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In the past decades, contact between individuals from different cultural backgrounds has increased in all domains of life, whether it is in organizations, schools or neighborhoods. Although cultural diversity potentially may lead to a more dynamic and interesting world, it also comes with the risk that people categorize others in terms of their cultural background. The now classic work of Allport (1954) and Tajfel (1969) already identified how easily differences between groups may lead to the categorizations of others into “us” versus “them”, or “ingroups” versus “outgroups”. As a consequence, social categorization processes may provide the psychological basis for many intergroup conflicts (e.g., Brown, 1995; Tajfel & Turner, 1973). These processes are especially relevant for culturally diverse neighborhoods, were many individuals from different cultural backgrounds live in close proximity to each other, yet remain relatively anonymous. In the current chapter we investigate whether and under what conditions urban district identities can function as a common ingroup identity, and as such, buffer the negative intergroup relations between residents with different cultural backgrounds.

Surprisingly, most research on common ingroup identities and on the subjective representations of these identities in terms of perceived group prototypicality (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999; Waldzus, Mummendey, Wenzel, & Weber, 2003), only focused on majority group members, or on situations in which two equal sized groups potentially share a common identity. However, in many real-life contexts groups differ in size, status and power. For instance, residents of culturally diverse neighborhoods can either belong to the national cultural majority or to a cultural minority group. The idea that members of majority and minority groups differ in their perceptions of a shared common ingroup identity, and especially the idea that this may result in different consequences for majority versus minority members’ outgroup attitudes, has only recently been acknowledged (Dovidio et al., 2007; Wenzel et al., 2007). As a consequence, studies on how members of majority and minority groups differ in their representations of common ingroup identities are scarce. In the current study we aim to address this void by investigating the consequences of urban city districts as a common ingroup identity for attitudes between majority and minority members. By doing so we demonstrate that the perceived prototypicality of one’s subgroup for the
overarching identity (ingroup prototypicality; Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999), may have different consequences for outgroup attitudes for cultural majorities than for minorities.

**Common Ingroup Identities and Ingroup versus Outgroup Prototypicality**

Social categorization processes are flexible, and people can relate to many different social categories. This notion forms the basis for the common ingroup identity model (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000), which proposes recategorization as a solution for improving intergroup relations. By stimulating subgroups members’ identification with a higher order common ingroup identity, which includes the own and other subgroups, intergroup attitudes can be improved (Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachman, & Rust, 1993). Once members of a former outgroup are recategorized as ingroup members within a broader, common ingroup, attitudes towards former outgroup members should be improved through the same processes that underlie ingroup favoritism. Indeed, in the past two decades many studies, in the laboratory as well as in various field contexts such as organizations, schools and mixed families, have demonstrated that the perception of a common ingroup identity may lead to improved intergroup attitudes (see Dovidio et al., 2007, for a review).

However, superordinate social categories may also provide group members with a new platform for making intergroup comparisons. That is, in situations in which two or more subgroups are included within a common ingroup, members of the different subgroups may vary in their perceptions of what an ideal-type member of this common ingroup may look like. More specifically, according to the ingroup projection model, group members tend to perceive their ingroup as more prototypical for a relevant superordinate category than other subgroups (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999; Wenzel, Mummendey, Weber, & Waldzus, 2003). This potentially leads to a situation in which outgroups can be objectively included in an overarching social identity, but are compared to—and negatively differentiated from—ingroup standards (e.g., Waldzus & Mummendey, 2004; Waldzus, Mummendey, & Wenzel 2005). A high degree of perceived ingroup prototypicality therefore usually is negatively related to outgroup attitudes.
Conversely, the more prototypical members of other groups are perceived to be for the common ingroup (i.e., outgroup prototypicality), the more they are perceived to be alike, and the more positive outgroup attitudes will be. Perceived ingroup and outgroup prototypicality thus appear to be two sides of the same medal, at least in their consequences for outgroup attitudes. As a result, most studies on the effect of ingroup prototypicality on outgroup attitudes used a relative ingroup prototypicality measure, referring to the extent to which the ingroup is perceived to be more positive for a common ingroup identity than the outgroup (Wenzel et al., 2007). However, as recently argued by Ulrich (2009), this relative measure may not be ideal for capturing the prototypicality of the ingroup and outgroup. That is, focusing on relative ingroup prototypicality as a predictor of outgroup attitudes disregards the possibility that perceived ingroup and perceived outgroup prototypicality are not different poles on the same dimension, but that each may uniquely predict outgroup attitudes. In the present study we therefore differentiate between ingroup and outgroup prototypicality, and investigate their distinct effects on outgroup attitudes. More importantly, we propose that ingroup and outgroup prototypicality perceptions, and the consequences of these perceptions for outgroup attitudes, differ for majority members and minority members.

