University of Groningen

Enhancing Majority Members' Pro-Diversity Beliefs in Small Teams The Facilitating Effect of Self-Anchoring

van Veelen, Ruth; Otten, Sabine; Hansen, Nina

Published in:
Experimental psychology

DOI:
[10.1027/1618-3169/a000220](https://doi.org/10.1027/1618-3169/a000220)

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:
2014

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

Citation for published version (APA):

van Veelen, R., Otten, S., & Hansen, N. (2014). Enhancing Majority Members' Pro-Diversity Beliefs in Small Teams The Facilitating Effect of Self-Anchoring. *Experimental psychology*, 61(1), 3-11.
<https://doi.org/10.1027/1618-3169/a000220>

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.

Enhancing Majority Members' Pro-Diversity Beliefs in Small Teams

The Facilitating Effect of Self-Anchoring

Ruth van Veelen, Sabine Otten, and Nina Hansen

Department of Social Psychology, University of Groningen, The Netherlands

Abstract. Majority members often react negatively to efforts to stimulate diversity. An important reason for this is that in diverse groups, majority members' own group bond is typically based on perceived prototypicality, which serves to disregard those who are different. In the present research we investigate how majority members' pro-diversity beliefs may be enhanced, by experimentally manipulating how the self is cognitively defined in relation to a diverse group. Specifically, we hypothesize that majority members' focus on the personal self (i.e., *self-anchoring*) rather than the social self (i.e., *self-stereotyping*) when creating a group bond may facilitate their pro-diversity beliefs and positive attitudes toward minority members. In two experiments we manipulated self-anchoring and self-stereotyping via mindset priming among ethnic majority members in diverse teams. As expected, results showed that relative to self-stereotyping, majority members' self-anchoring enhanced pro-diversity beliefs and positive attitudes toward minority members.

Keywords: majority, self-anchoring, self-stereotyping, pro-diversity beliefs, attitudes

In today's societies diversity is increasing. Advances in communication technology and growing mobility bring people from different groups and origins together. Currently, 9.4% of all people in the European Union are foreign-born residents (Eurostat, 2011). This development is accompanied by programs and campaigns set out to elicit pro-diversity attitudes. Not everyone, however, shares the belief that diversity is a valuable asset to a group's identity. Specifically, majority members are often skeptical about the idea that diversity is something valuable (Thomas & Plaut, 2008; Verkuyten, 2005; Wolsko, Park, & Judd, 2006). In two experiments, the present paper addresses this topic and shows how majority members' pro-diversity beliefs can be enhanced by manipulating projection from self to group and vice versa.

Prior research has attributed majority members' negative sentiments toward diversity to factors such as prejudice, threat (e.g., Sanchez-Burks, Nisbett, & Ybarra, 2000), and perceived losses in social dominance and status (e.g., Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Importantly however, rather than focusing on these affective intergroup aspects, we argue that majority members' cognitive representation of the *self* within a diverse group also forms a crucial factor explaining their attitude toward diversity. Specifically, in diverse groups majority members typically perceive themselves as prototypical members; and it is this perceived

prototypicality that forms the basis for majority members' own group belongingness (Wenzel, Mummendey, & Waldzus, 2007). Therefore, attaching value to diversity may endanger majority members' own belongingness, because being similar to group prototypes is no longer an important requirement to be part of a group. Hence, to secure their own group membership, majority members are likely to refrain from perceiving diversity as valuable and accepting those who are different (i.e., minority members) within the diverse group (Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011).

The aim of the current research is to investigate how majority members' own belongingness to diverse groups may go hand in hand with attaching positive value to diversity. In other words, how can majority members shape a bond between the self and the group that is not detrimental for the inclusion of those who are different, namely the minority members? In answering this question we focus on the cognitive processes that determine how the *self* is defined within a diverse group. In general, people's psychological bond with a group is based on the strength of the cognitive relationship between self and group (Tropp & Wright, 2001). Such bond can either be inferred from the *personal self* or the *social self* (Van Veelen, Otten, & Hansen, 2011). We argue that using the personal self as an anchor to create a relationship with a diverse group

(i.e., *self-anchoring*;¹ Cadinu & Rothbart, 1996), rather than using the social self (i.e., *self-stereotyping*, Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987) will facilitate majority members' pro-diversity beliefs and their positive attitudes toward minority members.

Cognitive Routes to Self-Group Overlap

Following from social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and self-categorization theory (SCT; Turner et al., 1987), self-stereotyping has traditionally been seen as the crucial process explaining how a cognitive self-group bond emerges. SCT posits that people have a social and a personal self existing at opposite ends of the same continuum. With self-stereotyping the social self becomes salient and the personal self shifts to the background, or *depersonalizes*. Consequently, group members will "...view themselves as interchangeable exemplars of the social category, rather than unique personalities defined by their individual differences from others" (Turner et al., 1987, p. 50). Thus, following self-stereotyping principles self-group overlap refers to the assimilation of the self to socially shared, prototypical group characteristics.

