University of Groningen

Urban district identity as a common ingroup identity

Ufkes, Elze G.; Otten, Sabine; Van der Zee, Karen I.; Giebels, Ellen; Dovidio, John F.

Published in:
European Journal of Social Psychology

DOI:
[10.1002/ejsp.1888](https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.1888)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2012

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Ufkes, E. G., Otten, S., Van der Zee, K. I., Giebels, E., & Dovidio, J. F. (2012). Urban district identity as a common ingroup identity: The different role of ingroup prototypicality for minority and majority groups. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(6), 706-716. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.1888>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Research article

Urban district identity as a common ingroup identity: The different role of ingroup prototypicality for minority and majority groups

ELZE G. UFKES^{1*,†}, SABINE OTTEN¹, KAREN I. VAN DER ZEE², ELLEN GIEBELS³ AND JOHN F. DOVIDIO⁴

¹Department of Social Psychology, University of Groningen, the Netherlands; ²Department of Organizational Psychology, University of Groningen, the Netherlands; ³Department Psychology of Conflict, Risk & Safety, University of Twente, the Netherlands; ⁴Department of Psychology, Yale University, USA

Abstract

In this paper, we examined how identification with urban districts as a common ingroup identity and perceived ingroup prototypicality influence the attitudes of residents toward other ethnic groups in their neighborhood. The overall conclusion of two field studies (N = 214 and N = 98) is that for majority-group members, there may be a positive relation between identification with an overarching identity and outgroup attitudes but only when they perceive their ingroup as low in prototypicality for the overarching group (Study 1 and 2). Conversely, for minority-group members, there may be a positive relation between identification and outgroup attitudes but only when they perceive their ingroup as high in prototypicality for the overarching group (Study 2). Outgroup prototypicality did not moderate the relation between identification and outgroup attitudes. Copyright © 2012 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

In many western societies, cultural diversity is expected to increase over the upcoming decades (e.g., Eurostat, 2010; U. S. Census Bureau, 2008). As such, contact between individuals from different cultural backgrounds will increase in all domains of life, whether it is in organizations, schools, or neighborhoods (Putnam, 2000). Although cultural diversity potentially leads to a more dynamic and interesting world, it also comes with the risk that people categorize others in terms of their cultural background and perceive the groups competitively (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999; Putnam, 2007). The classic work of Allport (1954) and Tajfel (1969) identified how easily differences between groups can lead to the categorizations of others into “us” versus “them,” or “ingroups” versus “outgroups.” As a consequence, social categorization processes provide the psychological basis for many intergroup conflicts (e.g., Brown, 1995; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). These processes may be especially relevant for culturally diverse neighborhoods, where individuals from many different cultural backgrounds live in close proximity yet remain relatively anonymous to each other (Putnam, 2000, 2007). The goal of the present paper is to combine insights from two models—the common ingroup identity model (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000) and the ingroup projection model (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999)—that make predictions about how recategorizing outgroup members as fellow members of a superordinate category may prevent negative outgroup attitudes in such contexts. Specifically, we investigated the specific conditions (in terms of perceived ingroup prototypicality) under which

urban district identities can function as a common ingroup identity and as such improve outgroup attitudes for both cultural majority- and minority-group members.

Common Ingroup Identities and Ingroup versus Outgroup Prototypicality

Social categorization processes are flexible (Turner, 1987), and people can identify with many different social categories. This is a central premise of the common ingroup identity model (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000), which proposes *recategorization* for a way of improving intergroup relations: Intergroup attitudes can be improved by stimulating subgroups members’ identification with a higher-order social category, which includes one’s own and other subgroups (Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachman, & Rust, 1993). Once members of a former outgroup are recategorized as ingroup members within such a broader, common ingroup identity, attitudes toward former outgroup members would be improved through the same processes that underlie ingroup favoritism. Indeed, in the past two decades many studies, in the laboratory as well as in various field contexts such as organizations, schools, and mixed families, have demonstrated that the perception of a common ingroup identity can lead to improved intergroup attitudes (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000, 2009; Dovidio, Gaertner, & Saguy, 2007; see Gaertner & Dovidio, 2009 for a review).

*Correspondence to: Elze G. Ufkes, Department Psychology of Conflict, Risk & Safety, University of Twente, PO Box 217, 7500 AE, Enschede, the Netherlands. E-mail: e.g.ufkes@utwente.nl

†Elze G. Ufkes is now at the Department Psychology of Conflict, Risk & Safety, University of Twente, the Netherlands.

However, superordinate social categories can also provide group members with a new platform for making intergroup comparisons. That is, in situations in which two or more subgroups are included within a common ingroup, members of the different subgroups can vary in their perceptions of what an ideal-type member of this common ingroup may look like. According to the ingroup projection model, group members tend to perceive their ingroup as more prototypical of a relevant superordinate category than other subgroups (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999; Waldzus, Mummendey, Wenzel, & Weber, 2003). For instance, in the case of urban districts majorities may see the district as typical "White," whereas minorities may see the same district as typical "Moroccan" or "Black." Perceiving one's subgroup as most prototypical for an overarching category potentially creates a situation in which outgroups can be objectively included in an overarching social identity but are compared with—and negatively differentiated from—ingroup standards. A higher degree of perceived ingroup prototypicality therefore usually relates to more negative outgroup attitudes (Waldzus & Mummendey, 2003; Waldzus, Mummendey, & Wenzel, 2005; Waldzus et al., 2003; Wenzel, Mummendey, Weber, & Waldzus, 2003; see Wenzel, Mummendey, & Waldzus, 2007 for a review).

Majority and Minority Perspectives on Perceived Subgroup Prototypicality

Although the ingroup projection model predicts that subgroup members generally have the tendency to perceive their own subgroup as most prototypical for a common ingroup (Wenzel et al., 2007), these perceptions may also be affected by reality constraints (Waldzus, Mummendey, Wenzel, & Boettcher, 2004). That is, in situations in which subgroups within a superordinate group clearly differ in size, status, or power, members of different subgroups may actually agree that the differences between these groups represent the social reality (Devos & Banaji, 2005; Mummendey & Otten, 2001; Waldzus et al., 2004; Weber, Mummendey, & Waldzus, 2002). As Waldzus et al. (2004) explain, "ingroup projection is not incompatible with an adaptive perception of social reality" (p. 396).

