Introduction

fabrizio butera and john m. levine

Society consists of numerous interconnected, interacting, and interdependent groups. Of the many dimensions that differentiate these groups, perhaps the most important are power and status. The consequences of belonging to a larger, more powerful "majority" group versus a smaller, less powerful "minority" group can be profound, and the tensions that arise between these two kinds of groups are the root of society's most difficult problems. To understand the origins of these problems and to develop solutions for them, it is critical to understand the dynamics of majority–minority relations.

Social psychological research on intergroup relations has tended to assume (either explicitly or implicitly) that (a) majorities have more impact on minorities than vice versa, and (b) it is more important, for both theoretical and applied reasons, to understand the cognitive, affective, and behavioral responses of majorities than of minorities. In recent years, however, these two assumptions have been challenged, with the result that increasing

attention is being devoted to how minorities influence majorities and how minorities respond to majorities' (often negative) reactions toward them. For example, research indicates that numerical minorities can exert influence when they adopt particular behavioral styles (e.g., Moscovici, Lage, & Naffrechoux, 1969) and that members of stigmatized minorities, such as African-Americans, perform worse on standardized intellectual tests when negative stereotypes of their group are made salient (e.g., Steele & Aronson, 1995).

Although research of this sort is quite valuable in enriching our understanding of majority–minority relations, it nevertheless fails to reflect the broad range of strategies that minorities can use to cope with their (typically) low power and status. For example, whereas minority-influence researchers have done numerous studies on how majority members react to variations in minority members' behavioral style, they have shown little if any interest in the factors that lead minority members to adopt one style versus another. In addition, whereas stigma researchers have devoted substantial attention to minority members' intrapersonal responses to perceived prejudice and discrimination (e.g., emotional reactions, cognitive coping strategies), they have been less interested in minority members' interpersonal and intergroup responses (e.g., assertiveness, collective action).

AIM OF THIS VOLUME

This volume focuses on how groups with low power and status respond to their social environments. Of course, low power and status are often associated with other group characteristics. These include small group size; limited access to resources; recent entry into society (i.e., immigrants); ethnic and religious distinctiveness; and a history of discrimination (see Seyranian, Atuel, & Crano, 2008). But these associations do not always occur. For example, in the case of women, low power and status are associated with large group size. For this reason, we will use the term "minority" to refer to low-status, low-power groups, irrespective of their numerical size. Finally, it is worth noting that the causal relationships between various group characteristics are often difficult to specify (e.g., small group size might lead to low status and power, or low status and power might stimulate member defection, thereby reducing group size).

For this volume, we assembled a set of leading scholars in the fields of stigma, prejudice and discrimination, minority influence, and intergroup relations, who provide diverse theoretical and methodological perspectives on what it means to be a minority. We believe that this diversity is a major

strength of the book, because it underscores the complexity and richness of the phenomena under consideration. Notwithstanding their diversity, however, all of the authors address the core issue of the volume, namely how minorities cope with their social environments. In so doing, they clarify coping strategies at different levels of analysis – intrapersonal, interpersonal, and intergroup.

STRUCTURE AND CONTENT OF THE VOLUME

The volume is organized into three parts. The first two deal with how minorities cope with *exclusion* by majorities. This emphasis on exclusion is appropriate in light of the ubiquity of prejudice and discrimination toward minorities and the difficulties they create for minorities (see Levine & Kerr, 2007). Given the large amount of work on how minorities cope with exclusion and the various kinds of minorities that have been studied from this perspective, we divided the relevant chapters on the basis of the underlying reason for the exclusion. Part 1, "Coping with exclusion: Being excluded for who you are," examines how minorities defined by uncontrollable personal characteristics (e.g., race, gender, ethnicity) cope with exclusion. Membership in such minorities is involuntary, in the sense that members have no choice about their affiliation. Part 2, "Coping with exclusion: Being excluded for what you think and do," examines how minorities defined by controllable characteristics (e.g., beliefs, behaviors) cope with exclusion. Membership in such minorities is voluntary, in the sense that members have substantial choice about their affiliation. Finally, Part 3, "Coping with inclusion," examines an interesting, but relatively neglected, type of coping – namely coping with *inclusion* by majorities. Although it might be assumed that inclusion is so desirable and pleasant that "coping" involves simply embracing it, inclusion often has unpleasant features that elicit more complex forms of coping. Several of these forms of coping are discussed in Part 3.

