



In Matters of Opinion, What Matters Is the Group: Minority Group Members' Emotional Reactions to Messages About Identity Expression

Sjoerd F. Pennekamp, Bertjan Doosje, Sven Zebel, Alejandra Alarcon
Henriquez

► To cite this version:

Sjoerd F. Pennekamp, Bertjan Doosje, Sven Zebel, Alejandra Alarcon Henriquez. In Matters of Opinion, What Matters Is the Group: Minority Group Members' Emotional Reactions to Messages About Identity Expression. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 2009, 45 (4), pp.778. 10.1016/j.jesp.2009.04.025 . hal-00694613

HAL Id: hal-00694613

<https://hal.science/hal-00694613>

Submitted on 5 May 2012

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Accepted Manuscript

In Matters of Opinion, What Matters Is the Group: Minority Group Members' Emotional Reactions to Messages About Identity Expression

Sjoerd F. Pennekamp, Bertjan Doosje, Sven Zebel, Alejandra Alarcon Henriquez

PII: S0022-1031(09)00107-3
DOI: [10.1016/j.jesp.2009.04.025](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.04.025)
Reference: YJESP 2264

To appear in: *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*

Received Date: 24 January 2008
Revised Date: 30 November 2008
Accepted Date: 27 April 2009

Please cite this article as: Pennekamp, S.F., Doosje, B., Zebel, S., Henriquez, A.A., In Matters of Opinion, What Matters Is the Group: Minority Group Members' Emotional Reactions to Messages About Identity Expression, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* (2009), doi: [10.1016/j.jesp.2009.04.025](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.04.025)

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



RUNNING HEAD: MINORITIES AND IDENTITY EXPRESSION

In Matters of Opinion, What Matters Is the Group: Minority Group Members'

Emotional Reactions to Messages About Identity Expression

Sjoerd F. Pennekamp, Bertjan Doosje, Sven Zebel

University of Amsterdam.

Alejandra Alarcon Henriquez

Free University of Brussels

Corresponding address:

Sjoerd F. Pennekamp

Social Psychology

University of Amsterdam

Roetersstraat 15

1018 WB Amsterdam

The Netherlands

Telephone: +31 20 525 6895

E-mail: sjoerdpennekamp@hotmail.com

Abstract

Two studies investigated the reactions of minority group members to messages about identity expression by ingroup and outgroup sources. Our main hypothesis was that compared to ingroup sources, outgroup sources arouse more anger when they argue for identity suppression. In the first study homosexuals evaluated an outgroup source arguing for identity suppression more negatively than an ingroup source, felt more threatened by this source and as a result, experienced stronger feelings of anger towards this source. The second study among members of a language-based minority replicated and extended these findings. Furthermore we showed that the anger that is experienced towards an outgroup source causes a willingness to change the opinion of this source. When ingroup or outgroup sources supported identity expression, evaluations and experience of anger did not differ in both studies. The importance of a source's group membership in reacting to opinions about one's group is discussed.

Keywords: intergroup relations, emotions, minorities, identity expression, communication.

In Matters of Opinion, What Matters Is the Group: Minority Group Members'
Emotional Reactions to Messages About Identity Expression.

Group memberships are an important part of everyday life. Given the omnipresence of group memberships, we are often confronted with people who have an opinion about our group. How these opinions are perceived not only depends on the qualities of the opinion itself, but largely on the group membership of the source as well. A striking example of this was when Gerrit Komrij and Gordon met on a Dutch late night show (Beerekamp, 2006). Gerrit Komrij, an elderly Dutch poet, gave his opinion about homosexuals on Dutch television. In particular, he expressed his amazement with the fact that nowadays homosexuals expressed their sexuality on television with such ease. Gordon, a popular Dutch folk singer and openly homosexual, reacted angry at his comment. The talk show host wisely interrupted the program for a commercial break. After the break, the singer and the poet had reconciled miraculously. During the interruption Gordon had been informed that Gerrit Komrij himself was homosexual which made the comment that had just seemed offensive now seem harmless.

The fact that minority members get angry at sources arguing for identity suppression is quite understandable. Throughout history there are numerous examples of (members of) majorities who tried to withhold minorities from expressing their identity, ranging from restricting the right to practice religion or using other languages than the dominant language, and even restricting the right to wear regional or national dresses. The example above however, also clearly shows the power of group membership in influencing the reactions to messages about identity expression. The present research investigates how the group membership of a source and the opinion that is expressed influence the emotions members of minority groups experience. In

particular we aim to show that opinions arguing for the suppression of minority identities are perceived as threatening and give rise to anger, especially if these opinions are expressed by outgroup members. This anger in turn is expected to influence the extent to which minority group members are willing to act on behalf of their group.

Minorities and identity expression

Opinions of majorities and minorities have received a great deal of attention in the study of social influence (for a review see Martin & Hewstone, 2003). This work investigates how minorities come to conform to the majority (e.g., Asch, 1951) or how active minorities can eventually influence majority members (e.g., Moscovici, 1976). In this research minorities and majorities are usually part of the same group, which may be essential for the influence they exert (Crano & Alvaro, 1998). When minority or majority sources belong to different groups, influence in the form of attitude change is less likely to occur (David & Turner, 1996). Rather, in these studies group members react more defensively to opinions from outgroup sources. It thus is likely that negative emotions are easily elicited when opinions are expressed in an intergroup context. However, how opinions about the minority group in general, and about identity expression in particular, affect the emotions of minority group members has not been addressed yet.

Identity expression can take many different forms. According to Ashmore, Deaux, and McLaughlin-Volpe (2004; see also Phinney, 1990) a distinction can be made between behaviors that directly indicate one's group membership and behaviors which are the outcome of one's identification with a particular group. The former constitute behaviors that do automatically imply a group categorization such as wearing the shirt of a soccer club, speaking a language, or participating in cultural

practices. They can also be found in more ordinary behavior, such as expressing affection to one's partner, by which people express their sexual orientation. The latter are not automatically related to identification but are linked with this concept through other psychological processes. Collective action for instance can be seen as expression of an identity but is not necessary the direct result of identification (Pennekamp, Doosje, Zebel, & Fischer, 2007). It is the first form of identity expression we are interested in this paper.

To members of the majority, identity expression is usually considered "normal". They do not have to expect negative reactions when they express their identity. To members of the minority expressing their identity is less self-evident, in particular when majority members devalue their identity. In these cases they may be faced with discrimination and negative expectations of majority members (Barreto, Ellemers, & Banal, 2006). Minorities may choose to adapt to the majority. However, research on acculturation suggests that fully assimilating to a majority can have negative consequences as well. Members of ethnic minorities usually have better mental health when they integrate their ethnic identity with the new majority identity (Berry, 1997; Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind, & Vedder, 2001). Being able to express one's identity as a minority group member thus seems to have positive consequences for one's well-being. Messages about the extent to which minorities are allowed to express their identity thus concern their well-being and are therefore likely to affect them emotionally. Before we go in to the emotional consequences of these specific messages, we first need to understand how people respond to intergroup communications.