In contrast, *self-anchoring* implies the projection of personal characteristics onto the group (Cadinu & Rothbart, 1996). It is the exact opposite process from self-stereotyping, because people use characteristics describing their individual self (i.e., "I am a creative person") to infer the representation of an ingroup identity (i.e., my group is a creative group). Thus, based on self-anchoring principles, the individual plays a crucial role in shaping a cognitive group bond (e.g., Cadinu & Rothbart, 1996; Krueger, 2007; Otten, 2004; Otten & Wentura, 2001).

Recent research has shown that both self-anchoring and self-stereotyping form distinct cognitive projection processes to create a group bond (Van Veelen et al., 2011). Moreover, both also impact on perceptions about the group's identity representation (Van Veelen, Otten, & Hansen, 2012a). Therefore, in the current research we compare self-anchoring and self-stereotyping in the context of diverse groups, and investigate how both may affect majority members' pro-diversity beliefs and attitudes toward minority group members. Importantly, the projection processes we investigate always pertain to the relationship between the *self* and the *superordinate* group (which is, in the context of our research, the diverse group as a whole, including both minority and majority subgroup), as our aim is to investigate how majority members' pro-diversity beliefs within this inclusive framework may be enhanced (see also Bianchi, Machunsky, Steffens, & Mummendey, 2009).

Projection Processes and Pro-Diversity Beliefs

Self-stereotyping implies assimilation of the self to prototypical group norms. For majority members in diverse groups, self-stereotyping can typically be assumed to facilitate a cognitive group bond, because there is a fit between the prototypes of the majority subgroup and the diverse group identity as a whole (Waldzus, Mummendey, Wenzel, & Boettcher, 2004). However, consequences for pro-diversity beliefs and attitudes toward minority members are likely to be negative. If majority members' group membership is based on a cognitive representation of the self as being similar to group prototypes, then those who deviate from these prototypes (i.e., minority members) likely form a threat to their sense of inclusion and social unity. This may explain why minority members often become victims of intolerance and discrimination (Verkuyten, 2011; Wenzel, Mummendey, Weber, & Waldzus, 2003). Thus, if self-stereotyping instigates perceived similarity and prototypicality as the cornerstone of majority members' group membership, this may likely hinder the perception that non-prototypical, minority members can also be valuable for the group's identity representation.

In contrast, with *self-anchoring* group membership does not depend on assimilation to group prototypes (e.g., Robbins & Krueger, 2005; Van Veelen et al., 2012a). Instead, personal characteristics provide an anchor to infer a direct link between the self and the superordinate group. Indeed, research has shown that in superordinate groups, people tend to project personal characteristics to the higher order social category almost as strongly as to the more local subcategory (Krueger & Clement, 1996; Krueger & Zeiger, 1993; Riketta & Sacramento, 2008). This implies that in diverse groups *self-anchoring* may allow majority members to cognitively link the self to the group, irrespective of being prototypical or not.

What consequences does this have for majority members' pro-diversity beliefs? A group's identity representation likely becomes quite heterogeneous when it is based on individuals' conceptions on what the group is like (see also Otten, 2005). When majority members engage in self-anchoring they may perceive themselves as an individual member who is different from others, just like minority members may be different from the majority (Krueger & DiDonato, 2008). Taken together, we assume that with self-anchoring majority members' mental representation of the personal self in a diverse group may go hand in hand with a belief that diversity is valuable.

To conclude, while self-stereotyping may lead majority members to perceive that similarity between group members is the cornerstone of group membership, self-anchoring may lead to the perception that individual differences and group membership form a nice blend. This idea links

¹ The terms self-anchoring and social projection are often used interchangeably in the literature, thereby referring to the process of using the self as a heuristic to make group judgments (e.g., Robbins & Krueger, 2005). We only used the term self-anchoring in the present paper, yet conceptually we consider the two terms as equivalents.

to social comparison research showing that using the group as a standard to evaluate the self (as with self-stereotyping) leads to a *similarity* focus, while using the self as a standard to evaluate the group (as with self-anchoring) leads to a *difference* focus (e.g., Mussweiler, 2001). Similarly, organizational diversity research showed that a focus on similarity-based self-categorization hinders pro-diversity beliefs (Van Knippenberg, de Dreu, & Homan, 2004; Van Knippenberg, Haslam, & Platow, 2007) while a focus on group members' individual characteristics facilitates pro-diversity beliefs (Homan, Greer, Jehn, & Koning, 2010). Hence, we hypothesize that for majority members in diverse groups self-anchoring leads to stronger pro-diversity beliefs than self-stereotyping (*Hypothesis 1*).

Attitudes Toward Minority Members

Aside from majority members' pro-diversity beliefs, we are also interested in specific attitudes toward minority members within diverse groups. Importantly, attitudes toward minority members draw specific attention to majority members' concrete perceptions about those who are different within diverse groups. Therefore, in line with our expectations regarding pro-diversity beliefs, we hypothesize that among majority members self-anchoring will also lead to more positive attitudes toward minority members in a diverse group than self-stereotyping (*Hypothesis 2*).

