
Is This About You or Me? Self- Versus Other-Directed Judgments and Feelings in Response to Intergroup Interaction

Jacquie D. Vorauer
Sandra M. Kumhyr
University of Manitoba

This research demonstrated that both dominant and lower status group members' responses to interacting with an out-group member can center largely on thoughts and feelings about themselves. Pairs of students (either two White Canadians or one White Canadian and one Aboriginal Canadian) had casual get-acquainted discussions. Consistent with our hypothesis that individuals would tend to frame the interaction in terms of the other person's evaluation of them, high-prejudice White Canadians felt stereotyped by an Aboriginal partner even though they actually were not stereotyped and even though they themselves did not stereotype an Aboriginal partner. Moreover, Aboriginal Canadians appeared to personalize negative behaviors exhibited by their White partner. These individuals experienced discomfort and self-directed negative affect—but not other-directed negative affect—when their White partner was high in prejudice.

A substantial and long-standing literature in social psychology and related disciplines attests to the value that individuals attach to understanding and managing how they are perceived by others (e.g., Cooley, 1902; Goffman, 1959; James, 1890/1890; Kenny, 1994; Schlenker, 1980; Swann, 1987) and suggests that people are highly attuned to this aspect of their social interactions. Research on people's propensity to exaggerate the extent to which they are the cause and intended target of another person's behavior has further highlighted individuals' egocentric inclinations (Zuckerman, Kernis, Guarnera, Murphy, & Rappoport, 1983). Only quite recently, however, has an understanding of people's tendency to be preoccupied with themselves and with their evaluation by others been extended to analyses of intergroup relations (e.g., Devine, Evett, & Vasquez-Suson, 1996; Plant & Devine, 1998; Stephan & Stephan, 1985). Investigations of prejudice and discrimination have gen-

erally tended to focus instead on individuals' judgments about out-group members.

This research was designed to contribute to the growing literature on the implications of evaluative concerns for intergroup relations by examining individuals' beliefs or metaperceptions regarding how they are viewed and their experience of self-directed negative affect in the context of actual intergroup interaction. Our analysis focused on casual discussions between a member of a dominant group (White Canadians) and a member of a lower status group (Aboriginal Canadians) and addressed the thoughts and feelings experienced by both people involved in the interaction. We expected that dominant group members' evaluative concerns would lead them to feel stereotyped by a lower status group member even though they actually were not stereotyped. Along similar lines, we expected that lower status group members would be inclined to personalize the implications of any negative behaviors exhibited by the dominant group member, such that those exposed to prejudice would experience negative affect that was directed at themselves rather than at the other person.

Authors' Note: The authors are indebted to the University of Manitoba Research Grants Program for its generous support of this research. We thank Dan Bailis, Kelley Main, Dale Miller, and Mike Ross for their helpful comments on an earlier version of the article and Holly Brathwaite and Shayla Harapiak for their assistance with data collection. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jacquie Vorauer, Department of Psychology, Duff Roblin Building, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, R3T 2N2; e-mail: vorauer@cc.umanitoba.ca.

PSPB, Vol. 27 No. 6, June 2001 706-719

© 2001 by the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc.

DOMINANT GROUP MEMBERS' EXPERIENCE
OF INTERGROUP INTERACTION

Our hypotheses regarding how dominant group members' metaperceptions would be affected by the ethnicity of their interaction partner were based on recent research examining these individuals' readiness to perceive that they have been stereotyped by a lower status group member. Vorauer, Main, and O'Connell (1998) used the term *meta-stereotype* to refer to a person's beliefs regarding the stereotype that out-group members hold about his or her own group. These authors demonstrated that White Canadians hold a consensual meta-stereotype regarding how they are viewed by Aboriginal Canadians that contains a host of undesirable traits, such as *prejudiced, closed minded, arrogant, selfish, unfair, and cruel*.

Vorauer et al. (1998) examined the implications of this group-level meta-stereotype for people's metaperceptions about how they personally were viewed by an individual out-group member by staging highly controlled interactions between White participants and an ostensible partner in the study. First, participants were videotaped as they responded to a variety of questions posed by the experimenter. Next they viewed a videotape of their partner, believing that he or she was simultaneously viewing their own videotape. The tapes shown to participants followed identical scripts and varied only in terms of whether their partner was Aboriginal or White. Participants were not aware of their partner's ethnicity until after they had finished making their own videotape. Participants' metaperceptions were subsequently assessed along dimensions relevant and irrelevant to White Canadians' meta-stereotype regarding how they are viewed by Aboriginal Canadians.

Results indicated that the implications of partner ethnicity for individuals' metaperceptions depended on their racial attitudes: Meta-stereotypes influenced the metaperceptions of low-and high-prejudice individuals to a similar extent but in opposite directions. High-prejudice individuals believed that they were viewed as possessing meta-stereotype-relevant traits to a greater extent by an Aboriginal partner than by a White partner, whereas low-prejudice individuals felt that they were viewed as possessing meta-stereotype-relevant traits to a lesser extent by an Aboriginal partner than by a White partner. There were no effects along dimensions irrelevant to the meta-stereotype. It appeared that high-prejudice persons thought that the out-group member would assimilate them to the meta-stereotype, whereas low-prejudice persons believed that they would be contrasted with the meta-stereotype. The authors interpreted these divergent metaperceptions as stemming from high- and low-prejudice individuals' distinct self-concepts and different expectations about out-group members' openness to individuating information. Highs should expect

an out-group member to focus on the ways in which they are similar to the stereotype and to be ready to apply it to them, whereas lows should expect an out-group member to be sensitive to the ways in which they personally differ from the stereotypical White person.

The present research examines a critical question left unanswered by Vorauer et al.'s (1998) research: To what extent are White individuals right about how an Aboriginal person's impressions of them would differ from a White person's impressions of them? It is possible that White individuals' metaperceptions would be corroborated by judgments actually formed by a White versus Aboriginal interaction partner (e.g., see Jussim, 1991). That is, high-prejudice individuals might be stereotyped—and low-prejudice individuals might be viewed in a counterstereotypical fashion—by an Aboriginal person. However, we consider this scenario to be unlikely. We believe, instead, that White individuals will actually tend to be viewed quite similarly by a White versus an Aboriginal interaction partner. Thus, we predicted that White individuals would overestimate the implications of their interaction partner's ethnicity for how they would be viewed.

Our hypothesis was based on theory and research documenting individuals' tendency to accord greater attention to self-relevant information than to information unrelated to their personal goals and concerns (Markus & Wurf, 1987; Rogers, Kuiper, & Kirker, 1977). In the context of intergroup interaction, individuals are apt to experience considerable uncertainty about how they will be viewed, and they may activate and focus on their meta-stereotype in hopes of gaining some insight into the out-group member's likely impressions of them. We expected that individuals' meta-stereotype about how their own group was viewed by the out-group would be considerably more salient to them than the stereotype of their group would be to their interaction partner. That is, we anticipated that White individuals would focus on their meta-stereotype regarding Aboriginal Canadians' beliefs about White Canadians to a greater extent than their Aboriginal partner would think about his or her stereotype of White Canadians.

