

---

# Expecting To Be the Target of Prejudice: Implications for Interethnic Interactions

**J. Nicole Shelton**

*Princeton University*

**Jennifer A. Richeson**

*Dartmouth College*

**Jessica Salvatore**

*Princeton University*

---

*Two studies investigated the implications of ethnic minorities' prejudice expectations for their affective and behavioral outcomes during interethnic interactions. In both studies, the more ethnic minorities expected Whites to be prejudiced, the more negative experiences they had during interethnic interactions. This finding held true for chronic prejudice expectations in a diary study of college roommates (Study 1) and for situationally induced prejudice expectations in a laboratory interaction (Study 2). In Study 2, the authors extended this work to examine the relationship between ethnic minorities' prejudice expectancies and their White partners' psychological experience during interethnic interactions. Consistent with predictions, the more ethnic minorities expected Whites to be prejudiced, the more their White partners had positive experiences during interethnic interactions. These divergent experiences of ethnic minorities and Whites have important implications for the psychological success of interactions between members of these groups.*

---

**Keywords:** *expectancies; prejudice; interracial interactions; stigma; social interactions*

**O**ur expectations about other people are apt to influence the way we interact with them. Indeed, perceivers' expectations can induce perceptual and behavioral confirmations during social interactions (Snyder & Swann, 1978; Snyder, Tanke, & Berscheid, 1977; for reviews, see Hilton & Darley, 1991; D. T. Miller & Turnbull, 1986). The sentiment of the majority of the research on expectancies has been to understand how White perceivers' expectations about ethnic minorities influence interethnic interactions. For example, the classic work by Word, Zanna, and Cooper (1974) illustrated that White interviewers who supposedly held negative beliefs

about Blacks created a more negative interviewing environment for Black applicants than for White applicants, which led to less favorable performances from the Black applicants. When it comes to stereotypes and prejudice, targets of course are often aware that perceivers hold negative beliefs about their group. What has been neglected in the literature on expectancies is an understanding of ethnic minorities' expectations that they will be the target of prejudice during social interactions.

In response to long-standing racial oppression in the United States, some ethnic minorities, and perhaps most ethnic minorities in certain social settings, expect to be the target of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination. Many ethnic minorities are aware of prejudices against their group (Pinel, 1999), and this awareness can influence their performance on potentially stereotype-confirming tasks (Steele & Aronson, 1995) as well as their attributions about Whites' ambiguous behaviors toward them (Crocker, Voelkl, Testa, & Major, 1991).

The primary goal of the present research was to examine the extent to which ethnic minorities' expectancies

---

**Authors' Note:** Data collection and preparation of this article were supported by a grant from the Russell Sage Foundation awarded to the first and second authors and a National Science Foundation grant awarded to the first author. The article was written while the first and second authors were visiting fellows at the Center for Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity at Stanford University. We gratefully acknowledge Bonnie Burlingham, Lisa Leslie, Leigh Poretzky, and Lisa Pugh for their assistance with data collection. In addition, we are grateful to Tiffany Yip for her assistance with the data analyses for Study 1. Correspondence should be addressed to J. Nicole Shelton, Department of Psychology, Princeton University, Green Hall, Princeton, NJ 08540; e-mail: nshelton@princeton.edu.

*PSPB*, Vol. 31 No. 9, September 2005 1189-1202

DOI: 10.1177/0146167205274894

© 2005 by the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc.

about being the target of prejudice impact affective and behavioral outcomes during dyadic interethnic interactions. We take into account the consequences of ethnic minorities' expectancies about prejudice not only for their own experiences but also for their White partners' experiences. This approach has been largely neglected in previous research on interethnic contact. Thus, our approach takes a broader view of the social interaction process by considering the implications of ethnic minorities' expectancies about being the target of prejudice for both individuals in the interaction. Building on the research on general expectancies in social interactions, we begin to explore a model that demonstrates ethnic minorities' expectancies about being the target of prejudice result in divergent experiences for ethnic minorities and Whites during interethnic situations.

#### *Expecting Prejudice and Outcomes for the Self*

We propose that expecting to be the target of prejudice is likely to generate negative experiences for ethnic minorities during interethnic interactions. Recent research is consistent with our prediction (Tropp, 2003; but see also Shelton, 2003). Tropp (2003) found that Latinos and Asians who overheard a confederate say he would rather not interact with a Latino/Asian person reported feeling more hostile and anxious about an upcoming interaction and marginally less positive about interacting with outgroup members in general compared to Latinos and Asians who overheard the confederate make a race-neutral comment.

We also propose that expecting to be the target of prejudice will lead ethnic minorities to be more engaged during the interaction. Previous research on general expectancies suggests that when targets know their interaction partners hold negative beliefs about them, they engage in social interaction tactics that allow them to overcome these beliefs (Hilton & Darley, 1985; Ickes, Patterson, Rajecki, & Tanford, 1982; Swann, 1987; Swann & Ely, 1984; Swann & Read, 1981). Consistent with this work, C. Miller and Myers (1998) suggested that through primary compensatory strategies, stigmatized individuals reduce the threat posed by prejudice by engaging in behaviors that enable them to achieve desired outcomes in spite of their stigma. For example, obese women who were visible to their interaction partners (and thus vulnerable to prejudice) behaved in a more socially skillful manner during interactions with normal weight individuals to prevent the interaction from being negative (C. Miller, Rothblum, Barbour, Brand, & Felicio, 1990; C. Miller, Rothblum, Felicio, & Brand, 1995). Overweight women who were not visible did not engage in these behaviors and were evaluated more negatively (i.e., perceived as having poorer social skills) than their visible counterparts. In addition,

research shows that women who expect that they will be targets of prejudice compensate by behaving in a less gender-stereotypical manner (Kaiser & Miller, 2001). We extend this previous work and examine the extent to which ethnic minorities who expect to be the target of prejudice are more socially engaged during an interethnic interaction, perhaps as a means to reduce the odds of being the target of prejudice. Taken together, we predict that increased social engagement occurs in tandem with more negative affective experiences for ethnic minorities who expect to be the target of prejudice during interethnic interactions.

#### *Expecting Prejudice and Partners' Outcomes*

Contrary to our prediction that ethnic minorities' expectations about being the target of prejudice will result in negative experiences for the self, we predict that these expectations will result in more positive experiences for their White interaction partners. Although somewhat counterintuitive, this prediction is consistent with the work on compensatory strategies. Recall that when members of stigmatized groups expect that they might be targets of prejudice during intergroup contact experiences, they engage in compensatory strategies, such as behaving particularly positively during the interaction, to ward off the negative evaluation. Because they are behaving particularly positively (e.g., portraying more positive social skills such as smiling, talking, providing in-depth responses, open/positive nonverbal gestures, etc.), these individuals' White interaction partners should enjoy interacting with them and experience more positive affect than the interaction partners of ethnic minorities without these expectations. Thus, quite ironically, we predict that Whites will have more positive experiences during interactions with ethnic minorities who suspect that they might be prejudiced against them.

#### OVERVIEW OF STUDIES

The present research was designed to explore the role of ethnic minorities' expectations about being the target of prejudice in shaping affective and behavioral outcomes during interethnic interactions. This work extends previous research by not only examining these outcomes for ethnic minorities but also by examining their White partners' experiences during the interaction. We proposed a model that considered the extent to which expecting to be the target of prejudice may result in divergent experiences for ethnic minorities and their White partners. Specifically, we predicted that these expectations would have a negative impact on ethnic minorities' experiences in interethnic encounters but a positive impact on their White partners' experiences.

