

Horizontal Hostility: Relations Between Similar Minority Groups

Judith B. White* and **Ellen J. Langer**

Harvard University

*Two studies were conducted to examine the relations between similar minority groups. We predicted that minority group members would show horizontal hostility, a form of prejudice, against members of a similar, but more mainstream, minority group. The results of both studies confirmed this hypothesis. In Study 1, members of 3 Jewish congregations (reform, conservative, orthodox) showed prejudice against a member of a similar but slightly more secular congregation. In Study 2, members of a college varsity soccer team showed prejudice against junior varsity players. We conclude by suggesting that horizontal hostility is the result of social changes since Allport (1954) wrote *The Nature of Prejudice*. Members of minority groups value their minority social identity, even when the group is stigmatized. The positive value of minority social identity causes group members to look down on members of similar, more mainstream groups.*

Horizontal hostility is the term used by feminists since the 1970s to describe infighting, or factionalism, within the women's movement. Rather than banding together, subgroups snipe (Penelope, 1992; for a humorous reference, see Boyd, 1976). Real-world anecdotes of horizontal hostility abound. Consider what happened to a law professor who happens to be a light-skinned Black woman. Her

* This article is based on an earlier manuscript that received the 1993 Gordon W. Allport Inter-group Relations Prize, and on the first author's doctoral dissertation, completed at Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, where she was supported by a National Science Foundation graduate student fellowship during the data collection phase. Portions of this research were also presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Society, San Francisco, June 1996. We thank Sarah Rimsky and Jenny Franzese for their assistance in conducting these studies, and Karen Ruggiero and Mark Hallahan for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this article.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Judith B. White, Kellogg Graduate School of Management, Northwestern University, 2001 Sheridan Road, Evanston, IL 60208-2001 [e-mail: j-white1@nwu.edu].

appointment at a prestigious university was opposed by the Black Students Association, whose spokesperson said the professor wasn't "black enough" (Sege, 1995). Similarly, when Heather Whitestone was heralded as the first Deaf Miss America, Deaf activists protested. Since Ms. Whitestone uses oral English, and not American Sign Language, Deaf activists didn't consider her Deaf enough ("Signs of Anger," 1995). Even a proposal to broaden The Society for the Psychological Study of Lesbian and Gay Issues (Division 44 of the American Psychological Association) to include the word "bisexual" met resistance from lesbian and gay members, despite the position of the Society's president, Robin Buhrke, that inclusiveness would strengthen the division (Buhrke, 1996). In each of these instances of horizontal hostility, the targets—a Black person who is light skinned, a deaf person who uses oral language, bisexuals—are willing to be identified with the more distinctive minority group. They are, instead, rejected by members of the more distinctive minority group, who may view the targets of horizontal hostility as "wannabes." In this sense, horizontal hostility is not truly horizontal. On close examination, it is only shown by members of minority groups toward more mainstream targets. We formally define horizontal hostility as a prejudice shown by members of a minority group toward members of a similar minority group that is perceived to be more mainstream.

To members of minority groups, these examples may seem all too familiar. The phenomenon of horizontal hostility, however, has yet to be examined empirically. The goal of the present research was to test whether horizontal hostility is a valid psychological phenomenon, in other words, whether these examples represent the rule in relations between similar minority groups, or the exception.

A Theoretical Paradox

Allport (1954) did not explicitly address relations between similar minority groups, other than to state that members of a minority group could be expected to follow the prejudices of the majority and hold all minority groups in low regard, excepting their own. This was because Allport believed that the majority group served as a reference group for minority group members. The commonly held assumption was that members of low-status minority groups desired to assimilate toward the majority. This assumption has been challenged, and 45 years later, a paradox has emerged among theories of relations between similar minority groups. Some theory and research suggests minority group members will be attracted to members of a similar minority group. For example, balance theory (Heider, 1958) and dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) both predict that similarity of attitudes and beliefs will result in attraction. Moreover, Kidder and Stewart (1975) reviewed the interpersonal attraction literature and concluded that similarity, particularly perceived belief similarity, leads to interpersonal and intergroup attraction (pp. 21–26). Citing Walster and Walster (1963), they suggest that in the absence of other information, people assume that someone similar to them will like them, and

people wish to be liked. In fact, similarity between social groups, especially in ideology, is expected to result in mutual attraction (e.g., Wilke, 1985) and to promote coalition building (e.g., Nicholson, Cole, & Rocklin, 1986). Research also suggests that minority group members will like members of similar minority groups. Wilder and Thompson (1988) had mock jurors rate a moderate outgroup, defined as one that reached a similar verdict, and an extreme outgroup, defined as one that reached an extreme, dissimilar verdict. The presence of the second, extreme outgroup did affect jurors' ratings of the similar outgroup, but the effect depended on how similar the similar outgroup's verdict was to the ingroup verdict. If it was very similar, the outgroup's ratings improved, indicating that the outgroup was assimilated toward the ingroup. If it was different enough, the outgroup's ratings got more negative, indicating that the outgroup was contrasted away from the ingroup. Together, this theory and research suggest that minority group members will be attracted to members of similar minority groups.

Other theory and research, however, suggest minority group members will attempt to distance themselves from members of a similar minority group, just as close siblings will try to distinguish themselves from one another. Social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) predicts that minority group members will dislike members of a similar minority group. According to social identity theory, group members are motivated to achieve positive social identity, or a positive value for group membership. The distinctiveness of a group is one factor that contributes to positive social identity. Social identity theory's similarity hypothesis is that a similar group provides less opportunity for meaningful social comparisons that would distinguish the ingroup from the outgroup, so a similar outgroup is a threat to distinctiveness and therefore to the positive value of social identity (Tajfel, 1982). Tajfel predicted that "groups will tend to work harder at establishing their distinctiveness from the outgroups which are perceived as similar than from those which are seen as dissimilar" (Tajfel, 1982, p. 25). Tests of the similarity hypothesis typically compare the degree of participants' ingroup preference shown in the presence of a similar outgroup with the degree of ingroup preference shown in the presence of a dissimilar outgroup. Allen and Wilder (1975) told participants their attitudes were similar or dissimilar to those of the ingroup and/or the outgroup (a 2×2 factorial). Participants who were similar to both the ingroup and the outgroup showed more ingroup preference than participants who were similar to the ingroup but dissimilar from the outgroup. The results support the similarity hypothesis, suggesting that when members of another minority group are similar (perhaps "too close for comfort"), then minority group members will like them less, not more.