Consequently, majority-group members are likely to perceive their own group as most prototypical not only because of ingroup projection but also because it is consistent with the reality of the situation. Minority-group members, however, may be less prone to claim that they are more prototypical for the common ingroup than majority-group members, because of reality constraints. For instance, in a study among Germans, East Germans (the minority) agreed that West Germans (the majority) were more prototypical for the common ingroup (Germany; Waldzus et al., 2004). In line with these former results, in the present study we expected that in multicultural urban districts members of the cultural majority would perceive their subgroup as most prototypical but that members of cultural minorities would not. However, not claiming the prototype of an overarching category for one's ingroup does not necessarily imply that minority-group members will not claim a certain level of ingroup prototypicality at all—after all, a sufficient degree of prototypicality ensures that they actually belong to the common ingroup. Claiming that their group is somewhat prototypical while acknowledging that the majority group is equally

prototypical of the common ingroup should be quite possible. Therefore, the first hypotheses tested in this study is that, whereas members of the majority group would perceive their ingroup as clearly most prototypical for their urban district, members of minority groups would perceive their ingroup and the majority group as equivalently prototypical (*Hypothesis 1*).

The Different Role of Group Prototypicality for Minority and Majority Groups for Outgroup Attitudes

Beyond extending the results from Waldzus et al. (2004) to a context of multicultural city districts, the aim of the current studies was to integrate the common ingroup identity model and the ingroup projection model. Although identification and perceived ingroup prototypicality are related constructs, there are also important differences. That is, identification can be defined as a self-categorization that includes the self in the group (Turner, 1987). Ingroup prototypicality, by contrast, is defined as a categorization of one's ingroup in a given—overarching—category (Wenzel et al., 2007). Thus, whereas identification is about the relation between the self and a group, ingroup prototypicality involves the relation between a group and another—higher order—group. Moreover, these two constructs can operate independently. For instance, a White American may perceive Whites as prototypical for the United States (US) but not necessarily strongly identify with the US. At the same time a Black American may perceive Blacks as non-prototypical for the US but identify strongly with the US.

On the basis of the combined insights from the common ingroup identity model and the ingroup projection model, we propose that whether identification with an overarching category relates to more positive outgroup attitudes depends on how prototypical one's own and other subgroups are perceived for the overarching category. Specifically, in the present work, we investigated how perceived group prototypicality, and in Study 2 also groups status, moderate the positive relation between identification with an overarching category and outgroup attitudes (Dovidio et al., 2007). We expected that when comparing members of majority groups to members of minority groups, perceived ingroup prototypicality may have opposite implications for the relation between identification with an overarching category and outgroup attitudes.

Majority-Group Members, Ingroup and Outgroup Prototypicality, and Outgroup Attitudes

For majority-group members, a high level of perceived *ingroup prototypicality* implies that the overarching category is merely representative for their ingroup. In that case, other subgroups indeed may be objectively included in the overarching category but still be compared with the standards of the majority group (see Wenzel et al., 2007). Consequently, identification with such an overarching identity should not be expected to lead to more positive outgroup attitudes. By contrast, if members of majority groups *do not* make strong claims on an overarching identity (i.e., have lower ingroup prototypicality perceptions), there should be more room to see this category as a true *common* ingroup—which can be shared with other (minority) subgroups. For majority-group members, we thus hypothesized that identification with an overarching identity would be positively

related to outgroup attitudes but only when perceived *ingroup* prototypicality is low (*Hypothesis 2*).

This reasoning further suggests that, in addition to perceived *ingroup* prototypicality, perceived *outgroup* prototypicality may moderate the impact of identification with the overarching category on outgroup attitudes as well. Specifically, the stronger people's identification with a common group that is seen as relatively high in outgroup prototypicality, the more their association with this common *ingroup* would be expected to promote positive outgroup attitudes. This common identity would be seen as strongly inclusive of other groups. We therefore also hypothesized for *majority-group members* that identification with an overarching identity would be more positively related to outgroup attitudes when perceived outgroup prototypicality is higher (*Hypothesis 3*). In Study 1, we test these hypotheses, with respect of the integration of the common *ingroup* identity and *ingroup* projection models, while focusing on majority-group members.

Minority-Group Members, Ingroup and Outgroup Prototypicality, and Outgroup Attitudes

For minority-group members, however, there may be different concerns with respect to whether or not an overarching category will be perceived as a common *ingroup*. That is, an important question for minority-group members is whether or not their subgroup is accepted and included by the majority group (Bergsieker, Shelton, & Richeson, 2010; Van Oudenhoven, Prins, & Buunk, 1998). Therefore, for minorities the question may not so much be whether there is room to include other groups into an overarching category but whether their own *ingroup* is included. This implies that perceiving one's minority *ingroup* as low in prototypicality may actually result in an image of the overarching category that is merely representative for the majority group—thereby questioning that it is in fact a *common ingroup*. For minority-group members, a high level of perceived *ingroup* prototypicality may thus be a necessary condition for seeing an overarching identity as relevant for their own subgroup. For minority-group members, we therefore hypothesized that identification with a common *ingroup* identity would be positively related to outgroup attitudes primarily when perceived *ingroup* prototypicality is high (*Hypothesis 4*).

Furthermore, similar to our prediction for majority-group members, higher perceptions of outgroup prototypicality would mean, for minority-group members as well, that they see the common *ingroup* as more inclusive for the outgroup. We therefore expected, in line with the common *ingroup* identity model, that minorities who more strongly identify with a common group that is highly prototypical of the outgroup, will have more positive attitudes. For minority-group members, we thus hypothesized that identification with a common *ingroup* identity would also be positively related to outgroup attitudes when *outgroup* prototypicality is high (*Hypothesis 5*). For the relation between outgroup prototypicality and outgroup attitudes, we thus do not expect to find differences between majority and minority-group members.

The Current Studies

We tested these hypotheses in two studies conducted in various multicultural city districts in the Netherlands. City

districts are geographically and objectively determined areas within a city. Unlike neighborhoods (which are subjectively defined), the borders of a city district are indicated on the city map, city districts have an official name, and most importantly, residents are aware in which district they live and have an image of whom else is living in these districts (Scientific Council for Government Policy, 2005). For these reasons, we investigated whether city districts can function as a common *ingroup* identity for residents of culturally diverse neighborhoods.