The Present Research

The present research aims to demonstrate that relative to self-stereotyping, self-anchoring may facilitate majority members' pro-diversity beliefs and positive attitudes toward minority members in diverse groups. We conducted two experiments to test our predictions. Experiment 1 used a scenario paradigm and Experiment 2 tested the assumptions in a real group setting. In both experiments group diversity was operationalized based on differences in ethnicity. Specifically, members of an ethnic majority participated in a study on diverse teams. Furthermore, self-anchoring and self-stereotyping were manipulated via mindset priming. In prior research this mindset priming has proven to be a valid methodology to instigate self-anchoring or self-stereotyping processes in groups (Van Veelen, Otten, & Hansen, 2012b). It is important to note that we assume that majority members' enhanced pro-diversity beliefs in response to self-anchoring (relative to self-stereotyping) do not negatively affect majority members' group belongingness (Plaut et al., 2011). Therefore, identification was included in our analyses as a covariate.

Experiment 1

Method

Participants and Design

In a one-factorial design we manipulated *projection* (self-anchoring and self-stereotyping) among majority members

in an ethnically diverse team and investigated its impact on pro-diversity beliefs and attitudes toward minority members. Forty-four native Dutch students participated in the study ($M_{\text{age}} = 21.84$; $SD = 2.58$; 22 women).

Procedure

Participants filled out a paper-and-pencil questionnaire about a fictitious organization called "Pure Nature" producing biological candy. They were asked to imagine being part of a marketing and development team of six employees. Participants were shown five pictures of the fictitious team members. A sixth empty picture frame represented the participant him/herself. The composition of the team was always such that the participant was part of a Dutch majority in a team with two ethnic minority members (i.e., Turkish-Dutch). The pictures were taken from the Amsterdam Dynamic Facial Expression Set (ADFES; Van der Schalk, Hawk, Fischer, & Doosje, 2011) and all neutral in emotional expression. For female participants we only used female faces and for male participants only male faces. Participants were asked to indicate whether there were more native or nonnative Dutch members in their team (manipulation check). Everyone indicated this correctly.

Subsequently, *projection* was manipulated via mindset priming. Van Veelen et al. (2012b) showed that this methodological procedure can instigate either self-anchoring or self-stereotyping when creating a self-group bond. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two projection conditions. In the *self-anchoring* condition, in order to make the personal self salient participants were first asked to write down traits that would typically characterize them as an individual. Next, we asked them to write about the applicability of the personal traits to the team they were just introduced to. By letting participants think about how personal characteristics are applicable to the team, we aimed to create a link between the self and the group based on personal attributes.

In the *self-stereotyping* condition, in order to make group prototypes salient participants were first asked to write down traits that would typically characterize the team. Subsequently, we asked them to write about the applicability of the team traits to themselves. By letting participants think about how group characteristics are applicable to themselves, we aimed to create a link between the self and the group based on group prototypes.

Dependent Measures

Subsequently, we measured majority members' *team identification* (eight items adapted from Leach et al., 2008) on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not at all; 7 = completely; e.g., "To what extent would you feel part of this team?"; $\alpha = .95$). *Attitudes* toward the Turkish-Dutch minority in the team were measured based on the applicability of four positive traits (e.g., "nice," "positive"; 1 = not at all; 7 = completely; $\alpha = .83$). Next,

pro-diversity beliefs were based on a multiculturalism measure (five items from Berry & Kalin, 1995; "People should value that the Dutch society consists of groups with different cultural backgrounds," "Ethnic minorities should be supported to preserve their cultural heritage in the Netherlands," "A society that has a variety of cultural groups is more able to tackle new problems as they occur," "Immigrants' parents must encourage their children to retain the culture and traditions of their homeland," "The Dutch should do more to learn about the customs and heritage of different cultural groups in this country"; $\alpha = .82$). Endorsement of multiculturalism implies recognition and appreciation of group differences and is therefore inextricably linked to the concept of pro-diversity beliefs (see Kauff & Wagner, 2012).

Finally, participants were debriefed and received candy in return for participating.

Results and Discussion

Manipulation Check

The implicit nature of our projection manipulation did not allow for an explicit manipulation check. However, two independent raters evaluated the projected traits on their *content* and *valence*.² The *content* of projected traits should be different across projection conditions; self-stereotyping should be associated with the projection of traits referring to the *team's characteristics*, while self-anchoring should not. To test this, all the projected traits were rated on whether or not they explicitly referred to socially shared aspects of the team, such as being "Dutch" or "White." We called these traits "team traits." We created a variable indicating whether "team traits" were projected (yes/no). As expected, the number of participants projecting "team traits" was significantly higher in the self-stereotyping ($N_{\text{yes}} = 7$; $N_{\text{no}} = 14$) compared to the self-anchoring condition ($N_{\text{yes}} = 0$; $N_{\text{no}} = 23$; $\chi^2 = 9.12$, $p = .003$).