We examined the veracity of the components of this model in two studies. In Study 1, we focused on the impli-

cations of expectations about being the target of prejudice for ethnic minorities' experiences during daily interethnic interactions. In Study 2, we manipulated prejudice expectations and examined the influence of these expectations on ethnic minorities' and their partners' affective experience. In addition, in Study 2 we explored the impact of ethnic minorities' expectations about being the target of prejudice on their use of compensatory strategies, specifically, their level of engagement during the interaction.

#### STUDY 1

The extent to which ethnic minorities expect to be reacted to on the basis of their group membership is known to vary across individuals. For some individuals, believing others harbor prejudices against their group is a regular way of perceiving the world. By contrast, other individuals are less disposed to perceive the world in this manner. In Study 1, we explored the relationship between ethnic minorities' tendency to expect to be the target of prejudice and the negativity of their interethnic interaction experiences.

Given that previous research suggests that targets of prejudice who expect dominant group individuals to be prejudiced tend to avoid intergroup encounters (e.g., Mendoza-Denton, Downey, Purdie, Davis, & Pietrzak, 2002; Pinel, 1999), we were particularly interested in finding a situation in which individuals would be required to interact with an outgroup member in order for us to examine the quality of these interactions on a daily basis. As a result, the present study focused on interactions between roommates during the 1st year of college. During the 1st year of college, many students are challenged with the daunting experience of living with someone from a different ethnic background. In general, research indicates that ethnic minority-White roommate pairs tend to be less satisfying for students than same race/ethnicity roommate pairs (Phelps et al., 1998). The experience may be even less satisfying for ethnic minorities who expect others to be prejudiced against their group.

We predicted that the more ethnic minorities expect to be the target of prejudice, the more negative affect they will experience with and the less they will like their White roommates. In addition, we examined the extent to which ethnic minorities disclosed information about themselves to their roommates. Consistent with research on compensatory strategies, we predicted that expectations about being the target of prejudice would lead to more self-disclosure. That is, self-disclosure might be employed as a strategy to manage interactions with roommates. Every behavior made by an ethnic minority to a perceived prejudiced roommate carries the potential to reaffirm negative racial stereotypes. As a result,

ethnic minorities who expect to be the target of prejudice might disclose information about themselves in hopes that the information might disconfirm ethnic stereotypes. More generally, ethnic minorities who expect to be the target of prejudice may be motivated to disclose information regardless of whether it disconfirms stereotypes as a means to facilitate harmony in the relationship. It is important to note, however, that the research on self-disclosure and intimacy suggests the opposite prediction as the one on self-disclosure and compensatory strategies. The close relationship research suggests that self-disclosure is positively related to liking and intimacy (Laurenceau, Feldman-Barrett, & Pietromonaco, 1998). As such, one would predict that expecting to be the target of prejudice would lead to less self-disclosure. These two competing hypotheses will be examined.

Last, we assessed participants' feelings of authenticity with their roommates. We predicted that the more ethnic minorities expect to be the target of prejudice, the more they would feel that they were being less authentic with their roommates. This stems from the notion that ethnic minorities who expect Whites to be prejudiced may feel that they are only able to present certain components of their identity in fear that some components will be interpreted through the lens of stereotypes. For example, a Black student may believe that she can only disclose information to her roommate that indicates that she is from a wealthy family, was the valedictorian at a prestigious high school, and enjoys race-neutral hobbies. This student may feel that although she shares somewhat personal information with her roommate (e.g., my family is rich), this information does not truly represent all aspects of her identity (e.g., she enjoys listening to hip-hop). Thus, ethnic minorities who expect to be the target of prejudice may feel that they cannot display (all of) the true self when interacting with Whites.

In sum, we expected increased expectations about being the target of prejudice to be associated with greater negative affect and self-disclosure with White roommates but also with lower levels of liking and feelings of authenticity. These relationships, however, were not expected to emerge for experiences with ethnic minority roommates.

#### *Method*

##### *PARTICIPANTS*

For Study 1, 54 ethnic minority Princeton University students participated (27 African American, 20 Asian American, 4 Latino/Latina, and 3 students who indicated that they were an ethnic minority but whose ethnicity was not listed on the form). All of the students were freshmen (34 women and 20 men). A little more than half ( $n = 34$ ) of the students had a White roommate,

whereas the others ( $n = 20$ ) had an ethnic minority roommate. The roommates were assigned by the university housing system.<sup>1</sup>

#### PROCEDURES

During the 1st week of the academic year, we recruited students to participate in a large study examining freshmen roommates and their college experiences.<sup>2</sup> We told participants that they would attend an orientation session where they would complete a prediary questionnaire and then complete a short questionnaire at the end of the day for the next 15 days. We did not inform participants until the end of the study that we recruited them to participate because of their race or their roommate's race.

The prediary questionnaire included demographic questions as well as a variety of individual difference measures. Most relevant to this study, participants completed the Stigma Consciousness Scale–Race. After completing the prediary questionnaire, we gave participants instructions about how to complete the diary portion of the study. Specifically, we told participants that an e-mail would be sent to them at the end of the day as a reminder to complete the diary questionnaire. We informed students that the URL for the diary Web page would be included in the e-mail message. We instructed participants to click on the URL link and complete the questionnaire. We urged participants to complete a diary entry every night. An automatic e-mail was delivered to all participants who had not completed the diary questionnaire by 8 a.m. the following morning. Participants completed the diary questionnaire Sunday through Thursday for 3 weeks. On completion of the study, we held a postdiary session where we debriefed participants and paid them \$50.

#### BACKGROUND MEASURES

*Stigma Consciousness measure.* The Stigma Consciousness Scale is a 10-item measure that assesses the extent to which individuals expect to be stereotyped based on an aspect of their social identity (PineI, 1999). Examples of items include, “When interacting with Whites, I feel like they interpret all my behaviors in terms of the fact that I am an ethnic minority” and “I never worry that my behaviors will be viewed as a stereotypical ethnic minority.” Participants answered all questions on a 7-point scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 7 = *strongly agree*. We combined all items (reverse coded when necessary) to form a stigma consciousness composite score ( $\alpha = .71$ ).

*Race of roommate.* Participants indicated the race and sex of their roommate. All participants had a roommate of the same sex.

#### DAILY LEVEL MEASURES

Unless noted, participants completed all daily level measures using a 7-point scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 7 = *strongly agree*.

*Liking.* We used two items to assess how much participants liked their roommate each day. Specifically, “I feel less close/more negative toward my roommate today” and “I liked my roommate today.” We reverse coded the first item and combined the two items to form a liking composite score ( $\alpha = .59$ ).

*Negative affect.* Participants rated the extent to which they experienced 10 negative emotions during their interactions with their roommate and when they thought about their roommate. We combined these 10 items (e.g., tense, anxious, frustrated) to create a negative affect composite score ( $\alpha = .86$ ).

*Self-disclosure.* We used two items to assess the amount of self-relevant information individuals disclosed during interactions with their roommate each day ( $\alpha = .93$ ). Specifically, we asked participants to indicate “How much personal information about yourself did you disclose to your roommate today?” and “How much new information about yourself did you disclose to your roommate today?” Participants answered these questions using a 7-point scale where 1 = *none* and 7 = *a very great deal*.

