



Discrimination divides across identity dimensions: Perceived racism reduces support for gay rights and increases anti-gay bias[☆]



Maureen A. Craig^{*}, Jennifer A. Richeson

Department of Psychology, Northwestern University, USA
Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University, USA

HIGHLIGHTS

- 3 studies examine perceived racism's effect on attitudes toward sexual minorities.
- Two studies analyze large-scale datasets and one study manipulates racism salience.
- Anti-ingroup racism led racial minorities to express bias toward sexual minorities.
- Discrimination harms intraminority intergroup relations across identity dimensions.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 24 July 2013

Revised 22 May 2014

Available online 15 July 2014

Keywords:

Intergroup relation

Minority group

Perceived discrimination

Prejudice

ABSTRACT

Recent research has found that perceiving racial discrimination toward one's own group results in the expression of more positive attitudes toward members of other racial minority groups; however, perceiving sexism results in the expression of more negative attitudes toward other stigmatized groups, namely, racial minorities. One possibility for this seeming discrepancy is that perceived group disadvantage better enables identification with other disadvantaged groups within a dimension of identity (i.e., among racial minorities) than across dimensions of identity (i.e., between White women and racial minorities). The present research investigates this possibility or, rather, whether racial discrimination is such a potent experience for racial minorities that making it salient will increase identification with and, thus, facilitate more positive attitudes toward members of other stigmatized groups, even those that cross an identity dimension (e.g., sexual minorities). Analyses of two nationally representative datasets (Studies 1a & 1b) reveal that perceived racial discrimination against the ingroup is associated with more negative attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. Similarly, a laboratory experiment with Black and Latino participants (Study 2) reveals that making racial discrimination against the ingroup salient leads to more negative attitudes toward gay men and lesbians as well as less support for policies that would benefit sexual minorities. Overall, the present research suggests that although perceived discrimination may result in more positive attitudes within an identity dimension, it is associated with more *negative* intra-minority intergroup relations across dimensions of identity.

© 2014 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

In 2008, an unprecedented number of racial minorities participated in the historic event of electing the first Black president of the United States (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009). Also on the ballot in California during the 2008 election cycle was Proposition 8—a proposal to amend the

California State Constitution to recognize only marriages between opposite-sex pairs.¹ Some expected Black Americans to empathize with gay Americans and vote against the ban due to Black Americans' own experiences with institutionalized discrimination, especially in the marriage domain (DiMassa & Garrison, 2008). Contrary to those expectations, however, Black and Latino voters tended to support the

[☆] The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of a NSF Graduate Fellowship and an American Bar Foundation Law and Social Science Fellowship to MAC, as well as the support of the John D. & Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and NSF grant BCS-0921728 to JAR. This manuscript is based on a portion of MAC's dissertation.

^{*} Corresponding author at: Department of Psychology, Ohio State University, Lazenby Hall, 1827 Neil Avenue Mall, Columbus, OH 43210, USA.

E-mail address: craig.305@osu.edu (M.A. Craig).

¹ As of the writing of this manuscript, a Ninth Circuit court ruling deemed Proposition 8 unconstitutional and in the appeal to the US Supreme Court it was ruled that the supporters of Proposition 8 did not have standing to appeal. Thus, Proposition 8 is effectively overturned.

ban on same-sex marriage to a greater extent than White and Asian voters (58% and 59%, compared to 49% and 48%, respectively; Egan & Sherrill, 2009). Hence, many were surprised that racial minorities who had fought for civil rights themselves were relatively unsupportive of gay and lesbian marriage rights. The present research examines whether the basic assumption that racial minority voters would feel greater empathy toward gay men and lesbians due to having faced similar forms of discrimination and disadvantage was misplaced. Specifically, three studies examine the relation between perceived racial discrimination and racial minority individuals' attitudes regarding sexual minorities and support for civil rights for gay men and lesbians.

The present studies build upon recent research exploring relations among members of different stigmatized groups—*intra-minority intergroup* relations. The larger question governing this line of research is whether the experiences that often distinguish low- from high-status group members (e.g., discrimination) may alter the trajectory of intra-minority intergroup relations, such that they unfold differently than do relations between members of majority and minority groups (Richeson & Craig, 2011). Members of different stigmatized groups share a disadvantaged societal status; perceived discrimination against their own group could be construed as a common experience held with other disadvantaged groups leading to positive intergroup relations. The Common Ingroup Identity Model (CIIM; Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000) suggests that perceived discrimination may lead members of different stigmatized groups to categorize themselves in terms of a common “disadvantaged” identity and, thus, may result in more positive attitudes toward stigmatized outgroups. Alternatively, extant research on Social Identity Threat (SIT; Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999) predicts that perceived discrimination against one's group—a clear threat to the value of one's social identity—should lead to more negative evaluations of stigmatized outgroups in order to bolster group esteem.