Group membership and the inference of motives

Instead of focusing solely on the message a source communicates, people are influenced by characteristics of the source itself as well. Specifically, people actively engage in a process of making attributions about the true motives of a source (Eagly, Wood, & Chaiken, 1978). An important characteristic that informs us on the motives of a source is the source's group membership. A general belief seems to exist that outgroup and ingroup members are differentially biased towards our ingroup (Judd, Park, Yzerbyt, Gordijn, & Muller, 2005). This leads people to expect and anticipate discrimination from outgroup members (Vivian & Berkowitz, 1993), but also to the expectation that ingroup members are positively biased to the ingroup (Duck & Fielding, 2003). In responding to communications about their ingroup, people will thus expect positive motives from ingroup sources, whereas they are likely to distrust outgroup members' motives.

How attributions about the true motives of a source affect the perception and evaluation of this source has received a great deal of attention in the domain of group criticism and the intergroup sensitivity effect (ISE; Elder, Sutton, & Douglas, 2005; Hornsey & Imani, 2004; Hornsey, Oppes, & Svensson, 2002; for an overview see Hornsey, 2005). In the basic paradigm used to demonstrate this effect, participants are exposed to an excerpt of an interview supposedly held with either an ingroup or outgroup member in which positive or negative comments are made about the ingroup (Hornsey et al., 2002). When this source makes positive comments, ingroup and outgroup sources are not evaluated differently. However, when the ingroup is criticized the outgroup source is reacted to more sensitively, is less agreed with, and is evaluated more negatively. These differences are due to the fact that ingroup members are perceived to have more constructive motives for expressing criticism than outgroup members. Furthermore, because ingroup critics are not seen as non-

normative (Sutton, Elder, & Douglas, 2006), they are not regarded as black sheep (Abrams, Marques, Bown, & Henson, 2000).

The fact that criticism from fellow group members can be constructive is now well understood. But what happens if a negative message does not intend to inspire positive change and in fact could impair the position of the ingroup in society? Are the positive reactions to ingroup members after receiving a negative message about one's group unique to constructive group criticism, or do they represent a more general pattern in which we attribute more positive motives to ingroup members even when the message is destructive by nature? And how will these messages influence the emotions that are experienced?

The emotional consequences of messages about identity expression

An interesting question that is left unanswered by the work on the ISE, is how messages about one's ingroup affect the emotions group members experience. Whether threatening and ambiguous messages, such as group criticism, have affective consequences is hypothesized, but has rarely been empirically tested (Hornsey, 2005; however see O'Dwyer, Berkowitz, & Alfeld-Johnson, 2002). Recent theories of intergroup emotions (IET; Mackie & Smith, 2002; Smith, 1993) however, have made clear the significance of distinct emotions in intergroup relations in explaining divergent reactions to outgroups. Indeed, research has shown that when people categorize as group members, their appraisals of the social environment are group-based, for ongoing issues as well as for past events (Doosje, Branscombe, Spears, & Manstead, 1998; Dumont, Yzerbyt, Wigboldus, & Gordijn, 2003; Pennekamp et al., 2007; Zebel et al., 2007).

In responding to messages about one's group, the inferences that are made about the motives of a source are likely to inform the appraisals about the

consequences of this message for the ingroup. Let us first consider the identity suppression message. When outgroup sources want the minority group to suppress their identity, we argue that the motives of this source for expressing this opinion will be doubted. Arguing for identity suppression by the minority in essence means that the ingroup is denied certain freedoms. These sources will be seen as unfair and as obstructing or limiting the freedom of the group, anger is likely to result from this threat (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005; Kuppens, Van Mechelen, Smits, & De Boeck, 2003). To date, anger is known as a response to social discrimination (e.g., McCoy & Major, 2003; Mendes, Major, McCoy, & Blascovich, 2008; Sassenberg & Hansen, 2007), but it is relatively unknown as a response to messages about identity expression

If an ingroup source argues that minority group members should suppress their identity, this opinion might also be aversive at first glance. Arguing that the ingroup should suppress their identity is unlikely to help the group to improve their position in society. However, given the negative consequences that are attached to expressing an identity that is devalued by a majority (Barreto et al., 2006), the ingroup source may have become reluctant to express the group identity. The motives an ingroup source has for arguing against expression of the minority identity could thus be very understandable. In this case the message to suppress the identity will not be appraised as threatening to the group and will not result in the experience of anger.

When a source has a positive message and argues that the ingroup should be free to express their identity we expect little differences in the reactions to ingroup and outgroup sources. Research on the ISE shows that reactions to ingroup and outgroup sources do not differ when positive comments are made (Hornsey, 2005; however see, Mae & Carlston, 2005). In this case ingroup members make the

inference that both ingroup and outgroup sources have positive motives towards the ingroup. Because these messages are appraised positively they will not cause anger.

If a source arguing against identity suppression gives rise to anger this will subsequently influence the action tendencies minority group members experience (Frijda, 1986). Earlier research on intergroup emotions has shown that anger causes a willingness of people to engage in protest and collective action (Pennekamp et al., 2007; Van Zomeren, Spears, Leach, & Fischer, 2005). In the current research, these action tendencies will be aimed at removing the obstacles to freely express one's identity.

Because minorities might be less powerful than majorities (Lücken & Simon, 2005), fear may also seem a likely emotion in response to this outgroup threat (Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000). However, in the situations studied here fear will be less likely, as fear usually results from a lack of coping responses with a threat (Lazarus, 1991), or from the threat of direct physical harm (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005). Because our participants are not immediately confronted with the source of threat, their action tendencies are more likely to be offensive than defensive by nature. Moreover, earlier research using a similar manipulation to instigate threat (e.g., a newspaper article) which participants individually responded to, has shown that fear is less relevant in these settings (Mackie et al., 2000). In this research we therefore focus on the experience of anger.

We investigate the emotional reactions of minority group members to messages about identity expression among homosexuals (Study 1) and members of a language-based minority (Study 2). In both studies participants are confronted with either an ingroup or an outgroup source, who argues for either expression or suppression of the minority group identity. In both studies we predict that an outgroup

source, compared to an ingroup source will be agreed with less, and is evaluated more negatively when arguing for identity suppression. Furthermore an outgroup source will be seen as more threatening to the group than an ingroup source when arguing for identity suppression and, as a result of this threat, will cause more anger. This anger in turn should cause a willingness to change the opinion of the source (Study 2). If a source supports identity expression by the minority, we do not expect any differences in the appraisals, emotions, and action tendencies between ingroup and outgroup sources.

Study 1

In the first study, we test our predictions among homosexuals in the Netherlands. To provide some background information, according to recent research in the Netherlands (summarized in Keuzenkamp, Bos, Duyvendak & Hekma, 2006), the general attitude towards homosexuals in the Netherlands is quite positive. As an example, only five percent of the population does not agree with the statement that homosexuals should be free to live the life they choose. However, a sizable proportion of the population still feels uncomfortable with homosexuals expressing affection for their partners in public. For instance, respectively 42% and 31% of the population is offended by male and female homosexuals expressing affection in public. By comparison, only 8% of the population is offended by heterosexuals doing so.

