Running head: acceptance of cultural diversity

When do people accept cultural diversity?: Affect as determinant

Arnd Florack

Universität Münster, Germany

Herbert Bless

Universität Mannheim, Germany

Ursula Piontkowski

Universität Münster, Germany

Mailing address:

Arnd Florack

Psychologisches Institut IV

Universität Münster

Fliednerstr. 21

D-48149 Münster

Germany

Abstract

Two experiments examined the influence of affect on the acceptance of cultural diversity. In Experiment 1, the salience of affective reactions towards Turkish immigrants was manipulated by asking German participants to think about their negative feelings towards Turks in general or towards a subgroup of Turks. It was found that the salience of negative affective reactions led to a decreased acceptance when affective reactions were generalized to the whole group, but not when they were attributed to a subgroup. Experiment 2 investigated the moderating role of perceived homogeneity with regards to the impact of affective reactions attributed to a subgroup of Muslim immigrants in Germany. As predicted, the salience of a negative aspect of a subgroup strengthened self-reported and implicitly-measured negative attitudes when the perceived homogeneity of the immigrant group was high, but not when it was low.

When do people accept cultural diversity?: Affect as determinant

The question of how society should deal with problems arising from immigration is a constant topic of discussion in politics and the media. The topic is complex and multi-faceted. One important issue is the question of whether the assimilation of ethnic minorities to the majority culture, including their adoption of the language, values, and rules of the majority, should be supported (e.g., by affirmative action), or whether immigrants should instead be encouraged to preserve their heritage and culture, including their language and religious customs. A number of studies stress that the attitudes within a host community towards the preservation of culture are crucial for a successful acculturation of immigrants (Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault, & Senécal, 1997; Florack & Quadflieg, 2002; Horenczyk, 1997; Piontkowski, Rohmann, & Florack, in press). But what are the factors that determine the attitudes of host community members towards cultural diversity? Even if many people accept cultural diversity within their society, others advocate the assimilation of ethnic minorities (Piontkowski, Florack, Hölker, & Obdrzalek, 2000).

Esses, Haddok, and Zanna (1993) reasoned that in addition to cognitive factors such as stereotypes and symbolic beliefs, affective responses should have an influence on intergroup attitudes. Results obtained by Stephan, Ybarra, Martinez, Schwarzwald, and Tur-Kaspa (1998) provided support for this assumption. This study showed that intergroup anxiety contributes to the prediction of attitudes towards immigrants in Israel and Spain, although cognitive determinants (realistic threat) were considered in addition to intergroup anxiety. Stephan and Stephan (1985) argued that anxiety about a foreign culture leads to an increased orientation towards group norms, which may, in the case of perceived threat, result in discrimination. Conversely, a reduction of anxiety should lead to acceptance.

Smith (1993; cf. Dijker, 1987) also stressed the importance of affective determinants. He argued that prejudice can be viewed as a "social emotion experienced with respect to one's social identity as a group member, with an out-group as target" (p. 304). According to Smith (1993; 1999), the appraisal of an out-group as self-relevant may trigger emotions and action tendencies that are directed at immigrants. Smith and Ho (2002) reported evidence supporting this assumption. They asked White Americans about their feelings towards Asian Americans and found that negative emotions (e.g., anger, frustration) were correlated with negative attitudes towards Asian Americans, whereas positive emotions (e.g., admiration, encouragement) were correlated with positive attitudes towards Asian Americans. More recently, some authors used experimental manipulations of threat (Esses, Jackson, Nolan, & Amstrong, in press; Florack, 2000; Florack, Piontkowski, Rohmann, Balser, & Perzig, in press; Maio, Esses, & Bell, 1994; Stephan, Martin, Esses, & Stephan, 2000) and showed that they triggered negative feelings about the out-group and negative attitudes towards immigration.

However, feelings are often related to specific aspects of an out-group culture and do not always apply to the whole group. For example, some members of an immigrant group may hold the opinion that children should grow up in line with specific religious customs, while others do not agree with this opinion at all. Thus, we assume that host community members are more likely to rely on feelings if they perceive the immigrant group as homogeneous rather than heterogeneous. Even if the literature on the consequences of group homogeneity is sparse (cf. Linville & Fischer, 1998), there are some indications that individuals do indeed make stronger generalizations from single incidents to an entire group when that group is perceived

as homogeneous (Nisbett, Kranz, Jepson, & Kunda, 1983; Park & Hastie, 1987; Quattrone & Jones, 1980).