The CIIM prediction that perceived discrimination is associated with perceived commonality and positive attitudes among different stigmatized groups has found support. For instance, prior work with Blacks and Latinos has found a positive association between perceived discrimination against one's own group and perceived commonality with another racial minority group (e.g., Craig & Richeson, 2012; Sanchez, 2008). Further, exposing racial minority participants (e.g., Asian Americans, Latinos) to discrimination against their own racial/ethnic group (i.e., anti-Asian/anti-Latino prejudice) leads to greater perceived similarity with and more positive evaluations of other racial minorities (e.g., Blacks; Craig & Richeson, 2012).

Despite this initial evidence regarding the promise of salient ingroup discrimination to engender more positive intra-minority intergroup relations, the results of a second set of experiments suggest that more *negative* reactions are also possible. Specifically, White women primed with pervasive sexism expressed more pro-White (relative to Black and Latino) self-reported and automatic racial bias, compared with White women who were not primed with sexism (Craig, DeHart, Richeson, & Fiedorowicz, 2012). Revealing the role of social identity threat in shaping these reactions, Craig et al. (2012, Study 3) found that a group-level affirmation prior to making sexism salient reduced its effect on intergroup bias. That is, White women who were affirmed prior to making sexism salient expressed similar levels of intergroup racial bias as did White women for whom sexism was not made salient. This work suggests, in other words, that making ingroup discrimination salient can indeed trigger social identity threat (Branscombe et al., 1999) without activating a sense of common disadvantage and, thus, result in the expression of greater bias against other disadvantaged groups.

What predicts whether the CIIM or SIT will govern stigmatized group members' responses to salient discrimination? One parsimonious explanation is that perceived discrimination against one's own group tends to promote bias directed toward other stigmatized groups across identity dimensions (e.g., across gender and race); however, within an identity dimension (e.g., race), perceived discrimination tends

to promote more positive intra-minority intergroup attitudes. This hypothesis seems particularly plausible, given that making ingroup discrimination salient increases the extent to which racial minority participants perceive their own groups to be similar to other racial minority groups, which predicts the expression of more positive attitudes toward those other racial minority groups (Craig & Richeson, 2012). In other words, perceived similarity seems to be important for engendering more positive intergroup attitudes, and may simply be easier to heighten within a dimension of identity rather than across dimensions.

Although this explanation is reasonable, another potential explanation for this pattern remains. That is, the evidence in support of perceived ingroup discrimination leading to more positive intergroup attitudes is largely based on racial minority participants' reactions to salient racial bias, whereas the evidence in support of perceived ingroup discrimination leading to more negative intergroup attitudes is based on White women's responses to salient sexism. Racial minorities and White women may respond differently to salient racism and sexism, respectively, because whereas racial minority group members are both numerical minorities in the US population as well as socio-culturally disadvantaged, women are in the numerical majority of the US population, albeit still socio-culturally devalued in many domains. Nevertheless, this difference in numerical minority vs. majority status could result in lower levels of group identification, a known predictor of reactions to discrimination (McCoy & Major, 2003). Consistent with this idea, previous research has found that, compared with Blacks and members of other disadvantaged groups (e.g., older adults), women have relatively low levels of gender group consciousness (Gurin, Miller, & Gurin, 1980), perhaps making it particularly difficult to activate the type of cross-category common “disadvantaged” identity that could engender more positive intergroup attitudes in response to salient sexism. By contrast, perceived racial discrimination could activate an ideology that promotes commonality among different oppressed groups (e.g., Oppressed Minority Ideology; Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous, 1998).

Hence, it is possible that the differential findings observed in previous research are not attributable to the relative difficulty associated with activating a common ingroup identity and enhancing feelings of similarity across identity dimensions, compared to within an identity dimension, but, rather, reflect differences in the experiences of White women with sexism and racial minorities with racism. One way to test this alternate explanation is by observing the relation between perceived racial discrimination and the attitudes racial minorities express toward stigmatized outgroups from a different identity dimension. To that end, three studies explore how perceived discrimination against one's racial/ethnic ingroup influences attitudes toward sexual minorities.