*Authenticity.* We used two items to assess how authentic participants felt during interactions with their roommate each day. Specifically, “I felt I had to change myself to fit in with my roommate today” and “I felt artificial in my interactions with my roommate today.” We combined the two items to form an authenticity composite score ( $\alpha = .85$ ).

#### DATA ANALYTIC PROCEDURES

Hierarchical linear modeling (HLM; Bryk & Raudenbush, 1992) was employed to examine the extent to which the daily level roommate interaction outcomes were influenced by the race of the roommate and ethnic minorities' stigma consciousness scores. HLM allows for the simultaneous data analysis of nested data at multiple levels; in this case, at the level of the individual (person) and the day (within person). As a result, it is possible to estimate the extent to which variation at the individual level (e.g., stigma consciousness; Stigcon) influences outcomes at the daily level (e.g., negative affect). We specified several equations in order to use a multilevel approach to assess mean level and temporal change in variables measured at the daily level and to establish whether the mean level and change differ as a function of participants' levels of stigma consciousness and the race of their roommate. In describing these equations,

**TABLE 1: Estimates From Hierarchical Linear Modeling Analyses**

Variable	Intercept		Race of Roommate		Sigma Consciousness		Interaction	
Liking	5.56	(0.10)	-0.25	(0.94)	-0.13	(0.35)	-0.03	(0.23)
Negative affect	2.77	(0.12)	2.87	(0.98)**	0.91	(0.35)**	-0.56	(0.23)**
Self-disclosure	2.12	(0.11)	1.90	(0.91)**	0.74	(0.38)**	-0.44	(0.22)**
Authenticity	1.78	(0.12)	-0.08	(0.24)	-0.14	(0.07)	0.11	(0.06)**

NOTE: Numbers in parentheses are the standard errors of the estimates.  
 \*\* $p < .05$ .

we use negative affect (NegAff) as an example of the dependent variable. Time is indexed by day in the study.

The within-person equation specifies that the value of the dependent variable for a given participant on a given day,  $NegAff_t$ , is a linear function of the average level of NegAff across time,  $B0$ ; the diary study day,  $Day$ ; and a residual component of the dependent variable,  $r_t$ , which is specific to each day and is assumed to have a mean of zero and a constant variance across individuals and days. Equation 1 is the result:

$$NegAff_t = B0 + B1*(Day)_t + r_t \tag{1}$$

The coefficient  $B0$  can be interpreted as the average level of NegAff across time because day has been centered such that zero is the average day. The coefficient  $B1$  is the main effect of day of NegAff. Equation 2 specifies that differences between participants in  $B0$  (individual's NegAff average over the diary period) are a function of the race of roommate, stigma consciousness level, and their interaction. Estimates of  $B0$  are obtained for each participant:

$$B0_i = G00 + G01*(Stigcon) + G02*(race\ of\ roommate) + G03*(interaction) + U0 \tag{2}$$

The term  $G00$  is the average level of NegAff across all participants. The term  $G01$  is the change in average NegAff for every unit change in stigma consciousness. The term  $G02$  is the change in average NegAff for every unit change in race of roommate. The  $U0$  refers to the residual component of the dependent variable unique to person  $i$ .

An estimate of  $B1$  in Equation 1 was also obtained for each participant in the sample. The between-persons equation specifies that for each participant  $i$ , the linear change in NegAff over time is a function of that participant's stigma consciousness, race of roommate, and the interaction:

$$B1_i = G10 + G11*(Stigcon) + G12*(race\ of\ roommate) + G13*(interaction) + U1 \tag{3}$$

In this equation,  $G10$  is the linear association between day and NegAff for the average participant, and  $G11$  is the change in the association for each unit change in stigma consciousness.  $G12$  is the change in the association for each unit change in race of roommate. The residual component of the dependent variable specific to each individual is  $U1$ .

If we substitute Equations 2 and 3 for the appropriate variables in Equation 1, we are able to examine the mean level of NegAff across participants and time and examine the linear association between day and NegAff as a function of participants' stigma consciousness, race of roommate, and the interaction term. The results of these analyses for each dependent variable are reported in the following.

*Results*

*LIKING*

Are ethnic minorities' expectations about being the target of prejudice related to how much they liked their roommates? Contrary to predictions, neither ethnic minorities' expectations about prejudice, the race of roommate, nor the interaction between the two were related to how much participants liked their roommate (see Table 1).

*NEGATIVE AFFECT*

Consistent with predictions, expectations about being the target of prejudice (i.e., stigma consciousness scores) were related to the amount of negative affect participants felt during interactions with their roommates. As Table 1 shows, the more ethnic minorities expect to be the target of prejudice, the more negative affect they expressed about their roommate relationships. This main effect however was modified by a significant stigma consciousness by race of roommate interaction. Further analyses revealed that among ethnic minorities who had an ethnic minority roommate, the more they expect to be the target of prejudice (i.e., the higher their stigma consciousness level), the less negative affect they experienced during interactions with their roommate ( $\beta = -.39, SE = 0.17, p = .03$ ). By contrast, among ethnic minorities who had a White roommate, the more they expect to be the

target of prejudice, the more negative affect they experienced ( $\beta = .38$ ,  $SE = 0.16$ ,  $p = .02$ ).

#### SELF-DISCLOSURE

Are ethnic minorities' expectations about being the target of prejudice related to how much they self-disclosed to their roommate? Results revealed that the more ethnic minorities expect to be the target of prejudice, the more they self-disclosed to their roommate (see Table 1). Consistent with predictions, this main effect was modified by a significant stigma consciousness by race of roommate interaction. Further analyses revealed that among ethnic minorities who had an ethnic minority roommate, prejudice expectations were unrelated to how much participants self-disclosed to their roommate ( $\beta = .00$ ,  $SE = 0.15$ ,  $p = .99$ ). By contrast, among ethnic minorities who had a White roommate, the more they expect to be the target of prejudice, the greater their tendency to self-disclose to their roommate ( $\beta = .33$ ,  $SE = 0.17$ ,  $p = .06$ ). In addition, time influenced these results. Specifically, among ethnic minorities who had a White roommate, the more they expected to be the target of prejudice, the more they disclosed over the course of the 15 days ( $\beta = .03$ ,  $SE = 0.01$ ,  $p = .03$ ). There was no change over time in self-disclosure for ethnic minorities with an ethnic minority roommate ( $\beta = .01$ ,  $SE = 0.01$ ,  $p = .15$ ).

#### AUTHENTICITY

Are ethnic minorities' expectations about being the target of prejudice related to how authentic they felt during interactions with their roommate each day? Results revealed a significant interaction between ethnic minorities' level of stigma consciousness and race of roommate on feelings of authenticity. Further analyses revealed that among ethnic minorities who had an ethnic minority roommate, prejudice expectations were unrelated to how authentic they felt during interactions with their roommate ( $\beta = .06$ ,  $SE = 0.24$ ,  $p = .79$ ). By contrast, among ethnic minorities who had a White roommate, the more they expected to be the target of prejudice, the less authentic they felt during interactions with their roommate ( $\beta = .33$ ,  $SE = 0.15$ ,  $p = .04$ ).

#### Discussion

The findings from Study 1 provide evidence that expectations about being the target of prejudice are associated with negative experiences for ethnic minorities during interethnic interactions in daily life. Consistent with predictions, the more ethnic minorities had a dispositional tendency to expect prejudice, the more negative affect and the less authentic they felt during interactions with their White roommate. In addition, the more ethnic minorities had a dispositional tendency to expect prejudice, the more they self-disclosed during interactions with a White roommate, which is consistent

with research on compensatory strategies. Taken together, these findings show that ethnic minorities who expect to be the target of prejudice have more negative affective experiences but self-disclose more information during interethnic interactions compared to ethnic minorities who hold this expectation to a lesser degree.

