroups that vary in terms

of their relative power, which in turn allow for predictions of intergroup behavior.

Walter G. Stephan, C. Lausanne Renfro and Mark D. Davis consider a special kind of antecedent of intergroup emotions, namely intergroup threat. These authors present a number of theoretical considerations relevant to the development of their integrated threat theory, and their later revised threat theory. Together, these discussions show how, depending on a defined set of individual, intergroup, cultural and situational variables, different forms of threat vis à vis an outgroup are experienced, and these feelings of threat in turn explain the emergence of prejudice and intergroup rejection. The authors also combine threat theory with intergroup contact theory, thus adopting one of Pettigrew's major research themes, in which they discuss how threat can be both an antecedent and consequence of intergroup contact.

Functions of Intergroup Contact in Improving Intergroup Relations

Intergroup contact has repeatedly been shown to be one of the most effective means of reducing intergroup bias. Pettigrew has in many papers described a number of potential mediators in the process of changing intergroup attitudes and behavior, suggesting that changes in both the cognitive representation and the emotional relation to the outgroup might be of relevance. Part II thus focuses on the functions of intergroup contact in intergroup relations and includes contributions by Dovidio, Gaertner, Saguy and Halabi, Tropp, and by Vonofakou, Hewstone, Voci, Paolini, Turner, Tausch, Tam, Harwood and Cairns.

John F. Dovidio, Samuel L. Gaertner, Tamar Saguy and Samer Halabi describe a number of mechanisms that help us understand *why* contact works. Summarizing much of their work, these authors demonstrate how the different processes of de- and recategorization can mediate the effects of intergroup contact on intergroup attitudes and behavior. Adopting one of Pettigrew's models, they also argue that intergroup contact may be most effective in reducing intergroup biases when these kinds of categorization are activated in a sequential order. In addition, they present evidence showing that members of powerful and powerless groups may be differentially affected by these processes due to their differing interests in maintaining or changing the intergroup power status quo.

Extending this focus, Linda R. Tropp also examines the question of why intergroup contact works, and how contact can have different effects for members of different status groups. Related to Dovidio et al., Tropp emphasizes that it is often more difficult for low status minorities, as opposed to high status majorities to develop a feeling of trust in relation to the outgroup, and this might explain the asymmetrical effect of intergroup contact on minorities and majorities. She then discusses trust as a key mechanism underlying Pettigrew's concept of "friendship potential" and explores how close cross-group friendships help to establish a willingness to trust, which in turn can promote broader shifts in relations between groups.

Christiana Vonofakou, Miles Hewstone, Alberto Voci, Stefania Paolini, Rhiannon Turner, Nicole Tausch, Tania Tam, Jake Harwood and Ed Cairns focus on the effects of both direct and indirect contact for improving intergroup relations. They analyze data from multiple settings, using different indicators of intergroup attitudes ranging from paper and pencil measures to implicit measures of attitudes and attitude strength. They show that empathy with outgroup members, self-disclosure, intergroup trust, and anxiety reduction mediate the positive effects that direct and indirect contacts have on intergroup relations. In line with the views of Wright et al., these authors also emphasize the role of indirect contact in improving intergroup relations, especially where there is limited opportunity for direct contact.

Intergroup Relations and Reflections on One's Own Group Membership

Typically, research on intergroup relations analyzes the attitudes, emotions, and behavior that people experience as group members in relation to an outgroup. Thus, it is not the attitudes or behavior of single and isolated individuals that is of interest in intergroup research, but rather the psychology of the person acting as a group member. Growing from this view, Thomas Pettigrew has long emphasized that we must focus not only on the outgroup, but also need to reevaluate our own groups in our attempts to improve intergroup relations. Thus, the following three chapters, written by van Laar, Levin and Sidanius, Wright, Aron and Brody, as well as by Brewer, explore the dynamics of intergroup relations in terms of reflections on our own group memberships.

Colette van Laar, Shana Levin and Jim Sidanius present results of a longitudinal study on contact at a large multi-ethnic US university.

