



Understanding the Complexity of Everyday Interethnic Contact: Recommendations for Researchers

John B. Nezlek^{1*} and Juliette Schaafsma²

¹ College of William & Mary

² Tilburg University

Abstract

Interethnic contact has long been a focus of social psychological research, and in this article, we provide some recommendations about how to study interethnic social contact. Our primary recommendation is that researchers should study interethnic contact more *in vivo* to complement single assessment surveys and laboratory research, sometimes of arbitrarily defined groups, with more naturalistic research and with research involving groups that exist in the real world. This recommendation is based in part on the limitations of surveys and laboratory methods and in part on the advantages provided by what are referred to as *intensive repeated measures designs*, methods that have proven to be useful in studying other topics. We discuss these limitations and the relative advantages of different types of intensive repeated measures methods for the study of interethnic contact and provide some recommendations for their use. Finally, regardless of how they study interethnic contact, researchers need to expand the focus of their questions, increase the sensitivity of the data they collect, and increase the ethnic diversity of the samples they study.

Intergroup relations, including social contact between members of different ethnic groups, have been an important focus of a considerable amount of social science research. Over the last decades, social psychologists have sought to identify how intergroup or interethnic contact may lead to mutual understanding and respect and how it may reduce prejudice. Nowadays, more than 50 years after Gordon Allport first developed the contact hypothesis in his seminal work *The Nature of Prejudice*; there is considerable insight into the conditions under which interethnic contact may promote positive intergroup outcomes (e.g., Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

Nevertheless, although existing research on intergroup or interethnic contact has yielded valuable insights, we have a limited understanding of interethnic contact as it unfolds in everyday life. As noted by Dovidio and Esses (2001), much of the social psychological research on interethnic relations has concerned imagined contact within laboratory settings (with students), which necessarily limits or controls important aspects of interethnic interaction such as the context within which it occurs. Studies that have been conducted outside the laboratory (often with nonstudents) have tended to use single assessment measures such as surveys that ask people to retrospect over lengthy (or undefined) periods of time. There is a growing realization that such methods can provide inaccurate descriptions of people's everyday experiences (e.g., Reis & Gable, 2000).

To date, there has been relatively little research on naturally occurring interethnic contact, particularly among nonstudents, and we believe that such research will add to our understanding of interethnic contact above and beyond the understanding provided by laboratory and survey research. In this article, we argue that research on interethnic

contact needs to be complemented by what are sometimes referred to as ‘intensive repeated measures designs,’ ‘experience sampling methods,’ or sometimes simply, diary methods. We advocate using such methods to study interethnic contact based in part on the success the use of such methods has had in research on personality theory (e.g., Cervone, 2005) and on personal relationships (e.g., Gable & Reis, 1999). Participants in such studies provide data on a frequent basis, sometimes as often as a few times a day, sometimes as infrequently as a few times a week. Moreover, they do so in ways that do not interfere with their daily lives while capturing both the changing and the unchanging aspects of their lives. We explain the rationale behind these methods, and we describe the advantages they have over those that have been traditionally used in research on interethnic contact. Finally, we argue that researchers need to examine interethnic interaction in more ethnically diverse populations (particularly nonstudents) than has been the case.

Laboratory- and Survey-based Studies of Interethnic Contact

Laboratory studies of interethnic contact

The laboratory study has been and will remain a popular way to examine interethnic contact in part because the ability to control various characteristics of interethnic and intergroup contact provides a basis for drawing causal inferences between manipulated (independent) variables and dependent variables. In such studies, participants might interact with a confederate who is a member of an ethnic outgroup (e.g., Dovidio, Kawakami, & Gaertner, 2002), they might describe how they would feel if they were interacting with an outgroup member (e.g., Stathi & Crisp, 2008), or they might be led to believe that they will be interacting with an outgroup member (e.g., Britt, Bonieci, Vescio, Biernat, & Brown, 1996; Plant & Devine, 2003). Moreover, in- and outgroups are often defined arbitrarily, within the confines of the experiment itself, a procedure that is frequently called the *minimal group technique* (Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971). In such studies, the creation of in- and outgroups within the experimental setting is meant to represent in- versus outgroup distinctions that exist outside the laboratory such as membership based on ethnic background or heritage.