Method

Participants and design

The participants in this study were 153 homosexuals (48 males, 92 females gender was not recorded for 13 participants, mean age $M = 30.98$, $SD = 10.07$). The participants were recruited through the social networks of students who participated in a research practicum. Participants received an email containing a link to one of the

conditions in our experiment, which was hosted on a Dutch research website. The assignment of conditions was random. The design was a 2 (group membership of source: ingroup or outgroup) x 2 (opinion of source: express or suppress identity).

Procedure and Materials

Our experiment consisted of the manipulations and a questionnaire containing the dependent variables. All questions were answered on 7-point Likert type scales (1 = *not at all* to 7 = *very much*).

Cover story. Participants were told we were interested in their opinion about expressing their identity as a homosexual, and in particular on the expression of affection between homosexuals. Furthermore, we told participants this was done by investigating the generalizability of opinions about the expression of affection between homosexuals that had been posted on Internet forums.

Manipulations. We manipulated the group membership of the source by introducing the source as either an ingroup (homosexual) or outgroup (heterosexual) member. In both cases the source was said to be a male named Hans (a common Dutch name) aged 30. As an operationalization of identity expression, participants then read the opinion of the source on the public expression of affection by homosexual couples (gender was not mentioned). In the suppress condition the source stated that homosexuals should take into account other people's opinion on homosexuals expressing affection in public, that they should be careful which reactions they evoke and that they could better express affection behind closed doors. In the express condition the source said homosexuals should not take into account other people's opinions, that they are not responsible for the reactions they evoke, and that they should be able to express affection in public.

Dependent variables. As manipulation checks participants first indicated whether the source was an ingroup or outgroup member, and whether the source had said that homosexuals should or should not express affection in public. Next, participants indicated their agreement with the opinion on a single item. Source evaluation was subsequently assessed using a scale we adapted from Hornsey and Imani (2004). We asked participants: “When you think about Hans who participated in the study, to what extent do you think he is...”. After which seven personality traits followed: Friendly, nice, honest, sympathetic, respectable, intelligent, and interesting ($\alpha = .89$). As a measure of group threat participants next judged how threatening the source’s opinion was to the group. This scale consisted of three items (e.g., “To what extent do you think people with an opinion like Hans are threatening to homosexuals?”; $\alpha = .97$). Finally, participants rated to what extent they felt angry¹ at the source. We asked: “To what extent do you experience the following emotions as a result of this opinion...”. After which four anger-related emotions followed: Anger, irritation, frustration, and moral outrage ($\alpha = .92$).

Results

Manipulation checks. Eight participants failed to indicate the correct opinion, and 23 participants failed to give the correct group membership of the source. Because of partial overlap, in total 24 participants were removed from the analyses. The analyses below are done with the remaining 129 participants. All ANOVAs were done using a 2 (group membership: ingroup or outgroup) x 2 (opinion: express or suppress identity) between-subjects design.² Variables inter-correlated with absolute r -values between .44 and .71 and p -values less than $p = .001$. The highest correlation was found between agreement and group threat. Importantly, in the analyses below, these variables are never entered in the same analyses.

Agreement. A main effect of opinion emerged on agreement, $F(1, 125) = 147.00$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .45$. Participants agreed more with a source supporting ($M = 5.74$, $SD = 1.37$) than opposing identity expression ($M = 2.57$, $SD = 1.73$). This main effect was qualified by the expected interaction between group membership and opinion, $F(1, 125) = 9.32$, $p = .003$, $\eta^2 = .03$. All relevant means are shown in Table 1. Inspection of the simple main effects showed that both ingroup and outgroup sources were more agreed with when they wanted the ingroup to express rather than suppress their identity, respectively $F(1, 125) = 45.07$, $p < .001$ and $F(1, 125) = 105.95$, $p < .001$. In line with the prediction in the suppress conditions, an ingroup source was agreed with more than an outgroup source, $F(1, 125) = 6.32$, $p = .013$. No other differences emerged.

Source evaluation. A main effect of opinion emerged on source evaluation, $F(1, 125) = 35.59$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .21$. The source was evaluated more positively in the express conditions ($M = 4.68$, $SD = 1.09$) than in the suppress conditions ($M = 3.59$, $SD = 1.21$). This main effect was again qualified by the expected interaction between opinion and group membership, $F(1, 125) = 13.99$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .08$. Simple main effects showed that the outgroup source was evaluated more positively in the express than in the suppress condition, $F(1, 125) = 43.35$, $p < .001$. For the ingroup sources this difference was not significant. In line with our hypothesis, the outgroup source was evaluated more negatively than the ingroup source in the suppress conditions, $F(1, 125) = 7.29$, $p = .008$, and unexpectedly more positively in the express conditions, $F(1, 125) = 6.71$, $p = .011$.

Group threat. A main effect of opinion resulted on group threat $F(1, 125) = 66.81$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .35$. The source was experienced as more threatening to the group in the suppress conditions ($M = 4.36$, $SD = 1.97$) than in the express conditions

($M = 1.97$, $SD = 1.39$). The predicted interaction between opinion and group membership was also significant, $F(1, 125) = 4.03$, $p = .047$, $\eta^2 = .02$. Simple main effects showed that the source arguing for identity suppression was perceived as more threatening to the group than the source arguing for identity expression for both the ingroup source, $F(1, 125) = 20.65$, $p < .001$, and the outgroup source, $F(1, 125) = 48.01$, $p < .001$. No other differences were significant, although the means were in the expected directions.

Anger. A main effect of opinion emerged on anger, $F(1, 125) = 30.51$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .19$. A source elicited less anger in participants in the express conditions ($M = 2.68$, $SD = 1.69$), than in the suppress conditions ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 1.60$). This main effect was qualified by the expected interaction between opinion and group membership, $F(1, 125) = 7.72$, $p = .006$, $\eta^2 = .05$. Simple main effects showed that more anger was experienced when the source argued for identity suppression instead of expression for both ingroup sources, $F(1, 125) = 4.13$, $p = .044$, and outgroup sources, $F(1, 125) = 31.72$, $p < .001$. In the suppress conditions the difference between ingroup and outgroup sources was in the expected direction, but not significant. Unexpectedly, in the express condition an ingroup source elicited more anger than an outgroup source, $F(1, 125) = 6.75$, $p = .011$.

Mediated moderation analysis. Following the steps outlined by Muller, Judd and Yzerbyt (2005), we investigated whether the moderation of the effect of opinion by group membership on anger was mediated by group threat. The ANOVA's above have already shown that the effect of opinion is moderated by group membership for both group threat and anger (the regression coefficients for all analyses are presented in Table 2). To show mediated moderation in our next step we conducted a regression analysis in which we included the main effects of opinion (coded -1 = express

identity, 1 = suppress identity) and group membership (coded -1 = outgroup source, 1 = ingroup source), their interaction, group threat, and the interaction between group threat and group membership as predictors. In this analysis group threat was the only significant predictor of anger. This indicates full mediated moderation.

