

UC Santa Barbara

UC Santa Barbara Previously Published Works

Title

Specific emotions as mediators of the effect of intergroup contact on prejudice: findings across multiple participant and target groups

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0xx4g45z>

Journal

Cognition & Emotion, 31(5)

ISSN

0269-9931

Authors

Seger, Charles R
Banerji, Ishani
Park, Sang Hee
[et al.](#)


Publication Date

2017-07-04

DOI

10.1080/02699931.2016.1182893

Peer reviewed



Specific emotions as mediators of the effect of intergroup contact on prejudice: Findings across multiple participant and target groups

Journal:	<i>Cognition and Emotion</i>
Manuscript ID	CEM-FA 59.15.R2
Manuscript Type:	Full Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Seger, Charles; University of East Anglia, School of Psychology Banerji, Ishani; University of Texas, San Antonio Park, Sang Hee; Chungbuk National University Smith, Eliot; Indiana University Mackie, Diane; University of California, Santa Barbara
Keywords:	intergroup contact, emotions, attitudes, prejudice, intergroup relations

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5 Specific emotions as mediators of the effect of intergroup contact on prejudice: Findings
6
7 across multiple participant and target groups
8

9 Charles R. Seger

Ishani Banerji

10 University of East Anglia

University of Texas, San Antonio

11 Sang Hee Park

Eliot R. Smith

12 Chungbuk National University

Indiana University, Bloomington

13 Diane M. Mackie

14 University of California, Santa Barbara
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Running Head: EMOTIONAL MEDIATORS OF PREJUDICE
27

28 Word count: 8,499 (including references)
29

30 Keywords: Intergroup contact, emotions, attitudes, prejudice, intergroup relations, social
31 image
32
33
34

35 Acknowledgments: Preparation of this manuscript was supported by NSF Grant
36 BCS-0719876. We are grateful to Catherine Cottrell and Steve Neuberg for proposing
37 the collection of these data and to the TESS project supported by NSF Grant 0094964
38 (Diana C. Mutz and Arthur Lupia, Principal Investigators) for collecting the data and
39 making them freely available for research use. Austin Chapman, Elizabeth Collins, and
40 Ashley Waggoner provided helpful advice and suggestions. Address correspondence to
41 Charles Seger, School of Psychology, University of East Anglia, Norwich Research Park,
42 Norwich NR4 7TJ, United Kingdom.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Specific emotions as mediators of the effect of intergroup contact on prejudice: Findings
6
7 across multiple participant and target groups
8
9

10 11 Abstract

12
13
14 Emotions are increasingly being recognized as important aspects of prejudice and
15 intergroup behavior. Specifically, emotional mediators play a key role in the process by
16 which intergroup contact reduces prejudice towards outgroups. However, which
17 particular emotions are most important for prejudice reduction, as well as the consistency
18 and generality of emotion-prejudice relations across different ingroup-outgroup relations,
19 remain uncertain. To address these issues, in Study 1 we examined 6 distinct positive and
20 negative emotions as mediators of the contact-prejudice relations using representative
21 samples of U. S. White, Black, and Asian American respondents (N = 639). Admiration
22 and anger (but not other emotions) were significant mediators of the effects of previous
23 contact on prejudice, consistently across different perceiver and target ethnic groups.
24
25 Study 2 examined the same relations with student participants and gay men as the
26 outgroup. Admiration and disgust mediated the effect of past contact on attitude. The
27 findings confirm that not only negative emotions (anger or disgust, based on the specific
28 types of threat perceived to be posed by an outgroup), but also positive, status- and
29 esteem-related emotions (admiration) mediate effects of contact on prejudice, robustly
30 across several different respondent and target groups.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Specific emotions as mediators of the effect of intergroup contact on prejudice: Findings
6
7 across multiple participant and target groups
8

9
10 Intergroup contact reduces prejudice toward an outgroup, across a wide variety of
11
12 perceiver and target groups (Allport, 1954; Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Pettigrew &
13
14 Tropp, 2006). For example, contact improves attitudes towards gay men (Barron,
15
16 Struckman-Johnson, Quevillon & Banka, 2008), the elderly (Caspi, 1984), Bosnian Serbs
17
18 (Cehajic, Brown, & Castano, 2008), and Irish Catholics and Protestants (Hewstone,
19
20 Cairns, Voci, Hamberger, & Niens, 2006). Recent work has emphasized the role of
21
22 affective rather than cognitive processes in mediating this relationship. While
23
24 information gained through contact can reduce prejudice by breaking down inaccurate
25
26 negative stereotypes about the outgroup, several types of evidence suggest that this
27
28 mediating process is of limited importance (Brown & Hewstone, 2005). The general
29
30 consensus now seems to be that whereas changed beliefs about the outgroup play a small
31
32 role in explaining reductions in prejudice, affective processes play a more critical
33
34 mediational role (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005; Miller, Smith, & Mackie, 2004). But which
35
36 specific emotions are the most important mediators?
37
38
39
40
41

42 *Negative threat-related emotions.* Past theorizing has mostly focused on negative
43
44 emotions¹ associated with different types of intergroup threats (e.g., Cottrell & Neuberg,
45
46 2005; Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000; Smith, 1993). For example, people might
47
48 experience anxiety when an outgroup is perceived as physically or symbolically
49
50 dangerous (or when interacting with outgroup members creates feelings of unease), anger
51
52 at an outgroup that is seen as demanding unfair advantages, or disgust at an outgroup that
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 is perceived as potentially contaminating the ingroup.
6

7 Much research has examined the anxiety experienced during intergroup
8 interactions (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). Although this emotion may arise for relatively
9 benign reasons (e.g., a desire not to appear prejudiced, or ignorance about how to interact
10 with the outgroup) it nevertheless has negative effects. It may narrow one's attention and
11 lead to expectancy confirming biases, while amplifying threat-related appraisals of the
12 outgroup (Van Zomeren, Fischer, & Spears, 2007). Intergroup anxiety is generally
13 associated with an unwillingness to engage in intergroup contact (e.g., Islam &
14 Hewstone, 1993; Voci & Hewstone, 2003), which obviously may be misconstrued by
15 observers as dislike or outright prejudice.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Anger is an emotion associated with threats to personal or group resources
29 (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005). It is particularly related to economic threats (Cottrell &
30 Neuberg, 2005; Tapias, Glaser, Keltner, Vasquez & Wickens, 2007), and increases the
31 perceived certainty that an ingroup has been wronged (Kamans, van Zomeren, Gordijn, &
32 Postmes, 2014). As a result, Van Zomeren, Spears, Leach and Fischer (2004)
33 demonstrate that group-based anger leads to collective action tendencies against an
34 outgroup.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 In addition to anxiety and anger, disgust is also relevant for intergroup relations.
46 Group-based disgust, at the most basic level, relates to a threat to group health via
47 contagion, and is associated with groups such as homosexuals (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005)
48 or those that are perceived as posing moral threats or violating ingroup moral norms
49 (Hutcherson & Gross, 2011).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Thus, several negative emotions may be relevant, depending on the type of threat
6
7 perceived to be posed by the target group. Whereas anxiety is typically associated with
8
9 avoidance of the outgroup, anger (an approach-oriented emotion) is associated with
10
11 increased support for collective and hostile action (Miller, Cronin, Garcia & Branscombe
12
13 2009). Van Zomeren et al. (2007) demonstrated that high levels of intergroup anxiety can
14
15 lead to an increase in feelings of threat, but that it is the resulting anger from this threat,
16
17 not anxiety itself, that proximally relates to action tendencies towards the outgroup. In
18
19 keeping with this, Tam et al. (2007) showed that intergroup contact improved attitudes
20
21 toward an outgroup, mediated by a reduction in anger. Thus, anger plausibly plays a
22
23 major role in explaining how contact changes intergroup attitudes and behavior.
24
25 However, this may depend in part on the nature of the groups involved. For instance,
26
27 Tapias et al. (2007) showed that while dispositional levels of anger predicted prejudice
28
29 against ethnic outgroups, dispositional disgust predicted heterosexuals' prejudice against
30
31 gay men. Thus, the role of specific emotions within an intergroup context may depend on
32
33 the particular groups involved.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 This view is in keeping with the idea (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005) that different
41
42 types of outgroups pose their own unique patterns of perceived threats to the ingroup,
43
44 which generate distinct emotional reactions. Cottrell and Neuberg (2005) did not directly
45
46 address the implications of their threat-based emotion model for the mediation of contact
47
48 effects on prejudice. However, the implications are clear, though untested. If intergroup
49
50 contact reduces perceptions of a particular type of threat, this would lead to a decrease in
51
52 the specific corresponding threat-based emotion. Thus, one would expect that positive
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 contact with an outgroup would reduce the specific emotion tied to the threat perceived
6
7 from that group (e.g., anger or disgust). Different negative emotions would then mediate
8
9 the prejudice-reducing effects of contact depending on the specific combination of
10
11 perceiver and target groups.
12