Nevertheless, the control provided by laboratory studies comes with costs, and although laboratory studies may tell us something about the psychological processes underlying interethnic contact, they may tell us little about the nature of actual, real-life, interethnic contact. For example, using laboratory methods, it is virtually impossible to study how often and under what circumstances interethnic contact occurs. In laboratory studies, the contacts people have are explicitly controlled, making it impossible to study individual differences in the amount and distribution of interethnic contact. Moreover, in some cases, participants may be interacting with members of groups with whom they have never interacted outside of the laboratory or with whom they have interacted so infrequently that they functionally have no contact. In such cases, it may be difficult to separate the influence the novelty of a specific type of interethnic contact has from the influence of interethnicity *per se*. Individual differences in interethnic experience can be taken into account by measuring how much interethnic contact a person has had, but the point remains that studying novel social contacts has inherent limitations. Another disadvantage is that by design, people have more control over their real-world social contacts than they have over social contacts in the laboratory, and so interactions in the laboratory are artificially constrained. Participants may be asked to do things or discuss topics that they would never do or discuss with ethnic outgroup members. Finally, the relationships

and social identities that are created in a laboratory may be pale imitations of those that emerge in real life. The brief acquaintance or temporary group identification that are some of the hallmark characteristics of laboratory studies are qualitatively different than the enduring relationships people have in their daily lives and the psychological attachments they feel toward groups of which they have been members for many years, perhaps since birth. Moreover, the salience of ethnicity and identity in a laboratory setting may be very different than the salience of ethnicity *in vivo*, calling into question the generalizability of results from the laboratory (e.g., Brewer & Gaertner, 2004). Such discrepancies were partially responsible for the increase in the use of diary style methods in the study of personal relationships such as friendship and romantic relationships. The dynamics underlying *in vivo* personal relationships may be very different from those underlying the types of temporary and transient personal relationships that are created in most laboratory studies.

Survey-based studies of interethnic contact

A second popular way to study interethnic contact is the survey. Although surveys have yielded valuable results, many survey-based studies of interethnic contact have relied on aggregate measures that typically do not (and perhaps cannot) capture the complexity of interethnic contact. For example, Pettigrew (1997) measured intergroup contact by asking people about the type of contact they had with 'people with another race' or 'people with another culture'. Such measures do not distinguish different outgroups and do not differentiate the types of contacts people have (e.g., work versus personal socializing).

In any study, the number of questions that can be asked is limited, and we do not think that the survey-based studies of interethnic contact conducted to date were poorly designed. Nevertheless, the measures of interethnic contact that are typically collected in such studies tend to ignore potentially valuable information about interethnic contact – characteristics that might serve as confounding variables. For example, assume a survey finds a negative relationship between rejection sensitivity (RS) and satisfaction with interethnic contact. We also know that interactions with friends are more satisfying than interactions with nonfriends. If RS is also related to whether people have interethnic friends, then the relationship between RS and satisfaction may be confounded by individual differences in the types of interethnic contact people have.

If high RS (compared to low RS) is associated with both less overall satisfaction with interethnic contact and a smaller percent of interethnic interactions that include friends, the source of the zero-order negative relationship between RS and satisfaction is not clear. It could be that high RS people behave in ways that reduce satisfaction with interethnic interaction, or it could be that high RS people have fewer interethnic interactions that include friends, and their lower satisfaction is because of the lower satisfaction people experience when interacting with nonfriends versus friends. Such a qualification would not invalidate *per se* the zero-order relationship between RS and satisfaction but it would pose or suggest an alternative or more nuanced explanation for that relationship.