Subsequently, we investigated whether including group threat as a mediator reduced the effect of the interaction between opinion and group membership on anger. Results show this was indeed the case, Sobel's $z = 1.89$, $p = .058$, although this effect was marginally significant. Finally, to test whether the indirect effects of opinion on anger through group threat was significant for each level of the moderator we calculated two separate Sobel tests. Results of these tests show that the indirect effect was significant for the outgroup, Sobel's $z = 3.67$, $p < .001$, but also for the ingroup Sobel's $z = 2.86$, $p < .001$. The beta-weights of the effects of opinion on group threat and anger, and the effect of group threat on anger, for each level of the moderator, are displayed in Figure 1.

Discussion

Study 1 provides clear evidence that opinions about identity expression among minority groups have the ability to elicit emotions in its members. With respect to opinions about identity expression, this means that minority group members judge opinions that argue for identity suppression by both ingroup and outgroup sources as more threatening to the ingroup. As shown by the mediated moderation analysis, it is the threat to the group that causes anger. The interaction between opinion and group membership on group threat indicates however, that judgments of the outgroup source are more extreme. That is, the effect of opinion on group threat is conditional, and is moderated by group membership, indicating that the opinion of the outgroup source influenced the experience of threat most strongly. The mediated moderation analysis

demonstrated that as a result of this threat, the opinion of the outgroup source has the strongest influence on anger³.

Our results reveal that the ISE may be more general than has been assumed so far, and is not necessarily unique to constructive group criticism. Our findings resemble earlier work (e.g., Hornsey et al., 2002), but show that even when a negative message can have negative consequences for the ingroup, ingroup sources receive the benefit of the doubt. The ingroup source who argues for suppression of the identity, is still evaluated more positively than the outgroup source doing so. Moreover, this source is also agreed with more. These ingroup sources do however, give rise to threat and anger. This shows that the freedom to express affection for each other is considered very important by homosexuals, and that they do not want fellow ingroup members to argue against this freedom.

As far as we know this is the first study that shows that group members' experience of anger after receiving a negative message about the ingroup is not only affected by the opinion of a source but also by its group membership. Although this study provides initial insights in these emotional consequences, not all of our hypotheses were confirmed. We expected that members of minority groups would have stronger negative reactions to outgroup sources than ingroup sources when they argue for identity suppression. This was the case with respect to the evaluation of the outgroup source, who was evaluated more negatively than an ingroup source in the suppression condition. However, on both source evaluation and anger, the outgroup source is also reacted to more positively, if identity expression is supported. These findings might be explained by the fact that outgroup members arguing for expression are perceived to act less out of self-interest, and are expressing support across group boundaries. Given that minority group members are often aware that their group has

less power in society (Lücken & Simon, 2005), such support and weak self-interest among the majority might be welcomed. Indeed, to fulfill their political goals, minorities are often dependent on the support of the majority. In the general discussion, we further elaborate on this.

Although majority outgroups are also reacted to more positively when supporting identity expression, their arguments for identity suppression can have particularly detrimental consequences for minority group members' well-being. Therefore in the second study we try to further uncover the dynamics of emotional reactions to opinions on identity suppression, and investigate whether minority group members are willing to challenge such opinions by outgroup sources. In order to increase the external validity, we focus on a different minority group. We aim to replicate the current findings and extend them, by investigating whether the anger that is experienced by minority group members indeed leads to the experience of action tendencies.

Study 2

In the second study we test our predictions among Flemish (i.e. Dutch speaking) people in Brussels. Brussels is the capital of Belgium, which consists of a Dutch speaking Flemish population and a French speaking Walloon population (and a German speaking minority). According to recent research, in Brussels a majority speaks French at home 51.5%, and a minority speaks either Dutch 9.3%, or both Dutch and French 10.3% at home (19.8% speaks a different language at home and 9.1% speaks French and some other language at home; Janssens, 2001). However Brussels is bilingual by law, meaning that in all public institutions people should be assisted in both Dutch and French. Although this works quite well in general,

problems still occur, in particular when civil servants (or medical doctors, etc.) do not speak Dutch, or not sufficiently so to offer help (Janssens, 2001).

Method

Participants and design

Ninety-eight Flemish students participated (39 males and 59 females, mean age $M = 20.69$, $SD = 3.32$). Most were students at the Free University of Brussels (94.4%). Participants were recruited in a student cafeteria and participated voluntarily. Participants were asked by the experimenter to participate in a study investigating opinions concerning the use of different languages in Brussels. The assignment to conditions was random. The design was a 2 (group membership of source: ingroup or outgroup) \times 2 (opinion of source: express or suppress identity), similar to Study 1.

Procedure and materials

If participants agreed to participate, they received a booklet containing the manipulation and all dependent variables. All questions were answered on 5-point Likert type scales (1 = *not at all* to 5 = *very much*), unless mentioned otherwise.

Cover story. Our study was presented as a collaboration between the University of Amsterdam and the Free University of Brussels. The research was said to investigate opinions concerning the use of multiple languages in Brussels. Furthermore we told participants that gaining insight in the different positions that exist on this matter could benefit the relations between both language groups.

Manipulations. Group membership was manipulated by presenting the source as a member of the ingroup (Flemish; Jan a common Flemish name) or as a member of the majority outgroup (Walloon; Jean a common Walloon name). In all cases the source was a student at the Free University of Brussels, although the ingroup source was a student at the Dutch-speaking branch of the university, whereas the outgroup

source studied at the French-speaking branch. Identity expression was operationalized by manipulating the source's opinion on the use of Dutch in Brussels, which had supposedly been printed in a student newspaper. In the express conditions the source stated that Brussels was bilingual by law and that the Dutch-speaking population had a right to be treated in their own language by authorities. Furthermore the source said that the French-speaking people should adapt to the Dutch, since most members of the Dutch-speaking community have also adapted to the French. In the suppress conditions the source said that the Dutch-speaking population had no right to be treated in their own language. The source stated also that the law on bilingualism was unrealistic because the French form a majority and because most of the Dutch-speaking community speaks French, there is no need for the French-speaking community to adapt to the Dutch.

Dependent variables. To check the manipulation of group membership participants indicated whether the source was a member of the ingroup or the outgroup. To check the opinion manipulation participants indicated to what extent the source was in favor of the French-speaking to adapt to the Dutch on a 5-point Likert type scale (1 = *against* to 5 = *in favor*).

After the manipulations the participants were first asked to what extent they agreed with the opinion using the same item as in Study 1. Source evaluation ($\alpha = .90$), group threat ($\alpha = .93$) and anger ($\alpha = .93$) were also measured using the same scales as in Study 1. Different from Study 1 was that we now included a scale to measure the action tendencies of the participants. These were conceptualized as the willingness of the participants to change the opinion of the source and contained three items ($\alpha = .83$). An example of a statement we used is: "If I would encounter a student like this, I would try to change his opinion".