#### STUDY 2

Although some ethnic minorities might have a dispositional tendency to expect to be the target of prejudice, there may be some situations that make these expectations salient for most ethnic minorities. Thus, in Study 2 we created a situation in which we made prejudice expectancies salient for half of our ethnic minority participants. This manipulation also helps bolster the interpretation of the correlational data from Study 1. Specifically, in Study 2 ethnic minority participants were primed with thoughts that ethnic minorities are often the target of prejudice or with thoughts that elderly individuals are often the target of prejudice just prior to engaging in an interethnic interaction. Participants' affect and behavior during the interaction were examined. Based on the findings of Study 1, we expected for ethnic minorities who were primed with racial prejudice to have negative experiences during the interaction (i.e., greater negative affect, lowered feelings of authenticity) compared to ethnic minorities who were primed with elderly prejudice. We also expected that participants in the racial prejudice prime condition would engage in compensatory strategies with their White interaction partners to a greater extent than participants primed with elderly prejudice.

In addition to examining the outcomes of prejudice expectancies with an experimental paradigm, a second purpose of Study 2 was to investigate the impact of ethnic minorities' expectations on their partners' experience during the interaction. We predicted that Whites who interacted with an ethnic minority partner who had been primed with expectations about ethnic prejudice would have more positive interethnic contact experiences than Whites who interacted with an ethnic minority partner who had been primed with expectations about elderly prejudice.

#### Method

##### PARTICIPANTS AND PROCEDURES

In Study 2, 58 participants from Princeton University participated for monetary compensation of \$8. The sample consisted of 29 ethnic minority and 29 White students.

The experimenter (an ethnic minority woman) told participants that the focus of the study was on "serial cognition." Specifically, the experimenter indicated that we

were investigating the influence of one cognitive task on a subsequent cognitive task when there is a delay between the two. She then explained that in the first task, participants would read several short newspaper articles and answer some questions about the articles and that the second task would take place on a computer. Furthermore, the experimenter explained that because it was essential to have about a 10-minute delay between the two tasks they would work on another study. Specifically, this "other study" was a get acquainted interaction with another participant.

*Prejudice expectation manipulation.* Participants read three newspaper articles and answered several questions after each article (e.g., "How persuasive was this article?"). The first two articles were neutral (i.e., lawsuit against McDonalds, plagiarism). The third article was used to manipulate prejudice expectations for ethnic minorities. Participants read one of two articles (both of which were approximately the same length).<sup>3</sup> Approximately half of the ethnic minority participants ( $n = 15$ ) read an article describing the prevalence of prejudice and discrimination directed against ethnic minorities. The article described an ostensible survey conducted by a research consortium that found ethnic minorities faced pervasive prejudice while in college and after college. For example, the article indicated that ethnic minorities are likely to be the target of racist remarks in social interactions and are likely to be treated disrespectfully because of their ethnicity. The other half of the ethnic minority sample ( $n = 14$ ) read a similar article describing the prevalence of prejudice and discrimination directed against elderly individuals. The content of the article was virtually the same except the targeted group was older adults. Hence, these participants read an equally negative article that primed expectancies regarding prejudice but not for their ingroup. All White participants read the first two neutral articles followed by the article about prejudice against elderly individuals. Participants read the newspaper articles in individual sessions in the laboratory.

*Interethnic interaction.* After reading the three articles, the experimenter informed participants that another graduate student in the department was conducting her dissertation on first impressions. Given that there needed to be a 10-minute delay before they could work on the next cognitive task, they would participate in the graduate student's research. The experimenter gave participants a new consent form to complete to help bolster the cover story that it was a new study. She informed participants that in the new study they would interact with another participant in the study. All interactions involved same-sex pairs. The goal was to have a brief 10-minute conversation and then answer a few questions

about the interaction. The experimenter did not give the participants a specific topic to discuss. Instead, she simply stated that the participants should "get to know one another during the next 10 minutes." The experimenter led participants to a different room to have the interaction. This room was equipped with two chairs that faced one another, and the experimenter asked the participants to sit in these chairs. In addition, this room was equipped with two hidden video cameras, each one pointed directly at one of the participants.<sup>4</sup> The experimenter left the room for 10 minutes. Upon her return she placed the participants in two separate rooms and asked them to complete a brief questionnaire.

After completing the brief questionnaire, participants completed an unrelated computer task to bolster the serial cognition cover story. Finally, the experimenter thanked and thoroughly debriefed each participant.

#### SELF-REPORT MEASURES

*Manipulation check.* As a check to make certain that participants read the articles, we asked them to answer questions regarding their content. Of primary importance, we asked participants, "According to the newspaper passage, what % of the surveyed majority group members held prejudiced attitudes and stated that they would discriminate against ethnic minorities (the elderly)?" The correct answer was between 80% and 85%. On average, ethnic minority participants slightly underestimated the percentage (75%) for the newspaper article about ethnic minorities but were more accurate about the percentage (85%) for the newspaper article about elderly individuals.

*Prior relationship with partner.* Participants indicated whether they knew their interaction partner prior to the study. Fortunately, all participants indicated that they did not know their partner prior to the interaction.

*Liking.* We used four items to assess how much participants liked their partner (e.g., "How much do you like your partner?" "To what extent is your partner a warm person?"), which were combined with higher scores indicating a more positive evaluation ( $\alpha = .76$  for ethnic minorities and  $\alpha = .53$  for Whites). Participants made their ratings on a 7-point scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*).

*Negative affect.* Participants indicated the extent to which they felt several emotions during the interaction. We created a negative affect composite score based on six items (i.e., anxious, tense, uncertain) such that higher scores indicate more negative affect ( $\alpha = .83$  for ethnic minorities and  $\alpha = .62$  for Whites). Participants made their ratings on a 7-point scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*).

*Enjoyment.* We used two items to assess the extent to which participants enjoyed interacting with their partner (i.e., “How much did you enjoy getting to know your partner?” and “How much did you enjoy the interaction?”). We created an enjoyment composite score such that higher scores indicated more enjoyment ( $\alpha = .75$  for ethnic minorities and  $\alpha = .80$  for Whites).

*Authenticity.* Participants completed two questions regarding how authentic they felt they were during the interaction (i.e., “I felt I had to change myself to fit in with my partner” and “It was easy to express my true attitudes and feelings during the interaction”). We combined these items to create an authenticity composite score with higher scores meaning participants felt more authentic during the interaction. Due to the low alpha reliabilities ( $\alpha = .56$  for ethnic minorities and  $\alpha = .30$  for Whites), results from this scale should be interpreted with caution. Participants made their ratings on a 7-point scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*).

*Perceived engagement.* Participants completed three questions regarding how engaged they perceived themselves to be during the interaction (e.g., “How often during the interaction did you elaborate on your thoughts about the topic of conversation?” “How involved were you during the interaction?” and “How much did you reveal to your partner about yourself?”). Participants made their ratings on a 7-point scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*). We combined these items to create a perceived engagement composite score ( $\alpha = .62$  for ethnic minorities and  $\alpha = .56$  for Whites).

