

Is Pluralism a Viable Model of Diversity? The Benefits and Limits of Subgroup Respect

Yuen J. Huo and Ludwin E. Molina
University of California, Los Angeles

In this paper, we focus on a key psychological principle underlying pluralism, *subgroup respect*, defined as feelings that one's subgroup is recognized, accepted, and valued by members of a common group (e.g. Americans' respect for various ethnic subgroups). Analyzing survey data collected from a large and diverse sample of respondents in two US cities (Oakland, California, and Los Angeles; $N = 1,229$), we found that subgroup respect was linked to more positive evaluations of America and its ethnic groups, but only among African Americans and Latinos. Among Whites, personal respect (i.e. how Americans feel about the individual) was a better predictor of the assessed attitudes (affect toward Americans, distrust of the justice system, and ingroup favoritism) than subgroup respect. Advocates of pluralism suggest that acknowledgment and regard for valued subgroup identities will have a unifying effect on the social system. The data here, while generally consistent with this perspective, suggests, however, that the unifying influence of subgroup respect is limited to members of ethnic minority groups.

KEYWORDS ethnic identity, intergroup attitudes, multiculturalism, national identity, subgroup relations, trust

'*E PLURIBUS UNUM*' ('Out of many one') was the motto on the first great seal of the United States and effectively captured the spirit of the enduring challenge faced by culturally diverse institutions. The debate about how to achieve unity amid diversity has centered around two distinct approaches—assimilation and pluralism (see Fredrickson, 1999 for a historical overview). Proponents of an assimilation strategy suggest that unity can be best achieved by redirecting attention away from subgroups toward a common identity. Over time,

subgroup attachments would fade and be replaced by loyalty to and positive feelings toward the common group and its members. An alternative approach, embodied by the pluralist (or multicultural) movement, proposes

Author's note

Address correspondence to Yuen Huo, Department of Psychology, University of California, Los Angeles, 4625 Franz Hall, Box 951563, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1563, USA [email: huoy@psych.ucla.edu]

that subgroup identities are a core component of individuals' self-concepts (especially among ethnic minority group members) and thus difficult to eradicate. Given this assumption, it has been argued that successful efforts to reduce group-based conflicts require the common group (e.g. nation state) to effectively convey to each ethnic subgroup that they are a valued component of the whole (for related discussion see Berry, 1991; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000b).

In this paper, we directly examine the validity of this latter strategy by focusing on a core psychological principle underlying pluralism—*subgroup respect*—which we define as feelings that one's subgroup is recognized, accepted, and valued by the members of the common group (i.e. the social category the subgroups share in common). Specifically, we suggest that feelings of subgroup respect should be linked to positive evaluations of the common group and tolerance of its subgroups—attitudes that are consistent with the larger goal of maintaining unity amid diversity.

Assimilation: Eradicating group-based distinctions

The ultimate goal of an assimilation strategy is to replace one set of ties and loyalties (e.g. culture of origin, ethnic group) with another (the nation-state or other collective identities). This line of thinking is quite consistent with research on social categorization effects. Empirical evidence supports the assimilation assumption that a common identity can facilitate both reductions in prejudice and greater social cooperation. In contrast, the salience of subgroup distinctions can have opposite effects.

This insight forms the basis of the common ingroup identity model of prejudice reduction and has been borne out in a series of experiments (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; Gaertner, Mann, Murrell, & Dovidio, 1989). The findings suggest that making a common identity salient reduces prejudice because it allows individuals to transform their mental representation of two separate groups (us vs. them) into one group (we). This recategorization into a common identity leads to improved attitudes toward

former outgroup members. In a similar vein, research on social dilemmas found that a focus on a common identity promotes greater willingness to cooperate with members of other subgroups (Kramer & Brewer, 1984; Wit & Kerr, 2002).

Pluralism: Acknowledging subgroup identities

More recently, studies have generated findings more consistent with the pluralist approach. One set of experiments manipulated the salience of self-relevant social identities and found that an emphasis on *both* the common and subgroup identities led to greater levels of prejudice reduction than a sole emphasis on the common identity (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000a). The experiments also produced some evidence suggesting that a sole focus on the common identity (implicitly neglecting a valued subgroup identity) motivates higher levels of attachment to the subgroup—creating conditions for separation and elevated prejudice. By demonstrating the importance of recognizing not only what subgroup members have in common but what distinguishes them, these findings lend support to the potential of a pluralist strategy.

Several explanations for the dual-salience effect have been offered. Following the logic of the Mutual Intergroup Differentiation Model (MIDM; Hewstone & Brown, 1986), Hornsey and Hogg (2000b) suggest that a sole focus on the common identity poses a form of identity threat to individuals. They argue that when a subgroup identity is a core component of the self, as is the case with ethnic identity, efforts to replace it with a common identity create a distinctiveness threat to which individuals respond by reasserting the threatened identity (see also Brewer, 1991). In other words, an emphasis on the common identity can have a boomerang effect—motivating a desire to defend the neglected subgroup and thus highlighting the very group differences the strategy was intended to attenuate. Barreto and Ellemers (2002) also point toward identity threat as an explanation by suggesting that individuals may

resist being categorized into a group that is discrepant with their self-view. For example, if a Latino sees himself in terms of his ethnic group membership, he may resist being categorized as just American.

Subgroup respect: A psychological principle underlying pluralism

Building on the work of identity processes in *intragroup* relations, we suggest that there is a key, but yet unexamined, explanation for why a pluralist (or dual identity) strategy may be successful in facilitating attitudes consistent with unity goals. This explanation is based on the psychological principle of *subgroup respect* which we view as an indicator of the extent to which an institution (the common group) acknowledges, accepts, and values each subgroup that comprises the whole.

The construct of respect arose out of the literature on group dynamics. Tyler, DeGoey, and Smith (1996) examined respect within the context of procedural justice research and found that individuals derived information about the extent to which they are respected members within a self-relevant group from the quality of their interactions with group authorities. Subsequent research suggests that information about respect can come not only from group authorities but also from other group members, and is linked to a number of pro-social attitudes including group-serving behavior (Branscombe, Spears, Ellemers, & Doosje, 2002; Simon & Sturmer, 2003; Smith & Tyler, 1997), willingness to engage in political participation (Boeckmann & Tyler, 2002), and cooperation with group members in a social dilemma (De Cremer, 2002).

Although the research on respect has been limited to investigations of individuals' connections to a single group and/or its representative authority, the social structure inherent in diverse communities suggests that feeling that one's subgroup is respected by the common group (e.g. work organization, nation) should influence the individual's attitudes and feelings toward both the collective and the subgroups within it. For example, research on organiz-

ational mergers and on power-sharing in politics suggests that including subgroups in the decision-making process leads subgroup members to perceive the decision-making process and its outcome as more fair and satisfactory (Azzi & Jost, 1997; Eggins, Haslam, & Reynolds, 2002).