Moreover, the *valence* of projected traits should be similar across conditions, rendering an interpretation of mind-set-effects in terms of differentially primed valence implausible. Results on the number of positive and negative projected traits revealed no significant differences between projection conditions on either positive (self-anchoring: $M_{\text{positive}} = 1.74$; $SD_{\text{positive}} = 1.13$; self-stereotyping: $M_{\text{positive}} = 1.29$; $SD_{\text{positive}} = 1.49$) or negative projected traits (self-anchoring: $M_{\text{negative}} = .04$; $SD_{\text{negative}} = 2.09$; self-stereotyping: $M_{\text{negative}} = 0.00$; $SD_{\text{negative}} = 0.00$), all p 's $> .21$. Together, these analyses indicate that our projection manipulation was successful.

Figure 1. The effect of projection (self-anchoring versus self-stereotyping) on majority members' pro-diversity beliefs (multiculturalism) and attitudes toward the minority (Experiment 1). Error bars represent standard errors.

Main Analyses

A MANOVA with *projection* (self-anchoring vs. self-stereotyping) as the independent variable, multiculturalism and attitudes toward the minority as dependent variables, and team identification as a covariate³ revealed a significant multivariate effect, $F(2, 40) = 4.67$, $p = .015$; Wilk's $\Lambda = .81$, $\eta^2 = .20$. Confirming Hypothesis 1, *multiculturalism* was stronger in the self-anchoring ($M = 4.81$; $SD = .91$) than the self-stereotyping ($M = 4.09$; $SD = 1.19$) condition, $F(1, 41) = 4.96$, $p = .032$, $\eta^2 = .11$. Furthermore, confirming Hypothesis 2, *attitudes toward the ethnic minority* were more positive in the self-anchoring ($M = 4.59$; $SD = .92$) compared to the self-stereotyping condition ($M = 3.71$; $SD = 1.09$; $F(1, 41) = 7.88$, $p = .008$, $\eta^2 = .16$; see Figure 1). Importantly, team identification did not differ between the self-anchoring ($M = 4.90$; $SD = 1.31$) and self-stereotyping ($M = 5.11$; $SD = .70$) condition, $F(1, 42) = .46$, $p = .501$, $\eta^2 = .01$. Also as a covariate, team identification had no effect on the dependent variables, $F(2, 40) = .006$, $p = .994$; Wilk's $\Lambda = 1.00$, $\eta^2 < .001$, nor did it affect results from the projection manipulation on the dependent variables. This signals that enhanced pro-diversity beliefs in response to self-anchoring do not decrease majority members' own sense of belongingness.⁴

Experiment 2

In Experiment 2 we aimed to replicate our findings in a more natural setting, in which participants were part of an online brainstorming team in the laboratory. Because participants were expecting to actually work together in an online team,

² In Experiment 1, inter-rater reliability on "team traits" indicated almost perfect agreement (Kappa = .83, $p < .001$). On *valence* inter-rater reliability indicated substantial agreement (Kappa = .74, $p < .001$; Landis & Koch, 1977). In case of disagreement, we took a conservative stance and did not indicate a trait as being a "team trait," and valence of traits was indicated as neutral.

³ In Experiment 1, the assumption of homogeneity of regression slopes (required for covariance analyses) was violated, suggesting that we should be tentative in our conclusions about the covariate. Yet, considering that our group sizes are quite large and equal across conditions, we can assume that our analysis is fairly robust against this assumption violation (Hamilton, 1977). In Experiment 2, assumptions for covariance analyses were all met.

⁴ In both experiments, controlling for gender did not affect our results. Thus we excluded this factor from further analysis.

we measured expected value in diversity for group functioning (van Knippenberg et al., 2007). In addition, we further refined our measure of attitudes toward the ethnic minority by distinguishing between attitudes in the social, moral, and competence domain (Leach, Ellemers, & Barreto, 2007).

Method

Participants and Design

In a one-factorial design we manipulated the type of projection process (self-anchoring and self-stereotyping) among 58 native Dutch students in ethnically diverse teams and investigated pro-diversity beliefs and attitudes toward the minority team members. Five participants were excluded from analysis: one exceeded the average age of the other team members substantially⁵ and four did not believe the cover story. In total, 53 participants remained in the dataset ($M_{\text{age}} = 19.25$; $SD = 1.78$; 44 women).

Procedure

On arrival in the laboratory, participants were placed in separate cubicles and the experimenter told them they would participate in a study on “first impressions and team effectiveness in virtual teams.” They were told that they would be connected via the computer to five other team members to engage in a brainstorming task. A picture was taken of each participant, ostensibly to form an impression of the team members. The experimenter left the cubicle while participants were ostensibly connected to the team network. The experimenter returned and gave a sheet with six printed pictures (Van der Schalk et al., 2011): one of the participants and five of the alleged other team members. There were always four native Dutch team members (just as the participant) and two Moroccan-Dutch. This time, we balanced the number of men and women. To make the native Dutch and Moroccan-Dutch subgroups more salient, team members' name and ethnic background were also provided. The sheet with pictures remained on participants' desk throughout the experiment. Again, all participants correctly indicated that there were more native than Moroccan-Dutch team members (manipulation check).