13
14 *Positive emotions.* But threat-based emotions are not the only ones that are
15
16 potentially relevant to prejudice; positive emotions are important as well. Miller et al.
17
18 (2004) found that past intergroup contact is associated with both a reduction in negative
19
20 emotions and an increase in positive emotions. Moreover, the relationship between
21
22 contact and prejudice was strongly mediated by positive emotions whereas negative
23
24 emotions had a marginal effect. Theoretical analyses of the intergroup contact effect
25
26 specifically emphasize the positive emotions that arise from a close friendship with an
27
28 outgroup member (Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Ellison & Powers, 1994; Pettigrew &
29
30 Tropp, 2006; Tropp, 2007). Intergroup friendship is associated with feelings of sympathy
31
32 and admiration toward the friend's group (Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, & Ropp,
33
34 1997). While contact may reduce threat-related emotions such as anxiety or anger, it may
35
36 also increase positive emotions and approach behavior.
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 Although positive emotions are generally less differentiated than negative
44
45 emotions (Fredrickson, 1998), we will examine two distinct forms, sympathy/pity and
46
47 respect/admiration. Intergroup sympathy or pity occurs when outgroups are unable to
48
49 fairly reciprocate to the ingroup for reasons out of their control (Cottrell & Neuberg,
50
51 2005). Pity or sympathy may motivate positive intergroup behavior such as donating to
52
53 help refugees. Still, it is not necessarily an ideal mediator of prejudice reduction, as it
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 suggests a large status differential between groups and intergroup contact is most
6
7 effective when there is equal status between groups or individuals (Pettigrew & Tropp,
8
9 2006).

10
11 Recent theoretical and empirical work has highlighted the potential role of
12
13 admiration in intergroup relations (Sweetman, Spears, Livingstone, & Manstead, 2013).
14
15 Admiration results from appraisals of an individual or group as high in perceived
16
17 competence (closely tied to status) and/or warmth (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2008; Algoe
18
19 & Haidt, 2009). The conceptualization of admiration as a distinct emotion is bolstered by
20
21 work demonstrating that it has unique psychophysiological and neurological correlates
22
23 including nonconscious systems such as hormone regulation and blood pressure
24
25 (Immordino-Yang, McColl, Damasio, & Damasio, 2009). Experimental studies
26
27 demonstrate the importance of admiration as a driver of intergroup attitudes and
28
29 behavior. For example, heterosexuals who think about admired gays and lesbians exhibit
30
31 less implicit antigay prejudice and more positive voting intentions toward gay rights
32
33 (Dasgupta & Rivera, 2008). Similarly, priming Whites with admired Black and disliked
34
35 White exemplars has been shown to reduce implicit bias against Blacks (Dasgupta &
36
37 Greenwald, 2001). Bergsieker, Shelton, and Richeson (2010) demonstrated that in
38
39 interracial interaction, racial minorities are especially focused on the desire to be
40
41 respected or admired, a goal they seek by emphasizing their competence. Finally, Ray,
42
43 Mackie, and Smith (2012) found that measured and manipulated admiration is a strong
44
45 predictor of attitudes toward several specific social groups.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Admiration also plays an important role in regulating intergroup behavior,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 because when a group is admired, people tend to take action supporting that group's
6
7 goals. Sweetman et al. (2013) demonstrated that admiration toward dominant groups
8
9 motivates deference toward them, thus inhibiting support for social change. In contrast,
10
11 admiration toward oppressed or minority groups motivates support for those groups,
12
13 including action aimed at changing social hierarchies. In either of these cases – whether
14
15 with a high-status or low-status outgroup – admiration relates to positive attitudes (i.e.,
16
17 reduced prejudice) toward that outgroup. Sweetman et al. found that admiration had
18
19 stronger effects on behavior compared to other emotions such as contempt, pity, and
20
21 sympathy.
22
23
24

25
26 All this research suggests that to the extent intergroup contact induces feelings of
27
28 admiration and respect for outgroup members, it should reduce prejudice – in other
29
30 words, admiration should be an emotional mediator of the effect of contact on prejudice.
31
32

33 *Summary of hypotheses.* Thus, our two central hypotheses for these studies are:

34
35
36 1. Effects of contact on prejudice reduction should be partially mediated by
37
38 reductions in negative emotions (e.g., anger, disgust, or anxiety) related to the specific
39
40 type of threat perceived to be posed by the outgroup.
41

42
43 2. Effects of contact on prejudice reduction should be partially mediated by
44
45 increases in the positive emotion of admiration toward the outgroup (Sweetman et al.,
46
47 2013).
48

49
50 *Limitations of previous literature.* We have argued that affective mediators are
51
52 central in the effect of intergroup contact on prejudice reduction, and that positive as well
53
54 as negative emotions may play a significant role. However, conclusions based on
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 previous research are necessarily limited and tentative for a number of reasons. First,
6
7 much existing research uses convenience samples such as student or community samples,
8
9 and probes the effects of contact with only a single target group. Such a strategy is
10
11 suitable for specific theory testing but is less able to demonstrate which emotions mediate
12
13 the effect of contact on prejudice across a broader diversity of perceiver and target
14
15 groups. Questions about whether similar or different emotional mediators operate in
16
17 different intergroup situations cannot be answered if studies use non-comparable sample-
18
19 selection procedures, measures of emotions and contact, or analytic approaches.
20
21
22
23

24 Second, of the studies that have used representative national samples to examine
25
26 relationships between contact and prejudice, few have measured emotions as potential
27
28 mediators. Moreover, the majority of studies that do focus on emotion mediators have
29
30 examined only one or two emotions, often anxiety (e.g., Greenland & Brown, 1999;
31
32 Islam & Hewstone, 1993). Such studies are incapable of determining if other emotions,
33
34 potentially correlated with anxiety, are the actual mediators of the contact-prejudice
35
36 relationship. Studies that measure only negative emotions but neglect positive emotions
37
38 such as admiration might also present an incomplete picture, in light of the evidence
39
40 reviewed above. Overall, we concur with Pettigrew's (1997, p. 181) advice that
41
42 "research involving changes in prejudice should routinely include a range of affect
43
44 measures."
45
46
47
48

49 Finally, different studies have measured affective mediators in two distinct ways.
50
51 Some studies have assessed the emotions experienced within an actual or imagined
52
53 contact situation, by asking how one would feel when interacting with an individual
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 outgroup member (e.g., Binder et al., 2009; Turner, Hewstone & Voci, 2007). Other
6
7 studies, in contrast, have measured more general emotions toward an outgroup, for
8
9 example the extent to which one feels angry, afraid, or disgusted about the group as a
10
11 whole, driven by appraisals of the group (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005; Miller et al., 2004).
12
13 Although presumably related, these two measurement approaches are not directly
14
15 comparable.
16
17

18
19 *The current studies.* To remedy several concerns regarding the existing literature,
20
21 our first study uses a unique dataset. Most notably, it includes representative samples
22
23 from three ethnic groups in the U.S. (White, Black, and Asian Americans) and randomly
24
25 assigns each respondent one of the other two groups as a target, allowing unconfounded
26
27 comparisons of responses to the different target groups by holding constant sample
28
29 selection and question wordings. It also incorporates measures of multiple emotions,
30
31 both positive and negative, felt toward the outgroup as a whole. Study 2 adds measures
32
33 of emotions expected in a specific intergroup contact situation for a group that is
34
35 predicted to elicit a different type of threat, gay men. Both studies examine a range of
36
37 positive and negative emotions, to examine which ones mediate the effects of contact on
38
39 prejudice for different groups. For studies 1 and 2, we report how we determined our
40
41 sample size, all data exclusions (if any), all manipulations, and all measures that we
42
43 analyzed.
44
45
46
47
48