In the Netherlands, a district is considered to be culturally diverse when 25% or more of the residents have a non-western background (Statistics Netherlands, 2010). In the current studies, we made a distinction between residents with a native-Dutch background (the cultural majority) and residents with a non-western background (the cultural minority; see Luijters, Van der Zee, & Otten, 2008 for a similar approach). The group non-western immigrants is defined by Statistics Netherlands (2010) as people who themselves, or of whom at least one parent, was born in Turkey, Africa, Latin America, or Asia (except Japan and Indonesia). The largest non-western immigrant groups in the Netherlands are in order: Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese, and Antilleans (Statistics Netherlands, 2010). Importantly, in most culturally diverse districts in the Netherlands, the native-Dutch still are the largest group of residents in terms of numbers. The distinction between majorities and minorities in these studies therefore refers to both group size and status, with respect to both the city districts studied as well as the Dutch society in general.

The aim of the two studies presented in the current paper was to examine how the integrated insights from the common *ingroup* identity model and the *ingroup* projection model can help to predict the intergroup attitudes of members of majority groups and minority groups. Because of the difficulties in collecting data among minority participants in the first study, Study 1 focused only on the hypothesized processes for majority-group members. Study 2 was designed to replicate the results from Study 1 with majority-group members in a different district and to extend Study 1 by testing the predictions for cultural minority-group residents in that district.

STUDY 1

For Study 1, we assessed native-Dutch residents' identification with their urban district (common *ingroup*) and perceived prototypicality of the subgroups for the common *ingroup*. Perceived *ingroup* prototypicality refers to the extent to which residents perceive their own cultural group as prototypical for their city district. Perceived outgroup prototypicality refers to the extent to which residents perceive other cultural groups as prototypical for their district. We also assessed their attitudes to the two largest minority groups in the district, Turks and Moroccans. We first tested whether native-Dutch residents (majority-group members) would perceive their *ingroup* as more prototypical for their urban district compared with the minority subgroups (*Hypothesis 1*). We then examined whether the relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes indeed was moderated by *ingroup* prototypicality (*Hypothesis 2*) and/or outgroup prototypicality (*Hypothesis 3*).

Method

Participants and Procedure

Participants of this study were 214 native-Dutch residents of a multicultural city district in a medium-sized city in the Netherlands. Of these, 47% were men, 53% were women. The mean age was 45 years (ranging from 19 to 100; $SD = 16.92$). To collect the data for this study, we went to several public places and door-to-door to invite residents of a multicultural city district to participate in our study. According to Statistics Netherlands (2010), 29% of the residents in this district had a non-western cultural background. We invited residents who were 18 years old or older to complete the survey and send it back using a pre-paid return envelope. In return, participants had a chance of winning one of five mp3-players. Of the total number of questionnaires that were distributed, approximately 13% were returned. Given the low overall response rate, and even lower rate of participation by minorities specifically (only 12% of the respondents indicated a non-western cultural background), a sufficient sample of minorities was not available for Study 1.

Measures

Participants' identification with their urban district was measured with three items: "I am glad to be a resident of [name district]", "It feels good to be a resident of [name district]", and "I think [name district] is a pleasant district to live". Participants answered these questions on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (*totally disagree*) to 6 (*totally agree*). We created a district identification scale by aggregating the scores on these three items, $\alpha = .89$.

Perceived prototypicality was assessed by participants' agreement (1 = *totally disagree* to 6 = *totally agree*) to the statements: "The [native-Dutch/Moroccans/Turks] are representative for [name district]," and "The typical resident of [name district] has a [Dutch/Moroccan/Turkish] background" (Waldzus et al., 2003). We combined participants' answers on the two items referring to their own group into an *ingroup prototypicality* scale, $r(215) = .53$, $p < .001$, and the items referring to Moroccan and Turk groups into an *outgroup prototypicality* scale, $\alpha = .82$.

We measured *outgroup attitudes* toward Moroccans and Turks with three items for each group ("How positive is your image of [ethnic group] in [name city district]?" and "In general, how competent/friendly do you think [members of ethnic group] in [name city district] are?" (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002). Participants answered the questions on a 6-point

scale. The anchors differed per question. For the positivity question, the scale ranged from 1 (*negative*) to 6 (*positive*), for the friendliness question the scale ranged from 1 (*unfriendly*) to 6 (*friendly*), and for the competence question, the scale from 1 (*incompetent*) to 6 (*competent*). These items together formed a reliable scale for outgroup attitudes ($\alpha = .87$). See Table 1 for an overview of the scale means, standard deviations, and inter-scale correlations.

Results

Perceived Ingroup Prototypicality

First, we tested Hypothesis 1, that native-Dutch participants would perceive their cultural group as more prototypical than minority groups. To this end, we conducted a repeated-measure ANOVA with perceived ingroup prototypicality and perceived outgroup prototypicality as a within-subject factor. The results showed a highly significant difference between perceived ingroup and outgroup prototypicality, $F(1, 213) = 66.41$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.24$. Native-Dutch participants perceived their subgroup to be more prototypical for their urban district than minority groups (Table 1). We thus found support for the prediction that native-Dutch residents perceive their cultural group as more prototypical for their district than minority groups.

District Identification, Subgroup Prototypicality and Outgroup Attitudes

We then investigated the zero-order correlations between district identity, ingroup and outgroup prototypicality, and outgroup attitudes (Table 1). Consistent with the common ingroup identity model, district identity was significantly and positively correlated with outgroup attitudes. In addition, consistent with Ullrich (2009), outgroup prototypicality was also positively correlated with outgroup attitudes, although this was not significant.

Moreover, for the present study, we specifically hypothesized that the positive relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes would be moderated by perceived ingroup and/or outgroup prototypicality. That is, we predicted a positive relation between identification and outgroup attitudes when perceived ingroup prototypicality was low (Hypothesis 2) and/or perceived outgroup prototypicality is high (Hypothesis 3). We tested this prediction with a regression model with the standardized scores of district identification, ingroup prototypicality, outgroup prototypicality, and the two hypothesized interaction terms as predictors. The dependent variable

Table 1. Scale means, standard deviations, and inter-scale correlations, Study 1

Variable	1	2	3	4
Native-Dutch ($N = 214$)				
1. Ingroup prototypicality	3.71 (1.24)	0.20**	0.16*	0.05
2. Outgroup prototypicality		2.89 (1.08)	-0.03	0.11
3. District identification			3.85 (1.21)	0.29**
4. Outgroup attitudes				3.25 (1.00)

Note: The numbers on the table diagonal represent the scale means with the standard deviations within parentheses.