Building on research on personal respect, we suggest that subgroup respect should motivate positive attitudes toward not only the common group but also other subgroups within it because it conveys the value of the subgroup, and by extension the individual, to the common group. In a broader sense, our argument finds support in the philosophical underpinnings of pluralism, which argues that successful integration must be a reciprocal process—not only must minority group members want to become a part of the larger collective, but the collective must value and welcome the diversity introduced by various subgroups (Glazer, 1997; Maalouf, 2003).

Our notion of subgroup respect is in accord with the construct of public collective self-esteem (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) and with work on the public regard component of Black identity development (Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous, 1998). Like these theoretically related concepts, we suggest that subgroup respect is an individual's subjective evaluation of others' acceptance and valuation of his/her subgroup identity.

One way in which our conceptualization differs from these related constructs is that we focus on feelings of respect from a group in which one is a member rather than from generalized others. Despite this conceptual distinction, at an empirical level measures of the three constructs may well be related and produce similar patterns of findings. However, because we are interested in comparing respect at the group versus personal level, we felt it would be most appropriate to adapt our measure of subgroup respect from measures of personal respect used in past research (Tyler et al., 1996). Another distinction between our work and related research on group-based evaluations is that these other programs of research have typically focused on treating the measures

as an outcome rather than a predictor variable (cf. Long & Spears, 1997; O'Brien et al., 2004).

The current study

Our goal in this study is to examine whether subgroup respect is associated with evaluations of the common category (i.e. the nation state) and of ethnic outgroups within that category. We first focus on individuals' evaluations of the social category they share with members of other subgroups. We do so because the quality of an individual's relationship to the common group is a key to maintaining social cohesion. Furthermore, such evaluations of the group have been the focus of work on personal respect.

We hypothesize that perceived subgroup respect should be associated with positive evaluations of the common category. This hypothesis is based on work on intragroup respect which suggests that respectful treatment communicates the individual's value to the group and thus strengthens the link between the self and the ingroup (Simon & Sturmer, 2003; Smith & Tyler, 1997). In the intergroup context, individuals, particularly minority group members, may be motivated to preserve the integrity of their subgroup because it provides an important basis for self-definition (Ethier & Deaux, 1994). Thus, the common category's communication of regard for the subgroup may offer the conduit that allows the transfer of commitment and positive evaluation from the subgroup onto the common group (Haslam, 2000).

In addition to evaluations of the common group, we examine the relationship between subgroup respect and ingroup favoritism—an outcome variable with important implications for relations among subgroups within a social system. Ingroup favoritism or a preference for one's ingroup over outgroup(s) is the traditional focus of social identity research on prejudice reduction. According to social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), an individual's primary strategy for securing a positive social identity is to establish positive distinctiveness of the ingroup vis-a-vis the outgroup. Thus, the process of engaging in ingroup favoritism satisfies two needs—to improve the standing of a

self-relevant social identity and to maintain the distinctiveness of one's subgroup identity. Consistent with the logic of the Mutual Intergroup Differentiation Model's interpretation of social identity theory (Hewstone & Brown, 1986), perceptions of subgroup respect can satisfy both of these needs because the value of the subgroup identity is acknowledged by the common group and in this process, the identity remains distinct.

The emphasis on the facilitative effects of strong common group identification and the detrimental effects of strong subgroup identification stems from work highlighting categorization processes (see Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000 for a discussion) and is consistent with an assimilation perspective. In contrast, subgroup respect, derived from the work on intragroup respect, focuses on how one's subgroup is viewed in the eyes of the common group as a whole and is consistent with a pluralist approach that emphasizes the importance of communicating regard for each subgroup that comprises the whole.

In our study, we examine both sets of predictions. However, we note that our goal is not to challenge the predictions derived from the categorization approach that has substantial support in the empirical literature. Rather, our intention is to examine whether perceptions of subgroup respect, highlighted in discussions of pluralism, would have the predicted effects after controlling for predictors derived from the alternative model.

In addition to evaluating these relationships of primary interest, two secondary predictions are examined. First, we explore the possibility that the influence of subgroup respect would be strongest among members of ethnic minority groups. For such individuals, their ethnic group membership may be particularly salient and meaningful, and thus they are more likely to define their sense of self and relationships with others in terms of this group membership (Crocker, Luhtanen, Blaine, & Broadnax, 1994; Smith & Leach, 2004). In contrast, ethnic group membership should be less relevant, if at all relevant, for dominant group members (i.e. Whites) because ethnicity has been of relatively little significance in their

experiences (Sears, Citrin, Cheleden, & van Laar, 1999). Thus, we will conduct analysis within each subsample included in our study: African Americans, Latinos, and Whites. This approach allows us to evaluate whether subgroup respect is particularly potent in determining attitudes among ethnic minority group members and less so among dominant group members. It also allows us to explore whether African Americans would be less responsive to social identity feedback about their subgroup than Latinos because of their long and unique history of experiences with racial discrimination in the US.

Second, we examine the relative utility of subgroup and personal respect in predicting attitudes toward the common group and its subgroups. This allows us to answer several important questions: (1) Is subgroup respect distinct from personal respect? (2) Is subgroup respect a more effective predictor for ethnic minority group members? and (3) Is personal respect, in contrast, a more effective predictor for members of the dominant group? It may be the case that for Whites (the dominant group), ethnicity and nation are overlapping social identities to such an extent that their relationship with other Americans is interpreted as one that occurs between members of the *same* group rather than as one that occurs between members of *different* groups—thereby making personal respect more relevant than subgroup respect (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999).

Method

Participants

The data came from telephone interviews conducted by the Survey Research Center at UC Berkeley in 1998. The survey drew a probability

sample of adult residents of two ethnically diverse cities in California (Oakland and Los Angeles) using a random digit telephone technique. The survey was designed to assess both general attitudes about ethnic relations and also more specific attitudes about individuals' one-on-one contact with legal authorities in their communities.¹

Inclusion in the study was restricted to adults who identified themselves as ethnically White/European American, Black/African American, or Hispanic/Latino American. Individuals were given the option of responding to the survey either in English or Spanish. The complete sample consisted of 1,656 respondents (78.9% response rate). To establish a baseline for comparison purposes, only US born respondents were retained for analysis. This left a total of 1,229 respondents: 533 African Americans, 190 Latinos, and 506 Whites.

Information about gender, education, income, and employment status for each ethnic group is presented in Table 1. There were clear group differences on the socio-economic variables. The two ethnic minority samples were characterized by lower levels of education attainment and income and higher levels of unemployment compared with the White sample.