White individuals should be inclined to think about the meta-stereotype because it is *about* them and relevant to their current goals and concerns. However, their Aboriginal partner is also involved in social interaction and is therefore apt to have goals and concerns of his or her own. Most notably, their Aboriginal partner may be interested in gauging how he or she is being evaluated. Such concerns may detract from a focus on knowledge structures about other people. Indeed, research on stereotypes about out-groups confirms that stereotype activation is not inevitable and can depend on factors such as cognitive resources and motivation (e.g., Gilbert &

Hixon, 1991; Spencer, Fein, Wolfe, Fong, & Dunn, 1998). Thus, we expected that White individuals would exaggerate the impact of partner ethnicity on how they were viewed as a function of the meta-stereotype being more figural in their own mind than the stereotype was in the mind of their Aboriginal partner—who would instead be focused on his or her own personal concerns.

LOWER STATUS GROUP
MEMBERS' EXPERIENCE OF
INTERGROUP INTERACTION

Our hypotheses regarding the implications of self-concerns for lower status group members' experience of intergroup interaction focused on their affective reactions to the behavior exhibited by their White interaction partners. Surprisingly, the important question of how dominant group members affect the thoughts and feelings of a lower status group member during social interaction has not traditionally received much attention in research (for discussions, see Devine et al., 1996; and Swim & Stangor, 1998). There are a number of interesting studies that have examined the types of negative behaviors that members of dominant groups exhibit toward members of lower status groups (e.g., Kleck, 1968; Word, Zanna, & Cooper, 1974). However, the effect of such behaviors on the feelings experienced by lower status group members remains unclear, because these studies have tended to involve out-group members who do not actually exist or who are confederates or, alternatively, to examine the effects of the behavior by giving the "treatment" to White individuals.

There would seem to be two main types of reactions that lower status group members might have to negative behavior exhibited by an interaction partner. First, they might attribute the behavior to their partner's being prejudiced against their ethnic group. Such attributions to prejudice may serve to protect individuals' own self-esteem (Crocker, Voelkl, Testa, & Major, 1991) and could also foster negative feelings toward the other person. Alternatively, individuals might take the behavior personally—as a response to something that they have said or done—and feel badly about themselves. Such self-as-target inferences may reflect individuals' interest in learning something about themselves from the other person's reactions (Vorauer & Ross, 1993). In addition, recent research by Ruggiero and Taylor (1997) indicates that lower status group members may be disinclined to view the other person's behavior as being about the other person (i.e., prejudice) because of the cost of such perceptions for their sense of control.

The investigations that have been conducted to date on individuals' readiness to attribute another person's

behavior to prejudice have generally examined this issue in controlled settings where the potential for discrimination is made rather explicit. The results of these investigations suggest that individuals are unlikely to perceive prejudice unless it is made clear to them that the probability of bias is high. Casual social interactions such as those that are of interest in the present research would seem comparatively ambiguous. For example, the lower status group member is unlikely to have "distinctiveness" information regarding the dominant group member's behavior with different interaction partners. We therefore expected that Aboriginal students would be hesitant to interpret a White student's behavior toward them as reflective of prejudice and that any negative behavior that they encountered would translate into negative feelings toward themselves rather than toward the other person.

A key question raised by this analysis centers on whether White individuals' racial attitudes are apt to make any difference to Aboriginal partners' experience of the discussion. Current evidence on this point is inconclusive, because the few interaction studies that have been conducted either have not included measures of racial attitudes or have not incorporated pair compositions that allow individuals' impact on in-group versus out-group members to be compared. For example, Ickes (1984) demonstrated that White students who reported avoiding out-group members smiled for shorter periods of time during interaction with a Black partner and made their partner more self-conscious than did White students who reported actively initiating contact with out-group members. Without White-White pairs for comparison, however, it is unclear whether avoidant individuals' relatively negative behavior was triggered by the ethnicity of their partner or instead reflected a more general interaction style: Perhaps these avoidant individuals would have had a negative impact on White partners too.

The design of this study enabled us to examine whether high- and low-prejudice White persons affected an Aboriginal partner differently and also whether the implications of their racial attitudes were unique to intergroup interaction. We anticipated that high-prejudice White individuals would foster more negative affective reactions in an Aboriginal as compared with a White partner and that there would be no such pattern for low-prejudice White individuals. Note that with respect to perceptions, the expected consequence of Aboriginal partners' tendency to take negative behavior personally was that they would not in fact view high-prejudice White Canadians as being more prejudiced than low-prejudice White Canadians.

INTERACTION PARADIGM

In this research, we arranged for casual, get-acquainted conversations to take place between either two White Canadians or between one White Canadian and one Aboriginal Canadian. All White participants had completed a prejudice scale in a previous mass-testing session. We included both men and women in the study, but we ensured that members of any given pair were of the same gender. Because several aspects of White individuals' meta-stereotype (e.g., independent, competitive, arrogant) are also components of the stereotype of men (Martin, 1987) and because men are generally evaluated less favorably than women (Eagly & Mladinic, 1989), we expected that we would need to include gender as a variable in our analyses. However, we did not anticipate that gender would qualify the effects relevant to our primary hypotheses.

At the end of the conversation, we assessed both pair members' metaperceptions and impressions as well as their affective reactions. Metaperceptions and impressions were assessed along trait dimensions that varied in terms of their relevance to White individuals' meta-stereotype regarding how they are viewed by Aboriginal Canadians and to their "other-stereotype" regarding the traits possessed by Aboriginal Canadians. We anticipated that the effects of partner ethnicity on White individuals' metaperceptions would be most pronounced for meta-stereotype-relevant traits. If the effects of partner ethnicity were instead similar across meta-stereotype-relevant and irrelevant traits, this might suggest that these individuals were considering the out-group's general evaluation of their group rather than more circumscribed trait expectations.

Our interaction paradigm was designed primarily to test hypotheses regarding White individuals' metaperceptions and Aboriginal individuals' affective reactions. We did not have a measure of Aboriginal participants' intergroup attitudes or sufficient numbers of Aboriginal participants to examine how these individuals' attitudes might be connected to their metaperceptions or to predict negative behaviors that might foster negative affective reactions in their White partners. However, we were able to examine on an exploratory basis whether Aboriginal individuals felt stereotyped and whether White individuals experienced significant levels of self-directed negative affect in response to intergroup interaction.

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 112 introductory psychology students at the University of Manitoba (36 men and 76 women) who received course credit or \$10 for their participation in the 1-hour "study of the acquaintance pro-

cess." Students were eligible for the study only if they had attended a previous mass-testing session in which a demographic question assessing their ethnicity and the Manitoba Prejudice Scale (Altemeyer, 1988) had been administered. The 20-item Manitoba Prejudice Scale is appropriate for our participant population in that it focuses on ethnic groups in Manitoba. It includes such items as "Canada should open its doors to more immigration from India and Africa" (reverse scored). Students responded on a 9-point scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 9 (*strongly agree*).

Students were contacted by telephone 2 to 4 months after the mass testing and were scheduled for the study in same-sex pairs. Prior to each session, it was ascertained that pair members were unacquainted with one another. There were 28 pairs (9 male and 19 female) in the Aboriginal-White condition and 28 pairs (9 male and 19 female) in the White-White condition. One Aboriginal-White pair was discarded because the White pair member reported being Métis during the discussion, and one White-White pair was discarded as participants discovered that they did know each other. Participants were not informed that ethnicity and racial attitudes were variables of interest in the study until debriefing. Participants' ages ranged from 17 to 52 ($M = 21.0$) years.