49 50 **Study 1**

51
52 Our first study uses representative samples of U. S. Whites, Blacks, and Asians.
53
54 Each respondent was randomly assigned one of the other two ethnic groups as a target for
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 questions about contact, emotions, and prejudiced attitudes. This study measures six
6
7 distinct positive and negative emotions, allowing us to examine what emotions are the
8
9 most important mediators of contact effects on prejudice, and whether the mediational
10
11 processes are the same across the six possible perceiver-target group combinations.
12
13

14 **Method**

15
16
17 *Data set.* The data were collected by Time-sharing Experiments for the Social
18
19 Sciences (TESS), following a design proposed to TESS by Catherine Cottrell and Steven
20
21 Neuberg. Following its standard policy, TESS made the data available exclusively to the
22
23 proposers for 9 months, and then published the data for general research use. The present
24
25 authors had no role in designing this study, including determining the sample size or
26
27 question wordings.
28
29

30
31 These data were collected online between August 25-September 3, 2004 from a
32
33 subset of the Knowledge Networks online panel. The panel is designed to be
34
35 representative of the entire U.S. population. Panel households were initially recruited by
36
37 random digit dialing, and then provided with computers and internet access if needed.
38
39 (For a more complete description of the panel recruitment and general methodological
40
41 approach, see <http://www.experimentcentral.org/data/data.php?pid=280>.) For the current
42
43 study, roughly equal numbers of respondents self-identifying as White, Black, and Asian
44
45 in ethnicity (and not claiming more than one ethnicity) were randomly selected from the
46
47 panel. Each respondent was randomly assigned one of these three ethnic groups as a
48
49 target for questions, and we analyzed only those respondents who were assigned an
50
51 outgroup (i.e., omitting those who answered questions about their own ethnic group).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 The total N is 639, meaning an average N of slightly over 100 for each of the 6
6
7 combinations of groups.
8

9
10 *Variables used in the analysis.* Five socio-demographic background variables
11 were used as control variables in all analyses, because these variables might affect
12 contact and/or prejudice levels and we wished to control for any potential spurious
13 relationships. These are age (in years), education (coded as 1=less than high school,
14 2=high school, 3=some college, 4=bachelor's degree or higher), region of residence
15 (Northeast, Midwest, South, West), gender (male, female), and ethnicity (White, Black,
16 Asian). The ethnicity variable was combined for analysis with the randomly assigned
17 target outgroup (also White, Black, Asian) used in the contact, emotion, and prejudice
18 questions. The average age of the sample was 47.0 years, gender was 55% female, and
19 the average education was 2.92 scale units (i.e., between high school and some college).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Contact with the target group was measured with the following question:
34
35 “Looking across your entire life, what kind of contact have you had with
36 [WHITE/BLACK/ASIAN] Americans? As you read down this list, please select the first
37 item that you come to that describes your experience.” (1) I have had a best friend or
38 romantic partner who is [WHITE/BLACK/ASIAN] American. (2) ... many close friends
39 ... (3) ... one close friend ... (4) ... a friend ... (5) ... a casual acquaintance or co-worker
40 ... (6) I have seen [WHITE/BLACK/ASIAN] Americans in my neighborhood and around
41 the community. (7) I have had no contact at all with [WHITE/BLACK/ASIAN]
42 Americans. We reversed the direction of scoring (so that higher numbers indicate more
43 contact) for ease of interpretation.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Emotions toward the group were measured with the wording “In general, how
6
7 much respect or admiration do you have for [WHITE/BLACK/ASIAN] Americans, as a
8
9 group?” with a response scale anchored at 1 (no respect or admiration at all), 4 (a
10
11 moderate amount of respect or admiration), and 7 (an extreme amount of respect or
12
13 admiration). The other emotions measured were angry or resentful (“In general, how
14
15 angry or resentful are you towards...”); fearful or anxious; disgusted or sickened; jealous
16
17 or envious; and pity or sympathy. Cottrell and Neuberg designed these questions with
18
19 two related emotion labels in each question (e.g., respect and admiration), presumably to
20
21 attain the advantages of a multi-item scale (i.e., increased conceptual breadth and
22
23 reliability compared to just a single item), while taking less interview time than asking
24
25 separately about each emotion and then averaging the responses. Finally, general
26
27 prejudice toward the target group was measured with “In general, how do you feel toward
28
29 [White/Black/Asian] Americans, as a group?” with responses from (1) extremely
30
31 unfavorable to (7) extremely favorable, again reverse scored so higher numbers mean
32
33 more prejudiced attitudes.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 The order of these questions was varied across respondents. After the attitude
41
42 question and the respect/admiration emotion item, the order of the other 5 emotion
43
44 measures was randomized for each respondent. The contact question always came last.
45
46

47 **Analytic approach.** We assume a path model (shown in Figure 1) from contact to
48
49 emotions as mediators, with prejudice as the final dependent variable, consistent with the
50
51 generally accepted idea that prejudice represents an attitude that summarizes and is based
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 on affective, cognitive, or behavioral types of information. All analyses also include the
6
7 background variables listed above.

8
9
10 [INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE]

11 12 **Results**

13
14 *Descriptive statistics.* The mean attitudes, emotions, and contact for each pair of
15
16 groups are presented in Appendix A.

17
18
19 *Predictors of prejudice.* In a regression including only the background variables, the
20
21 main effect of Group (i.e., the six combinations of perceiver and target groups), and
22
23 contact as predictors (without the emotion mediators), contact significantly related to
24
25 prejudice, $b = -0.17$, $p < .001$. Thus, replicating many previous studies (Pettigrew &
26
27 Tropp, 2006) in our sample contact is associated with lower prejudice across all
28
29 combinations of perceiver and target groups. To begin investigating the mediation of this
30
31 effect, we added the six measured emotions to this regression as predictors. This
32
33 preliminary analysis, shown in Table 1, found that anxiety, disgust, envy, and sympathy
34
35 were not significant independent predictors of prejudice, all p 's $> .35$. These emotions
36
37 were dropped from further analyses, leaving anger and admiration as the two candidate
38
39 emotion mediators.
40
41
42
43
44

45 [INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

46
47
48 *Mediation model.* The structural equation model to examine mediation was run using
49
50 the *sem* function of the “lavaan” package (v 0.5-20; Rosseel, 2012) under R version 3.2.0
51
52 (R Core Team, 2015). We used a multiple-groups analysis, allowing all regression
53
54 coefficients except those of immediate interest to be estimated freely in each of the six
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 groups. This reflects the assumption that the sociodemographic determinants of
6
7 emotions, prejudice, etc. may vary across groups and are not our central question in this
8
9 paper. For each of the four parameters relevant to our questions about mediation, we
10
11 tested whether constraining the parameters to be equal across the six groups led to a
12
13 significant decrease in model fit; this is a test of the equality of the parameters across
14
15 groups. For the effect of admiration on prejudice, this test showed significant differences
16
17 across groups ($\text{Chi-sq}(5) = 22.46, p < .001$). For the other three key parameters
18
19 differences between groups were nonsignificant: effect of contact on admiration (Chi-
20
21 $\text{sq}(5) = 2.16, p = .83$); effect of contact on anger ($\text{Chi-sq}(5) = 8.08, p = .15$); effect of
22
23 anger on prejudice ($\text{Chi-sq}(5) = 6.49, p = .26$).

24
25
26
27
28 Table 2 shows the results for the WB group, White perceivers and Black targets.
29
30 (Results for all groups, as well as the correlation matrix combining all six groups, are
31
32 included in supplementary online material.) In this model, the three parameters just listed
33
34 were constrained to be equal for all groups, while the effect of admiration on attitude was
35
36 allowed to vary. Overall the fit of this model to data is excellent, with a cumulative fit
37
38 index of .995 and RMS error of approximation of .040. A nonsignificant chi-square(15)
39
40 = 17.482, $p = .29$ indicates deviations from fit are nonsignificant.