There is thus a theoretical paradox concerning the relationship between similar minority groups. Some theory and research suggests that similarity will result in attraction, whereas other theory and research suggests that similarity will result in distancing. We attempt to resolve this paradox by examining the conditions under

which horizontal hostility, prejudice against members of a similar minority group, is predicted to occur.

Resolving the Paradox: The Role of Relative Distinctiveness

We propose that whether minority group members like members of a similar minority group depends on two factors: similarity and relative distinctiveness. Sets of social groups can often be described according to the degree to which they are defined by some distinctive characteristic. In the case of skin tone, the groups might be called White, biracial, and Black. In the case of sexual orientation, the groups might be heterosexual, bisexual, and lesbian and gay. In the case of hearing, the groups might be hearing, hard-of-hearing, and Deaf. In the case of Jewish religious orthodoxy, the groups might be secular, reform, conservative, orthodox, and Hasidic. The relationship between any two groups along such a distinctiveness continuum can then be defined in terms of proximity, which we will call similarity, and distance from the majority, which we will call *distinctiveness*. Using this simple model, lesbians and gay men are more similar to bisexuals than they are to heterosexuals and, at the same time, lesbians and gay men are relatively more distinctive than bisexuals. Similarity, conservative Jews are more similar to reform Jews than they are to secular Jews and, at the same time, conservative Jews are also relatively more distinctive than reform Jews.

Minority group members, for example, lesbians and gay men or conservative Jews, should show horizontal hostility toward members of a minority group that is similar *and* relatively less distinctive. A similar group is defined as an outgroup that is in close proximity along the distinctiveness continuum. A less distinctive group is defined as an outgroup that differs from the ingroup in the direction of the majority, or mainstream. For lesbians and gay men, the targets of horizontal hostility should be bisexuals. For conservative Jewish people, the targets of horizontal hostility should be reform Jews. Even though reform Jews are more similar to conservative Jews than are secular Jews, reform Jews should still be the targets of horizontal hostility. And even though orthodox Jews are roughly as similar to conservative Jews as are reform Jews, orthodox Jews should not be the targets of horizontal hostility.

The rationale for horizontal hostility against a similar, less distinctive group is based on the premise that minority group members value their minority group membership. Theory and research suggest that the distinctiveness of a group is one attribute that makes group membership valuable to individuals. Optimal distinctiveness theory (Brewer, 1991, 1993) posits that an individual's opposing needs for assimilation and differentiation are balanced by membership in a group that is distinctive. Brewer, Manzi, and Shaw (1993) found that when participants had been deindividuated (treated as not distinctive in any way), minority group membership was valued more than majority group membership, even when the

group had a negative stigma. Members of a similar, less distinctive group are targets of horizontal hostility, we believe, because there is the potential that outsiders will tend to lump them together with the minority ingroup, and that would threaten the minority group's distinctiveness in two ways. If they were seen by outsiders as part of the minority ingroup, their presence would render the minority ingroup boundaries both unclear and permeable. For example, if bisexuals were to be considered lesbian or gay, then it would become more difficult to tell who is and who isn't a homosexual. In addition, their presence would make the minority ingroup larger—another way of making it less distinctive—and at the same time add members who themselves are closer to the mainstream than the typical group member. Members of a similar, less distinctive minority outgroup uniquely threaten the distinctiveness of the minority ingroup. Other outgroups do not pose such a threat. Members of a dissimilar, even more mainstream group (e.g., heterosexuals) would not be considered lesbian or gay, as bisexuals might. And the inclusion of lesbian and gay extremists, who are more distinctive than most lesbians and gay men, would enhance rather than diminish the distinctiveness of the minority ingroup.

Present Research

The purpose of the two studies that follow was to examine the attitudes held by minority group members toward members of similar minority groups. We expected to find a pattern of horizontal hostility, a negative attitude held by minority group members toward members of a minority group that is similar and at the same time less distinctive, or more mainstream. To measure attitude valence, we asked minority group members to evaluate targets from their own ingroup and multiple outgroups on several positive social traits. We combined those traits to arrive at a global measure of attitude valence. A relatively positive evaluation indicates a positive attitude; a relatively negative evaluation indicates a negative attitude. When we say "relative," we imply that an evaluation is positive when it is compared to other evaluations. We conceptualize horizontal hostility to be part of an interaction between the minority group member's group identity and the target's group identity. For example, horizontal hostility is when conservative Jews don't like reform Jews, not because *all* Jews don't like reform Jews (that would be a main effect of the target's group) or because conservative Jews don't like *anybody* (that would be a main effect of participant's group), but because above and beyond any main effects, the particular group of Jews who are conservative don't like the particular group of Jews who are reform. In other words, if conservative Jews are as favorable toward reform Jews as are other Jews, and at the same time they are as favorable toward reform Jews as they are toward other similar groups of Jews, then there is no horizontal hostility.

We predicted that minority group members will show horizontal hostility toward a member of a similar, less distinctive group but not toward a member of a similar, more distinctive group. Implicit in this prediction is that the two outgroups are equally similar to the ingroup, and it is the relative distinctiveness of the groups, and not the perceived similarity, that results in one being the target of horizontal hostility. An alternative explanation, however, is possible.¹ The alternative is that group members' attitudes follow the perceived similarity between the ingroup and the outgroup in question. Perhaps minority group members perceive themselves to be more similar to a distinctive outgroup and less similar to the mainstream than do observers. There is some theory and research to support this explanation. The meta-contrast ratio (Haslam & Turner, 1992), derived from social categorization theory (Turner, 1985; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Weatherell, 1987), is the ratio of participant's mean distance to all outgroups divided by participant's distance to target's outgroup. When comparing two similar groups, such as reform and conservative Jews, the meta-contrast ratio would be larger for members of the more distinctive group (e.g., conservative), since their group is farther from the center of the distribution, than for members of the less distinctive group (e.g., reform). In other words, conservative Jews should perceive less similarity with reform Jews than vice versa. If liking were correlated with perceived similarity, the meta-contrast ratio could help explain horizontal hostility. We predicted, however, that since horizontal hostility arises from perceived threat to distinctiveness, it would not be correlated with perceived similarity.

Study 1: Religious Orthodoxy

Design and Hypotheses

In Study 1, we asked members of reform, conservative and orthodox Jewish congregations to evaluate targets who were either nonpracticing, reform, conservative, orthodox, or Hasidic Jews. This created a 3 (participant's congregational affiliation) \times 5 (target's congregational affiliation) mixed factorial design, with participant's congregational affiliation as a between-subjects factor, and target's congregational affiliation as a within-subjects factor. The number of target affiliations exceeded the number of participant affiliations, so that each participant would have the opportunity to evaluate a target who was more mainstream, or secular, than the ingroup as well as a target who was more orthodox than the ingroup.