Subsequently, participants were randomly assigned to a *projection* condition as in Experiment 1.

Dependent Variables

After the projection manipulation we told participants that in a few moments they would start brainstorming, but that before we were interested in their first impressions about the team. Actually, at this point participants answered ques-

tions about our dependent measures. *Team identification* was measured with seven items (Jansen, Otten, van der Zee, Vos, & Smith, 2012 from 1 (completely disagree) to 7 (completely agree; i.e., “I feel a bond with this team”; $\alpha = .89$). *Attitudes toward minority* were based on the applicability of six traits to the Moroccan-Dutch team members on a scale from 1 (not at all applicable) to 9 (completely applicable). Following Leach et al. (2007) we measured attitudes in three domains: sociability [friendly, nice; $r(53) = .81$, $p < .001$], morality [trustworthy, honest; $r(53) = .68$, $p < .001$], and competence [intelligent, disciplined; $r(53) = .66$, $p < .001$]. Finally, *pro-diversity beliefs* focused on expectations about value in diversity for group functioning during the brainstorm task. Items were adapted from van Knippenberg et al. (2007) and Wolsko et al. (2006; five items; e.g., “I think it will be positive for the collaboration that the team consists of both native and Moroccan Dutch”; $\alpha = .86$; 1 = I completely disagree; 7 = I completely agree). Finally, participants were told that the actual brainstorm task would not take place. They were carefully debriefed and received study credits in return.

Results and Discussion

Manipulation Check

As in Experiment 1, two raters judged the content and valence of projected traits.⁶ Again, the number of participants projecting “team traits” was significantly higher in the self-stereotyping ($N_{\text{yes}} = 13$; $N_{\text{no}} = 12$) compared to the self-anchoring condition ($N_{\text{yes}} = 0$; $N_{\text{no}} = 28$; $\chi^2 = 19.29$, $p < .001$), and the valence of projected traits did not differ between conditions, either for positive (self-anchoring: $M_{\text{positive}} = 2.21$; $SD_{\text{positive}} = 1.20$; self-stereotyping: $M_{\text{positive}} = 2.64$; $SD_{\text{positive}} = 1.41$) or for negative traits (self-anchoring: $M_{\text{negative}} = .18$; $SD_{\text{negative}} = .77$; self-stereotyping: $M_{\text{negative}} = 0.00$; $SD_{\text{negative}} = 0.00$), all p 's $> .23$.

Main Analyses

A MANOVA revealed a similar pattern of results as in Experiment 1. The multivariate effect of *projection* on the dependent variables was significant, $F(4, 47) = 4.05$, $p = .007$; $\text{Wilk's } \Lambda = .74$, $\eta^2 = .26$. Importantly, perceived *value in diversity* was significantly higher among majority members in the self-anchoring ($M = 5.75$; $SD = 1.01$) compared to the self-stereotyping condition ($M = 5.18$; $SD = 1.08$), $F(1, 50) = 4.22$, $p = .05$, $\eta^2 = .08$. Moreover, majority members considered the Moroccan minority members to be more *moral* in the self-anchoring ($M = 6.77$; $SD = .81$) compared to the self-stereotyping ($M = 6.22$;

⁵ This exclusion was based on the notion that a big age difference introduces yet another form of diversity. Note however that results remain stable when including this participant in analyses.

⁶ In Experiment 2, inter-rater reliability on both “team traits” ($\text{Kappa} = .93$, $p < .001$) and *valence* ($\text{Kappa} = .83$, $p < .001$) indicated almost perfect agreement (Landis & Koch, 1977).

Figure 2. The effect of projection (self-anchoring vs. self-stereotyping) on majority members' pro-diversity beliefs (perceived value in diversity; left panel) and attitudes (sociability, morality, and competence; right panel) toward the minority (Experiment 2). Error bars represent standard errors. *Notes.* Pro-diversity beliefs were measured on a scale

$SD = 1.18$) condition, $F(1, 50) = 4.79$, $p = .03$, $\eta^2 = .09$, and more competent in the self-anchoring ($M = 7.21$; $SD = .72$) compared to the self-stereotyping condition ($M = 6.44$; $SD = 1.23$), $F(1, 50) = 9.14$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .16$. Thus, self-anchoring positively affected attitudes toward the minority subgroup. Only sociability attitudes toward minority members did not differ between the self-anchoring ($M = 6.83$; $SD = 1.00$) and self-stereotyping condition ($M = 6.74$; $SD = 1.19$), $F(1, 50) = .33$, $p = .57$, $\eta^2 = .007$ (see Figure 2).⁷

In addition, as in Experiment 1, team identification did not differ between the self-anchoring ($M = 4.20$; $SD = .80$) and the self-stereotyping ($M = 4.38$; $SD = .94$) condition, $F(1, 51) = .59$, $p = .45$, $\eta^2 = .01$. Also as a covariate, team identification had no effect on the dependent variables, $F(4, 47) = 1.41$, $p = .24$; Wilk's $\Lambda = .89$, $\eta^2 = .11$, nor did it affect results from the projection manipulation on the dependent variables.