Part 1: Coping with exclusion: Being excluded for who you are

This part, which is concerned with exclusion on the basis of uncontrollable characteristics, begins with the chapter, "On being the target of prejudice: Educational implications," by Michael Inzlicht, Joshua Aronson, and Rodolfo Mendoza-Denton. These authors are interested in how being the target of prejudice on the basis of one's race, ethnicity, or gender affects students' thoughts, feelings, and behaviors in academic settings. They review

evidence indicating that membership in a stigmatized group (e.g., African-Americans) often undermines students' performance on standardized tests, academic engagement, academic self-concept, institutional trust, and overall achievement. Their analysis is informed by a theoretical model of threatening academic environments that highlights the importance of stereotype threat, attributional ambiguity, and race-based rejection sensitivity. In a concluding section, the authors adopt a more optimistic tone, arguing that motivational and performance decrements produced by social identity threat can be overcome with careful attention to how tasks are framed and what students are taught.

The second chapter, "To climb or not to climb? When minorities stick to the floor," by Margarita Sanchez-Mazas and Annalisa Casini, focuses on how women adapt to the workplace. Despite the removal of formal barriers to gender equality and increased opportunities for upward mobility, women are underrepresented at the top levels of most organizations. This state of affairs suggests that there are invisible impediments that prevent women from ascending the corporate ladder, a phenomenon known as "the glass ceiling effect." This chapter addresses some possible social-psychological antecedents of women's reluctance to search for or accept promotion in work settings (i.e., the self-selection hypothesis). Experimental studies are presented testing the hypothesis that willingness to climb the social ladder depends on the degree of fit between gender-related variables (e.g., participants' psychological orientation toward instrumentality vs. relatedness) and work-setting variables (e.g., organizational norms regarding instrumentality vs. human relations).

Although members of stigmatized minorities often respond rather passively to their social environments, this is not always the case. In some cases, minority members (e.g., African-Americans, women, gays) actively challenge the status quo. In the third chapter, "Managing the message: Using social influence and attitude change strategies to confront interpersonal discrimination," Janet K. Swim, Sarah J. Gervais, Nicholas Pearson, and Charles Stangor discuss minority members' use of confrontation to reduce prejudice and discrimination. These authors define confrontation as "any behavior or verbalization that indicates disagreement with another's behavior or comments." Swim and her colleagues review their own and others' work on this topic using the classic message-learning framework developed by attitude-change researchers. According to this framework, attitude change depends on message attention, comprehension, and acceptance. In addition, translating attitudes into behaviors requires retaining the message and applying it to later action. The authors first examine confronters' goals

vis-à-vis perpetrators of discrimination and bystanders. They then consider the ways that confronters can use messages to manage their impressions on others. Finally, they examine features of audiences that influence the success of confrontations.

Different minority groups use different strategies for confronting majorities. This thesis is developed by Serge Moscovici and Juan A. Pérez in the fourth chapter, "A new representation of minorities as victims." The authors point out that theoretical and empirical work on minority influence has traditionally focused on "active minorities," which provoke conflict and reject the norms and beliefs of the majority with the goal of converting the majority to a new set of beliefs or an alternative lifestyle. Moscovici and Pérez argue that more attention should be given to how victimized minorities produce change by arousing social culpability in majorities. Such culpability is based on majorities' recognition of a contradiction between their basic principles and their behavior toward minorities. In a series of studies portraying Gypsies as either an active or a victimized minority, the authors provide evidence that a victimized minority (which seeks recognition for its suffering) elicits more compensation from a majority than does an active minority (which seeks change in how the majority feels about the minority). These findings suggest that the "ethical" relationship elicited by a victimized minority is different from the "antagonistic" relationship elicited by an active minority.

Various strategies that stigmatized minorities might use for coping with rejection are discussed in the last chapter in this part, "Marginalization through social ostracism: Effects of being ignored and excluded," by Kipling D. Williams and Adrienne Carter-Sowell. Although their discussion of how people respond to being ignored and excluded does not focus explicitly on those who are ostracized because of uncontrollable personal characteristics, victims of ostracism often assume that their treatment is based on who they are rather than what they think and do. Williams and Carter-Sowell argue that ostracism elicits both reflexive and reflective responses. The former responses involve psychological pain and distress, which occur immediately in the wake of ostracism and are not moderated by individual differences, situational forces, or causal attributions. The latter responses include pro-social actions (meant to fortify needs for belonging and self-esteem) and anti-social actions (meant to fortify needs for control and meaningful existence). Pro-social actions include attending carefully to social information, conforming to others' views, and working hard on collective tasks. Anti-social actions include direct and indirect aggression.