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

was outgroup attitudes. As noted before, there was a significant direct relation between identification with the urban district and outgroup attitudes, $\beta = .28$, $t(208) = 4.32$, $p < .001$. More importantly, this effect was qualified by the predicted two-way interaction between identification and ingroup prototypicality, $\beta = -.28$, $t(208) = -4.39$, $p < .001$.

Simple slopes analyses (Aiken & West, 1991) revealed, in line with Hypothesis 2, that when majority-group members perceived their ingroup as low in prototypicality (estimated at -1 SD), there was a significant positive relation between identification and outgroup attitudes, $\beta = .57$, $t(208) = 6.04$, $p < .001$. When perceived ingroup prototypicality was high (estimated at $+1$ SD), however, the relation between identification with the superordinate group and outgroup attitudes was not significant, $\beta = -.01$, $t(208) = -0.04$, $p = .971$ (Figure 1). Together, these results thus support the idea that for majority-group members identification with a common ingroup identity is related to more positive attitudes toward other subgroups but only when majorities perceive their subgroup as low in prototypicality.

With respect to Hypothesis 3, the interaction between identification and outgroup prototypicality was not significant, $\beta = -.01$, $t(208) = -0.06$, $p = .955$. Outgroup prototypicality thus did not moderate the relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes.

Discussion

This study investigated three hypotheses derived from integrating insights from the common ingroup identity model and ingroup projection model to predict majority-group members' attitudes toward minority groups. Specifically, on the basis of these two models, we predicted that the relation between identification with a common ingroup and outgroup attitudes would be moderated by perceptions of subgroup prototypicality. The results showed, in line with Hypothesis 1, that majority-group members perceived their own group as more prototypical than they perceive minority groups in their district. This finding is in line with the idea that group members are motivated to see their own subgroup as most prototypical within a shared category, as suggested by the

ingroup projection model. However, it is also important to note that this finding is also in line with the idea that prototypicality perceptions are affected by the social reality (Waldzus et al., 2004).

In addition, we found support for the prediction that identification with an overarching district identity would be positively related to residents' outgroup attitudes. Majority-group members were more positive toward outgroups when they identified more strongly with their urban district (common identity). More importantly, the results showed that ingroup prototypicality, but not outgroup prototypicality, moderated this relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes.

That is, in line with Hypothesis 2, the results showed that the positive relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes was restricted to those who perceive their ingroup as low in prototypicality for their urban district. Although these results are in support of our predictions, we do note that, as illustrated in Figure 1, participants with high perceived ingroup prototypicality had more positive outgroup attitudes than expected. Previous research has shown that high levels of perceived ingroup prototypicality are associated with generally negative outgroup attitudes (Wenzel et al., 2007). Perhaps one reason was that the urban district we studied was one in which multicultural relations were quite positive overall, and thus participants' responses were anchored by this "reality." Additionally, the prediction that perceived outgroup prototypicality would positively moderate the relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes (Hypothesis 3) was not supported. Also, although the direct relation between outgroup prototypicality and outgroup attitudes was positive, this correlation was not significant. This is surprising because most previous research did find a positive relation (Wenzel et al., 2007; Ullrich, 2009). For these reasons, in Study 2, we included a different measure of ingroup and outgroup prototypicality perceptions. Nevertheless, the current results provide initial evidence demonstrating that integrating the implications from both the common ingroup identity model and the ingroup projection model can produce novel and more specific predictions about when collective identities may contribute to more positive intergroup attitudes.

Figure 1. The interaction effect of perceived ingroup prototypicality and district identification on outgroup attitudes for native-Dutch participants, Study 1

STUDY 2

In the first study, we found for majority-group members that perceived ingroup prototypicality moderated the relation between identification with an overarching category and outgroup attitudes. Study 2 examined intergroup relations in an urban district that had comparable minority-group and majority-group proportions as the district of Study 1 (Statistics Netherlands, 2010). In addition, for this study, we oversampled minority-group respondents to ensure a comparable number of participants with a majority and a minority background. Thirdly, in Study 2, ingroup and outgroup prototypicality were assessed using a different measure than the items used in Study 1.

The first aim of Study 2 was replicating the findings of Study 1 with respect to majority group members. The second

aim of Study 2 was to examine how the findings of Study 1 are further moderated by group status. Specifically, in Study 2, we tested the predictions that majority-group members would perceive their ingroup as most prototypical for their urban district, but, because of reality constraints (Waldzus et al., 2004), minority groups members would not perceive their ingroup as more prototypical than the majority outgroup (Hypothesis 1). We further hypothesized that for majority-group members the relation between identification with a common ingroup and outgroup attitudes would be positive when perceived ingroup prototypicality is low (Hypothesis 2), but for minority-group members, the relation between identification with a common ingroup and outgroup attitudes would be positive when perceived ingroup prototypicality is high (Hypothesis 4). To recapitulate, these predictions are based on the rationale that majority-group members typically perceive the ingroup as highly prototypical, therefore for majorities decreased perceptions of ingroup prototypicality would make the common ingroup representative for their group as well as minority outgroups. Minority-group members typically perceive their ingroup as less prototypical, and therefore for minority-group members, increased ingroup prototypicality perceptions would imply that their subgroup is included in the common ingroup, as well. We also predicted for both majority-group and minority-group members that perceived outgroup prototypicality would positively moderate the relation between identification and outgroup attitudes. Specifically, we predicted that for both groups that identification with a common ingroup identity would be positively related to outgroup attitudes when *outgroup* prototypicality is high (Hypotheses 3 and 5).

Method

Participants and Procedure

Participants were 121 residents of two multicultural city districts in the Netherlands. Of these, 48% were men, and 46% were women (6% unknown). The mean age of the participants was 40 years, ranging from 18 to 92 ($SD = 14.36$). We classified participants with a native-Dutch background as majority-group members and participants with a non-western background as minority-group members (also see, Luijters et al., 2008). We omitted 23 (19%) participants, who did not indicate an ethnic background, indicated a non-Dutch *western* background, or did not complete one of the central measures from further analyses. The total N for analyses therefore was 98. There were 53 participants with a native-Dutch background (54%) and 45 with a non-western minority background (46%; of which 17% was Antillean; 7% Moroccan; 60% Turkish; and 16% Surinamese). While recognizing important social differences among these groups, because the percentages of minority-group participants other than Turkish participants were limited (no more than 17% of the minority sample, and 9% of the total sample were Antillean, Moroccan, or Surinamese participants), we combined all of the non-western minority-group respondents for the analyses.