Measures

There were four main predictors: American identification, ethnic identification, subgroup respect, and personal respect. In terms of outcome variables, we included a measure of affect toward Americans as a global indicator of evaluations of the common group. We also included a second, more concrete indicator in the form of a composite measure of distrust for the American justice system. We felt that this second variable was a reasonable indicator of

Table 1. Demographic breakdown

	African Americans	Latinos	Whites
Gender (% women)	60%	50%	51%
Education (% college graduates)	18%	19%	57%
Income (% with family income > \$50K)	26%	28%	48%
Employment status (% unemployed)	10%	11%	7%

evaluations of America because it captured attitudes toward an important institution that represents the common group. Moreover, because of the way in which participants were selected, all of them had direct experiences with the justice system. Thus, their attitudes were linked to actual experiences. Lastly, we included a measure of ingroup favoritism as an indicator of evaluations of ethnic outgroups in America. Each measure is described in detail below. Unless otherwise indicated, response options range from (1) *disagree strongly* to (4) *agree strongly*.

American identification Two items measured identification with the common group (America): 'I am proud to be an American'; and 'What America stands for is important to me'. The two items were collapsed into a single index: African Americans ($\alpha = .77$), Latinos ($\alpha = .77$), and Whites ($\alpha = .81$).

Ethnic identification Two items measured identification with the respondent's ethnic subgroup. These items paralleled the items measuring identification with America: 'I am proud to be [respondent's ethnic group]'; and 'What [respondent's ethnic group] community stands for is important to me'. The two items were collapsed into a single index: African Americans ($\alpha = .52$), Latinos ($\alpha = .76$), and Whites ($\alpha = .77$).

Subgroup respect (i.e. Americans' respect for respondent's ethnic group) The subgroup respect items were adapted from measures of personal respect validated in prior research (Tyler et al., 1996). Three items measured the extent to which Americans respect the respondent's ethnic subgroup: 'Most Americans respect what most [respondent's ethnic group] have accomplished in life'; 'Most Americans approve of how most [respondent's ethnic group] live their lives'; and 'Most Americans value the opinions and ideas of most [respondent's ethnic group]'. The three items were collapsed into a single index: African Americans ($\alpha = .83$), Latinos ($\alpha = .82$), and Whites ($\alpha = .80$).

Personal respect (i.e. Americans' respect for the individual) Three items measured the extent to which Americans respect the individual respondent. These items paralleled the subgroup respect items. However, the items were preceded by a qualifying stem ('If they knew me'). In prior research, Tyler et al. (1996) added the stem because respondents generally found it more natural to respond about how a large collective of people feel about them as individuals when the question was amended with the qualifier. The three items were: 'If they knew me, most Americans would respect what I have accomplished in my life'; 'If they knew me, most Americans would approve of how I live my life'; and 'If they knew me, most Americans would value my opinions and ideas'. The three items were collapsed into a single index: African Americans ($\alpha = .83$), Latinos ($\alpha = .84$), and Whites ($\alpha = .80$).

Affect toward Americans Affect toward Americans was assessed with a feeling thermometer. Respondents were asked to rate Americans on a scale from 0 to 10 with higher numbers representing warmer, more favorable feelings and lower numbers representing colder, less favorable feelings.

Distrust in America's justice system Three items measured the extent to which the respondent expressed lack of trust in America's justice system: 'The law represents the values of the people in power, rather than the values of people like me'; 'People in power use the law to try to control people like me'; and 'The law does not protect my interests'. The three items were collapsed into a single index: African Americans ($\alpha = .70$), Latinos ($\alpha = .75$), and Whites ($\alpha = .77$).²

Ingroup favoritism Attitudes about each ethnic subgroup were assessed with feeling thermometers. Respondents were asked to rate four ethnic groups (Whites, Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks) on a scale from 0 to 10 with higher numbers representing warmer, more favorable feelings and lower numbers representing colder, less favorable feelings. The order of

presentation of groups was varied such that respondents always rated their own ethnic group last. Our indicator of intergroup attitudes was generated by averaging ratings toward all ethnic outgroups and subtracting that averaged index from respondents' ratings of their ethnic ingroup (see Sidanius, Feshbach, Levin, & Pratto, 1997 for a similar approach).

Results

Summary statistics and intercorrelations by ethnic group for the main variables included in this study are presented in Table 2 and Table 3 respectively. An alpha level of .05 was used to evaluate the reliability of all statistical tests.

Preliminary analyses

We begin by examining the main variables for differences in group means. Such analysis is informative on its own and is also helpful in suggesting whether to follow a group-based approach in evaluating the study's hypotheses. Analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were performed on each variable included in the study, with ethnic group as the between-subject variable. There were significant effects for ethnic group on each variable. The significant main effects were followed up by Duncan's post hoc comparisons. Group means and standard deviations are presented alongside the *F* ratios in Table 2.

To begin, we evaluate whether there are systematic group differences in the four primary

predictor variables: American identification, ethnic identification, subgroup respect, and personal respect. As Table 2 shows, somewhat surprisingly, neither African Americans nor Latinos differed significantly from Whites in their level of American identification. However, the mean level of American identification was lower for African Americans compared to Latinos.

More consistent with general expectations, African Americans and Latinos reported higher levels of ethnic identification and lower levels of subgroup respect compared to Whites. The two minority groups did not differ significantly from each other on either ethnic identification or subgroup respect. African Americans and Latinos also did not differ in their reported levels of personal respect. However, compared to Whites, each minority group reported higher levels of personal respect.

On the dependent measures, African Americans reported less positive evaluations of Americans than either Latinos or Whites, who did not differ significantly from each other. African Americans reported the highest level of distrust in the American justice system followed by Latinos and Whites. Finally, African Americans and Latinos did not differ significantly in their levels of ingroup favoritism. But they each reported higher levels of ingroup favoritism compared to Whites.

