

5-2015

Reacting to Microaggressions: Do Individual Identity Processing Styles Play a Role?

Suraj Patel

University of South Carolina - Aiken

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/aiken_psychology_theses

 Part of the [Community Psychology Commons](#), [Personality and Social Contexts Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Patel, Suraj, "Reacting to Microaggressions: Do Individual Identity Processing Styles Play a Role?" (2015). *USC Aiken Psychology Theses*. 16.

https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/aiken_psychology_theses/16

This Thesis is brought to you by the Psychology Department at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in USC Aiken Psychology Theses by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu.

Reacting to Microaggressions: Do Individual Identity Processing Styles Play a Role?

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Psychology

University of South Carolina Aiken

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

By

Suraj Patel

May 2015

Abstract

The majority of literature on the impact of microaggressions focuses on ethnic minority stereotypes with little research on how microaggressions and negative stereotypes affect other types of minority groups, such as minorities based on social group. Additionally, within the literature on general group membership, it has been found that social disapproval results in the typical, global response of negative affect. However, the behaviors that are evoked by the negative affect differ considerably among individuals whether the response is to strengthen, maintain, or avoid interpersonal conflict (Richman & Leary, 2009). Moreover, there is no single model that can conceptualize the complexity of these responses (Richman & Leary, 2009). Therefore, the present study sought to understand the impact of a microaggression on students affiliated with Greek life at a southeastern university by focusing on how group identification, need to belong, and collective self-esteem are affected according to an individual's identity processing style. While the microaggression did not appear to impact participants' group identification or collective self-esteem, it did interact with an informational identity processing style to predict participants' need to belong. This research supports that even within a minority population, people react differently. Thus, strategies to help individuals within a minority group that have stereotype-related experiences may need to differ based on characteristics, such as identity processing style.

What is a Microaggression?

A microaggression is a form of aversive racism characterized by subtle insults in the form of verbal, non-verbal, and/or visual negative slights directed towards minority individuals. There are three types of microaggressions, ranging from most to least explicit: microassault (verbal or nonverbal discriminatory attack or avoidance), microinsult (conveying insensitivity and directly demeaning via actions), and microinvalidation (communications that negate thoughts and feelings). All forms of microaggressions are often dismissed as being innocuous by the perpetrator and having minimal effect on the recipient. However, due to the ambiguous nature of a microaggression, the recipient is placed in a challenging situation and is forced to think about several factors. The recipient has to determine whether a microaggression actually occurred, how to react toward the microaggression, and how to respond to the microaggression. This rumination and response process has the ability to influence anger, frustration and self-esteem, as well as contributing to diminished trust and psychological distress. For example, choosing not to respond to the microaggression may lead to an internalization of anger and frustration. Alternatively, confronting the microaggression may be an emotional release, but may engender other types of negative consequences, such as further perpetuating stereotypes of being hostile and oversensitive, as in the case with Black males. What is lacking in microaggression research is how to adaptively handle microaggressions and how to increase cultural awareness and sensitivity (Sue et al., 2007).

“I, Too, Am Harvard” initially began as a play based on interviews with members of the Black community to create cultural awareness about their experiences as Black students at Harvard College. The participating students performed monologues highlighting their

experiences with microaggressions on campus. For instance, some were mistaken as waiters at a formal event (i.e., microinsult), or told that they were admitted because of their skin color, not their academic aptitude (i.e., microassault). Although these examples are not outwardly violent or threatening, they have the ability to make the minority individual feel like an outsider and question the validity of the microaggression and the intention of the perpetrator. The play premiered in March 2014 and quickly snowballed into a movement with other minority communities in academia speaking out across the nation. The movement's main purpose was to create awareness for the existence of microaggressions, and moreover, that a new form of covert racism exists that is often overlooked and undermined. A Tumblr blog site created by Dartmouth students called BigGreenMicroAggressions defined a microaggression as "...a brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignity, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicates a hostile, derogatory, or negative slight or insult toward people of non-dominant identities," a definition grounded in Derald W. Sue's (2007) pioneering research on microaggressions.

The collegiate initiatives have sparked the movement to create awareness for the presence and effects of microaggressions in the daily lives of minority individuals. Furthermore, it has given minority individuals a safe platform to speak out about their experiences, normalize them, and receive social support. Although this movement is in its early stages, it is already an example of why it is important to continue research on how to effectively handle a microaggression situation. Without an understanding of the dynamics of subtle microaggressions, they will remain invisible and potentially harmful to minority group individuals (Sue et al., 2007). Although blatant racism is declining with the rise of political correctness, the presence of ambiguous microaggressions remains rooted (Sue et al., 2007).