¹ We thank Clark McCauley for this alternative explanation.

At the most general level, we expected to find that Jewish participants would show horizontal hostility by negatively evaluating a target who belonged to a congregation that was similar but slightly more secular than their own. Evaluations of the predicted targets of horizontal hostility were compared to evaluations of other outgroups that were either similar to the ingroup but slightly more orthodox (distinctive), or dissimilar to the ingroup and even more secular (mainstream). Specifically, we predicted that (a) members of a reform congregation would evaluate a nonpracticing Jew less favorably than they would a conservative Jew; (b) members of a conservative congregation would evaluate a reform Jew less favorably than they would either an orthodox Jew or a nonpracticing Jew; and (c) members of an orthodox congregation would evaluate a conservative Jew less favorably than they would either a Hasidic Jew or a nonpracticing Jew. These predictions were tested with planned contrasts on the Participant's Congregation Affiliation \times Target's Congregation Affiliation interaction residuals.

We also predicted that the role of relative distinctiveness would help explain horizontal hostility against a member of a similar, more secular congregation. Also, we expected that strength of ingroup identification (strength of identification as a Jew) would mediate horizontal hostility. Pilot testing showed that members of our participant pool were reluctant to evaluate a target individual solely on the basis of congregational or category affiliation, preferring instead the American ideal of judging each person on his or her individual merits. To overcome this reluctance, we created a context in which participants would feel comfortable evaluating the targets. We chose the context of a potential romantic relationship in part because it was an area in which participants felt comfortable making a public judgment of an individual in part based on religion.

Method

Participants. Participants were 85 Jewish students at Harvard University who identified as either reform ($n = 30$), conservative ($n = 30$), or orthodox ($n = 25$) Jews. Forty-one were male and forty-three were female (one did not specify gender). Participants were recruited at a kosher dining hall at the university Hillel and by sign-up sheets located in the lobby of the psychology building. All agreed to complete a questionnaire on Jewish relationships in exchange for \$7.

Questionnaire. We created a questionnaire to obtain evaluations of five target individuals, women with different Jewish congregational affiliations, in the guise of evaluating their strengths as potential romantic matches for the fictional "David." To create the questionnaire, six brief biographical descriptions were generated containing a city of origin, a hobby and preferred athletic activity, and a literary and a music preference. These six biographies were rotated using a Latin-square design between David and the five women, Abigail, Dena, Leah, Rachel, and Rebecca.

This resulted in six versions of the questionnaire. From each of those six biographic orders, we generated five versions in which we rotated the women's congregational affiliations. In other words, Rachel, who was always the first woman introduced, was from Boston one sixth of the time, and equally often from Hartford, Washington, DC, Pittsburgh, New York, and Philadelphia. When she was from Boston (i.e., within each of the six versions), she was nonpracticing one fifth of the time, and equally often reform, conservative, orthodox, and Hasidic. To avoid having the reform target follow the conservative target four fifths of the time, as would have happened with a Latin-square rotation, five different random orders of congregation were selected that resulted in a balanced design. This resulted in $6 \times 5 = 30$ versions of each questionnaire. Finally, David's congregational affiliation always matched that of the participant; he was reform for the reform participants, conservative for the conservative participants, and orthodox for the orthodox participants. This resulted in $3 \times 30 = 90$ versions of the questionnaire, a unique questionnaire for each participant. (Five questionnaires prepared for orthodox participants remained uncompleted at the end of the data collection period.)

Procedure. Participants were told that the study was about Jewish relationships, that they could stop at any time, and that their individual questionnaire responses would be anonymous. Participants first informed the experimenter whether they identified as reform, conservative, or orthodox, then were randomly assigned one of the 30 questionnaires for that group. The questionnaire asked participants to rate preferred qualities in a potential partner, the importance of religion, and whether the participant considered himself or herself to be a good matchmaker. It then stated that short biographies of six people would follow, and that participants could assume all six were approximately the same age (19–25), living in the same area, and Jewish. The first person (always David) was interested in meeting someone compatible, and the other five were to be considered as potential dates for the first person. Participants were asked to evaluate each of the five women on five traits: appearance, honesty, kindness, intelligence, and religion. The questions were asked in the form, "Is appearance one of [Dena's] strengths?" to which participants circled a number between 1 (*not at all*) and 5 (*extremely*). Participants were also asked to report their age, gender, and congregational affiliation (*reform, conservative, orthodox, or "other"*), and to indicate their level of observance by checking one of the following: *nonobservant or nonpracticing; observe only the more major holidays; observe most holidays and traditions; observe all holidays and traditions or observe most holidays and all traditions; observe all holidays and all traditions to my greatest ability; observe all holidays and all traditions no matter what.* Participants' level of observance was later converted to a scale of 1 (*nonpracticing*) to 6 (*observe . . . no matter what*). Other measures of ingroup identification were *the importance of personal religion, strength of Jewish identification, and frequency of Jewish identification*, all rated on a scale of 1 (*not at all or none of the time*) to 5 (*extremely or all the time*).

Participants were asked to judge the similarity between every possible pair of the five target groups presented in random order (e.g., nonpracticing and reform, reform and conservative, nonpracticing and reform) on scales ranging from 1 (*not at all similar*) to 5 (*completely similar*). Participants also indicated their the degree of personal experience they'd had with each target group (*none, a little, a lot*), and ranked the groups by perceived size from the largest to the fifth largest. The questionnaire took participants approximately 30 minutes to complete. When they finished, participants were paid, thanked, and debriefed.

Results

Preliminary analyses. Participants who were themselves either reform, conservative, or orthodox Jews evaluated five Jewish targets (a nonpracticing woman, a reform woman, a conservative woman, an orthodox woman, and a Hasidic woman) on five social traits (attractive, honest, intelligent, kind, religious). The preliminary results were analyzed using a Participant's Congregational Affiliation \times Target's Congregational Affiliation analysis of variance (ANOVA) on each of the five trait evaluations. The results appear in Table 1. The preliminary analyses yielded main effects for target's congregational affiliation on all five of the traits. For example, the Hasidic target was evaluated as relatively more kind, honest, and religious, but relatively less attractive and intelligent. It may be useful to examine whether the Jewish participants' evaluations of the five targets reflect a perception that these five targets fall along a continuum. The perception that the targets fall along an underlying continuum was revealed by single-degree linear contrasts of the means. Honesty was considered more of a strength the more orthodox the woman, $F(1, 79) = 14.87, p < .01, r = .40$. Kindness was also considered more of a strength the more orthodox the woman, $F(1, 80) = 15.16, p < .01, r = .40$. Religion was considered a strength the more orthodox the woman, $F(1, 81) = 66.70, p < .01, r = .67$. Conversely, appearance was considered less of a strength the more orthodox the woman, $F(1, 81) = 37.51, p < .01, r = .56$. No linear effect was observed for intelligence, $F(1, 81) = 1.53, p = .22, r = .14$.