In addition, some authors have argued that the salience of positively or negatively evaluated group exemplars does not necessarily contribute to a change of group attitudes in the same direction. They assume that exemplars may, under certain circumstances, be excluded from the representation of the group and that evaluations of the respective exemplars may lead to contrast effects as regards the evaluation of the group. For example, Herr (1986) reported that priming of moderate stimuli led to assimilation of a subsequent judgment to the evaluation of the prime, while priming of extreme stimuli led to contrasting evaluations in a subsequent judgment task. Strack, Schwarz, and Geschneidiger (1985) found similar contrast effects as regards life satisfaction. When participants were asked to describe events that happened long ago, their judgment of life satisfaction was contrasted to these events. When participants were asked to describe events that happened recently, their judgment was assimilated to these events.

Kunda and Oleson (1995; 1997) examined assimilation and contrast effects in an intergroup context. They argue that stereotype change results from deviating exemplars only when perceivers find no reason to judge these exemplars as atypical. In one experiment, Kunda and Oleson (1995) found that participants who received a description of an introverted lawyer changed their stereotypes when no additional information about the lawyer was provided. Participants who received additional information used this information to subtype the atypical exemplar and no stereotype change occurred. Kunda and Oleson (1997) showed that extreme exemplars were more likely to lead to stereotype change when participants had moderate stereotypes. Furthermore, other authors found evidence that the same exemplars

may be viewed as typical or atypical, and, depending on the context, may lead to assimilation or contrast effects in the judgment of the group category. For example, Bless, Schwarz, Bodenhausen, and Thiel (2001) found that information about a positive exemplar of an ethnic out-group led to a more positive evaluation of the entire out-group when participants were induced to include the exemplar in the group category as compared to when they were induced to exclude the exemplar.

Experiment 1

Experiment 1 examined whether the impact of negative feelings about an immigrant group on the acceptance of this group depends on the representativeness of these feelings. Specifically, we asked German students to answer a questionnaire that included questions related to their attitudes towards Turkish immigrants and the acceptance of cultural diversity. The focus on negative feelings, which should be either related to the whole group or to single exemplars of the Turkish community, was manipulated by a task that appeared just before the acceptance measure within the questionnaire. We asked participants to think about negative feelings they had about Turks or the Turkish culture in general, or about negative feelings they had about single exemplars or a minority of Turks. Participants of the control group answered a question that was not relevant to the intergroup context. Based on the cited research, we assumed that feelings related to representative group exemplars may yield different consequences for the acceptance of cultural diversity than feelings related to unrepresentative exemplars. In particular, we supposed that the mechanism that Bless et al. (2001) demonstrated for the case of a positive exemplar is also valid for negative exemplars. In particular, we assumed that negative feelings related to non-representative out-group exemplars would lead to an increase in the

acceptance of cultural diversity, while negative feelings related to the whole culture would result in a decrease of acceptance.

Method

Participants and design

The participants were 61 male students at the University of Trier. They were randomly assigned to three experimental conditions (low representativeness, control condition, high representativeness). Ten participants were excluded from the analyses because they indicated citizenship other than German (n = 3) or because they returned an incomplete questionnaire (n = 7). In addition, one participant was excluded after the check on the experimental manipulation.

Procedure

After arriving at the experimental lab, participants were told that it would be their task to answer a questionnaire pertaining to several different topics. They were then given the questionnaire which included, first, the manipulation of affect, and, subsequently, the dependent measure.

Representativeness

In the high representativeness condition, participants were asked to think about those aspects of Turkish culture they considered unpleasant and repulsive and to list some of them. In the low representativeness condition, participants were asked to think about the aspects of single members or a subgroup of Turkish culture they considered unpleasant and repulsive and to list some of them. In the control condition, participants answered an unrelated open question. A preliminary study tested whether this manipulation triggered feelings in the expected direction. A single factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA) with the conditions salience of negative feelings, salience of positive feelings, and a control group revealed that the salience of feelings had an impact on the affective evaluation of the immigrant group in the expected direction, $F(2, 92) = 5.46$, $p < .01$. Contrast

tests showed that Turks were evaluated more negatively on feeling scales when negative feelings were salient as compared to conditions when no feelings, $t(92) = 2.57$, $p < .01$, or positive feelings were salient, $t(92) = 3.13$, $p < .001$, all t-tests one-tailed. However, the representativeness was not varied in this preliminary study.