41
42
43
44
45 In the WB group, contact is not a significant predictor of attitude, suggesting that its
46
47 effect is fully mediated by emotions. The same is true in four of the other five groups (all
48
49 but AB). Anger has a significant positive effect on prejudice ($b = .12$), which as noted
50
51 above does not statistically vary across groups. Admiration has a strong and significant
52
53 negative effect, estimated at $-.59$ if it is constrained to be equal across groups. The
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 difference between the absolute value of these two coefficients is significant ($\text{Chi-sq}(1) =$
6
7 $56.75, p < .0001$; tested through the decrement in model fit if they are constrained to be
8
9 equal, after reflecting the anger variable so the coefficients have the same sign).

10
11 However, as noted above, the effect of admiration varies if estimated separately in each
12
13 group (significant in each case). The effect was strongest for Asians evaluating Whites
14
15 ($b = -.85$) and weakest for Blacks evaluating Asians ($b = -.36$).

16
17
18
19 [INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

20
21 Based on these regression coefficients, the *sem* function computes the indirect
22
23 effects, mediated by admiration (computed separately in each group) and by anger
24
25 (constrained to be equal across groups as discussed above). The standard errors and
26
27 significance tests are calculated using the Bollen-Stine bootstrap procedure, using default
28
29 parameters for the function (Rosseel, 2012). Results are shown in Table 3. Overall,
30
31 admiration is a strong and highly significant mediator for each pair of perceiver and
32
33 target groups, though the magnitude of the effects varies across groups by a little over
34
35 2:1. The mediation by anger is descriptively smaller and similar in size across groups.
36
37
38
39

40 [TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

41
42 *Effects of anxiety.* Additionally, we ran an analysis including fear/anxiety as the sole
43
44 emotion measure to see if this data set could replicate typical results found with such an
45
46 analysis. In a regression also including contact and the background variables, anxiety is a
47
48 highly significant predictor of prejudice ($b = .19, p < .001$). Contact still has a significant
49
50 effect ($b = -.15, p < .001$), indicating that only a small portion of its total effect ($-.02$ of -
51
52 $.17$) is mediated through anxiety.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Discussion

Using a unique sample that is representative of three ethnic groups in the U.S. and that allowed us to examine respondents and targets representing all possible pairs of those groups, we investigated the relationships between contact, emotions, and prejudice using identical sampling designs, measures, and analytic models.

The most important result of Study 1 is that the causal processes that predict prejudice (Figure 1) are generally similar across all combinations of perceiver and target ethnic groups. Increased intergroup contact is associated with an increase in a positive emotion that reflects appraisals of warmth and status (admiration) and a decrease in a threat-based emotion (anger) toward the outgroup. In turn, both of these emotions predict reduced prejudice toward the outgroup, with admiration having the stronger effect. Four other emotions (anxiety, disgust, envy, and sympathy) had no significant independent effects on prejudice.

Even though we find that the mediating processes underlying the relations between contact and prejudice are similar across these ethnic groups, we certainly accept the idea that distinct perceived threats create different emotional responses depending on the perceiver and target groups (e.g., Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005). However, the fact that one group elicits a high *level* of a particular emotion from another does not mean that emotion is necessarily an important *mediator* of contact effects. Here, mediational effects were similar across all group pairs. Admiration and anger mediate the effects of contact on prejudice for ethnic groups, whether in a majority-minority context (i.e., for a

1
2
3
4
5 majority group perceiver and a minority group target), a minority-majority context, or a
6
7 minority-minority context.
8

9
10 Admiration has a larger effect on prejudice, and mediates more of the contact-
11 prejudice link, than anger. This effect is consistent with previous work showing that
12 admiration for an outgroup promotes positive attitudes and supportive actions toward that
13 group (Sweetman et al., 2013). The effect of admiration on prejudice was the one key
14 parameter in our multi-group model that varied significantly across groups. Generally,
15 the effect of admiration was relatively strong when Whites were the target group, and
16 weakest in the Asian-Black pairings (see Table 3). The generally greater effect of
17 admiration directed toward Whites makes sense since that emotion is strongly tied to
18 perceived status or competence (Sweetman et al., 2013; Bergsieker et al., 2010). Thus,
19 minority group members who acknowledge Whites' high status through feelings of
20 respect and admiration are also likely to hold more generally positive attitudes toward
21 Whites. Anger, the other mediator that we found effective, is a key variable for both
22 attitudes and action tendencies directed towards many types of outgroups (e.g., Smith,
23 Seger, & Mackie, 2007; Tam et al. 2007). For relations among ethnic groups in the U.S.,
24 the relevant intergroup threats seem mainly economic; such threats seem generally likely
25 to involve feelings of anger (e.g., Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005; Tapias et al., 2007),
26 consistent with the pattern found in this study.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 *The issue of intergroup anxiety.* In contrast to some previous research, we did not
50 find intergroup anxiety to have a significant mediational effect on prejudice, despite our
51 study's large N. However, some previous research showing an effect for anxiety
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 measured only that one emotion, not a range of emotions, and as reported above we
6
7 replicate that finding in our sample when anxiety is considered alone. However, when
8
9 the effects of all six emotions are examined simultaneously, the results change because
10
11 emotions are generally correlated with each other. Anger and admiration have significant
12
13 independent predictive power, but anxiety, disgust, envy, and sympathy do not.
14
15

16
17 Another difference between this study and some previous research is that
18
19 intergroup anxiety has often been conceptualized and measured as a feeling of unease and
20
21 discomfort about a real or imagined intergroup interaction. For example, Binder et al.
22
23 (2009) measured anxiety in an imagined intergroup interaction and considered it as a
24
25 mediator of effects on reactions to the outgroup. In contrast, in Study 1 (as in other
26
27 previous research such as Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005; Miller et al., 2004) the emotion
28
29 measure tapped feelings of anxiety directed at the outgroup as a whole. These two
30
31 approaches are related but clearly not identical, and the difference in measurement
32
33 approach may partially account for the differences in findings with regard to anxiety.
34
35
36
37

38 **Study 2**

39
40 Study 2 therefore aimed to examine the relations between prejudice and specific
41
42 emotions felt in intergroup contact situations as well as general emotions. This study
43
44 would reveal whether the mediational relationships are similar for both of these emotion
45
46 measurement approaches that have been used in the literature. We also sought to test the
47
48 generality of our findings with another type of target group, gay men. We chose gay men
49
50 because antigay prejudice is linked specifically to threats of moral contamination which
51
52 result in feelings of disgust (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005; Herek & Capitanio, 1996; Inbar et
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 al., 2009; Tapias et al., 2007)². Hence in study 2 we expected that disgust may have a
6
7 more important mediational role than anger or other negative emotions. Furthermore, we
8
9 take a more typical approach by measuring separately each emotion in the pairs used in
10
11 Study 1.

14 **Method**

15
16 *Participants.* We attempted to obtain 100-120 participants, comparable to the size of
17
18 each group in Study 1. Participants (N = 119) were first-year college students enrolled at
19
20 a Midwestern University. Their mean age was 18.98 years (*SD* = 1.59 years). Most
21
22 participants reported themselves as female (81.5%), White (75.6%), heterosexual (95.8%)
23
24 and citizens of the United States (92.4%). They received course credit for completing the
25
26 study.
27
28

29
30 *Materials and Procedure.* Participants completed a series of computer-administered
31
32 questionnaires.³ Participants first reported prejudice toward gay men using a 7-point
33
34 Likert-scale that asked how they felt in general toward the target group. We scaled this so
35
36 higher numbers indicated more prejudice.
37
38

39
40 Participants were then asked to report how they would feel if they were to meet a
41
42 gay man in the future. Specifically, they reported the extent to which they anticipated
43
44 feeling twelve emotions. We averaged their responses across admiration + respectful,
45
46 angry + resentful, anxious + fearful, disgusted + sickened, envious + jealous, and
47
48 sympathy + pity to replicate the emotion pairs assessed in Study 1. Each item used a 7-
49
50 point Likert scale anchored at “not at all” and “very much.” Higher numbers indicated
51
52 experiencing the emotion with greater intensity. The order of these emotion items was
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 randomized.⁴ After reporting their emotions in a specific contact situation, participants
6
7 rated the extent to which they felt these emotions toward *gay men in general*.

