The Cambridge Handbook of the Psychology of Prejudice

Edited by

Chris G. Sibley
University of Auckland, New Zealand

Fiona Kate Barlow
University of Queensland, Australia

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107098336

© Cambridge University Press 2017

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2017

Printed in the United Kingdom by Clays, St Ives plc

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-1-107-09833-6 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

20 Recent Developments in Intergroup Contact Research: Affective Processes, Group Status, and Contact Valence

Linda R. Tropp, Agostino Mazziotta, and Stephen C. Wright

What are the consequences of bringing people from diverse groups together? Does it enhance trust and goodwill, or does it lead to mistrust and hostility? More than 60 years ago, social scientists offered initial evidence and theoretical perspectives regarding how contact between members of different groups can reduce intergroup hostility and promote positive intergroup attitudes (see Allport, 1954; Williams, 1947). Since then, Allport's (1954) formulation of intergroup contact theory has become one of the most enduring models in the history of social psychology (Brewer & Brown, 1998), as well as one of psychology's best strategies to improve intergroup relations (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011).

This chapter provides an overview of recent theorizing and research on intergroup contact with a focus on three key developments in the literature. First, we highlight the special role of affective processes and friendship in improving intergroup attitudes while considering both direct and indirect forms of intergroup contact. We then review the differential effects and implications of contact among members of minority and majority groups and describe how contact effects reach far beyond shifts in intergroup attitudes. Finally, we discuss the effects of both positive and negative intergroup contact on attitudes and relations between groups.

Effects of Direct Contact

Research reveals the crucial roles that affective processes play in contact effects, both in terms of the kinds of contact that are most likely to improve intergroup attitudes and the kinds of positive outcomes we can expect from such contact (see Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011). With survey data from seven European samples, seminal work by Pettigrew (1997) showed that intergroup contact in the form of cross-group friendships was consistently and negatively associated with a range of prejudice measures, particularly those assessing feelings of sympathy

and admiration toward the outgroup. In line with Pettigrew's (1997) findings, other studies indicate that cross-group friendships relate more strongly to reduced prejudice than more distant forms of contact (Herek & Capitanio, 1996), particularly when affective dimensions of prejudice such as feelings and emotions toward outgroup members are involved (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005a).

Cross-group friendships. Empirical interest in the special role of cross-group friendships has expanded and corroborated these early findings through longitudinal, meta-analytic, and experimental research. Longitudinal surveys in several countries have shown that greater cross-group friendships predict more positive intergroup attitudes over time (Binder et al., 2009; Levin, van Laar, & Sidanius, 2003; Swart, Hewstone, Christ, & Voci, 2011). Meta-analytic research by Davies, Tropp, Aron, Pettigrew, and Wright (2011) lends further support, demonstrating that cross-group friendships predict more positive intergroup attitudes irrespective of how friendship is measured – whether assessed as numbers or percentages of cross-group friends or as reported closeness to or time spent with cross-group friends. Experimental studies also show that both developing new cross-group friendships (Page-Gould, Mendoza-Denton, & Tropp, 2008; Wright, Brody, & Aron, 2005) and reflecting on existing cross-group friendships (Page-Gould, Mendoza-Denton, Alegre, & Siy, 2010) can improve intergroup attitudes.

Contact quantity and quality. Paralleling this emphasis on cross-group friendships, other work has usefully distinguished between the quantity and quality of intergroup contact. Building on Allport's (1954) formulation of optimal conditions for contact, contact quality has often been operationalized in terms of the participant's subjective sense of these conditions – for example, feeling that the contact is cooperative and supported and that members of both groups are regarded as equals (Dixon, Tropp, et al., 2010, Islam & Hewstone, 1993). Others have stressed the importance of affective closeness and intimacy as markers of high-quality intergroup contact; indeed, some propose that the potential for members of different groups to become friends should be regarded as its own optimal condition for contact (Cook, 1962; Pettigrew, 1998), or that the optimal contact can be construed as conditions that facilitate the development of cross-group friendships (Wright et al., 2005; Wright, 2009). Although the broad conclusion is that contact between members of different groups generally improves intergroup attitudes (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011), it is now well established that not all types of contact are equal. Contact quantity alone is limited in its impact on intergroup attitudes, whereas contact quality – especially when defined as close relationships across group boundaries – is much more influential (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005a).

Mediators of contact effects. Substantial research also highlights the importance of affect in the processes through which contact improves intergroup attitudes. Affective pathways such as reducing intergroup anxiety (Barlow, Louis, & Hewstone, 2009; Islam & Hewstone, 1993, Paolini, Hewstone, Cairns, & Voci, 2004) and promoting intergroup empathy toward the outgroup (Finlay & Stephan,

2000) have emerged as key mediators of the contact-prejudice relationship. Meta-analytic work confirms these findings (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008), while also showing that these pathways function largely independently of each other. Similarly, longitudinal studies indicate that over time, high-quality contact such as cross-group friendships predicts lower intergroup anxiety (Levin et al., 2003) as well as greater intergroup empathy (Swart et al., 2011).