6   *Butera and Levine*

Part 2: Coping with exclusion: Being excluded for what you think and do

This part, which is concerned with exclusion on the basis of controllable characteristics, begins with chapter 6, "Delinquents as a minority group: Accidental tourists in forbidden territory or voluntary emigrées?," by Nicholas Emler. In analyzing why young people join and remain in delinquent groups, Emler criticizes several conventional analyses of deviance (e.g., negative group influence, inadequate socialization, labeling theory), arguing instead that delinquency is a self-chosen rather than an externally imposed status. According to his analysis, young people enter and stay in delinquent groups because they desire certain goals, such as protection from victimization and fair treatment, but have little confidence that they can attain these goals through compliance with conventional norms. By adopting a delinquent identity, young people perceive themselves as tougher and braver, and hence less likely to be victimized. Once adopted, a delinquent identity is reinforced in several ways – by selective association with delinquent peers, by polarization of shared norms within the delinquent group, by "intergroup" encounters with authorities, and by the reinforcing effect of negative societal reactions on delinquents' self-perceptions and affiliations with like-minded peers.

A complementary view of why some people join and maintain loyalty to devalued groups is proposed by Jolanda Jetten and Nyla R. Branscombe in chapter 7, "Minority group identification: Responses to discrimination when group membership is controllable." Basing their analysis on social identity and self-categorization theory, these authors suggest that people sometimes join devalued groups (e.g., counter-culture youth groups, radical political organizations, terrorist groups) "precisely because they are devalued by the powers that be." They argue that affiliation with and loyalty to such groups occurs because ingroup identification allows members of devalued groups to differentiate their ingroup from outgroups that discriminate against it. Jetten and Branscombe identify three bases of identification with devalued groups that are relevant to the interplay between intragroup and intergroup self-categorization: (1) politicized identity, which is associated with efforts to gain acceptance for "being different"; (2) rebel identity, which is associated with efforts to demonstrate the uniqueness of one's group; and (3) identity as resource, which is associated with efforts to obtain psychological support to counteract discrimination. The first two identities derive from intergroup processes, whereas the third identity derives from intragroup processes.

Members of stigmatized groups based on controllable characteristics are often targets of persuasion efforts designed to change their thoughts and behaviors, with the ultimate goal of "liberating" them from their stigmatized identity. A salient example in contemporary society is smokers, whose responses to persuasion efforts are analyzed in chapter 8, "Coping with stigmatization: Smokers' reactions to antismoking campaigns," by Juan Manuel Falomir-Pichastor, Armand Chatard, Gabriel Mugny, and Alain Quiamzade. These authors point out that, although smokers recognize their stigmatized status and smoking prevention campaigns use expert persuasion sources, smokers often resist the messages in these campaigns and continue to smoke. Why is this the case? The authors argue that anti-smoking campaigns often threaten the social identity and self-esteem of smokers, which causes them to resist injunctions to quit smoking. In documenting their claim, they present the results of several studies investigating the impact of smokers' acknowledgment of their social stigmatization and the threat that expert sources pose to smokers' identity and freedom.

In addition to identifying with a stigmatized group and resisting majority pressure to leave it, other minority coping strategies involve active efforts to change the majority. In extreme cases, these strategies involve horrific acts of violence. Such acts are the hallmark of terrorist organizations, which are discussed in chapter 9, "Terrorism as a tactic of minority influence," by Xiaoyan Chen and Arie W. Kruglanski. These authors note that research in social psychology has focused on minorities that use nonviolent and socially sanctioned means in an effort to influence majorities. But in the last several decades, the world has seen a dramatic increase in minorities that attempt to exert influence through the use of terrorism, defined as "the deliberate targeting of civilians by non-state actors, aimed to advance political objectives through the induction of fear." In analyzing terrorism as a tactic of minority influence, Chen and Kruglanski argue that this strategy appeals to minorities for several reasons. These include terrorism's ability to gain observers' attention and convince them of the minority's commitment, to equalize the minority's power vis-à-vis the majority, and to create cognitive conflict in the majority. The authors further suggest that the efficacy of terrorism is influenced by several factors, including its persistence and tenacity, conformance to the Zeitgeist, and leadership. These and related issues (e.g., the perceived morality of terrorism, the proximal vs. distal effects of terrorism) are discussed in reference to contemporary terrorist movements.

White supremacist/anti-Semitic groups that seek to marginalize, expel, or physically destroy Blacks, Jews, Asians, and other "non-Aryans" also

sometimes use violence to attain their goals. In chapter 10, "The stigma of racist activism," Kathleen M. Blee focuses on how members of such groups cope with the stigmatization they face for their views. Blee reports narratives from extensive life history interviews with women racist activists, who represent an increasingly important component of White supremacist groups. These women regard themselves as unfairly stigmatized by mainstream society and hold deep and wide-ranging conspiratorial beliefs about the power of their "enemies," particularly Jews. They respond to their perceived stigmatization in several ways, for example by disengaging from people they see as hostile to White supremacism, attempting to blend into mainstream society, drawing distinctions between acceptable and unacceptable racist activities, arguing for the victimized status of White Aryans, and flaunting their racial beliefs in public situations. These responses are shaped by racists' perceptions of their external environment as well as the internal dynamics of racist groups.