Table 1. Jewish Participants' Evaluations

Trait	Target's Jewish congregation				
	Nonpracticing	Reform	Conservative	Orthodox	Hasidic
Appearance ^a	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.3	2.8
Honesty ^b	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.6
Intelligence ^c	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.4
Kindness ^d	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.7
Religion ^e	1.6	2.5	3.3	3.5	3.2

^a $F(4, 324) = 13.85, p < .01, \eta = .38$. ^b $F(4, 316) = 5.25, p < .01, \eta = .25$. ^c $F(4, 326) = 2.44, p = .05, \eta = .17$.

^d $F(4, 320) = 5.51, p < .01, \eta = .25$. ^e $F(4, 324) = 49.84, p < .01, \eta = .62$.

Thus, kindness and honesty were positively associated with the underlying continuum of orthodoxy, and appearance was negatively associated with the underlying continuum of orthodoxy. We wanted to test whether horizontal hostility would be expressed globally, in both positively and negatively associated traits. Our hypotheses were tested with planned contrasts on the combined interaction residuals of all five traits, as described in the next section. Additional preliminary analyses for each trait are summarized below.

For evaluations of appearance, there was no main effect for participant's congregational affiliation, $F(2, 81) = .34, p = .71, \eta = .09$, and no significant Participant's Congregational Affiliation \times Target's Congregational Affiliation interaction, $F(8, 324) = 1.28, p = .25, \eta = .18$. For evaluations of honesty, there was no main effect for participant's congregational affiliation, $F(2, 79) = .14, p = .87, \eta = .06$, and no significant Participant's Congregational Affiliation \times Target's Congregational Affiliation interaction, $F(8, 316) = 1.35, p = .22, \eta = .18$. For evaluations of intelligence, there was a main effect for participant's congregational affiliation, $F(2, 81) = 4.76, p = .01, \eta = .32$, and no significant Participant's Congregational Affiliation \times Target's Congregational Affiliation interaction, $F(8, 324) = 1.39, p = .20, \eta = .18$. For evaluations of kindness, there was no main effect for participant's congregational affiliation, $F(2, 80) = .61, p = .54, \eta = .12$, and no significant Participant's Congregational Affiliation \times Target's Congregational Affiliation interaction, $F(8, 320) = 1.08, p = .38, \eta = .16$. For evaluations of religion, there was a trend for participant's congregational affiliation, $F(2, 81) = 2.56, p = .08, \eta = .24$, and a Participant's Congregational Affiliation \times Target's Congregational Affiliation interaction, $F(8, 324) = 5.42, p < .01, \eta = .34$.

Horizontal hostility. We tested our predictions of horizontal hostility against a target who was a member of a similar, but more mainstream, congregation on the Participant's Congregational Affiliation \times Target's Congregational Affiliation interaction. Conceptually, analyzing the interaction allowed us to ask our question in the form, "What effect did identifying as reform Jews (rather than as conservative or orthodox Jews) have on the relative evaluations of the targets? Did being members of the reform congregation make their evaluations of the secular target less favorable than they otherwise would have been?" Methodologically, interaction analyses are a powerful tool for observing results that would otherwise remain beneath the surface of the main effects. We used a method for analyzing interaction residuals that allowed us to combine the residuals from all five trait evaluations, even though their main effects were observed to be inconsistent (i.e., the secular target was evaluated as more attractive but less religious than the Hasidic target). Our question was whether identifying with a particular congregation had the effect of making the overall evaluation of the target of horizontal hostility lower than it otherwise would have been.

We followed Rosenthal and Rosnow’s (1985) method for testing contrasts in repeated-measure designs. To test a planned contrast on the participant’s affiliation by target’s affiliation interaction, we created a set of composite interaction residuals. We first computed a set of 25 residual trait evaluations for each participant: five traits (attractive, honest, intelligent, kind, religious) for each of the five targets. To compute each residual evaluation, we subtracted the main effects (across targets and between participant groups; the row and column effects) from each individual trait evaluation by letting a residual evaluation equal the original evaluation minus the grand mean, minus the relevant row effect (the group mean, made from summing the cell means across targets for a particular group of participants, minus the grand mean), and minus the relevant column effect (the target mean, made from summing all the cell means for a particular target, minus the grand mean). This left us with a set of 25 residual evaluations for each participant. We let our new dependent measure for each target be the sum of the residual evaluations from all five traits. This left us with a single three (participant’s congregational affiliation) by five (target’s congregational affiliation) mixed factorial design, representing the Participant’s Congregation × Target’s Congregation interaction. (The means for the summed residuals appear in Table 2.) Then we created a contrast score for each participant by multiplying each of his or her residual evaluations by the corresponding planned contrast weight. Planned contrast weights appear in Table 2. The participants’ contrast scores ($M = .85$) were tested as a group against zero. As predicted, participants showed horizontal hostility against a target who was a member of a similar, but slightly more mainstream congregation, $t(82) = 1.89, p = .03$, one-tailed, $r = .20$.

Role of relative distinctiveness. We predicted who the targets of horizontal hostility would be, based on our ordering of the congregations: nonpracticing, reform, conservative, orthodox, Hasidic. In other words, we assumed that the more

Table 2. Horizontal Hostility Contrast Weights and Jewish Participants’ Summed Residual Evaluations

Participant’s Jewish congregation	Target’s Jewish congregation				
	Nonpracticing	Reform	Conservative	Orthodox	Hasidic
Horizontal hostility contrast weights					
Reform	-1	0	+1	0	0
Conservative	+1	-2	0	+1	0
Orthodox	+1	0	-2	0	+1
Summed residual evaluations					
Reform	-.33*	+.81	+.09	-.28	-.32
Conservative	+.17	-.30*	+.42	-.03	-.23
Orthodox	+.24	-.51	-.46*	+.33	+.49

Note. Means reflect the summed Participant’s Congregational Affiliation × Target’s Congregational Affiliation interaction residuals for participants’ evaluations of targets’ appearance, honesty, intelligence, kindness, and religiosity.

*Indicates target of horizontal hostility.

orthodox the congregation, the more distinctive. As predicted, Jewish participants showed horizontal hostility against a target who was a member of a similar, more mainstream congregation. We performed two tests to examine the role of relative distinctiveness, as defined in our model, in predicting horizontal hostility.