Effects of Indirect Contact

The growing focus on affective processes is also consistent with theorizing by Wright, Aron, and colleagues (Aron et al., 2004; Wright, Aron, & Tropp, 2002; Wright et al., 2005), who suggest that close cross-group contact can shift our broader understandings of intergroup relationships and can impact intergroup attitudes even in the absence of direct contact. In recent years, many scholars have highlighted the importance of indirect forms of contact (see Dovidio, Eller, & Hewstone, 2011; Vezzali, Hewstone, Capozza, Giovanni, & Wölfer, 2014; Wright & Aron, 2010, for reviews), as these offer strategies through which a relatively small number of direct cross-group friendships can have a wider impact on intergroup relations. Prominent among these perspectives is the extended contact effect introduced by Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, and Ropp (1997), which holds that the mere "knowledge that an ingroup member has a close relationship with an outgroup member can lead to more positive intergroup attitudes" (p. 73). Across two survey studies, these authors showed that independent of their own direct cross-group contact, White, Latino(a), and Black Americans who knew of greater numbers of cross-ethnic friendships reported more positive intergroup attitudes than those who knew of fewer cross-ethnic friendships. Subsequent survey studies have shown similar effects across a wide range of groups and contexts, including Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland (Tam, Hewstone, Kenworthy, & Cairns, 2009); South Asians and Whites in the United Kingdom (Turner, Hewstone, & Voci, 2007); Spaniards and immigrants in Spain (Gómez, Tropp, & Fernandez, 2011); Germans in relation to "foreigners" in Germany (Christ et al., 2010); and heterosexuals in relation to gay men (Mereish & Poteat, 2015).

These correlational findings have been complemented by controlled experiments offering causal evidence of the effects of extended contact on intergroup attitudes (see Lemmer & Wagner, 2015, for review). Laboratory research by Wright and colleagues (1997) used variants of minimal group procedures (Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971) in which participants watched two confederates – ostensibly one ingroup member and one outgroup member – work together on a puzzle and act as though they were close friends, strangers, or disliked acquaintances. Compared to those who watched pairs of strangers or disliked acquaintances, those who watched a cross-group friendship pair reported more positive evaluations of the outgroup.

Experimental studies in applied contexts have revealed similar patterns of effects. For example, Cameron, Rutland, and Brown (2007) found that British schoolchildren who listened to stories depicting cross-group friendships between British and refugee children offered more positive evaluations of refugees than children who heard the same stories depicting friendships between two British children. Similar effects have been found for children's attitudes toward children with disabilities (Cameron & Rutland, 2006), Finnish adolescents' attitudes toward "foreigners" (Liebkind & McAlister, 1999), and Italian adolescents' attitudes toward immigrants (Vezzali, Stathi, & Giovannini, 2012).

Mediators of extended contact effects. A number of processes have been proposed to account for these effects of extended contact. Observing others engaged in intergroup contact can reduce anxieties associated with cross-group interactions (West & Turner, 2014). There is also evidence that extended contact works by creating a meaningful connection between oneself and the outgroup, referred to as the "inclusion of the outgroup in the self" (Turner, Hewstone, Voci, & Vonofakou, 2008; Wright, Aron, & Brody, 2008), whereby the positive feelings typically reserved for the self (and ingroup) are extended to the outgroup and its members. Extended contact can also change our perceptions of both ingroup norms – how we believe members of our group relate to the outgroup – and outgroup norms – how we believe outgroup members relate to the ingroup (Gómez et al., 2011; Turner et al., 2008). In a powerful field experiment in Rwanda, Paluck (2009) showed that exposure to a radio soap opera that included positive contact between Hutus and Tutsis changed respondents' beliefs about norms for relations between the groups, and led to more positive intergroup behavior. Related work by Mazziotta, Mummendey, and Wright (2011) highlights the value of presenting ingroup role models who demonstrate that and how cross-group contact can be successful; observing positive cross-group interactions not only encouraged more positive intergroup attitudes but also enhanced participants' beliefs about their ability to navigate cross-group interactions successfully. Thus, changing perceptions of norms may be a particularly valuable means through which extended and other indirect forms of contact can influence the broader relations between groups.

Relationships between direct and indirect contact. A recent meta-analysis (Lemmer & Wagner, 2015) suggests that both indirect and contact interventions are effective in improving intergroup attitudes, and studies typically show modest positive correlations between the two forms of contact (Mazziotta, Rohmann, Wright, De Tezanos-Pinto, & Lutterbach, 2015; Mereish & Poteat, 2015). Extended contact may be especially predictive of intergroup attitudes in contexts where opportunities for direct contact are limited, whereas direct contact plays a stronger role when it is possible (Christ et al., 2010). Importantly, indirect forms of contact may help to prepare people for direct contact with members of other groups. For example, longitudinal survey research with undergraduates in the United States has shown that positive extended contact prior to college significantly predicts students' formation of cross-group friendships during college (Schofield,

Hausmann, Ye, & Woods, 2010). Experimental research also indicates th extended contact can lead to more positive nonverbal behavior durir a subsequent cross-group interaction, which in turn leads one's partner to perceiv the interaction as more positive (West & Turner, 2014). In sum, indirect conta involving knowledge of and exposure to positive and successful cross-grou interactions can supplement or set the stage for direct contact as a means (improving intergroup attitudes.

Contact Effects Among Minority and Majority Groups

Beyond extending the scope of intergroup contact to include both dire and indirect forms, new generations of research have identified important diffe ences in the nature and experience of intergroup contact among members c different groups depending on their status. Group status plays a defining role i relations between groups (Bobo, 1999), as the attitudes of majority group membe are often linked to their privileged status, while the attitudes of minorities are ofte based in the anticipation of prejudice and discrimination from the majority grou (see Monteith & Spicer, 2000).[1] Meta-analytic and longitudinal studies also sho that the effects of contact are typically weaker among members of minority group than among members of the majority group (Binder et al., 2009; Tropp & Pettigrew 2005b). Moreover, research has uncovered differences in minority and majorit group members' experiences during intergroup contact, along with differences i the perceptions and expectations they bring to contact situations (see Devine & Vasquez, 1998; Shelton, Richeson, & Vorauer, 2006; Tropp, 2006).

