Research article

Ethnocultural identification and naturally occurring interethnic social interactions: Muslim minorities in Europe

JULIETTE SCHAAFSMA[1]*, JOHN B. NEZLEK[2],
IZABELA KREJTZ[3] AND MAGDALENA SAFRON[4]
[1]*Tilburg University, The Netherlands*
[2]*College of William and Mary, USA*
[3]*Institute of Psychology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland*
[4]*Warsaw School of Social Psychology, Poland*

Abstract

This study examined relationships between ethnic identification and ethnic minority members' interactions with majority group members. Members of Muslim minority groups, ethnic Turks and Moroccans in the Netherlands and Chechens in Poland, described the social interactions they had for two weeks using a variant of the Rochester Interaction Record (RIR). They also completed measures of ethnocultural identification that distinguished involvement with and attachment to their ethnic minority culture and to the majority culture. Relationships between ethnic identification and contact with the majority group varied as a function of the dimension and source of identification and the aspect of interaction (quantity or quality) being considered. Across the samples, involvement with the ethnic minority culture was negatively related to the quantity of contact with majority group members, whereas emotional attachment to the majority culture was positively related to the quality of interactions with majority group members. Attachment to the ethnic minority culture was not related to either the quantity of interaction with majority group members or to the quality of these interactions. These results suggest that when studying interethnic contact, it is important to distinguish different dimensions and sources of ethnic identification and different aspects of interethnic contact. Copyright © 2009 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

For various reasons, societies around the world are, or are increasingly becoming, ethnically and culturally diverse. This increased diversity has important consequences as members of different ethnic groups with different skills, knowledge, languages, beliefs, and values come into contact with each other. For ethnic minority members in particular, it is important to establish good relationships with members of the host majority culture. It is generally recognized that the successful integration of minority members is a function of how often they interact with members of the cultural majority group and how accepted they feel they are by members of the majority culture (e.g., Berry, 1999; Ward & Kennedy, 1999).

There is evidence, however, that ethnic minorities may have difficulty engaging in and having rewarding interactions with majority group members. The social distance between ethnic minority and majority group members is large in many Western countries, and tensions between the two groups are not uncommon (e.g., Brown & Hewstone, 2005; McLaren, 2003; Stephan, Ybarra, & Bachman, 1999). It has been theorized that such difficulties in interethnic contact are due in part to the tension and distress people may feel when interacting or anticipating interactions with a person from a different ethnic group (e.g., Stephan & Stephan, 1985). For example, people may be uncertain about proper codes of conduct for interacting with members of other groups or may fear negative reactions, which may lead them to avoid or react negatively to interactions with outgroup members. It has also been argued that the extent to which ethnic minority members

*Correspondence to: Juliette Schaafsma, Department of Humanities, Tilburg University, PO Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands.
E-mail: J.Schaafsma@uvt.nl

Copyright © 2009 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

experience such difficulties is likely to depend on their ethnic identification, because ethnic identification provides frames of reference for both self-definition and for ordering social relationships (e.g., Berry, 1979). In this regard, it has increasingly been argued in many Western countries that ethnic minorities should abandon their heritage group identity and adopt the identity of the dominant culture.

Yet, it is unclear how ethnic minority members' identity affects their interactions with majority group members. So far, there has hardly been any research on naturally occurring everyday interethnic contact and, to our knowledge, no studies to date have directly examined relationships between ethnic identification and ethnic minority members' everyday interactions. Moreover, studies on the relationship between group identification (ethnic or social) and constructs that are possibly related to outgroup contact (e.g., outgroup attitudes) have yielded inconsistent results (for overviews, see Brewer, 1999; Duckitt, Callaghan, & Wagner, 2005). Some have found a negative relationship between ingroup identification and attitudes toward outgroups (e.g., Pettigrew et al., 1998) and others have found no relationship (e.g., Ray & Lovejoy, 1986) or a positive (indirect) relationship (e.g., Phinney, Ferguson, & Tate, 1997). This combination of a lack of research explicitly concerning naturally occurring interethnic social interaction and inconsistent results across studies concerning potentially related constructs provides a poor basis for understanding relationships between ethnic identification and everyday interethnic contact.

Given the centrality of identification to theories of intergroup interaction and intergroup relations, and the ongoing debates about these topics across the world, the goal of the current study was to examine how ethnic identification shapes ethnic minority members' everyday interactions with majority group members. More specifically, we aimed to gain a better understanding of how different dimensions and sources of ethnic identification shape these interactions. To date, most studies on ethnic identification and outgroup relations have used a single dimension, single source definition of identification (e.g., ingroup identification defined in terms of whether a person is involved in the cultural practices of a group or not). There is, however, a growing recognition that ethnic identification is a multifaceted construct. For example, several authors (e.g., Duckitt et al., 2005; Phinney, 1990) have demonstrated that it is important to distinguish how much people know about or how involved they are in the cultural practices of a group (*ethnocultural involvement*) from how emotionally attached they feel to that group (*ethnocultural attachment*). Moreover, it has become recognized that people may have multiple identities and that a strong identification with one group (e.g., one's heritage culture) does not necessarily imply a weak identification with another (e.g., the host majority culture) (e.g., Flannery, Reise, & Yu, 2001; Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000). Research suggests that these different dimensions and sources of identification may be related in different ways to minority members' relations with host majority group members (e.g., Duckitt et al., 2005; Jackson & Smith, 1999).

Accordingly, we examined the relationships between minority members' ethnocultural involvement to and attachment with their heritage group and the majority group on the one hand, and the quantity and quality of their daily social interactions with members of their heritage ingroup and with majority group members on the other. Participants were self-identified Muslim adults (non-collegiate community residents) living in the Netherlands and Poland. Studying Muslim adults in Europe served several purposes. First, tensions between Muslim minorities and majority group members are an issue in many European countries, and such tensions are frequently attributed to Muslim minorities' lack of identification with the larger society. Second, differences between the heritage cultures of Muslim minorities and the majority cultures in Europe are pronounced and salient, something we believed increased the psychological importance of contact between the two groups. Third, the data we collected allowed us to examine whether relationships between ethnic identification and interethnic contact differed across socio-culturally different samples.

In the Netherlands, we studied ethnic Turks and Moroccans because they are the largest minority groups living in the Netherlands, constituting approximately 4% of the population. Many arrived during the 1960s to fill shortages in the labor market, and both groups occupy an unfavorable position in the social hierarchy (e.g., Verkuyten & Kinket, 2000). Moreover, the vast majority of them are Muslim. In Poland, we studied Chechens, the biggest Muslim group in Poland. Most Chechens who live in Poland are asylum seekers. Official statistics suggest that there are about 3400 asylum seekers from Chechnya. Most live in refugee camps, waiting for a decision regarding their status from the Polish authorities (Iglicka, Podolski, & Uklanski, 2004).

Each day for two weeks, participants described the social interactions they had using a variant of the Rochester Interaction Record (RIR, Wheeler & Nezlek, 1977). Participants also provided measures of their ethnocultural attachment to and ethnocultural involvement with their ethnic ingroup and with the majority group. These data allowed us to examine differences in the quantity and quality of intra- and interethnic contact, and to investigate whether such differences varied as a function of different dimensions and different sources of ethnic identification.

Quantity and Quality of Interethnic Contact

Our first expectations concerned differences between intra- and interethnic contact in terms of amount of social contact and the quality of social contact. It is generally believed that interethnic contact is more anxiety producing and therefore less rewarding than intraethnic contact. For example, in a questionnaire-based study, Spencer-Rodgers and McGovern (2002) found that American college students felt uncomfortable, impatient, and frustrated when interacting with foreign students on their campuses, and comparable results have been found in studies in which participants were asked to imagine how they would feel during interethnic encounters (e.g., Tropp, Stout, Boatswain, Wright, & Pettigrew, 2006). Moreover, laboratory studies have shown that, when given the choice, people tend to avoid interethnic interactions (e.g., Plant & Devine, 2003; Towles-Schwen & Fazio, 2003).

Although most of these studies have been performed among ethnic majority members, it is likely that ethnic minority members will experience similar reactions when interacting with majority group members. For example, several studies have shown that ethnic minority members may have negative expectations about interactions with majority group members because they are concerned about being rejected or discriminated against (e.g., Mendoza-Denton, Downey, Purdie, Davis, & Pietrzak, 2002; Pinel, 1999; Shelton, Richeson, & Salvatore, 2005). This, in turn, may negatively affect their attitudes toward and hence their interactions with them (e.g., Tropp, 2007; Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005; Tropp et al., 2006). Therefore, we expected that ethnic minority members would have less inter- than intraethnic interactions. In addition, we expected that ethnic minority members would find interactions involving a member of the majority culture to be less positive than interactions that did not involve a member of the majority culture. These expectations were also based on the premise that interactions with ethnic ingroup members are likely to be more predictable and to be better understood than interethnic interactions (Brewer, 1999), and the fact that similarity, such as in attitudes, demographic background, values and beliefs, has generally been found to increase interpersonal attraction (e.g., Byrne, 1971; Roccas & Schwartz, 1993).