Acceptance of cultural diversity. Seven items were used to assess the acceptance of cultural diversity of Turkish immigrants. Participants had to indicate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements (1 = I do not agree at all, 9 = I completely agree): “I accept it when Turks live in Germany in accordance with the rules of Turkish culture;” “I accept it when behaviors and experiences of Turks in Germany are similar to those of Turks in Turkey;” “I accept it when Turks live in Germany in line with their religious traditions;” “I accept it when Turks live in Germany as they are accustomed to in Turkey;” “I accept it when Turks in Germany wear the same clothes as they would in Turkey;” “I accept it when Turks in Germany educate their children as they would in their homeland;” “I accept it when Turks in Germany speak their mother tongue whenever possible.” A scale score was computed by averaging responses across the single items (Cronbach’s alpha = .87). High values on this scale indicated a high degree of acceptance of cultural diversity.

Results

Check on the experimental manipulation. We verified that all participants in the low and high representativeness conditions listed aspects of Turks that were of negative valence. A categorization of the listed aspects showed that, with the exception of one participant who wrote down no aspects, all participants wrote down negative aspects of Turks. The participant who listed no aspects was excluded from the following analyses.

Representativeness and acceptance. The results of a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) supported the hypothesis that thinking about negative emotions related to Turks affects the acceptance of the cultural diversity of Turkish immigrants in Germany, depending on the perceived representativeness of one's own feelings, $F(2, 47) = 2.81$, $p < .05$, one-tailed. Participants who supposed that their negative feelings were directed at the group ($M = 4.92$) accepted the cultural diversity of Turks to a lesser degree than participants who believed that their negative feelings were directed at single exemplars or a subgroup of Turks ($M = 6.31$), $t(47) = 2.37$, $p < .02$, one-tailed. In addition, there is a tendency for a higher acceptance in comparison to the control group ($M = 5.66$) when negative but non-representative feelings were salient, $t(47) = 1.13$, $p < .14$, one-tailed.

Discussion

The results of Experiment 1 are consistent with the idea that negative affect, when related to an ethnic minority, does not necessarily lead to a reduced acceptance of cultural diversity. The acceptance of cultural diversity was higher when negative affect towards unrepresentative exemplars was salient than when the negative affect was perceived as directed at the entire minority culture. In fact, thinking about negative feelings towards unrepresentative exemplars tended to result in an increase of acceptance compared to a control group.

Even if we did not find a significant contrast between the control condition and the condition in which a negative affect towards an unrepresentative exemplar was salient, we would like to stress that this result has been obtained in other recent research. Bless et al. (2001) as well as Kunda and Oleson (1997) reported that a subtyping of exemplars resulted in a contrast between the evaluation of a group member and the evaluation of the group. For example, in the experiments of Bless et

al., the exclusion of a positive target from the group category yielded a more positive evaluation of the target and a more negative evaluation of the group. To explain these results, Bless et al. argued that individuals cannot simply ignore the evaluation of the target; instead, they use this evaluation (along with other information) to construct a standard comparison.

It remains an open question whether the difference between the acceptance of cultural diversity in the low and high representativeness conditions is the result of a conscious correction or an automatic categorization. Both mechanisms seem plausible. It may be that participants were aware that it is unfair to base their acceptance on a feeling directed at an unrepresentative subgroup. In that case, they may have attempted to correct for their perceived bias in the acceptance judgment (von Hippel, Sekaquaptewa, & Vargas, 1997; Strack, 1992; Wegener & Petty, 1995). Also, it may be that our instruction elicited a sub-categorization of the unrepresentative exemplars, which resulted in the kind of inevitable accentuation of differences between the categories that we know from categorization research (cf. Turner, 1987).

Experiment 2

Experiment 1 demonstrated that salient feelings towards an immigrant group do not necessarily have an impact on the acceptance of cultural diversity. In particular, it was shown that the impact of negative feelings depends on whether they are related to specific instances or to the whole group. In Experiment 2, we studied the question of whether the acceptance of cultural diversity is more likely to be affected by salient feelings which are related to a subgroup or single exemplars when the immigrant group is perceived as homogeneous.

If the underlying mechanism of the differential impact of salient feelings is based on the categorization of the incident that triggered the feelings as representative for the immigrant group or not, it seems plausible that individuals are more likely to perceive specific aspects or exemplars of an immigrant group as representative when the group is perceived as homogeneous. In addition, it is an open question whether these processes are limited to self-reported attitudes or whether negative feelings can have a differential impact on automatically activated associations as well.