**Majority and Minority Perspectives on Perceived Subgroup Prototypicality**

Although the ingroup projection model predicts that subgroup members have the tendency to perceive their own subgroup as most prototypical for a common ingroup (Mummendey, & Wenzel, 1999), it is likely that these perceptions also are affected by reality constraints (cf. Waldzus, Mummendey, Wenzel, Boettcher, 2004). That is, in situations wherein subgroups within a superordinate group clearly differ in size, status, or power, members of different subgroups may actually agree that the differences between these groups are a given of the social reality (cf. Devos & Banaji, 2005; Mummendey & Otten, 2001; Waldzus, et al., 2004). Consequently, majority group members are likely to perceive their own group as most prototypical not only because of ingroup projection, but also because it is consistent with the reality of the situation. Minority group members, however, may be less prone to claim that they are more prototypical for common ingroup than
majority members, due to these reality constrains (Waldzus et al., 2004). Yet, this does not necessarily imply that minority members will not claim a certain level of ingroup prototypicality at all; after all, a sufficient degree of prototypicality ensures that they actually belong to the common ingroup. Claiming that the own group is also prototypical can well be combined with acknowledging that the majority group is a characteristic element of the common ingroup. Hence, we expect that whereas majority group members perceive their ingroup as most prototypical for their urban district, minority groups members perceive their ingroup not as more prototypical than the majority outgroup (Hypothesis 1).

Moreover, we expect that these differences between majority and minority members’ perception of the common ingroup in terms of ingroup prototypicality, also affect how identification with a common ingroup affects outgroup attitudes on the subgroup level. In line with previous research, we expect for both majority and minorities that identification with a common ingroup identity is most beneficial when the common ingroup is perceived to be representative for both the ingroup and the outgroup(s) (Wenzel et al., 2007). However, in a shared reality, in which the majority group is relatively prototypical for the common ingroup, perceived ingroup prototypicality may have different consequences majority or minority members in terms of how representative they see the common ingroup for both subgroups. That is, for majority members a relatively high level of ingroup prototypicality implies that the common ingroup is perceived as merely representative for the majority group. We therefore predict in line with intergroup projection model, that for majority members identification with a common ingroup identity is positively related to outgroup attitudes, but only when perceived outgroup prototypicality is low (Hypothesis 2a).

Conversely, for minority members perceiving their ingroup as low in prototypicality may actually result in an image of the superordinate group that is merely representative for the majority group—thereby questioning that it is in fact a common ingroup. For minority members, a high level of perceived prototypicality may thus be a necessary condition for seeing the common ingroup identity also as representative for their own subgroup. We therefore predict that, for minority members, identification with a common ingroup identity is positively
related to outgroup attitudes, but only when perceived ingroup prototypicality is high (Hypothesis 2b).

Furthermore, for the relation between outgroup prototypicality and outgroup attitudes we do not expect to find differences between majority and minority members. That is, a higher perceived outgroup prototypicality would mean, for majority as well as minority group members, that they see the common ingroup as more inclusive for the outgroup. For both groups we thus predict that the relation between a common ingroup and outgroup attitudes is stronger when perceived outgroup prototypicality is high (Hypothesis 3).

The Current Studies

We tested these hypotheses in two studies conducted in various multicultural city districts in the Netherlands. City districts are geographically and objectively determined areas within a city. The borders of a city district are indicated on the city map, city districts have an official name, and, most importantly, residents are aware in which district they live, and have an image of who else is living in these districts (unlike neighborhoods which are subjectively defined). For these reasons we investigated whether urban districts can function as a common ingroup identity for residents of culturally diverse neighborhoods.

In the Netherlands, a urban district is considered to be culturally diverse when 25% or more of the residents have a non-western background (Statistics Netherlands, 2010). Importantly, in most culturally diverse district there is still a majority group of residents with a native-Dutch background, versus a minority group of residents with a non-western cultural background. The term culturally diverse neighborhood thus does not refer to segregated neighborhoods with a majority of residents that belong to a cultural minority group on national level (e.g., black neighborhoods in the United States of America). The biggest cultural minority groups in the Netherlands respectively are: Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese, and Antilleans (Statistics Netherlands, 2010). In the current studies we therefore made a distinction between residents with a native-Dutch background (the cultural majority) and residents with a non-western background (the cultural minority).
In the first study we used data from a door-to-door survey conducted in a culturally diverse city district in one of the larger cities in the Netherlands. The second study was designed to replicate the results from Study 1 in a different area and to have a more balanced sample in terms of cultural backgrounds. That is, because in Study 1 there were relatively few participants with a cultural minority background, in Study 2 we actively approached both majority and minority group members in order to get a reliable sample of residents with a minority background as well.

**Study 1**

A survey assessed residents’ cultural background (ingroup on subgroup level), identification with their urban district (common ingroup) and perceived prototypicality of the subgroups for the common ingroup. Perceived ingroup prototypicality thus refers to the extent to which residents perceive their own cultural group as prototypical for their district. Perceived outgroup prototypicality refers to the extent to which residents perceive other cultural groups as prototypical for their city district. We tested whether the predicted patterns of perceived ingroup versus outgroup prototypicality would differ for majority and minority members as we predicted in Hypothesis 1. In addition, we tested whether the relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes indeed was moderated by ingroup or outgroup prototypicality and group status, as predicted in Hypotheses 2 and 3.