Procedure

Once both pair members had arrived, the White female experimenter explained that the researchers were interested in how people exchange information when they first meet one another. Accordingly, they would be asked to have a get-to-know-you conversation and to then fill out a questionnaire about their thoughts, feelings, and impressions. The experimenter provided participants with a list of potential discussion topics. The instructions accompanying the topics emphasized that participants could spend as much or as little time on each topic as they liked. The five main categories of topics included academic experiences (e.g., lectures, assignments), social experiences (e.g., parties, sports, clubs), career goals, employment experiences, and relationships with family members. The experimenter left participants alone to have their discussions. There was a 15-minute time limit, and the conversation was tape-recorded (with participants' knowledge).

Dependent Measures

Once the conversation had concluded, participants were escorted to separate rooms to fill out the questionnaire. Participants were assured that their responses would be kept completely confidential. The metaperception questions asked participants to describe the other student's impressions of them along 25 trait dimensions; the impression questions asked participants

to describe their impressions of the other student along the same dimensions. For each dimension, they circled the appropriate number on a 7-point scale anchored on contrary versions of the trait in question.

The 25 trait dimensions were selected on the basis of previous research that used the diagnostic ratio technique to examine the content of White Canadians' meta-stereotypes and other-stereotypes regarding Aboriginal Canadians (Vorauer et al., 1998). Our selection of traits was guided by a desire to include sufficient numbers of dimensions relevant and irrelevant to the meta- and other-stereotype for analyses without requiring participants to make an inordinate number of judgments. We also sought to ensure that traits representing the major themes of each stereotype were included. Seven of the dimensions were relevant to the meta-stereotype only (closed-minded, egocentric, cruel, unfair, arrogant, selfish, and unfeeling), 7 were relevant to the other-stereotype only (aggressive, defiant, resentful, careless, lazy, immoral, and irresponsible), 1 was relevant to both stereotypes (prejudiced), and 3 were not relevant to either stereotype (ignorant, dishonest, and weak). For the remaining 7 dimensions, the meta-stereotype and other-stereotype were represented by opposite ends of the continuum (the meta-stereotype versions were materialistic, competitive, phony, individualistic, well-groomed, not superstitious, and independent). For example, *competitive* is part of the meta-stereotype, and the contrary trait *cooperative* is part of the other-stereotype. The order of the metaperception and impression ratings was counter-balanced, and these ratings always preceded the mood measure.

The 27-item mood measure included subsets of adjectives designed to assess negative feelings toward self (self-critical, remorseful, angry at myself, annoyed at myself, guilty, upset at myself, disappointed with myself, ashamed), discomfort (uncomfortable, tense, frustrated, anxious), negative feelings toward others (hostile, upset at others, irritated with others, resentful, angry at others), and positive affect (optimistic, enthusiastic, friendly, happy, satisfied). These items were based on research by Devine, Monteith, Zuwerink, and Elliot (1991). We also included a number of items designed to tap into feelings of wariness that individuals might experience during interaction with out-group members (suspicious, careful, uncertain, defensive, self-conscious); these adjectives were all drawn from Stephan and Stephan's (1985) intergroup anxiety scale. Participants made their ratings on a 5-point scale, from 1 (*very slightly or not at all*) to 5 (*extremely*). They were instructed to answer according to how they felt "right now, that is, at the present moment." After they had completed the questionnaire, pair members were debriefed separately.

RESULTS

We began our analyses by identifying an actor and partner in each pair. For the Aboriginal-White pairs, the White participant served as the actor and the Aboriginal participant served as the partner. For the White-White pairs, the actor and partner were randomly selected. Thus, all actors were White, whereas partners varied in terms of their ethnicity. Analyses confirmed that actors' prejudice scores did not differ across the White-White and Aboriginal-White conditions, $M_s = 3.20$ and 3.13 respectively, $t < 1$. Table 1 contains descriptive statistics and reliabilities for all variables together with their intercorrelations.

We analyzed all of the measures with the same regression analysis, in which the predictors were actors' level of prejudice (centered), the ethnicity of their partner (White = -1 and Aboriginal = 1), and the interaction between actor prejudice and partner ethnicity. As preliminary analyses confirmed effects for gender, pair members' gender (male = -1 , female = 1), and the interaction between gender and partner ethnicity were also included as predictors. There was no evidence of a three-way interaction on any measure when we tested this possibility, and we therefore did not include the terms associated with this effect in our final analyses. The main effects (actor prejudice, partner ethnicity, and gender) were entered as a block on the first step, and the interaction terms (Actor Prejudice \times Partner Ethnicity and Gender \times Partner Ethnicity) were entered as a block on the second step. Because our hypotheses focused on interaction effects, we discuss the first step of the analysis only where it revealed a significant main effect. Gender did not qualify any of our effects, and we delay discussion of the findings involving gender until the end of the Results section, where they are briefly summarized.

Actors' Metaperceptions

We first analyzed actors' metaperceptions along the 15 dimensions relevant to the meta-stereotype. These traits were scored so that higher numbers reflected more stereotype-consistent perceptions and were combined together to form an index of the extent to which actors felt stereotyped by their partner. The results of the regression revealed an Actor Prejudice \times Partner Ethnicity interaction, $b = .26$, $\beta = .50$, $t(48) = 3.62$, $p < .001$. Simple-effects analyses were conducted according to Aiken and West (1991), with one standard deviation below and above the mean taken to represent low- and high-prejudice points, respectively.

Consistent with our hypothesis that individuals higher in prejudice would perceive that they were stereotyped by Aboriginal partners, high-prejudice actors' metaperceptions were more congruent with the

TABLE 1: Study 1: Intercorrelations of Predictors and Dependent Measures (N = 54 pairs)

	APREJ	PETH	GEND	AMPSTER	AMPIRR	AIMPSTER	AIMPIRR	ADISCOM	ANEGSELF	ANEGOTH	AWARI	APOSAFF				
Predictors																
APREJ	—	-.04	-.49***	.11	.02	.12	.23*	.14	-.05	.18	.24*	-.06				
PETH		—	.04	-.03	-.20	-.13	-.09	.05	.29**	.31**	.06	.08				
GEND			—	-.30**	-.19	-.26*	-.27**	-.33**	-.13	-.18	-.16	.21				
Actor perceptions																
AMPSTER				—	.72***	.36***	.73***	.32**	-.02	-.01	.12	-.28**				
AMPIRR					—	.50***	.62***	.28**	.04	-.02	.06	-.44***				
AIMPSTER						—	.65***	.29**	.26*	.33**	.22	-.25*				
AIMPIRR							—	.35***	.04	.10	.18	-.32**				
Actor affect																
ADISCOM								—	.49***	.49***	.36***	-.34***				
ANEGSELF									—	.58***	.41***	-.15				
ANEGOTH										—	.31**	.00				
AWARI											—	-.02				
													R^2	M	SD	α
Predictors																
APREJ	.15	.04	.29**	.15	.15	-.04	-.20	.04	.09		3.16	0.98	.87			
PETH	.19	.09	-.12	-.06	.19	.06	.06	.09	-.26*							
GEND	-.31**	-.19	-.35***	-.23*	.05	-.01	.08	.03	-.09							
Actor perceptions																
AMPSTER	.34***	.28**	.10	.11	.23*	.27**	.14	.11	-.17	.36***	3.29	0.50	.68			
AMPIRR	.20	.15	.12	.15	.08	.10	.04	-.06	.01	.22**	3.01	0.69	.77			
AIMPSTER	.16	.09	-.02	-.16	.20	.05	.06	.13	.07	.17	3.42	0.53	.61			
AIMPIRR	.22	.21	.06	-.01	.33**	.27**	.20	.29**	-.03	.41***	2.49	0.71	.85			
Actor affect																
ADISCOM	.25*	.18	.11	.10	-.03	-.05	-.08	-.08	.10	.16	1.88	0.67	.62			
ANEGSELF	.02	-.06	.05	-.05	-.02	.02	-.05	.02	.11	.14	1.44	0.54	.82			
ANEGOTH	.08	.07	.09	.10	.25*	.19	.02	.12	-.01	.23**	1.22	0.52	.87			
AWARI	.16	.22	.16	.06	.04	-.14	.07	.11	.00	.10	2.02	0.51	.43			
APOSAFF	-.17	-.06	-.17	-.16	-.08	.03	.13	.02	-.28**	.13	3.28	0.70	.78			
Partner perceptions																
PMPSTER	—	.71***	.33**	.36***	.27**	.10	.34***	.16	-.37***	.20**	3.44	0.55	.56			
PMPIRR		—	.51***	.47***	.20	.08	.44***	.07	-.46***	.08	2.73	0.84	.89			
PIMPSTER			—	.76***	.00	.05	.03	-.03	.04	.18*	3.10	0.53	.65			
PIMPIRR				—	.12	.24*	.03	.14	-.12	.11	2.61	0.77	.80			
Partner affect																
PDISCOM					—	.71***	.53***	.70***	-.25*	.19*	1.91	0.80	.67			
PNEGSELF						—	.39***	.53***	-.33**	.15	1.51	0.52	.84			
PNEGOTH							—	.38***	-.34***	.07	1.37	0.66	.88			
PWARI								—	-.02	.03	2.14	0.69	.68			
PPOSAFF									—	.11	3.30	0.69	.80			