This question is of particular importance, because numerous studies have shown the profound impact of automatically activated associations, stereotypes, and prejudice on social behavior (Bodenhausen, Macrae, & Sherman, 1999). Furthermore, recent research demonstrated that automatically activated associations or attitudes are sensitive to experimental manipulations (e.g., Dagupta & Greenwald, 2001; Kühnen, Schießel, Bauer, Paulig, Pöhlmann, & Schmidthals, 2001; Olson & Fazio, 2001), even if they are not as context-dependent as self-reported attitudes (Florack et al., in press). For instance, Dasgupta and Greenwald (2001) exposed White participants to admired Black and disliked White individuals and found that this exposure weakened automatic pro-White attitudes. Extending this research, we assumed that salient feelings which are related to specific exemplars or aspects of an immigrant group are more likely to affect automatic associations with this group when the group is perceived as homogeneous rather than heterogeneous.

We examined our hypotheses as regards attitudes towards Muslim immigrants in Germany. The procedure was similar to that of Experiment 1. Negative feelings towards a subgroup were varied by asking half of the participants to think about a negative aspect of single exemplars or a subgroup of Muslims, while the other half

was not asked to think about such an aspect. In addition, we measured the perceived homogeneity of Muslim immigrants to consider the moderating role of this variable. Besides the acceptance of cultural diversity, we assessed explicit attitudes towards Muslims with a self-report scale and automatically activated associations with the implicit association test (IAT) of Greenwald, McGhee, and Schwarz (1998).

Method

Participants and Design

The participants were 32 students from the University of Münster (4 men and 28 women), who received three euros (approximately US $3) for their participation. Participants were randomly assigned to two experimental conditions (salience of negative feelings related to a subgroup of Muslims vs. control group). One participant was excluded from the analyses because she indicated a citizenship other than German.

Procedure

After arriving at the lab, participants were seated in front of a computer. During the experiment, all materials and questionnaires were presented on the computer screen. First, participants were asked to answer a questionnaire that included the manipulation and all self-report scales. Finally, participants worked on the implicit association test (IAT).

Manipulation

To manipulate the salience of feelings related to a subgroup of the Muslim community, we used a manipulation similar to that in Experiment 1. Half of the participants were asked to list one aspect of single members or a subgroup of Muslims they considered unpleasant and threatening. The other half were assigned to the control group and did not answer such a question. In the salience condition, we asked participants to write down only one aspect and not several aspects as we did in Experiment 1, because we hoped to keep the number of participants who refused to fill out the questionnaire to a minimum.

Perceived out-group homogeneity. The perceived homogeneity of the immigrant group was measured with six items. Using 9-point bipolar ratings scales (1 = not at all different, 9 = very different), participants had to indicate the degree to which they perceived differences according to cultural customs, mentality, religion, clothing, family life, and nutrition ("How different are Muslims among each other according to …"). The item scores were transformed and averaged in a way that high values indicate high perceived homogeneity (Cronbach's alpha = .78).

Acceptance of cultural diversity. The acceptance of cultural diversity was measured with the same items as in Experiment 1 (Cronbach's alpha = .87), the only difference being that in this experiment they were applied to Muslims and not to Turks.

Self-reported attitudes. To measure the self-reported attitudes, we asked participants to indicate on a 6-point scale (1="not at all", 6="very much") the degree to which five positive attributes (pleasing, enriching, likable, attractive, good) and five negative attributes (negative, dangerous, unpleasant, unwanted, forbidding) applied to Muslims. High values of the combined scale indicate positive attitudes towards Mulsims (Cronbach's Alpha = .93).

Implicitly-measured attitudes. The associations between the groups and positive and negative attributes were measured with an adapted version of the IAT of Greenwald et al. (1998). The adapted IAT consisted of five steps in which participants, using two response keys, had to assign words presented on a computer screen to certain attribute categories (positive vs. negative) or group categories (Muslims vs. Germans). The words representing the attribute categories were adjectives with a positive (e.g., beautiful, joyful) or negative meaning (e.g., angry, sad). The adjectives were selected from a study by Hager, Mecklenbräuker, Möller,

and Westermann (1985). The selected adjectives were equal in length and of unambiguous valence. The words representing the group categories were German first names (e.g., Rudi, Dieter) and Muslim first names (e.g., Özal, Muhammat). Altogether, 72 words (18 for each category) were selected for presentation.