**Method**

**Participants and procedure**

Participants were 260 residents of a multicultural city district in a medium sized city in the Netherlands. Of these, 46% were male, 53% were female (1% unknown). The mean age of the participants was 45 years (ranging from 19 to 100; SD = 16.46). Participants indicated their ethnic background, which included Antillean, Dutch, Moroccan, Turkish and other non-western cultural backgrounds. For the purpose of this study we classified participants with a native-Dutch background (n = 215, 83%) as majority members, and participants with a non-western background (n = 33, 13%), as minority members. We omitted 12 participants (4%) who did not
indicate a cultural background, or indicated a western non-Dutch background from further analyses.

To collect the data for this study we approached residents of a multicultural city district house-to-house with a questionnaire. According to Statistics Netherlands (2009), 29% of the residents in this district had a non-western cultural background. We invited residents with the age of 18 or older to complete the survey and send it back using a pre-paid return envelope. In return, participants had a chance of winning one of five mp3-players.

Measures

Participants' identification with their urban district was measured with three items (e.g., “I am happy to be a resident of [name district]”). Participants answered these questions on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (totally disagree) to 6 (totally agree). We created a district identification scale by aggregating the scores on these three items, α = .89.

Participants’ perceived prototypicality of three cultural groups (Moroccan, Turkish, and Dutch) for their urban district was assessed with two questions per group: “the [ethnic group] culture is representative for [name district]” and “the typical resident of [name district] has a [ethnic group] background”. Participants with a cultural background other than Moroccan, Turkish, or Dutch in addition answered the same two questions referring to their own cultural background (e.g., “my own cultural group is representative for [name district]”). Participants answered these questions on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (totally disagree) to 6 (totally agree). We combined participants' answers on the two items referring to their own group into an ingroup prototypicality scale. We created an outgroup prototypicality scale by aggregating all of these items, except those referring to the participants’ ingroup, all, rs > .50, ps < .001.

We measured outgroup attitudes towards Moroccan, Turkish, and Dutch people with three items for each group (e.g., “how positive is your image of [ethnic group] in [name city district]?” and “in general, how competent/friendly do you think [members of ethnic group] in [name city district] are?”). These three items together formed a reliable scale for each outgroup (all αs > .72). Participants answered the questions on a 6-point scale. The anchors differed per question: for the positivity
question the scale ranged from 1 (negative) to 6 (positive), for the friendliness question the scale ranged from 1 (unfriendly) to 6 (friendly), and for the competence question the scale from 1 (incompetent) to 6 (competent). We constructed an outgroup attitude scale by aggregating participants’ answers for all groups except one’s own group.

Results

Perceived ingroup prototypicality

First, we tested our prediction that native-Dutch participants would perceive their cultural group as more prototypical than minority groups, whereas minority group members would not perceive their ingroup as more prototypical than the majority outgroup (Hypothesis 1). To this end we conducted two repeated-measure Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) for native-Dutch and non-western minority participants separately. For native-Dutch participants we found, as predicted, a highly significant difference between perceived ingroup and outgroup prototypicality, $F(1, 213) = 66.41, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .24$. Native-Dutch participants perceived their subgroup to be more prototypical for their urban district than minority groups (see Table 4.1). For participants with a non-western cultural background we performed a repeated-measure ANOVA with three dependent variables: ingroup prototypicality, prototypicality of the majority, and prototypicality of outgroup minorities. Here we also found a significant difference, $F(2, 33) = 5.08, p = .009$, partial $\eta^2 = .14$. For participants with a non-western cultural background, perceived ingroup prototypicality was lower than perceived prototypicality of the majority. This signals that the high prototypicality of the majority group is a shared reality within the inclusive group. Moreover, outgroup minority groups were perceived as equally prototypical to the ingroup (see Table 4.1). We thus found support for our first prediction. Native-Dutch participants indeed perceived their group as most prototypical for their district whereas minorities did not perceive their ingroup as more prototypical than the majority group.
Following Ulrich (2009), we investigated the raw correlations between ingroup and outgroup prototypicality, and outgroup attitudes. As shown by the correlations in Table 4.2, both constructs showed no significant direct relations with outgroup attitudes. Both ingroup and outgroup prototypicality were thus not directly related to outgroup attitudes.

Next, we expected to find a positive relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes, and that this was moderated by perceived ingroup or outgroup prototypicality, and group status (Hypotheses 2 & 3). We ran a regression model with the standardized scores of district identification, ingroup prototypicality, majority versus minority background of the participant (coded as -1 versus 1), all two-way interaction terms, and the three-way interaction term as predictors. As dependent variable we used the outgroup attitude scale. There was a significant direct relation between identification with urban district and outgroup attitudes, $\beta = .36$, $t(233) = 4.08$, $p < .001$. More importantly, this effect was qualified by a significant three-way interaction, $\beta = .16$, $t(233) = 2.21$, $p = .028$. Additional analyses demonstrated that this three-way interaction, in turn, was due to a different relation between ingroup prototypicality and identification for majority and minority participants.