We did, however, anticipate some contextual differences. We expected that, because of their refugee status, Chechens in Poland would have fewer interactions with majority group members than ethnic Turks and Moroccans in the Netherlands. Yet, we also expected that reactions to interactions involving a majority group member would be more negative in the Dutch than in the Polish sample, particularly because public discussion of problems related to ethnic minorities (Turks and Moroccans in particular) has intensified in the Netherlands over the past years. Although we do not want to suggest that attitudes of the majority culture toward refugees in Poland are uniformly positive, we expected that, given their relative familiarity with Dutch society, ethnic Turks and Moroccans in the Netherlands would be more aware of negative feelings toward them than Chechen refugees in Poland. Therefore, we expected that they would have more negative expectations about interactions with majority group members than Chechens, and hence respond more negatively to these interactions.

Ethnic Identification and Interethnic Contact

We also expected that the quantity and quality of minority members' interactions with majority group members would vary as a function of individual differences in ethnocultural involvement with and ethnocultural attachment to the majority culture and their heritage culture. As mentioned in the foregoing, people's *ethnocultural involvement* concerns people's knowledge of the host or heritage culture's traditions, customs, values, beliefs, attitudes, and lifestyles, and *ethnocultural attachment* concerns their appreciation of and emotional attachment to their heritage culture or the host culture. The ways in which these different dimensions and sources of identification might influence ethnic minority members' daily interethnic interactions are discussed below.

Ethnocultural Involvement and Contact with Majority Group Members

Broadly speaking, we expected that ethnocultural involvement would be related to quantity of interactions with majority group members, but not to the quality of these interactions. This expectation was based upon a model presented by Nezlek (2000), suggesting that quantity and quality of social interaction reflect the operation of different processes. According to this model, quantity of interaction reflects the operation of cognitively or behaviorally focused processes such as norms and role obligations, more than the operation of affectively focused processes. In contrast, the quality of people's interactions reflects the operation of affectively focused processes, more than the operation of cognitively or behaviorally

focused processes. In terms of identification, ethnocultural involvement is a more behaviorally focused or knowledge-based construct. People who are more involved in a certain group may have the appropriate skills and knowledge to interact with its members, without feeling a strong connection to them or without accepting their values (Ghorpade, Lackritz, & Singh, 2004). As a result, they may find it relatively easy to engage in interactions with them, without experiencing positive outcomes during these interactions.

Regarding the relationship between ethnocultural involvement with the minority group and quantity of interethnic contact, we expected that minority members' involvement with their heritage group would be negatively related to the amount of contact with majority group members. This expectation was based in part on the assumption that ethnic minorities who are more involved with their ethnic heritage group are likely to feel more knowledgeable about the norms guiding intraethnic contact than minority members who are not as involved with their heritage group. Accordingly, they may find interactions with other members of their ethnic heritage group to be more attractive than interactions with members of the majority culture. In turn, ethnic majority members may feel threatened when ethnic minorities are more oriented toward their heritage culture, and they may avoid interactions with them (e.g., Stephan & Stephan, 2000), which may decrease ethnic minority members' opportunity to interact with majority group members. For example, in a study of Chinese sojourners in Singapore, Leong and Ward (2000) found a negative relationship between people's cultural involvement with their heritage group and amount of contact with majority group members.

Although not the polar opposite of ethnocultural involvement with the minority group, we expected that ethnocultural involvement with the majority group would be positively related to quantity of contact with majority group members. Minority members who are more involved with the majority culture (and feel they know more about the majority culture), may perceive the majority group as less threatening and they may find starting and maintaining interactions with them to be less difficult than those who are less involved with the majority culture (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). For example, Leong and Ward (2000) found a positive relationship between people's cultural involvement with the majority group and amount of contact with majority group members. Moreover, minority group members who behave in ways (e.g., style of dress, manners, language use) that indicate their adoption of the majority culture may also be more attractive (or less unattractive) to majority group members (e.g., Van Oudenhoven, Prins, & Buunk, 1998).

Nevertheless, we were also sensitive to the possibility that the relationship between *majority ethnocultural involvement* and quantity of interaction with majority group members might vary between the Dutch and Polish samples, with such relationships perhaps being stronger in Poland than in the Netherlands. In the Polish sample, Chechen participants were recent arrivals, and responses in focus group interviews conducted before the study suggested that they had a mixed attitude about settling in Poland. Although they may be thankful for Poland's open door policy, they tend not to be engaged in the broader Polish society and some may not want to stay in Poland. Nevertheless, Chechens who are more involved with the majority culture may have a more positive attitude toward native Poles and be more motivated to interact with them than those who are less involved. Therefore, we expected to find a positive relationship between *majority ethnocultural involvement* and quantity of interaction with majority group members in the Polish study. In contrast, in the Netherlands study, participants were second-generation immigrants who speak Dutch and are likely to be familiar with Dutch society. Even those who are relatively weakly involved with the majority culture may be sufficiently oriented to and knowledgeable about the majority culture to feel comfortable interacting with ethnic Dutch and to not feel anxious about such interactions. For this reason, we expected that *majority ethnocultural involvement* would be unrelated to quantity of contact with majority group members in the Dutch study.

Ethnocultural Attachment and Contact with Majority Group Members

We expected that ethnocultural attachment would be related to the quality, but not to the quantity of interactions minorities had with members of the majority culture. Previous research on daily interactions shows that, whereas quantity of interaction reflects the operation of cognitive or behavioral processes, quality of interactions reflects the operation of more socio-emotional processes. For example, Nezlek and Reis (1999) found that people's sense of social acceptance was positively related to the quality, but not to the quantity of their daily social interactions. Given that ethnocultural attachment is also a more affectively focused construct (it concerns feelings of acceptance, pride, being understood, etc.), we expected it to be related to quality rather than to quantity of interactions with members of the majority group.

We expected that ethnic minority members' ethnocultural attachment to the majority culture would be positively related to the quality of their interactions with majority group members. This expectation was based in part on social

identity theory (Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). According to social identity theory, people who identify with a social group evaluate its members positively and embrace the group's norms and values. Ethnic minority group members who are more attached to the majority group may believe that they have more in common with its members (e.g., Doosje, Ellemers, & Spears, 1995), and they may feel more valued and accepted during interactions with majority members than minorities who are less attached to the majority group.

With respect to the relationships between ethnocultural attachment to the minority group and reactions to interethnic interactions, existing research and theory provided conflicting views. According to social identity theory and Sumner's (1906) ethnocentrism hypothesis, attachment to a social group leads people not only to view their ingroups more positively, but also leads them to view outgroups less positively or more negatively. The social identity-intergroup differentiation hypothesis (Brown, 2000; Turner, 1999) states that individuals who are more strongly attached to the ingroup will perceive greater differences between their ingroup and a relevant outgroup, and such greater differences may make outgroups less attractive and lead to less positive interactions with them. In contrast, Allport (1954) suggests that a stronger attachment to the ingroup does not necessarily lead to outgroup negativity, and Berry's (1984) multiculturalism hypothesis states that a more secure attachment to the ethnic ingroup leads to more positive attitudes toward outgroups.

Empirical studies on the relationships between ingroup identification and outgroup attitudes and experiences have provided inconsistent results as well, sometimes finding a negative relationship, sometimes a positive one, and sometimes no relationship (Duckitt et al., 2005). For example, Lee and Gudykunst (2001) in one sample (non-European Americans) found a positive relationship between strength of ethnic ingroup identity and how positive people's expectations were about interactions with members of other ethnic groups, whereas in another sample (European Americans) they found no relationship between identification and such expectations. In contrast, Operario and Fiske (2001) found that minority members who strongly identified with their ethnic ingroup were more aware of and showed stronger reactions to prejudice during an interaction with a White confederate. Yet, in a study among British and Japanese students, Greenland and Brown (1999) did not find a relationship between ingroup identification and quality of outgroup contact. There is also evidence that the relationship between ethnic identification and outgroup evaluations and experiences may depend on the social position of groups and on characteristics of the intergroup situation. For example, some studies show that, when status differences are high and when ethnic boundaries are perceived to be impermeable and stable, minority group members may identify with their ethnic ingroup without demonstrating a strong ingroup bias (e.g., Ellemers, Van Rijswijk, Roefs, & Simons, 1997; Mummendey, Klink, Mielke, Wenzel, & Blanz, 1999; Verkuyten & Reijerse, 2008).