*Observers' ratings.* To obtain an unbiased perspective of participants' level of engagement during the interaction, two observers (one White and one Black) who were blind to the prejudice expectations manipulation coded the participants' verbal behaviors from the audiotape of the interaction and nonverbal behaviors from a silent videotape of the interaction. Given that each person in the interaction was on a separate tape, the observers did not know the race of the other participant. We were interested in observers' ratings of how much participants' behaviors seemed to indicate they were using compensatory strategies to facilitate a smooth interaction. We relied on behaviors that have been assessed in previous related work on compensatory strategies (see Curtis & Miller, 1986; Frable, Blackstone, & Scherbaum, 1990).

For the nonverbal behaviors, observers rated the extent to which participants leaned toward their partner on a 7-point scale, where 1 = *body leaned away from partner* and 7 = *body leaned forward toward partner*. In addition, they rated what participants did with their arms during the interaction using a 7-point scale, where 1 = *arms crossed a lot* and 7 = *arms open and/or inviting*. Observers also

rated the extent to which participants smiled during the interaction using a 7-point scale, where 1 = *did not smile at all* and 7 = *smiled a lot*. We combined both observers' ratings on these items to create a nonverbal effort composite score (interrater reliability = .79 for both the White and the ethnic minority participants).

For the verbal behaviors, observers rated the participants on four behaviors. Specifically, they rated the extent to which participants (a) asked their partner questions about themselves, (b) elaborated on their own thoughts and feelings, (c) appeared engaged in the conversation, and (d) talked (i.e., how much the participant talked). Observers made all ratings on a 7-point scale where 1 = *not at all* and 7 = *a lot*. We combined both observers' ratings on these items to create a verbal effort composite score (interrater reliability = .70 for the White and .79 for the ethnic minority participants).

## Results and Discussion

### DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

We computed correlations among participants' self-report and coders' ratings. Please see Table 2 for correlations across the experimental conditions and see Table 3 for correlations within the two experimental conditions. In general, the more ethnic minorities liked their partner, the less negative affect and the more they enjoyed the interaction (see Table 2). Moreover, for ethnic minorities, the more they reported being engaged, the less authentic they felt during the interaction. Ethnic minorities' and Whites' self-report outcomes were unrelated to one another. In addition, within the experimental conditions, most of the correlations were not significant, perhaps because of the small sample size (see Table 3).

### PREJUDICE EXPECTATIONS AND OUTCOMES

To examine the extent to which ethnic minorities' expectations influenced their own and their partners' outcome, we analyzed the data separately for the two racial groups. We first report results for ethnic minorities, followed by results for their White interaction partners.

*Ethnic minorities' experiences.* Did priming ethnic minority participants with prejudice expectations about their ethnic group, compared to priming them with prejudice expectations about an outgroup, impact their experiences during the interaction? Consistent with predictions, results suggest that ethnic minorities who were primed with ethnic prejudice had more negative experiences during the interaction compared to ethnic minorities who were primed with elderly prejudice. Specifically, ethnic minorities who were primed to expect racial prejudice ( $M = 4.72$ ,  $SD = 1.03$ ) liked their partner less than ethnic minorities who were primed to expect prejudice against the elderly ( $M = 5.41$ ,  $SD = 0.72$ ),  $t(27) =$

**TABLE 2: Correlations From Study 2**

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Ethnic minorities														
1. Liking	<b>1.00</b>	-.35*	.73**	.22	.24	-.14	-.19	.15	.11	.00	.04	.03	.11	.15
2. Negative affect		<b>1.00</b>	-.21	-.25	.12	-.04	.12	-.09	.10	-.14	.03	.18	.17	.13
3. Enjoy			<b>1.00</b>	.24	.27	-.07	.05	.32*	.02	.00	-.07	.06	-.00	.24
4. Authenticity				<b>1.00</b>	-.36**	-.28	-.16	-.22	.22	-.31	-.24	-.24	.06	-.04
5. Engagement					<b>1.00</b>	.14	-.05	.09	-.20	.17	.04	-.13	-.12	.07
6. Verbal engagement						<b>1.00</b>	.69**	.25	-.19	.51**	.15	.39**	-.24	-.03
7. Nonverbal engagement							<b>1.00</b>	.14	-.18	.16	.31	.39**	-.06	.15
Whites														
8. Liking								<b>1.00</b>	-.12	.55**	-.02	.29	-.53**	-.29
9. Negative affect									<b>1.00</b>	-.25	-.26	-.15	.15	.08
10. Enjoy										<b>1.00</b>	.12	.42**	-.25	-.32
11. Authenticity											<b>1.00</b>	.52**	.25	.26
12. Engagement												<b>1.00</b>	.13	.11
13. Verbal engagement													<b>1.00</b>	.65**
14. Nonverbal engagement														<b>1.00</b>

\* $p < .10$ . \*\* $p < .05$ .

**TABLE 3: Correlations Within Experimental Conditions for Study 2**

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Ethnic Minorities														
1. Liking	<b>1.00</b>	-.25	.75***	.03	.50***	-.19	-.44	.46*	.11	.13	-.01	.13	.08	.38
2. Negative affect	-.23	<b>1.00</b>	-.29	-.11	-.06	-.32	-.02	-.36	.43	-.44	-.27	.16	.17	.04
3. Enjoy	.65***	.19	<b>1.00</b>	.28	.48*	-.15	-.23	.62***	.03	.23	-.31	.08	-.12	.22
4. Authenticity	.16	-.15	.09	<b>1.00</b>	.04	-.39	-.23	.10	-.30	.06	-.21	-.05	-.08	.04
5. Engagement	.32	.09	.18	-.55*	<b>1.00</b>	-.05	-.56***	.03	.17	-.14	-.38	-.36	-.12	.03
6. Verbal engagement	.22	-.06	.11	.01	.01	<b>1.00</b>	.48*	-.21	-.10	.52***	.07	.35	.16	.23
7. Nonverbal engagement	.39	.02	.48*	.09	.12	.80***	<b>1.00</b>	-.25	-.23	.05	.17	.46*	.27	.14
Whites														
8. Liking	.25	-.22	.19	-.18	-.26	.47*	.25	<b>1.00</b>	.19	.32	-.18	-.15	-.39	-.04
9. Negative affect	-.29	.09	-.23	.38	-.44	-.02	.14	-.04	<b>1.00</b>	.31	-.20	-.05	.14	.00
10. Enjoy	.35	-.31	-.07	-.31	.18	.32	-.03	.56***	-.54***	<b>1.00</b>	-.03	.23	-.04	.10
11. Authenticity	.34	.21	.31	-.14	.26	.11	.34	-.13	-.19	.04	<b>1.00</b>	.46*	.19	.16
12. Engagement	.18	-.01	.17	-.24	-.12	.29	.18	.66***	-.15	.48*	.51*	<b>1.00</b>	.34	.53
13. Verbal engagement	-.07	.52*	.12	.06	.13	-.57***	-.29	-.68***	-.05	-.39	.51*	-.04	<b>1.00</b>	.76
14. Nonverbal engagement	-.24	.41	.25	-.16	.21	-.19	.25	-.57***	.15	-.74***	.39	-.27	.51*	<b>1.00</b>

NOTE: Correlations above the diagonal are for the racial prejudice prime condition. Correlations below the diagonal are for the elderly prejudice prime condition.

\* $p < .10$ . \*\*\* $p < .01$ .