### Table 4.1.
Means Perceived Group Prototypicality, Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prototypicality</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>native-Dutch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>3.71 (1.25)</td>
<td>[3.54, 3.88]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup</td>
<td>2.89 (1.07)</td>
<td>[2.74, 3.03]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-western Minorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>3.24 (1.60)</td>
<td>[2.67, 3.81]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup (Majority)</td>
<td>4.28 (1.07)</td>
<td>[3.83, 4.75]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup (Minority)</td>
<td>3.54 (1.54)</td>
<td>[2.99, 4.08]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District identification, subgroup prototypicality and outgroup attitudes**

Following Ulrich (2009), we investigated the raw correlations between ingroup and outgroup prototypicality, and outgroup attitudes. As shown by the correlations in Table 4.2, both constructs showed no significant direct relations with outgroup attitudes. Both ingroup and outgroup prototypicality were thus not directly related to outgroup attitudes.

Next, we expected to find a positive relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes, and that this was moderated by perceived ingroup or outgroup prototypicality, and group status (Hypotheses 2 & 3). We ran a regression model with the standardized scores of district identification, ingroup prototypicality, majority versus minority background of the participant (coded as -1 versus 1), all two-way interaction terms, and the three-way interaction term as predictors. As dependent variable we used the outgroup attitude scale. There was a significant direct relation between identification with urban district and outgroup attitudes, $\beta = .36$, $t(233) = 4.08$, $p < .001$. More importantly, this effect was qualified by a significant three-way interaction, $\beta = .16$, $t(233) = 2.21$, $p = .028$. Additional analyses demonstrated that this three-way interaction, in turn, was due to a different relation between ingroup prototypicality and identification for majority and minority participants.
We broke this tree-way interaction down by looking at the pattern for majority and minority group members separately. For majority members there was a direct relation between identification with the superordinate group and outgroup attitudes, $\beta = .29$, $t(233) = 4.44$, $p < .001$. However, this was qualified by the predicted two-interaction between identification and ingroup prototypicality, $\beta = -.29$, $t(233) = -4.63$, $p < .001$. Simple slopes analyses (Aiken & West, 1991) revealed, in line with Hypothesis 2a, that when majority members perceived their ingroup as relatively low in prototypicality, there was a significant positive relation between identification and outgroup attitudes, $\beta = .58$, $t(233) = 6.55$, $p < .001$. When perceived ingroup prototypicality was high, however, the relation between identification with the superordinate group and outgroup attitudes was not significant, $\beta = -.01$, $t(233) = -0.10$, $p = .918$, (see Figure 4.1).

For minority members we also found a significant direct relation between identification and outgroup attitudes, $\beta = .43$, $t(233) = 2.63$, $p = .009$. The two-way
interaction between identification and prototypicality on outgroup attitudes was not significant, $\beta = .02$, $t(233) = 0.16$, $p = .876$. For minorities, perceived ingroup prototypicality, thus, did not moderate the positive relation between identification and outgroup attitudes.

In addition, we built the same regression model but now with outgroup prototypicality instead of ingroup prototypicality as predictor. The results showed, in addition to the significant relation between identification and outgroup attitudes, $\beta = .30$, $t(239) = 2.14$, $p = .033$, that all two-way interactions, and the three-way interaction were not significant, all $t$s < 0.65, $ps > .500$. Outgroup prototypicality thus did not moderate the relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes. The third hypothesis was therefore not supported.

Figure 4.1.
The interaction effect of perceived ingroup prototypicality and district identification on outgroup attitudes for Native-Dutch participants, Study 1.
In this study, we investigated how majority members and minority members differ in the extent to which they perceive their own group to be prototypical for a common ingroup, and what consequences this has for outgroup attitudes. The results showed, in line with Hypothesis 1, that majority group members perceived their own group as most prototypical, whereas minority group members perceived their own group as equally prototypical as the majority subgroup. The prominence of the majority group within the common ingroup, thus, forms a shared reality for both majority and minority members. In addition, the results revealed that minorities perceived their ingroup as equally prototypical as other minority groups.

The prediction that identification with an overarching district identity is positively related to residents’ outgroup attitudes was supported. Both majority and minority members were more positive towards outgroups when identifying more strongly with their urban district. Moreover, the results showed that ingroup prototypicality, but not outgroup prototypicality, moderated the relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes, and that this moderation effect was different for majority members versus minority members.

Specifically, for majority members we found, in line with Hypothesis 2a, that the positive relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes was restricted to those who perceive their ingroup as low in prototypicality for their urban district. For majority members who perceived their ingroup as highly prototypical, we found no significant relation between identification and outgroup attitudes. For residents with a cultural minority background there was a direct, and positive, relation between identification with their urban district and outgroup attitudes. However, unlike predicted in Hypothesis 2b there were no interaction effects of ingroup prototypicality. Moreover, the third hypothesis that perceived outgroup prototypicality would positively moderate the relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes was not supported. This implies that the representation of an overarching identity in terms of the relevance for one’s own group, but not for outgroups, is the most relevant for outgroup attitudes.