Nevertheless, even if the data needed to take into account possible threats to inference were collected in a survey, broadly focused surveys have important limitations in terms of the accuracy of the data they collect. Most surveys ask respondents to retrospect over lengthy or unspecified periods of time (e.g., Eller & Abrams, 2004; Islam & Hewstone, 1993). In either case, as discussed by Reis and Gable (2000), broad, retrospective surveys are prone to various biases. For example, recent experiences are generally recalled better than temporally distant ones and may have a greater influence on retrospective reports

than more distant experiences have. Moreover, distinctive, important, or personally relevant experiences will influence retrospective reports more than more common or mundane experiences will. In addition, individuals tend to reconstruct their recollections in terms of their general beliefs, often over-riding reactions they would have provided at the time they experienced something. Finally, recollections of experiences tend to reflect an individual's present or immediate state of mind (e.g., mood or attitude), in some cases more than they reflect the experience itself.

In terms of studying interethnic contact, these biases can have either non-systematic or systematic effects. For example, the mood an individual is experiencing when he or she answers a survey is probably randomly distributed in relation to the questions on the survey. In contrast, individuals' global beliefs about members of an ethnic group probably meaningfully influence their reconstruction of the contacts they have had with members of that group. Regardless of whether the biases are systematic, they undermine the accuracy of the descriptions of interethnic contact provided by retrospective surveys.

Using broadly focused retrospective surveys may also make it difficult to differentiate reactions to interethnic contact and to distinguish quality and quantity of interethnic contact. Although surveys may differentiate reactions to interethnic contact on the surface, the retrospective nature of surveys tends to increase the influence on responses of global response sets. Furthermore, as discussed by Nezlek (2000), how socially active people are (quantity) is conceptually distinct from how they react to the contacts they have (quality), and he cited a series of studies supporting this distinction. Moreover, quality and quantity of interethnic contact have not always been clearly distinguished. For example, researchers have used number of outgroup friends as a measure of quality of contact (e.g., Eller & Abrams, 2003, 2004; Pettigrew, 1998). Finally, when people retrospect over an extended period of time, it is difficult for them to provide accurate descriptions of the contact they have, and it is likely that their reactions to this contact influence their reports of the amount of contact they had.

Intensive Repeated Measures Designs in the Study of Interethnic Contact

Types of designs

To overcome some of the limitations of laboratory- and survey-based studies of interethnic contact, we advocate the use of a class of methods that have come to be known as intensive repeated measure designs (IRMD). As suggested by Wheeler and Reis (1991), the types of methods with which we are concerned here can be classified as a function of the protocol or schedule that is used to organize or structure data collection. Wheeler and Reis described one such method as *event-contingent*. In such studies, participants provide data every time a certain type of event occurs. The most common type of event-contingent study in personality and social psychology is the social interaction diary study. Much of this research has used a variant of what is typically called the Rochester Interaction Record (RIR), introduced by Wheeler and Nezlek (1977). Participants describe the social interactions they have each day using a fixed format, and diaries are updated as close to the occurrence of the interaction as is practical. In RIR studies, social interactions have typically been 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'. Wheeler and Reis described another method as *interval-contingent*. In interval-contingent studies, data are collected after the passage of a specific amount of time, every day, every 4 hours, and so forth. The other type of

schedule is referred to as *signal-contingent*. In signal-contingent studies, participants provide data when they are signaled to do so, typically on a random basis. Readers may be familiar with the pioneering research by Csikszentmihalyi in what have become known as 'beeper studies' because people are beeped when they are supposed to provide data (e.g., Csikszentmihalyi & Larson, 1992).

General advantages of IRMD for the study of interethnic contact

One of the most important advantages all three IRMD methods provide over survey methods is that they are less prone to various types of recall biases, in part because decreasing the time between the occurrence of an event or a state of mind and the description of that event or state reduces the influence of the types of factors Reis and Gable (2000) discussed that we mentioned previously. Immediate reports also require less cognitive energy (concentration, focus, recall, etc.) than reports of more temporally distant entities, and because the target of a description is fresher in one's mind, more detailed and more accurate descriptions can be obtained. All three methods also provide advantages over laboratory methods in that interethnic contact is studied as it occurs in people's lives. With these methods, there are few concerns about the ecological validity of the data that are collected. The identities people have and encounter are real, and the relationships they have with others are not artificially created and temporary by design. Moreover, IRMD studies can provide accurate estimates of how much and what type of interethnic contact people have (and do not have). More detailed discussions of the advantages of IRMD can be found in Wheeler and Reis (1991), Reis and Gable (2000), and Bolger, Davis, and Rafaeli (2003).