Study 1a

Study 1a sought to examine whether perceiving discrimination against one's own racial group is associated with more negative attitudes toward sexual minorities, consistent with SIT theory or, rather, more positive attitudes toward sexual minorities, consistent with the CIIM. Because it should be more difficult to activate a common ingroup identity across dimensions of social identity (i.e., across race and sexual orientation) than within an identity dimension, we predicted that perceived anti-ingroup discrimination would be associated with more negative attitudes toward sexual minorities.

Data & methods

The present study examined the General Social Survey cumulative data set (GSS; Smith, Marsden, Hout, & Kim, 2013). The GSS is a large-scale survey of United States residents that has been conducted since 1972. In the interviews, which generally take about 1.5 h to conduct, respondents are asked about their attitudes and behaviors in relation to different political and social issues. There are many different questions asked in the GSS that could reasonably assess the constructs of

interest for the present study (i.e., perceived discrimination and attitudes toward homosexuality). However, many items are rotated in and out of the survey, so not all items are asked in each iteration of the GSS. In order to yield a large enough sample of Black respondents to achieve reliable estimates, we determined which items assessing perceived racial discrimination and attitudes toward homosexuality were included in the greatest number of surveys and utilized those items to operationalize the constructs. The variables of interest for our research question were asked in every year that the survey was conducted between 1985 and 2012, except for 1986 and 1987. Analyses focused on the sample of self-identified Black respondents who were US born and who had completed the variables of interest ($n = 1230$; 63.82% women, $M_{\text{age}} = 42.97$, $SD_{\text{age}} = 16.32$).

Perceived discrimination

Perceived discrimination was operationalized by an item that was asked in the greatest number of surveys (i.e., from 1985 to 2012, except 1987).² Specifically, respondents indicated whether they thought that the reason that Black Americans have worse jobs, income, and housing than White people was due to discrimination (0 = No, 1 = Yes). Thus, higher numbers indicate greater perceived anti-Black discrimination.

Attitudes toward homosexuality

Four items that were included in the greatest number of surveys (i.e., 1973–1974, 1976–1977, 1980, 1982, 1984–1985, and 1987–2012) assessed individuals' attitudes toward homosexuality. Specifically, respondents indicated whether they thought that a gay man should be allowed to 1) make a speech in his community or 2) teach in a college or university. These two items were scored such that 0 = Not allowed and 1 = Yes, allowed. A third item asked respondents to indicate whether they would support removing a hypothetical book that was in favor of homosexuality from their public library (0 = Remove, 1 = Not remove). A final item asked respondents to indicate the degree to which they considered sexual relations between two adults of the same sex to be wrong (1 = Always wrong, 4 = Not wrong at all). These four items were standardized and averaged to create an index of attitudes toward homosexuality ($\alpha = .71$); higher numbers indicate more positive attitudes toward or acceptance of homosexuality.

Demographic variables

The following indicators of respondents' demographic characteristics were assessed: age, gender (0 = Female, 1 = Male), the frequency of the respondents' religious attendance (0 = Never, 8 = Several times a week), and educational attainment (0 = Less than high school, 4 = Graduate degree).

Results & discussion

The weight provided by the study authors (Smith et al., 2013) was utilized in order to make inferences for the American adult population from the results. Weights are used to adjust for non-response and unequal probability sampling (Kalton, 1983). We were interested in the subsample of Black respondents; thus, analyses were conducted using the survey-data analysis features of a statistical program designed to accurately compute standard errors when conducting subsample analyses (i.e., Stata v13.1).

The descriptive statistics and zero-order correlations between perceived anti-Black discrimination and attitudes toward homosexuality are shown in Table 1. We regressed attitudes toward homosexuality on perceived anti-Black discrimination, as well as participants' demographic variables.³ This analysis revealed a modest negative relationship

Table 1
Descriptive statistics and zero-order correlations for Studies 1a & 1b.

Variables	M	SD	PGD	PPD
<i>Study 1a</i>				
Perceived group discrimination (PGD)	.67	.48	–	–
Attitudes toward homosexuality (AH)	0.0	.73	–.13***	–
<i>Study 1b</i>				
Perceived group discrimination (PGD)	1.76	.66	–	–
Perceived personal discrimination (PPD)	.19	.39	.26***	–
Attitudes toward homosexuality (AH)	.63	.48	–.09**	.11**

** $p < .01$.

*** $p < .001$.

between attitudes toward homosexuality and perceived anti-Black discrimination, $b = -.17$, $p < .001$, $r_{\text{partial}} = -.12$.⁴ Thus, Black respondents' reports of perceived ingroup discrimination were significantly and negatively associated with attitudes toward homosexuality. The present findings are consistent with those found among White women reported in Craig et al. (2012) and with the hypothesis that perceiving ingroup discrimination leads to more negative attitudes toward stigmatized minority outgroups across dimensions of social identity.