They found strong support for the basic assumption that contact between ethnic groups has a positive causal influence on ethnic intergroup attitudes. However, these authors also show that interactions with ingroup members, and especially interactions of white students with ingroup friends, can have a negative effect on individuals' attitudes toward other ethnic groups. They discuss their findings in terms of normative influences, such that greater interactions with ingroup members makes ingroup standards salient, thereby presenting norms and customs that may interfere with outgroup acceptance.

Whereas most research on intergroup contact has focused on the effects of direct contact experiences (i.e., face-to-face contact with an outgroup member), Stephen C. Wright, Arthur Aron and Salena M. Brody show convincingly how knowing that another ingroup member has a close relation with an outgroup member reduces intergroup prejudice. In their extended intergroup contact hypothesis they nominate a number of explanations for this effect: reduction of anxiety; perceived changes in group norms; and inclusion of the outgroup member in the self. Wright and his coauthors present empirical findings from a number of studies suggesting that inclusion of outgroup members in the self and the ingroup explains much of the extended contact effect.

In a 1998 contribution to the *Annual Review of Psychology* Pettigrew proposed that an important precondition of improving intergroup relations is the "deprovincialization" of one's ingroup. Marilynn B. Brewer takes this idea as a starting point for her discussion of how social identity complexity can improve intergroup relations. She explains how complexity of a social identity is negatively related to the perceived overlap between the different groups to which an individual belongs, and how it depends on cognitive abilities and values. As Brewer demonstrates across a range of studies, social identity complexity correlates with reduced intergroup tension and outgroup devaluation. Brewer then hints at a practical intervention by suggesting that negative intergroup relations may be reduced or prevented by increasing social identity complexity.

Focusing on Social Context in Improving Intergroup Relations

At the very beginning of his academic career as a social psychologist in the mid 1950s, Pettigrew compared the role of authoritarianism in understanding hostile intergroup relations in South Africa and in the

Southern US. With this paper he made one of the first contributions in social psychology to the analysis of context effects and cross-level interactions. He has persistently asked for a contextualized social psychology that allows focusing on the social context in improving intergroup relations. The chapters in Part IV, written by Finchilescu and Tredoux, Wagner, Christ, Wolf, van Dick, Stellmacher, Schlüter, and Zick, and Jonas and Mummendey, therefore concentrate on the relevance of contextual dimensions when attempting to improve intergroup relations.

Gillian Finchilescu and Colin Tredoux describe the phenomenology and effects of intergroup contact under unfavorable conditions, namely contact between ethnic groups in South Africa. The few available studies conducted during the Apartheid period show only weak effects of contact on outgroup attitudes, ostensibly due to the extremely negative social and political context of that period. But the situation seems to have changed very slowly, despite the dissolution of Apartheid and the installation of a democratic government. Finchilescu and Tredoux provide evidence showing that modern South Africa remains highly segregated. The research they cite and describe makes clear that being copresent in schools, universities, on beaches or in clubs does not necessarily imply intergroup contact, and ethnic groups typically self-segregate under those conditions. They point to survey data from contemporary South Africa that show that self-rated contact is negatively correlated with prejudice, and while this is grounds for optimism, they argue that it is important to understand the strong tendency to avoid contact.

Ulrich Wagner, Oliver Christ, Hinna Wolf, Rolf van Dick, Jost Stellmacher, Elmar Schlüter, and Andreas Zick also analyze the effect of coexistence of ethnic groups in the same geographical context. Based on results of large-scale survey data from Europe and Germany, they show that the immigrant percentage of the population has different effects on their acceptance by the autochthonous population, depending on the size of the geographical region under consideration. In smaller units such as districts, a higher percentage of immigrants is associated with a reduction in prejudice. By contrast, a higher immigrant percentage at the level of the national state is associated with higher prejudice. Wagner et al., show that this difference can be explained by different mediators, namely, on the one hand, intergroup contact and, on the other, intergroup threat. An increase in intergroup threat is assumed to depend on nationwide negative political propaganda about immigrants.