There is research on the fact that microaggressions do exist and that they do affect minority individuals negatively, however, there is little research on how microaggressions affect these individuals.

Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakami, and Hodson (2002) reviewed a series of studies that illustrated how contemporary racism (i.e. microaggressions) shaped different perspectives of Blacks and Whites (DeAngelis, 2009). The researchers found that interracial interactions of aversive racists could appear inconsistent and unpredictable, as well as dishonest or deceitful: an inconsistency that could significantly impact Black people's confidence in another individual's motivations and values, ultimately leading to interpersonal distrust. Furthermore, Jones and Harris (1967) found that people tend to over-attribute intentionality to another person's actions; those who feel discriminated against may likely assume that the aversive racist's behavior is motivated by conscious, old-fashioned discrimination, while the perpetrator remains unaware of the impact of their microaggression. The unpredictability and ambiguous nature of a microaggression leads to the potential for mistrust and distress, while also continuing the cycle of discrepancies about racial attitudes. Additionally, minority group members may be particularly sensitive to signs of rejection, and are more likely to weigh negative signs more heavily than positive overt behaviors due to mixed messages and biases between overt and nonverbal behaviors from out-group members. These findings suggested that minority group members are susceptible to effects of blatant and subtle discrimination (Dovidio et al., 2002).

Much of the research on microaggressions has been qualitative, Offerman et al., (2014) conducted one of the first studies that attempted to quantify perceptions of microaggressions, and the first to examine an individual difference predictor of microaggression perceptions. The study was conducted by presenting participants with six vignettes that captured varying subtleties of

racial workplace microaggressions and two vignettes that served as a control condition. The participants included undergraduate students age 17-23, males and females, and multiple ethnic and racial backgrounds. Each vignette described an interaction between a non-Hispanic White male supervisor and a Black male subordinate. Participants' completed a perceived microaggressions measure after each vignette by reporting the degree to which they perceived the supervisor to be intentionally discriminatory and aware of the racial undertones in his actions. Prior to hypothesis testing, a repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) and post-hoc analysis found that the differences in levels of perceived microaggression differed significantly between vignette type (microassault, microinvalidation, microinsult) and mean perceived microaggression significantly increased from control level, microinvalidation, to microinsult, to microassault. Thus providing support that less explicit forms of microaggressions are still perceived negatively.

The results of Offerman et al.'s (2014) study suggested that group membership influenced perceptions of microaggressions and that there was a significant discrepancy in racial attitudes between racioethnic majority and minority group members. Additionally, post-hoc analyses found significant differences between types of minorities and their perceptions on different types of race-related microaggressions (e.g., institutional discrimination significantly lower for non-Black minorities). Given that gender had significant correlations with outcome variables, analyses were run with and without gender as a covariate, and it was found that gender did not change the significance of the relationships of interest. The finding that group membership influenced perception of microaggression is an interesting notion. Exploring the reverse could expand upon this notion by examining how a microaggression might influence perception of group membership; moreover, how other types of individual differences might

predict the influence of a microaggression on an individual's group membership. The results of this study highlighted the fact that there still remains a persistent discrepancy in racial attitudes between racioethnic majority and minority group members. Considering the demographic of the participant base, 17-23 year old undergraduate students in 2014, it is concerning that these attitudes continue to persist among young adults of diverse backgrounds who have presumably have had greater exposure and appreciation of diversity than previous generations (Offerman et al., 2014).

Evidently, the majority of the available research on microaggressions is based on racial microaggressions; however, there are many types of minority group members that are stigmatized by long-standing negative stereotypes, such as the Greek life organizations on college campuses. Greek life is nation-wide and has much diversity within itself as an organization, similar to racial and ethnic groups. As such, stereotypes about sorority and fraternity members are deeply ingrained in society, similar to stereotypes about minority racial and ethnic groups.

By expanding on the existing microaggression literature through the use of varying minority groups (such as Greek life members), it is possible to examine whether responses towards microaggressions are based on individual identity characteristics, rather than strictly ethnicity or racial background. It was reported that 96% of African-Americans experienced racial discrimination in a one-year period and most incidents included being mistaken for a service worker, being ignored, given poor service, treated rudely, or experiencing strangers acting fearful or intimidated when around them (Sue et al., 2007). On the other hand, most Caucasian Americans believe that minorities are doing better in life and that racism is on the decline. This disparity in racial relations highlights the problem with microaggressions: they are

hidden, unconscious biases and the offended response of the victim is viewed as uncalled for (Sue et al., 2007). The stereotype of the angry African-American male may be broken, instead, viewing the angry male as being either an angry individual, or angry because of the circumstance and not because he is African-American. An exploration of a long-standing, highly stereotyped culture (i.e., Greek life) might expand upon the literature about microaggressions by highlighting individual responses among group members in the aftermath of a microaggression towards a group membership outside of ethnic and minority status. Looking at identity processing style would place the emphasis of the reaction on how individuals interpret and respond to incoming information.