Because the discrimination item explicitly referred to anti-Black discrimination in the GSS dataset, we could only examine the association between Black respondents' perceived discrimination and their attitudes toward homosexuality. In Study 1b, we examine whether the relationship between perceived ingroup discrimination and attitudes toward sexual minorities found in the GSS is also observed in a different racial minority group—Asian Americans. Recall that previous research revealed that salient anti-Asian discrimination leads Asian Americans to express more positive attitudes toward Blacks and Latinos (Craig & Richeson, 2012).⁵ Hence, Study 1b considers whether this pattern of positive intra-minority intergroup relations in the face of salient ingroup racial bias persists across dimensions of identity.

Study 1b

Study 1b explored whether the association found in Study 1a would replicate in a different racial minority group—Asian Americans. We examined data from a Pew Research Center survey of Asian American adults (Pew Research Center, 2012). Similar to the GSS data analyzed in Study 1a, this dataset included items assessing perceived discrimination faced by respondents' racial group and attitudes toward sexual minorities. Furthermore, unlike the GSS, the Pew survey assessed both perceived group discrimination and perceived personal discrimination (i.e., discrimination faced by respondents themselves due to their racial/ethnic group membership). Hence, we can examine whether perceived group and personal discrimination have similar associations with attitudes toward stigmatized outgroups from a different dimension of identity. We predicted that, similar to Study 1a, perceived racial discrimination would be negatively associated with attitudes toward homosexuality.

⁴ Analyzing the data without weights produced similar results and did not alter the direction or significance, $b = -.15$, $p < .001$, $r_{\text{partial}} = -.10$.

⁵ We sought to explore whether, consistent with our predictions and Craig and Richeson (2012), perceived anti-Black discrimination was associated with more positive attitudes toward Latinos in the GSS dataset. Although the GSS has been conducted for many years, quite surprisingly, attitudes toward Latinos (measured via a feeling thermometer) were only asked in one year (2002). Only 113 Black Americans were asked about both their attitudes toward Latinos and perceived anti-Black discrimination. Regressing attitudes toward Latinos on perceived anti-Black discrimination and participants' demographic variables with this small sample revealed the predicted positive, albeit nonsignificant, association (weighted results: $b = .49$, $p = .281$, $r_{\text{partial}} = .11$; unweighted results: $b = .74$, $p = .091$, $r_{\text{partial}} = .15$).

² By contrast, the next most-frequently-asked item assessing perceived discrimination was included in three surveys (2002, 2006, and 2010).

³ Continuous variables were centered at their means for the regression models in Studies 1a and 1b.

Data & methods

Study 1b examined data from a survey of 3511 Asian Americans that was conducted via telephone interviews from January to March 2012 in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Individuals who identified as Asian or Asian American were eligible for the survey, including individuals who identified with more than one racial group and/or individuals who also identified as Hispanic. Analyses focused on the sample of Asian Americans who primarily identified with their Asian American identity, who were not Hispanic, who completed the variables of interest, and who were US citizens ($n = 2134$; 50.11% women, $M_{\text{age}} = 46.02$, $SD_{\text{age}} = 17.29$).

Perceived discrimination

Two items assessed perceived discrimination. One item asked respondents to indicate the degree to which they thought that discrimination against their country of origin/ethnic group (e.g., Chinese Americans) was a problem (1 = *Not a problem*, 2 = *Minor problem*, and 3 = *Major problem*). Another item asked if in the past twelve months respondents had personally experienced discrimination or been treated unfairly because of their country of origin/ethnic group membership (0 = *No*, 1 = *Yes*). Thus, the data include assessments of perceived discrimination against respondents' ethnic group (perceived group discrimination) as well as perceived discrimination against respondents themselves due to their ethnic group membership (perceived personal discrimination). Higher numbers indicate greater perceptions of group and personal discrimination.

Attitudes toward homosexuality

There was only one item in the dataset that assessed respondents' attitudes toward homosexuality; respondents were asked to indicate the statement that was closer to their views, "Homosexuality should be accepted by society" or "Homosexuality should be discouraged by society." Indicating that there should be societal acceptance of homosexuality was coded as 1 and indicating that society should discourage homosexuality was coded as 0; higher numbers indicate more positive attitudes.

Demographic variables

The following indicators of respondents' demographic characteristics were included in the analyses: age, gender (0 = *Female*, 1 = *Male*), the frequency of the respondents' religious attendance (0 = *Never*, 6 = *More than once a week*), and educational attainment (0 = *Less than high school*, 7 = *Post-graduate training or professional schooling after college*).