The first test of the role of relative distinctiveness in predicting horizontal hostility was to consider how distinctive participants believed the target group to be. The distinctiveness of a minority group depends not only on how different it is from the mainstream, but also its size. A small group is more distinctive than a large group. Conservative Jews may be more orthodox than reform Jews, but if they vastly outnumber them, are they truly considered more distinctive? And if conservative Jews are not more distinctive than reform Jews by this definition, would they still show horizontal hostility toward reform Jews? To test whether size matters, we performed an internal analysis. We grouped participants according to how they ranked the five Jewish congregations by size. Twenty-five participants (four reform, twelve conservative and eleven orthodox) ordered the congregations by size in the same order as our design (nonpracticing, reform, conservative, orthodox, Hasidic). These participants showed greater horizontal hostility, $M = 1.93$, $t(24) = 2.19$, $p = .02$, one-tailed, $r = .41$, than the remaining participants, $M = .39$, $t(57) = .75$, $p = .23$, one-tailed, $r = .10$, supporting the role of relative distinctiveness in predicting horizontal hostility.

The second test of the role of relative distinctiveness was to examine the relationship between horizontal hostility and the degree of similarity Jewish participants perceived between their own congregation and the target's Jewish congregation. We predicted that horizontal hostility would be independent of perceived similarity, a result that would strengthen the explanatory role of relative distinctiveness. Participants rated the degree of similarity they perceived between their own congregation and the horizontal hostility target's congregation (e.g., reform Jewish participants rated the similarity between reform and nonpracticing Jews) using a 5-point scale (1 = *not at all similar*, 5 = *completely similar*). As predicted, the overall correlation between the perceived similarity of the target's congregation to the participant's own congregation and participants' horizontal hostility contrast scores was nonsignificant, $r(83) = -.12$, $p = .29$. Perceived similarity did not account for evaluations of a target who was a member of a similar, more mainstream congregation. The correlation between perceived similarity to a similar, more mainstream congregation and residual evaluations of the target from that congregation was $r(83) = .04$, $p = .70$.

Strength of ingroup identification. Four items were included to test the strength of Jewish participants' identification as Jews. As predicted, these measures of the strength of Jewish identity were positively correlated with individual horizontal hostility contrast scores. Participants' horizontal hostility was correlated with their self-reported level of observance (from *nonpracticing* to *observe*

all holidays and traditions no matter what), $r(83) = .24, p = .03$; the importance of personal religion (1 = *not at all*, 5 = *extremely*), $r(81) = .22, p = .05$; strength of Jewish identification (1 = *not at all strongly*, 5 = *very strongly*), $r(83) = .21, p = .05$; and frequency of Jewish identification (1 = *none of the time*, 5 = *all the time*), $r(83) = .16, p = .15$.

Discussion

As predicted, members of Jewish congregations showed horizontal hostility against a target who was a member of a similar, more secular congregation. Jewish participants evaluated five women, each from a different Jewish congregation (nonpracticing, reform, conservative, orthodox, or Hasidic) under the guise of evaluating the women's suitability as potential romantic partners for the fictional "David," who was always a member of participant's own congregation. Reform Jewish participants showed horizontal hostility against a nonpracticing woman by evaluating her more negatively than they did a conservative woman. Conservative Jewish participants showed horizontal hostility against a reform woman by evaluating her more negatively than they did either an orthodox woman or a nonpracticing woman. Orthodox Jewish participants showed horizontal hostility against a conservative woman by evaluating her more negatively than they did either a Hasidic woman or a nonpracticing woman. We believe this pattern of horizontal hostility emerged only because Jewish participants had the opportunity to evaluate targets from multiple Jewish congregations, rather than simply comparing one outside congregation to their own. In this multiple group context, Jewish participants showed a residual negative attitude toward a member of a congregation that was similar, but slightly more secular, than their own.

The role of relative distinctiveness in predicting horizontal hostility was supported in two ways. First, a subset of participants who ranked the size of the five Jewish congregations in the same order as they would be ranked in terms of orthodoxy (nonpracticing, reform, conservative, orthodox, Hasidic) showed more horizontal hostility than the remaining participants. In other words, if a Jewish person believes that a similar, more secular congregation is larger than his or her own, he or she is more likely to show horizontal hostility toward a member of that congregation than if he or she believes the more secular congregation is actually smaller than his or her own congregation. We interpret this finding as support for our explanation that horizontal hostility arises from a threat to the distinctiveness of minority group identity. Joining together with a larger outgroup, similar and more mainstream, is more of a threat than joining together with a smaller outgroup. Second, the degree of similarity participants perceived between their congregation and the target's congregation did not predict horizontal hostility. We interpret this finding as strengthening the explanatory power of the distinctiveness continuum. Clearly, similarity to the ingroup, or proximity on a

continuum, is not a sufficient factor to explain intergroup relations. A second factor, relative distinctiveness, is also necessary to understand the patterns of multiple group relations.

Strength of ingroup identification, in this case, identity as a Jew, was positively correlated with horizontal hostility. This is consistent with previous research that has found increased ingroup favoritism among group members who strongly identify with their group.

To summarize, the results of Study 1 indicate that horizontal hostility is a part of the pattern of relations between similar Jewish groups. We found support for the role of relative distinctiveness in predicting who would be the target of horizontal hostility. And we identified an individual difference variable, strength of ingroup identification, that mediates the phenomenon.

Study 2: Athletic Elitism

Design and Hypothesis

In Study 2 we sought to replicate the pattern of horizontal hostility with a high-status minority group. Varsity college athletes represent an elite among college students, many of whom participate in organized athletics. We selected three groups of male soccer players: intramural, junior varsity, and varsity. Study 2 utilized a 3 (participant's team) by 3 (target's team) mixed-factorial design, with participant's team as a between-subjects factor, and target's team as a within-subjects factor. Unlike Study 1, which allowed all participants to evaluate a similar, more distinctive group and a similar, more mainstream group, Study 2 participants evaluated only three groups, the ingroup and two outgroups.

We expected to find that soccer players would show horizontal hostility against a target who was a member of a team that was similar, but slightly more mainstream than their own. Specifically, we expected that varsity players would show horizontal hostility against a junior varsity player, by evaluating him less favorably than they did an intramural player, and that junior varsity players would show horizontal hostility against an intramural player, by evaluating him less favorably than they did a varsity player. These predictions were tested with a planned contrast on the Participant's Team \times Target's Team interaction residuals. We also predicted that the role of relative distinctiveness, as defined by the underlying continuum of athletic elitism, would help explain horizontal hostility.