In terms of studying interethnic contact *per se*, we think an event-contingent protocol (in which data collection is triggered by the occurrence of some type of social contact) provides the most comprehensive data concerning interethnic contact *per se*. We also think that for some questions, interval-contingent methods can be very valuable. In our opinion, signal-contingent (e.g., beeper) studies, which are not well suited for the study of low-frequency or unusual events or states of mind, may not be a good method to study interethnic contact. If interethnic contact is not that common for a sample of participants, it will be difficult to 'catch them' when they are experiencing (or have just experienced) some type of interethnic contact. Moreover, depending upon the data collection protocol, if participants are signaled frequently, it may be difficult to collect more than a minimal amount of data at each time point. In the following sections, we describe some of the advantages of using event-contingent and interval-contingent methods for the study of interethnic contact.

Event-contingent studies

An important advantage of an event-contingent protocol is that such methods can provide detailed descriptions about the quantity and quality of daily interethnic interactions in their natural, spontaneous context. Our model for such a method is the RIR, and in RIR studies, two types of data are typically collected about each interaction: various types of reactions (quality – described below) and quantitative/structural characteristics. These quantitative characteristics could include details about those present (e.g., ethnic background, gender, social relationship) and other characteristics of the interaction such as location, purpose, language spoken, and so forth. Detailed descriptions of the RIR method are presented in Wheeler and Nezlek (1977) and Reis and Wheeler (1991), and

an example of using the RIR to study interethnic contact can be found in Schaafsma, Nezlek, Krejtz, and Safron (forthcoming).

One advantage such quantitative data provide is the ability to compare different types of interactions. For example, people's reactions to interethnic interaction may vary as a function of factors such as the specific ethnic outgroup involved. Ethnic groups that are lower in the social or ethnic hierarchy than others may evoke more negative reactions (e.g., Verkuyten & Kinket, 2000). Reactions may also vary depending upon the relationships between the people present (e.g., friend versus colleague) and the context in which the interaction occurs (e.g., number of in- and outgroup members present, competitive versus cooperative) (e.g., Britt et al., 1996). Researchers should collect data that anticipate such possibilities, and such data can be collected quite easily using a social interaction diary.

Another advantage of social interaction diaries is the ability to distinguish clearly different reactions to interactions. For example, Devos, Silver, Mackie, and Smith (2002) suggest that reactions to interethnic interaction may not be uniform. Although surveys may ask questions about different reactions to interethnic contact, the retrospective nature of surveys tends to increase the influence on responses of a global 'good-bad' dimension, reducing the distinctiveness of individual ratings. For example, using a retrospective survey, Islam and Hewstone (1993) measured five aspects of interethnic interaction (equality, voluntary, intimate, pleasant, and cooperative) and found that these ratings formed a reliable single scale. Yet social interaction diary studies have found that instrumental (e.g., status) and socio-emotional aspects (e.g., satisfaction) of interaction represent different dimensions (e.g., Nezlek & Smith, 2005). In terms of interethnic contact *per se*, Nezlek, Schaafsma, Krejtz, and Safron (2009) found that relationships between self-construal and reactions to interethnic interactions varied as a function of whether the reactions concerned interpersonal (e.g., feeling liked) or intrapersonal (e.g., satisfaction) states. Keeping in mind that no single rule covers all cases, we recommend that researchers distinguish the following classes of reactions to interethnic contact: socio-emotional, e.g., satisfaction and intimacy; instrumental, e.g., influence and status; interpersonal, e.g., feeling accepted; and affective, including positive versus negative emotions. These classes represent fuzzy sets, but existing research suggests they are worth distinguishing, and researchers can add items or sets of items as they see fit.