In our first study with thus found that minority and majority members differ in the extent to which they perceive their ingroup as prototypical for such a common
ingroup. Perceived ingroup prototypicality, in turn, may moderate the relation between identification and outgroup attitudes. In Study 1 we could find support for this last claim only for majorities, but not for minorities. One reason for not confirming our second hypothesis for minority members is that because of the nature of this study, a door-to-door questionnaire, only a limited number (13%) of the participants that responded had a cultural minority background. This group therefore may have been less representative for the population of residents with a culturally minority background. Secondly, in Study 1 we measured perceived prototypicality of, and attitudes about minority outgroups by assessing the prototypicality and attitudes of Moroccan and Turkish residents. As a consequence, the minority outgroups prototypicality scale and the minority outgroup attitude scale for Moroccan and Turkish participants was based on the perceptions of only one outgroup, which may have resulted in a less reliable measure for outgroup attitudes and prototypicality.

**Study 2**

The aim of the second study was to replicate the findings of Study 1. In addition, in Study 2 we made sure that our sample would be more balanced in terms of proportion of residents with a majority and a minority background. Third, in Study 2 we included items referring to more minority outgroups, in order to get a more representative minority outgroup prototypicality and attitude measure for minority participants.

**Method**

**Participants and procedure**

Participants were 121 residents of two multicultural city districts in the Netherlands. Of these, 48% were male, and 46% female (6% unknown). The mean age of the participants was 40 years, ranging from 18 to 92 (SD = 14.36). A distinction between native-Dutch and non-western participants was made in the same way as in Study 1. In Study 2 there were 58 participants with a native-Dutch background (48%) and 45 with a non-western minority background (37%). We omitted 18 (15%) participants, who did not indicate an ethnic background or indicated a non-Dutch western background, from further analyses.
To collect the data, we went to various public places located in two city districts. These districts were different districts than the one in Study 1, situated in the same city. Both districts were comparable in terms of cultural diversity (respectively, 31% and 27% of the residents had a non-western background; Statistics Netherlands, 2009). To ensure our subsamples of participants with a native-Dutch and non-western minority background would be comparable in terms of size, we actively approached residents from both groups, and asked them to complete the questionnaire on the spot. We solely included resident of the respective district which were of the age of 18 or older. It took participants circa 10 minutes to complete the survey.

**Measures**

Unless noted otherwise, participants answered the questions on a 7-centimeter thermometer line. We processed the answers on these scales by measuring the distance from the left anchor to the place were participants checked the line in tenths of centimeters. Scale scores therefore ranged from 0 to 7.

We measured identification with residents’ urban district using the satisfaction (e.g., “It is pleasant to be a resident of [name district]”) and centrality (e.g., “I often think about the fact that I am a resident of [name district]”) components of ingroup identification as suggested by Leach and colleagues (2008). The scale ran from 0 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). We created an urban district identification scale by aggregating the answers to all 7 items, \( \alpha = 84 \).

In addition, we measured participants’ perceived prototypicality of five cultural groups (Moroccans, Turks, Antilleans, Surinamese, and Dutch) for their urban district. To this end we used an adapted version of the overlap of self, ingroup and outgroup scale (OSIO; Schubert & Otten, 2002; cf. Waldzus & Mummendey, 2004). Per subgroup we had an one-item measure, consisting of seven diagrams of two increasingly overlapping circles. One circle was labeled with the name of the subgroup and the other with the name of the urban district. From top to bottom, the circles got closer, starting with a gap between them, touching each other in the third diagram, and nearly completely overlapping in the seventh diagram. Participants were instructed to indicate what picture best represented the closeness of the subgroup and their urban district. A score of 1, thus, represented the lowest
perceived prototypicality and a score of 7 the highest perceived prototypicality. We constructed an ingroup prototypicality scale out of the item that referred to the ingroup of the participant. In addition, we constructed an outgroup prototypicality scale by aggregating all scores, except the one referring to the ingroup of the participant.

Attitudes towards Antilleans, Moroccans, Dutch, Turks, and Surinamese were measured with two items: “to what extent do you have a positive/negative image of [cultural group]”. The scale ran from 0 (not at all positive/negative) to 7 (extremely positive/negative). We reversed the answers of the negativity scale and combined the two items referring to the same group into one score per group, $rs > .42, ps < .001$. We constructed an outgroup attitude scale by aggregating all scores, except the one referring to one’s own group.

**Results**

**Perceived ingroup versus outgroup prototypicality**

As in Study 1, we started with testing the first hypothesis that native-Dutch participants would perceive their ingroup as more prototypical than other groups, and that participants with a non-western cultural background would perceive their ingroup as equally or less prototypical as the majority group. We performed two repeated-measure ANOVAs for majority and minority participants separately. For majority participants we found that perceived ingroup prototypicality was significantly higher than perceived outgroup prototypicality, $F(1, 55) = 16.61, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .23$. For minority participants we found a significant difference between ingroup, majority outgroup, and minority outgroup prototypicality, $F(2, 45) = 4.20, p = .022$, partial $\eta^2 = .16$. For participants with a non-native background perceived ingroup prototypicality did not differ significantly from perceived prototypicality of the majority outgroup. Outgroup minorities, however, were perceived as lower in prototypicality (see Table 4.3).
Subsequently, we investigated whether and how both ingroup and outgroup prototypicality were related to outgroup attitudes. As shown by the correlations in Table 4.4, and replicating Study 1, the correlation between ingroup prototypicality and outgroup attitudes was not significant. For majority members outgroup prototypicality was positively correlated with outgroup attitudes. Although we did not find this relation in Study 1, it is consistent with previous research (e.g., Wenzel, 2007; Ulrich, 2009). We will return to this point in the general discussion.