In sum, there appeared to be reliable differences among the three ethnic groups in terms of both the predictor and the dependent variables, although the nature of the group-based

Table 2. Mean scores and standard deviations for main variables

Variables	African Americans	Latinos	Whites	One-way ANOVA
American identification	3.49 (0.73) ^a	3.63 (0.61) ^b	3.55 (0.65) ^{ab}	F(2,1225) = 3.27*
Ethnic identification	3.84 (0.37) ^a	3.76 (0.53) ^a	2.56 (0.88) ^b	F(2,1209) = 552.86**
Subgroup respect	2.28 (0.82) ^a	2.32 (0.77) ^a	2.73 (0.59) ^b	F(2,1219) = 77.29**
Personal respect	3.39 (0.66) ^a	3.27 (0.66) ^a	3.14 (0.62) ^b	F(2,1223) = 18.60**
Positive affect toward Americans	6.68 (2.03) ^a	7.12 (1.94) ^b	7.17 (1.62) ^b	F(2,1223) = 9.66**
Distrust of the justice system	2.87 (0.83) ^a	2.67 (0.86) ^b	2.41 (0.80) ^c	F(2,1225) = 39.20**
Ingroup favoritism	1.04 (1.84) ^a	0.86 (1.51) ^a	0.10 (1.09) ^b	F(2,1218) = 52.84**

Notes: The *F* values represent the results of a one-way ANOVA to test for ethnic group differences (* *p* < .05; ** *p* < .01). Means within rows not having a common superscript differ at *p* < .05 using Duncan's post hoc test.

Table 3. Correlations for main variables by ethnic group

		1. American identification	2. Ethnic identification	3. Subgroup respect	4. Personal respect	5. Positive affect toward Americans	6. Distrust of justice system	7. Ingroup favoritism
1. American identification	AFA	–						
	LAT	–						
	WHT	–						
2. Ethnic identification	AFA	.20**	–					
	LAT	.05	–					
	WHT	.40**	–					
3. Subgroup respect	AFA	.33**	.11**	–				
	LAT	.24**	.20**	–				
	WHT	.05	.20**	–				
4. Personal respect	AFA	.32**	.29**	.23**	–			
	LAT	.38**	.24**	.39**	–			
	WHT	.41**	.32**	.16**	–			
5. Positive affect toward Americans	AFA	.38**	.16**	.30**	.20**	–		
	LAT	.42**	–.02	.32**	.23**	–		
	WHT	.49**	.34**	.13**	.35**	–		
6. Distrust of justice system	AFA	–.23**	–.08 ⁺	–.21**	–.07	–.27**	–	
	LAT	–.15*	.04	–.20**	–.15*	–.29**	–	
	WHT	–.22**	–.05	.02	–.18**	–.22**	–	
7. Ingroup favoritism	AFA	–.18**	.13**	–.15**	.02	–.07 ⁺	.09*	–
	LAT	–.22**	.25**	–.19**	–.14 ⁺	–.34**	.17**	–
	WHT	.22**	.34**	.09*	.16**	.20**	.02	–

⁺ $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Note: AFA (African Americans), LAT (Latinos), and WHT (Whites).

differences changed across variables. In particular, although there were consistent differences between Whites and each of the two ethnic minority groups, there were sometimes but not always consistent differences between African Americans and Latinos. Thus, a prudent approach would be to test the main hypotheses within each ethnic group.

Before moving on to the primary analyses, we also conducted exploratory factor analyses to evaluate whether the four conceptually distinct constructs included as main predictors (national identification, ethnic subgroup identification, subgroup respect, and personal respect) can be empirically distinguished from one another. When the sample was considered as a whole, factor analysis using Promax (oblique) rotation produced a four-factor solution, which together accounted for 65.47% of the total variance. All items loaded on their conceptually appropriate factors. Factor analysis conducted within each ethnic subsample produced similar findings. Thus, the data support our view that national identification, ethnic subgroup identification, subgroup respect, and personal respect represent empirically distinct constructs.³

Testing the core assumptions of assimilation and pluralism

Two sets of questions motivate our analysis. The first is motivated by the assimilation model, which suggests that patterns of social identification that highlight common group membership and deemphasize subgroup differences would be most effective in shaping attitudes consistent with a unity goal. Thus, two predictions can be derived: (1) identification with the nation should predict more positive affect toward Americans, lower levels of distrust in the justice system, and lower levels of ingroup favoritism; (2) in contrast, ethnic subgroup identification should have the opposite relationship with each of these variables. The second question is motivated by the pluralism perspective and derives from work on intra-group respect, which suggests that perceptions that others in the nation value and respect one's ethnic group should predict more

positive evaluations of the common group and other subgroups within it.

Hierarchical regression analysis was used to address these questions. Because preliminary analyses indicated reliable group-based differences in the main variables, the subsequent analyses were run separately for each ethnic group. We test the predictions derived from the assimilation model by entering national and ethnic identification in the first step. To test the prediction derived from the pluralism model, we entered subgroup respect in a second step. This approach seems reasonable given that our goal was not to refute the claims of the assimilation model but to evaluate whether subgroup respect has predictive value beyond what can be accounted for by national and ethnic identification.

In all models, background variables including gender, education, income, and employment status were entered as control variables. It should be noted that regression models that excluded the control variables produced essentially the same results. For the sake of completeness, results from the models that included the control variables are presented. Participants with missing data were dropped from analysis involving that measure. Consequently, the number of cases in each analysis may vary. The results, by ethnic group, are presented in Table 4 (affective evaluations of Americans), Table 5 (distrust in the American justice system), and Table 6 (ingroup favoritism).

Affect toward Americans In the first step of the analysis, American identification and ethnic identification were entered simultaneously into a regression equation to predict affect towards Americans. A separate model was run for each ethnic group. As Table 4 indicates, these main effects accounted for a significant amount of variance in all three ethnic groups. In all cases, American identification significantly predicted more positive affect. Ethnic identification did not predict affect responses among the ethnic minority groups. However, among Whites, ethnic identification significantly predicted more positive affect toward Americans. In a second step, subgroup respect was added. The

Table 4. American identification, ethnic identification, and subgroup respect predicting positive affect toward Americans

Predictors	African Americans		Latinos		Whites	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
American identification	.36**	.30**	.45**	.37**	.42**	.42**
Ethnic identification	.08 ⁺	.08 ⁺	-.03	-.09	.17**	.16**
Subgroup respect	-	.17**	-	.33**	-	.08 ⁺
R ²	.15**	.17**	.20**	.29**	.28**	.29**

⁺ $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Notes: Except as otherwise noted, numerical entries represent standardized regression coefficients. Background variables (gender, education, income, employment status) were entered as control variables in all models. Removing the control variables produced essentially the same results.

addition of this predictor produced a significant increase in the variance accounted for over the first model among both African Americans (R^2 change = .025; $F(1, 468) = 14.32, p < .001$) and Latinos (R^2 change = .085; $F(1, 170) = 20.27, p < .001$). In each case, subgroup respect was associated with more positive affect toward Americans. Among Whites, the addition of subgroup respect was associated with a marginally significant increase in variance (R^2 change = .006; $F(1, 432) = 3.53, p = .061$).

Distrust of the justice system We followed the analysis approach described above to evaluate the relationship between our predictors and distrust of the justice system. In the first step of the analysis, American identification and ethnic identification were entered simultaneously into a regression equation to predict distrust of the

justice system. As Table 5 indicates, these main effects accounted for a significant amount of variance among African Americans and Whites but not among Latinos. In all cases, American identification was associated with lower levels of distrust.