In agreement with Allport (1954), we thought that minority members' strength of attachment to their ethnic ingroup would be unrelated to how they reacted to interactions with majority members. How accepted or valued an individual feels by his or her own ethnic ingroup may be conceptually (and empirically) distinct from feelings of acceptance by an ethnic outgroup. A core assumption of the growing body of research in the acculturation literature (e.g., Berry, 1997) and the interethnic relations literature (e.g., Phinney, 1990) is that people can simultaneously identify with multiple groups, without such identities operating in an ''either/or'' fashion. If people can hold multiple identities, which may independently vary in strength, ethnic minorities' ethnocultural attachment to their minority cultures might tell us very little about how they feel about the majority culture and about how they will react to interactions with majority members.

The Present Study

The primary objective of the present study was to examine ethnic minority members' daily interactions with ethnic ingroup members and with majority outgroup members, and to examine whether the quantity and quality of these interactions varied as a function of individual differences in ethnocultural involvement with and attachment to the heritage group and the majority group. The following expectations guided the study:

(1) We expected that ethnic minority members would have less contact with majority group members than with ethnic ingroup members, and that they would also find interactions involving a member of the majority culture to be less positive than interactions that did not involve a majority group member.
(2) We expected that minority members' ethnocultural involvement would be related to the quantity of contact with majority group members, but not to the quality of these interactions. More specifically, we expected a negative relationship between ethnocultural involvement with the minority culture and quantity of contact with the majority group. In contrast, we expected a positive relationship between involvement with the majority culture and quantity of

contact with majority group members. In this regard, however, we also anticipated a contextual difference. We expected to find this relationship in the Polish sample but not in the Dutch sample.

(3) We expected that minority members' ethnocultural attachment would be related to the quality of interactions with majority group members, but not to the quantity of these interactions. We predicted that there would be a positive relationship between ethnic minority members' ethnocultural attachment to the majority culture and the quality of their interactions with majority group members. Yet, we also expected that ethnocultural attachment to the minority culture would not be related to the quality of minority members' interactions with majority group members.

METHOD

Samples

In the Netherlands study, the initial sample consisted of 49 participants who were recruited through a community organization. After inspection of their data, the data of six participants were excluded from the analyses because the participants had not filled out the diary properly. The data of six more were eliminated because they had not completed the measures of ethnocultural identification. This left a sample of 18 persons of Turkish origin and 19 persons of Moroccan origin. All had been born in the Netherlands (although their parents had been born in Turkey or Morocco) or had arrived in the Netherlands before their 8th birthday. Twelve participants were men. Participants' ages ranged from 16 to 43 years, with a mean age of 26.7 years ($SD = 7.7$).

In Poland, potential participants were approached in meetings held either in or nearby refugee camps. It was made very clear to potential participants that their decision to participate would have no bearing on their refugee status. In total, 89 Chechens agreed to participate in the study. Eight participants did not complete various forms properly and were excluded from the analyses, leaving 46 men and 35 women, whose average age was 30.9 years ($SD = 9.5$). All Chechen participants lived nearby or in refugee camps, and none had a permanent residence permit. All participants in both samples identified themselves as Muslim.

Instruments

Aside from the necessary differences in the languages in which the instruments were written, the instruments used in the two studies were the same. For both studies, the instruments were first prepared in English and were then translated and back-translated into Dutch for the Netherlands Study and into Russian for the Poland Study, following guidelines suggested by Van de Vijver and Leung (1997). Translations and back-translations were done by native speakers who were fluent in English.

Social Interaction Diary

In both studies, participants described their social interactions using a variant of the Rochester Interaction Record (Wheeler & Nezlek, 1977). Consistent with the definition provided by Wheeler and Nezlek and that used in most social interaction diary research, a social interaction was defined as ''an encounter with one or more other people in which the participants attend to one another and adjust their behavior in response to one another''. Similar to previous research, participants were told to record only interactions that lasted 10 minutes or more. In addition, they were told to record only face-to-face interactions. Participants were asked to maintain the diary for two weeks.[1]

At the end of each day, participants described with whom they had interacted and they described their reactions to these interactions. Descriptions of co-interactants included: initials (unique for each person), gender, age, ethnicity (the specific categories varied across the two studies) and relationship (casual friend, close friend, romantic friend, partner, relative, co-

---

[1]We chose to limit our study to face-to-face interactions (and exclude various forms of electronic communication) for various reasons. Since the RIR was introduced in 1977, studies have been limited to face-to-face interactions. The rationale for this was (and remains) the fact that face-to-face interactions are different from phone calls and text messaging in terms of important characteristics (e.g., facial expression). Electronic social episodes are interesting in their own right, but we felt that a focus on face-to-face social interaction using the same methods used in considerable previous research was best, particularly considering that ours was the first study of its kind (i.e., a study of daily social interaction among ethnic minority adults).

worker, stranger, or other). They also described other aspects of the interaction (time of onset, duration, location, purpose, and language spoken) that are not discussed in this paper.

In the present studies, we measured socio-emotional, instrumental, and affective reactions to interactions. Participants described their reactions using 9-point scales with endpoints labeled 1 = not at all and 9 = very much. Similar to previous studies using the RIR, they described each interaction in terms of seven dimensions: how enjoyable the interaction was, how intimate it was, how much in control they felt, how much the other people present respected them, how accepted they felt, how much the other people present liked them, and how free they felt to exchange ideas and opinions with others. Participants also described their affective reactions using four ratings representing what is known as the affective circumplex (e.g., Barrett & Russell, 1998), a two–dimensional representation of emotional experience (positive/negative and active/deactive). These ratings were also made using 9-point scales with endpoints labeled: sad-happy, relaxed-nervous, enthusiastic-bored, and content-angry.

In the Netherlands study, the 37 participants whose data were retained for analysis described 662 interactions ($M = 17.9$, $SD = 6.0$), over an average of 12.9 days ($SD = 1.8$). In the Poland study, the 81 participants whose data were retained for analysis described 2066 interactions ($M = 25.9$, $SD = 14.5$), over an average of 12.9 days ($SD = 3.0$).

Measures of Ethnocultural Involvement and Ethnocultural Attachment

Ethnocultural involvement was measured with five items taken from the Adult Acculturation Scale (Groenvynck, Beirens, Arends-Tóth, & Fontaine, 2006). This scale assesses the extent to which people have knowledge of or are involved in the cultural practices of the majority group and the minority group. Each of the five items was worded to refer to the participants' minority ethnic group and the majority cultural group, separately, for a total of 10 items. For example, for ethnic Turks in the Netherlands study, five items referred to Turkish culture (e.g., I know the Turkish culture and traditions well), and five items referred to Dutch culture (e.g., I know the Dutch culture and traditions well). Ethnocultural attachment was measured with an adjusted version of the Psychological Acculturation Scale (Stevens, Pels, Vollebergh, & Crijnen, 2004; Tropp, Erkut, Coll, Alarcón, & Garcia, 1999). Six items referred to the participants' ethnic group (e.g., I feel proud to be part of the Turkish culture), and six parallel items referred to the dominant cultural majority (e.g., I feel proud to be part of the Dutch culture). For all these measures, participants responded to each item using a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). It is important to note that for each of these measures, we used fewer items than the original versions. In a series of pre-tests we found that participants would not complete lengthy instruments with seemingly repetitive or redundant items. We selected items based on factor analyses and relevance to the project, and the items we administered are presented in the Appendix. Summary statistics for these measures are presented in Table 1.

Procedure

Participants were introduced to the study in groups of 10–15 or individually. They were told that the purpose of the study was to investigate daily social interactions and people's responses to them. At this introductory session, the use of the diary forms was explained, any questions the participants had were answered, and participants were given a printed set of instructions and enough blank forms for the duration of the study. To reduce reactivity to the study, participants completed the measures of ethnocultural involvement and ethnocultural attachment at the end of the study. During the study, a member of the research team maintained regular contact with participants to ensure that they were completing the diary forms as requested.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for measures of ethnocultural involvement and ethnocultural attachment

		The Netherlands			Poland		
		Mean	*SD*	α	Mean	*SD*	α
Involvement	Minority	4.01	.72	.74	4.21	.59	.71
	Majority	4.37	.49	.62	3.10	.74	.76
Attachment	Minority	4.32	.65	.86	4.39	.69	.88
	Majority	3.94	.64	.82	3.83	.69	.84

RESULTS

Overview of Analyses

The data collected in these studies constituted what are called multilevel or hierarchically nested data structures: interactions were nested within individuals. In the terminology of multilevel modeling, interactions were the level 1 observations (or units of analysis) and persons were the level 2 observations. The data were analyzed with a random coefficient modeling technique known as hierarchical linear modeling (HLM6; Raudenbush, Bryk, Cheong, & Congdon, 2004). Using multilevel random coefficient modeling to analyze social interaction diary data is discussed in Nezlek (2001a, 2003). Although the two studies used the same methods and measures, the differences between the studies were sufficient to justify parallel, separate analyses. The same analyses were done for each data set and the results are presented together.