Next, we ran a regression model with the standardized scores of district identification, ingroup prototypicality, majority versus minority background of the participant (coded as -1 versus 1), and all two-way interaction terms and the three-way interaction term as predictors. We used outgroup attitudes as dependent variable. There was a significant relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes, $\beta = .42, t(91) = 2.82, p = .006$. As in Study 1, and in support of Hypothesis 2, this effect was qualified by a significant three-way interaction of identification by ingroup prototypicality by majority versus minority members, $\beta = .41, t(91) = 2.83, p = .006$. Additional analyses demonstrated that this three-way interaction was due to a reverse two-way interaction pattern of identification and

### Table 4.3

Means Perceived Group Prototypicality, Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prototypicality</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native-Dutch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>4.63 (1.76)</td>
<td>[4.15, 5.10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup</td>
<td>3.57 (1.67)</td>
<td>[3.13, 4.02]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Western Minorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>4.16 (1.82)</td>
<td>[3.61, 4.70]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup (Majority)</td>
<td>4.16 (1.67)</td>
<td>[3.65, 4.66]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup (Minority)</td>
<td>3.33 (1.46)</td>
<td>[2.89, 3.76]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District identification, subgroup prototypicality and outgroup attitudes**

Subsequently, we investigated whether and how both ingroup and outgroup prototypicality were related to outgroup attitudes. As shown by the correlations in Table 4.4, and replicating Study 1, the correlation between ingroup prototypicality and outgroup attitudes was not significant. For majority members outgroup prototypicality was positively correlated with outgroup attitudes. Although we did not find this relation in Study 1, it is consistent with previous research (e.g., Wenzel, 2007; Ulrich, 2009). We will return to this point in the general discussion.

Next, we ran a regression model with the standardized scores of district identification, ingroup prototypicality, majority versus minority background of the participant (coded as -1 versus 1), and all two-way interaction terms and the three-way interaction term as predictors. We used outgroup attitudes as dependent variable. There was a significant relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes, $\beta = .42, t(91) = 2.82, p = .006$. As in Study 1, and in support of Hypothesis 2, this effect was qualified by a significant three-way interaction of identification by ingroup prototypicality by majority versus minority members, $\beta = .41, t(91) = 2.83, p = .006$. Additional analyses demonstrated that this three-way interaction was due to a reverse two-way interaction pattern of identification and
ingroup prototypicality on outgroup attitudes for majority versus minority members.

Table 4.4.  
Correlations, Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native-Dutch (n = 56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ingroup Prototypicality</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outgroup Prototypicality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. District Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Outgroup Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Western Minorities (n = 45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ingroup Prototypicality</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25†</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outgroup Prototypicality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.27†</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. District Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Outgroup Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** p < .01, * p < .05, † p < .10.

For majority members we found a marginal significant direct relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes, $\beta = .44$, $t(91) = 1.84$, $p = .069$. Importantly, this was qualified by a significant ingroup prototypicality by identification interaction effect on outgroup attitudes, $\beta = -.43$, $t(91) = -2.54$, $p = .013$. Simple slopes analyses revealed that when perceived ingroup prototypicality was low, there was a positive effect of identification on outgroup attitudes, $\beta = .78$, $t(91) = 2.56$, $p = .012$. However, when ingroup prototypicality was high there was no significant relation between identification and outgroup attitudes, $\beta = -.08$, $t(91) = -0.64$, $p = .680$ (see Figure 4.2.). These results therefore are in support of Hypothesis 2a.
For minority participants we found the reverse pattern predicted in Hypothesis 2b. The interaction effect of identification and ingroup prototypicality was marginally significant, $\beta = .39, t(91) = 1.66, p = .100$. Simple slope analyses revealed that when minorities perceived their group as low in prototypicality, there was a non-significant relation between identification and outgroup attitudes, $\beta = .10, t(91) = 0.32, p = .750$. When ingroup prototypicality was high, however, there was a positive relation between identification and outgroup attitudes for minorities, $\beta = .88, t(91) = 2.85, p = .011$ (see Figure 4.3).