However, once subgroup respect was added in the second step, the relationship between American identification and distrust was no longer significant among Latinos, but it remained significant for African Americans and for Whites. In no case did ethnic identification predict distrust of the justice system. The addition of subgroup respect in a second step produced a significant increase in the variance accounted for over the first model among both African Americans (R^2 change = .024; $F(1, 468) = 12.21, p = .001$) and Latinos (R^2 change = .060; $F(1, 170) = 11.34, p = .001$). In each case,

Table 5. American identification, ethnic identification, and subgroup respect predicting distrust of the justice system

Predictors	African Americans		Latinos		Whites	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
American identification	-.22**	-.17**	-.17**	-.11	-.22**	-.22**
Ethnic identification	-.02	-.02	.04	.08	.01	.02
Subgroup respect	-	-.17**	-	-.27**	-	-.03
R ²	.06**	.08**	.05	.11**	.10**	.10**

⁺ $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Notes: Except as otherwise noted, numerical entries represent standardized regression coefficients. Background variables (gender, education, income, employment status) were entered as control variables in all models. Removing the control variables produced essentially the same results.

subgroup respect was associated with lower levels of distrust in the justice system. Among Whites, the addition of subgroup respect was not associated with a significant increase in the variance (R^2 change = .002; $F(1, 433) = .60, p > .100$).

Ingroup favoritism Again, in the first step of the analysis, American identification and ethnic identification were entered simultaneously into a regression equation to predict ingroup favoritism. As Table 6 indicates, these main effects accounted for a significant amount of variance in all three ethnic groups. American identification significantly predicted lower levels of ingroup favoritism, but only among African Americans and Latinos. Among Whites, the relationship, although not statistically reliable, was in the opposite direction such that American identification was associated with higher levels of ingroup favoritism. In contrast, ethnic identification significantly predicted higher levels of ingroup favoritism among all three ethnic groups.

In a second step, subgroup respect was added. The addition of this predictor produced a significant increase in the variance accounted for over the first model among both African Americans (R^2 change = .008; $F(1, 468) = 3.94, p = .048$) and Latinos (R^2 change = .055; $F(1, 170) = 11.57, p = .001$). In each case, subgroup respect was associated with lower levels of ingroup favoritism. Among Whites, the addition of subgroup respect was not associated with a significant increase in the variance (R^2 change = .002; $F(1, 429) = 1.02, p > .100$).

Does ethnic group membership moderate the relationship between subgroup respect and the outcome variables?

The pattern of data described above suggests that subgroup respect is associated with more positive affect toward Americans (Table 4), less distrust in the justice system (Table 5), and lower levels of ingroup favoritism (Table 6) among African Americans and Latinos but not among Whites. We evaluate this apparent interaction through a series of hierarchical regressions.

Although we hypothesized that subgroup respect would be a stronger predictor among ethnic minorities in general, the data patterns in the regression tables suggest that subgroup respect may be a stronger predictor among Latinos compared to African Americans ($\beta = .33$ vs. $.17$ for affect toward Americans; $\beta = -.27$ vs. $-.17$ for distrust; and $\beta = -.26$ vs. $-.09$ for ingroup favoritism). Thus, we did not collapse our analysis across the two ethnic minority groups. Instead, we first conducted an analysis to compare African Americans to Whites and then a separate set of analyses to compare Latinos to Whites. Finally, we conducted a third set of analyses comparing the two ethnic minority groups.

Separate analyses were run for each outcome variable within each set of comparisons. To test for differences in magnitude of effect for subgroup respect within each set of group-based comparisons, we followed Aiken & West (1991). In each regression, the centered subgroup respect variable and a dummy code

Table 6. American identification, ethnic identification, and subgroup respect predicting ingroup favoritism

Predictors	African Americans		Latinos		Whites	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
American identification	-.23**	-.19**	-.29**	-.22**	.06	.06
Ethnic identification	.18**	.18**	.25**	.30**	.31**	.30**
Subgroup respect	-	-.09*	-	-.26**	-	.05
R^2	.09**	.10**	.14**	.19**	.13**	.13**

+ $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Notes: Except as otherwise noted, numerical entries represent standardized regression coefficients. Background variables (gender, education, income, employment status) were entered as control variables in all models. Removing the control variables produced essentially the same results.

representing the relevant comparison groups were entered into a first step followed by a term representing the interaction between these two variables in a second step.

We first compared whether African Americans and Whites differed in terms of the strength of the relationship between subgroup respect and each of the outcome variables. We conducted hierarchical regression analysis in which the main effects of the centered subgroup respect variable and the dummy coding representing African Americans vs. Whites were entered into a first step followed by the interaction between the two in the second step. For affect toward Americans, the added variance introduced in the second step was marginally significant (R^2 change = .003; $F(1, 921) = 3.18, p = .075$; β (interaction term) = .07, $p = .075$). For the other two outcome variables, the addition of the interaction term in the second step each produced a significant increase in variance: distrust in the justice system (R^2 change = .004; $F(1, 921) = 4.63, p = .032$; β (interaction term) = .08, $p = .032$); and ingroup favoritism (R^2 change = .012; $F(1, 918) = 12.47, p < .001$; β (interaction term) = .13, $p < .001$). Simple slopes analyses were not conducted because the earlier regression analyses by ethnic group (Tables 4, 5, and 6) already showed that subgroup respect was a stronger predictor of the outcome variables among African Americans than among Whites (marginally so in the case of evaluations of Americans).

We conducted a similar analysis comparing the predictive value of subgroup respect among Latinos and Whites. Again, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted in which the main effects of the centered subgroup respect variable and the dummy code representing Latinos vs. Whites were entered into a first step followed by the interaction between the two in the second step. The addition of the interaction term in the second step resulted in a significant increase in variance accounted for in each of the three regressions: affect toward Americans (R^2 change = .011; $F(1, 623) = 3.94, p = .007$; β (interaction term) = .16, $p = .007$); distrust of the justice system (R^2 change = .009; $F(1, 624) = 3.94, p = .015$; β (interaction term) = .15, $p =$

.015); and ingroup favoritism (R^2 change = .029; $F(1, 620) = 20.25, p < .001$; β (interaction term) = .27, $p < .001$). Again, simple slopes analyses were not conducted because the earlier regression analyses by ethnic group already showed that across all three outcome variables, subgroup respect was a stronger predictor among Latinos than among Whites.