The analyses focused on quantity and quality of interethnic contact and on individual differences in these contacts. Analyses of quantity concerned how much contact participants had with members of the majority cultures—ethnic Dutch in the Netherlands and ethnic Poles in Poland. Analyses of quality concerned ratings of interactions: how participants reacted to and felt about their contacts with others, with an emphasis on differences between interactions that involved a member of the majority culture and interactions that did not. We refer to this as the *majority effect*. Some of our hypotheses concerned interethnic contact *per se*, and so we first examined quantity and quality of interethnic contact with no attention to individual differences. Other hypotheses concerned relationships between interethnic contact and ethnocultural identification. So, we then examined relationships between individual differences in quantity and quality of interethnic interaction and individual differences in ethnocultural involvement and attachment. As is customary in regression analyses, when discussing these relationships in terms of individuals who are high and low on measures of identification we refer to estimated scores for individuals who were $+/-1$ *SD*.

Amount of Contact with Members of the Majority Cultural Group

Amount of contact with members of the majority cultural group was defined as the per cent of interactions that involved at least one majority member. Each interaction was coded 1 if a majority member was present and 0 if one was not present. In HLM, categorical dependent variables are analyzed with techniques appropriate for non-linear outcomes. For this measure, this was a Bernoulli model, which is used for dichotomous (0, 1) dependent measures. The model is presented below, and the subscript j refers to persons:

$$\text{Level 1}: \quad \text{Prob}(y=1|\beta_{0j}) = \phi$$
$$\text{Level 2}: \quad \beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + u_{0j}$$

These analyses estimated a per cent for each participant. For the Netherlands study, on average, 38% of participants' interactions involved at least one ethnic Dutch person. For the Poland study, approximately 13% of participants' interactions involved at least one ethnic Pole.[2]

Ethnic Identification and Amount of Contact with Members of the Majority Cultural Group

Relationships between ethnic identification and amount of contact were analyzed by including measures of ethnocultural involvement and ethnocultural attachment at level 2. Following the recommendation of multilevel modelers to use forward stepping procedures (e.g., Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002), these level 2 predictors were examined first in isolation, and predictors that were significant individually were then analyzed together. These initial, single predictor models are

---

[2]For both Dutch samples and the Polish sample, we examined how often participants interacted with members of ethnic minority groups other than their own. In all three cases, very few interactions involved a member of an ethnic minority group other than the participant's group. The mean per cents for such interactions were: Turks 5%, Moroccans 7%, and Chechens, 2%. This meant that it was not possible to examine interactions between members of different minority groups.

illustrated with an analysis that examined relationships between involvement with the ethnic minority culture and the per cent of interactions involving a member of the majority culture:

$$\text{Level 1}: \quad \text{Prob}(y = 1|\beta_{0j}) = \phi$$
$$\text{Level 2}: \quad \beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(\text{minority ethnocultural involvement}) + u_{0j}$$

The results of these analyses were clear and consistent with our expectations. For the Netherlands study, the only measure that was significantly related to the per cent of interactions involving a member of the majority Dutch culture was minority ethnocultural involvement ($\gamma_{01} = -.42, p < .05$). Individuals who were more involved with their ethnic minority group had less contact with majority members than individuals who were less involved. For participants who were one standard deviation above the mean on minority ethnocultural involvement, 27% of interactions involved a majority member. In contrast, for participants who were one standard deviation below the mean on this scale, 48% of interactions involved a member of the majority Dutch culture. Analyses comparing these relationships for ethnic Turkish and Moroccan participants found no significant differences.

As expected, the pattern of results for the Poland study was similar, although not identical. A negative relationship was found between amount of contact and minority ethnocultural involvement and minority ethnocultural attachment, and a positive relationship was found between amount of contact and majority ethnocultural involvement. When these three measures were entered in an analysis simultaneously, only the two ethnocultural involvement measures were significant (minority involvement: $\gamma_{01} = -.42, p < .01$; majority involvement: $\gamma_{02} = .44, p < .01$).

As indicated by the coefficients, amount of contact with ethnic Poles was positively related to majority ethnocultural involvement, whereas it was negatively related to minority ethnocultural involvement. Predicted values for Chechen participants who were $+/-1$ SD on ethnocultural involvement indicated that for those who scored low on majority ethnocultural involvement approximately 9% of interactions involved an ethnic Pole, whereas for those who scored high on majority ethnocultural involvement, approximately 18% of interactions involved an ethnic Pole. For Chechen participants who scored high on minority ethnocultural involvement, approximately 9% of interactions involved an ethnic Pole, and for those who scored low on minority ethnocultural involvement, approximately 18% of interactions involved an ethnic Pole.

Quality of Interactions Involving a Majority Group Member: The "Majority Effect"

Interaction quality was examined with a set of models in which interactions were nested within participants, and reactions to interactions (measures of quality) were treated as continuous variables. The first analyses had no predictors at either level 1 or level 2 (sometimes referred to as "totally unconditional" models), and they provided the basic descriptive statistics in a multilevel analysis of continuous outcomes: means and level 1 (within-person or interaction) and level 2 (between-person) variances. These descriptive statistics are presented in Table 2. Of particular importance is the fact that in all samples, for all measures, there was meaningful variance at level 1, the within-person (or interaction) level.

The critical feature of our analyses of interaction quality is that they focused on differences in reactions to interactions in which a member of the ethnic majority was present and interactions in which an ethnic majority member was not present. This difference was represented with a contrast-coded variable at level 1 (the interaction level), labeled *majority effect*. We created a contrast variable (rather than examine only interactions involving a member of the majority culture) to control for individual differences in mean reactions. Interactions in which a member of the majority culture was present were coded 1, and interactions in which one was not present were coded -1. This variable was entered uncentered. These analyses are summarized with the following model:

$$\text{Level 1}: \quad y_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}(\text{majority effect}) + r_{ij}$$
$$\text{Level 2}: \quad \beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + u_{0j}$$
$$\beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + u_{1j}$$

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for quality of interactions

| | The Netherlands | | | | Poland | | |
| | | Variance | | | | Variance | |
	Mean	Within	Between		Mean	Within	Between
Enjoyable	7.24	2.26	.54		7.68	2.48	.83
Intimate	6.80	2.39	.69		7.11	3.91	.94
Control	7.08	2.24	.42		6.98	3.81	1.09
Liked	7.31	1.64	.65		7.43	2.79	1.06
Respected	7.65	1.51	.54		7.86	2.14	.72
Accepted	7.68	1.67	.56		7.67	2.48	.83
Free to express opinions	7.86	1.71	.44		7.92	2.74	.54
Happy	7.01	2.28	.83		6.46	4.82	1.59
Anxious/nervous	3.09	2.89	.74		3.95	5.02	2.22
Bored/sluggish	3.19	2.33	1.09		3.70	4.40	2.41
Angry	2.73	2.23	.96		3.38	4.91	1.93

In these analyses, y_{ij} refers to a reaction (i interactions nested within j persons), β_{0j} is the intercept, and β_{1j} is the *majority effect* (i.e., the difference in reactions to interactions in which a member of the majority culture was present or not). A *majority effect* was estimated for each participant, and the average of these individual effects, the γ_{10} coefficient in the second equation, was tested for significance at level 2. A significant γ_{10} coefficient indicates that, on average, there was a significant difference in reactions as a function of the presence of a member of the majority culture. For positively valent ratings, a negative coefficient indicates that interactions involving a majority member were less positive than those not involving a majority member. For negatively valent ratings, a positive coefficient indicates that interactions involving a majority group member were more negative than those that did not. The results of these analyses are summarized in Table 3.[3]

Table 3. Quality of interactions as a function of the presence of a member of the majority culture: Estimated values representing the *majority effect*

| | The Netherlands | | | | Poland | | |
	Coefficient	Present	Absent		Coefficient	Present	Absent
Enjoyable	−.22**	6.95	7.39		.06	7.38	7.26
Intimate	−.40**	6.28	7.08		.00	7.10	7.10
Control	−.18**	6.86	7.22		−.14	6.74	7.02
Liked	−.27**	6.95	7.49		−.20**	7.11	7.51
Respected	−.19**	7.38	7.76		−.12	7.67	7.90
Accepted	−.17†	7.43	7.77		−.04	7.60	7.68
Free to express opinions	−.12†	7.69	7.93		−.18**	7.62	8.00
Happy	−.23**	6.63	7.19		−.06	6.36	6.48
Anxious/nervous	.22*	3.40	2.96		.06	4.04	3.92
Bored/sluggish	.18**	3.42	2.96		−.05	3.61	3.71
Angry	.17*	2.96	2.62		−.19*	3.04	3.43

Note: Coefficients accompanied by * were significant at $p < .05$, and those accompanied by ** were significant at $p < .01$. Coefficients accompanied by † were significant at $p < .10$.