In the most critical steps of the experiment, adjectives and first names were presented at random and participants had to map the presented items onto the response keys in a prejudice-consistent manner (right key: positive words and German names; left key: negative words and Muslim names) or prejudice-inconsistent manner (right key: positive words and Muslim names; left key: negative words and German names). To prepare the data for analyses that require a normal distribution, we followed the procedures of Greenwald et al. (1998). Responses slower than 300 ms were regarded as guesses and responses faster than 3000 ms as controlled responses and were therefore eliminated. Furthermore, the first two trials from each step were dropped because of typically delayed responses at the beginning of a new step (cf. Greenwald et al., 1998). Finally, a difference score was computed on the basis of the log-transformed and averaged latencies of the prejudice-consistent and the prejudice-inconsistent mode. The mean latency for the prejudice-inconsistent mode was subtracted from the mean latency for the prejudice-consistent mode. Thus, higher values indicate that Muslims were more strongly associated with positive attributes and that Germans were more strongly associated with negative attributes. All analyses were conducted on the transformed data, but the untransformed means were reported in the text to facilitate the interpretation.

Results

Median split and check on the experimental manipulation. Participants were classified into groups of low (M = 2.78, n = 15) and high (M = 4.97, n = 16) perceived

homogeneity on the basis of a median split. The experimental manipulation of salient feelings had no effect on the perceived homogeneity, t(29) < 1, ns. Furthermore, we checked whether all participants of the experimental group listed at least one negative aspect of the Muslim culture. As that was the case, no participant was excluded from the statistical analyses.

The effect of salient feelings on self-reported attitudes. In line with our expectations, a two-factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA) with the salience manipulation (salience of a negative aspect of a subgroup vs. control condition) and the perceived homogeneity (low vs. high) as independent factors yielded a significant interaction between the two factors, F(1,27) = 4.13, p [.05. The salience of a negative aspect related to a subgroup weakened the acceptance of cultural diversity in comparison to the control group when participants perceived the Muslim group as homogeneous (salience of negative aspect: M = 4.84 vs. control: M = 6.51), t(27) = 2.22, p < .05, but not when they perceived more differences between Muslims, t(27) < 1, ns. A similar moderating function of the perceived homogeneity was found for the effect of the salience manipulation on the self-reported attitude towards Muslims, F(1, 27) = 4.73, p < .05. For the high homogeneity group, the listing of one negative aspect of single members or a subgroup of Muslims led to more negative attitudes (M = 3.18) compared to the control group (M = 4.59), t(27) = 3.54, p < .01. For participants of the low homogeneity group, no such differences were found, t(27) < 1, ns. The main effect of the perceived homogeneity was not significant for either the acceptance of cultural diversity, F(1, 27) = 1.85, p < .20, or for the self-reported attitude towards Muslims, F(1, 27) = 1.59, p < .22. The main effect for the salience of negative aspects of a subgroup of Muslims was significant for the self-reported attitudes towards Muslims, F(1,27) = 7.37, p < .05. The self-reported attitudes were

more negative when one negative aspect of single exemplars or a subgroup of Muslims was salient (salience condition: M = 3.57; control condition: M = 5.58). However, this main effect of salience was qualified by the interaction between salience and perceived homogeneity as described above. The main effect of salience was not significant for the ANOVA with the acceptance of cultural diversity as dependent measure, F(1, 27) = 1.85, p < .19. The means of all dependent measures are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

The effect of salient feelings on implicitly-measured associations. As regards the impact of the salience manipulation on implicitly-measured associations, we expected that it, too, would be moderated by the perception of homogeneity. In line with this expectation, implicitly-measured associations differed between low homogeneity participants who listed one negative aspect of single exemplars or a subgroup of Muslims (M = -326,28), and low homogeneity participants of the control group (M = -117.87), t(27) = 2.74, p < .05. The salience of a negative aspect related to a subgroup or single exemplars had no effect when participants perceived the immigrant group as heterogeneous, t(27) < 1, ns. An ANOVA with the salience manipulation (salience of a negative aspect of a subgroup vs. control) and the perceived homogeneity (low vs. high) as independent factors yielded a marginally significant main effect of salience, F(1, 27) = 3.49, p < .08, which was qualified by a marginally significant interaction between the two factors, F(1, 27) = 3.70, p < .07. The main effect of the perceived homogeneity was not significant, F(1, 27) < 1, ns.