NOTE: APREJ = actor prejudice; PETH = partner ethnicity. GEND = gender; MPSTER and MPIRR denote metaperceptions along stereotype-relevant and stereotype-irrelevant dimensions respectively; IMPSTER and IMPIRR denote impressions along stereotype-relevant and irrelevant dimensions, respectively. DISCOM = discomfort; NEGSELF = negative feelings toward self; NEGOTH = negative feelings toward others; WARI = wariness; POSAFF = positive affect. For stereotype-relevant traits, higher numbers indicate more stereotypical perceptions; for stereotype-irrelevant traits, higher numbers indicate more negative perceptions. R^2 values are for the full five-predictor regression analysis.

* $p < .10$. ** $p < .05$. *** $p < .01$.

meta-stereotype when their partner was Aboriginal than when he or she was White, $b = .24$, $\beta = .47$, $t(48) = 2.68$, $p = .01$. In line with our hypothesis that low-prejudice individuals' perceptions would be positively affected by having an out-group member as a partner, low-prejudice actors' metaperceptions were less consistent with the meta-stereotype when their partner was Aboriginal rather than White, $b = -.26$, $\beta = -.50$, $t(48) = 2.87$, $p < .01$. Further simple-effects analyses revealed a positive relation between actor prejudice and feeling stereotyped in the Aboriginal partner condition, $b = .22$, $\beta = .42$, $t(48) =$

2.40 , $p < .025$. Interestingly, there was instead a negative relation between actor prejudice and feeling stereotyped in the White partner condition, $b = -.29$, $\beta = -.57$, $t(48) = 2.71$, $p < .01$. The predicted values for the interaction are presented in Table 2. The R^2 s for the overall five-predictor regression for this and all other dependent measures are included in Table 1.

Next, we examined actors' metaperceptions along the 10 trait dimensions irrelevant to the meta-stereotype, which were scored so that higher numbers reflected more negative perceptions. This analysis was designed to

TABLE 2: Predicted Values for Actors' Perceptions and for Actors' and Partners' Affective Reactions as a Function of Actor Prejudice and Partner Ethnicity ($N = 54$ pairs)

	<i>Low-Prejudice Actor</i>		<i>High-Prejudice Actor</i>	
	<i>White</i>	<i>Aboriginal</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Aboriginal</i>
Actors' Metaperceptions				
Stereotype-relevant traits	3.58 _c ^a	3.07 _d ^a	3.01 _c ^b	3.49 _d ^b
Stereotype-irrelevant traits	3.46 _b ^a	2.71 ^a	2.81 _b	3.03
Actors' Impressions				
Stereotype-irrelevant traits	2.79 _c ^a	2.05 _d ^a	2.28 _c ^b	2.80 _d ^b
Affective reactions				
Partners' discomfort	1.84	1.56 _b	1.67 ^a	2.58 _b ^a
Partners' negative feelings toward self	1.72 _c ^a	1.33 _d ^a	1.23 _c ^b	1.75 _d ^b
Actors' positive affect	2.98 _b ^a	3.51 ^a	3.49 _b	3.14

NOTE: For each measure, predicted values associated with partner ethnicity simple effects significant at $p < .05$ are marked with matching superscripts, and predicted values associated with actor prejudice simple effects significant at $p < .05$ are marked with matching subscripts; italics are used for effects significant at $p < .10$. Predicted values for low- and high-prejudice actors were calculated at one standard deviation below and above the mean on the Manitoba Prejudice Scale, respectively. For stereotype-relevant traits, higher numbers indicate more stereotypical perceptions; for stereotype-irrelevant traits, higher numbers indicate more negative perceptions. Responses were made along 7-point scales.

provide indirect evidence that the effects of partner ethnicity on actors' metaperceptions reflected actors' focus on their meta-stereotype. If, as we propose, actors were considering the specific trait expectations potentially held by their Aboriginal partner, the effects of partner ethnicity should center on meta-stereotype-relevant rather than meta-stereotype-irrelevant dimensions. If actors were instead considering their Aboriginal partner's general negative attitude toward their group, the results across meta-stereotype-relevant and meta-stereotype-irrelevant trait dimensions should be similar.

Although results revealed a significant Actor Prejudice \times Partner Ethnicity interaction, $b = .25$, $\beta = .35$, $t(48) = 2.31$, $p < .05$, the pattern for the predicted values (presented in Table 2) suggested that here the interaction was driven primarily by low-prejudice actors feeling viewed especially negatively by White partners. Indeed, simple-effects analyses yielded a significant partner ethnicity effect for low-prejudice individuals only, $b = -.37$, $\beta = -.53$, $t(48) = 2.75$, $p < .01$; for high-prejudice individuals, $b = .11$, $\beta = .15$, $t < 1$. Moreover, the prejudice effect was evident only in the White partner condition, $b = -.33$, $\beta = -.47$, $t(48) = 2.28$, $p < .05$; for the Aboriginal partner condition, $b = .17$, $\beta = .00$, $t(48) = 1.04$, *ns*. Thus, in line with our hypothesis regarding the role of meta-stereotypes, high-prejudice actors' perception that they were viewed more negatively by an Aboriginal as compared with a

White partner was specific to meta-stereotype-relevant dimensions. The relationship between actor prejudice and feeling viewed negatively by an Aboriginal partner was also specific to meta-stereotype-relevant dimensions.

Partners' Impressions

The results for actors' metaperceptions indicated that high-prejudice individuals believed that they were viewed in a more stereotypical fashion by an Aboriginal as compared with a White partner. In contrast, low-prejudice individuals believed that they were viewed in a less stereotypical fashion by an Aboriginal as compared with a White partner. Were these perceptions justified? To examine whether White and Aboriginal partners formed different impressions of actors and whether their impressions were affected by actors' prejudice level, we analyzed partners' actual impressions in the five-predictor regression described previously. As expected, there were no effects on meta-stereotype-relevant ($\beta > .29$) or meta-stereotype-irrelevant dimensions ($\beta > .23$).