[3]The analyses we present did not distinguish interactions that involved one member of the ethnic majority culture from those that had involved more than one. For both samples, we compared reactions to interactions involving no member of the ethnic majority group, one member, and two or more (no finer grained analyses were possible). The clear pattern from these analyses was that the comparison between no member and some members (1 or 2+) was the important distinction. In the Netherlands study, only one comparison between one and two or more ethnic majority Dutch present was significant at $p < .05$, and none of the similar comparisons for ethnic Poles was significant in the Poland study.

In the Netherlands study, the results were clear, consistent, and consistent with our expectations. On average, when an ethnic Dutch person (i.e., a member of the majority culture) was present, participants found interactions to be less positive across a variety of dimensions compared to interactions when an ethnic Dutch person was not present. This difference was significant for all but two of the ratings (feeling accepted and free to express opinions), although for these two measures, the differences approached conventional levels of significance ($ps = .06, .09$ respectively). Also, analyses comparing the size of the majority effect between ethnic Turkish and Moroccan participants found no significant differences.

As expected, in the Poland study, fewer differences were found in participants' reactions to intra- and interethnic interactions (see Table 3). Participants felt less liked when an ethnic Pole was present than when a Pole was not present, and they felt that it was easier to express their opinions when a Pole was not present than when a Pole was present. Curiously and somewhat inconsistently, they felt less angry (or more content) when a Pole was present than when a Pole was not present. To examine the possibility that we may have found weaker majority effects in the Poland study than in the Netherlands study because of the smaller number of interactions our Chechen participants had with native Poles, we deleted Chechens who had no interactions involving an ethnic Pole and re-analyzed reactions to interactions. The results of these analyses were not meaningfully different from the results reported above.[4,5]

Ethnic Identification and Quality of Interactions Involving a Majority Group Member

The next set of analyses examined whether differences in the quality of interactions in which a majority member was present or not (the majority effect) were moderated by individual differences in ethnic identification. Similar to the analyses of individual differences in amount of contact with members of the majority culture, measures of ethnocultural involvement and attachment were added at level 2, individually, using a forward stepping procedure when more than one predictor was significant. For example, relationships between the majority effect and attachment to the majority culture were examined with the following model:

$$\text{Level 1}: \quad y_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}(\text{majority effect}) + r_{ij}.$$
$$\text{Level 2}: \quad \beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(\text{majority ethnocultural attachment}) + u_{0j}$$
$$\beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11}(\text{majority ethnocultural attachment}) + u_{1j}$$

The critical coefficient in these analyses is the γ_{11} coefficient representing the moderating effect of a person level individual difference on the within-person majority effect coefficient. Relationships between mean reactions (the γ_{01} coefficient) and ethnocultural involvement and attachment were not of interest and are not reported.

When interpreting the coefficients from these analyses, it is critical to keep in mind that the dependent measure (the level 1 coefficient) is a difference score (i.e., the difference in quality of interactions that involved and did not involve a member of the majority culture), and that the coefficients in the tables represent how much this difference varied as a function of individual differences in measures of identity. Moreover, the ethnic identification measures were standardized (separately within each study) prior to analysis. This means that the tabled coefficients represent the changes in majority effect associated with a 1 *SD* increase in a measure of identity.

[4]In some Muslim communities, there are relatively strong norms about with whom women can interact. This possibility combined with the fact that the majority of participants in the Dutch sample were women left open the possibility that our results reflected the experiences of women more than they reflected the experiences of men and women. To examine this possibility, we analyzed sex differences in the majority effect in each study by including a contrast variable representing participant sex in the level 2 model. In the Dutch sample, there were significant sex differences in the size of the majority effect for enjoyment, intimacy, anxiety, and anger. In each case, women responded less positively or more negatively to interactions with majority group members than men did. In contrast, in the Polish study (which had a balanced sex ratio), there were no sex differences in the size of the majority effect.
[5]It was also possible that the relationships participants had with members of the majority culture were not as close as the relationships they had with ingroup members. Such a possibility would mean that the majority effect we studied might have overlapped with some type of relationship effect. To address this issue, we re-analyzed the data controlling for the absence/presence of a ''close'' same-ethnic person. In the Dutch sample, this was someone of Turkish or Moroccan origin, and in the Polish study it was a Chechen, and we included a contrast variable in the level-1 analyses indicating the absence/presence of such a person. In the Dutch sample, the coefficient for this contrast was significant in only three of the analyses, and for two of those, the majority effect remained significant (.05 and .09) when the contrast was included. The situation was somewhat different in the Polish sample. In the original analyses, the majority effect was significant for three measures. Controlling for the presence of a close same-ethnic person rendered nonsignificant the majority effect in the analyses of feeling liked and feeling free to express one's opinion, whereas it remained significant for anger.

For the ethnocultural attachment measures, the results of these analyses were fairly clear and consistent with our expectations across the two samples. As expected, there were numerous significant relationships between the majority effect and attachment to the majority culture. In the Netherlands study, this moderating relationship was significant (or near significant) for intimacy ($\gamma_{11} = .16$, $p < .05$), feeling liked ($\gamma_{11} = .12$, $p < .05$), feeling respected ($\gamma_{11} = .14$, $p < .05$), feeling accepted ($\gamma_{11} = .23$, $p < .01$), feeling free to express ideas ($\gamma_{11} = .13$, $p = .07$), being happy ($\gamma_{11} = .12$, $p = .09$), and feeling angry ($\gamma_{11} = .13$, $p = .10$). As indicated by the predicted values for people $+/-1$ SD on majority ethnocultural attachment presented in Table 4, for all measures (even those for which the moderating relationship was not significant) the moderating effect was such that ethnic Turkish and Moroccan participants who felt more strongly attached to the majority ethnic Dutch culture reacted more positively or less negatively to interactions involving an ethnic Dutch member than those who felt less strongly attached. For three of the measures that were more concerned with relative status (feeling respected, accepted, and free to express opinions) and for feeling happy, the majority effect for ethnic Turkish and Moroccan participants who felt more strongly attached to the majority culture was functionally 0.

The results for the Poland study were similar to these. The moderating relationship of attachment to the majority culture on the majority effect was significant for feeling liked ($\gamma_{11} = .16$, $p < .05$), feeling respected ($\gamma_{11} = .15$, $p < .05$), feeling free to express ideas ($\gamma_{11} = .18$, $p < .01$), and feeling bored/sluggish ($\gamma_{11} = -.22$, $p < .01$). As indicated by the predicted values presented in Table 4, for all measures (even those for which the moderating relationship was not significant) the moderating effect was such that Chechen participants who were more strongly attached to the majority ethnic Polish culture responded more positively or less negatively to interactions involving a Polish majority group member than those who felt less strongly attached.

Our expectation that there would be no relationships between people's attachment to their minority culture and their reactions to interactions involving a majority member was largely confirmed as well. Across both studies, we only found one significant relationship between attachment to the minority culture and the majority effect. In the Poland study, there was a negative relationship between minority ethnocultural attachment and the majority effect for feeling accepted ($\gamma_{11} = -.11$, $p < .05$).

The analyses of relationships between the measures of ethnocultural involvement and the majority effect were fully consistent with our expectations in the Dutch study. In the Dutch study, there were no significant or near significant moderating effects of either minority or majority ethnocultural involvement on the majority effect. In the Poland study, our expectations were partially confirmed. Consistent with our expectations, there were no significant moderating effects of minority ethnocultural involvement on the majority effect. Unexpectedly, however, majority ethnocultural involvement sometimes moderated the majority effect. Significant effects were found for intimacy ($\gamma_{11} = .26$, $p < .01$), influence ($\gamma_{11} = .24$, $p < .05$), feeling accepted ($\gamma_{11} = .15$, $p < .05$), feeling nervous ($\gamma_{11} = -.22$, $p = .06$), and feeling bored/sluggish ($\gamma_{11} = -.25$, $p < .01$). In each case, the moderating effect was such that Chechen participants who were more strongly involved with the majority Polish culture reacted more positively or less negatively to interactions involving a majority group member.