2.08,  $p = .047$ . In addition, ethnic minorities who were primed to expect racial prejudice ( $M = 2.97$ ,  $SD = 1.29$ ) experienced more negative affect during the interaction than ethnic minorities who were primed to expect prejudice against the elderly ( $M = 2.14$ ,  $SD = 0.81$ ),  $t(27) = 2.03$ ,  $p = .052$ . Contrary to our predictions, ethnic minorities who were primed to expect racial prejudice ( $M = 5.16$ ,  $SD = 1.14$ ) did not enjoy the interaction less than ethnic minorities who were primed to expect prejudice

against the elderly ( $M = 5.53$ ,  $SD = 0.79$ ),  $t(27) = 1.00$ ,  $p = .33$ , although the means are in the predicted direction.

Consistent with predictions, ethnic minorities who were primed to expect racial prejudice ( $M = 2.63$ ,  $SD = 0.58$ ) believed they were being less authentic than ethnic minorities who were primed to expect prejudice against the elderly ( $M = 3.21$ ,  $SD = 0.78$ ),  $t(27) = 2.28$ ,  $p = .03$ . Finally, and consistent with the compensatory strategy theory, ethnic minorities who were primed to expect

racial prejudice ( $M = 5.02$ ,  $SD = 1.05$ ) reported that they were more engaged during the interaction than ethnic minorities who were primed to expect prejudice against the elderly ( $M = 4.28$ ,  $SD = 0.89$ ),  $t(27) = 2.03$ ,  $p = .053$ .

*Whites' experiences.* Did Whites' experiences during the interaction vary as a function of the prejudice expectations of their partner? Consistent with predictions, results revealed that Whites who interacted with an ethnic minority who was primed to expect racial prejudice ( $M = 5.58$ ,  $SD = 0.62$ ) liked their partner more than Whites who interacted with an ethnic minority who was primed to expect prejudice against the elderly ( $M = 5.02$ ,  $SD = 0.54$ ),  $t(27) = 2.61$ ,  $p = .014$ . Similarly, Whites who interacted with an ethnic minority who was primed to expect racial prejudice ( $M = 2.28$ ,  $SD = 0.73$ ) experienced less negative affect than Whites who interacted with an ethnic minority who was primed to expect prejudice against the elderly ( $M = 2.84$ ,  $SD = 0.56$ ),  $t(26) = 2.26$ ,  $p = .03$ . Furthermore, Whites who interacted with an ethnic minority who was primed to expect racial prejudice ( $M = 5.67$ ,  $SD = 0.84$ ) enjoyed the interaction more than Whites who interacted with an ethnic minority who was primed to expect prejudice against the elderly ( $M = 4.78$ ,  $SD = 0.87$ ),  $t(27) = 2.78$ ,  $p = .01$ .

Interestingly, Whites' feelings of authenticity were not influenced by their ethnic minority partners' prejudice expectation,  $t(27) = 1.28$ ,  $p = .21$  ( $M_s = 3.50$  and  $3.14$ ,  $SD_s = 0.65$  and  $0.84$  for racial prejudice expectation and elderly prejudice expectation, respectively). Likewise, Whites' perceptions of how engaged they were during the interaction were not influenced by their ethnic minority partners' prejudice expectation,  $t(27) = 1.44$ ,  $p = .16$  ( $M_s = 4.73$  and  $4.32$ ,  $SD_s = 0.79$  and  $0.75$  for racial prejudice and elderly prejudice expectation, respectively).

#### OBSERVERS' PERCEPTIONS

Recall that the video and audiotapes of the interactions were coded by two observers to obtain external judgments of how engaged individuals were during the interaction. Results revealed that the observers perceived that ethnic minorities who were primed to expect racial prejudice ( $M = 4.85$ ,  $SD = 0.57$ ) as more verbally engaged compared to ethnic minorities who were primed to expect prejudice against the elderly ( $M = 4.41$ ,  $SD = 0.58$ ),  $t(26) = 2.03$ ,  $p = .05$ . Similarly, there was a tendency for coders to believe that ethnic minorities who were primed to expect racial prejudice ( $M = 4.28$ ,  $SD = 0.55$ ) were more nonverbally engaged than ethnic minorities who were primed to expect prejudice against the elderly ( $M = 3.89$ ,  $SD = 0.58$ ),  $t(26) = 1.78$ ,  $p = .086$ . This pattern of results is consistent with the pattern of perceived engagement during the interaction reported by the ethnic minority participants.

Also consistent with self-reports, the observers did not rate Whites as behaving differently during the interaction as a function of their partners' expectation. There was no reliable difference in observers' ratings of the verbal behavior of Whites who interacted with an ethnic minority primed to expect racial prejudice ( $M = 4.53$ ,  $SD = 0.70$ ) and that of Whites who interacted with an ethnic minority primed to expect prejudice against the elderly ( $M = 4.80$ ,  $SD = 0.49$ ),  $t(25) = 1.15$ ,  $p = .26$ . Similarly, observers perceived little difference in the nonverbal behavior of Whites who interacted with ethnic minorities in the racial prejudice prime condition ( $M = 4.11$ ,  $SD = 0.56$ ) and that of Whites who interacted with ethnic minorities in the elderly prejudice prime ( $M = 4.19$ ,  $SD = 0.58$ ),  $t(25) = 0.41$ ,  $p = .69$ .

We further explored whether ethnic minorities' engagement in the interaction mediated the relationship between the prejudice expectation priming condition and participants' experiences during the interaction. Unfortunately, based on Baron and Kenny's (1986) approach, we did not find evidence for mediation—the priming condition was not statistically reduced when ethnic minorities' level of engagement was entered into the regression analyses. This was the case regardless of whether we used self-report or observers' ratings of engagement.

#### GENERAL DISCUSSION

The results of these studies support our model that ethnic minorities' expectations about being the target of prejudice have divergent effects during interethnic interactions. Across two studies we found that expectations about being the target of prejudice have negative effects for ethnic minorities' experiences in interethnic interactions. Specifically, ethnic minorities who expected prejudice against their ethnic group experienced more negative affect, liked their partner less (Study 2 only), and felt less authentic during the interethnic interaction. In addition, in our second study, we obtained support for our hypothesis that Whites have a more positive experience during interactions in which their ethnic minority partner has expectations of racial prejudice compared to when their ethnic minority partner does not have (or has to a lesser extent) such expectations. Specifically, Whites who interacted with ethnic minorities who expected racial prejudice experienced less negative affect, enjoyed the interaction more, and liked their partner more. Taken together, the findings from these two studies reveal the complexity of effects that ethnic minorities' expectations have on the dynamics of interethnic interactions.

The present findings extended previous research on ethnic minorities' expectations about being the target of prejudice in several ways. First, previous research

focused on ethnic minorities' expectations about how a specific White individual would treat ethnic minorities (Shelton, 2003; Tropp, 2003). In the present research, we extended the focus on individual-level prejudice expectancies (i.e., this one White person is biased against my group) to more societal-level prejudice expectancies (i.e., most Whites are biased against my group). The phenomenon of expecting prejudice from Whites as a group may more accurately reflect the state of what ethnic minorities experience on a daily basis. Second, previous research focused on the impact of expectancies in brief interactions in the laboratory with strangers. Study 1 explored the extent to which expectations about being the target of prejudice influence outcomes in individuals' daily lives with people they interact with on a regular basis. By doing so, we were able to obtain a more ecologically valid assessment of the consequences of prejudice expectancies.