Yet another coping strategy available to minorities is leaving the group to form a competing group or to join another existing group. This strategy is discussed by Fabio Sani in chapter 11, "Why groups fall apart: A social psychological model of the schismatic process." Sani presents a model of schisms based on data from the Italian Communist Party and the Church of England. The model postulates that schismatic intentions are caused by the perception that the identity of the group is being subverted by a new norm. This occurs because perceived identity subversion reduces group identification and increases dejection- and agitation-related emotions, both of which affect schismatic intentions. Finally, the impact of these variables on schismatic intentions is moderated by the extent to which the people who oppose the new norm feel that they have "voice" (i.e., will not be discriminated against if they state their views). More specifically, voice reduces the impact of group identification and dejection/agitation on schismatic intentions.

Part 3: Coping with inclusion.

As noted above, it seems obvious that minorities desire inclusion and hence embrace it with "no questions asked." Why, after all, look a gift horse in the mouth? In fact, the reality of majority–minority relations is not so simple. In some cases, inclusion has unpleasant connotations for minorities and hence elicits more complex forms of coping. The first chapter in this part, Chapter 12, "Multiple identities and the paradox of social inclusion," by Manuela Barreto and Naomi Ellemers, examines how social inclusion

of minorities can paradoxically contribute to feelings of social exclusion. The authors' central argument is that assimilative (i.e., inclusionary) pressures on members of minority groups are problematical for three reasons: they constitute a threat to the distinctiveness of the minority's subgroup identity, they imply a lack of respect for that identity, and they threaten minority members' self-definition by imposing an external definition of the self in place of the person's preferred identity. Barreto and Ellemers review research documenting these effects of assimilative pressures and demonstrating their negative impact on social cohesion and the inclusion of all groups in a superordinate category.

In chapter 13, "Prominority policies and cultural change: A dilemma for minorities," Angelica Mucchi-Faina argues that certain well-intentioned inclusionary policies, namely "hard" affirmative action and language reform, can have paradoxical effects on members of the groups they are designed to help. In support of this contention, she reviews evidence documenting the negative consequences of these two policies. For example, hard affirmative action has been found to reduce the self-esteem, motivation, and performance of the beneficiaries of this policy and to create negative attitudes toward these beneficiaries. Mucchi-Faina suggests that work needs to be done to identify when minorities should shift from collective protest and demands for equal treatment to efforts to institutionalize newly-gained rights.

The last two chapters in this part also examine paradoxical effects of minority "success." In these chapters, success is defined as moving from minority to majority status by convincing other group members to adopt one's position. In chapter 14, "Influence without credit: How successful minorities respond to social cyptomnesia," Fabrizio Butera, John M. Levine, and Jean-Pierre Vernet examine how minorities respond when they succeed in producing influence but fail to get credit for doing so (i.e., social cryptomnesia). The authors argue that successful "nomic" minorities, which are motivated to produce social change, are upset by failure to gain recognition for the influence they produce. As a result, they become more homogeneous in their beliefs, more committed to their position, and more resistant to majority influence. Research confirming these hypotheses is presented.

Finally, in chapter 15, "Influence and its aftermath: Motives for agreement among minorities and majorities," Radmila Prislin and P. Niels Christensen discuss how members of minority and majority factions respond to changes in their relative status within the group (i.e., promotion to majority status in the case of initial minorities vs. demotion to minority status in the case of initial majorities). They present research relevant to their theory, which

postulates that loss of majority status elicits a strong negative reaction, whereas gain of majority status elicits a weak positive reaction. As a result, the immediate effect of social change is a reduction in members' overall identification with the group. Their research indicates that an initial minority's motives (social validation, social acceptance, social control) have a substantial impact on its reaction to becoming a majority. For example, when minorities are motivated to attain social validation and acceptance, gaining numerical dominance leads to identification with the group only when majority members' conversion seems genuine.

REFERENCES

Levine, J. M., & Kerr, N. L. (2007). Inclusion and exclusion: Implications for group processes. In A. E. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (2nd ed., pp. 759–784). New York: Guilford.

Moscovici, S., Lage, E., & Naffrechoux, M. (1969). Influence of a consistent minority on the responses of a majority in a color perception task. *Sociometry*, *32*, 365–380.

Seyranian, V., Atuel, H., & Crano, W. D. (2008). Dimensions of majority and minority groups. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *11*, 21–37.

Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*, 797–811.