Method

Participants. Participants were 49 male college soccer players: 21 varsity players, 10 junior varsity players, and 18 intramural players. Women soccer players were not included because of the difficulty of recruiting women intramural

soccer players. Varsity and junior varsity players were approached after team practice, and intramural players were recruited by word of mouth and by posters in dormitories. All agreed to complete an anonymous questionnaire in exchange for a coupon for ice cream worth \$1.

Procedure. We created a questionnaire to obtain evaluations of varsity, junior varsity, and intramural soccer players. One page asked players to indicate their team affiliation and how many people they knew on each team (male and female varsity, junior varsity, and recreational), and what quartile they ranked themselves compared to other members of their team. A second page contained nine trait scales: three traits (soccer-playing ability, honesty, and intelligence) per team (varsity, junior varsity, and intramural). Each scale was a line, length 12.2 cm. On each scale, participants were instructed to make three marks: one to indicate how he or she rated the average team member, and two to indicate the endpoints of the range (least and most, or lowest and highest) of team members. Participants were randomly assigned to one of six possible orders of teams, within which each team's trait scales were presented together in the same order: soccer-playing ability, honesty, and intelligence.

Results

Preliminary analyses. Male soccer players who were themselves members of an intramural, junior varsity, or varsity team evaluated three targets: a typical male intramural player, a typical male junior varsity player, and a typical male varsity player. Participants evaluated the soccer-playing ability, honesty, and intelligence of the targets by making slash marks on lines that were 12.2 cm. in length. We converted each slash mark into distance from the left origin. For all traits, the highest possible evaluation was thus 12.2; the lowest was 0. The preliminary results were analyzed using a Participant's Team (intramural, junior varsity, varsity) \times Target's Team (intramural, junior varsity, varsity) ANOVA on each of the three trait evaluations. Means appear in Table 3.

The preliminary analysis yielded main effects for target's team for evaluations of soccer-playing ability and honesty, and a trend for evaluations of intelligence.

Table 3. Soccer Players' Evaluations

Trait	Target's soccer team		
	Intramural	Junior varsity	Varsity
Soccer-playing ability ^a	3.4	5.9	8.6
Honesty ^b	6.6	6.4	5.7
Intelligence ^c	7.4	7.4	6.8

^a $F(2, 94) = 83.00, p < .01, \eta = .80$. ^b $F(2, 92) = 4.96, p = .01, \eta = .31$. ^c $F(2, 92) = 2.16, p = .12, \eta = .21$.

The typical varsity player was evaluated as having greater soccer-playing ability, but less honesty and (nonsignificantly) less intelligence, than his junior varsity and intramural counterparts. The perception that soccer teams fall along a continuum was revealed by single-degree linear contrasts of the means, weighting the intramural target with -1 , the junior varsity target with 0 , and the varsity target with $+1$. A linear contrast of soccer-playing ability evaluations was significant, $F(1, 47) = 132.97, p < .01, \eta = .86$. A linear contrast of honesty evaluations was significant $F(1, 46) = 9.00, p < .01, \eta = .41$. A linear contrast of intelligence evaluations showed a trend, $F(1, 46) = 2.95, p = .09, \eta = .25$. Thus, soccer-playing ability was positively associated with the underlying continuum of athletic elitism, whereas honesty and to a lesser extent intelligence were negatively associated with the underlying continuum. Additional preliminary analyses are reported below.

For evaluations of soccer-playing ability, participants from the different teams gave different overall evaluations, $F(2, 47) = 8.45, p < .01, \eta = .51$. Intramural players were more generous, and varsity players were less generous, in evaluating all the targets' soccer-playing ability. There was no significant Participant's Team \times Target's Team interaction, $F(4, 94) = .83, p = .51, \eta = .19$. For evaluations of honesty, there was no main effect of participant's team, $F(2, 46) = .38, p = .68, \eta = .13$, and no significant Participant's Team \times Target's Team interaction, $F(4, 92) = .46, p = .77, \eta = .14$. For evaluations of intelligence, there was no main effect of participant's team, $F(2, 46) = 1.47, p = .24, \eta = .25$, and no significant Participant's Team \times Target's Team interaction, $F(4, 92) = .69, p = .60, \eta = .17$.

As in Study 1, we wanted to test whether soccer players would show horizontal hostility globally, on both positive and negative traits. We followed the same procedure as in Study 1 to compute participants' residual evaluations for each trait. We then summed these residual evaluations, and the summed residual evaluations, three for each participant (one for the typical intramural player, one for the typical junior varsity player, and one for the typical varsity player) became our main dependent measure. Our prediction of horizontal hostility was tested with a planned contrast on the summed interaction residuals.

Horizontal hostility. We tested our prediction of horizontal hostility against a member of a similar, less elite team with planned contrast on the interaction residuals (the contrast weights and summed interaction residuals appear in Table 4).²

² Following Rosenthal and Rosnow (1985), we computed contrast scores for each participant by summing his or her weighted composite evaluations. For junior varsity players, we summed the residual evaluation of the typical intramural player, multiplied by a weight of -1 , and the residual evaluation of the typical varsity player, multiplied by a weight of $+1$. For varsity players, we summed the residual evaluation of the typical intramural player, multiplied by a weight of $+1$, and the residual evaluation of the typical junior varsity player, multiplied by a weight of -1 . These contrast scores were tested as group against zero.

Table 4. Horizontal Hostility Contrast Weights and Soccer Players' Summed Residual Evaluations

Participant's soccer team	Target's soccer team		
	Intramural	Junior varsity	Varsity
Horizontal hostility contrast weights			
Intramural	0	0	0
Junior varsity	-1	0	+1
Varsity	+1	-1	0
Residual evaluations			
Intramural	+0.01	+0.38	-0.39
Junior varsity	-0.26*	+0.45	-0.20
Varsity	+0.26	-0.83*	+0.56

Note. Means reflect the summed Participant's Team \times Target's Team interaction residuals for participants' evaluations of targets' soccer-playing ability, honesty, and intelligence.

*Indicates target of horizontal hostility.

There was a trend toward horizontal hostility, $t(30) = 1.46$, $p = .08$, one-tailed, $r = .26$. An examination of the participants' teams showed that varsity players showed more horizontal hostility ($M = 1.09$) against a junior varsity target than junior varsity players ($M = .06$) showed against an intramural target. A post hoc test on varsity players alone revealed they showed horizontal hostility against the junior varsity target, $t(20) = 2.13$, $p = .03$, one-tailed, $r = .45$.