Discussion

The goal of Experiment 2 was to test the hypothesis that the impact of negative feelings triggered by aspects of a subgroup of immigrants on attitudes

towards the whole immigrant group depends on the perceived homogeneity of this group. The findings supported this prediction not only for the acceptance of cultural diversity and the self-reported attitude towards the immigrant group, but also for implicitly-measured associations. Thus, the results strengthen the findings of Experiment 1 that the salience of negative feelings do not inevitably lead to a rejection of the immigrant group. While Experiment 1 showed that the impact of salient feelings depends on whether or not the feelings are directed at the whole group of immigrants, the results of Experiment 2 suggest that feelings directed towards single members or a subgroup of immigrants can also affect attitudes towards the whole group when the group is perceived as homogeneous.

In addition, the present study extends previous research by pointing to a condition under which the salience of negative feelings can affect implicitly-measured associations. Previous studies provided heterogeneous results. While some research demonstrated the influence of priming manipulations on implicitly-measured associations (Greenwald & Dasgupta, 2001; Kühnen et al., 2001), other research found no such effects (Florack et al., in press). Taking into account the perceived homogeneity as moderator, the present research shows a possible way of resolving these inconsistencies. The results of Experiment 2 clearly indicate that the salience of negative feelings triggered by aspects of single group members or a subgroup is more likely to strengthen automatically activated negative associations with the immigrant group when the immigrant group is perceived as homogeneous rather than heterogeneous.

A limitation of Experiment 2 should be noted as well. We did not manipulate the perception of homogeneity experimentally, in fact, we considered the moderating role of existing differences in the perception of homogeneity. It seems plausible that

individuals who differ in the perception of out-group homogeneity differ in other variables which may also be important when it comes to the acceptance of cultural diversity. We cannot rule out that such variables had an effect in Experiment 2. However, the finding in Experiment 1 that an experimental variation of the representativeness of negative feelings led to different degrees of the rejection of cultural diversity supports the assumption that the perceived homogeneity does indeed moderate the impact of salient feelings.

General Discussion

Earlier research has emphasized that affect should be an important predictor of attitudes towards immigrants and immigration. However, most studies conducted in this context have been correlational. We have extended this work by showing that the salience of affect related to an immigrant culture does have a causal influence on attitudes towards immigration. The results of Experiment 1 highlight that the salience of negative feelings directed at the whole culture leads to rejection of cultural diversity. However, we also found in Experiment 1 and Experiment 2 that affect related to an immigrant culture does not necessarily determine the acceptance of cultural diversity in this direction. Obviously, the impact of affect on acceptance of cultural diversity depends on the representativeness of the felt affect. If participants assumed that their negative affect was caused by single exemplars or if they perceived the immigrant group as heterogeneous, they did not reject the cultural diversity of the immigrant group. Interestingly, the same moderating effect of perceived homogeneity was found for the impact of negative feelings on implicitly-measured attitudes. Taking into account that implicitly-measured attitudes are less likely to be affected by contextual variables (Florack et al., in press), we can say that this finding underlines the strength of the observed mechanisms.

In the media, we can often find presentations of minority members that relate them to crime or other undesirable behavior (e.g., Romer, Jamieson, & deCoteau, 1998). An intuitive assumption is that such cases trigger negative emotions that determine our attitudes to the whole culture or group. Our results have made us a little more optimistic about this mechanism. People are able to differentiate and do not always generalize from individual exemplars to the group. If people perceive their negative emotions to be caused by an unrepresentative exemplar or subgroup, this may indeed have a positive effect on the attitudes towards the immigrant group. However, an important precondition for such a positive effect of negative exemplars is that the affect or the exemplars who caused the affect are seen as unrepresentative of the group as a whole. In our experiments, we examined the perceived homogeneity of the group as determinant of the generalization from single incidents to the whole group. Other research offers us additional assumptions about the circumstances under which individuals are likely to generalize from exemplars to a group. For example, Kunda and Oleson (1997) found that extreme exemplars are less likely to influence the perception of the group than are exemplars who deviate moderately from the stereotype. Extending this finding, we can further assume that prior attitudes and prejudices may also have an influence on such corrective mechanisms: individuals with a more negative prior attitude may not see a negative exemplar as unrepresentative, while individuals with a more positive prior attitude might do so.