After finishing the experiment, the participants returned the booklet to the experimenter and were informed on the true goal of the experiment.

Results

Manipulation checks. In total eight participants mistook the group membership of the source. These participants were removed from the dataset, leaving 90 participants. To check the manipulation of opinion, we conducted an ANOVA with the item measuring the extent to which the source was in favor of bilingualism as the dependent variable. All ANOVA's were done using a 2 (group of source: ingroup or outgroup) x 2 (opinion: express or suppress identity) between-subjects design. This ANOVA resulted in a main effect of opinion $F(1,86) = 210.34, p < .001$. Participants in the express conditions ($M = 4.36, SD = .86$) perceived the source as being more in favor of identity expression than participants in the suppress conditions ($M = 1.60, SD = .92$). No other effects emerged. These results show that our manipulations were successful. Variables inter-correlated with absolute r-values between .32 and .71 and p-values less than $p = .003$. The highest correlation was found between agreement and change opinion. Importantly, in the analyses below, these variables are never entered in the same analyses.

Agreement. A main effect of opinion emerged for agreement, $F(1, 86) = 117.03, p < .001, \eta^2 = .53$. Participants agreed more with a source in the express conditions ($M = 4.22, SD = .90$) than in the suppress conditions ($M = 1.93, SD = 1.16$). This main effect was qualified by the predicted interaction between group membership and opinion, $F(1, 86) = 9.35, p = .003, \eta^2 = .04$. All relevant means are shown in Table 3. Inspection of the simple main effects showed that sources were agreed with more in the express condition than in the suppress condition for both ingroup sources, $F(1, 86) = 30.82, p < .001$, and outgroup sources, $F(1, 86) = 90.10, p$

$< .001$. As expected, in the suppress conditions, an ingroup source was more agreed with than an outgroup source, $F(1, 86) = 117.03, p < .001$. In the express conditions there was no difference in agreement.

Source evaluation. A main effect of opinion emerged on source evaluation, $F(1, 86) = 12.18, p < .001, \eta^2 = .19$. A source was evaluated more positively in the express conditions ($M = 3.37, SD = .76$) than in the suppress conditions ($M = 2.60, SD = .74$). The predicted interaction between opinion and group membership was also significant, $F(1, 86) = 16.14, p < .001, \eta^2 = .12$. Inspection of the simple main effects showed that an outgroup source was evaluated more negatively in the suppress condition than in the express condition, $F(1, 86) = 40.45, p < .001$. No difference emerged for the ingroup sources. As expected, in the suppress conditions, an ingroup source was evaluated more positively than an outgroup source, $F(1, 86) = 16.22, p < .001$. The difference between ingroup and outgroup sources was not significant in the express conditions.

Group threat. The main effect of opinion was significant for group threat, $F(1, 86) = 40.57, p < .001, \eta^2 = .30$. The source in the suppress conditions ($M = 2.76, SD = 1.15$) was seen as more threatening to the group than the source in the express conditions ($M = 1.47, SD = .72$). This main effect was qualified though, by the significant interaction between opinion and group membership, $F(1, 86) = 4.42, p = .038, \eta^2 = .03$. Simple main effects showed that a source arguing for suppression instead of expression of the identity was perceived as more threatening for both ingroup sources, $F(1, 86) = 9.32, p = .003$, and outgroup sources, $F(1, 86) = 35.08, p < .001$. In the suppress conditions, an outgroup source was seen as more threatening to the group than an ingroup source, $F(1, 86) = 5.43, p = .022$. No such difference emerged in the express conditions.

Anger. For anger a main effect of opinion emerged, $F(1, 86) = 10.91, p = .001, \eta^2 = .10$. A source wanting the ingroup to suppress their identity ($M = 3.03, SD = 1.17$) elicited more anger than a source wanting the group to express their identity ($M = 2.26, SD = 1.13$). As predicted, this main effect was qualified by the significant interaction between opinion and group membership, $F(1, 86) = 13.76, p < .001, \eta^2 = .12$. Inspection of the simple main effects revealed that an outgroup source elicited more anger in the suppress condition than in the express condition, $F(1, 86) = 23.67, p < .001$. There was no difference for ingroup sources. In the suppress conditions, the outgroup source elicited more anger than the ingroup source, $F(1, 86) = 12.89, p = .001$. There was no difference in the express conditions.

Action tendencies. For the action tendencies both main effects were significant. Participants were more willing to change the opinion of an outgroup source ($M = 3.06, SD = 1.35$) than the opinion of an ingroup source ($M = 2.28, SD = .93$), $F(1, 86) = 10.16, p = .002, \eta^2 = .06$. Participants were also more willing to change the opinion of the source in the suppress conditions ($M = 3.31, SD = 1.18$) than in the express conditions ($M = 2.01, SD = .84$), $F(1, 86) = 40.80, p < .001, \eta^2 = .26$. Both main effects were qualified however by the expected interaction between opinion and group membership, $F(1, 86) = 15.06, p < .001, \eta^2 = .10$. Simple main effects revealed that participants were more willing to change the opinion of an outgroup source in the suppress condition than in the express condition, $F(1, 86) = 51.53, p < .001$. No difference occurred for ingroup sources. Participants were also more willing to change the opinion of an outgroup source than an ingroup source in the suppress conditions, $F(1, 86) = 25.13, p < .001$. The difference between the ingroup and outgroup source was not significant in the express conditions.

Mediated moderation analyses. To gain more insight in the processes involved in the reactions to opinions about minority identity expression, we conducted two mediated moderation analyses. The regression coefficients for all analyses are presented in Table 4. Similar to the analysis reported in Study 1 we investigated whether the moderation by group membership of the effect of opinion on anger was mediated by group threat. The results above have shown that the effect of opinion is moderated by group membership for both group threat and anger. Subsequently we conducted a regression analysis in which we included the main effects of opinion and group membership, their interaction, group threat and the interaction between group threat and group membership as predictors of anger. The results show that group threat is a significant predictor of anger. However, the interaction between opinion and group membership on anger also remained significant. Nonetheless, a Sobel test showed that including group threat significantly reduced the variance that was explained by the interaction between opinion and group membership, Sobel's $z = -2.11$, $p = .035$. This indicates partial mediated moderation. Investigating the indirect effects of opinion on anger on both levels of the moderator, Sobel tests show that only for the outgroup this indirect effect is significant, Sobel's $z = 2.14$, $p = .032$, ingroup $p > .19$. The beta-weights of the effects of opinion on group threat and anger, and the effect of group threat on anger, for each level of the moderator, are displayed in Figure 2.