Social interaction diary data also provide a clear basis for distinguishing quality and quantity of interethnic contact. For example, Schaafsma et al. (forthcoming) found that ethnic minority members' involvement with their heritage culture was negatively related to the quantity of contact they had with majority group members but was not related to the quality of interethnic contacts. In contrast, their emotional attachment to the majority culture was positively related to the quality of interethnic interactions but was not related to the quantity of interethnic interactions. The importance of distinguishing quality and quantity of interethnic contact was also demonstrated by McLaughlinMcLaughlin-Volpe, Aron, Wright, and Reis (1999). Using a social interaction diary, they found that prejudice was not related to quantity of contact with ethnic outgroup members but was (strongly and negatively) related to the quality of interactions with outgroup members.

Within-person relationships can also be examined using social interaction diaries. For example, Schaafsma et al. (forthcoming) examined relationships between identification and reactions to interethnic interaction by estimating the difference between reactions to inter- and intraethnic interaction – a within-person comparison. Conceptually, many researchers are interested in differences in how people react to members of their own ethnic groups and members of other groups, and the difference score Schaafsma et al. examined provided ecologically valid measures of such differences.

Interval-contingent studies

Although we think event-contingent methods are the best way to study interethnic contact *per se*, interval-contingent methods may be better suited to address some questions, particularly concerning phenomena that do not occur regularly. Event-contingent methods presume a certain regularity of the events being studied, typically more than once per day (unless researchers want to have studies that extend over lengthy periods of time). If a phenomenon does not occur that often, some type of interval-contingent method may be preferable. Interval-contingent methods also have a different target of inference than event-contingent methods – periods of time (e.g., days) versus events *per se* (e.g., interactions).

For example, Mendoza-Denton, Downey, Purdie, Davis, and Pietrzak (2002) conducted a daily diary study in which participants described the discriminatory or prejudicial behaviors they experienced each day and they described their daily well-being. They found that well-being was lower on days when people experienced race-based negative events than on days when they did not, and that this difference was larger for people higher in racially based RS.

The use of interval-contingent design is also nicely illustrated by West, Shelton, and Trail (2009). They examined inter-racial roommate pairs and found that people's anxiety during interethnic interactions depended on the anxiety their interactional partners had experienced the previous day. Moreover, perceptions of partner's anxiety were negatively related to interest in future intergroup contact, above and beyond relationships between interest and participants' own anxiety. It is difficult to imagine how relationships in either of these studies could have been examined using laboratory or survey methods.

Analyses of data from intensive repeated measures studies of interethnic contact

IRMD studies produce multilevel or nested data structures. Frequently, these are two-level structures – observations or events (interactions) are treated nested within persons. When there are multiple observations each day, observations can be nested within days and days within persons, producing a three-level model. Discussions of the multilevel analyses needed to analyze data generated by IRMD studies can be found in Nezlek (2001a, 2003, 2007a).

IRMD studies tend to provide data that are essentially correlational, and because of this, researchers need to think of ways of maximizing the strength of their inferences using statistical controls, e.g., using covariates to control for third variable possibilities. The types of controls researchers will need will vary as a function of the data and questions they have, but researchers need to anticipate such issues as they design studies and conduct analyses. Also, diary and experience sampling studies may not provide the data needed to make the orderly comparisons that experiments provide. Events occur or do not occur, people have certain types of interactions or they do not, and so forth. For example, a researcher may want to compare interactions involving one member of an ethnic minority and two members of an ethnic majority to interactions involving two members of an ethnic minority and one member of a majority culture. As interesting as such a question might be, participants may not provide the data needed to answer it.