To conclude, in Experiment 2 we replicated the effects of Experiment 1. Moreover, self-anchoring enhanced majority members' positive attitude toward minority members on two of the three attitude domains. At present, we can only speculate why we did not find effects on sociability. Perhaps, sociability is less relevant for attitude formation in an online work team, where the success of a brainstorm session may rely mostly on perceived competence and trustworthiness among team members.

General Discussion

Over the past decades group diversity has become an inextricable part of our lives. While group diversity itself has

rapidly increased, pro-diversity beliefs among majority members seem to decrease (e.g., Joppke, 2004). Hence, there seems to be a barrier for majority members to perceive diversity as valuable to a group's identity. An important reason for this may lie in majority members' tendency to base their own group membership on being prototypical rather than being unique and different (e.g., Plaut et al., 2011). In the current research, we demonstrated across two experiments that majority members' self-anchoring (compared to self-stereotyping) facilitates pro-diversity beliefs and positive attitudes toward minority members in diverse groups. Our findings also show that majority members' enhanced pro-diversity beliefs in response to self-anchoring are not related to their level of identification with the diverse, superordinate group.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

Our cognitive approach to majority members' perceptions about the self and diversity resonates to recent research taking an evolutionary approach to diversity issues. Specifically, it has been argued that majority members' natural tendency to resist diversity is grounded in human's natural evolvement to think heuristically, in terms of simple "us" and "them" social categories (Crisp & Meleady, 2012). Indeed, majority members' negative attitudes toward minority members are most pronounced when their own prototypicality is derived from a simple, similarity-based group representation (Machunsky, Meiser, & Mummendey, 2009). Yet, as our findings underline, humans do have the cognitive capacity to bypass such heuristics and perceive groups

⁷ We also tested mediation effects in both experiments. However, we found equally strong support for *pro-diversity beliefs* being the mediator between *projection* and *attitudes* towards the minority and the reversed causal model.

to be more complex, inclusive social entities (Crisp & Meleady, 2012). Potentially, the shift from the social (i.e., self-stereotyping) to the personal self (i.e., self-anchoring) to create a bond with a superordinate, diverse group may form an important first step to facilitate majority members' adaptation to more "pro-diversity-based" social cognitions.

Our research fits with prior work showing that a focus on the individual self in the group can facilitate the formation of group bonds (Hornsey, Jetten, McAuliffe, & Hogg, 2006; Hutchison, Jetten, & Gutierrez, 2011; Jans, Postmes, & van der Zee, 2011; Jetten, Postmes, & McAuliffe, 2002). Building on this, our findings indicate that a bond between the self and the group based on the individual self (i.e., self-anchoring) leads to the acknowledgment of *differences* between individual group members, while self-stereotyping results in a focus on *similarity* between group members. This suggests that focusing on the individual self in the group might be beneficial when striving to foster majority members' pro-diversity beliefs and attitudes toward those who are different (i.e., minority members).

Our findings nicely extend work by Plaut and colleagues (2011), who found that only if majority members perceive themselves to be included in the definition of the diverse group this should lead to the acceptance of pro-diversity efforts. Adding to this, our results suggest a further refinement of *how* majority members should include the self in a diverse group identity. In this respect, self-stereotyping seems to make the representation of the self and those who are different mutually exclusive, while self-anchoring may be a way for majority members to represent the self within a diverse group's definition, while at the same time leaving room for other (different) group members to be included. Thus, with self-anchoring the inclusion of the self and those who are different, complement rather than conflict with each other.

In a recent paper, we also investigated the impact of self-anchoring and self-stereotyping in diverse groups, thereby specifically focusing on the beneficial effect of self-anchoring for *minority members'* level of *identification* with diverse groups (Van Veelen et al., 2012b). The current research complements this work on projection processes in diverse groups, by focusing on *majority members'* *pro-diversity beliefs* and *attitudes toward minorities* in diverse groups. Here, we also demonstrate the beneficial effect that self-anchoring may have relative to self-stereotyping.

Limitations and Further Research

A limitation in our experiments is that we did not include a control condition in our design to locate majority members' base rate level of pro-diversity beliefs. Importantly however, such control condition was already included in the aforementioned study by Van Veelen et al. (2012b). In that study, a comparison between the two projection conditions and the control condition revealed that the self-stereotyping and the control condition did not differ from each other, but only from the self-anchoring

condition. This suggests that self-stereotyping forms the default process to create self-group overlap. This is in line with research showing that in diverse groups with highly cognitively accessible subcategories (i.e., gender, ethnicity) people automatically differentiate those who are similar from those who are different from them (Stangor, Lynch, Duan, & Glass, 1992). Based on this, we feel confident that in the present research self-anchoring *facilitates* majority members' pro-diversity beliefs, rather than self-stereotyping *hindering* it.