#### *Divergent Experiences*

Whites and ethnic minorities often make different judgments about the same event (Chatman & von Hippel, 2001) and make different attributions about their own and outgroup individuals' behavior even when the behaviors are identical (Shelton & Richeson, 2005). Our work uncovers yet another nuance of intergroup relations in that the results show that Whites and ethnic minorities can participate in the same interaction but walk away with vastly different experiences. Our results suggest that because of ethnic minorities' expectations about how the dominant group may treat them, Whites may leave the interaction feeling comfortable about interethnic interactions, or at least comfortable with that particular outgroup member, whereas ethnic minorities may leave feeling less comfortable about such interactions. These different perceptions can result in misunderstandings that may cause conflict in the long run as well as deter ethnic minorities from engaging in future interethnic interactions.

Do ethnic minorities' expectations about how Whites may treat them always result in ethnic minorities having negative experiences during interethnic interactions? We suspect the answer is no. For instance, compared to the negative outcomes associated with actually being the target of prejudice, the consequences of trying to avoid that fate may be the lesser of two evils. Furthermore, the present data suggest one benefit for ethnic minorities who expect racial prejudice during interethnic interactions. Specifically, Study 2 found that ethnic minorities who expect racial prejudice are liked by their White partner more than ethnic minorities who do not have this expectation. Given that people have a desire to be liked by others, these results suggest that there is at least one, albeit indirect, benefit of racial prejudice expectations.

Given this indirect benefit and the ironic effect that ethnic minorities' expectations lead to positive affective outcomes for Whites, one could argue that it may be somewhat useful for ethnic minorities to have these expectations when interacting with Whites. Although there are self-protective effects associated with expecting Whites to be prejudiced (Crocker & Major, 1989), we do not mean to imply that individuals should enter interactions with expectations of racial prejudice. Although prejudice expectations result in more positive experiences for Whites (i.e., less negative affect and more enjoyment), ethnic minorities have the opposite reaction. Moreover, ethnic minorities' expectations may negatively influence Whites' experiences during the interaction in ways that we did not explore in our study. In fact, one could argue that Whites do incur negative consequences as a result of ethnic minorities' expectations. Recall that in Study 2, ethnic minorities who expected racial prejudice liked their interaction partner less compared to ethnic minorities who did not have this prejudiced expectation. Thus, the utility of ethnic minorities' expectations about prejudice remains somewhat unclear at this point.

#### *Compensatory Strategies*

During social interactions, targets are often motivated to dispel the negative expectations that their partner holds, or at least expectations that they think their partner holds, about their group (Hilton & Darley, 1985; C. Miller & Myers, 1998). Given the implications of this research for interethnic interactions, we thought it was important to explicitly examine the effect of ethnic minorities' prejudice expectancies on such efforts. We found evidence that expectations about racial prejudice prompt ethnic minorities to engage in compensatory strategies, perhaps as a means to prevent being the target of prejudice.

We find it intriguing that across both long-term and short-term interactions, ethnic minorities who held expectations about being the target of prejudice seemed to engage in compensatory strategies. In Study 1 we found that the more ethnic minorities had a dispositional tendency to expect prejudice, the more they disclosed information to their White roommate. In Study 2, ethnic minorities who were primed to expect racial prejudice, compared to those who were primed to expect prejudice against the elderly, were more engaged during the interaction, which was indicated by self-reports and independent coders' ratings. This increased engagement, which included the use of warm, interactive verbal and nonverbal behaviors, was perhaps a means of making the interaction comfortable. One may argue that these findings are not surprising in the long-term interaction. That is, given that 1st-year college

roommates usually live together for at least 9 months, both roommates are generally invested in making sure that the relationship is at least cordial. However, ethnic minorities who expect to be the target of prejudice may be especially motivated to be cordial so that they will not have to struggle with the negative outcomes associated with prejudice throughout the entire academic year. As a result, ethnic minorities with White roommates may have self-disclosed more information as a means of increasing intimacy and maintaining harmony.

It is interesting, however, that even in brief and relatively inconsequential interactions, ethnic minorities who expect racial prejudice will engage in behaviors to facilitate a smooth interaction. One question that emerges therefore is whether targets who expect prejudice engage in compensatory strategies consciously and deliberately. For instance, did the ethnic minorities in Study 2 consciously weigh the odds of experiencing prejudice and deliberately make the decision to employ social interaction tactics to reduce potential bias? The self-report data suggest that when asked, ethnic minorities can and do report that they were engaged during the interaction, suggesting some level of awareness of these tactics. It remains unclear however whether the use of compensatory strategies was a conscious decision to prevent prejudice from the onset of the interaction.

#### *Limitations and Future Directions*

One question that the present findings leave unanswered is why ethnic minorities' expectations result in divergent effects during intergroup interactions. Although previous research makes us inclined to believe that ethnic minorities' use of compensatory strategies is what led to the divergent effects for self and other, mediation analyses did not support this claim. As a result, the underlying cause of our pattern of results remains unclear. Perhaps, the use of compensatory strategies is a mediating factor, but our measures were not sensitive enough or did not capture the correct strategies that led to the divergent effects. Or, perhaps other factors that we did not examine in the present studies are responsible for the emergence of the divergent experiences. One intriguing possibility for example is the distinction between general compensatory strategies and stereotype-reducing compensatory strategies. Our measure of compensatory strategies focused on general social engagement (e.g., being involved in the interaction, disclosing information). It is possible that what is driving our effect is individuals' use of compensatory strategies directly associated with dispelling negative racial stereotypes. For example, Blacks may present themselves in a way to indicate that they are intelligent and hardworking to counter the unintelligent and lazy stereotypes associated with their group. Ethnic minorities' use of stereotype-

reducing compensatory strategies may have prevented racial stereotypes from being activated for Whites, which, in turn, led Whites to have a more positive experience during the interaction. Thus, because we relied on a general measure of compensatory strategies, we were not able to capture this in our studies. Future research is needed to disentangle general compensatory strategies from stereotype-reducing compensatory strategies and the impact of these strategies for ethnic minorities' and Whites' divergent experiences during interethnic interactions.

We were surprised to find that expectations about prejudice did not influence ethnic minorities' liking for their roommate in Study 1 but did influence their liking for their partner in Study 2. This difference may have occurred because of the difference in long- and short-term interactions. The extent to which individuals like someone they know they are going to interact with on a regular basis is apt to be influenced by many variables. Perhaps expecting to be the target of prejudice is not the most pivotal factor for explaining liking in this context. Or, it is probably more likely the case that the difference between the findings across studies is a function of measurement issues (liking was measured with two vs. four items).

Future research is necessary to address the boundary conditions of ethnic minorities' use of compensatory strategies when they expect to be the target of prejudice. Two variables that are apt to be important are (a) motivation and (b) self-efficacy. Ethnic minorities must be motivated to engage in the strategies and believe that they have the skills to do so. Moreover, they must believe that using compensatory strategies will result in the desired outcome—a harmonious interethnic encounter (see Plant & Butz, 2004, for a similar discussion with Whites' motivation to respond without prejudice).