Next, we conducted a mediated moderation analysis to investigate whether the moderation by group membership of the effect of opinion on the willingness to change the opinion of the source was mediated by anger. As shown above for both anger and the willingness to change the opinion the effect of opinion is moderated by group membership. In a subsequent regression analysis we included both main effects

of opinion and group membership, their interaction, anger and the interaction between anger and group membership as predictors of willingness to change opinion. In this analysis opinion, group membership, the opinion by group membership interaction, and anger, were significant predictors of willingness to change opinion. However, important to show partial mediated moderation, a Sobel test showed that the reduction in variance explained by the opinion by group membership interaction due to the inclusion of anger as a predictor, was marginally significant, Sobel's $z = -1.87$, $p = .062$. Furthermore, testing of the indirect effect of opinion on willingness to change the opinion through anger on both levels of the moderator, showed that this indirect effect was marginally significant for outgroup sources, Sobel's $z = 1.90$, $p = .057$, whereas it was not for ingroup sources, Sobel's $z < 1$. The beta-weights of the effects of opinion on anger and willingness to change opinion, and the effect of anger on willingness to change the opinion, for each level of the moderator, are displayed in Figure 3.

Discussion

Study 2 again demonstrates that both the opinion and the group membership of a source have consequences for the evaluation of this source and the emotions that are experienced towards this source. As in Study 1, outgroup sources arguing for identity suppression were agreed with less and were evaluated less positively than ingroup sources with the same message. Messages about identity expression were appraised in terms of the threat they can pose to the ingroup. When arguing for identity suppression, outgroup sources more than ingroup sources were perceived as threatening to the ingroup. This accordingly influenced the extent to which minority group members experience anger towards the source. The outgroup source arguing for identity suppression aroused more anger than an ingroup source with the same

message. A mediated moderation analysis shows that it is indeed group threat that causes this anger, but that this is only the case for outgroup sources. In addition Study 2 shows that this anger has consequences for the action tendencies people experience. Members of minority groups are most willing to change the opinion of the outgroup source arguing for identity suppression. A marginally significant mediated moderation analyses shows that only for outgroup sources anger partially causes this willingness to change the opinion.

General Discussion

In two studies we have argued that messages about identity expression can give rise to emotions in members of minority groups, and that these emotions are not only influenced by the kind of message that is expressed but also by the group membership of the source. We find clear evidence that minority group members appraise messages about their group in terms of the consequences this message has for their group (Mackie et al., 2000). Sources who argue for the suppression of the minority's identity are appraised as threatening to the group, especially when this source is an outgroup member. In reaction to this threat minority group members experience anger towards these sources. As shown in Study 2, this anger subsequently causes a willingness to change the source's opinion. This pattern is most clear for outgroup sources. Although ingroup members arguing for identity suppression are also perceived as threatening to the group, this does not necessarily translate to the experience of anger. Furthermore, as shown in Study 2, minority group members do not experience a willingness to change the opinion of ingroup sources.

Besides arousing more anger, outgroup sources are also consistently evaluated less positively and are agreed with less when they argue for identity suppression than ingroup sources doing so. This confirms that ingroup members receive the benefit of

the doubt, even when they express a message that can have negative consequences for the ingroup. Earlier research shows that the fact that outgroup sources with negative and ambiguous messages are evaluated worse is driven by destructive motives that are attributed to this source (Hornsey, 2005). It is likely that it were these negative motives that caused the experience of threat and subsequently anger in our studies. The fact that we studied the emotions group members experience as a result of intergroup communication is an important contribution of this paper. Taking into account these emotions allows one to go beyond a simple valence distinction of positive or negative evaluations. Importantly, specific emotions will provide insight into the kind of action tendencies that will be experienced. In the current research we have focused on anger and offensive actions. It is not unlikely however, that in other instances of intergroup communication, other emotions, such as fear or sadness may play a role.

Contrary to work within the intergroup sensitivity framework, the negative messages that were expressed in our studies do not have positive consequences for the ingroup when acted upon. In fact, suppressing one's identity as a minority can have destructive consequences for individual group members, as well as for the group as a whole (e.g., Barreto et al., 2006). Not expressing the minority group's identity is unlikely to foster acceptance of the identity by members of the majority group. The fact that the ingroup source is still agreed with more and evaluated better when taking a position that can have detrimental consequences for the group, suggests that group membership has the capacity to generate understanding for fellow group members' opinion, beyond the goals of the group itself.

The studies reported here are the first to our knowledge to study the emotional reactions of minorities to communication about the ingroup's identity. In previous

studies group size generally was not an issue (Hornsey, 2005). We have argued that the pattern of reactions to negative messages by ingroup and outgroup sources, is more general and applies to messages other than criticism as well. With regard to positive messages though, there seems to be an important difference between other studies and the current ones. In research on group criticism, outgroup sources expressing a positive message are usually reacted to just as positively as ingroup sources (e.g., Hornsey & Imani, 2004). In our research however, outgroup sources are reacted to more positively when they support identity expression. Although these differences are not necessarily significant, they are present on *all* variables measured in these studies. An alternative way to interpret our findings then, is that minority group members react more extreme to the dominant outgroup than to ingroup sources.

Minority groups in general occupy a lower power position in society, and minority group members are generally aware of this fact (Lücken & Simon, 2005). Theories on power argue that powerless individuals are more motivated to form an accurate impression of powerful individuals on whom they depend, because the decisions of powerful individuals have important consequences for the powerless (Fiske, 1993). Likewise, research in the intergroup domain has shown that relatively powerless groups focus more on powerful groups than vice versa (Doosje & Haslam, 2005). Because the opinions of powerful outgroup members will be more influential for the ingroup's position, the reactions to these opinions could have become more extreme, independent of the valence of the opinion that is expressed.

Whether these effect reported here are restricted to minorities or whether majorities will respond similarly requires further study. As we know ingroups in general do not respond positively to an outgroup member who voices an opinion which could have negative consequences for the ingroup (Hornsey, 2005). Members

of the minority arguing for identity suppression by the majority might therefore also be derogated. However, given the fact that minorities often have less power than majorities their opinions also tend to have less influence. Therefore it is unlikely that minority sources arguing for identity suppression are experienced as threatening and will give rise to strong emotions such as anger in majority group members. Future research might investigate such differences between majorities and minorities in responding to intergroup communication in more detail by varying the majority/minority status of the audience group.

Implications. The present studies extend theory and research on (inter-) group communication, by showing that these communications affect the emotions of minority group members experience, and that these emotions influence behavioral intentions. In particular we have focused on the experience of anger, and we have shown that this emotion occurs when an outgroup source obstructs identity expression by the minority. The fact that we replicated this process in two different minorities adds to the external validity of these findings. The experience of anger however, is not likely to be unique to the obstruction of identity expression. In fact, in any situation in which opinions are expressed by an outgroup source that threaten goals important to the group, anger will be the likely result (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005). Anger is particularly interesting because it motivates actions aimed at removing the obstacles that are confronted (Frijda, 1986). This could be collective efforts such as protesting for reparation of past wrong-doings by the outgroup (Pennekamp et al., 2007), or collective action (Van Zomeren et al., 2004), but also more modest and individually performed actions, such as writing a letter to a newspaper, or posting one's opinion on the internet, that are performed in the interest of the group (Wright, Taylor, & Moghaddam, 1990).