Table 4. Predicted *majority effects* for participants low and high in ethnocultural attachment to the majority culture

	The Netherlands		Poland	
	Low − 1 SD	High + 1 SD	Low − 1 SD	High + 1 SD
Enjoyable	−.32	−.12	−.01	.13
Intimate	−.56	−.24	−.10	.10
Control	−.21	−.15	−.17	−.11
Liked	−.39	−.15	−.36	−.06
Respected	−.34	.05	−.27	.03
Accepted	−.40	.06	−.14	.06
Free to express opinions	−.25	.01	−.36	.00
Happy	−.25	.00	−.15	.03
Anxious/nervous	.24	.20	.10	.02
Bored/sluggish	.20	−.16	.17	−.27
Angry	.30	.04	.07	−.31

DISCUSSION

The present studies examined the naturally occurring daily interactions of Muslim minority members in two European countries and compared interactions that included the presence of a majority group member to those that did not. Our primary goal was to extend previous research on interethnic relations by examining the roles played by different dimensions of ethnic identification in everyday interethnic encounters. We expected that ethnic minority members would have fewer interactions with majority group members than they would with members of their ethnic ingroup and that they would find those interactions to be less positive. We also expected, however, that the quantity and quality of contact with majority group members would vary as a function of different dimensions of ethnic identification, i.e., their ethnocultural involvement with and ethnocultural attachment to the ethnic minority and the host majority group.

Ethnic Identification and Amount of Contact with Members of the Majority Culture

The results confirmed our expectations regarding amount of contact with members of the majority culture. The ethnic minorities we studied had fewer interactions with members of the majority culture than they had with members of their ethnic ingroups. Although there were some differences between the samples in this regard (an issue addressed later), this result is consistent with laboratory and field studies in which people have been found to avoid interethnic contact (e.g., Plant & Devine, 2003) or to be more attracted to culturally or ethnically similar others (e.g., Lee & Gudykunst, 2001). We also found that the relationship between ethnic identification and amount of contact depends on the specific dimension of identification being explored. In both studies we found no relationships between minority and majority ethnocultural attachment and amount of contact with the majority culture, but we did find relationships between ethnocultural involvement and amount of contact with the majority culture.

Across the two settings, we found that individuals who were more strongly involved with their minority ethnic culture had fewer interactions that involved a member of the majority culture. Such a negative relationship is relatively easy to understand. Ethnic minority members who are involved more strongly with their minority cultures (e.g., I know the Turkish culture and traditions well) may be more certain about proper codes of conduct for interacting with ethnic ingroup members compared to ethnic minorities whose ingroup involvement is weaker. They may also perceive greater similarity between themselves and members of the ethnic ingroup. In turn, interactions with ethnic ingroup members may be more attractive and consequently more common (e.g., Hogg & Hardie, 1991). Moreover, individuals who are more involved in their ethnic culture may behave publicly in ways (e.g., style of dress, language) that members of the majority culture find unusual or off-putting. As a result, majority group members may avoid interactions with them (e.g., Osbeck, Moghaddam, & Perreault, 1997).

In line with our expectations, in the Poland study we also found that people who were more involved with the majority culture had more interactions with majority group members, whereas in the Netherlands study majority involvement and contact with the majority culture were unrelated. The positive relationship for Chechen participants between contact with the majority culture and involvement with the majority culture is also relatively easy to understand. Chechens who feel more comfortable with and knowledgeable about the Polish culture should be less anxious about contact with ethnic Poles compared to Chechens who are less comfortable and knowledgeable (e.g., Stephan & Stephan, 1985) and, in turn, should have more contacts. Moreover, Chechen participants with a relatively stronger majority ethnocultural involvement may have been more open to or have had more positive attitudes toward the Polish majority culture than those who were not as strongly involved (e.g., Searle & Ward, 1990), and consequently, they may have been more willing to interact with majority group members.

One explanation for the fact that there was no relationship between contact with the majority culture and involvement with the majority culture in the Netherlands study relies on the possibility that between-person variance in involvement with the majority culture was less meaningful in the Netherlands study. That is, participants had been raised and schooled in the Netherlands and were Dutch citizens, and as a result, they were familiar with Dutch culture. In contrast, in the Poland study, participants were recent arrivals and differences in their majority ethnocultural involvement were probably more meaningful than they were in the Netherlands study. This is reflected by the fact that the mean for majority ethnocultural involvement in the Netherlands study was 4.37, higher (though not statistically different from) the mean for minority ethnocultural involvement (4.01). Conversely, in the Poland study, the mean majority ethnocultural involvement score was

3.10, both meaningfully and statistically ($p < .05$) less than the mean score for minority ethnocultural involvement (4.21). This general argument is also consistent with research that shows that ethnocultural involvement is typically low as people enter a new environment and then increases until it reaches a plateau (e.g., Ward, Okura, Kennedy, & Kojima, 1998).

Ethnic Identification and Quality of Contact with Majority Group Members

The results also confirmed our expectations regarding the quality of ethnic minority members' interactions with members of the majority culture. Particularly in the Netherlands study, minority members tended to find interactions that included an ethnic Dutch person less positive than intraethnic interactions in terms of virtually all the reactions we measured. In the Poland study, Chechen participants felt less liked and less free to express their ideas during interactions that included the presence of a majority group member. At the same time, however, they also felt less angry during interactions with majority group members than during interactions that only involved ethnic ingroup members, a result we discuss below. We also found that the relationship between identification and quality of contact with majority group members varied across different dimensions of identification (e.g., attachment vs. involvement) and the groups with which people identify (e.g., majority vs. minority).

Our results support our expectation that minority members' attachment to the majority group is an important factor in determining the quality of their interactions with majority group members. A stronger attachment to the majority culture tended to be associated with smaller differences between inter- and intraethnic interactions. These results suggest that ethnic minorities who feel more attached to the majority culture may also feel more accepted by its members compared to those who feel less attached to the majority culture. As a result, they may be less uncertain about how they will be viewed or received by majority group members (e.g., Tropp et al., 2006), feel more close and similar to them (e.g., Spears, Doosje, & Ellemers, 1997), and anticipate being perceived less in terms of their group membership (e.g., Pinel, 1999). Conversely, people who feel less attached to the majority culture may be more anxious about being rejected or being perceived stereotypically, which may negatively affect their reactions to interactions with majority group members (e.g., Shelton et al., 2005).

In contrast, strength of attachment to the minority culture did not moderate people's reactions to interactions in which a majority group member was present. Across both studies there was only one significant relationship between attachment with the minority culture and the size of the *majority effect*. These results support Allport's (1954) suggestion that a stronger attachment to the ingroup does not necessarily lead to more negativity toward outgroups. These findings are noteworthy, given that it has often been argued (e.g., Brewer, 1999; Duckitt et al., 2005) that ingroup identification should be associated with greater outgroup negativity when intergroup relations are more conflictual, as was certainly the case in the Netherlands. In combination with the fact that we found positive relationships between attachment to the majority culture and quality of interethnic contact, our results suggest that for ethnic minorities, the quality of interactions with members of the majority culture are determined by how much they feel part of the majority culture, not by how much they feel part of their ethnic ingroup.

Relationships between *ethnocultural involvement* and reactions to interactions involving a majority member differed between the two studies. As expected, in the Netherlands study, there were no relationships between the *majority effect* and neither measure of *ethnocultural involvement*. In the Poland study, however, for six reactions, stronger involvement with the majority culture was associated with a smaller *majority effect*. People who were more strongly involved with the host majority group reacted more positively or less negatively to interactions involving a majority group member. This may again reflect the fact that Chechen participants were recent arrivals and that differences in majority ethnocultural involvement were more meaningful in the Poland study than in the Netherlands study.

Contextual Differences in Quantity and Quality of Contact with Majority Group Members

Although many of the results across the samples were meaningfully similar, as expected, there were also a few differences in the quantity and quality of people's interactions that deserve further mention. Most important perhaps, Chechen participants had fewer interactions with majority group members than the ethnic Turkish and Moroccan participants in the Dutch study, and they also responded more positively (or less negatively) to interactions involving a majority group

member. A possible explanation for these differences is that participants in the Poland study were refugees who probably had mixed feelings about staying in Poland. As a result, they may have been less motivated to interact with Polish majority group members and may have been less concerned about how they would be received by them. Moreover, their living environment (in and around refugee camps) may have limited their opportunities for engaging with majority group members. In contrast, participants in the Netherlands study were intermediate or second-generation Turks and Moroccans, who despite their relative familiarity with Dutch society, are not well-accepted and are increasingly being negatively evaluated by ethnic Dutch (Verkuyten & Kinket, 2000; Verkuyten & Zaremba, 2005). Such negative evaluations might have led them to expect more strongly that they were being viewed and evaluated in terms of their minority identity (e.g., Frey & Tropp, 2006) which, in turn, may have led them to avoid contact with majority group members or react more negatively to those interactions (e.g., Shelton et al., 2005).