Different anxieties in intergroup relationships. Members of both minority an majority groups may be concerned about how they will be perceived by outgrou members (Sigelman & Tuch, 1997; Vorauer, 2006), and they are both likely to fee anxious about engaging in cross-group interactions (Plant & Devine, 2003 Stephan & Stephan, 1985; Tropp, 2003). Nonetheless, given their divergen views of intergroup relationships, their anxieties are often based in differen concerns: Members of majority groups are especially likely to experience anxiet about being perceived as prejudiced, whereas members of minority groups ar more likely to be anxious about becoming the target of prejudice (Devine & Vasquez, 1998).

Different motivations and goals in intergroup relationships. Correspondingly, members of minority and majority groups may have different motivations and goals as they approach contact with each other. Members of majority groups tend to seek acceptance and assurance of their moral integrity, while members of minority groups seek respect and empowerment (Bergsieker,

1 Here, we use the terms "minority" and "majority" to refer to groups of different status in a broader social hierarchy, where "minority" is meant to refer to groups that have been socially devalued, subordinate, and/or historically disadvantaged, while "majority" is meant to refer to groups that have been socially valued, dominant, and/or historically advantaged.

Shelton, & Richeson, 2010; Shnabel, Nadler, Ullrich, Dovidio, & Carmi, 2009); to the extent that their respective needs are satisfied, members of these groups demonstrate greater willingness to engage with the other group and greater optimism for their future relations (Shnabel et al., 2009). Relatedly, willingness to engage in contact may be predicted by different psychological factors for members of these groups: Majority group members' interest often stems from their own beliefs and valuing of diversity, whereas minority group members' interest often stems from their perceptions of the majority group's beliefs and values around diversity, social integration, and interest in contact (Tropp & Bianchi, 2006; Zagefka, González, & Brown, 2011).

Different preferences for representations of intergroup relationships. In line with their distinct motivations and concerns, members of minority and majority groups also tend to differ in their preferred representations of intergroup relationships. Majority group members prefer representations that minimize the salience of group differences and emphasize common ties across groups (see Saguy, Tausch, Dovidio, Pratto, & Singh, 2010; Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2000), while members of minority groups tend to prefer representations that highlight the distinctiveness of their group identity when ties are established across group boundaries (see Hehman et al., 2011; Ryan, Hunt, Weible, Peterson, & Casas, 2007). These trends suggest that members of minority groups value positive acknowledgment of their group identities (Eggins, Haslam, & Reynolds, 2002; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000), such that they may feel more positively inclined toward cross-group interactions when group identities are explicitly recognized (Tropp & Bianchi, 2007).

Extended contact among minority and majority groups. Research also points to distinct processes in extended contact for members of minority and majority groups. Although these groups tend not to differ in their mean levels of extended contact (Gómez et al., 2011) or in overall effects of extended contact on intergroup attitudes (Turner et al., 2007; Wright et al., 1997), some work indicates that perceived outgroup norms play a greater role in extended contact for minority groups than for majority groups (Gómez et al., 2011). Taken together with other work cited previously (Tropp & Bianchi, 2006; Zagefka et al., 2011), these findings suggest that members of minority groups may attend carefully to cues from the majority group, and they may become less willing to engage in contact to the extent that they anticipate disregard or rejection (see Tropp, 2006).

Contact Effects Beyond Shifting Intergroup Attitudes

Granted, intergroup contact research has traditionally been focused on the perspectives of majority groups toward the goal of shifting intergroup attitudes toward the reduction of intergroup prejudice (Allport, 1954). Yet research has highlighted the

importance of thinking more broadly about the potential outcomes and implications of intergroup contact (see Dixon & Levine, 2012; Tropp & Mallett, 2011). Along with improving intergroup attitudes, emerging research shows how contact can impact a variety of other outcomes relevant to relations between groups.

Potential beneficial effects of contact. Through positive contact experiences, group members' views of and approaches to relations between groups can shift in many beneficial ways. Contact can enhance trust between groups (Tam et al., 2009; Tropp, 2008), and feelings of inclusion within the broader social context in which contact occurs (Mendoza-Denton & Page-Gould, 2008). Positive contact in the past can also facilitate more positive contact experiences in the future (Page-Gould et al., 2010; Paolini et al., 2014), a greater willingness to help outgroup members in need (Oliner & Oliner, 1988), and a tendency to have a more diverse social networks later in life (Ellison & Powers, 1994). Moreover, close cross-group relationships are associated with more positive beliefs about outgroup members' intentions (Powers & Ellison, 1995; Tropp, Hawi, O'Brien, et al., under review), as well as a stronger desire to improve relations between groups (Sigelman & Welch, 1993). Indeed, even in contexts of violent intergroup conflict (see Wagner & Hewstone, 2012), positive contact experiences can enhance a willingness to forgive, and a desire for intergroup reconciliation (Čehajić, Brown, & Castano, 2008; Hewstone, Cairns, Voci, Hamberger, & Niens, 2006; Tam et al., 2009; Tropp et al., under review).

Positive contact experiences can also enhance support for policies designed to reduce intergroup inequality among members of high-status majority groups. Experimental research shows that Whites who developed a friendship with a Black or Latino(a) partner showed less support for state ballot initiatives that would ban affirmative action, end bilingual education, and tighten controls on immigration, compared to those who developed a friendship with a White partner (Wright et al., 2005). Large-scale survey research also shows that White South Africans who reported positive contact with Black South Africans were less likely to indicate opposition to compensatory policies (e.g., scholarships) and preferential policies (e.g., affirmative action) that would promote the advancement of Black South Africans (Dixon, Durrheim et al., 2010). Similarly, positive contact with Palestinians predicts greater willingness to compromise and make reparations among Jewish Israelis (Maoz & Ellis, 2008), and positive contact with immigrants predicts greater support for pro-immigration policies among citizens of the United States and many Western European countries (Fetzer, 2000; Pettigrew, Wagner, & Christ, 2007). Thus, although improving intergroup attitudes has been a primary focus in contact research, the positive impacts of contact can extend far beyond improved intergroup attitudes.