In this paper we have shown that identity expression is an important and emotionally relevant topic to members of minorities. Earlier research has made clear the negative consequences of concealing one's identity (Barreto et al., 2006) or assimilating to the majority (Berry, 1997). Our research suggests that members of minority groups indeed have some understanding of why fellow ingroup members want to refrain from expressing their identity. However, if the possibility to express their identity is threatened by the outgroup, minorities may not be likely to give up this right without a fight.

References

- Asch, S. E. (1951). Effects of group pressure upon the modification and distortion of judgments. In H. Guetzhaw (Ed.), *Groups, leadership, and men* (pp. 177-190). Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie Press.
- Ashmore, R. D., Deaux, K., & McLaughlin-Volpe, T. (2004). An organizing framework for collective identity: Articulation and significance of multidimensionality. *Psychological Bulletin*, 13, 80-114.
- Barreto, M., Ellemers, N., & Banal, S. (2006). Working under cover: Performance-related self-confidence among members of contextually devalued groups who try to pass. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 337-352.
- Beerekamp (2006, March 10). Het beeld [The image]. *NRC Handelsblad*, p. 35.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 46, 5-68.
- Cottrell, C. A., & Neuberg, S. L. (2005). Differential emotional reactions to different groups: A sociofunctional threat based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 770-789.
- Crano, W.D., & Alvaro, E.M. (1998). The context/comparison model of social influence: Mechanisms, structure, and linkages that underlie indirect attitude change. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (Vol. 8, pp. 175-202). Chichester: John Wiley.
- David, B., & Turner, J.C. (1996). Studies in self-categorization and minority conversion: Is being a member of the outgroup an advantage? *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 179-199.

- Doosje, B., Branscombe, N. R., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1998). Guilt by association: When one's group has a negative history. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 872-886.
- Doosje, B., & Haslam, A. (2005). What have they done for us lately? The dynamics of reciprocity in intergroup contexts. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35, 508-535.
- Duck, J. M., & Fielding, K. S. (2003). Leaders and their treatment of subgroups: Implications for evaluations of the leader and the superordinate group. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 387 – 401.
- Dumont, M., Yzerbyt, V. Y., Wigboldus, D., & Gordijn, E. H. (2003). Social Categorization and Fear Reactions to the September 11th Terrorist Attacks. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 1509-1520.
- Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Chaiken, S. (1978). Causal inferences about communicators and their effect on opinion change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 424-435.
- Elder, T. J., Sutton, R. M., & Douglas, K. M. (2005). Keeping it to ourselves: Effects of audience size and composition on reactions to criticism of the ingroup. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 8, 231 – 244.
- Fiske, S. T. (1993). Controlling other people: The impact of power on stereotyping. *American Psychologist*, 48, 621-628.
- Frable, D. E. S., Platt, L., & Hoey, S. (1998). Concealable stigmas and positive self-perceptions: Feeling better around similar others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 909-922.
- Frijda, N. H. (1986). *The emotions*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

- Hornsey, M. J. (2005). Why being right is not enough: Predicting defensiveness in the face of group criticism. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 16, 301-334.
- Hornsey, M. J., & Imani, A. (2004). Criticizing groups from the inside and the outside: A social identity perspective on the intergroup sensitivity effect. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 365-383.
- Hornsey, M. J., Frederiks, E., Smith, J. R., & Ford, L. (2007). Strategic defensiveness: Public and private responses to group criticism. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 46, 697-716.
- Hornsey, M. J., Oppes, T., & Svensson, A. (2002). "It's ok if we say it, but you can't": Responses to intergroup and intragroup criticism. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 293 – 307.
- Janssens, R. (2001). *Taalgebruik in Brussel: taalverhoudingen, taalverschuivingen en taalidentiteit in een meertalige stad [Language use in Brussels: Language relation, language shifts and language identity in a multilingual city]* (Brussels Themes 8). Brussels, Belgium: Vubpress.
- Judd, C. M., Park, B., Yzerbyt, V., Gordijn, E. H., & Muller, D. (2005). Attributions of intergroup bias and outgroup homogeneity to ingroup and outgroup others. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 677-704.
- Keuzenkamp, S., Bos, D., Duyvendak, J. W., & Hekma, G. (Eds.) (2006). *Gewoon doen: Acceptatie van homoseksuelen in Nederland [Just do it: Acceptation of homosexuals in The Netherlands]* (Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau 2006/15). The Hague, The Netherlands: Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau.
- Kuppens, P., Van Mechelen, I., Smits, D. J. M., & De Boeck, P. (2003). The appraisal basis of anger: Specificity, necessity and sufficiency of components. *Emotion*, 3, 254-269.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991). *Emotion & Adaptation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Lücken, M., & Simon, B. (2005). Cognitive and affective experiences of minority and majority members: The role of group size, status and power. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 41, 396-413.
- Mackie, D. M., Devos, T., & Smith, E. R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 602-616.
- Mackie, D. M., & Smith, E. R. (Eds.) (2002). *From prejudice to intergroup emotions: Differentiated reactions to social groups*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Mae, L., & Carlston, D. E. (2005). Hoist on your own petard: When prejudiced remarks are recognized and backfire on speakers. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 41, 240-255.
- McCoy, S. K. & Major, B. (2003). Group Identification Moderates Emotional Responses to Perceived Prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 1005-1017.
- Mendes, W. B., Major, B., McCoy, S., & Blascovich, J. (2008). How attributional ambiguity shapes physiological and emotional responses to social rejection and acceptance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 278-291.
- Moscovici, S. (1976). *Social influence and social change*. London: Academic Press.
- Muller, D., Judd, C. M., & Yzerbyt, V. Y. (2005). When moderation is mediated and mediation is moderated. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89, 852-863.
- O'Dwyer, A., Berkowitz, N. H., & Alfeld-Johnson D. (2002). Group and person attributions in response to criticism of the in-group. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 41, 563-588.
- Pennekamp, S. F., Doosje, B., Zebel, S., & Fischer, A.H. (2007). The past and the pending: The antecedents and consequences of group-based anger in

historically and currently disadvantaged groups. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 10, 41-55.

Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: A review of research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 499-514.

Phinney, J. S., Horenczyk, G., Liebkind, K., & Vedder, P. (2001). Ethnic identity, immigration, and well-being: An international perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 493-510.

Quinn, D. M., Kahng, S. K., & Crocker, J. (2004). Discreditable: Stigma effects of revealing a mental illness history on test performance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 803-815.

Sassenberg, K., & Hansen, N. (2007). The impact of regulatory focus on affective responses to social discrimination. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37, 421-444.

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

Sutton, R. M., Elder, T. J., & Douglas, K. M. (2006). Reactions to internal and external criticism of outgroup: Social convention in the intergroup sensitivity effect. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 567-575.

Tanis, M., & Postmes, T. (2005). A social identity approach to trust: Interpersonal perception, group membership and trusting behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 413-424.