The data were collected at various public places (e.g., parks, street corners, and in front of local stores) located in two city districts. These districts were different districts than the one in Study 1, situated in the same city. Both districts

were comparable in terms of cultural diversity (respectively, 31% and 27% of the residents had a non-western background; Statistics Netherlands, 2010). To ensure that the subsamples of participants with a native-Dutch and non-western minority background would be comparable in terms of size, we alternately approached residents from both groups and asked them to complete the questionnaire on the spot. We solely included residents of the respective district who were 18 years or older. It took participants approximately 10 minutes to complete the survey. Approximately 10% of the people approached agreed to participate.

Measures

Unless noted otherwise, participants answered the questions on a 7-centimeter thermometer line. We processed the answers on these scales by measuring the distance from the left anchor to the place where participants checked the line in tenths of centimeters. Scale scores therefore ranged from 0 to 7.

We measured *identification* with residents' urban district using the satisfaction (e.g., "It is pleasant to be a resident of [name district]") and centrality (e.g., "I often think about the fact that I am a resident of [name district]") components of ingroup identification as suggested by Leach et al. (2008). The scale ran from 0 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). We created an urban district identification scale by aggregating the answers to all 7 items, $\alpha = .84$.

In addition, we measured participants' *perceived prototypicality* for five cultural groups (Moroccans, Turks, Antilleans, Surinamese, and Dutch) for their urban district. To this end, we used an adapted version of the overlap of self, ingroup, and outgroup scale (Schubert & Otten, 2002; see Waldzus & Mummendey, 2003). For each subgroup, we had a one-item measure, consisting of seven diagrams of two increasingly overlapping circles. One circle was labeled with the name of the subgroup and the other with the name of the urban district. From top to bottom, the circles got closer, starting with a gap between them, touching each other in the third diagram and completely overlapping in the seventh diagram. Participants were instructed to indicate what picture best represented the closeness of the subgroup and their urban district. A score of 1 thus represented the lowest perceived prototypicality and a score of 7 the highest perceived prototypicality. We constructed an ingroup prototypicality scale out of the item that referred to the ingroup of the participant. In addition, we constructed an outgroup prototypicality scale by aggregating all scores, except the one referring to the ingroup of the participant ($\alpha = .81$).

Attitudes toward Antilleans, Moroccans, Dutch, Turks, and Surinamese were measured with two items: "To what extent do you have a positive/negative image of [cultural group]." The scale ran from 0 (*not at all positive/negative*) to 7 (*extremely positive/negative*). We reversed the answers of the negativity scale and then constructed an outgroup attitude scale by aggregating all scores, except the one referring to one's own group ($\alpha = .82$). See Table 2 for an overview of the scale means, standard deviations, and inter-scale correlations.

Table 2. Scale means, standard deviations, and inter-scale correlations, Study 2

Variables	1	2	3	4
Native-Dutch ($n = 53$)				
1. Ingroup prototypicality	4.67 (1.80)	0.37**	0.40**	0.02
2. Outgroup prototypicality		3.49 (1.67)	0.13	0.47**
3. District identification			3.19 (1.39)	0.13
4. Outgroup attitudes				4.10 (1.16)
Non-western Minorities ($n = 45$)				
1. Ingroup prototypicality	4.16 (1.82)	0.25 [†]	0.46**	0.09
2. Outgroup prototypicality		3.53 (1.20)	0.27 [†]	0.12
3. District identification			3.80 (1.15)	0.30*
4. Outgroup attitudes				4.07 (1.17)

Note: The numbers on the table diagonal represent the scale means with the standard deviations within parentheses.

** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$; [†] $p < .10$.

Results

Perceived Ingroup versus Outgroup Prototypicality

First, we tested whether the results of Study 1 were replicated in the present sample. Thus, we started with testing the first hypothesis that native-Dutch participants would perceive their ingroup as more prototypical than other groups. In addition, in this study, we could test whether participants with a non-western cultural background would perceive their ingroup as equally or less prototypical as the majority group. To this end, we performed two repeated-measure ANOVAs for majority and minority participants separately. For majority participants, we again found that perceived ingroup prototypicality ($M = 4.62$, $SD = 1.79$) was significantly higher than perceived outgroup prototypicality ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 1.67$), $F(1, 52) = 16.261$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.23$. For minority participants, we found a significant difference between ingroup, majority outgroup, and minority outgroup prototypicality, $F(2, 43) = 4.20$, $p = .022$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.16$. For participants with a non-native background, perceived ingroup prototypicality ($M = 4.16$, $SD = 1.82$) did not differ significantly from perceived prototypicality of the majority outgroup ($M = 4.16$, $SD = 1.68$; $t(44) < 1.00$, $p = 1.00$). Outgroup minorities (i.e., other minority groups in their district), however, were perceived as lower in prototypicality ($M = 3.32$, $SD = 1.46$; $t(44) = 2.78$, $p = .008$).

District Identification, Subgroup Prototypicality and Outgroup Attitudes

Subsequently, we investigated whether and how district identification, ingroup, and outgroup prototypicality were related to outgroup attitudes. As shown by the correlations in Table 2 district identification (significantly for minority-group participants) was positively related to outgroup attitudes. Moreover, as in Study 1, for native-Dutch participants (but not for minority-group participants) outgroup prototypicality was positively related with outgroup attitudes (this time this relation was statistically significant). The relation between ingroup prototypicality and outgroup attitudes, however, was not significant. These findings are consistent with previous studies (see Ullrich, 2009; Wenzel et al., 2007). We return to this point in the Discussion.

Next, we ran a regression model with majority versus minority background of the participant (coded as -1 vs. 1), the standardized scores of district identification, ingroup prototypicality and outgroup prototypicality, and the hypothesized interaction terms as predictors. We used outgroup attitudes as dependent variable. Preliminary analyses revealed no systematic effects associated with district. That is, the -2 Log likelihood for the 2-level model was 292.10 vs. 292.51 for the 1-level model. This difference was not significant, $\chi^2(1) = 0.50$, $p = .480$. Therefore, this factor was not included in subsequent analyses.