Potential detrimental effects of contact. Despite the clear benefits of positive contact, researchers have importantly begun to question the exclusive focus on these benefits, while raising concerns about contact's "darker side" (Dixon, Levine, Reicher, & Durrheim, 2012; Wright, 2001). In our enthusiastic pursuit of the harmony afforded by positive contact, we may have underemphasized its

relationship to other important routes to achieving social equality, such as collective action and resistance by members of low-status minority groups. Although the goals of promoting intergroup harmony and fighting for social equality are not necessarily in conflict, the underlying psychological processes supporting these two routes to these goals may be: Contact focuses on creating harmony between groups, while collective action has at its core conflict between groups (Wright & Baray, 2012; Wright & Lubensky, 2009).

A growing body of research shows that while positive contact can improve intergroup attitudes, it can at the same time reduce the likelihood that members of low-status minority group members will seek to protect the interests of their groups and engage in activities to challenge intergroup inequality. Wright and Lubensky (2009) found that among Black and Latino(a) Americans, positive contact with Whites was associated with more positive attitudes toward Whites, but also with less support for collective action to advance equality; they also showed that this effect was mediated in part by reduced identification with their low-status group and a stronger belief that individual personal advancement was possible. Similar findings have been observed among Arab Israelis in relation to Jewish Israelis (Saguy, Tausch, Dovidio, & Pratto, 2009), among Māori New Zealanders in relation to European New Zealanders (Barlow, Sibley, & Hornsey, 2012), and among Muslims in relation to Hindus in India (Saguy et al., 2010). Parallel results have been found in South Africa where among Black South Africans, positive contact with Whites predicts more positive intergroup attitudes and trust, yet lower perceptions of racial discrimination (see Dixon, Tropp et al., 2010), and less support for social policies that could advance racial equality (Dixon, Durrheim, & Tredoux, 2007).

Additional studies provide stronger evidence of causal direction. Using longitudinal survey data from Black and Latino(a) Americans, Tropp, Hawi, Van Laar, and Levin (2012) observed that greater friendships with Whites predicted significantly lower perceptions of discrimination over time and lower subsequent support for ethnic activism. Experimentally, Becker, Wright, Lubensky, and Zhou (2013) showed that members of the LGBT community who were primed to recall positive contact with a heterosexual friend or family member known to be unsupportive of same-sex marriage indicated lower intentions to engage in ongoing protests supporting same-sex marriage, compared to participants in a "no prime" control condition. In addition to obscuring perceptions of discrimination and undermining intentions to engage in collective action, it has also been proposed that positive contact can blur intergroup boundaries, leading group members to focus more on commonalities between groups and deflect attention away from inequalities (Wright & Lubensky, 2009; see also Dovidio, Saguy, Gaertner, & Thomas, 2012); consistent with this view, members of low-status groups who have contact with high-status groups where commonalities are emphasized may develop overly optimistic expectations of fair treatment by members of high-status groups (Saguy et al., 2009).

In summary, there is growing evidence that positive contact, in addition to creating more positive attitudes, can encourage members of high-status majority groups to support policies that can benefit low-status minority groups. However, positive contact between these groups can also have the unintended consequences of reducing minority group members' perceptions of discrimination, identification with their own low-status group, recognition of structural inequality, and intentions to challenge the status quo and take action to promote minority group interests. Yet these undesirable effects need not always occur. For example, the experimental research by Becker et al. (2013) also reveals that when members of a low-status minority group have contact with a member of the high-status majority group, and that high-status group partner clearly indicates that he or she supports greater equality and sees existing inequalities as illegitimate, the undermining effect of positive contact on collective action can be erased. Greater research attention is therefore needed to specify conditions under which positive contact between minority and majority groups need not interfere with, or may even enhance, commitment to collective efforts to dismantle status inequalities.

Effects of Positive and Negative Contact

In addition to specifying potentially beneficial and detrimental effects of positive contact, recent years have witnessed growing interest in studying the effects of both positive and negative contact experiences (Barlow, Paolini et al., 2012; Graf, Paolini, & Rubin, 2014; Paolini et al., 2014; Paolini, Harwood, & Rubin, 2010; Pettigrew, 2008; Techakesari et al., 2015). Across a range of intergroup contexts, this work shows that people typically experience more positive intergroup encounters than negative ones. At the same time, the research suggests that negative contact is more strongly associated with negative intergroup attitudes than positive contact is with positive intergroup attitudes (Barlow, Paolini et al., 2012). This asymmetry is especially likely to occur when cognitive dimensions of intergroup attitudes, such as stereotypes or beliefs about the outgroup, are measured (Aberson, 2015; Mazziotta, Rohmann, Wright, & De Tezanos-Pinto, 2014); this is likely because negative contact heightens the salience of social categories and is consistent with the negative expectations people have for relations with outgroup members (Paolini et al., 2010). However, Graf and colleagues (2014) provide evidence that while negative contact may have a stronger influence on intergroup attitudes, positive contact may outweigh its influence by occurring more frequently.

Effects of positive and negative contact among minority and majority groups. Although most investigations of positive and negative contact effects have concentrated on members of majority groups, Stephan and colleagues' (2002) large-scale survey importantly investigated the effects of negative

contact among both Black and White Americans; their findings showed that Blacks reported having experienced more negative contact with Whites than Whites reported having experienced with Blacks. Similarly, in a secondary analysis of US national survey data, Tropp (2007) found that Black Americans reported significantly greater perceptions of racial discrimination than Whites, and greater perceptions of racial discrimination inhibited the effects of contact on positive attitudes toward Whites. Experimental and diary studies further show that exposure to prejudice and discrimination can undermine racial and ethnic minorities' willingness to engage in contact with members of the White majority (Shelton & Richeson, 2006; Tropp, 2003). These initial findings point to the need for greater efforts to integrate the emerging research on positive and negative contact effects with earlier findings on minority-majority differences in perceptions of and experiences with intergroup contact.