8
9 Specifically, participants were instructed: “Now we would like to ask you about the
10 feelings you have toward gay men IN GENERAL. Please note that these feelings may be
11 SIMILAR OR DIFFERENT from what you just reported regarding your expected
12 feelings when meeting a PARTICULAR gay man.” The individual items emphasized that
13 they were about the group as a whole: “In general, how much [emotion] do you have for
14 gay men, as a group?” Participants rated the same twelve emotions, in randomized order.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Next, participants reported their previous contact experiences. We wished to
25 improve on the ad-hoc single item contact measure used in study 1, so we adapted the 12-
26 item previous contact questionnaire used by Islam and Hewstone (1993). The
27 questionnaire consists of three sub-scales that assess the quantity of previous contact (five
28 items), the quality of previous contact (five items), and the intergroup nature of previous
29 contact (two items). Sample items from each sub-scale include: “Please rate the
30 frequency of visits you have made to a gay man’s home (can be their apartment, dorm
31 room, etc.)” (quantity), “To what extent were your previous interactions with gay men
32 superficial or close?” (quality), and “Please rate the extent to which you usually saw the
33 gay men with whom you had contact as typical gay men?” (intergroup). Each item was
34 rated on a 7-point Likert scale, with higher numbers indicating greater quantity, greater
35 quality, or the contact being of a more intergroup nature. The subjective nature of
36 judgments about quality of contact means that the respondent’s attitude toward the group
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

could contaminate this measure, so we used the quantity of contact subscale in all analyses reported here. (Analyses using quality instead produce highly similar results.)

Finally, participants provided information about their age, gender, racial/ethnic categorization, citizenship status, and sexual orientation. The five participants who reported other than heterosexual orientation were excluded from analysis, leaving a final N of 114.

Results

First, we examined whether general emotions toward the outgroup overall relate to prejudice in the same way as in Study 1. Study 1 controlled for a range of background and demographic variables. Similarly, all analyses for Study 2 include controls for participant's gender and race, coded as White/non-White because individual non-White groups were too small in number. (On the other variables controlled in Study 1, our student sample is quite homogeneous.) This model also includes intergroup contact. In this model, participant race and previous contact had significant effects on prejudice (see Table 4, left side). Two of the emotion measures, admiration and disgust, had effects each with $p < .001$. Admiration is associated with lower levels of prejudice, and disgust with higher levels.

[INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]

To examine the parallel mediational model as in Study 1, we looked at indirect effects of past contact on prejudice, through these two emotions of admiration and disgust (with gender and race included as control variables). The relevant regression analyses are shown on the left side of Table 5. The effects of contact on admiration ($b = 0.45, p <$

1
2
3
4
5 .001) and disgust, ($b = -0.35, p < .001$) were significant. As research typically finds (e.g.,
6
7 Herek, 2002), women also reported significantly less disgust than men. Because both
8
9 admiration and disgust also had significant effects on prejudice ($p < .001$), both of these
10
11 emotions were mediators of the contact effect. In contrast to study 1, the magnitude of
12
13 these coefficients did not differ significantly. Bootstrapped estimates of the indirect
14
15 effects using the Bollen-Stine procedure were $-.162$ (CI: $-.062, -.262; p = .001$) for
16
17 admiration and $-.148$ (CI: $-.038, -.258; p = .007$) for disgust.
18
19

20
21 [INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE]
22

23
24 *Emotions in specific contact situations.* Study 1 measured only general emotions
25
26 toward the outgroup as a whole, whereas this study also examined emotions felt in a
27
28 specific intergroup encounter. We performed the same analysis described in the previous
29
30 section with the emotions felt in a specific interaction, obtaining highly similar results
31
32 (see Table 4, right side). Besides significant effects of previous contact and race,
33
34 admiration and disgust were again the only significant emotional predictors of prejudice
35
36 (with p 's $\leq .001$).
37
38

39
40 The right side of Table 5 shows the mediation model. The results for admiration and
41
42 disgust in contact situations are highly similar to the general-emotion analyses just
43
44 reported. Bootstrapped estimates of the indirect effects using the Bollen-Stine procedure
45
46 were $-.138$ (CI: $-.040, -.236; p = .005$) for admiration and $-.153$ (CI: $-.019, -.287; p = .02$)
47
48 for disgust.
49

50 51 52 **Discussion** 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3
4
5 In summary, whether the measures assess emotions felt toward the group in
6
7 general or those felt in a specific contact situation, the mediation analyses show near-
8
9 identical patterns. In predicting prejudice toward gay men, increased levels of a positive
10
11 emotion (admiration) and decreased levels of a threat-based emotion (disgust) mediate
12
13 the effects of previous contact with the group. Other emotions were not independently
14
15 related to prejudice and so were not significant mediators of this effect. The strong effect
16
17 of admiration replicates Study 1, but this study finds effects of a different threat-based
18
19 emotion (disgust rather than anger), consistent with the idea that different types of groups
20
21 are perceived as posing different types of intergroup threats (Tapias et al., 2007).
22
23
24
25

26 **General Discussion**

27
28 In two studies, participants reported past contact and rated their emotions and
29
30 attitudes toward ethnic outgroups (Study 1) and gay men (Study 2). Unlike previous
31
32 research, which has often focused on only one or two emotions, these studies measured
33
34 six distinct emotions. In both studies, respect/admiration, a positive emotion that reflects
35
36 perceived warmth and competence or status, significantly mediated effects of contact on
37
38 attitudes toward the target groups. Anger was a mediator for prejudice toward ethnic
39
40 groups and disgust for prejudice toward gay men, consistent with the distinct threats
41
42 perceived to be posed by those groups under the sociofunctional threat model (Cottrell &
43
44 Neuberg, 2005; Tapias et al., 2007). Other emotions were not significant mediators. In
45
46 Study 2 almost completely parallel results were found both for measures of general
47
48 emotions felt toward the outgroup and measures of specific emotions in a hypothetical
49
50 intergroup encounter.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 The similarity of the results is remarkable considering the several differences
6
7 between these two studies. First, the studies use a representative sample of the U. S.
8
9 population versus college student volunteers. Therefore, the replication suggests that the
10
11 findings are not limited to a specific sample. Second, the target group was an ethnic
12
13 outgroup in Study 1 but gay men in Study 2. Gay men are typically perceived as posing a
14
15 different type of threat (i.e., contamination to ingroup; Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005)
16
17 compared to ethnic groups (probably mostly economic threats). Third, in Study 1 the
18
19 order of the emotion items was randomized except for respect/admiration, which was
20
21 always measured first. That study left open the possibility that the strong effect of that
22
23 emotion could be due to a theoretically uninteresting order effect. However, Study 2
24
25 replicated the effect of admiration while fully randomizing the order of all emotion items
26
27 for each participant, removing any plausibility of this explanation.
28
29
30
31
32

33 Finally, Study 2 obtains parallel findings with measures of emotions toward
34
35 groups in general versus emotions expected in specific interactions. Thus, this difference
36
37 in measurement strategy is not a plausible explanation of differences in results between
38
39 these studies and other research that finds anxiety to be a major influence on intergroup
40
41 attitudes (e.g., Paolini, Hewstone, Cairns, & Voci, 2004; Stephan & Stephan, 1985; Voci
42
43 & Hewstone, 2003). Even when emotions expected in specific interactions were
44
45 considered, admiration and disgust rather than anxiety were the dominant predictors of
46
47 prejudice. And these parallel findings could not be due to responses to general emotion
48
49 questions influencing measurement of specific emotions, since the specific emotions
50
51 were measured first.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Beyond negative threat-based emotions, both studies point to the significant role of admiration. Indeed, positive emotions such as admiration have long been thought to be a critical factor in mediating the contact-prejudice relationship, and these studies clearly document its importance in shaping intergroup attitudes. Admiration, defined as an other-praising emotion by Haidt (2003), implies a sense of approval toward the outgroup as a whole, and may motivate positive behaviors toward group members (Algoe & Haidt, 2009). Admiration is associated with positive behaviors such as intergroup cooperation (e.g., Aronson & Patone, 1997) and the tendency to act to support the admired group's goals (Sweetman et al., 2013). It also relates to a positive status or social image, suggesting that a group is respected and valued in the eyes of others⁵ (Cuddy et al., 2008; Wolfensberger, 1983). As noted earlier, recalling or seeing admired outgroup individuals can reduce prejudice toward an entire social group (Dasgupta & Greenwald, 2001). Therefore, it is no surprise that admiration, the emotion most strongly associated with a positive social image, had a strong role in mediating the effect of contact on attitudes.