Disadvantages

Intensive repeated measures designs have certain disadvantages. Participants may need to be monitored closely to ensure that they comply with research protocols. If data

are not provided in a manner consistent with the research protocol, the advantages of the repeated measures format may be lost. Perfect compliance rarely occurs, but researchers need to maximize compliance. Moreover, IRMD studies are likely to be more demanding for participants than survey or laboratory studies that typically demand only some fixed amount of time on a single occasion. Participants may need to be assured that their participation is valuable and may need to be compensated for their time. All in all, these types of studies are more demanding for both researchers and participants, but we think the benefits outweigh the costs. Finally, regardless of the methods that are used, we think there are certain issues that need to be taken into account when studying interethnic contact, and we discuss these in the following section.

Broader Issues in the Study of Interethnic Contact

Interethnic contact: cause or effect?

The study of interethnic contact has been dominated by what is known as the *Contact Hypothesis*, following Allport (1954). Research within this tradition has emphasized the importance of interethnic contact as a necessary (but not necessarily sufficient) condition for the reduction of prejudice. Accordingly, many researchers have examined how interethnic contact influences interethnic attitudes. Nevertheless, we think the reverse causal relationship, that individual predispositions such as ethnic identification influence interethnic contact, needs to be given more attention. Such a possibility is consistent with some research on causal relationships between social interaction and individual differences such as social skills (Nezlek, 2001b) and well-being (Nezlek & Reis, 1999). It is entirely possible that relationships between dispositions and interethnic contact are bidirectional (e.g., Berry, 1990; Pettigrew, 1997), but such bidirectionality requires considering contact as an outcome rather than a cause. We think that the more nuanced measures of interethnic contact provided by IRMD and the multi-level analyses they require make it easier to conceptualize contact as an outcome rather than a cause.

How much interethnic contact occurs?

Our sense is that many researchers do not take into account the amount of interethnic contact that actually occurs, and we think that accurate measures of the amount of interethnic contact are needed to understand the dynamics underlying interethnic contact. Moreover, we think that the types of IRMD we have advocated in this paper provide the most reliable means of assessing just how much interethnic contact occurs.

IRMD studies of interethnic contact suggest that members of ethnic minorities may interact more frequently with members of ethnic majorities than the reverse. For example, all of the Dutch ethnic minority participants in Schaafsma et al. (forthcoming) had interacted with a member of the majority culture over two weeks. In contrast, in a two-week social interaction diary study involving members of the Dutch ethnic majority culture, we found that <10% of the sample had interacted with a member of an ethnic minority during the study. Similarly, in a two-week social interaction diary study of collegians (on a campus where approximately 12% of students were Black), approximately 55% of Black students had interacted with a White student during the study. In contrast,

close to 95% of White participants did not interact with a Black person (Nezlek, 2007b). Although these samples were not drawn systematically and may not be representative of the general population, they are no less representative than the samples used in many social and personality psychology studies.

Such results suggest caution when interpreting people's responses to questions about interethnic contact, particularly the responses of member of majority cultures. What basis are people using when they answer such questions if they have no interethnic contact? When individuals who have no interethnic contact answer questions about interethnic contact, this must reflect something other than their interethnic contacts. This does not invalidate such responses; rather, it suggests that answers to such questions need to be understood for what they are and what they are not. The importance of such possibilities will vary across contexts as a function of baseline levels of interethnic contact but such baselines need to be taken into account more fully.

Beyond black and white, beyond minority–majority, beyond the USA, beyond students

For better or worse, the research agenda of US psychologists has shaped the research agenda of the discipline internationally. Although this is changing, for studies of interethnic contact, this has meant a relative over emphasis on Black–White relations in the United States compared to other interethnic combinations in other contexts. Studying Black–White relationships in the United States has advanced our understanding of interethnic relations, but researchers need to be cautious when generalizing from studies of this specific relationship within the specific cultural historical context of the United States. Furthermore, much of the research on interethnic contact has concerned contact between members of a majority group and members of a minority group. In contrast, contact between members of different minority groups has received relatively little attention. Nevertheless, as societies become increasingly multicultural, interminority contact is likely to increase, and it remains to be seen if the relationships between constructs are the same for interminority and minority–majority contact.