Effects of positive and negative contact in contexts of intergroup conflict. The relative effects of positive and negative contact may be further influenced by the degree to which the larger intergroup relationship is marked by past or ongoing conflict (see Wagner & Hewstone, 2012). However, studies conducted in conflict zones report encouraging effects of intergroup contact, even in the face of violent intergroup conflict. Indeed, even after taking into account suffering, loss, and exposure to violence resulting from intergroup conflict, studies between religious groups in Northern Ireland and racial groups in South Africa show that positive contact can predict greater intergroup trust, more positive beliefs about outgroup members' intentions, and greater willingness to work toward intergroup reconciliation (Al Ramiah & Hewstone, 2013; Hewstone et al., 2006; Tropp et al., under review). Studies in Northern Ireland and Cyprus show that extensive positive intergroup contact in the past can buffer the effects of a negative contact experience in the present (Paolini et al., 2014). Moreover, meta-analytic research indicates that positive contact interventions can improve intergroup attitudes, even when used after periods of intergroup violence (Lemmer & Wagner, 2015). Although more work is needed to understand how the temporal sequencing of positive and negative contact contributes to their effects, existing work suggests that positive contact can contribute to many positive intergroup outcomes in conflict settings, whether it occurs before or after periods of negative contact.

Effects of positive and negative extended contact. To date, little work has investigated the effects of positive and negative extended contact. However, Mazziotta and colleagues (2015) show that, like direct contact, positive extended contact was reported more often than negative extended contact, and that both positive and negative forms of extended contact uniquely predicted Germans' attitudes toward Turks (Study 1) and Muslims (Study 2). Similarly, research by LaBianca, Brass, and Gray (1998) suggests that having friends who report negative relations with outgroup members predicts stronger perceptions of intergroup conflict, whereas having friends who report positive relations with outgroup members predicts weaker perceptions of intergroup conflict. These initial findings provide

important reminders that relations between groups are embedded in broader social and historical contexts where both positive and negative intergroup encounters may be experienced directly or indirectly, and where both can impact group members' intergroup attitudes and behaviors.

Concluding Remarks

Despite its long history, empirical and theoretical advances in the intergroup contact literature remain as vibrant as ever and have contributed to a true renaissance in our understanding of contact effects, leading us to many new insights and important research directions. In this chapter, we have focused on three key recent developments in intergroup contact research – namely, the roles of affective processes, group status, and the valence of contact experiences. Consensus is growing that while intergroup contact can influence a variety of intergroup outcomes, it is the affective elements of these contact experiences – such as intergroup closeness and anxiety – that are most influential. Emerging bodies of research also show that while positive contact can promote positive intergroup attitudes, trust, and a range of other beneficial intergroup outcomes, it may inadvertently undermine some efforts to promote social change. As our field continues to advance, we call for greater synthesis and integration across these new developments – for example, identifying the similarities and differences in how affective processes drive the effects of direct and indirect forms of positive and negative contact; studying the implications of affective processes for shifting intergroup attitudes as well as for challenging social inequalities; and enhancing our understanding of how both positive and negative contact, in their direct and indirect forms, affect intergroup attitudes and motivations for social change among members of both minority and majority groups. Adding layers of conceptual complexity – through emphasizing both direct and indirect forms of contact, the experiences of both minority and majority groups, and the nature of both positive and negative contact experiences – presents a real challenge for contemporary researchers, but it appears that many are rising to the challenge. Inspired by these new developments, future generations of research promise to offer more comprehensive and far-reaching insights regarding how people's experiences with members of other groups can shift not only their own attitudes and intentions toward other groups but also their contributions to shaping and influencing social policies and institutions that will guide broader societal relations between groups.

References

Aberson, C. L. (2015). Positive intergroup contact, negative intergroup contact, and threat as predictors of cognitive and affective dimensions of prejudice. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *18*, 743–760.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Al Ramiah, A., & Hewstone, M. (2013). Intergroup contact as a tool for reducing, resolving, and preventing intergroup conflict: Evidence, limitations, and potential. *American Psychologist, 68*, 527–542.

Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., Mashek, D., Lewandowski, G., Wright, S. C., & Aron, E. N. (2004). Including others in the self. *European Review of Social Psychology, 15*, 101–132.

Barlow, F. K., Louis, W. R., & Hewstone, M. (2009). Rejected! Cognitions of rejection and intergroup anxiety as mediators of the impact of cross-group friendships on prejudice. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 48*, 389–405.

Barlow, F. K., Paolini, S., Pedersen, A., Hornsey, M. J., Radke, H. R. M., Harwood, J. . . . Sibley, C. G. (2012). The contact caveat: Negative contact predicts increased prejudice more than positive contact predicts reduced prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38*, 1629–1643.

Barlow, F. K., Sibley, C. G., & Hornsey, M. J. (2012). Rejection as a call to arms: Inter-racial hostility and support for political action as outcomes of race-based rejection in majority and minority groups. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 51*, 167–177.

Becker, J. C., Wright, S. C., Lubensky, M. E., & Zhou, S. (2013). Friend or ally: Whether cross-group contact undermines collective action depends what advantaged group members say (or don't say). *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39*, 442–455.

Bergsieker, H. B., Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2010). To be liked versus respected: Divergent goals in interracial interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99*, 248–264.