The other positive emotion in our studies, sympathy/pity, did not have such an effect. Similarly, Sweetman et al. (2013) found admiration significantly predicted political action in favor of an outgroup while sympathy did not. This could be because sympathy toward a group is associated with perceptions that it is lower in status or has a more negative image (e.g., sympathy for refugees or AIDS patients), in contrast to admiration which reflects positive appraisals of warmth and/or status. Sympathy is often felt when people are attitudinally ambivalent toward members of stigmatized groups (Katz, Wackenhut, & Hass, 1986; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002), so it would be

1
2
3
4
5 unlikely to relate to unambiguously positive attitudes. In this regard, one limitation of
6
7 our studies is that the questions for Study 1 combined sympathy and pity into a single
8
9 item, but recent work suggests that these are not exact synonyms (Harth, Kessler, &
10
11 Leach, 2008; Stellar & Keltner, 2014). Future research should use more precise wordings
12
13 to measure these emotions.
14
15

16 17 **Implications and Conclusion**

18
19 These results add to a growing body of research suggesting that emotions play a key
20
21 role in intergroup attitudes and behaviors, specifically in mediating the effect of contact
22
23 on prejudice (Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Miller et al., 2004; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2005;
24
25 Smith et al., 2007). Study 1 especially is based on a unique dataset from a representative
26
27 national sample, that affords clean comparisons of results across 6 distinct combinations
28
29 of perceiver and target groups, without the methodological differences that usually
30
31 confound comparisons across studies. Our two studies robustly show that a positive
32
33 friendship-related emotion, admiration, plus specific threat based emotions mediate the
34
35 effects of contact on prejudice toward outgroups. The consistency of results is
36
37 impressive in view of between-group differences in overall attitudes, emotions, levels of
38
39 contact, group status, and historical/structural relationships among groups.
40
41
42
43
44

45 These studies add a dynamic dimension to the study of intergroup emotions. Much
46
47 past work (e.g., Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005; Mackie et al., 2000) has been aimed at
48
49 understanding the group-based appraisals that cause such emotions, or the effects of
50
51 emotions on such important variables as collective action (e.g., van Zomeren et al.,
52
53 2004). Here we move beyond looking at causes and consequences of the *levels* of
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 particular emotions experienced in specific intergroup situations, to examine how
6
7 *changes* in these emotions participate in the well-documented causal pathway from
8
9 intergroup contact to prejudice. In this way, our work bridges the literatures on contact
10
11 and prejudice and on intergroup emotions, which have had surprisingly little intersection
12
13 to date.
14
15

16
17 Overall, our findings provide strong support for the generalizability of the affective
18
19 processes that underlie intergroup attitudes – generalizability across multiple perceiver
20
21 and target groups, across the entire U.S. population (based on the representative sample
22
23 in Study 1), and across emotions felt in general and emotions felt in response to a more
24
25 specific intergroup situation (Study 2). The robustness of these effects should encourage
26
27 researchers to examine further the impact of positive emotions, specifically admiration,
28
29 as well as a range of negative threat-based emotions, in prejudice and intergroup
30
31 behavior.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Algoe, S. B., & Haidt, J. (2009). Witnessing excellence in action: the 'other-praising'
8 emotions of elevation, gratitude, and admiration. *Journal of Positive Psychology, 4*,
9 105-127. doi: 10.1080/17439760802650519.
- 10
11
12
13
14 Allport, G. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Oxford, England: Addison-Wesley.
- 15
16
17 Aronson, E., & Patone, S. (1997). *The jigsaw classroom: Building cooperation in the*
18 *classroom (2nd ed.)*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- 19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Barron, J. M., Struckman-Johnson, C., Quevillon, R., & Banka, S. R. (2008).
Heterosexual men's attitudes toward gay men: A hierarchical model including
masculinity, openness, and theoretical explanations. *Psychology of Men &*
Masculinity, 9, 154-166. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.9.3.154
- Bergsieker, H. B., Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2010). To be liked versus respected:
Divergent goals in interracial interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social*
Psychology, 99, 248-264. doi: 10.1037/a0018474
- Binder, J., Zagefka, H., Brown, R., Funke, F., Kessler, T., Mummendey, A., Maquil, A.,
Demoulin, S., & Leyens, J. (2009). Does contact reduce prejudice or does
prejudice reduce contact? A longitudinal test of the contact hypothesis among
majority and minority groups in three European countries. *Journal of Personality*
and Social Psychology, 96, 843-856. doi: 10.1037/a0013470
- Brown, R., & Hewstone, M. (2005). An integrative theory of intergroup contact.
Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 37, 255-343. San Diego, CA, US:
Elsevier Academic Press.

- 1
2
3
4
5 Caspi, A. (1984). Contact hypothesis and inter-age attitudes: A field study of cross-age
6
7 contact. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 47, 74-80.
8
- 9
10 Cehajic, S, Brown, R., & Castano, R. (2008). Forgive and forget? Antecedents and
11
12 consequences of intergroup forgiveness in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Political*
13
14 *Psychology*, 29, 351-367. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2008.00634.x
15
- 16
17 Cottrell, C. A., & Neuberg, S. L. (2005). Different emotional reactions to different
18
19 groups: A sociofunctional threat-based approach to 'prejudice'. *Journal of*
20
21 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(5), 770-789. doi: 10.1037/0022-
22
23 3514.88.5.770
24
- 25
26 Cuddy, A. J. C., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2008). Warmth and competence as universal
27
28 dimensions of social perception: The Stereotype Content Model and the BIAS Map.
29
30 In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Vol. 40. (pp.
31
32 61–149). New York, NY: Academic Press.
33
- 34
35 Dasgupta, N., & Greenwald, A. (2001). On the malleability of automatic attitudes:
36
37 combating automatic prejudice with images of admired and disliked individuals.
38
39 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 800-814. doi: 10.1037/0022-
40
41 3514.81.5.800
42
43
- 44
45 Dasgupta, N., & Rivera, L. M. (2008). When social context matters: The influence of
46
47 long-term contact and short-term exposure to admired outgroup members on
48
49 implicit attitudes and behavioral intentions. *Social Cognition*, 26, 112-123. doi:
50
51 10.1521/soco.2008.26.1.112
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 Ellison, C. G. & Powers, D.A. (1994). The contact hypothesis and racial attitudes among
6
7 black Americans. *Social Science Quarterly*, 75, 385-400.
8
- 9
10 Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed)
11
12 stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived
13
14 status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 878-
15
16 902. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.82.6.878
17
- 18
19 Fredrickson, B. L. (1998). What good are positive emotions?. *Review of General*
20
21 *Psychology*, 2, 300-319. doi: 10.1037/1089-2680.2.3.300
22
- 23
24 Greenland, K. & Brown, R. (1999). Categorization and intergroup anxiety in contact
25
26 between British and Japanese nationals. *European Journal of Social Psychology*,
27
28 29, 503-521. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199906)29:4<503::AID-
29
30 EJSP941>3.0.CO;2-Y
31
- 32
33 Haidt J. (2003). Elevation and the positive psychology of morality. In: C. L. M. Keyes &
34
35 J. Haidt (Eds.), *Flourishing: Positive psychology and the life well-lived*, pp. 275–
36
37 289. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
38
- 39
40 Harth, N. S., Kessler, T., & Leach, C. W. (2008). Advantaged Group's Emotional
41
42 Reactions to Intergroup Inequality: The Dynamics of Pride, Guilt, and Sympathy.
43
44 *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34(1), 115–129.
45
46 <http://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207309193>
47
- 48
49 Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., Voci, A., Hamberger, J. & Niens, U. (2006). Intergroup
50
51 contact, forgiveness, and experience of 'the troubles' in northern Ireland. *Journal*
52
53 *of Social Issues*, 62, 99-120. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00441.x
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 Herek, G. M., & Capitanio, J. P. (1996). "Some of my best friends": Intergroup contact,
6
7 concealable stigma, and heterosexuals' attitudes toward gay men and lesbians.
8
9
10 *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 412-424. doi:
11
12 10.1177/0146167296224007
13
14 Herek, G. M. (2000). Sexual prejudice and gender: Do heterosexuals' attitudes toward
15
16 lesbians and gay men differ?. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56, 251-266. doi:
17
18 10.1111/0022-4537.00164
19
20
21 Herek, G. M. (2002). Gender gaps in public opinion about lesbians and gay men. *Public*
22
23 *Opinion Quarterly*, 66, 40-66. doi: 10.1086/338409
24
25
26 Hutcherson, C. A., & Gross, J. J. (2011). The moral emotions: A social-functional
27
28 account of anger, disgust, and contempt. *Journal of Personality and Social*
29
30 *Psychology*, 100, 719-737. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0022408>
31
32
33 Immordino-Yang, M. H., McColl, A., Damasio, H., & Damasio, A. (2009). Neural
34
35 correlates of admiration and compassion. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
36
37 *Sciences*, 106, 8021-8026. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0810363106
38
39
40 Inbar, Y., Pizarro, D. A., Knobe, J., & Bloom, P. (2009). Disgust sensitivity predicts
41
42 intuitive disapproval of gays. *Emotion*, 9, 435-439. doi: 10.1037/a0015960
43
44
45 Islam, M. R., & Hewstone, M. (1993). Dimensions of contact as predictors of intergroup
46
47 anxiety, perceived out-group variability, and out-group attitude: An integrative
48
49 model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19(6), 700-710.
50
51
52 doi: 10.1177/0146167293196005
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Kamans, E., van Zomeren, M., Gordijn, E. H., & Postmes, T. (2014). Communicating the
6
7 right emotion makes violence seem less wrong: Power-congruent emotions lead
8
9 outsiders to legitimize violence of powerless and powerful groups in intractable
10
11 conflict. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 17(3), 286-305.