Actors' metaperceptions controlling for partners' impressions.

The fact that partners' impressions did not vary according to partner ethnicity suggests that actors perceived an effect of partner ethnicity that did not exist and that their metaperceptions were, in this sense, inaccurate. We conducted an additional set of analyses to examine more directly the extent to which actors' metaperceptions were calibrated with the impressions that they actually conveyed. We conducted the regression analyses of actors' metaperceptions along stereotype-relevant and meta-stereotype-irrelevant dimensions again, this time entering partners' impressions in addition to the other predictors. If actors' metaperceptions were calibrated with the impressions that they actually conveyed, then (a) partners' impressions should strongly predict actors' metaperceptions and (b) including impressions in the regression should reduce or eliminate the Actor Prejudice \times Partner Ethnicity interaction effect.

Partners' impressions were in fact unrelated to metaperceptions in both analyses, $b = -.04$, $\beta = -.04$, $t < 1$, on relevant traits and $b = .09$, $\beta = .10$, $t < 1$, on irrelevant traits. It is therefore not surprising that the metaperception effects described previously remained significant when impressions were included. On relevant traits, Actor Prejudice \times Partner Ethnicity interaction $b = .26$, $\beta = .50$, $t(47) = 3.59$, $p < .001$; on irrelevant traits, Actor Prejudice \times Partner Ethnicity $b = .23$, $\beta = .33$, $t(47) = 2.13$, $p < .05$. We also examined the relationship of actors' metaperceptions to partners' impressions by computing simple correlations between these variables. These correlations were assessed across the whole sample and for White-White and Aboriginal-White pairs separately. None of the correlations was significant.

Influence of Actors' Racial Attitudes on Their Partner's Affective State

The preceding analysis suggests that partners did not notice any differences between high- and low-prejudice actors. To examine whether actors' level of prejudice had implications for their partner's affective state that were not reflected in the impressions that he or she formed, we turned to our data regarding partners' mood at the end of the discussion. We conducted a series of analyses in which partners' responses to each of the five mood subscales were entered into the five-predictor regression. Results indicated effects on both discomfort and negative feelings toward self.

On discomfort, there was a significant Actor Prejudice \times Partner Ethnicity interaction, $b = .31$, $\beta = .38$, $t(47) = 2.43$, $p < .025$. As predicted, high-prejudice actors led Aboriginal partners to experience more discomfort than White partners, $b = .46$, $\beta = .57$, $t(47) = 2.80$, $p < .01$, whereas low-prejudice actors did not have a differential impact on Aboriginal as compared with White partners, $b = -.14$, $\beta = -.17$, $t < 1$. Additional simple-effects analyses confirmed that Aboriginal partners experienced more discomfort after having interacted with a high-prejudice as compared with a low-prejudice White actor, $b = .53$, $\beta = .65$, $t(47) = 2.82$, $p < .01$, whereas White partners' discomfort was unaffected by the prejudice of the actor, $b = -.09$, $\beta = -.11$, $t < 1$. The results on negative feelings toward self were largely parallel to those on discomfort. Here again there was an interaction between actors' prejudice level and partner ethnicity, $b = .23$, $\beta = .44$, $t(47) = 2.79$, $p < .01$. High-prejudice actors led Aboriginal partners to feel more self-critical than White partners, $b = .26$, $\beta = .49$, $t(47) = 2.40$, $p < .025$; in contrast, low-prejudice actors tended to have a positive impact on Aboriginal as compared with White partners' feelings about themselves, $b = -.20$, $\beta = -.37$, $t(47) = 1.86$, $p < .075$.

Detection of Actors' Racial Attitudes

The results for partner affect indicate that high- and low-prejudice White actors influenced Aboriginal partners' mood state differently. Moreover, the effects centered on discomfort and negative feelings toward self rather than on negative feelings toward the other person. It would seem, then, that high-prejudice White actors exhibited some form of negative behavior that was personalized by Aboriginal partners. The fact that Aboriginal partners did not form different overall impressions of high-prejudice White actors than did White partners is consistent with the idea that Aboriginal partners did not link negative behavior that they encountered to prejudice. However, we addressed this issue more directly by analyzing partners' impressions of actors along the prejudiced/tolerant dimension alone. There were no significant or marginally significant

effects. White actors with higher prejudice scores were not viewed as more prejudiced than those with lower prejudice scores by either Aboriginal or White partners.

Actors' Affective State

Next, we explored whether actors' affective state following the discussion varied according to the ethnicity of their partner and/or their own racial attitudes by entering their responses on each of the five mood subscales into the regression analysis. Results revealed effects on negative feelings toward self, negative feelings toward other, and positive affect.

Results indicated that White actors' reaction to intergroup interaction did include negative feelings that were directed toward themselves. A main effect for partner ethnicity was evident on negative feelings toward self, $b = .16$, $\beta = .30$, $t(50) = 2.25$, $p < .05$, whereby all actors felt more self-critical when their partner was Aboriginal rather than White. A main effect for partner ethnicity was also evident on negative feelings toward other, $b = .16$, $\beta = .32$, $t(50) = 2.44$, $p < .025$. Both low- and high-prejudice White actors endorsed these mood adjectives more when their partner was Aboriginal rather than White. Analyses of positive affect revealed an Actor Prejudice \times Partner Ethnicity interaction, $b = -.22$, $\beta = -.31$, $t(48) = 1.95$, $p = .057$. Low-prejudice actors tended to report higher levels of positive affect after interacting with an Aboriginal as compared with a White partner, $b = .26$, $\beta = .37$, $t(48) = 1.82$, $p < .10$, whereas there was no such pattern for high-prejudice actors, $b = -.17$, $\beta = -.24$, $t(48) = 1.18$, *ns*. The predicted values for this interaction are included in Table 2.

Partners' Metaperceptions and Actors' Impressions

We next examined the second set of perception measures obtained from each pair member, that is, partners' metaperceptions and actors' impressions. In this case, the ethnicity of the person forming impressions is constant, and the ethnicity of participants providing metaperceptions varies. To explore whether Aboriginal partners believed that they were viewed differently than White partners and whether these metaperceptions were affected by the actor's prejudice level, partners' metaperceptions were entered into the same regression analysis described previously. In this analysis, the trait dimensions were categorized in terms of their relevance to the other-stereotype (i.e., the stereotype regarding Aboriginal Canadians). The results provided no evidence that Aboriginal partners felt that they had been stereotyped by White actors or that partners' metaperceptions were affected by actors' prejudice level. There were no significant or marginal effects on metaperceptions along the 15 other-stereotype-relevant

trait dimensions or along the 10 other-stereotype-irrelevant trait dimensions. We also examined the relationship of partners' metaperceptions to actors' impressions by computing the correlations between these variables across the whole sample and for White-White and Aboriginal-White pairs separately. None of the correlations was significant.

Next, we examined whether actors formed different impressions of Aboriginal versus White partners. There were no significant effects on impressions along other-stereotype-relevant dimensions. On impressions along dimensions irrelevant to the other-stereotype, however, analyses revealed an Actor Prejudice \times Partner Ethnicity interaction, $b = .32$, $\beta = .44$, $t(48) = 3.35$, $p < .005$. Low-prejudice actors viewed Aboriginal partners more positively than White partners, $b = -.37$, $\beta = -.50$, $t(48) = 3.02$, $p < .01$, whereas the opposite pattern was evident for high-prejudice actors, $b = .26$, $\beta = .35$, $t(48) = 2.12$, $p < .05$. These results are summarized in Table 2.