Lastly, we compared African Americans with Latinos using a similar approach as the two previous sets of comparisons. Although the pattern of regression coefficients presented in Tables 4, 5, and 6 suggest that subgroup respect is a stronger predictor among Latinos relative to African Americans, neither the added variance introduced in the second step nor the interaction terms, themselves, were statistically reliable in predicting any of the three outcome variables (all $ps > .100$).

Subgroup respect vs. personal respect

The findings described suggest that subgroup respect is a more potent predictor among ethnic minority group members than among dominant group members. This finding raises the question, why? One possible way to understand why subgroup respect is *not* predictive among Whites is to consider how their experiences as part of the dominant group in the USA are different from the experiences of ethnic minorities. In the USA where there is a clear dominant group (Whites), the category of Americans and of Whites may be conflated. Thus, for Whites, their relationship with Americans may be viewed as one that occurs in an *intragroup* context (between an individual and his/her ingroup). In contrast, for ethnic minorities, their relationship with other Americans may be viewed as one that occurs in an *intergroup* context (between their subgroup and a common group defined primarily by Whites). Thus, while ethnic minorities may seek information about whether Americans value their ethnic group (subgroup respect), Whites may turn, instead, to information about whether Americans value them as individual members of the ingroup (personal respect).

To investigate this possibility, we conducted a series of regression analyses entering subgroup

respect and personal respect simultaneously into the equation to predict each of the three outcome variables. Following our earlier approach, separate analyses were conducted for each ethnic group. The findings in Table 7 indicate that among African Americans and Latinos, subgroup respect was a stronger predictor of each of the outcome variables than was personal respect. The opposite pattern was found for Whites. Among this latter group, personal respect was a stronger predictor than was subgroup respect.

Discussion

We introduced the construct of subgroup respect as the extent to which a common group accepts and values each subgroup that it is composed of. Relying on survey data gleaned from telephone interviews with a large and diverse sample of adults (African Americans, Latinos, and Whites), we found that subgroup respect was a coherent and reliable construct among members of each of the three ethnic groups considered. More importantly, we found that subgroup respect was related to both evaluations of the common group as well as subgroups within it.

Among African Americans and Latinos, greater perceived subgroup respect was associated with more positive affect toward Americans,

less distrust of the American justice system, and lower levels of ingroup favoritism. Among Whites, however, there was no significant relationship between subgroup respect and any of the assessed attitudes. Thus, our findings, while consistent with the pluralist premise that acknowledging and valuing subgroup identities promote unity, also suggest that the reach of this strategy may be limited to members of ethnic minority groups.

In contrast, our study offers strong support for at least one of the primary predictions of the alternative, assimilationist model of diversity—that common group identification facilitates attitudes consistent with a unity goal. American identification was, for the most part, associated with more positive affect toward Americans, less distrust for the justice system, and less ingroup favoritism. There were, however, two notable exceptions. First, American identification was not reliably associated with less distrust among Latinos, although the relationship was in the same direction as the two other ethnic groups. Second, American identification was not reliably associated with ingroup favoritism among Whites. Interestingly, however, this relationship was in the opposite direction of the relationship demonstrated among the two ethnic minority groups. Among Whites, American identification was associated with a nonsignificant *increase* ($p > .10$) in ingroup favoritism.

Table 7. Subgroup respect and personal respect predicting positive affect toward Americans, distrust of the justice system, and ingroup favoritism

Predictors	Dependent variables								
	Positive affect toward Americans			Distrust of the justice system			Ingroup favoritism		
	AFA	LAT	WHT	AFA	LAT	WHT	AFA	LAT	WHT
Subgroup respect	.24**	.36**	.09*	-.22**	-.25**	-.03	-.15**	-.23**	.08 ⁺
Personal respect	.17**	.12	.31**	-.03	-.07	-.16**	.03	-.09	.13**
R ²	.11**	.17**	.14**	.06**	.10**	.08**	.04**	.07*	.05**

⁺ $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Notes: AFA (African Americans), LAT (Latinos), and WHT (Whites). Except as otherwise noted, numerical entries represent standardized regression coefficients. Background variables (gender, education, income, employment status) were entered as control variables in all models. Removing the control variables produced essentially the same results.

This asymmetry between American identification and ingroup favoritism for Whites versus the two ethnic minority groups is consistent with findings from research documenting the different motives driving dominant versus subordinate groups. Mummendey and Wenzel (1999) suggest that the dominant group has a tendency to regard itself as the prototype of the common category. Since their conception of the common group does not include the other subgroups, greater common group identification would lead to higher rather than lower levels of ingroup favoritism (see also Lipponen, Helkama, & Juslin, 2003).

In addition to the important role assigned to common group identification, assimilation proponents also warn of the divisive effects of strong subgroup attachment. The support in our data for this prediction is mixed. Across the three ethnic groups in our sample, ethnic identification was associated with greater ingroup favoritism. However, ethnic identification was unrelated to distrust in the justice system among all ethnic groups. It was also unrelated to evaluations of Americans among African Americans and Latinos, although this relationship was positive among Whites.

Given the history of struggles among ethnic minorities in the USA, we should expect to see, if anything, a negative relationship between ethnic identification and evaluations of Americans (Sidanius et al., 1997) among ethnic minority group members. However, this was the case only among Latinos—but the relationship was not statistically reliable. Thus, our data suggest that subgroup attachment is problematic primarily because it is associated with a greater tendency to prefer one's ingroup over all others.

One of the most interesting and potentially important findings of our study is that subgroup respect was associated with evaluations of America and its subgroups but only among ethnic minority group members. Although subgroup respect was a coherent and distinct construct among both Whites and the two ethnic minority groups, among Whites it was unrelated to any of our outcome variables.

We speculate that there are at least two reasons why subgroup respect is a potent pre-

dictor among ethnic minorities but not among dominant group members. First, subgroup identities are much more salient and self-relevant for members of minority groups, as indicated by significantly higher levels of ethnic group attachment among African Americans and Latinos compared to Whites. Thus, members of ethnic minority groups may be more likely to interpret their experiences in terms of their group membership. Second, respect can be thought of as an indicator of one's worth in the eyes of others, especially members of a self-relevant group (Smith & Tyler, 1997; see Emler & Hopkins, 1990 for a similar argument about social reputation). In this way, members of groups whose collective identity and status are uncertain or called into question (i.e. non-dominant groups) may be most aware of and responsive to information about how they are viewed by members of the common group.