According to the Association of Fraternity Sorority Advisors (AFA), the top stereotypes that were perceived as most negative and damaging to their organizations were hazing, drinking/parting, promiscuity, and arrogance (Wilson & Tollini, 2013). The majority of the existing literature about sororities and fraternities highlights these stereotypes by providing a predominately negative view of Greek life members, without including how the members themselves perceive their group membership in light of the stereotypes. Furthermore, these stereotypes are also perpetuated in the media through music, movies, and television. Therefore, research including Greek life members would add to the literature on microaggressions and group membership by gaining a better understanding of how different types of minority group members perceive themselves, their group membership, and the microaggressions that they face.

A major barrier in understanding microaggressions is that many researchers continue to believe that subtle negative slights are not as harmful as overt prejudice, a belief that is a microaggression in itself. Interestingly, the more subtle forms of microaggression, microinvalidation and microinsult, may actually generate more distress than less subtle forms of

prejudice because of their ambiguous nature. For mental health purposes, exploring how minority individuals respond to a subtle microaggression would add to the much needed research on how to effectively cope with microaggressions. Researchers in the microaggression field have posed the question of how a certain minority population copes with microaggressions to stave off negative effects (Sue et al., 2007). This question in itself is based on the assumption that members of a minority group would have a similar coping mechanism.

The present study seeks to understand how individual differences in managing conflicts influence how a minority individual responds to a microaggression. With this knowledge, practitioners, educators, Greek organizations, professionals, etc. may be able to better address concerns about negative stereotypes via information, specialized programs, and socializing techniques (Wilson & Tollins, 2013). Furthermore, the emphasis on individual identity within a minority group will potentially serve to increase awareness for diversity within a minority group.

Identity Processing Style

An individual's sense of identity may play a key role in managing identity conflicts between their self and their group membership. Erikson's (1968) psychosocial theory postulated that the process of forming an individualized, well-integrated sense of identity played a central role in personality development over the lifespan. As such, having a consolidated, well-integrated sense of identity would provide a stable frame of reference for making decisions and interpreting both environmental and self-relevant information (Berzonsky, Soenens, Luyckx, Smits, Papini, & Goossens 2013). This may be particularly relevant for an individual in deciphering the complexities of a microaggression as illustrated above.

Research on identity formation is primarily based around the status paradigm developed by Marcia (1966) that served to operationally define Eriksonian identity formation. Eriksonian

identity formation is based on the notion that a person confronts a challenge (i.e. Trust vs. Mistrust) at each stage in life from infancy to adulthood, and that if the challenge is not successfully completed, the negative virtue (i.e. Mistrust) will carry on through remaining life stages (Berzonsky, Soenens, Luyckx, Smits, Papini, & Goossens, 2013). Marcia (1966) crossed high and low levels of self-exploration and commitment that ultimately resulted in four identity types, or statuses: “(a) identity achievement (highly committed following a period of self-exploration), (b) identity moratorium (currently engaged in self-exploration with limited commitment), (c) identity foreclosure (highly committed with limited self-exploration), and (d) identity diffusion (limited commitment but not engaged in self-exploration)” (Berzonsky, Soenens, Luyckx, Smits, Papini, & Goossens 2013, p. 894). These statuses were conceptualized as identity outcomes because exploration and commitment are confounded within each status category (Berzonsky, Soenens, Luyckx, Smits, Papini, & Goossens, 2013).

Beyond identity formation, researchers have attempted to focus more directly on the process by which identity is formed. Berzonsky and Barclay (1981) hypothesized that Marcia’s (1966) four statuses reflected three different ways of managing identity-relevant conflicts and issues: an informed, rational orientation; a more automatic, normative or conforming orientation; and a procrastinating, diffuse-avoidant orientation. These orientations are often used to categorize individuals as having either informational, normative, or diffuse-avoidant identity style.

Individuals with an Informational identity style tend to have a clear sense of commitment and direction. They are interested in learning new things about themselves, they seek out, evaluate, and utilize relevant information, and they are willing to reflect on their own self-views in light of dissonant feedback (Berzonsky et al., 2013). Berzonsky (2011) found that this style of

identity was associated with cognitive complexity, problem-focused coping, vigilant decision-making, open mindedness, and personal effectiveness (Berzonsky et al., 2013). These individuals have a moratorium identity status or an identity achievement identity status, indicating either high self-exploration with limited commitment, or high self-exploration and high commitment, respectively.