Perhaps more so for the study of interethnic contact than for other social psychological topics, researchers also need to examine interethnic contact as it exists in non-student populations. The vast and overwhelming majority of the people in the world (and in most countries) do not attend college, and by design, many universities are meant to be separated from the world around them. This means that the interethnic contact that occurs among collegians involves a select group of people often in an isolated context. For example, it is possible that the relationships reported by West et al. (2009) do not exist outside of the unique confines of the relationships between college roommates. Certainly, all situations are unique in some ways, and results based on any specific combination of ethnicities in any specific situation are subject to limitations (students or otherwise). Regardless, more scholars of interethnic contact need to get off campus.

Conclusion

Despite the fact that laboratory- and survey-based studies of interethnic contact have important limitations, we think such methods have made and will continue to make important contributions to our understanding of interethnic contact. The global beliefs and attitudes people have about members of ethnic groups are meaningful, and surveys can be excellent ways of measuring them. It is difficult to match the control and strength

of inference of a laboratory study when study naturally occurring social behavior. The types of methods we advocate are intended to complement, not replace, surveys and laboratory studies. Moreover, IRMD have certain disadvantages that may make them inappropriate in certain settings.

Although intensive repeated measures designs hold great promise for the study of interethnic contact, we think that researchers need to expand the focus of their questions and the sensitivity of the data they collect regardless of how they study interethnic contact. Quality and quantity of interethnic contact need to be measured in a more sophisticated fashion that is able to take into account different aspects of how people react to interethnic contact and the nature, as well as the amount, of the interethnic contacts they have. Moreover, clear distinctions need to be made between quality and quantity of interethnic contact. More attention needs to be paid to the interethnic experience people are using as the basis for answering questions about interethnic contact. Do they have any? In terms of dispositional measures such as attitudes, the possibility that attitudes about interethnic contact lead to interethnic behavior should be given more attention. And last, but certainly not least, researchers need to move beyond the confines of laboratories and campuses and examine interethnic contact as it occurs between members of actual ethnic groups as they are living their lives. Without such changes, the insights the study of interethnic contact can provide will remain unrealized.

Short Biographies

John B. Nezlek's primary research interests are naturally occurring social behavior and naturally occurring variability in psychological states, and the statistical methods needed to analyze such data. In collaboration with Ladd Wheeler, he developed the Rochester Interaction Record, which has become a standard method for studying naturally occurring social interaction. Moreover, he has written numerous articles describing the results of studies using different types of diary methods. He received his PhD from the University of Rochester, and since then, he has been on the faculty of the College of William & Mary, where he is now a Professor of Psychology.

Juliette Schaafsma is an Assistant Professor at Tilburg University (the Netherlands). She earned her MA at Leiden University and her PhD at Tilburg University. Her research interests lie broadly in interethnic contact and processes of social in- and exclusion. More specifically, she is interested in relationships between ethnic identity and the quality of everyday interethnic interactions. Furthermore, she studies how ethnic minority and majority members respond to being excluded by ethnic in- and outgroup members and examines what can be done to prevent negative responses. In her work, she uses a broad range of methods, including surveys, experiments and diary methods.

Endnote

* Correspondence address: Department of Psychology, College of William & Mary, PO Box 8795, Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795, USA. Email: jbnz@wm.edu