Interestingly, when actors' metaperceptions along dimensions relevant to the White meta-stereotype were entered into the analysis, their metaperceptions were significantly related to their impressions of their partner, $b = .81$, $\beta = .57$, $t(47) = 5.14$, $p < .001$, and the Actor Prejudice \times Partner Ethnicity interaction effect was eliminated, $b = .11$, $\beta = .15$, $t(47) = 1.30$, $p > .20$. The indirect effect of the interaction on impressions by means of metaperceptions was significant, $Z = 2.92$, $p < .005$. Although conclusions regarding a causal relation await research in which metaperceptions are manipulated, this result suggests that White individuals' reactions to an out-group member may be closely connected to their sense of his or her impressions of them. The tenor of the evaluation they perceive may guide the positivity of their reactions to the out-group member. Moreover, the fact that most of the other-stereotype-irrelevant traits were relevant to White individuals' meta-stereotype suggests a pattern of rather direct reciprocity in evaluations.

Gender Effects

The most consistent effects that we obtained involving gender occurred on actors' metaperceptions and impressions of their partner. Here we obtained significant Gender \times Partner Ethnicity interactions on both stereotype-relevant and irrelevant traits. In White-White pairs, male actors believed that they were viewed more stereotypically and more negatively—and judged their partner more stereotypically and negatively—than did female actors. There were no such effects in Aboriginal-White pairs. Although the direction of the gender effects was as expected, with greater negativity attached to men than to women, the absence of such effects in the mixed-ethnicity pairs was unanticipated. The lack of gender effects in this condition conceivably reflects

actors' becoming more focused on ethnicity than gender in the presence of an Aboriginal student, but definitive conclusions on this point clearly await further research.

FOLLOW-UP STUDY

We conducted a follow-up study to examine the phenomenology of high-prejudice persons' unwarranted perception that they were viewed in a more stereotypical fashion by an Aboriginal as compared with a White interaction partner. Although we interpret this effect as reflecting high-prejudice persons' sense that they were being viewed inaccurately by an out-group member, there are other possibilities. Perhaps the most intriguing alternative is that high-prejudice individuals actually felt especially revealed or transparent in intergroup interaction as a function of expecting the out-group member to be particularly attentive or discerning. The question of whether White individuals' racial attitudes are associated with their beliefs about an out-group member's propensity for making relatively accurate or inaccurate judgments about them has not been directly addressed in previous research. In line with our belief that expecting to be stereotyped coincides with expecting to be misunderstood, we predicted that high-prejudice individuals would expect especially inaccurate judgments from an Aboriginal as compared with a White person along meta-stereotype-relevant dimensions.

Thirty-two White introductory psychology students (19 men and 13 women) at the University of Manitoba completed a survey in which they were asked to imagine interacting with another student who was either Aboriginal ($n = 14$) or White ($n = 18$). For each of the 25 trait dimensions, they indicated how accurate they thought that the other student would be at judging people on that dimension. Responses were made on 7-point scales from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*extremely*). Participants completed the Manitoba Prejudice Scale at the end of the survey. MPS scores were unaffected by the manipulation, $t(30) = 1.15$, *ns*, overall $M = 3.00$, $SD = .92$, $\alpha = .86$.

Participants' accuracy beliefs across the 15 meta-stereotype dimensions were combined ($\alpha = .84$, $M = 4.89$, $SD = .79$) and were entered into a regression analysis with participants' (centered) prejudice scores, "audience" ethnicity (White = 0 and Aboriginal = 1), and the interaction between these variables as predictors. The only effect obtained was a significant Prejudice \times Audience Ethnicity interaction, $b = -.68$, $\beta = -.54$, $t(28) = 2.23$, $p < .05$. Consistent with our predictions, high-prejudice participants expected an Aboriginal audience to be less accurate than a White audience, $b = -.84$, $\beta = -.64$, $t(28) = 2.10$, $p < .05$; the predicted values were 4.34 and 5.18, respectively. In contrast, low-prejudice participants did not have differential expectations regarding the accuracy of an Aboriginal as compared with a White audi-

ence, $b = .40$, $\beta = .36$, $t(28) = 1.05$, ns ; the predicted values were 5.08 and 4.68, respectively. There were no effects on the 10 meta-stereotype-irrelevant traits, all t s < 1 ($\alpha = .80$, $M = 4.58$, $SD = .85$).

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Overall, the results of this research were highly consistent with our general hypothesis that both dominant and lower status group members' responses to intergroup interaction would center largely on thoughts and feelings about themselves.

Dominant Group Members' Metaperceptions

Our findings indicated that high-prejudice White actors expected to be seen in a more stereotype-consistent manner by an Aboriginal as compared with a White partner, even though they actually were not—and even though they themselves did not stereotype their Aboriginal partner. This pattern conceivably reflects these actors' focus on their meta-stereotype outpacing both their interaction partner's readiness to activate stereotypes about them and their own readiness to think in terms of the stereotype of Aboriginal Canadians. Consistent with our hypothesis that the effects of partner ethnicity on White actors' metaperceptions would center on the specific traits involved in their meta-stereotype instead of reflecting a more diffuse expected dislike, high-prejudice White actors did not expect to be viewed differently by an Aboriginal as compared with a White partner along meta-stereotype-irrelevant dimensions. The effect obtained in the follow-up study whereby high-prejudice White individuals expected an Aboriginal person to form less accurate impressions than a White person was also specific to trait dimensions relevant to the meta-stereotype.

It is noteworthy that the pattern we obtained for White actors' metaperceptions in these uncontrolled interactions, in which individuals could potentially receive feedback from their interaction partner and could try to manage their behavior in response to their partner's ethnicity, was quite consistent with the pattern obtained in the highly controlled interactions staged by Vorauer et al. (1998). As was also the case in Vorauer et al.'s research, we found an effect for partner ethnicity on low-prejudice actors' metaperceptions that was opposite to that obtained for high-prejudice actors: Low-prejudice actors expected to be seen in a less stereotype-consistent manner by an Aboriginal as compared with a White partner. In the present investigation, however, the effect of partner ethnicity on low-prejudice actors' metaperceptions was also evident along meta-stereotype-irrelevant dimensions. Perusal of the predicted values for irrelevant dimensions highlights low-prejudice

actors' sense of being viewed especially negatively by White partners. Indeed, for both relevant and irrelevant dimensions, there was an unexpected effect for White-White pairs whereby low-prejudice actors believed that they were viewed more negatively than high-prejudice actors.

In our view, the most parsimonious account for the effects obtained for low-prejudice actors' metaperceptions centers on these individuals' low felt similarity or bond to other White persons (for a discussion, see Vorauer et al., 1998). When low-prejudice actors' partners were White, they may have felt less liked than did high-prejudice actors as a function of feeling less similar to their partner. When low-prejudice actors were instead paired with an Aboriginal person, they may have believed that they had expressed their own unique values sufficiently clearly to be contrasted with their Aboriginal partner's negative image of "most White people" (i.e., the meta-stereotype). This account is speculative, however, and a better understanding of the effects awaits future research. For example, an alternative possibility is that the relatively negative metaperceptions formed by low-prejudice actors with a White partner were due to other individual differences associated with being low in prejudice, such as greater cognitive complexity or private self-consciousness. Regardless, the findings do clearly indicate that low-prejudice individuals' sense that they are viewed more positively by Aboriginal than by White interaction partners is reliable and is not corroborated by their partners' actual impressions.