Results & discussion

The sampling weight and replicate weights made by the survey creators (Pew Research Center, 2012) were used in order for the results to be representative of Asian American adults in the United States and to accurately compute the point estimates, standard errors, and test statistics.⁶ Standard statistical programs assume simple random sampling, which can produce underestimated (and sometimes overestimated) sampling errors if analyzing data collected via complex sampling designs such as the design of the present study. Analyses were conducted with a statistical software package designed for complex survey data (Stata v13.1).

The descriptive statistics and zero-order correlations among the variables of interest are shown in Table 1. Similar to prior work (e.g., Bourguignon, Seron, Yzerbyt, & Herman, 2006), perceived personal discrimination and perceived group discrimination were moderately positively correlated ($r = .26$). To examine the relationship between perceived discrimination (both group and personal) and attitudes toward homosexuality among Asian Americans, we conducted a logistic regression in which we regressed attitudes toward homosexuality on perceived group discrimination, perceived personal discrimination, and respondents' demographic variables. Consistent with predictions and Study 1a, perceived group discrimination was negatively related to attitudes toward homosexuality, $b = -.32$, $p = .002$, $OR = 0.73$. That is, for a one unit increase in perceived group discrimination (e.g., indicating that discrimination against Asian Americans was a major rather than a minor problem), one would expect a 27% decrease in the odds of expressing positive attitudes toward homosexuality, adjusted for the effects of the other variables. Interestingly, perceived personal discrimination was positively related to attitudes toward homosexuality, $b = .45$, $p = .023$, $OR = 1.57$. Put another way, for an individual who has personally experienced discrimination, the odds of expressing more positive attitudes toward homosexuality are 1.57 times as large as an individual who has not personally experienced discrimination, adjusted for the effects of the other variables. This unexpected finding is intriguing and suggests that a personal connection with discrimination and/or disadvantage may help to increase perceptions of commonality with stigmatized outgroups from a different dimension of identity and, thus, facilitate more positive intergroup attitudes—an issue to which we return in the General discussion.

While the associations revealed in Studies 1a and 1b between attitudes toward homosexuality and perceived anti-ingroup discrimination are modest in terms of effect size, they emerged from responses to national surveys with adult respondents in which a large number of questions were asked. Nevertheless, the limitations of correlational research remain a concern (e.g., a third variable could be driving the association, the directionality of the effects is uncertain). These limitations call for an examination of the effect of perceived (group level) racial discrimination on the expression of bias toward gay men and lesbians utilizing experimental methods.

Study 2

While Studies 1a and 1b provided evidence of an association between perceived group-level racial discrimination and attitudes toward sexual minorities/homosexuality, a more controlled experimental approach is warranted. Thus, the primary goal of Study 2 was to test whether making anti-ingroup racial discrimination salient leads to the expression of more negative attitudes toward sexual minorities. Further, the national survey data examined in Studies 1a and 1b largely included measures regarding "homosexuality in general" and, thus, did not differentiate between attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. Further, given the policy implications of this work, we wanted to examine whether the association found previously between perceived discrimination and evaluative attitudes toward homosexuality would also be observed in individuals' attitudes regarding policies pertaining to gay civil rights (e.g., same-sex marriage, adoption by same-sex couples). Hence, in Study 2, Black and Latino participants were first primed with anti-ingroup racism (or control information) and then reported on their attitudes toward gay men and lesbians and their support for a number of social policies affecting sexual minorities. We predicted that, consistent with Studies 1a and 1b, participants who were primed with anti-ingroup racial discrimination would express more negative attitudes toward sexual minorities and express less support for gay rights than participants who were not primed with anti-ingroup racial discrimination.

⁶ Due to the complex nature of the survey design of Study 1b, reporting the unweighted results would be inappropriate. Specifically, the data examined in Study 1b were collected by employing multiple sampling frames (with some overlap within the frames) that were stratified along multiple strata and the replicate weights are needed to accurately compute standard errors (Pew Research Center, 2012).

Method

Participants

Thirty-five participants (15 Latino, 20 Black) took part in the experiment for partial course credit. All participants (23 women, $M_{\text{age}} = 18.46$, $SD_{\text{age}} = 0.56$) identified as a 0 or 1 on the Kinsey scale of sexual orientation (0 = *Exclusively heterosexual*, 6 = *Exclusively homosexual*).