Binder, J., Zagefka, H., Brown, R., Funke, F., Kessler, T., Mummendey, A., . . . Leyens, J.-P. (2009). Does contact reduce prejudice or does prejudice reduce contact? A longitudinal test of the contact hypothesis amongst majority and minority groups in three European countries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*, 843–856.

Bobo, L. D. (1999). Prejudice as group position: Microfoundations of a sociological approach to racism and race relations. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*, 445–72.

Brewer, M. B., & Brown, R. (1998). Intergroup relations. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (Vol. *2*, pp. 554–594). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cameron, L., & Rutland, A. (2006). Extended contact through story reading in school: Reducing children's prejudice toward the disabled. *Journal of Social Issues, 62*, 469–488.

Cameron, L., Rutland, A., & Brown, R. (2007). Promoting children's positive intergroup attitudes towards stigmatized groups: Extended contact and multiple classification skills training. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 31*, 454–466.

Čehajić, S., Brown, R. & Castano, E. (2008). Forgive and forget? Antecedents and consequences of intergroup forgiveness in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Political Psychology, 29*, 351–367.

Christ, O., Hewstone, M., Tausch, N., Wagner, U., Voci, A., Hughes, J., & Cairns, E. (2010). Direct contact as a moderator of extended contact effects: Cross-sectional and longitudinal impact on outgroup attitudes, behavioral intentions, and attitude certainty. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*, 1662–1674.

Cook, S. W. (1962). The systematic analysis of socially significant events: A strategy for social research. *Journal of Social Issues, 18*, 66–84.

Davies, K., Tropp, L. R., Aron, A., Pettigrew, T. F., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Cross-group friendships and intergroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 15*, 332–351.

Devine, P. G., & Vasquez, K. A. (1998). The rocky road to positive intergroup relations. In J. L. Eberhardt & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), *Confronting racism: The problem and the response* (pp. 234–262). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., Tredoux. C., Tropp, L., Clack, B., Eaton, L., & Quayle, M. (2010). Challenging the stubborn core of opposition to equality: Racial contact and policy attitudes. *Political Psychology, 31*, 831–855.

Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2007). Intergroup contact and attitudes toward the principle and practice of racial equality. *Psychological Science, 18*, 867–872.

Dixon, J., & Levine, M. (2012). *Beyond prejudice: Extending the social psychology of conflict, inequality and social change*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, J., Levine, M., Reicher, S., & Durrheim, K. (2012). Beyond prejudice: Are negative evaluations the problem and is getting us to like one another more the solution? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 35*, 411–425.

Dixon, J., Tropp, L. R., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2010). "Let them eat harmony": Prejudice-reduction strategies and attitudes of historically disadvantaged groups. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 19*, 76–80.

Dovidio, J. F., Eller, A., & Hewstone, M. (2011). Improving intergroup relations through direct, extended, and other forms of indirect contact. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 14*, 147–160.

Dovidio, J. F., Saguy, T., Gaertner, S. L., & Thomas, E. L. (2012). From attitudes to (in) action: The darker side of "we." In J. Dixon & M. Levine (Eds.), *Beyond prejudice: Extending the social psychology of conflict, inequality and social change* (pp. 248–268). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Eggins, R. A., Haslam, S. A., & Reynolds, K. J. (2002). Social identity and negotiation: Subgroup representation and superordinate consensus. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 887–899.

Ellison, C. G., & Powers, D. A. (1994). The contact hypothesis and racial attitudes among Black Americans. *Social Science Quarterly, 75*, 385–400.

Fetzer, J. S. (2000). *Public attitudes toward immigration in the United States, France, and Germany*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Finlay, K., & Stephan, W. G. (2000). Reducing prejudice: The effects of empathy on intergroup attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*, 1720–1737.

Gómez, A., Tropp, L. R., & Fernandez, S. (2011). When extended contact opens the door to future contact: Testing the effects of extended contact on attitudes and intergroup expectancies in majority and minority groups. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 14*, 161–173.

Graf, S., Paolini, S., & Rubin, M. (2014). Negative intergroup contact is more influential, but positive intergroup contact is more common: Assessing contact prominence and contact prevalence in five Central European countries. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 44*, 536–547.

Hehman, E., Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Mania, E. W., Guerra, R., Wilson, D. C., & Friel, B. M. (2011). Group status drives minority and majority integration preferences. *Psychological Science, 23*, 46–52.

Herek, G. M., & Capitanio, J. P. (1996). "Some of my best friends": Intergroup contact, concealable stigma, and heterosexuals' attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 412–424.

Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., Voci, A., Hamberger, J., & Niens, U. (2006). Intergroup contact, forgiveness, and experience of "the troubles" in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Social Issues, 62*, 99–120.

Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000). Assimilation and diversity: An integrative model of subgroup relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4*, 143–156.

Islam, M. R., & Hewstone, M. (1993). Dimensions of contact as predictors of intergroup anxiety, perceived out-group variability, and out-group attitude: An integrative model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19*, 700–710.

LaBianca, G., Brass, D. J., & Gray, B. (1998). Social networks and perceptions of intergroup conflict: The role of negative relationships and third parties. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*, 55–67.

Lemmer, G., & Wagner, U. (2015). Can we really reduce ethnic prejudice outside the lab? A meta-analysis of direct and indirect contact interventions. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 45*, 152–168.

Levin, S., van Laar, C., & Sidanius, J. (2003). The effects of ingroup and outgroup friendship on ethnic attitudes in college: A longitudinal study. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 6*, 76–92.

Liebkind, K., & McAlister, A. L. (1999). Extended contact through peer modelling to promote tolerance in Finland. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 29*, 765–780.

Maoz, I., & Ellis, D. (2008). Intergroup communication as a predictor of Jewish-Israeli agreement with integrative solutions to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: The mediating effects of outgroup trust and guilt. *Journal of Communication, 58*, 490–507.