12
13
14 Katz, I., Wackenhut, J., & Hass, R. G. (1986). Racial ambivalence, value duality, and
15
16 behavior. In J. F. Dovidio, & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination and*
17
18 *racism* (pp. 35-60). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

19
20
21 Mackie, D. M., Devos, T., & Smith, E. R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining
22
23 offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and*
24
25 *Social Psychology*, 79, 602-616. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.79.4.602

26
27
28 Miller, D. A., Cronin, T., Garcia, A. L., & Branscombe, N. R. (2009). The relative impact
29
30 of anger and efficacy on collective action is affected by feelings of fear. *Group*
31
32 *Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 12, 445-462. doi: 10.1177/1368430209105046

33
34
35 Miller, D. A., Smith, E. R., & Mackie, D. M. (2004). Effects of intergroup contact and
36
37 political predispositions on prejudice: Role of intergroup emotions. *Group*
38
39 *Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 7(3), 221-237.

40
41
42 doi: 10.1177/1368430204046109

43
44
45 Paolini, S., Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., & Voci, A. (2004). Effects of direct and indirect
46
47 cross-group friendships on judgments of Catholics and Protestants in Northern
48
49 Ireland: The mediating role of an anxiety-reduction mechanism. *Personality and*
50
51 *Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 770-786. doi: 10.1177/0146167203262848

- 1
2
3
4
5 Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality*
6
7 *and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 173-185. doi: 10.1177/0146167297232006
8
9
10 Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2005). Differential relationships between intergroup
11
12 contact and affective and cognitive dimensions of prejudice. *Personality and*
13
14 *Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(8), 1145-1158. doi: 10.1177/0146167205274854
15
16
17 Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of Intergroup Contact
18
19 Theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90:751-783. doi:
20
21 10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751
22
23
24 R Core Team (2015). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
25
26 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL [http://www.R-](http://www.R-project.org/)
27
28 [project.org/](http://www.R-project.org/).
29
30
31 Ray, D.L., Mackie, D.M., & Smith, E.R. (2012). Discrete emotions mediate and elucidate
32
33 the effects of crossed-categorization on prejudice: Examples from American
34
35 politics, sexual prejudice, and the laboratory. *Journal of Experimental Social*
36
37 *Psychology*, 48, 55-69. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2011.07.011
38
39
40 Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of*
41
42 *Statistical Software*, 48(2), 1-36. URL <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v48/i02/>.
43
44
45 Smith, E. R. (1993). Social identity and social emotions. Toward new conceptualizations
46
47 of prejudice. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition, and*
48
49 *stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception*.(pp. 297-315). San Diego,
50
51 CA: Academic Press.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 Smith, E. R., Seger, C. R., & Mackie, D. M. (2007). Can emotions be truly group-level?
6
7 Evidence regarding four conceptual criteria. *Journal of Personality and Social*
8
9 *Psychology, 93*, 431-446. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.3.431
10
11 Stellar, J. E., & Keltner, D. (2014). Compassion. In M. Tugade, M. Shiota, & L. Kirby
12
13 (Eds), *Handbook of positive emotions* (pp. 329-341). New York: Guilford Press.
14
15
16 Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues,*
17
18 *41*, 157-175. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.1985.tb01134.x
19
20
21 Sweetman, J., Spears, R., Livingstone, A. G., & Manstead, A. S. (2013). Admiration
22
23 regulates social hierarchy: Antecedents, dispositions, and effects on intergroup
24
25 behavior. *Journal of experimental social psychology, 49*, 534-542. doi:
26
27 10.1016/j.jesp.2012.10.007
28
29
30 Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., Tausch, N., Maio, G., & Kenworthy, J. (2007). The
31
32 impact of intergroup emotions on forgiveness in Northern Ireland. *Group*
33
34 *Processes and Intergroup Relations, 10*, 119-136.
35
36 doi: 10.1177/1368430207071345
37
38
39 Tapias, M. P., Glaser, J., Keltner, D., Vasquez, K., & Wickens, T. (2007). Emotion and
40
41 prejudice: Specific emotions toward outgroups. *Group Processes and Intergroup*
42
43 *Relations, 10*, 27-39. doi: 10.1177/1368430207071338
44
45
46 Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005). Relationships between intergroup contact and
47
48 prejudice among minority and majority status groups. *Psychological Science, 16*,
49
50 951-957. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2005.01643.x
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 Tropp, L. R. (2007). Perceived discrimination and interracial contact: Predicting
6
7 interracial closeness among Black and White Americans. *Social Psychology*
8
9 *Quarterly*, 70, 70-81. doi: 10.1177/019027250707000108
10
11
12 Turner, R. N., Hewstone, M., & Voci, A. (2007). Reducing explicit and implicit outgroup
13
14 prejudice via direct and extended contact: The mediating role of self-disclosure
15
16 and intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 369-
17
18 388. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.93.3.369
19
20
21 Van Zomeren, M., Spears, R., Fischer, A. H., & Leach, C. W. (2004). Put your money
22
23 where your mouth is! Explaining collective action tendencies through group-
24
25 based anger and group efficacy. *Journal of Personality and Social*
26
27 *Psychology*, 87, 649-664. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.87.5.649
28
29
30
31 Van Zomeren, M., Fischer, A. H., & Spears, R. (2007). Testing the limits of tolerance:
32
33 How intergroup anxiety amplifies negative and offensive responses to out-group-
34
35 initiated contact. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33, 1686-1699. doi:
36
37 10.1177/0146167207307485
38
39
40
41 Voci, A. & Hewstone, M. (2003). Intergroup contact and prejudice towards immigrants in
42
43 Italy: The mediational role of anxiety and the moderational role of group salience.
44
45 *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 6, 37-54.
46
47 doi: 10.1177/1368430203006001011
48
49
50 Wolfensberger, W. (1983). Social role valorization: A proposed new term for the
51
52 principle of normalization, *Mental Retardation*, 21, 234-239.
53
54
55 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1352/1934-9556-49.6.435>
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended
6
7 contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of*
8
9 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 73-90. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.73.1.73
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

ENDNOTES

¹ In this study we do not measure emotions in the sense of episodic reactions to appraisals of a specific event, but broader emotional sentiments directed toward a target (as one might feel anger toward the landlord or fear of a dog). Work on intergroup emotions describes how such group-targeted emotions may become associated with groups, after building up on the basis of repeated emotional episodes (e.g., Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000; Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005).