Lower Status Group Members' Affective Reactions

The results for partners' affective states following the discussions were consistent with our expectation that lower status group members would be inclined to personalize the implications of any negative behaviors exhibited by their interaction partner. Aboriginal partners felt more uncomfortable and experienced more self-directed negative affect after having interacted with a high-prejudice White actor than did White partners. Moreover, Aboriginal partners did not experience these negative feelings when they had interacted with a low-prejudice White actor. Thus, high-prejudice actors in mixed-ethnicity pairs appeared to do something during their discussions that translated into a negative experience for their Aboriginal partners. It is particularly interesting that the negative feelings experienced by Aboriginal partners paired with a high-prejudice actor did not include negativity toward the other person. This pattern is consistent with the finding that Aboriginal partners did not view high-prejudice actors as more prejudiced than low-prejudice actors and with our expectation that individuals would be disinclined to think about

the interaction in terms of what it said about the other person.

The results for Aboriginal partners' affective states and impressions of White actors are highly relevant to recent theory and research regarding the anxieties that dominant group members may experience during intergroup interaction (Devine et al., 1996). Devine et al. contend that low-prejudice individuals sometimes experience evaluation anxiety when they are interacting with an out-group member and that the behavioral manifestations of low-prejudice individuals' evaluation anxiety and high-prejudice individuals' antipathy are similar. Thus, it may be difficult for out-group members to tell the difference. Our finding that Aboriginal students' impressions were not connected to White actors' racial attitudes is consistent with this analysis. However, the fact that Aboriginal students' affective states were influenced by White actors' racial attitudes reveals that Aboriginal students were on some level sensitive to differences in the behavior of low- versus high-prejudice actors, even though this sensitivity did not translate into explicit recognition of actors' attitudes.

It may be informative here to consider what the actors were feeling after the exchange. Results indicated that both low- and high-prejudice actors felt more self-criticism and antipathy if they had interacted with an Aboriginal as compared with a White partner. These main effects for partner ethnicity were juxtaposed with an Actor Prejudice \times Partner Ethnicity interaction for positive affect, whereby low- but not high-prejudice actors tended to feel happier and friendlier after having interacted with an Aboriginal as compared with a White partner. Thus, high-prejudice actors experienced a mix of negative self- and other-directed affect, and low-prejudice actors experienced these same negative reactions but tended to experience positive feelings as well.

The results for self-criticism are consistent with the idea that individuals tend to frame intergroup interaction in terms of how they are evaluated, and suggest that White actors may have tended to interpret any negative thought or behavior that occurred during intergroup interaction at least partially in terms of what it said about themselves. The negative feelings toward others reported by lows were unanticipated and may reflect imprecision of the measure. For example, lows may have indicated that they felt "angry at others" thinking of White persons who discriminate against minorities. The results for these items therefore need to be interpreted with caution. It does seem clear, however, that high-prejudice actors experienced more uniformly negative feelings after intergroup interaction than did low-prejudice actors (whose reactions were quite ambivalent overall, including positive metaperceptions and impressions together with both positive and negative affect). Con-

ceivably, this difference between lows' and highs' own feelings accounts for the differential impact that they had on their Aboriginal partners.

Interestingly, in the present casual discussions, there was no evidence of heightened anxiety or discomfort for White actors when their partner was Aboriginal, at least as measured after the interaction was over. It is possible that more difficult intergroup interaction conditions would create feelings of anxiety in low-prejudice persons that would have negative implications for Aboriginal partners, as per Devine et al.'s (1996) speculations. Alternatively, it may be important to distinguish between low-prejudice persons who are confident about their ability to behave in a nonprejudiced manner and those who are not (Devine et al., 1996). However, although Devine et al. focus on the possibility that low-prejudice individuals will be misidentified as being high in prejudice, on the basis of the present data we suspect that any negative implications of evaluation anxiety are apt to center instead on out-group members' being induced to feel negatively about themselves.

Lower Status Group Members' Metaperceptions

The results of this study provided no evidence that Aboriginal partners believed that they were seen in terms of the stereotype of their group. Aboriginal partners' metaperceptions were no different from those of White partners and did not vary according to the racial attitudes of the White actor with whom they had the get-acquainted discussion. A measure of intergroup attitudes or group identification appropriate for Aboriginal individuals may have distinguished between those who believed that they were seen in especially stereotypical or counterstereotypical terms by out-group members, just as was the case for White individuals. Alternatively, the lack of effects for Aboriginal individuals' metaperceptions could reflect a process whereby the greater frequency of intergroup interaction for minority group members renders them less apt to activate meta-stereotypes (and other-stereotypes) during intergroup interaction. Both of these possibilities warrant further research. It would also be helpful in future investigations to assess Aboriginal individuals' meta-stereotype directly rather than inferring it from the stereotype of Aboriginal Canadians held by White persons.

It is interesting to consider the present results alongside recent research by Ruggiero and her colleagues (Ruggiero & Major, 1998; Ruggiero & Marx, 1999) indicating that high-status group members are more apt than low-status group members to perceive that they are the target of discrimination. These researchers advance several possible explanations for this pattern, including greater costs to interpersonal relationships and greater

damage to feelings of control for low- than for high-status group members making such attributions. Our findings are consistent with those obtained by Ruggiero and colleagues in that we found effects on metaperceptions to be evident for the high- but not the low-status group. Here the pattern was particularly intriguing in view of our data indicating that Aboriginal partners were actually perceived especially positively by low-prejudice actors.

Why is it that Aboriginal partners' metaperceptions did not reflect the especially positive impressions that they actually conveyed? Perhaps members of low-status groups have more reason to avoid positive as well as negative judgments relative to members of high-status groups. When one is in a lower power position, it may be particularly costly to exaggerate how positively one is viewed or how clearly one has managed to conquer the stereotype regarding one's group. Thus, low-status group members may generally be more cautious in making judgments about high-status group members' intentions and perceptions than vice versa. The fact that Aboriginal partners tended to feel less self-critical after interacting with low-prejudice actors suggests that there was some tangible evidence in these interactions of lows' especially positive evaluations and hence lends credence to a cautiousness interpretation of the metaperceptions that Aboriginal partners reported.

Limitations

Several limitations of this research need to be acknowledged. Perhaps most important, although our results for White actors' metaperceptions were generally consistent with predictions made from a meta-stereotype framework, we have no direct evidence that the effects obtained for these individuals' metaperceptions reflected their focus on their meta-stereotype. Future research examining metaperceptions together with meta-stereotype activation will allow a more definitive examination of the process by which individuals' metaperceptions are affected by the ethnicity of their interaction partner. As a start in this direction, a series of investigations recently conducted in our lab have confirmed that the meta-stereotype is indeed activated for both low- and high-prejudice White individuals when they imagine or anticipate interacting with an Aboriginal person (Vorauer, Hunter, Main, & Roy, 2000). However, a connection between the activation of these knowledge structures and individuals' perception that they will be viewed differently by an out-group member as compared with an in-group member has not yet been directly demonstrated.