In support of Hypotheses 2 and 4, there was a significant three-way interaction of identification by ingroup prototypicality by group status, $\beta = .44$, $t(86) = 2.91$, $p = .005$. Additional analyses demonstrated that this three-way interaction was due to a reversed two-way interaction pattern of identification and ingroup prototypicality on outgroup attitudes for majority versus minority-group members. That is, for majority-group members, we found a marginal significant ingroup prototypicality by identification interaction effect on outgroup attitudes, $\beta = -.32$, $t(86) = -1.80$, $p = .075$. Simple slopes analyses revealed that when perceived ingroup prototypicality was low (-1 SD), there was a positive relation between identification and outgroup attitudes, $\beta = .63$, $t(86) = 2.01$, $p = .041$. However, when ingroup prototypicality was high ($+1$ SD) there was no significant relation between identification and outgroup attitudes, $\beta = -.01$, $t(86) = -0.01$, $p = .990$ (Figure 2a). These results therefore are in support of Hypothesis 2 and replicate our findings of Study 1 that for majority-group members identification with a shared identity is positively related with outgroup attitudes but only when perceived ingroup prototypicality is low.

For minority-group participants, we found the reverse pattern that was predicted in Hypothesis 4. There was a significant interaction effect of identification and ingroup prototypicality, $\beta = .57$, $t(86) = 2.29$, $p = .024$. Simple slope analyses revealed that when minorities perceived their group as low in prototypicality (-1 SD), the relation between identification and outgroup attitudes was non-significant, $\beta = -.23$, $t(86) = -0.63$, $p = .534$. When ingroup prototypicality was high ($+1$ SD), however, there was a significant and positive relation between identification and outgroup attitudes for minorities, $\beta = .91$, $t(86) = 2.88$, $p = .005$ (Figure 2b). These results thus support the prediction that for minority-group

Figure 2. The interaction effect of perceived ingroup prototypicality and district identification on outgroup attitudes for (a) native-Dutch participants and for (b) non-western minority participants, Study 2

members identification with a shared identity is positively related with outgroup attitudes, only when perceived ingroup prototypicality is high.

Of relevance to Hypotheses 3 and 5, the three-way interaction involving identification, outgroup prototypicality, and group status was not significant, $\beta = -.21$, $t(86) = -1.06$, $p = .293$, nor was the two-way interaction between identification and outgroup prototypicality, $\beta = -.28$, $t(86) = -1.44$, $p = .155$. The prediction that identification with a common ingroup is related to positive outgroup attitudes when perceived outgroup prototypicality is high, but not when outgroup prototypicality is low was thus not supported.

Discussion

In Study 2, we found that whereas majority-group members clearly perceived their ingroup as the most prototypical group for their district, minority-group members perceived their ingroup as equally prototypical as the majority group. In addition, minority-group members perceived their own subgroup as more prototypical than other minority groups. These results are in line with our first hypothesis and the findings of Waldzus et al. (2004) that subgroup members' perceptions of ingroup prototypicality are affected by social reality, and not only by members' motivation to claim the prototype of a shared category.

In addition, the results supported the prediction that the positive relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes is moderated by ingroup prototypicality and group status: For majorities there was a positive relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes when perceived ingroup prototypicality was low, but for minorities when perceived ingroup prototypicality was high. Moreover, as in Study 1, we did not find support for the hypothesis that perceived outgroup prototypicality moderated the relation between identification and outgroup attitudes.

General Discussion

Preventing intergroup conflicts between residents is a major challenge in many multicultural neighborhoods around the world. The results of the current research showed that district identities have the potential to function as common ingroup identities for residents with different cultural backgrounds and as such can lead to more intergroup tolerance. These outcomes are in line with the common ingroup identity model (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000), which states that attitudes between members of different subgroups improve in situations in which subgroup members have a salient shared identity. In two field studies, we found that residents from the cultural majority as well as residents with a cultural minority background had more positive attitudes about the respective other cultural groups in their city district the more strongly they identified with their district.

Moreover, in the present research we aimed to integrate the insights from the common ingroup identity model (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000) and the ingroup projection model (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999). Although we found results generally consistent with both models (for example, that district identity (see Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000) and outgroup prototypicality (Ullrich, 2009) were positively correlated with outgroup attitudes), the present research emphasized the additional importance of understanding how common identity and group prototypically operate jointly—and differently for majority and minority groups—to potentially shape intergroup attitudes. We found that the consequences of perceived ingroup prototypicality are different for members of the majority group and minority groups. Whereas for majority-group members, a high level of perceived ingroup prototypicality may hamper the beneficial effects of a common ingroup identity for outgroup attitudes, for minority-group members, it actually may reinforce the positive effects. These results support the idea that by combining the predictions of the common ingroup model and ingroup projection model, one can make more sophisticated and precise predictions about when and how collective identities will bolster positive intergroup relations.

Differences in Perceived Ingroup Prototypicality for Minority versus Majority-group members

In line with Waldzus et al. (2004), we also investigated to what extent members of majority and minority groups perceived their own cultural group in relation to other groups, as being prototypical for their city district. We expected, and found in both studies, that majority-group members perceived their ingroup as more prototypical than minority groups for the

shared, superordinate identity (i.e., urban city district). This finding is in line with the ingroup projection model (e.g., Wenzel et al., 2007), which states that subgroup members are biased when judging the prototypicality of their own subgroup for an overarching category. However, claiming the prototype of an overarching group is more complicated for minority-group members because of social reality constraints (Devos & Banaji, 2005; Mummendey & Otten, 2001; Waldzus et al., 2004). In a reality in which it is clear that one group has the majority status (in terms of power, and/or size), minority-group members may actually agree that this other group is prototypical for the shared identity. The results of Study 2 support this reasoning; minority-group members did not perceive their ingroup as more prototypical than the majority group.

In line with previous research (e.g., Luijters et al., 2008), group status was represented in the present research by the distinction between participants with a native-Dutch (majority) or a non-western (minority) background. Because of the limited sample sizes of different ethnic or racial minority groups other than Turkish participants, we could not meaningfully analyze differences in responses among these groups. However, we acknowledge that, although these groups are all considered “minorities” in the Netherlands, the different cultural backgrounds and collective experiences in the country could produce differences in their responses. Thus, future research might productively consider how the unique position of the different immigrant groups could relate to the levels of perceived common identity and prototypicality of the ingroup and outgroup, as well as moderate the relationships between these variables and intergroup attitudes.