Van Zomeren, M., Spears, R., Fischer, A. H., & Leach, C. W. (2004). Put your money where your mouth is! Explaining collective action tendencies through group-based anger and group efficacy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 649–664.

Vivian, J. E., & Berkowitz, N. H. (1993). Anticipated outgroup evaluations and intergroup bias. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 23, 513 – 524.

Wright, S. C., Taylor, D. M., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1990). Responding to membership in a disadvantaged group: From acceptance to collective protest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 994–1003.

Zebel, S., Pennekamp, S. F., Van Zomeren, M., Doosje, B., Van Kleef, G. A., Vliek, M. L. W., & Van der Schalk, J. (2007). Vessels with gold or guilt: Emotional reactions to family involvement associated with glorious or gloomy aspects of the colonial past. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 10, 71- 86.

Author Note

Sjoerd F. Pennekamp, Bertjan Doosje, Sven Zebel, Department of Social Psychology,
University of Amsterdam, and Alejandra Alarcon Henriquez, Social Psychology Unit,

Free University of Brussels

This research was supported by a NWO/VIDI grant 2623051 granted to the second
author.

We would like to thank Bianca Anastacia, Sjoerd van Bennekom, Janneke van den
Brand en Angelique van Diepen for their help in collecting data for Study 1

Correspondence concerning this paper can be sent to Sjoerd F. Pennekamp,
Department of Social Psychology, University of Amsterdam, Roetersstraat 15, 1018
WB Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Email: sjoerdpennkamp@hotmail.com. Tel.:

+31205256895. Fax: +31206391896.

Footnotes

¹ Although anger is theoretically the most relevant emotion in these studies, a few other emotions were measured namely, sadness, contempt and negative self-focused emotions (i.e., shame and guilt). Results showed that for anger we find the most consistent and strongest effects of our manipulation. For anger the p -value of the interaction between opinion and group membership is $p = .006$ and $p < .001$ for Study 1 and 2 respectively. For sadness this was $p = .014$ and $p = .045$ respectively for Study 1 and 2, for contempt $p = .008$ and $p = .126$, and $p = .735$ and $p = .535$ for negative self-focused emotions. Furthermore, anger was the only emotion mediating the effect of opinion on willingness to change opinion in Study 2. Therefore we chose only to report the results of anger in this paper.

² No gender differences were found with respect to the analyses reported here.

³ We thank the editor for pointing out that our manipulation of identity expression might be confounded in terms of valence. When arguing for suppression of the identity by not showing affection for each other (negative), the source is also arguing that group members should consider other's people's opinion (positive), and the reverse is true for the expression manipulation. However, if our participants were indeed influenced by the argument to be considerate, we believe this would work against our hypotheses and thus provides a more conservative test for our arguments. All of our measures show that participants generally reacted more negatively to the suppression manipulation, but especially so if the source is an outgroup member.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Mediation of the effect of opinion on anger by group threat in Study 1 for each level of group membership. Opinion was coded as -1 = identity expression, and +1 = identity suppression. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Figure 2. Mediation of the effect of opinion on anger by group threat in Study 2 for each level of group membership. Opinion was coded as -1 = identity expression, and +1 = identity suppression. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Figure 3. Mediation of the effect of opinion on willingness to change opinion by anger in Study 2 for each level of group membership. Opinion was coded as -1 = identity expression, and +1 = identity suppression. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 1

Means (Standard Deviations) of the Dependent Variables as a Function of Group membership and Opinion in Study 1

Dependent variables	Ingroup		Outgroup	
	Express	Suppress	Express	Suppress
Agreement	5.43 _c (1.60)	3.00 _b (1.88)	6.10 _c (.98)	2.04 _a (1.37)
Source evaluation	4.36 _b (1.03)	3.92 _b (1.13)	5.05 _c (1.04)	3.17 _a (1.19)
Group threat	2.21 _a (1.61)	4.05 _b (1.94)	1.71 _a (1.05)	4.75 _b (1.96)
Anger	3.16 _b (1.84)	3.94 _c (1.50)	2.13 _a (1.32)	4.49 _c (1.68)

NOTE: $N = 129$. Means with a different subscript differ significantly ($p < .05$) in a simple main effects analysis. Variables in Study 1 are measured on a 7-point scale

Table 2.

*Regression Coefficients and Standard Errors for the Mediated Moderation Analysis in**Study 1*

Predictors	Group Threat			Anger		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Main effects and interaction						
Opinion	1.22	.15	.59**	.78	.14	.44**
Group membership	.05	.15	.03	-.12	.14	-.07
Opinion x						
Group membership	.30	.15	.15*	.39	.14	.22**
Mediated moderation of anger by group threat						
Opinion				.25	.16	.14
Group membership				-.13	.13	-.07
Opinion x						
Group membership				.20	.16	.12
Group threat				.44	.08	.50**
Group threat x						
Group membership				.04	.08	.04

Note: $N = 129$. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

Table 3.

Means (Standard Deviations) of the Dependent Variables as a Function of Group membership and Opinion in Study 2

Dependent variables	Ingroup		Outgroup	
	Express	Suppress	Express	Suppress
Agreement	4.12 _c (.99)	2.50 _b (1.24)	4.37 _c (.76)	1.48 _a (.87)
Source evaluation	3.22 _b (.67)	3.06 _b (.54)	3.56 _b (.84)	2.23 _a (.68)
Group threat	1.55 _a (.72)	2.40 _b (1.06)	1.37 _a (.72)	3.05 _c (1.15)
Anger	2.48 _a (1.07)	2.39 _a (1.07)	1.93 _a (1.17)	3.54 _b (1.00)
Change opinion	2.06 _a (.81)	2.55 _a (1.02)	1.93 _a (.90)	3.92 _b (.92)

NOTE: $N = 90$. Means with a different subscript differ significantly ($p < .05$) in a simple main effects analysis. Variables in Study 2 are measured on a 5-point scale

Table 4.

Regression Coefficients and Standard Errors for the Mediated Moderation Analyses in Study 2

Predictors	Group Threat			Anger			Change Opinion		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Main effects and interaction									
Opinion	.63	.10	.55**	.38	.12	.32*	.62	.10	.51**
Group membership	-.12	.10	-.10	-.15	.12	-.13	-.31	.10	-.26*
Opinion x									
Group membership	-.21	.10	-.18*	-.43	.12	-.35**	.38	.10	-.31**
Mediated moderation of anger by group threat									
Opinion				.17	.14	.14			
Group membership				-.11	.11	-.09			
Opinion x									
Group membership				-.33	.14	-.27*			
Group threat				.32	.12	.30*			
Group threat x									
Group membership				-.05	.12	-.05			
Mediated moderation of change opinion by anger									
Opinion							.50	.11	.42**
Group membership							-.30	.10	-.25*
Opinion x									
Group membership							-.25	.11	-.21*
Anger							.20	.09	.20*
Anger x									
Group membership							-.07	.09	-.07

Note: $N = 90$. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3