Moreover, while we found that subgroup respect was not related to any of our outcome variables among Whites, *personal* respect was. This pattern of finding suggests that Whites perceive their relationship to other Americans differently than ethnic group minorities do. For Whites, the relationship may be conceived as one that occurs between members of the same ingroup—thus the focus is on personal respect. For minorities, the relationship may be conceived as one that occurs between different groups and thus the focus is on group-level respect. There is some indirect support for this logic in the pattern of positive correlations between national and ethnic identity which tends to be stronger among Whites than among either of the ethnic minority groups: $r(\text{Whites}) = .40$; $r(\text{African Americans}) = .20$; and $r(\text{Latinos}) = .05$.⁴

Limitations and future directions

Our research findings are based on cross-sectional data gleaned from telephone interviews with individuals. A distinct advantage of this approach is that it allows us to base our analyses on the opinions of a large and diverse sample of adult respondents. However, the limitation of data generated by this method is that

it constrains our ability to answer some theoretically important questions that can be best addressed in controlled experiments.

In particular, our study raises two important questions which we hope will be addressed in future research. The first has to do with reconciling our conception of respect with that adopted in other lines of research. Branscombe et al. (2002), for example, in their related work introduced a distinction between respect (positive evaluation of the individual from an ingroup) and prestige (positive evaluation of the ingroup from an outgroup). Although we also distinguish between intragroup and intergroup evaluations, our concept of respect (at both levels) differs from Branscombe et al.'s perspective in an important way. In their work, both forms of evaluations are operationalized in terms of affect (i.e. how much you and your ingroup are liked). In contrast, we conceive of respect as being accepted and valued *in addition* to being liked.

Research on prejudice suggests that one can be liked but not viewed as worthwhile or valued (e.g. paternalistic sexism; Fiske, Xu, Cuddy, & Glick, 1999). Moreover, Duckitt (2003) suggests that true tolerance and acceptance is based on perceiving the target group not only as good and likable but also of equal worth and value. We believe this distinction is important and hope that the question of whether being valued is required in addition to being liked in order to generate feelings of respect can be parsed out in future experiments that orthogonally manipulate these basic elements.

Another potentially important question that needs to be addressed experimentally is how diversity messages from institutions affect the relationship between subgroup respect and evaluations of the institution and its subgroups. The group-value model (Lind & Tyler, 1988), upon which our work is based, suggests that making salient common group membership would enhance the effect of personal respect on group-oriented attitudes and behavioral intentions (see also Ellemers, Doosje, & Spears, 2004). This prediction stems from theorizing about an intragroup context in which only one social category is relevant. However, in the

context of subgroup relations where multiple social categories are relevant, the same strategy could produce quite different results.

A number of recent studies have demonstrated that focusing solely on (i.e. making salient) the common identity would backfire as a strategy for creating unity because such efforts also communicate devaluation, or at the very least, neglect of a self-relevant subgroup identity (e.g. Barreto & Ellemers, 2002; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000b). In a recent paper (Huo, Molina, Sawahata, & Deang, 2005), we argued that when a valued self-identity is rejected by an institution, the individual's trust in that institution would be broken. As a consequence, the influence of respect or social feedback on group-oriented attitudes, if any, would be attenuated, whether at the personal or the group-level. Thus, although identity processes are implicated at both the personal and the group-level, they operate in distinct ways. We draw our concept of subgroup respect from a theory of intragroup relations. However, to understand the conditions under which subgroup respect operates require us to recognize the complexity introduced by multiple levels of social identity.

The benefits and limits of subgroup respect: implications for the management of diversity

Our study highlights the importance of considering subgroup respect in discussions about the consequences of different diversity strategies. A common concern about a pluralistic approach to diversity is that it would reify group boundaries and result in social fragmentation (see discussion in Brewer, 1997). Our findings suggest that, if anything, the opposite may be true when pluralism is conceived of not as assigning primary importance to subgroup identities, but as a way of bridging the divide between subgroup and the common group. The importance of ethnic identity as a core component of the self for minority group members was recently recognized in a 2004 human development report from the United Nations Development Programme, which recommended building more inclusive societies by adopting multicultural policies that explicitly

recognized cultural differences (United Nations Development Programme, p. 2).

But before we fully endorse a pluralist model for subgroup relations, we should consider the fact that subgroup respect may not serve a similar function for members of a dominant group. Thus, although we offer some insights into the benefits of pluralism for social cohesion, our model tells only part of the story. For dominant group members, evaluations of the common group and tolerance of ethnic minority group members can, perhaps, be better understood in terms of their relationship with the common group as individuals rather than as representatives of a subgroup. Respect for the dominant group, as a whole, has very little consequence, if any, on members' attitudes.

The ideals of pluralism were based, in part, on the assumption that subgroups are equal partners in the common pursuit of unity (Berry, 1991). In societies where a single group dominates over all others, the optimism of pluralism's advocates may need to be tempered somewhat. Adopting diversity policies that value and hold in regard each subgroup that comprises the whole, rather than neglecting this fundamental need for group respect, will earn the loyalty of newcomers to the society as well as members of historically disenfranchised groups. However, this approach may fall short of the full pluralist ideal, in that it fails to motivate similar commitment to unity among perhaps the most problematic group—the one that holds the most influence and power over society as a whole.

Notes

1. Only those with a recent experience with legal authorities were interviewed. The most frequently reported experience was calling the police (54%), followed by being stopped by the police—primarily for traffic related incidents (32%), and then by going to court (14%). The overall pattern of reporting was similar across the three ethnic groups. Thus, although the sampling strategy was not designed to produce a sample representative of the entire community from which the respondents were drawn, the resulting sample does represent a diverse cross-section of residents

who, in the course of their everyday lives, have had casual encounters with the legal system. For more information about the sample, see Tyler & Huo (2002).

2. Although the items were not framed explicitly in terms of the law as an American institution, theories of social regulation argue that the law is generally viewed by people as an institution that represents the nation-state (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999; Tyler & Huo, 2002).
3. Complete details regarding the factor analysis are available from the corresponding author.
4. Drawing from the same legal authorities study, Huo (2003) also examined the relationship between national and ethnic identity. Unlike the present analysis which excluded non-native born respondents, Huo (2003) based the analysis on the entire sample (native and foreign born) and reported the following correlations: $r = .41$ for Whites; $r = .37$ for African Americans; and $r = .25$ for Latinos. These correlations tend to be slightly higher than those presented here. Despite differences in strength of correlations, the relationships were all in a positive direction, whether based on the entire sample or just on the native born subsample.

Acknowledgments

Portions of this research were presented at the 5th Biennial Convention of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, June 25–26, 2004, Washington D.C. The data reported in this study are part of a larger data set collected with funding by the National Science Foundation's Law and Society Program and the Public Policy Institute of California. The authors wish to thank the anonymous reviewers, Michael Hogg, and especially Heather Smith for their thoughtful and valuable feedback on earlier versions of this paper.