Third, we built the same regression model with outgroup prototypicality instead of outgroup prototypicality as predictor. The results from this model showed, in addition to a direct relation of outgroup prototypicality, $\beta = .27, t(90) = 2.15, p = .035$, and identification, $\beta = .24, t(90) = 1.70, p = .090$, that the two-way interactions and three-way interaction were not significant, $ts < 1.16, ps > .13$. Hence, we only found a significant direct relation between outgroup prototypicality and outgroup attitudes, but as in Study 1 no interactions with district identification or outgroup prototypicality.
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In Study 2 we found that whereas majority group members clearly perceived their ingroup as the most prototypical group, minority members perceived their ingroup as equally prototypical as the majority group. In addition, minority members perceived their own subgroup as more prototypical than other minority groups. These results are in line with our first hypothesis, and generally replicate the results from Study 1: both majority and minority group members acknowledge that the majority group is a prototypical subgroup for the common ingroup. However, there are also some differences between Study 1 and 2. Whereas in Study 1 minority group members perceived their ingroup as less prototypical, in Study 2 they perceived their group equally prototypical. We will return to this difference in the general discussion.

In addition, the results supported the second hypothesis that the positive relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes is moderated by ingroup prototypicality and group status: For majorities there was a positive relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes when perceived
ingroup prototypicality was low, and for minorities when perceived ingroup prototypicality was high. Finally, as in Study 1, there was no support for the third hypothesis that perceived outgroup prototypicality moderated the relation between identification and outgroup attitudes.

**General Discussion**

Preventing intergroup conflicts between residents is a major challenge in many multicultural neighborhoods around the world. The results of the current research showed that district identities have the potential to function as common ingroup identities for residents with different cultural backgrounds, and as such can lead to more intergroup tolerance. These outcomes are in line with the common ingroup identity model (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000), which states that attitudes between members of different subgroups improve in situations in which subgroup members have a salient shared identity. In two field studies we found that residents from the cultural majority as well as residents with a cultural minority background had more positive attitudes about the respective other cultural groups in their city district the more strongly they identified with their district.

In addition, both studies demonstrated that the extent to which subgroup members perceived their cultural group to be prototypical for the shared district identity moderates the relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes. Most importantly, our findings revealed that these consequences of perceived ingroup prototypicality may be different for members of the majority group versus minority groups. Whereas for majority group members a high level of perceived ingroup prototypicality may hamper the beneficial effects of a common ingroup identity for outgroup attitudes, for minority members it actually may reinforce the positive effects.

**Differences in Perceived Ingroup Prototypicality for Minority versus Majority Members**

We first investigated to what extent members of majority and minority groups perceived their own cultural group in relation to other groups, as being prototypical for their city district. We expected, and found in both studies, that majority group members perceived their ingroup as more prototypical than
minority groups for the shared, superordinate identity (i.e., urban city district). This is in line with the ingroup projection model (e.g., Wenzel et al., 2007), which states that subgroup members are biased when judging the prototypicality of their own subgroup for an overarching category. However, claiming the prototype of an overarching group is more complicated for minority group members because of social reality constraints (Devos & Banaji, 2005; Mummendey & Otten, 2001; Waldzus et al., 2004). In a reality in which it is clear that one group has the majority status (in terms of power, and/or size), minority members may agree that this other group is prototypical for the shared identity. The results of both studies support this reasoning; minority members did not perceive their ingroup as more prototypical than the majority group.

Importantly, in the current research being a member of the majority group applied to both city district (the overarching group), as well as the broader society. Hence, the reality constraints with regards to the majority versus minority status are clear-cut and offer little room for interpretation. However, we can conceive of city districts in which the majority-minority relation may actually reverse, creating the interesting situation that group status in the broader society differs from group status in the city district. For instance, unlike in the Netherlands, in the United States of America there are many neighborhood in which the majority of the residents has a cultural background which on national level is perceived as a culturally minority group (i.e., Black, Hispanic). Investigating how such constellation can affect attitudes towards outgroups on the subgroup would be an interesting task for future research.

Furthermore, while in our first study we found that minority group members perceived their cultural group as equally prototypical as other minority groups, in the second study we found that minority group members perceived their ingroup as more prototypical than minority groups. Although we did not make any strong predictions about this pattern, the results from the second study may actually be in line with ingroup projection model. That is, minority group members in this case also show an ingroup projection effect, but within the reality constraints of the given situation. As a result, minority group members may not make the claim that their subgroup is more prototypical than the majority group, but that their group is more prototypical than other minority groups.
Differences in the Relation Between Ingroup Prototypicality and Attitudes for Minority and Majority Groups

This difference between majority and minority members in the representation of the overarching identity may also result in different consequence of ingroup prototypicality for outgroup attitudes. That is, the positive relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes was moderated by perceived ingroup prototypicality and group status. For majority group members we found a positive relation between identification and outgroup attitudes, only for residents that did not claim their own cultural group to be highly prototypical for their city district. We thus find support for the reasoning that majority members perceiving their ingroup as highly prototypical for the common ingroup identity, are more likely to compare outgroup to the ingroup standards, and as a result have more negative outgroup attitudes.

For minority members ingroup prototypicality was less important for, or even had a reversed effect on the relation between identification with a common ingroup identity and outgroup attitudes. Specifically, in Study 1 for minority members there was only a direct positive relation between district identification and outgroup attitudes. In Study 2 identification with the common ingroup positively predicted outgroup attitudes, only for members who did strongly claim that their cultural group was defining for the urban district. A possible explanation for this difference in results between Study 1 and 2 might be that only a small percentage minority members participated in Study 1; possibly there was a selection bias such that the participating minority members were those who already felt more “Dutch”. As a result, prototypicality of the minority ingroup might have been less relevant for the perceptions of these minorities of the relations between the different groups in their district.