We should note that our current findings only resonate to small, diverse teams constructed either based on a scenario (Experiment 1), or set up on the computer in the laboratory (Experiment 2). Also, in this research we specifically focused on ethnic diversity. Importantly however, group diversity, and pro-diversity beliefs can also be based on many other social categorization dimensions (e.g., age, gender, class). Therefore, in future research it would be highly valuable to investigate the generalizability of our findings to other group settings (i.e., larger social categories) and in relation to other types of diversity.

Furthermore, prior research has shown that pro-diversity beliefs can facilitate intergroup contact (Tropp & Bianchi, 2006), group commitment (Van Knippenberg et al., 2007), and group performance (Van Knippenberg et al., 2004) in diverse groups. In this respect, an interesting question for future research is whether our mindset prime to instigate self-anchoring, and its beneficial effects on pro-diversity beliefs, may also translate to actual group functioning in interactive, diverse groups. Possibly, a self-anchoring prime may form a promising starting point to facilitate a pro-diversity group climate in culturally diverse societies, organizations, schools and work teams (see also Luijters, van der Zee, & Otten, 2008). Indeed, repetitive priming of a self-standard has been shown to result in chronic accessibility of this standard to evaluate a target (Herr, 1986; Higgins, King, & Mavin, 1982).

To conclude, the present research suggests that the road toward pro-diversity attitudes may start within the individual self. Through self-anchoring majority members may shape a cognitive self-group bond that allows for the endorsement of pro-diversity beliefs.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Marloes Huis for her valuable contribution to the methodological implementation of the projection manipulation in this manuscript.

References

- Berry, J. W., & Kalin, R. (1995). Multicultural and ethnic attitudes in Canada: An overview of the 1991 national survey. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement*, 27, 301–320. doi: 10.1037/0008-400X.27.3.301
- Bianchi, M., Machunsky, M., Steffens, M. C., & Mummendey, A. (2009). Like me or like us: Is ingroup projection just

- social projection? *Experimental Psychology*, 56, 198–205. doi: 10.1027/1618-3169.56.3.198
- Cadinu, M. R., & Rothbart, M. (1996). Self-anchoring and differentiation processes in the minimal group setting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 661–677. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.70.4.661
- Crisp, R. J., & Meleady, R. (2012). Adapting to a multicultural future. *Science*, 336, 853–855. doi: 10.1126/science.129009
- Eurostat. (2011). *6.5% of the EU population are foreigners and 9.4% are born abroad – Issue number 34/2011*. Retrieved from http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/population/publications/migration_asylum
- Hamilton, B. L. (1977). An empirical investigation of the effects of heterogeneous regression slopes in analysis of covariance. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 37, 701–712. doi: 10.1177/001316447703700313
- Herr, P. M. (1986). Consequences of priming: Judgment and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1106–1115. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1106
- Higgins, E. T., King, G. A., & Mavin, G. H. (1982). Individual construct accessibility and subjective impressions and recall. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 35–47. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.43.1.35
- Homan, A. C., Greer, L. L., Jehn, K. A., & Koning, L. (2010). Believing shapes seeing: The impact of diversity beliefs on the construal of group composition. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 13, 477–493. doi: 10.1177/1368430209350747
- Hornsey, M. J., Jetten, J., McAuliffe, B. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2006). The impact of individualist and collectivist group norms on evaluations of dissenting group members. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 42, 57–68. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2005.01.006
- Hutchison, P., Jetten, J., & Gutierrez, R. (2011). Deviant but desirable: Group variability and evaluation of atypical group members. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 1155–1161. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2011.06.011
- Jans, L., Postmes, T., & Van der Zee, K. I. (2011). The induction of a shared identity: The positive role of individual distinctiveness in groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37, 1130–1141. doi: 10.1177/0146167211407342
- Jansen, W. S., Otten, S., van der Zee, K. I., Vos, M. W., & Smith, L. (2012). *The development and validation of the perceived organizational inclusion scale*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Groningen.
- Jetten, J., Postmes, T., & McAuliffe, B. J. (2002). “We’re all individuals”: Group norms of individualism and collectivism, levels of identification and identity threat. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 189–207. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.65
- Joppke, C. (2004). The retreat of multiculturalism in the liberal state: Theory and policy. *British Journal of Sociology*, 55, 237–257. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-4446.2004.00017.x
- Kauff, M., & Wagner, U. (2012). Valuable therefore not threatening: The influence of diversity beliefs on discrimination against immigrants. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 3, 714–721. doi: 10.1177/1948550611435942
- Krueger, J. I. (2007). From social projection to social behaviour. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 18, 1–35. doi: 10.1080/10463280701284645
- Krueger, J., & Clement, R. W. (1996). Inferring category characteristics from sample characteristics: Inductive reasoning and social projection. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 125, 52–68. doi: 10.1037/0096-3445.125.1.52
- Krueger, J. I., & DiDonato, T. E. (2008). Social categorization and the perception of groups and group differences. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2, 733–750. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00083.x
- Krueger, J., & Zeiger, J. S. (1993). Social categorization and the truly false consensus effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 670–680. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.65.4.670
- Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 33, 159–174.
- Leach, C. W., Ellemers, N., & Barreto, M. (2007). Group virtue: The importance of morality (vs. competence and sociability) in the positive evaluation of in-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 234–249. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.93.2.234
- 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. doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2007.09.003
- Machunsky, M., Meiser, T., & Mummendey, A. (2009). On the crucial role of mental ingroup representation for ingroup bias and the ingroup prototypicality-ingroup bias link. *Experimental Psychology*, 56, 156–164. doi: 10.1027/1618-3169.56.3.156
- Mussweiler, T. (2001). Focus of comparison as a determinant of assimilation versus contrast in social comparison. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 38–47. doi: 10.1177/0146167201271004
- Otten, S. (2004). Self-anchoring as predictor of in-group favoritism: Is it applicable to real group contexts? *Cahiers De Psychologie Cognitive/Current Psychology of Cognition*, 22, 427–443.
- Otten, S. (2005). The ingroup as part of the self: Reconsidering the link between social categorization, ingroup favoritism, and the self-concept. In M. D. Alicke, D. A. Dunning, & J. I. Krueger (Eds.), *The self in social judgment* (pp. 241–265). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Otten, S., & Wentura, D. (2001). Self-anchoring and in-group favoritism: An individual profiles analysis. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 525–532. doi: 10.1006/jesp.2001.1479
- Plaut, V. C., Garnett, F. G., Buffardi, L. E., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2011). “What about me?” perceptions of exclusion and whites’ reactions to multiculturalism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101, 337–353. doi: 10.1037/a0022832
- Riketta, M., & Sacramento, C. A. (2008). “They cooperate with us, so they are like me”: Perceived intergroup relationship moderates projection from self to outgroups. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 11, 115–131. doi: 10.1177/1368430207084849
- Robbins, J. M., & Krueger, J. I. (2005). Social projection to ingroups and outgroups: A review and meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9, 32–47. doi: 10.1207/s15327957pspr0901_3
- Sanchez-Burks, J., Nisbett, R. E., & Ybarra, O. (2000). Cultural styles, relationship schemas, and prejudice against outgroups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 174–189. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.79.2.174
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Stangor, C., Lynch, L., Duan, C., & Glas, B. (1992). Categorization of individuals on the basis of multiple social