However, it would seem that the extremity of the exemplar is not the only variable determining whether an exemplar is seen as representative. Bless et al. (2001; cf. Bless & Wänke, 2000) showed that the same exemplar, irrespective of central characteristics, can be perceived in one context as typical and in another

context as atypical. Thus, in addition to the characteristics of the exemplar or subgroup, it is apparently also important whether or not the context facilitates subtyping. Altogether, some practical implications of the present study might include, first, that information about an immigrant group that elicits negative emotions should be presented in a way that inhibits generalization, and, second, that individuals should be trained to be more attentive to the representativeness of information they receive about immigrant group members.

In sum, the present experiments demonstrate that affect is a crucial determinant in the acceptance of cultural diversity of an immigrant minority. However, negative emotions are not destiny and do not invariably lead to the rejection of cultural diversity. Negative affect has a direct impact on the acceptance of cultural diversity only when the affect is generalized to the whole group, and not when individuals are aware that their negative affect is caused by unrepresentative exemplars. Future studies may help us to understand the circumstances under which affect is or is not generalized to the whole group.

References

Berry, J. W. & Kalin, R. (1995). Multicultural and ethnic Canada: An overview of the 1991 national survey. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 27, 301-320.

Bless, H., Schwarz, N., Bodenhausen, G. V., & Thiel, L. (2001). Personalized versus generalized benefits of stereotype disconfirmation: Tradeoffs in the evaluation of atypical exemplars and social groups. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37, 386-397.

Bless, H. & Wänke, M. (2000). Can the same information be typical and atypical? How perceived typicality moderates assimilation and contrast in evaluative judgments. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26, 306-315.

Bodenhausen, G. V., Macrae, C. N., & Sherman, J. W. (1999). On the dialectics of discrimination: dual processes. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), Dual process theories in social psychology (pp. 271-290). New York: Guilford.

Bourhis, R. Y., Moïse, C. L., Perreault, S., & Senécal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: A social psychological perspective. International Journal of Psychology, 32, 369-386.

Dasgupta, N. & Greenwald, A. G. (2001). On the malleability of automatic attitudes: Combating automatic prejudice with images of admired and disliked individuals. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81, 800-814.

Dijker, A. J. M. (1987). Emotional reactions to ethnic minorities. European Journal of Social Psychology, 17, 305-325.

Esses, V. M., Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. (1993). Values, stereotypes, and emotions as determinants of intergroup attitudes. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception (pp. 137-166).

Esses, V. M., Jackson, L. M., Nolan, J. M., & Amstrong, T. L. (in press). Economic threat and attitudes toward immigration. In S. Halli & L. Drieger (Eds.), Immigrant Canada: Demographic, economic and social challenges. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Florack, A. (2000). Umgang mit fremden Kulturen [interaction with foreign cultures]. Wiesbaden: Deutscher Universitätsverlag.

Florack, A., & Quadflieg, C. (2002). Akkulturation und Selbstwert von Eritreern in Deutschland [Acculturation and self-esteem of Eritrean immigrants in Germany]. Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie, 33, 137-147.

Florack, A., Piontkowski, U., Rohmann, A., Balser, T. & Perzig, S. (in press). Perceived intergroup threat and attitudes of host community members towards immigrant acculturation. Journal of Social Psychology.

Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The implicit association test. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74, 1464-1480.

Hager, W., Mecklenbräuker, S., Möller, H., & Westermann, R. (1985). Emotionsgehalt, Bildhaftigkeit, Konkretheit und Bedeutungshaltigkeit von 580 Adjektiven. Ein Beitrag zur Prüfung und Normierung einiger Zusammenhangshypothesen [Emotionality, imagery, concreteness and meaningfulness of 580 adjectives: A normative study and test of hypotheses concerning different variables]. Archiv für Psychologie, 137. 75-93.

Herr, P. M. (1986). Consequences of priming: judgment and behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 1106-1115.

Horenczyk, G. (1997) Immigrants' perceptions of host attitudes and their reconstruction of cultural groups. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 46, 34-38.

Kunda, Z. & Oleson, K. C. (1995). Maintaining stereotypes in the face of disconfirmation: Constructing grounds for subtyping deviants. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 565-579.

Kunda, Z. & Oleson, K. C. (1997). When exceptions prove the rule: How extremity of deviance determines the impact of deviant examples on stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72, 965-979.

Kühnen, U., Schießel, M., Bauer, N., Paulig, N., Pöhlmann, C. & Schmidthals, K. (2001). How robust is the IAT? Measuring and manipulating implicit attitudes of East and West Germans. Zeitschrift für Experimentelle Psychologie, 2, 135-144.