Moreover, in the current research being a member of the majority group applied to both city district (the overarching group), as well as the broader society. Hence, the reality constraints with respect to the majority versus minority status were clear-cut and offered little room for interpretation. However, we can conceive of city districts in which the majority–minority relation may actually be reversed, creating the interesting situation that group status in the broader society differs from group status in the city district. For instance, unlike in the Netherlands, in the USA there are many neighborhoods in which the majority of the residents has a cultural background which on national level is perceived as a culturally minority group (i.e., Black, Hispanic). Investigating how such a constellation can affect attitudes toward outgroups on the subgroup in future research could be further theoretically informative. The results of the present research suggest that, depending whether the salient common group identity is at the national or at the local level, the relationship-effects of perceived ingroup prototypicality may differ in opposite directions for Blacks and Whites. In particular, when national common identity is salient, Blacks would be expected to show a positive relation between identification with an overarching identity and outgroup attitudes, primarily when these see their group as highly prototypical (the result obtained in the present research). However, when the local common group identity is salient, for Blacks there may be a positive relation between identification and outgroup attitudes but only when they perceive their ingroup as *low* in prototypicality (our results for majority groups). For Whites in districts in which they are the numerical minority, we would expect that they would

show the reverse pattern as a function of salient national versus local common identity.

Ingroup versus Outgroup prototypicality and Identification with a Common Ingroup

In addition, we investigated whether the representation of the overarching identity in terms of *ingroup* prototypicality or *outgroup* prototypicality would be most relevant for outgroup attitudes. Past research on the ingroup projection model usually relied on a relative ingroup prototypicality measure; the extent to which one's ingroup is perceived to be more prototypical for the overarching identity compared with an outgroup. However, ingroup prototypicality and outgroup prototypicality may actually differ in their relations with outgroup attitudes, and it has recently been suggested that mainly outgroup and not ingroup prototypicality is related to outgroup attitudes (Ullrich, 2009).

For majority-group members, the current studies showed a positive direct relation between outgroup prototypicality and outgroup attitudes (although in Study 1 this was not significant) but no relation between ingroup prototypicality and outgroup attitudes, which is in line with previous research (see Wenzel et al., 2007 for an overview; and Ullrich, 2009). These findings fit with Ullrich's (2009) claim that outgroup prototypicality is a relevant predictor of outgroup attitudes, but ingroup prototypicality is not. It is also in line with a meta-analysis over 27 studies (Wenzel et al., 2007) that found that outgroup prototypicality showed especially consistent positive relations with outgroup attitudes ($r = .23$), whereas the relation between ingroup prototypicality and outgroup attitudes is less consistent and on average was very small ($r = -.05$). The results of the current study extend these previous findings by showing that whereas perceived outgroup prototypicality may be directly related to outgroup attitudes, for ingroup prototypicality it may be necessary to take level of identification into account. Although certainly more research on this topic is necessary, these results suggest that ingroup prototypicality is only relevant for outgroup attitudes when the overarching identity is perceived to be important for oneself. Or in the words of Waldzus et al. (2003): “A superordinate category is only relevant as a normative background if group members regard it as a salient self-category and identify with it” (p. 33).

Limitations and Implications for Future Research

The present research tested predictions derived from an integration of the ingroup projection model and the common ingroup identity model in a context of both theoretical and practical relevance: intergroup relations between cultural groups in multicultural urban districts. Because the processes outlined by the ingroup projection model pertain to how established values and norms of one's subgroup apply to a superordinate group, which are hard to manipulate in an experiment (see Weber et al., 2002 for an exception), the present work, as well as the most previous work on the ingroup projection model, focused on the dynamics between existing groups (Wenzel et al., 2007).

One consequence of the focus on naturalistic intergroup relations is that the present work was based on cross-sectional survey data. We acknowledge that reliance on such data limits conclusions about the causal directions of the relations that were observed. With respect to the current findings, the positive relation between identification with an overarching identity and positive outgroup attitudes may be reciprocal. Previous experimental research has established that increasing the salience of a common ingroup identity can lead to more positive attitudes toward other subgroups that are part of the same identity (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2009). However, it is also possible that residents may identify more strongly with their city district because they have more positive attitudes about the other cultural groups that are living in their district (Hogg & Turner, 1985). We also note that, because much of the previous research on the relation between ingroup projection and outgroup attitudes is correlational, stronger evidence about the causal impact of projection on outgroup attitudes can be obtained using fictitious groups (see Weber et al., 2002), or by directly manipulating perceptions of ingroup prototypicality of natural groups—albeit within the constraints of the “reality principle” (Waldzus et al., 2004). For example, a manipulation that would have majority-group members either focus on why their subgroup is equally prototypical as, or more prototypical than minority-group members, and minority-group members focus on either on why their group is less prototypical than, or equally prototypical as the majority group, may (temporarily) manipulate perceptions of ingroup prototypicality within the boundaries of reality.

The present research suggests the importance of considering the dynamic relations between majority and minority groups in this process. An important question for future research is *when* subgroup members generally (Peker, Crisp, & Hogg, 2010; Sindic & Reicher, 2007) and minority-group members specifically (Rosa, Alexandre, & Waldzus, 2011), claim the prototype of the overarching group (i.e., project their group’s values onto the superordinate group versus disidentify with the common group). Moreover, the results presented in this paper suggest that among majority-group members a higher level of perceived ingroup prototypicality may lead to greater intergroup bias, whereas at the same time for minority-group members facilitating ingroup projection potentially may reduce their biases. However, additional factors might bring the attitudes of majority-group and minority-group members in greater positive alignment. Particularly, Waldzus et al. (2003) found that when majority-group members focused on the complexity (versus the unity) of a superordinate category, perceived ingroup prototypicality and, consequently, negative outgroup attitudes were reduced. The present work suggests that having minorities focus on the complexity (versus unity) of a superordinate category would increase their perceived ingroup prototypicality, and therefore also reduce their negative outgroup

Besides these theoretical implications, as demographics in many western societies shift with minority group approaching the size of the traditional majority groups (e.g., Outten, Schmitt, Miller, & Garcia, 2012, also see Eurostat, 2010; U. S. Census Bureau, 2008), understanding minority-group members’ perceptions of ingroup prototypicality may have important practical implications. Although, at first, these changing demographics will only pertain to relative size (and less so to status

or power), it may result in less reality constraints for minorities to claim the prototypicality of their subgroup for many of the relevant shared social identities in these societies.