- features. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 207–218. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.62.2.207
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Thomas, K. M., & Plaut, V. C. (2008). The many faces of diversity resistance in the workplace. In K. M. Thomas & K. M. Thomas (Eds.), *Diversity resistance in organizations* (pp. 1–22). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group/Erlbaum.
- Tropp, L. R., & Bianchi, R. A. (2006). Valuing diversity and interest in intergroup contact. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62, 533–551. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00472.x
- Tropp, L. R., & Wright, S. C. (2001). Ingroup identification as the inclusion of ingroup in the self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 585–600. doi: 10.1177/0146167201275007
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Van der Schalk, D. S., Hawk, S. T., Fischer, A. H., & Doosje, B. (2011). Moving faces, looking places: Validation of the Amsterdam Dynamic Facial Expression Set (ADFES). *Emotion*, 11, 907–920. doi: 10.1037/a0023853
- Van Knippenberg, D., de Dreu, C. K. W., & Homan, A. C. (2004). Work group diversity and group performance: An integrative model and research agenda. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 1008–1022. doi: 10.1177/0018726708095711
- Van Knippenberg, D., Haslam, S. A., & Platow, M. J. (2007). Unity through diversity: Value-in-diversity beliefs, work group diversity, and group identification. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 11, 207–222. doi: 10.1037/1089-2699.11.3.207
- Van Veelen, R., Otten, S., & Hansen, N. (2011). Linking self and ingroup: Self-anchoring as distinctive cognitive route to social identification. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 41, 628–637. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.792
- Van Veelen, R., Otten, S., & Hansen, N. (2012a). Social identification when an ingroup identity is unclear: The role of self-anchoring and self-stereotyping. *British Journal of Social Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8309.2012.02110.x
- Van Veelen, R., Otten, S., & Hansen, N. (2012b). A personal touch to diversity: Self-anchoring increases minority members' identification in a diverse group. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1177/1368430212473167
- Verkuyten, M. (2005). Ethnic group identification and group evaluation among minority and majority groups: Testing the multiculturalism hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 121–138. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.88.1.121
- Verkuyten, M. (2011). Assimilation ideology and outgroup attitudes among ethnic majority members. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 14, 789–806. doi: 10.1177/1368430211398506
- 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. doi: 10.1348/0144666042037944
- Wenzel, M., 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, M., 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
- Wolsko, C., Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (2006). Considering the tower of Babel: Correlates of assimilation and multiculturalism among ethnic minority and majority groups in the United States. *Social Justice Research*, 19, 277–306. doi: 10.1007/s11211-006-0014-8

Received December 23, 2012
 Revision received April 9, 2013
 Accepted April 11, 2013
 Published online July 30, 2013

Ruth van Veelen

Department of Social Psychology
 Universiteit van Groningen
 Grote Kruisstraat 2/1
 9712 TS Groningen
 The Netherlands
 Tel. +31503636420
 E-mail r.van.veelen@rug.nl