Mazziotta, A., Mummendey, A., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Vicarious intergroup contact effects: Applying social-cognitive theory to intergroup contact research. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 14*, 255–274.

Mazziotta, A., Rohmann, A., Wright, S. C., & De Tezanos-Pinto, P. (2014, June). *The effects of positive and negative day-to-day contact experiences*. Paper presented at the 10th Biennial Conference of the Society of the Psychological Study of Social Issues, Portland.

Mazziotta, A., Rohmann, A., Wright, S. C., De Tezanos-Pinto, P., & Lutterbach, S. (2015). (How) Does positive and negative extended cross-group contact predict direct cross-group contact and intergroup attitudes? *European Journal of Social Psychology, 45*, 653–667.

Mendoza-Denton, R., & Page-Gould, E. (2008). Can cross-group friendships influence minority students' well-being at historically white universities? *Psychological Science, 19*, 933–939.

Mereish, E., & Poteat, V. P. (2015). Effects of heterosexuals' direct and extended friendships with sexual minorities on their attitudes and behaviors: Intergroup anxiety and attitude strength as mediators and moderators. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 45*, 147–157.

Monteith, M. J., & Spicer, C. V. (2000). Contents and correlates of Whites' and Blacks' racial attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36*, 125–154.

Oliner, S. P., & Oliner, P. M. (1988). *The altruistic personality: Rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe*. New York: Free Press.

Page-Gould, E., Mendoza-Denton, R., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). With a little help from my cross-group friend: Reducing anxiety in intergroup contexts through cross-group friendship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 1080–1094.

Page-Gould, E., Mendoza-Denton, R., Alegre, J. M., & Siy, J. O. (2010). Understanding the impact of cross-group friendship on interactions with novel outgroup members. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98*, 775–793.

Paluck, E. L. (2009). Reducing intergroup prejudice and conflict using the media: A field experiment in Rwanda. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*, 574–587.

Paolini, S., Harwood, J., & Rubin, M. (2010). Negative intergroup contact makes group memberships salient: Explaining why intergroup conflict endures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*, 1723–1738.

Paolini, S., Harwood, J., Rubin, M., Husnu, S., Joyce, N., & Hewstone, M. (2014). Positive and extensive intergroup contact in the past buffers against the disproportionate impact of negative contact in the present. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 44*, 548–562.

Paolini, S., Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., & Voci, A. (2004). Effects of direct and indirect cross-group friendships on judgments of Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland: The mediating role of an anxiety-reduction mechanism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 770–786.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*, 173–185.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65–85.

Pettigrew, T. F. (2008). Future directions for intergroup contact theory and research. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 32*, 187–199.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 38*, 922–934.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2011). *When groups meet: The dynamics of intergroup contact*. New York: Psychology Press.

Pettigrew, T. F., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2007). The predictors of anti-immigration attitudes. Comparing German results with those of Canada and the United States. *Du Bois Review, 4*, 19–39.

Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (2003). The antecedents and implications of interracial anxiety. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 790–801.

Powers, D. A., & Ellison, C. G. (1995). Interracial contact and black racial attitudes: The contact hypothesis and selectivity bias. *Social Forces, 74*, 205–226.

Ryan, C. S., Hunt, J. S., Weible, J. A., Peterson, C. R., & Casas, J. F. (2007). Multicultural and colorblind ideology, stereotypes, and ethnocentrism among Black and White Americans. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 10*, 617–637.

Saguy, T., Tausch, N., Dovidio, J. F., & Pratto, F. (2009). The irony of harmony: Intergroup contact can produce false expectations for equality. *Psychological Science, 20*, 114–121.

Saguy, T., Tausch, N., Dovidio, J. F., Pratto, F., & Singh, P. (2010). Tension and harmony in intergroup relations. In R. P. Shaver & M. Mikulincer (Eds.), *Understanding and reducing aggression, violence, and their consequences* (pp. 333–348). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Schofield, J. W., Hausmann, L. R. M., Ye, F., & Woods, R. L. (2010). Intergroup friendships on campus: Predicting close and casual friendships between White and African American first-year college students. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 13*, 585–602.

Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2006). Ethnic minorities' racial attitudes and contact experiences with white people. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 12*, 149–164.

Shelton, J. N., Richeson, J. A., & Vorauer, J. D. (2006). Threatened identities and interethnic interactions. *European Review of Social Psychology, 17*, 321–358.

Shnabel, N., Nadler, A., Ullrich, J., Dovidio, J. F., & Carmi, D. (2009). Promoting reconciliation through the satisfaction of the emotional needs of victimized and perpetrating group members: The needs-based model of reconciliation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*, 1021–1030.

Sigelman, L., & Tuch, S. A. (1997). Metastereotypes: Blacks' perceptions of Whites' stereotypes of Blacks. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 61*, 87–101.

Stephan, W. G., Boniecki, K. A., Ybarra, O., Bettencourt, A., Ervin, K. S., Jackson, L. A. . . . Renfro, C. L. (2002). The role of threats in the racial attitudes of Blacks and Whites. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 1242–1254.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues, 41*, 157–175.

Swart, H., Hewstone, M., Christ, O., & Voci, A. (2011). Affective mediators of intergroup contact: A three-wave longitudinal study in South Africa. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*, 1221–1238.

Tajfel, H., Billig, M. G., Bundy, R. P., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 1*, 149–178.

Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J., & Cairns, E. (2009). Intergroup trust in Northern Ireland. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*, 45–59.

Techakesari, P., Barlow, F. K., Hornsey, M. J., Sung, B., Thai, M., & Chak, J. L. Y. (2015). An investigation of positive and negative contact as predictors of intergroup attitudes in the United States, Hong Kong, and Thailand. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 46*, 454–468.