References

- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Azzi, A. E., & Jost, J. T. (1997). Votes without power: Procedural justice as mutual control in majority–minority relations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 27*, 124–155.
- Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2002). The impact of respect versus neglect of self-identities on identification and group loyalty. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 629–639.

- Berry, J. W. (1991). Understanding and managing multiculturalism: Some possible implications of research in Canada. *Psychology and Developing Societies*, 3, 17–49.
- Boeckmann, R. J., & Tyler, T. R. (2002). Trust, respect and the psychology of political engagement. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32, 2067–2088.
- Branscombe, N. R., Spears, R., Ellemers, N., & Doosje, B. (2002). Intragroup and intergroup evaluation effects on group behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 744–753.
- Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17, 475–482.
- Brewer, M. B. (1997). The social psychology of intergroup relations: Can research inform practice? *Journal of Social Issues*, 53, 197–211.
- Crocker, J., Luhtanen, R., Blaine, B., & Broadnax. (1994). Collective self-esteem and psychological well-being among white, black, and Asian college students. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 503–513.
- De Cremer, D. (2002). Respect and cooperation in social dilemmas: The importance of feeling included. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 1335–1341.
- Duckitt, J. (2003). Prejudice and intergroup hostility. In D. O. Sears, L. Huddy, & R. Jervis (Eds.), *Political psychology* (pp. 559–600). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Eggers, 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.
- Ellemers, N., Doosje, B., & Spears, R. (2004). Sources of respect: The effects of being liked by ingroups and outgroups. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 34, 155–172.
- Emler, N., & Hopkins, N. (1990). Reputation, social identity and the self. In D. Abrams & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity theory: Constructive and critical advances* (pp. 113–130). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Ethier, K. A., & Deaux, K. (1994). Negotiating social identity when contexts change: Maintaining identification and responding to threat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 243–251.
- Fiske, S., Xu, J., Cuddy, A., & Glick, P. (1999). (Dis)respecting versus (dis)liking: Status and interdependence predict ambivalent stereotypes of competence and warmth. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 473–489.
- Fredrickson, G. M. (1999). Models of American ethnic relations: A historical perspective. In D. A. Prentice & D. T. Miller (Eds.), *Cultural divides: Understanding and overcoming group conflict* (pp. 23–34). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Gaertner, S. L., Mann, J., Murrell, A., & Dovidio, J. F. (1989). Reducing intergroup bias: The benefits of recategorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 239–249.
- Glazer, N. (1997). *We are all multiculturalists now*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Haslam, S. A. (2000). *Psychology in organizations: The social identity approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hewstone, M., & Brown, R. (1986). Contact is not enough: An intergroup perspective. In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters* (pp. 1–44). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000a). Subgroup relations: A comparison of mutual intergroup differentiation and common ingroup identity models of prejudice reduction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 242–256.
- Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000b). Assimilation and diversity: An integrative model of subgroup relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4, 143–156.
- Huo, Y. J. (2003). Procedural justice, identity, and social regulation across group boundaries: Does subgroup loyalty undermine relationship-based governance? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 336–348.
- Huo, Y. J., Molina, L. E., Sawahata, R., & Deang, J. M. (2005). Leadership and the management of conflicts in diverse groups: Why acknowledging versus neglecting subgroup identity matters. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 237–254.
- Kramer, R. M., & Brewer, M. B. (1984). Effects of group identity on resource use in a simulated commons dilemma. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 1044–1057.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Lipponen, J., Helkama, K., & Juslin, M. (2003). Subgroup identification, superordinate identification and intergroup bias between the subgroups. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 6, 239–250.
- Long, K., & Spears, R. (1997). The self-esteem hypothesis revisited: Differentiation and the disaffected. In R. Spears, P. J. Oakes, N. Ellemers,

- & S. A. Haslam (Eds.), *The social psychology of stereotyping and group life* (pp. 296–317). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*, 302–318.
- Maalouf, A. (2003). *In the name of identity: Violence and the need to belong*. New York: Penguin.
- Mummendey, A., & Wenzel, M. (1999). Social discrimination and tolerance in intergroup relations: Reactions to intergroup difference. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3*, 158–174.
- O'Brien, A. T., Haslam, S. A., Jetten, J., Humphrey, L., O'Sullivan, L., Postmes, T. et al. (2004). Cynicism and disengagement among devalued employee groups: The need to ASPIRE. *Career Development International, 9*, 28–44.
- Sears, D., Citrin, J., Cheleden, S. V., & van Laar, C. (1999). Cultural diversity and multicultural politics: Is ethnic balkanization psychologically inevitable? In D. A. Prentice & D. T. Miller (Eds.), *Cultural divides: Understanding and overcoming group conflict* (pp. 35–79). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Sellers, R. M., Smith, M. A., Shelton, J. N., Rowley, S. A. J., & Chavous, T. M. (1998). Multidimensional model of racial identity: A reconceptualization of African American racial identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 2*, 18–39.
- Sidanius, J., Feshbach, S., Levin, S., & Pratto, F. (1997). The interface between ethnic and national attachment: Ethnic pluralism or ethnic dominance. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 61*, 103–133.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Simon, B., & Sturmer, S. (2003). Respect for group members: Intragroup determinants of collective identification and group-serving behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 183–193.
- Smith, H. J., & Leach, C. W. (2004). Group membership and everyday social comparisons. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 34*, 297–308.
- Smith, H. J., & Tyler, T. R. (1997). Choosing the right pond: The impact of group membership on self-esteem and group-oriented behavior. *Journal of Experimental and Social Psychology, 33*, 146–170.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Tyler, T. R., Degoey, P., & Smith, H. (1996). Understanding why the justice of group procedures matters: A test of the psychological dynamics of the group-value model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 913–930.
- Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. J. (2002). *Trust in the law: Encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2004). Overview: Cultural liberty in today's diverse world. In *Human development report 2004*. Retrieved May 9 2006 from <http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/>.
- Wit, A. P., & Kerr, N. L. (2002). "Me vs. just us vs. us all." Categorization and cooperation in nested social dilemmas. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 616–637.

Paper received 9 September 2004; revised version accepted 9 February 2005.

Biographical notes

YUEN J. HUO received her Ph.D. in social psychology from the University of California, Berkeley and is currently associate professor of psychology at the University of California, Los Angeles. Her research focus on the psychology of groups and organizations and examine how conflicts arise in response to perceived injustice, the role of social evaluation in shaping cooperation and well-being, and the psychological and societal consequences of different diversity strategies. She is a member of the Governing Council of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues.

LUDWIN EDGARDO MOLINA is currently a doctoral student in the social psychology program at University of California, Los Angeles. His research focuses on issues of multiculturalism, social identity, and social dominance. His research is being supported by the UCLA Graduate Research Mentorship Program Fellowship.