Conclusion

The context of the current studies, naturalistic intergroup relations in multicultural districts, allowed us to study how urban district identities actually may effectively function as a common ingroup identity for residents with various cultural backgrounds. In addition, we found important differences between majority and minority-group members’ representations of these shared identities and the consequences for attitudes toward other subgroups within a common ingroup. The conditions under which common ingroup identities stimulate intergroup tolerance between majority and minority-group members may thus differ for the two subgroups. For a common ingroup identity to be effective in improving intergroup attitudes, majority-group members should realize that the group prototype is more than only about their own group. Minority-group members, in turn, need the feeling that they have the opportunity and legitimacy to claim that, they too, are prototypical for the common ingroup. In this way, the present study is the first step showing that by taking the predictions from both the common ingroup model and ingroup projection model into account, one can come to more precise predictions about when and how shared identities may lead to more outgroup tolerance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research presented in this paper is part of the research program of the Institute for Integration and Social Efficacy (ISE) at the University of Groningen and was partially funded by the housing companies in Arnhem, the Netherlands. We would like to thank Jason Lejues and Hilga van der Weele-Mik for their help in collecting the data for these studies and Tom Postmes for his valuable feedback on a previous draft of the present manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- 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. DOI: 10.1037/a0018474
- Brown, R. (1995). *Prejudice*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Devos, T., & Banaji, M. R. (2005). American = White? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 88, 447–466. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.447
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Saguy, T. (2007). Another view of “we”: Majority and minority group perspectives on a common ingroup identity. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 18, 296–330. DOI: 10.1080/10463280701726132
- Eurostat. (2010). The Europop2010 convergence scenario [Data file]. Retrieved from http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/statistics/search_database
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 878–902. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.878

- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*. Philadelphia, PA: The Psychology Press.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2009). A common ingroup identity: A categorization-based approach for reducing intergroup bias. In T. Nelson (Ed.), *Handbook of prejudice* (pp. 489–506). Philadelphia, PA: Taylor & Francis.
- Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Anastasio, P. A., Bachman, B. A., & Rust, M. C. (1993). The common ingroup identity model: Recategorisation and the reduction of intergroup bias. In W. Stroebe, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (pp. 1–26). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hogg, M. A., & Turner, J. C. (1985). Interpersonal attraction, social identification and psychological group formation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 15, 51–66.
- Leach, C. W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, M. L. W., Pennekamp, S. F., Doosje, B., ... Spears, R. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment: A hierarchical (multicomponent) model of in-group identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 144–165. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.144
- Luijters, K., Van der Zee, K. I., & Otten, S. (2008). Cultural diversity in organizations: Enhancing identification by valuing differences. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 32, 154–163. Elsevier.
- Mummendey, A., & Otten, S. (2001). Aversive discrimination. In R. Brown, & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes* (pp. 112–132). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Mummendey, A., & Wenzel, M. (1999). Social discrimination and tolerance in intergroup relations: Reactions to intergroup difference. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3, 158–174. DOI: 10.1207/s15327957pspr0302_4
- Outten, H. R., Schmitt, M. T., Miller, D. A., & Garcia, A. L. (2012). Feeling threatened about the future: Whites' emotional reactions to anticipated ethnic demographic changes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38, 14–25. DOI: 10.1177/0146167211418531
- Peker, M., Crisp, R. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2010). Predictors of ingroup projection: The roles of superordinate category coherence and complexity. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 13, 525–542. DOI: 10.1177/1368430209360205
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York, NY US: Touchstone Books/Simon & Schuster.
- Putnam, R. D. (2007). E pluribus unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century. The 2006 Johan Skytte prize lecture. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30, 137–174. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9477.2007.00176.x
- Rosa, M., Alexandre, J., & Waldzus, S. (2011, July). The future belongs to us: Conditions for minorities to claim superiority. In K. Deaux (Ed.), (Chair), *Minority membership: Processes and outcomes of facing inferiority and claiming superiority*. Stockholm, Sweden: Symposium conducted at the meeting of the European Association of Social Psychology.
- Schubert, T. W., & Otten, S. (2002). Overlap of self, ingroup, and outgroup: Pictorial measures of self-categorization. *Self and Identity*, 1, 353–376. DOI: 529–8868/2002
- Scientific council for government policy. (2005). *Vertrouwen in de buurt* [Trust in the neighborhood]. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sindic, D., & Reicher, S. D. (2007). The instrumental use of group prototypicality judgments. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44. DOI: 10.1016/j.jesp.2008.05.007
- Statistics Netherlands. (2010). Kerncijferswijken en buurten [Core figures districts and neighborhoods] [Data File]. Retrieved from <http://statline.cbs.nl/>
- Tajfel, H. (1969). Cognitive aspects of prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 25, 79–97.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–48). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Turner, J. C. (1987). A self-categorization theory. In J. C. Turner, M. Hogg, P. J. Oakes, S. D. Reicher, & M. S. Wetherell (Eds.), *Rediscovering the social group. A self-categorization theory* (pp. 42–67). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- U. S. Census Bureau. (2008). National population projection [Data file and code book]. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/projections/downloadablefiles.html>
- Ullrich, J. (2009). Reconsidering the “relative” in relative ingroup prototypicality. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 299–310. DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.540
- Van Oudenhoven, J. P., Prins, K. S., & Buunk, B. P. (1998). Attitudes of minority and majority members towards adaptation of immigrants. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 995–1013.
- Waldzus, S., & Mummendey, A. (2003). Inclusion in a superordinate category, in-group prototypicality, and attitudes toward out-groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39, 31–47. DOI: 10.1016/j.jesp.2003.09.003
- Waldzus, S., Mummendey, A., & Wenzel, M. (2005). When “different” means “worse”: In-group prototypicality in changing intergroup contexts. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 41, 76–83. DOI: 10.1016/j.jesp.2004.05.006
- Waldzus, S., Mummendey, A., Wenzel, M., & Boettcher, F. (2004). Of bikers, teachers and Germans: Groups diverging views about their prototypicality. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 43, 385–400.
- Waldzus, S., Mummendey, A., Wenzel, M., & Weber, U. (2003). Toward tolerance: Representations of superordinate categories and perceived ingroup prototypicality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39, 31–47.
- Weber, U., Mummendey, A., & Waldzus, S. (2002). Perceived legitimacy of intergroup status differences: Its prediction by relative ingroup prototypicality. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 449–470.
- Wenzel, S., Mummendey, A., & Waldzus, S. (2007). Superordinate identities and intergroup conflict: The ingroup projection model. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 18, 331–372. DOI: 10.1080/10463280701728302
- Wenzel, S., Mummendey, A., Weber, U., & Waldzus, S. (2003). The ingroup as pars pro toto: Projection from the ingroup onto the inclusive category as a precursor to social discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 461–473. DOI: 10.1177/0146167202250913