Linville, P. W. & Fischer, G. W. (1998). Group variability and covariation: Effects on intergroup judgment and behavior. C. Sedikides, J. Schopler, & C. A. Insko (Eds.), Intergroup cognition and behavior (pp. 123-150). Mahawa, NJ: Erlbaum.

Maio, G. R., Esses, V. M., & Bell, D. W. (1994). The formation of attitudes toward new immigrant groups. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24, 1762-1776.

Nisbett, R. E., Krantz, D. H., Jepson, C., & Kunda, Z. (1983). The use of statistical heuristics in every day intuitive reasoning. Psychological Review, 90, 339-363.

Olson, M. A. & Fazio, R. H. (2001). Implicit attitude formation through classical conditioning. Psychological Science, 12, 413-417.

Park, B. & Hastie, R. (1987). Perception of variability in category development: Instance- versus abstraction-based stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53, 621-635.

Piontkowski, U., Florack, A., Hölker, P., & Obdrzalek, P. (2000). Predicting acculturation attitudes of dominant and non-dominant groups. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 24, 1-26.

Piontkowski, U., Rohmann, A., & Florack, A. (in press). Concordance of acculturation attitudes and perceived threat. Group Processes and Intergroup Relations.

Quattrone, G. A. & Jones, E. E. (1980). The perception of variability within ingroups and outgroups: Implications for the law of small numbers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 141-152.

Romer, S., Jamieson, K. H., & deCoteau, N. (1998). The treatment of persons of color in local television news. Communication Research, 25, 286-305.

Smith, E. R. (1993). Social identity and social emotions: Toward new conceptualizations of prejudice. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception (pp. 297-315).

Smith, E. R. (1999). Affective and cognitive implications of a group becoming part of the self: New models of prejudice and of the self-concept. In D. Abrams & M. Hogg (Eds.), Social identity and social cognition (pp. 183-196). Blackwell: Oxford.

Smith, E. R. & Ho, C. (2002). Prejudice as intergroup emotion: Integrating relative deprivation and social comparison explanations of prejudice. In I. Walker & H. Smith (Eds.), Relative deprivation: Specification, development, and integration (pp. 332-348). Boulder: Westview Press.

Stephan, W. G., Martin, T., & Esses, V. M. (2000). The effects of realistic and symbolic threats on attitudes towards immigrants. Unpublished Manuscript, New Mexico State University.

Stephan, W. G. & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. Journal of Social Issues, 41, 157-176.

Stephan, W. G. & Ybarra, O. (1999). Prejudice towards immigrants. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 29, 2221-2237.

Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., Martinez, C. M., Schwarzwald, J., & Tur-Kaspa, M. (1998). Prejudice towards immigrants to Spain and Israel: an integrated threat theory analysis. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29, 559-576.

Strack, F. (1992). The different routes to social judgments: Experiential versus informational strategies. L. L. Martin & A. Tesser (Eds.), The construction of social judgments (pp. 249-275). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Strack, F., Schwarz, N., & Gschneidiger, E. (1985). Happiness and reminiscing: The role of time perspective, mood, and mode of thinking. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 1460-1469.

Turner, J.C. (1987). Rediscovering the Social Group: A self-categorization theory. Oxford & New York: Blackwell.

von Hippel, W., Sekaquaptewa, D., & Vargas, P. (1997). The linguistic intergroup bias as an implicit indicator of prejudice. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 33, 490-509.

Wegener, D. T., & Petty, R. E. (1995). Flexible correction processes in social judgment: The role of naive theories in corrections for perceived bias. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 36-51.

Author Note

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Arnd Florack, Psychologisches Institut IV, Universität Münster, Fliednerstr. 21, 48149 Münster, Germany. Electronic mail may be sent to florack@psy.uni-muenster.de.

Experiment 2 was funded by a grant from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft to the first author (FL 365 1-1).

Table 1:

Means of Acceptance of Cultural Diversity, Self-reported Attitudes, and Implicitly-measured Associations for the Interaction between Salience and Perceived Homogeneity

Dependent measure	Salience	
	Negative aspect (subgroup)	Control
	Low homogeneity	
Acceptance	6.69_a	6.14_a
Self-reported attitude	4.17_a	4.32_a
Implicitly-measured associations	-150.03_a	-167.22_a
	High homogeneity	
Acceptance	4.84_a	6.51_b
Self-reported attitude	3.18_a	4.59_b
Implicitly-measured associations	-326.28_a	-117.87_b

Note. Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $p < .05$. High scores indicate high acceptance, positive self-reported attitudes, and positive associations.