In the Poland study, reactions to interactions with majority group members were also not uniformly negative. Chechen participants felt less liked and felt less free to express their opinions during interactions in which a native Pole was present, but they also felt less angry. This lends support to the idea that people can experience conflicting emotions during interethnic encounters (e.g., Mackie & Smith, 2002). In this regard, Cottrell and Neuberg (2005) argue that differences in intergroup emotions may emerge from different appraisals, which depend on the threat a specific outgroup poses to the ingroup. For example, people may feel angry when they believe that an outgroup poses a competitive threat, e.g., by obstructing valuable goals or taking away valuable resources. In the case of the Chechen refugees in our study, it is possible that ethnic ingroup members posed more of a threat than ethnic outgroup members, because refugees might be worried that they are competing with other refugees for residence permits. Although firm conclusions cannot be drawn regarding this possibility, these results highlight the importance of distinguishing different reactions across different contexts when studying interethnic contact.

Dual Identity

As mentioned previously, research has shown that people may identify with both their heritage group and the majority culture, without such identities interfering with each other. Some have argued that such a dual identity may be beneficial because it may reduce negative psychological effects of interethnic contact (e.g., Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993). Others have argued that it may also make people more tolerant toward outgroups in general (e.g., Brewer, 1999), which in turn, may lead to more rewarding interethnic interactions.

To examine this possibility, we conducted a series of analyses (not reported in the result section) in which we examined whether the interaction between minority and majority attachment and the interaction between minority and majority involvement moderated the *majority effect*. (In terms of the present data, dual identity can be defined as the interaction of majority and minority identification—i.e., high on both sources). These results did not suggest that a strong identification with both the heritage culture and the majority culture leads to more positive interactions with majority group members. In the Netherlands sample, the *majority effect* did not vary as function of the interaction of minority and majority identification for either involvement or attachment. In the Polish sample, although the interaction between minority and majority attachment was significant in some (three) analyses, the pattern of results did not suggest that a dual identity had beneficial effects. A possible explanation for this finding is that people may not always be aware of their different identities, or that these identities may not always be salient during interethnic contact. How people construct their identities is also important because this may affect the extent to which people see others as ingroup or outgroup members. For example, did Dutch participants think of themselves as Turkish–Dutch as opposed to Turkish in general and Dutch in general? According to Brewer (1999), the positive effects of a dual identity will be realized only if ingroups are defined inclusively rather than exclusively; however, more studies are needed to understand such issues.

Causality

When conceptualizing relationships between interaction and ethnic identification, we have implicitly assumed that individual differences in identification were causes of individual differences in interaction. Such an assumption fits well with the multilevel analyses we used—often, higher order measures are assumed to be causes of lower order measures—and it is consistent with the assumption of much of the research on personality and other individual differences in which

dispositions are often assumed to be causes of behaviors. Moreover, such an assumption is consistent with research on causal relationships between social interaction and individual differences such as social skills (Nezlek, 2001b) and well-being (Nezlek & Reis, 1999).

Nevertheless, for the constructs we studied, the opposite causal sequence, from interaction to involvement and attachment, also needs to be considered. For example, it is entirely possible that ethnic minorities develop a sense of attachment (including acceptance) *following* positive interactions with members of the majority culture. Similarly, compared to ethnic minorities who interact more with members of the majority culture, ethnic minorities who interact less with majority group members may be less knowledgeable about and less appreciative of the majority culture and therefore remain more involved with their ethnic ingroup (e.g., Eller & Abrams, 2004; Ward & Kennedy, 1993). It is also possible that causal relationships among these constructs are bi-directional—experiences in interaction lead to changes in attachment and involvement and *vice versa* (e.g., Berry, 1990; Pettigrew, 1997). Unfortunately, our data did not allow us to test such possibilities, and so at present, we can offer no definitive answers to such questions.

Limitations and Strengths

Despite its strengths, the study suffers from several limitations. First and perhaps most important, the samples were small, and they were not randomly drawn. Although we have no reason to suspect that our participants differed from other members of their ethnic ingroups in ways that would have affected our results, it is possible that they did. Moreover, larger samples would have provided more power to detect relationships. Second, we examined only ethnic minorities. The results of a study of interethnic interaction with members of ethnic majorities as participants might be different from the results we found for ethnic minorities. Third, we only examined two types of ethnic identification, whereas other dimensions of ethnic identification may also be related to the quantity and quality of ethnic minority members' interactions with majority group members. For example, Duckitt et al. (2005) found that ethnocultural evaluation (ingroup attitudes) was systematically related to outgroup attitudes. Future research should incorporate a broader range of identification dimensions. Finally, our study did not examine the underlying processes we assumed were responsible for the relationships we found. Although understanding such processes is clearly important, our primary concern when conducting this study was to examine our hypothesized relationships. Moreover, given the lack of studies of this type (intensive repeated measures) with samples similar to the samples in our study (non-student ethnic minorities) we felt that we needed to start simply, if only because at the outset, we were not certain if the study could be done at all.

Nevertheless, the present results provide a necessary starting point for more complicated studies of process. To our knowledge, this study is the first to measure naturally occurring day-to-day interactions between ethnic minorities and ethnic majority members in a non-student population. Whatever limitations might exist, at the least, we believe we have demonstrated that such studies can provide useful insights into interethnic relations. More specifically, we believe we have demonstrated that the relationships between ethnic identification and contact with the majority group are not uniformly negative or positive, but depend on the specific dimension and source of identification and the different aspects of contact being explored.

In particular, our data show that it is important to distinguish identification with the ethnic ingroup from identification with the ethnic outgroup and to consider identification as a multidimensional construct. So far, very little social psychological research has explored the unique consequences of these dimensions. Moreover, the similarities and dissimilarities between the results of our two studies suggest that although some relationships may be similar for different in- and outgroup combinations, other relationships may vary as a function of the context in which interethnic contact is defined and occurs. Such a possibility suggests that future research on identification and interethnic relations will need to consider more fully the specific sociocultural context within which interethnic contact occurs.

REFERENCES

Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Barrett, L. F., & Russell, J. A. (1998). Independence and bipolarity in the structure of current affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 967–984.

Berry, J. W. (1979). Social and cultural change. In H. C. Triandis, & R. Brislin (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Social psychology* (Vol. 5, pp. 211–279). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Berry, J. W. (1984). Cultural relations in plural societies: Alternatives to segregation and their sociopsychological implications. In N. Miller, & M. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 11–29). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Berry, J. W. (1990). Psychology of acculturation. In J. Berman (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation: Cross-cultural perspectives. Current theory and research in motivation* (Vol. 37, pp. 201–234). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *46*, 5–68.

Berry, J. W. (1999). Intercultural relations in plural societies. *Canadian Psychology*, *40*, 12–21.

Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, *55*, 429–444.

Brown, R. (2000). Social identity theory: Past achievements, current problems and future challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *30*, 745–778.

Brown, R., & Hewstone, M. (2005). An integrative theory of intergroup contact. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 37, pp. 256–343). Amsterdam: Elsevier Academic Press.

Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.

Cottrell, C. A., & Neuberg, S. L. (2005). Different emotional reactions to different groups: A sociofunctional threat-based approach to ''prejudice''. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*, 770–789.

Doosje, B., Ellemers, N., & Spears, R. (1995). Perceived intragroup variability as a function of group status and identification. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *31*, 410–436.

Duckitt, J., Callaghan, J., & Wagner, C. (2005). Group identification and outgroup attitudes in four South-African ethnic groups: A multidimensional approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *31*, 633–646.

Ellemers, N., Van Rijswijk, W., Roefs, M., & Simons, C. (1997). Bias in intergroup perceptions: Balancing group identity with social reality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*, 186–198.

Eller, A., & Abrams, S. (2004). Come together: Longitudinal comparisons of Pettigrew's reformulated intergroup contact model and the common intergroup identity model in Anglo-French and Mexican-American contexts. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *34*, 229–256.

Flannery, W. P., Reise, S. P., & Yu, J. (2001). An empirical comparison of acculturation models. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*, 1035–1045.

Frey, F. E., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). Being seen as individuals versus as group members: Extending research on metaperception to intergroup contexts. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *10*, 265–280.

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Ghorpade, J., Lackritz, J., & Singh, G. (2004). Psychological acculturation of ethnic minorities into White Anglo American culture: Consequences and predictors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *34*, 1208–1228.