Additional questions center on the reasons why partner ethnicity affected White actors' metaperceptions but not the impressions that they actually conveyed. Our interpretation of this finding has centered on each per-

son being focused primarily on his or her own evaluative concerns and self-relevant knowledge structures. However, there are other factors that may have contributed to the effect. Perhaps most interestingly, the scarcity of clear social feedback (Blumberg, 1972) may have left White actors with fewer alternatives to stereotypes for making judgments about how they were viewed than their Aboriginal partner had for making judgments about them. Indeed, a growing literature documents that people may be unlikely to use stereotypes when individuating information is available (e.g., Madon et al., 1998). Thus, the fact that White actors overestimated the impact of partner ethnicity on how they were viewed might not have stemmed from asymmetry in actors' and partners' focus on the actor (i.e., egocentrism) but instead from asymmetry in the quality of the information available to actors versus partners: White actors might have been necessarily more dependent on ethnic stereotypes when estimating how they were viewed than their partners were when forming impressions. Other explanations such as lack of agreement across groups regarding stereotype content (e.g., Rettew, Billman, & Davis, 1993) also remain viable at the present time. For example, it is possible that Aboriginal partners did stereotype White actors but that they did so along different trait dimensions than White actors expected.

Further limitations involve the correlational nature of this research and issues of construct and external validity. Although the effects we obtained for actors' racial attitudes were consistent with our predictions, the results for this variable could conceivably reflect other personality attributes associated with prejudice, such as self-esteem. To address this possibility, it would be useful in future research to assess a range of individual differences in addition to racial attitudes.

With respect to construct validity, the effects for partner ethnicity might not have stemmed from the partner's status as White or Aboriginal per se but instead from other factors such as differences in how White and Aboriginal partners behaved. In addition, the fact that Aboriginal partners did not report heightened negative feelings toward others when paired with a high-prejudice actor may have been due to the fact that the questions did not specify that participants should focus on their feelings toward the person with whom they had just interacted. Our conclusions here should thus remain tentative until the results are replicated with more sensitive measures of other-directed negative affect.

In terms of generalizability, it will be important for future research to address the extent to which the present findings extend to interactions between members of different groups than those we considered. It will also be necessary to assess the generalizability of the findings to other members of the groups that were examined in the

present research. Perhaps, as university students, our Aboriginal participants were not seen (by themselves or others) as fitting the prototype for their group. Indeed, at the time this study was conducted, Aboriginal individuals represented only about 3% of the introductory psychology student population, as compared with 11% of the population of the province (Colombo, 1996). Perceived nonrepresentativeness of these individuals may have influenced participants' judgments and affective reactions. In sum, there is clearly much future work to be done to obtain a fuller understanding of the dynamics that we have only begun to explore here.

Conclusions

This research suggested that both dominant and lower status group members tend to frame interactions with an out-group member in terms of how they themselves are evaluated. This focus on self may have important implications for intergroup relations. High-prejudice dominant group members' unwarranted perception that they are viewed in a stereotypical fashion by a lower status group member could exacerbate intergroup conflict if these prejudiced individuals respond by expressing hostility toward the (ostensible) source of the negative appraisal or by trying to avoid contact with out-group members. Lower status group members' tendency to experience self- but not other-directed negative affect after interacting with a high-prejudice member of a dominant group and their corresponding failure to view such persons as prejudiced is also significant. This finding highlights that in everyday social exchanges, lower status group members may be unlikely to detect prejudice and that they may therefore find interactions with a dominant group member to be difficult for reasons they do not fully recognize. We hope that future research will pursue deeper understanding of these dynamics using methods that consider the judgments, feelings, and evaluative concerns of individuals on both sides of intergroup interaction.

REFERENCES

- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Altemeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of freedom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Blumberg, H. H. (1972). Communication of interpersonal evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 23, 157-162.
- Colombo, J. R. (Ed.). (1996). *Canadian global almanac*. Toronto: Macmillan Canada.
- Cooley, C. H. (1902). *Human nature and the social order*. New York: Scribner's.
- 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.
- Devine, P. G., Evett, S. R., & Vasquez-Suson, K. A. (1996). Exploring the interpersonal dynamics of intergroup contact. In R. Sorrentino & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition: The interpersonal context* (Vol. 3). New York: Guilford.
- Devine, P. G., Monteith, M. J., Zuwerink, J. R., & Elliot, A. (1991). Prejudice with and without compunction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 817-830.
- Eagly, A. H., & Mladinic, A. (1989). Gender stereotypes and attitudes toward women and men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 15, 543-558.
- Gilbert, D. T., & Hixon, G. J. (1991). The trouble of thinking: Activation and application of stereotypic beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 509-517.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday.
- Ickes, W. (1984). Compositions in black and white: Determinants of interaction in interracial dyads. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 330-341.
- James, W. (1981). *The principles of psychology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published in 1890)
- Jussim, L. (1991). Social perception and social reality: A reflection-construction model. *Psychological Review*, 98, 54-73.
- Kenny, D. (1994). *Interpersonal perception*. New York: Guilford.
- Kleck, R. E. (1968). Physical stigma and nonverbal cues emitted in face-to-face interactions. *Human Relations*, 21, 19-28.
- Madon, S., Jussim, L., Keiper, S., Eccles, J., Smith, A., & Palumbo, P. (1998). The accuracy and power of sex, social class, and ethnic stereotypes: A naturalistic study in person perception. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 1304-1318.
- Markus, H., & Wurf, E. (1987). The dynamic self-concept: A social psychological perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 38, 299-337.
- Martin, C. L. (1987). A ratio measure of sex stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 489-499.
- Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (1998). Internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 811-832.
- Rettew, D. C., Billman, D., & Davis, R. A. (1993). Inaccurate perceptions of the amount others stereotype: Estimates about stereotypes of one's own group and other groups. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 14, 121-142.
- Rogers, T. B., Kuiper, N. A., & Kirker, W. S. (1977). Self-reference and the encoding of personal information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 677-688.
- Ruggiero, K. M., & Major, B. N. (1998). Group status and attributions to discrimination: Are low- or high-status group members more likely to blame their failure on discrimination? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 821-837.
- Ruggiero, K. M., & Marx, D. M. (1999). Less pain and more to gain: Why high-status group members blame their failure on discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 774-784.
- Ruggiero, K. M., & Taylor, D. M. (1997). Why minority group members perceive or do not perceive the discrimination that confronts them: The role of self-esteem and perceived control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 373-389.
- Schlenker, B. R. (1980). *Impression management: The self-concept, social identity, and interpersonal relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Spencer, S. J., Fein, S., Wolfe, C. T., Fong, C., & Dunn, M. A. (1998). Automatic activation of stereotypes: The role of self-image threat. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 1139-1152.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41, 157-175.
- Swann, W. B. Jr. (1987). Identity negotiation: Where two roads meet. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 1038-1051.
- Swim, J. K., & Stangor, C. (Eds.). (1998). *Prejudice: The target's perspective*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Vorauer, J. D., Hunter, A. J., Main, K. J., & Roy, S. (2000). Concerns with evaluation and meta-stereotype activation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 690-707.
- Vorauer, J. D., Main, K. J., & O'Connell, G. B. (1998). How do individuals expect to be viewed by members of lower status groups? Content and implications of meta-stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 917-937.
- Vorauer, J. D., & Ross, M. (1993). Making mountains out of molehills: An informational goals analysis of self and social perception. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19, 620-632.

Word, C. O., Zanna, M. P., & Cooper, J. (1974). The nonverbal mediation of self-fulfilling prophecies on inter-racial interaction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 10*, 109-120.

Zuckerman, M., Kernis, M. H., Guarnera, S. M., Murphy, J. F., & Rappoport, L. (1983). The egocentric bias: Seeing oneself as

cause and target of others' behavior. *Journal of Personality, 51*, 621-630.

Received July 28, 1999

Revision accepted May 19, 2000