Materials & measures

Perceived discrimination manipulation. Racial discrimination faced by the ingroup was primed through a manipulation adapted from previous research (Craig & Richeson, 2012; Major, Kaiser, O'Brien, & McCoy, 2007). Participants read three newspaper articles with the final article providing the experimental manipulation. In the final article, all participants read about an alleged research study related to Blacks or Latinos in the United States. In the discrimination salient condition, the study outlined the social and economic consequences of racial discrimination against Blacks (for Black participants) or against Latinos (for Latino participants). This article included the same information as the perceived discrimination manipulation article from Study 5 of Craig and Richeson (2012). The control condition article utilized in the present experiment differed from the control articles used in previous research (Craig & Richeson, 2012; Major et al., 2007). Specifically, rather than being completely unrelated to the relevant ingroup (i.e., race) as in previous work, the control article in the present experiment described an alleged research study regarding risk factors for lupus, noting the higher incidents and severity of the disease in either Black (for Black participants) or Latino (for Latino participants) populations. Hence, the present study utilized a more stringent control condition wherein participants in both conditions received negative information about their racial ingroup, but only the discrimination salient condition referred to group level racial discrimination.

Attitudes toward sexual minorities and policy support. The Attitudes toward Lesbians and Gay Men Scale (Herek, 1988) assessed attitudes toward lesbians (8 items) and gay men (8 items). Participants indicated their agreement to statements (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 7 = *Strongly Agree*) such as, "Lesbians just can't fit into our society" and "I would not be too upset if I learned that my son were a homosexual." Support for policies that affect sexual minorities was assessed with the Support for Gay and Lesbian Civil Rights Scale (Brown & Henriquez, 2011). Participants indicated their agreement (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 7 = *Strongly Agree*) to 20 items such as, "Gays and lesbians should not be allowed to adopt children," and "Immigrant partners of gays and lesbians should receive the same immigration rights as partners of heterosexuals." Due to very high correlations among the three scales of attitudes toward sexual minorities and policy support (r s among scales ranged .89–.92), items were averaged to create a single index of attitudes toward sexual minorities and re-scored such that higher scores indicate more positive attitudes toward lesbians and gay men as well as more support for policies that would benefit sexual minorities ($\alpha = .97$).⁷

Procedure. Participants came into the lab individually and were met by an Asian American experimenter. After providing informed consent, participants read the articles providing the perceived discrimination manipulation. Participants then completed the measure of attitudes toward sexual minorities and attitudes toward gay and lesbian civil rights. Finally, participants were thanked and debriefed.

Results & discussion

Two participants who were outliers (i.e., participants with values that are 1.5 times greater than the interquartile range; Tukey, 1977) on the attitudes toward sexual minorities scale were removed from the analyses,⁸ leaving 33 participants in the final sample (17 discrimination salient condition, 16 control condition).

We examined whether making anti-ingroup discrimination salient influences support for policies affecting gay men and lesbians as well as attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. Consistent with predictions, participants in the discrimination salient condition ($M = 5.35$, $SD = 1.29$) expressed more negative attitudes toward sexual minorities, compared to participants in the control condition ($M = 6.28$, $SD = 0.55$), $t(31) = 2.68$, $p = .012$, $d = .93$. Consistent with Studies 1a and 1b, we found support for the hypothesis that making anti-ingroup racial discrimination salient leads racial minorities to express relatively more negative attitudes toward and less support for policies that would benefit sexual minorities—an outgroup stigmatized in a different identity dimension (i.e., sexual orientation). That is, while on average, participants were relatively positive toward and supportive of civil rights for gay men and lesbians (i.e., all participants but one were above the midpoint of the scale), participants for whom racial discrimination was made salient tended to express less positive attitudes and express less support than participants in the control condition. Overall, the results are consistent with the hypothesis that salient ingroup discrimination—be it sexism or racism—results in the expression of more negative attitudes toward stigmatized outgroups across dimensions of social identity.

General discussion

The present work explored whether perceiving anti-ingroup discrimination is associated with more negative attitudes toward another disadvantaged group stigmatized in a different identity dimension (i.e., across the dimensions of race and sexual orientation). One strength of this work is that we examined the research question both with pre-existing nationally-representative data and with a controlled laboratory experiment (albeit with a small sample). Overall, the results of the present research are consistent with Craig et al. (2012), which found that salient ingroup discrimination (i.e., sexism) leads White women to express more negative racial attitudes. Indeed, in the present studies, perceiving anti-ingroup racial discrimination was associated with greater bias against sexual minorities, consistent with the predictions of the social identity threat literature (e.g., Branscombe et al., 1999) in which threats to the value of one's group can lead to the derogation of other groups.