Greenland, K., & Brown, R. (1999). Categorization and intergroup anxiety in contact between British and Japanese internationals. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *29*, 503–521.

Groenvynck, H., Beirens, K., Arends-Tóth, J., & Fontaine, J. R. (2006). The factorial validity of a behavioral acculturation questionnaire: Evidence for the bi-dimensional model. *Paper presented at the 18th biennial meeting of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Spetses, Greece.

Hogg, M. A., & Hardie, E. A. (1991). Social attraction, personal attraction and self-categorization: A field study. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*, 175–180.

Iglicka, K., Podolski, A., & Uklanski, J. (2004). *Uchodzcy z Czeczenii w Polsce. Przystanek czy nowy raj utracony?* (Chechen Refugees in Poland. The Stop or the New Lost Paradise?). Warsaw: Center for International Relations. Retrieved on June 4, 2007, from www.csm.org.pl

Jackson, J., & Smith, E. (1999). Conceptualizing social identity: A new framework and evidence for the impact of different dimensions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *25*, 120–135.

LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H. L. K., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, *114*, 395–412.

Lee, M. C., & Gudykunst, W. B. (2001). Attraction in initial interethnic interactions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *25*, 373–387.

Leong, C. H., & Ward, C. (2000). Identity conflict in sojourners. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24, 763–776.

Mackie, D. M., & Smith, E. R. (2002). Moving from positive and negative evaluations to differentiated reactions to social groups. In D. M. Mackie, & E. R. Smith (Eds.), *From prejudice to intergroup emotions: Differentiated reactions to social groups* (pp. 1–12). New York: Psychology Press.

McLaren, L. (2003). Anti-immigrant prejudice in Europe: Contact, threat perception, and preference for the exclusion of migrants. *Social Forces*, 81, 909–936.

Mendoza-Denton, R., Downey, G., Purdie, V., Davis, A., & Pietrzak, J. (2002). Sensitivity to status-rejection: Implications for African American students' college experience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 896–918.

Mummendey, A., Klink, A., Mielke, R., Wenzel, M., & Blanz, M. (1999). Socio-structural characteristics of intergroup relations and identity management strategies: Results from a field study in East Germany. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 259–285.

Nezlek, J. B. (2000). The motivational and cognitive dynamics of day-to-day social life. In J. P. Forgas, K. D. Williams, & L. Wheeler (Eds.), *The social mind: Cognitive and motivational aspects of interpersonal behavior* (pp. 92–111). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nezlek, J. B. (2001a). Multilevel random coefficient analyses of event and interval contingent data in social and personality psychology research. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 771–785.

Nezlek, J. B. (2001b). Causal relationships between perceived social skills and day-to-day social interaction: Extending the sociometer hypothesis. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 18, 386–404.

Nezlek, J. B. (2003). Using multilevel random coefficient modeling to analyze social interaction diary data. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 20, 437–469.

Nezlek, J. B., & Reis, H. T. (June, 1999). Causal relationships between quality and quantity of social interaction and psychological well being. *Paper presented at the International Network on Personal Relationships Conference*, Louisville, KY.

Operario, D., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). Ethnic identity moderates perceptions of prejudice: Judgments of personal versus group discrimination and evaluations of subtle versus blatant bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 550–561.

Osbeck, L. M., Moghaddam, F. M., & Perreault, S. (1997). Similarity and attraction among majority and minority groups in a multicultural context. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 21, 113–123.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 173–185.

Pettigrew, T. F., Jackson, J., Brika, J., Lemaine, G., Meertens, R., Wagner, U., et al. (1998). Outgroup prejudice in Western Europe. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 8, 241–273.

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

Phinney, J. S., Ferguson, D., & Tate, J. (1997). Intergroup attitudes among ethnic minority adolescents: A causal model. *Child Development*, 68, 955–969.

Pinel, E. (1999). Stigma consciousness: The psychological legacy of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 114–128.

Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (2003). The antecedents and implications of interracial anxiety. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 790–801.

Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Raudenbush, S. W., Bryk, A. S., Cheong, Y. F., & Congdon, R. (2004). *HLM 6: Hierarchical linear and nonlinear modeling*. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International.

Ray, J., & Lovejoy, F. (1986). The generality of racial prejudice. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 126, 563–564.

Roccas, S., & Schwartz, S. H. (1993). Effects of intergroup similarity on intergroup relations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 23, 581–595.

Ryder, A. G., Alden, L. E., & Paulhus, D. L. (2000). Is acculturation unidimensional or bidimensional? A head-to-head comparison in the prediction of personality, self-identity, and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 59–65.

Searle, W., & Ward, C. (1990). The prediction of psychological and sociocultural adjustment during cross-cultural transitions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 14, 449–464.

Shelton, J. N., Richeson, J. A., & Salvatore, J. (2005). Expecting to be the target of prejudice: Implications for interethnic interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 1189–1202.

Spears, R., Doosje, B., & Ellemers, N. (1997). Self-stereotyping in the face of threats to the group status and distinctiveness. The role of group identification. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 538–553.

Spencer-Rodgers, J., & McGovern, T. (2002). Attitudes toward the culturally different: The role of intercultural communication barriers, affective responses, consensual stereotypes, and perceived threat. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 26, 609–631.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41, 157–175.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 23–45). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., & Bachman, G. (1999). Prejudice toward immigrants. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29, 2221–2237.

Stevens, G. W. J. M., Pels, T. V. M., Vollebergh, W. A. M., & Crijnen, A. A. A. (2004). Patterns of psychological acculturation in adult and adolescent Moroccan immigrants living in the Netherlands. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35, 689–704.

Sumner, W. (1906). *Folkways*. New York: Ginn.

Tafjel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel, & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.

Towles-Schwen, T., & Fazio, R. H. (2003). Choosing social situations: The relation between automatically activated racial attitudes and anticipated comfort interacting with African Americans. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *29*, 170–182.

Tropp, L. R. (2007). Perceived discrimination and interracial contact: Predicting interracial closeness among Black and White Americans. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *70*, 70–81.

Tropp, L. R., Erkut, S., Coll, C. G., Alarcón, O., & Garcia, H. A. V. (1999). Psychological acculturation: Development of a new measure for Puerto Ricans on the U.S. mainland. *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, *59*, 351–367.

Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005). Relationships between intergroup contact and prejudice among minority and majority status groups. *Psychological Science*, *16*, 951–957.

Tropp, L. R., Stout, A. M., Boatswain, C., Wright, S. C., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2006). Trust and acceptance in response to references to group membership: Minority and majority perspectives on cross-group interactions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *36*, 769–794.

Turner, J. C. (1999). Some current issues in research on social identity and self-categorization theories. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity: Context, commitment, content* (pp. 6–34). Oxford: Blackwell.

Van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Leung, K. (1997). *Methods and data analysis for cross-cultural research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Van Oudenhoven, J. P., Prins, K. S., & Buunk, B. P. (1998). Attitudes of minority and majority members towards adaptation of immigrants. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *28*, 995–1013.

Verkuyten, M., & Kinket, B. (2000). Social distances in a multi ethnic society: The ethnic hierarchy among Dutch preadolescents. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *63*, 75–85.

Verkuyten, M., & Reijerse, A. (2008). Intergroup structure and identity management strategies among ethnic minority and majority groups: The interactive effects of perceived stability, legitimacy, and permeability. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *38*, 106–127.

Verkuyten, M., & Zaremba, K. (2005). Interethnic relations in a changing political context. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *68*, 375–386.

Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1993). Where's the ''culture'' in cross-cultural transition? Comparative studies of sojourner adjustment. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *24*, 221–229.

Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1999). The measurement of sociocultural adaptation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *23*, 659–677.

Ward, C., Okura, Y., Kennedy, A., & Kojima, T. (1998). The U-curve on trial: A longitudinal study of psychological and sociocultural adjustment during cross-cultural transition. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *22*, 277–291.

Wheeler, L., & Nezlek, J. (1977). Sex differences in social participation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*, 742–754.

APPENDIX

Items used to measure Ethnocultural Identification
   Each question was asked in terms of participants' minority culture and in terms of the majority culture.

Ethnocultural Involvement

I understand other people well when they speak ''minority/majority language.''
I know the ''minority/majority'' culture and traditions well.
I keep up with the ''minority/majority'' news.
I do things in a ''minority/majority'' fashion.
I want to raise my children in a ''minority/majority'' way.

Ethnocultural Attachment

''Minority/majority'' people understand me.
I understand ''minority/majority'' persons.
I feel comfortable with ''minority/majority'' people.
I have a lot in common with ''minority/majority'' people.
I feel proud to be a part of the ''minority/majority'' culture.
I share most of my beliefs and values with ''minority/majority'' people.