Role of relative distinctiveness. We predicted who the targets of horizontal hostility would be based on our ordering of intramural, junior varsity, and varsity soccer teams along a continuum of athletic elitism. We tested the explanatory power of the distinctiveness continuum against the alternative explanation that participants' evaluations of targets would be based on the similarity they perceived between the target's team and their own team. In Study 2, we did not ask participants to directly compare, for example, the varsity and junior varsity teams. Instead, we asked them to evaluate the soccer-playing ability of the best junior varsity player and that of the worst varsity player. We took the degree of overlap between the best junior varsity player and the worst varsity player as a measure of each participant's perceived similarity between the teams. Similarly, we took the degree of overlap in soccer-playing ability between the best intramural player and the worst junior varsity player as a measure of perceived similarity between these two teams. Varsity players' horizontal hostility against a junior varsity target was not significantly correlated with the degree to which they perceived an overlap between the junior varsity team and their own team, $r(21) = .11$, $p = .63$. And junior varsity players' horizontal hostility against an intramural target was not significantly correlated with the degree to which they perceived an overlap between the intramural team and their own team, $r(10) = .11$, $p = .75$.

Discussion

Varsity soccer players showed horizontal hostility against a junior varsity player, as predicted. Male varsity, junior varsity, and intramural soccer players evaluated the soccer-playing ability, honesty, and intelligence of the average male varsity, junior varsity, and intramural players. Varsity soccer players evaluated a typical junior varsity player less favorably than they did a typical intramural player, as part of the Participant's Team \times Target's Team interaction. Junior varsity soccer players, contrary to our prediction, did not show horizontal hostility against an intramural player. This finding may appear inconsistent, yet we lack the information on relevant factors that could explain it within the framework of horizontal hostility. The boundary between junior varsity and varsity, for example, is far less clear and more permeable than the boundary between intramural and junior varsity. Intramural players must await annual tryouts before being considered for the intercollegiate teams, whereas a coach's decision could move a player from the junior varsity to the varsity roster at any time. We can speculate that when a boundary is clear and impermeable, there will be no threat to minority group identity, and thus no horizontal hostility. Further research, however, is needed to address this speculation.

The role of relative distinctiveness in predicting horizontal hostility was supported, relative to the role of perceived similarity, since players' horizontal hostility was not significantly correlated with the degree of similarity they perceived between the target's team and their own team.

General Discussion

The goal of the present research was to bring attention to the experience of horizontal hostility, and to establish it as a psychological phenomenon deserving of investigation. Previous theory and research cast relations between similar minority groups as being governed by the degree of similarity between them, irrespective of whether one of the groups was relatively more distinctive than the other along an underlying continuum. The result was conflicting research and theory about whether members of similar minority groups would like each other. We attribute part of that conflict to the prevailing paradigm for studying intergroup relations, which limits observable phenomena to those that occur between just two groups, an ingroup and an outgroup. We predicted that when multiple minority groups could be arranged along an underlying distinctiveness continuum, members of minority groups would show horizontal hostility, a negative attitude, against a target who was a member of a minority group that was similar, but more mainstream than their own.

We tested our prediction in field studies of members of stigmatized minority groups (Study 1) and members of elite minority groups (Study 2). The results of

both studies confirmed our prediction of horizontal hostility. In Study 1, members of Jewish congregations showed horizontal hostility against a target who was a member of a similar, more mainstream Jewish congregation. Reform Jews showed horizontal hostility against nonpracticing Jews, conservative Jews showed horizontal hostility against reform Jews, and orthodox Jews showed horizontal hostility against conservative Jews. In Study 2, varsity soccer players showed horizontal hostility against junior varsity soccer players. In both studies, horizontal hostility was part of the Participant's Group \times Target's Group interaction. In other words, horizontal hostility emerged from the particular interaction between the participant's minority identity and the target's minority group. It could not be explained as part of an overall prejudice, shown by all participants, against the targets.

It is important to acknowledge that in these studies, participants evaluated targets on positive traits, using scales ranging from *not at all* to *extremely*. We interpret a less favorable evaluation as negative, though technically it would be correct to say it is less positive. In the economic world in which we live, when group categorization results in a less favorable evaluation than the target would otherwise receive, the result is prejudice.

Horizontal hostility is a form of prejudice shown by minority group members against members of a similar minority group. It is unidirectional: The targets of horizontal hostility are always members of a similar minority group that is more mainstream than the minority ingroup. We believe that the targets of horizontal hostility represent a unique threat to the minority ingroup's identity. In particular, we believe that minority group members show horizontal hostility against people who, were they to be considered part of the minority ingroup, would devalue the minority ingroup identity by making it less distinctive. Our explanation for horizontal hostility is based on two factors that describe the relationship between similar minority groups: proximity, or similarity, and relative distinctiveness. These two factors describe the relationship among groups that are easily arranged on a continuum of some underlying characteristic or attribute. In the case of Jewish congregations, the underlying continuum was religious orthodoxy. In the case of soccer teams, the underlying continuum was level of competition. Of these two factors, similarity alone was not sufficient to account for our results. Participants in both studies showed horizontal hostility, yet the degree to which they showed horizontal hostility was not significantly correlated with the degree of similarity they perceived between the target's group and their own group. The inability of similarity alone to explain horizontal hostility underscores the importance of the role of relative distinctiveness in understanding the relations between similar minority groups.

Protecting the Value of Minority Group Identity

One way to understand horizontal hostility is from the perspective of the minority group. We suggested earlier that when members of a minority group show horizontal hostility, they act against their own group's interest. In the eyes of the majority, that may seem true. The majority see a small, isolated minority that they stigmatize. But from the perspective of the minority group members, the value of the minority group lies in its distinctiveness. A minority group is not going to become any more powerful by becoming a little bigger; it would have to become a lot bigger to gain power. But it may lose value if it becomes less distinctive, if *anyone* can be considered a member. In this way, a low-status minority group is very much like a high-status group, for example, a country club. Membership is more valuable if the number of members is limited and if membership is for life. Social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) calls this value *positive social identity*, and group distinctiveness is a part of it.

Distinctiveness is not a tangible good, and therefore it is easily overlooked. But if we assume that the distinctiveness of a minority group identity has value and treat it as we would a more tangible resource, then an intuitive understanding of horizontal hostility is possible. This understanding follows Blumer's (1958) elegant statement of group position theory, a theory of prejudice based on protecting the ingroup's advantaged position from outgroup threat. Blumer's thesis is that prejudice arises when ingroup members perceive a threat to their group's advantaged position from members of an outgroup. We believe that horizontal hostility can be understood as a form of prejudice that arises when members of a minority group perceive a threat to their minority identity from members of a similar, more mainstream outgroup.