How do the present findings reconcile with those reported in Craig and Richeson (2012), wherein perceived ingroup discrimination among racial minorities was associated with the perception of greater perceived similarity with and more positive attitudes toward members of other racial minority groups? The findings of the present work suggest that racial minority group members do not always express more positive attitudes toward other stigmatized groups when ingroup racial discrimination is salient. Considering the results of the present studies, in tandem with those reported in Craig et al. (2012) and in Craig and Richeson (2012), a clear pattern emerges: salient ingroup discrimination is likely to be construed as a social identity threat and result in the expression of more negative attitudes toward other stigmatized outgroups, perhaps unless feelings of commonality are also engendered (Cortland, Shapiro, Neel, & Goldstein, 2014; Galanis & Jones, 1986; Shnabel, Halabi, & Noor, 2013; Vollhardt, 2013).

Sharing a common dimension of identity (e.g., within the dimension of race) appears to be one such basis for promoting similarity or

⁷ Examining the effect of experimental condition on each scale separately yielded nearly identical results as analyzing the combined scale, (p s ranged .008–.024).

⁸ If the two outlier participants are included in the dataset, the effect becomes weaker, $t(33) = 1.92$, $p = .064$, $d = .65$.

common identification, perhaps due to the perception of a common outgroup perpetrator and/or a readily-available superordinate label (e.g., “racial minority”). Another factor promoting commonality among disadvantaged groups may have been revealed in Study 1b in the association between personally-experienced discrimination and attitudes toward homosexuality. Whereas our results across studies revealed a negative association between perceived group discrimination and attitudes toward homosexuality, a *positive* association emerged between perceived personal discrimination and attitudes toward homosexuality. This intriguing, albeit unexpected, difference suggests that relative to group-level experiences of discrimination, personal experiences of discrimination may better promote sympathy and/or perceived commonality with other disadvantaged groups, even across dimensions of identity.

Indeed, increased overlap in the manner in which individuals represent the self and other groups often promotes common ingroup categorization (e.g., Coats, Smith, Claypool, & Banner, 2000; Smith, Coats, & Walling, 1999; Smith & Henry, 1996). Perceiving a connection between the self and disadvantage, in other words, may facilitate the activation of a common categorization/identification with other disadvantaged groups across identity dimensions. For example, in a series of experiments with Israeli Jews and Palestinians, Shnabel et al. (2013) found that making a common victim identity (or a common perpetrator identity) salient led to more positive intergroup outcomes (e.g., less competitive victimhood and greater forgiveness). Our data suggest that in the absence of active intergroup conflict, a personal connection with disadvantage may also promote more positive intergroup outcomes with other disadvantaged groups. Further research is necessary, however, to replicate this apparent distinction between the effects of personal vs. group discrimination and, of course, to explore the mechanisms that underlie it.

In conclusion, the present research contributes to the growing literature examining intra-minority intergroup relations (Richeson & Craig, 2011; Shapiro & Neuberg, 2008). Specifically, the present work sheds light on the conditions under which perceived discrimination against the ingroup will promote coalition with or derogation of other stigmatized minority groups (e.g., Cortland et al., 2014; Craig & Richeson, 2012; Craig et al., 2012; Galanis & Jones, 1986; Gordon, 1943; Sanchez, 2008; Shapiro, Mistler, & Neuberg, 2010). The current research suggests that conjuring one group's experiences with discrimination may not necessarily promote feelings of commonality with other minority groups and may even backfire, resulting in less support for other minority groups' causes than might otherwise be observed. Future research, however, is necessary to discern whether the findings for intergroup attitudes revealed in the present work extend to individuals' actual voting behavior and other forms of civic participation vis-à-vis issues that primarily affect other stigmatized groups. Nevertheless, given that racial minority group members are becoming a larger proportion of the voters in many jurisdictions as well as nationally, understanding the factors that lead members of one stigmatized minority group to support or oppose issues that affect other stigmatized minority groups is both timely and important.