References

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

- Bolger, N., Davis, A., & Rafaeli, E. (2003). Diary methods: Capturing life as it is lived. *Annual Review of Psychology*, **54**, 579–616.
- Brewer, M. B., & Gaertner, S. (2004). Toward reduction of prejudice: Intergroup contact and social categorization. In M. B. Brewer & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Self and Social Identity* (pp. 298–319). Chichester, UK: Blackwell.
- Britt, T. W., Bonieci, K. A., Vescio, T. K., Biernat, M., & Brown, L. M. (1996). Intergroup anxiety: A person x situation approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **22**, 1177–1188.
- Cervone, D. A. (2005). Personality architecture: Within-person structures and processes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, **56**, 579–616.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Larson, R. (1992). Validity and reliability of the experience sampling method. In M. W. deVries (Ed.), *The Experience of Psychopathology: Investigating Mental Disorders in Their Natural Settings* (pp. 43–57). New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Devos, T., Silver, L. A., Mackie, D. M., & Smith, E. R. (2002). Experiencing intergroup emotions. In D. M. Mackie & E. R. Smith (Eds.), *From Prejudice to Intergroup Emotion: Differentiated Reactions to Social Groups* (pp. 111–134). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Dovidio, J. F., & Esses, V. M. (2001). Immigrants and immigration: Advancing the psychological perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, **57**, 378–387.
- Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S. L. (2002). Implicit and explicit prejudice and interracial interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **82**, 62–68.
- Eller, A., & Abrams, S. (2003). “Gringos” in Mexico: Cross-sectional and longitudinal effects of language school-promoted contact on intergroup bias. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, **6**, 55–75.
- 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.
- Gable, S. L., & Reis, H. T. (1999). Now and then, them and us, this and that: Studying relationships across time, partner, context, and person. *Personal Relationships*, **6**, 415–432.
- Islam, M. R., & Hewstone, M. (1993). Dimension of contact as predictors of intergroup anxiety, perceived outgroup variability, and outgroup attitude: An integrative model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **19**, 700–710.
- McLaughlin-Volpe, T., Aron, A., Wright, S. C., & Reis, H. T. (1999). *Intergroup Social Interaction and Intergroup Prejudice: Quantity Versus Quality*. Unpublished Manuscript.
- 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.
- Nezlek, J. B. (2000). The motivational and cognitive dynamics of day-to-day social life. In J. P. Forgas, K. Williams & L. Wheeler (Eds.), *The Social Mind: Cognitive and Motivational Aspects of Interpersonal Behaviour* (pp. 92–111). New York, NY: 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**, 387–404.
- 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. (2007a). A multilevel framework for understanding relationships among traits, states, situations, and behaviors. *European Journal of Personality*, **21**, 789–810.
- Nezlek, J. B. (2007b). *Naturally Occurring Interethnic Contact: Blacks and Whites in the US*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Experimental Social Psychology, Chicago, IL.
- Nezlek, J. B., & Reis, H. T. (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.
- Nezlek, J. B., Schaafsma, J., Krejtz, I., & Safron, M. (2009). *Self-construal and Intra- and Interethnic Social Interaction*. Unpublished Manuscript, College of William & Mary.
- Nezlek, J. B., & Smith, C. V. (2005). Social identity in daily social interaction. *Self and Identity*, **4**, 243–261.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **23**, 173–185.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Future directions for intergroup contact theory and research. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, **32**, 187–199.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **90**, 751–783.
- Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (2003). The antecedents and implications of interracial anxiety. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **29**, 790–801.

- Reis, H. T., & Gable, S. L. (2000). Event-sampling and other methods for studying everyday experience. In H. T. Reis & C. M. Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Social and Personality Psychology* (pp. 190–222). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Reis, H. T., & Wheeler, L. (1991). Studying social interaction with the Rochester Interaction Record. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, **24**, 269–318.
- Schaafsma, J., Nezlek, J. B., Krejtz, I., & Safron, M. (forthcoming). Ethnocultural identification and naturally occurring interethnic social interactions: Muslim minorities in Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*.
- Stathi, S., & Crisp, R. J. (2008). Imagining intergroup contact promotes projection to outgroups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, **44**, 943–957.
- Tajfel, H., Billig, M. G., Bundy, R. P., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, **1**, 149–178.
- Verkuyten, M., & Kinket, B. (2000). Social distances in a multi-ethnic society: The ethnic hierarchy among Dutch preadolescents. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, **63**, 75–85.
- West, T. V., Shelton, J. N., & Trail, T. E. (2009). Interracial roommate relationships: Negotiating daily interactions. *Psychological Science*, **20**, 289–292.
- Wheeler, L., & Nezlek, J. (1977). Sex differences in social participation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **35**, 742.
- Wheeler, L., & Reis, H. T. (1991). Self-recording of everyday life events: Origins, types, and uses. *Journal of Personality*, **59**, 339–354.