In Study 2 we did find the predicted reversed impact of ingroup prototypicality on the link between common ingroup identification and outgroup attitudes. That is, strong identification with the common ingroup was associated with more positive outgroup attitudes, only for those who perceived ingroup prototypicality as high. These results support our reasoning that minority members who perceive their ingroup as high in prototypicality have a more inclusive representation of the overarching group, and therefore have more positive attitude about other
subgroup members. They are also in line with earlier research showing that identity complexity may diminish the negative consequences of ingroup prototypicality (Wenzel et al., 2007). That is, because minority members who are high in perceived ingroup prototypicality are more likely to perceive their own, as well as the majority group as prototypical for superordinate groups, they are more likely to have a more complex representation of the group prototype (cf. Waldzus, Mummendey, & Wenzel, 2005).

**Ingroup versus Outgroup prototypicality**

In addition, we investigated whether the representation of the overarching identity in terms of ingroup prototypicality or outgroup prototypicality would be most relevant for outgroup attitudes. Past research on the ingroup projection model usually relied on a relative ingroup prototypicality measure; the extent to which one's ingroup is perceived to be more prototypical for the overarching identity compared to an outgroup. However, ingroup prototypicality and outgroup prototypicality may actually differ in their relations with outgroup attitudes, and it has recently been suggested that mainly outgroup, and not ingroup, prototypicality is related to outgroup attitudes (Ulrich, 2009). In the current study, there were no significant direct relations between ingroup and outgroup prototypicality and outgroup attitudes for minority members. For majority members there was a positive relation between outgroup prototypicality and outgroup attitudes (although in Study 1 this was not significant), but no relation between ingroup prototypicality and outgroup attitudes, which is in line with previous research (see Wenzel et al., 2007 for an overview; and Ulrich 2009).

This latter finding fits, at first glance, with Ulrich's (2009) claim that outgroup prototypicality is a relevant predictor of outgroup attitudes, but ingroup prototypicality is not. It is also in line with in a recent meta-analyses over 27 studies (Wenzel et al., 2007), which showed that outgroup prototypicality showed especially consistent positive relations with outgroup attitudes ($r = .23$), whereas the relation between ingroup prototypicality and outgroup attitudes is less consistent, and on average was very small ($r = -.05$). The results of the current study add on to these previous findings by showing that whereas perceived outgroup prototypicality may be directly related to outgroup attitudes, for ingroup
prototypicality it may be necessary to take level of identification into account. In other words, ingroup prototypicality may only be related to outgroup attitudes if the overarching identity is highly salient, or relevant, for the self. This would also be an explanation the inconsistent relations between ingroup prototypicality and outgroup attitudes.

**Merits and Limitations of the Current Study**

One of the merits of the current studies is that the data were collected in a field setting and involving natural groups. Therefore, we can assume that the ecological validity of our results is high. The results therefore support the generalizability of the common ingroup identity model and the ingroup projection model to the context of multicultural city districts. More importantly, the context of the study made it possible to test these models while taking the complexity of real-life intergroup relations into account. For instance, we could compare the views of majority and minority group members.

A limitation of the current studies is that they are based on cross-sectional data, and that one therefore needs to be careful in drawing conclusions about the causal directions of the relations that we described. For instance, residents may identify stronger with their city district, just because they have more positive attitudes about the other cultural groups that are also living in their district as well. In a similar vein, an interesting question would be whether the extent to which subgroup members would claim the prototype of the overarching group depends on the relations between subgroups within the overarching identity. However, the fact that salience of a common ingroup identity can lead to more positive attitudes towards other subgroups that are part of the same identity, has been well established in previous (experimental) studies (Dovidio et al., 2007).

In addition, as is typical for questionnaire studies in the field, in our research we blatantly assessed perceived group prototypicality and outgroup attitudes. Admittedly, this enhances the chance that our findings were subject to social desirability biases. Yet, the fact that we were able to largely replicate findings from previous studies on the ingroup projection model, in which indirect measures were used (Waldzus et al., 2002; Waldzus & Mummendey, 2003) speaks to the validity of our findings.
Conclusion

The set-up of the current studies gave us the chance to show, in the real-life context of multicultural districts, that urban district identities actually may successfully function as a common ingroup identity for residents with various cultural backgrounds. In addition, we found important differences between majority group members’ and minority group members’ representations of these shared identities, and the consequences for attitudes towards other subgroups within a common ingroup. The conditions under which common ingroup identities stimulate intergroup tolerance between majority and minority group members, may thus differ for the two subgroups. For a common ingroup identity to be effective in improving intergroup attitudes, majority members should realize that the group prototype is more than only about their own group. Minority group members, in turn, need the feeling that they have the opportunity and legitimacy to claim that they, too, are prototypical for the common ingroup.