Kai J. Jonas and Amelie Mummendey point out that most intergroup research focuses on intergroup relations that are conflictual and

negative. Similarly, intergroup programs that are intended to promote intergroup relations are typically designed to "reduce conflict," or "reduce prejudice," or in some way ameliorate a state of negative interaction. A different focus would be to consider, and develop explanatory models of positive intergroup relations. They present some considerations for such a model, and identify the significance of a superordinate joint group categorization as central, as well as some specific modes of interaction that can promote positive relations. They end their chapter by urging researchers in the field to consider widening the limited perspective in intergroup relations on levels of categorization, arguing that we should incorporate multilevel categorization into our theories. Such a widening, they suggest, may allow joint recognition of positive and negative instances of intergroup relations.

Intergroup Relations as a Commitment to Social Change

Interventions aimed at improving societal conditions and the lives of individuals should be based on systematic scientific knowledge and controlled empirical findings. Throughout his work, Thomas Pettigrew has demonstrated an unwavering commitment to rigorous scientific research that can be used to address social problems. He has always understood intergroup research as a commitment to social change, and he has served as an important example to researchers who wish to maintain high scientific standards while conducting socially relevant work. In Part V, Smith and Walker, Kelman, and Schofield, discuss the broader implications of intergroup research for the promotion of social change.

Heather Smith and Iain Walker focus on the roles of relative deprivation, perceived injustice and emotions for the emergence of collective action. They emphasize the importance of distinguishing between deprivation experienced at the personal and group levels, and they discuss the range of emotions that people may experience upon perceiving themselves to be disadvantaged. Citing from their own research and related work of their colleagues, these authors document how an individual's readiness to participate in social protest as a means of changing group relations depends on both rational decisions about cost–benefit probabilities and on emotional processes, especially anger.

With a shift in focus on relations between national groups, Herbert C. Kelman describes a series of interactive problem-solving workshops designed to help Israeli and Palestinian people find a way to peace.

The workshops Kelman organized are based on social psychological mechanisms known to help participants gain a feeling for their different perspectives, and to promote discussions of commonalities and differences in basic needs. The workshops were not developed to improve intergroup relations between participants only. Kelman and his coworkers usually selected politicians, state advisers, and opinion leaders as participants. Through this selection process, the effects of the workshop were expected to generalize more broadly, to have a positive impact on relations between the Palestinian and Israeli states.

The question of interrelationships between science and politics is also at the heart of Janet Ward Schofield's contribution. Stemming from social psychological perspectives on contact theory, she analyzes the effects of school desegregation in the US on ethnic intergroup relations over the past 50 years. She takes school desegregation as a case to discuss the complicated communication between social psychological scientists working in the field of intergroup relations and political decision makers. In particular, her list of constraints and sources of difficulty are extremely helpful for all who feel committed to using the scientific results presented in the foregoing chapters as a means for improving intergroup relations in everyday life.

Final Reflections

Taken together, the chapters in this book present recent theoretical analyses and empirical results regarding the many ways in which intergroup relations may be improved. It is also a book about one of the most prominent and influential promoters of research on intergroup relations and their improvement, Thomas F. Pettigrew. This book would not be complete without the voice of Thomas Pettigrew himself. In response to our request, he has written the final chapter, in which he reflects on the many new research directions that have emerged from his contributions to the study of intergroup relations and which are brought together in this book.

We hope that this book will be enjoyed by all those interested in the field of intergroup relations. But, above all, this book is a call for social psychologists and allied researchers to consider the broader implications of their work. Pettigrew's legacy lies in the demand that social psychology not remain simply an intellectual, academic discipline, but that it serves the quest for societal advancement, governed by principles of social justice. As such, we hope this volume will not only encourage future generations of research and theory development,

but that it will inspire its readers to renew their commitment to achieving positive intergroup relations around the world.

References

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
Williams, R. M., Jr. (1947). *The reduction of intergroup tensions*. New York: Social Science Research Council.