Ethnic minorities' motivation to engage in compensatory strategies may be shaped by contextual factors. For example, ethnic minorities who expect to be the target of prejudice are likely to be more socially engaged during an interethnic interaction when situational norms promote tolerance and diversity compared to when the norms do not. When the situational norms are more hostile toward racial tolerance, ethnic minorities will probably not be motivated to be socially engaging. In the latter situations, the effort involved in using the social tactics will not likely prevent one from being the target of prejudice. The participants in our studies are students at an institution where racial diversity is highly valued. As a result, although some of our participants expected to be the target of prejudice, they probably felt that because diversity is valued it would be worth the effort to be socially engaging during interethnic interactions. In addition, some situations may be too trivial to motivate

ethnic minorities who expect to be the target of prejudice to consider using compensatory strategies. For example, a Hispanic woman may expect to be followed around a prestigious shopping store, but she may not be motivated to have pleasant interactions with the salespeople in the store. Although she expects to be the target of prejudice, the situation may not be important enough for her to try to prevent from being treated in a negative manner.

Even if ethnic minorities who expect to be the target of prejudice are motivated to engage in compensatory strategies, they may lack the skills for doing so. They may feel that the social context is extremely hostile against ethnic minorities and that they do not have the skills to override this hostility. As a result, when self-efficacy is low, ethnic minorities who expect prejudice are not likely to engage in compensatory strategies.

It is important to keep in mind that verbal and non-verbal compensatory strategies are only one way that ethnic minorities may cope with expectations about being the target of prejudice. Such tactics are self-focused and concentrate on what is personally controllable about the interaction. Other strategies place relatively less focus on one's own behavior as a vehicle for positive outcomes. For example, ethnic minorities who expect prejudice may increase their attention to their partners' actions, which may result in them enjoying the interaction more because they are not trying to manage their impressions. Future research should explore other strategies that ethnic minorities who expect prejudice use during interethnic interactions.

In the present research, we did not focus on the parallel concerns of Whites, who tend to be aware, and thus may expect, that others perceive them as prejudiced during interethnic interactions. Whites' prejudice expectancies have been the focus of recent work by Plant and Devine (2003) as well as Vorauer and Kumhyr (2001). Future research should examine the combined effects of both ethnic minorities' and Whites' expectancies on interethnic interactions (see Shelton, 2003, for preliminary work in this area).

#### *Final Thoughts*

In sum, the present findings suggest that ethnic minorities' expectations about being the target of prejudice can sometimes have divergent effects for interethnic interactions. These divergent effects (positive outcomes for one's partner but negative outcomes for the self) may help explain why it is not uncommon for Whites and ethnic minorities to disagree about issues related to intergroup relations. Not only are Whites and ethnic minorities perceiving racial events differently, but in some situations they are also experiencing racial events differently.

#### NOTES

1. Administrators at Princeton informed us that freshmen are randomly assigned to rooms. In addition, we asked participants to indicate whether they had selected their roommate. All participants indicated that they had not selected their roommate.

2. We obtained a list of ethnic minority students at the university from the Registrar's Office. Then we selected students from this list and sent them an e-mail about the study. The students who responded became the participants for the study.

3. We are grateful to Brenda Major for sharing these materials with us.

4. During the debriefing session, the experimenter informed participants that they were videotaped. Of the participants, 1 ethnic minority and 2 White participants indicated that they preferred that their tapes not be used in the research. As a result, the degrees of freedom for the self-report and coders' outcomes are not the same in the following analyses.

#### REFERENCES

- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 1173-1182.
- Bryk, A., & Raudenbush, S. (1992). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Chatman, C., & von Hippel, W. (2001). Attributional mediation of ingroup bias. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36*, 267-272.
- Crocker, J., & Major, B. (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. *Psychological Review, 96*, 608-630.
- Crocker, J., Voelkl, K., Testa, M., & Major, B. (1991). Social stigma: The affective consequences of attributional ambiguity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 218-228.
- Curtis, R. C., & Miller, K. (1986). Believing another likes or dislikes you: Behaviors making the beliefs come true. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 284-290.
- Frable, D. E., Blackstone, T., & Scherbaum, C. (1990). Marginal and mindful: Deviants in social interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 140-149.
- Hilton, J. L., & Darley, J. M. (1985). Constructing other persons: A limit on the effect. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 21*, 1-18.
- Hilton, J. L., & Darley, J. M. (1991). The effects of interaction goals on person perception. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 235-267). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Ickes, W., Patterson, M. L., Rajcecki, D. W., & Tanford, S. (1982). Behavioral and cognitive consequences of reciprocal versus compensatory responses to preinteraction expectancies. *Social Cognition, 1*, 160-190.
- Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2001). Reacting to impending discrimination: Compensation for prejudice and attributions to discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 1357-1367.
- Laurenceau, J., Feldman-Barrett, L., & Pietromonaco, P. R. (1998). Intimacy as an interpersonal process: The importance of self-disclosure, partner disclosure, and perceived partner responsiveness in interpersonal exchanges. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1238-1251.
- Mendoza-Denton, R., Downey, G., Purdie, V. J., Davis, A., & Pietrzak, J. (2002). Sensitivity to status-based rejection: Implications for African American students' college experience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 896-918.
- Miller, C., & Myers, A. (1998). Compensating for prejudice: How heavyweight people (and others) control outcomes despite prejudice. In J. Swim & C. Stangor (Eds.), *Prejudice: The target's perspective* (pp. 191-218). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Miller, C., Rothblum, E., Barbour, L., Brand, P., & Felicio, D. (1990). Social interactions of obese and nonobese women. *Journal of Personality, 58*, 365-380.
- Miller, C., Rothblum, E., Felicio, D., & Brand, P. (1995). Compensating for stigma: Obese and nonobese women's reactions to being visible. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*, 1093-1106.

- Miller, D. T., & Turnbull, W. (1986). Expectancies and interpersonal processes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *37*, 233-256.
- Phelps, R., Altschul, D., Wisenbaker, J., Day, J., Cooper, D., & Potter, C. (1998). Roommate satisfaction and ethnic identity in mixed-race and White university roommate dyads. *Journal of College Student Development*, *39*, 194-203.
- Pinel, E. (1999). Stigma consciousness: The psychological legacy of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *76*, 114-128.
- Plant, E. A., & Butz, D. A. (2004). *Expectancies and motivations regarding interracial interactions: Implications for intergroup emotions and behavior*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (2003). The antecedents and implications of interracial anxiety. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *29*, 790-801.
- Shelton, J. N. (2003). Interpersonal concerns in social encounters between majority and minority group members. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *6*, 171-186.
- Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2005). Intergroup contact and pluralistic ignorance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*, 91-107.
- Snyder, M., & Swann, W. B. (1978). Behavioral confirmation in social interaction: From social perception to social reality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *14*, 148-162.
- Snyder, M., Tanke, E. D., & Berscheid, E. (1977). Social perception and interpersonal behavior: On the self-fulfilling nature of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*, 656-666.
- Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*, 797-811.
- Swann, W. (1987). Identity negotiation: Where two roads meet. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *53*, 1038-1051.
- Swann, W. B., & Ely, R. J. (1984). A battle of wills: Self-verification versus behavioral confirmation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *46*, 1287-1302.
- Swann, W. B., & Read, S. J. (1981). Self-verification processes: How we sustain our self-conceptions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *17*, 351-372.
- Tropp, L. R. (2003). The psychological impact of prejudice: Implications for intergroup contact. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *6*, 131-149.
- Vorauer, J., & Kumhry, S. (2001). Is this about you or me? Self-versus other-directed judgments and feelings in response to intergroup interaction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*, 706-719.
- Word, C. O., Zanna, M. P., & Cooper, J. (1974). The nonverbal mediation of self-fulfilling prophecies in interracial interaction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *10*, 109-120.

Received September 3, 2004

Revision accepted December 15, 2004