Tropp, L. R. (2003). The psychological impact of prejudice: Implications for intergroup contact. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 6*, 131–149.

Tropp, L. R. (2006). Stigma and intergroup contact among members of minority and majority status groups. In S. Levin & C. van Laar (Eds.), *Stigma and group inequality: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 171–191). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tropp, L. R. (2007). Perceived discrimination and interracial contact: Predicting interracial closeness among Black and White Americans. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 70*, 70–81.

Tropp L. R. (2008). The role of trust in intergroup contact: Its significance and implications for improving relations between groups. In U. Wagner, L. R. Tropp, G. Finchilescu, & C. Tredoux (Eds.), *Improving intergroup relations: Building on the legacy of Thomas F. Pettigrew* (pp. 91–106). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Tropp, L. R., & Bianchi, R. A. (2006). Valuing diversity and interest in intergroup contact. *Journal of Social Issues, 62*, 533–551.

Tropp, L. R., & Bianchi, R. A. (2007). Interpreting references to group membership in context: Feelings about intergroup contact depending on who says what to whom. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 37*, 153–170.

Tropp, L. R., Hawi, D. R., Van Laar, C., & Levin, S. (2012). Cross-ethnic friendships, perceived discrimination, and their effects on ethnic activism over time: A longitudinal investigation of three ethnic minority groups. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 51*, 257–272.

Tropp, L. R., Hawi, D., O'Brien, T. C., Gheorghiu, M., Zetes, A., & Butz, D. (under review). *Intergroup contact and the potential for post-conflict reconciliation: Studies in South Africa and Northern Ireland.*

Tropp, L. R., & Mallett, R. K. (2011). *Moving beyond prejudice reduction: Pathways to positive intergroup relations*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005a). Differential relationships between intergroup contact and affective and cognitive indicators of prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 1145–1158.

Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005b). Relationships between intergroup contact and prejudice among minority and majority status groups. *Psychological Science, 16*, 951–957.

Turner, R. N., Hewstone, M., & Voci, A. (2007). Reducing explicit and implicit outgroup prejudice via direct and extended contact: The mediating role of self-disclosure and intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*, 369–388.

Turner, R. N., Hewstone, M., Voci, A., & Vonofakou, C. (2008). A test of the extended intergroup contact hypothesis: The mediating role of intergroup anxiety, perceived ingroup and outgroup norms, and inclusion of the outgroup in the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 843–860.

Vezzali, L., Hewstone, M., Capozza, D., Giovannini, D., & Wölfer, R. (2014). Improving intergroup relations with extended and vicarious forms of indirect contact. *European Review of Social Psychology, 25*, 314–389.

Vezzali, L., Stathi, S., & Giovannini, D. (2012). Indirect contact through book reading: Improving adolescents' attitudes and behavioral intentions toward immigrants. *Psychology in the Schools, 49*, 148–162.

Vorauer, J. D. (2006). An information search model of evaluative concerns in intergroup interaction. *Psychological Review, 113*, 862–886.

Wagner, U., & Hewstone, M. (2012). Intergroup contact. In L. R. Tropp (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of intergroup conflict* (pp. 193–209). New York: Oxford University.

West, K., & Turner, R. N. (2014). Using extended contact to improve physiological responses and behavior toward people with schizophrenia. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 50*, 57–64.

Williams, R. M. Jr. (1947). *The reduction of intergroup tensions*. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Wolsko, C., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2000). Framing interethnic ideology: Effects of multicultural and color-blind perspectives on judgments of groups and individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 635–654.

Wright, S. C. (2001). Strategic collective action: Social psychology and social change. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes* (pp. 409–430). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Wright, S. C. (2009). Cross-group contact effects. In S. Otten, T. Kessler, & K. Sassenberg (Eds.), *Intergroup relations: The role of emotion and motivation* (pp. 262–283). New York: Psychology Press.

Wright, S. C., & Aron, A. (2010). The extended contact effect. In J. Levine & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *The encyclopedia of group processes and intergroup relations* (pp. 265–267). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 73–90.

Wright, S. C., Aron, A., & Brody, S. M. (2008). Extended contact and including others in the self: Building on the Allport/Pettigrew legacy. In U. Wagner, L. R. Tropp, G. Finchilescu, & C. Tredoux (Eds.), *Improving intergroup relations: Building on the legacy of Thomas F. Pettigrew* (pp. 143–159). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Wright, S. C., Aron, A., & Tropp, L. R. (2002). Including others (and their groups) in the self: Self-expansion theory and intergroup relations. In J. P. Forgas & K. Williams (Eds.), *The social self: Cognitive, interpersonal and intergroup perspectives* (pp. 343–363). Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

Wright, S. C. & Baray, G. (2012). Models of social change in social psychology: Collective action or prejudice reduction, conflict or harmony. In J. Dixon & M. Levine (Eds.), *Beyond prejudice: Extending the social psychology of intergroup conflict, inequality and social change* (pp. 225–247). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wright, S. C., Brody, S. M., & Aron, A. (2005). Intergroup contact: Still our best hope for improving intergroup relations. In C. S. Crandall & M. Schaller (Eds.), *The social psychology of prejudice: Historical perspectives* (pp. 115–142). Lawrence, KS: Lewinian Press.

Wright, S. C., & Lubensky, M. (2009). The struggle for social equality: Collective action vs. prejudice reduction. In S. Demoulin, J.-P. Leyens, & J. F. Dovidio (Eds.), *Intergroup misunderstandings: Impact of divergent social realities* (pp. 291–310). New York: Psychology Press.

Zagefka, H., González, R., & Brown, R. (2011). How minority members' perceptions of majority members' acculturation preferences shape minority members' own acculturation preferences: Evidence from Chile. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 50*, 216–233.