² Attitudes toward lesbians may be more multifaceted than attitudes towards gay men, especially for male respondents (Herek, 2000). Therefore, gay men rather than homosexuals or 'gays and lesbians' were used as the target group.

³ These questionnaires were completed at the end of an unrelated study that assessed evaluations of target individuals who had a large versus small number of outgroup friends. That study focused on racial groups and consequently was judged as being sufficiently unrelated to the content of this study.

⁴ Additional questions, not analyzed here, asked about feeling awkward, competent, happy, relaxed, and self-conscious.

⁵ Of course, seeing a potentially competing group as competent without warmth or positive valuation in such a situation may lead to negative attitudes and feelings of anger, envy, or anxiety (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002).

Table 1. Unstandardized parameter estimates for the effects of emotions, contact, and background variables on prejudice, Study 1 (R-squared = .40).

Parameter	Estimate	Std. Err.	t-value
Contact	-.021	.028	-.762
Age	-.001	.003	-.519
Education	-.063	.047	-1.328
Region (Midwest)	.018	.140	.132
Region (South)	.046	.127	.358
Region (West)	.087	.137	.638
Region (Northeast)+	.000	--	--
Gender (Female)	-.117	.086	-1.369
Group (WA)	.041	.146	.283
Group (BW)	-.009	.146	-.062
Group (BA)	.134	.153	.871
Group (AW)	-.074	.172	-.430
Group (AB)	.461	.165	2.789**
Group (WB)+	.000	--	--

Table 1, continued

Admiration	-.557	.038	-14.733***
Anger	.119	.046	2.589**
Anxiety	.036	.041	.870
Disgust	.038	.046	.816
Envy	-.044	.043	-1.023
Sympathy	-.008	.031	-.252

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$; two-tailed tests.

+ reference category of a categorical variable

Table 2. Unstandardized parameter estimates for the three equations of our structural model, for the WB group (White perceivers, Black targets). The three parameters shown with (a), (b), and (d) are constrained to be equal across all six groups, while (c) and all other regression coefficients shown are freely estimated in each group. Results for the other five groups are contained in online supplemental material.

	Estimate	Std. err.	Z value
Admiration predicted by:			
Age	.002	.007	.239
Region (Midwest)	-.457	.306	-1.495
Region (South)	-.675	.317	-2.131*
Region (West)	-.823	.339	-2.428*
Region (Northeast)+	.000	--	--
Education	-.117	.117	-1.001
Gender (Female)	.253	.207	1.219
Contact (a)	.160	.030	5.272***
Anger predicted by:			
Age	.009	.007	1.217
Region (Midwest)	.075	.320	.233
Region (South)	-.261	.332	-.786
Region (West)	-.417	.355	-1.175
Region (Northeast)+	.000	--	--
Education	.037	.122	.299

Table 2, continued.

Gender (Female)	-.402	.217	-1.853
Contact (b)	-.154	.030	-5.100***
Prejudice predicted by:			
Age	-.001	.006	-.137
Region (Midwest)	-.088	.255	-.345
Region (South)	-.009	.268	-.035
Region (West)	-.537	.289	-1.858
Region (Northeast)+	.000	--	--
Education	.163	.097	1.681
Gender (Female)	-.053	.173	-.309
Contact	.015	.056	.270
Admiration (c)	-.762	.081	-9.452***
Anger (d)	.118	.033	3.548***

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$; two-tailed tests.

+ reference category of a categorical variable

Table 3. Estimates and bootstrap significance tests of indirect (mediated) effects, Study 1.

Effect of contact on	Group	Estimate	Std. Error	Z value
prejudice mediated				
through:				
Admiration	WB	-.122	.026	-4.604***
Admiration	WA	-.089	.020	-4.354***
Admiration	BW	-.096	.022	-4.340***
Admiration	BA	-.058	.018	-3.222***
Admiration	AW	-.135	.030	-4.568***
Admiration	AB	-.069	.018	-3.777***
Anger	(all)	-.018	.006	-2.912**

** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$; two-tailed tests.

Table 4. Unstandardized parameter estimates for the effect on prejudice toward gay men of contact, background variables, and general emotions (left side) and emotions in specific contact situations (right side), Study 2 (R-squared = .73 and .70 respectively).

Parameter	Emotions toward outgroup in general		Emotions in specific contact situation	
	Estimate	t-value	Estimate	t-value
Contact	-.322	-4.139***	-.323	-3.847***
Gender (Female)	-.553	-1.942	-.601	-1.944
Race (White)	-.575	-2.44*	-.502	-2.004*
Admiration	-.354	-4.783***	-.338	-3.695***
Anger	-.0555	-.342	-.016	-.086
Fear	-.197	-1.244	-.023	-.124
Envy	.088	.388	-.271	-1.544
Pity	-.078	-.992	-.006	-.066
Disgust	.532	4.646***	.561	4.227***

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$; two-tailed tests.

Table 5. SEM unstandardized parameter estimates for the effect of contact and background variables on prejudice, mediated by general emotions of admiration and disgust toward the outgroup (left side) and emotions in specific contact situations (right side), Study 2.

	General emotions toward group			Emotions in specific contact situation		
	Estimate	Std. err.	Z value	Estimate	Std. err.	Z value
Admiration						
predicted by:						
Gender (F)	.769	.415	1.855	.354	.378	.938
Race (W)	-.494	.349	-1.418	-.442	.318	-1.390
Contact	.445	.109	-3.348***	.384	.099	3.869***
Disgust						
predicted by:						
Gender (F)	-.856	.403	-2.127*	-.923	.324	-2.847**
Race (W)	.313	.339	.924	.336	.273	.218
Contact	-.354	.106	-3.348***	-.311	.085	-3.645***
Prejudice						
predicted by:						
Gender (F)	-.537	.274	-1.958*	-.591	.292	-2.026*
Race (W)	.534	.226	2.363*	.519	.240	2.166*


Table 5, continued.

Contact	-.331	.078	-4.262***	-.349	.082	-4.236***
Admiration	-.364	.060	-6.077***	-.361	.070	-5.180***
Disgust	.418	.062	6.776***	.494	.081	6.092***

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1. Path model showing the effect of contact on prejudice, as mediated by admiration and anger.



Appendix A

Mean attitude, emotion, and intergroup contact for each group pair in Study 1.

Respondent Group	Target Group	N*	Prejudice	Anger	Admiration	Anxiety
White	Black	110	3.37ab	1.87ab	4.26	2.26b
White	Asian	121	3.32b	1.55a	4.38	1.52a
Black	White	126	3.35b	2.27c	4.3	1.72a
Black	Asian	110	3.34b	1.55a	4.5	1.50a
Asian	White	81	3.03b	2.04bc	4.65	2.15b
Asian	Black	88	3.73a	2.08bc	4.38	2.65c
Overall test for between-group differences			F(5, 628) = 2.46, $p < .05$	F(5, 630) = 6.21, $p < .001$	F(5, 629) = 1.27, ns	F(5, 627) = 14.21, $p < .001$

Appendix A, continued.

Respondent Group	Target Group	Disgust	Envy	Sympathy	Contact
White	Black	1.89ab	1.28a	2.45b	2.22b
White	Asian	1.51a	1.31a	1.89a	1.86a
Black	White	2.09b	1.58ab	2.32b	2.59c
Black	Asian	1.60a	1.51a	1.94a	1.73a
Asian	White	2.25b	2.30c	2.51b	2.67c
Asian	Black	2.24b	1.89b	3.07c	2.17b
Overall test for between-group differences		F(5, 629) = 6.67, $p < .001$	F(5, 628) = 11.15, $p < .001$	F(5, 626) = 8.49, $p < .001$	F(5, 633) = 37.46, $p < .001$

* The N may vary slightly across each column, due to a small number of invalid responses.