Boundaries matter. Intergroup boundaries tend to dissolve upon close inspection, and to fade away when viewed from a distance. When brought into focus they are at best fuzzy; at worst chimeric. Boundaries matter, nevertheless. We readily categorize individuals into social groups, and we give those groups names or category labels. Our attitudes, cognition, and behavior are affected by our perceptions of these categories and where we draw the boundaries between them. In this article, we assumed there is an intergroup boundary between subgroups of a minority group, that is, that reform and conservative are separate groups of Jewish people. The other assumption we made is that identifiable subgroups of a minority group differ along a linear dimension, in this case, religious orthodoxy. Our data suggest that this is, indeed, how people perceive minority subgroups. Whether people perceive the same linear relationship between different minority groups (e.g., Jews and gays) is still an empirical question. To the extent that Jews and gays are defined along different, orthogonal dimensions, we would not predict a pattern of horizontal hostility between them.

Societal Implications

Allport emphasized that minority group members valued their group identity, even when their groups were stigmatized by members of the majority. “Minority ethnic group members, “ Allport wrote, “are of two minds” (1954, p. 238). On one hand, they seek to assimilate toward and blend into the majority. On the other hand, they tend to actively maintain at least some aspects of their distinctive culture, language, and social customs. We believe that the balance of these opposing tendencies has shifted over time. Allport wrote *The Nature of Prejudice* before the full flowering of the African American civil rights movement. In the past 30 years, other minority groups—gay men and lesbians, people with disabilities—have followed the example set by African Americans and have sought and achieved a positive value for their stigmatized group identities. Roger Brown observed: “I do think there is an upsurge, greater than any in prior history, of affirmation of group distinctiveness and insistence on being valued as distinct. Assimilation is not a popular idea nowadays” (Brown, 1986, p. 563). The result of these social changes is a shift toward distinctiveness that has gradually made minority identity attractive even to nonmembers. Stigmatized minority group members enjoy a popular notoriety in today’s culture even as they continue to bear the burden of discrimination and prejudice from the majority. It is in this sense that distinctive minority group members are advantaged, vis-à-vis a similar, more mainstream group. And it is from this advantaged position, we believe, that distinctive minority group members look down on less distinctive group members, showing horizontal hostility, a form of prejudice, against them.

Gordon Allport hoped that by unlearning negative stereotypes and reframing ingroup boundaries we might reduce prejudice. His rationale was that if we perceive greater similarities with other groups, we might reduce our prejudice. The last 40 years of stereotype research have shown us, to the contrary, that stereotypes are resilient. Horizontal hostility raises the possibility that even when groups are quite similar, prejudice may persist. Future research should focus more on the issues of prejudice and stereotypes from the perspective of the minority group member. We hope this research will allow us to generate new strategies for reducing prejudice in an ever-shrinking world.

References

- Allen, V. L., & Wilder, D. A. (1975). Categorization, belief similarity, and intergroup discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 971–977.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Blumer, H. (1958). Race prejudice as a sense of group position. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 1, 3–7.
- Boyd, M. (1976). Horizontal hostility. In D. Stillman & A. Beatts (Eds.), *Titters: The first collection of humor by women* (p. 153). New York: Collier.

- Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17, 475–482.
- Brewer, M. B. (1993). Social identity, distinctiveness, and in-group homogeneity. *Social Cognition*, 11, 150–164.
- Brewer, M. B., Manzi, J. M., & Shaw, J. S. (1993). In-group identification as a function of depersonalization, distinctiveness, and status. *Psychological Science*, 4, 88–92.
- Brown, R. (1986). *Social psychology*. (2nd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Buhrke, R. (1996, April). [President's column.] *Division 44 Newsletter*, 12, 1.
- Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, 7, 117–140.
- Haslam, S. A., & Turner, J. C. (1992). Context-dependent variation in social stereotyping 2: The relationship between frame of reference, self-categorization and accentuation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 251–277.
- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley.
- Kidder, L. H., & Stewart, V. M. (1975). *The psychology of intergroup relations: Conflict and consciousness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nicholson, N., Cole, S. G., & Rocklin, T. (1986). Coalition formation in parliamentary situations as a function of simulated ideology, resources, and electoral systems. *Political Psychology*, 7, 103–116.
- Penelope, J. (1992). *Call me lesbian: Lesbian lives, lesbian theory*. Freedom, CA: Crossing Press.
- Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. L. (1985). *Contrast analysis: Focused comparisons in the analysis of variance*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University.
- Sege, I. (1995, February 9). Not Black enough? Law professor heads to BU after furor at Northwestern over her racial identity. *The Boston Globe*, pp. 63, 68.
- Signs of anger. (1995, March 4). *The Boston Globe*, p. 22.
- Tajfel, H. (1978). Social categorization, social identity and social comparison. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups* (pp. 61–76). London: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 33, 1–39.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. Austin & S. Worschel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks Cole.
- Turner, J. C. (1985). Social categorization and the self-concept: A social-cognitive theory of group behavior. In E. J. Lawler (Ed.), *Advances in group processes: Theory and research* (Vol. 2, pp. 77–121). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Weatherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell.
- Wilder, D. A., & Thompson, J. E. (1988). Assimilation and contrast effects in the judgments of groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 62–73.
- Wilke, H. A. M. (1985). Coalition formation from a socio-psychological perspective. In H. A. M. Wilke (Ed.), *Coalition formation* (pp. 115–171). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier Science.

JUDITH B. WHITE is a postdoctoral fellow at the Kellogg Graduate School of Management at Northwestern University. She received her BA from Indiana University and earned her PhD in social psychology from Harvard University in 1998. Her research interests lie in the area of minority identity, minority influence, and relations between minority groups. She was awarded the Gordon W. Allport Intergroup Relations Prize in 1993 for her paper with Ellen J. Langer entitled “Horizontal Hostility and the Reverse Magnet Effect: An Intergroup Model of Minority Influence.”

ELLEN J. LANGER is Professor of Psychology at Harvard University, where she has been a member of the faculty since 1977. She taught at the Graduate Center of CUNY for three years after receiving her PhD from Yale University. Her most recent books, *Mindfulness* and *The Power of Mindful Learning*, reveal her abiding concern for the reciprocal and interactive nature of theory, research and application to social issues. She was awarded prizes for the Distinguished Contribution to Psychology in the Public Interest and the Distinguished Contribution of Basic Science to Psychology from the American Psychological Association.