References

- Bourguignon, D., Seron, E., Yzerbyt, V., & Herman, G. (2006). Perceived group and personal discrimination: Differential effects on personal self-esteem. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 773–789. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.326>.
- Branscombe, N. R., Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1999). The context and content of social identity threat. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity: Context, commitment, content*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Brown, M. J., & Henriquez, E. (2011). Support for gay and lesbian civil rights: Development and examination of a new scale. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 58(4), 462–475. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2011.555664>.
- Coats, S., Smith, E. R., Claypool, H. M., & Banner, M. J. (2000). Overlapping mental representations of self and in-group: Reaction time evidence and its relationship with explicit measures of group identification. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 36(3), 304–315. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1999.1416>.
- Cortland, C. I., Shapiro, J. R., Neel, R., & Goldstein, N. J. (2014). *From prejudice to solidarity: Shared experiences with stigma improve inter-minority relations*. (Unpublished manuscript).
- Craig, M.A., DeHart, T., Richeson, J. A., & Fiedorowicz, L. (2012). Do unto others as others have done unto you? Perceiving sexism influences women's evaluations of stigmatized racial groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(9), 1107–1119. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167212445210>.
- Craig, M.A., & Richeson, J. A. (2012). Coalition or derogation? How perceived discrimination influences intraminority intergroup relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(4), 759–777. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0026481>.
- DiMassa, C. M., & Garrison, J. (2008, Nov. 8). Why gays, blacks are divided on Prop. 8. The Los Angeles Times. Retrieved from <http://articles.latimes.com/2008/nov/08/local/me-gayblack8>.
- Egan, P. J., & Sherrill, K. (2009). California's Proposition 8: What happened, and what does the future hold? Retrieved from National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute website: http://www.thetaskforce.org/downloads/issues/egan_sherrill_prop8_1_6_09.pdf.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Galanis, C. M. B., & Jones, E. E. (1986). When stigma confronts stigma: Some conditions enhancing a victim's tolerance of other victims. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 12(2), 169–177. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167286122003>.
- Gordon, A. I. (1943). Frustration and aggression among Jewish university students: A survey at the University of Minnesota. *Jewish Social Studies*, 5(1), 27–42.
- Gurin, P., Miller, A. H., & Gurin, G. (1980). Stratum identification and consciousness. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 43(1), 30–47.
- Herek, G. M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: Correlates and gender differences. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 25(4), 451–477. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0022449880951476>.
- Kalton, G. (1983). *Introduction to survey sampling*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Major, B., Kaiser, C. R., O'Brien, L. T., & McCoy, S. K. (2007). Perceived discrimination as worldview threat or worldview confirmation: Implications for self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(6), 1068–1086. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.6.1068>.
- McCoy, S. K., & Major, B. (2003). Group identification moderates emotional responses to perceived prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(8), 1005–1017. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167203253466>.
- Pew Research Center (2012). 2012 Asian-American Survey [Data file and code book]. Retrieved from <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2012/06/19/the-rise-of-asian-americans/>.
- Richeson, J. A., & Craig, M.A. (2011). Intra-minority intergroup relations in the twenty-first century. *Daedalus, the Journal of the American Academy of Arts & Sciences*, 140(2), 166–175. http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/DAED_a_00085.
- Sanchez, G. R. (2008). Latino group consciousness and perceptions of commonality with African Americans. *Social Science Quarterly*, 89(2), 428–444. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2008.00540.x>.
- Sellers, R. M., Smith, M.A., Shelton, J. N., Rowley, S. A. J., & Chavous, T. M. (1998). Multidimensional model of racial identity: A reconceptualization of African American racial identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2(1), 18–39.
- Shapiro, J. R., Mistler, S. A., & Neuberg, S. L. (2010). Threatened selves and differential prejudice expression by White and Black perceivers. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46, 469–473. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.12.013>.
- Shapiro, J. R., & Neuberg, S. L. (2008). When do the stigmatized stigmatize? The ironic effects of being accountable to (perceived) majority group prejudice-expression norms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(4), 877–898. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0011617>.
- Shnabel, N., Halabi, S., & Noor, M. (2013). Overcoming competitive victimhood and facilitating forgiveness through re-categorization into a common victim or perpetrator identity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 867–877.
- Smith, E. R., Coats, S., & Walling, D. (1999). Overlapping mental representations of self, in-group, and partner: Further response time evidence and a connectionist model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(7), 873–882. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167299025007009>.
- Smith, E. R., & Henry, S. (1996). An in-group becomes part of the self: Response time evidence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(6), 635–642. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167296226008>.
- Smith, T. W., Marsden, P. V., Hout, M., & Kim, J. (2013). *General Social Surveys, 1972–2010 [Data file and code book]*. Storrs, CT: The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut (distributor).
- Tukey, J. W. (1977). *Exploratory data analysis*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2009, July 20). Voter turnout increases by 5 million in 2008 presidential election, U.S. Census Bureau Reports. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/voting/cb09-110.html>.
- Vollhardt, J. R. (2013). “Crime against humanity” or “crime against Jews”? Acknowledgment in construals of the Holocaust and its importance for intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 69(1), 144–161.