The second type of identity processing style, the Normative identity processing style, is seen in individuals who are conscientious, self-disciplined, and have a strong sense of commitment and purpose. These individuals tend to internalize and adhere to the goals, expectations, and standards of significant others or groups in a relatively more automatic manner than an individual with Informational identity processing style (Berzonsky et al., 2013). A Normative individual would also have a limited tolerance for uncertainty and a strong need for structure and closure; in addition, this individual's primary goal is to defend and preserve their existing self-views and identity structure (Berzonsky et al., 2013). They typically have a foreclosed identity status, in which they are highly committed, however they have limited self-exploration. Unlike individuals with an Informational identity style, the individual with a Normative identity processing style does not approach potentially self-diagnostic information in a rational, open-minded fashion (Berzonsky et al., 2013). The major difference between Informational and Normative is that Normative individuals have a characteristic inability to remain flexible and open-minded about external influences. On the other hand, Informational individuals have the ability to change their commitments in accordance with their self-views, whereas, Normative individuals become distressed with changes to their existing self-views and do not entertain change in commitment.

The third identity style, Diffuse-avoidant, is characteristic of individuals who attempt to avoid dealing with identity conflicts and decisions (Berzonsky et al., 2013). Their behavior is determined by situational demands and consequences, and how they act is largely dependent on where they are and whom they are with (Berzonsky et al., 2013). These individuals have an external locus of control, limited self-control, weak commitments, and self-handicapping behaviors (Berzonsky et al., 2013). They also typically possess a diffusion identity status and have limited engagement and self-exploration.

The notion of perceiving and interpreting incoming information according to differing identity styles may partially account for the wide variety of behaviors seen in the aftermath of negative reactions from social others. Individuals with high self-exploration (i.e., Informational Identity processing style) and/or high commitment (i.e., Normative Identity processing style) are likely to have a well-integrated sense of identity that would provide a stable frame of reference for making decisions about how to effectively respond to negative reactions from others. Individuals with Informational and Normative identity processing styles may benefit from group membership effects because they are likely to develop strong, committed group identities. Furthermore, those low in self-exploration and commitment, such as individuals with a Diffuse-Avoidant processing style, may not equally benefit from group membership benefits due to a lack of a committed group identity.

Therefore, it is probable that individuals with a stable sense of identity, due to the ability for self-exploration and commitment, will maintain their group identity in spite of a microaggression. This may be a plausible prediction due to the assumption that commitment in a group fosters a strong group identity and that self-exploration allows for self-views to be evaluated in light of negative reactions about group membership. These individuals perceive

themselves as belonging to a valued social group regardless of the opinions of others. On the other hand, individuals that waiver on their commitments may avoid interpersonal conflicts as they do not feel a strong sense of group identity one way or the other and their typically external locus of control indicates an instable sense of identity. These individuals may vary on their emotional and behavioral responses depending on their need for belongingness and acceptance, or their indifference to social inclusion altogether. Those high in need for acceptance, but low in commitment, may find themselves at a crossroads in a negative feedback situation. However, those low in need for acceptance and low in commitment may not experience an identity-relevant conflict at all.

Richman and Leary (2009) found that the negative emotions and lowered self-esteem that people usually experience after a rejection-related experience are typical, global responses, however, the behaviors that follow these responses differ considerably. Furthermore, the degree to which these responses are instrumental in restoring belonging needs also vary (Richman & Leary, 2009). As such, exploration of identity processing styles may shed light on how an individual is likely to react in the aftermath of a microaggression.

An exploratory study by Beaumont and Zukanovic (2005) examined differences in men's self-reports of psychosocial distress and self-worth as a function of identity style and age period (early, middle, and late adulthood). As of this study, there was no literature that linked identity style with psychological age-related stress; however, previous studies by Berzonsky, Kuk, Sullivan, Dollinger, and Schwartz et al., (1992, 1992, 1995, 2000) described typical coping strategies and personality characteristics of individuals with the informational, normative, and diffuse-avoidant identity styles irrespective of age and gender as: "1) individuals with an informational identity style would report low levels of distress and moderate levels of self-worth;

2) individuals with a diffuse/avoidant identity style would report high levels of distress and low levels of self-worth; and, 3) individuals with a normative identity style would report low levels of distress and high levels of self-worth” (Beaumont & Zukanovic, 2005, p. 4). As such, informational would use mature coping strategies (i.e., problem-focused coping), diffused-avoidant would use avoidant coping strategies, and that normative strategies would be mixed as they would use avoidant coping strategies, but display high levels of conscientiousness (Beaumont & Zukanovic, 2005). It was expected that the findings of the study would support Berzonsky’s contention that the difference in the three identity styles is the cognitive processing or coping styles used by the groups of individuals (Beaumont & Zukanovic, 2005).

Three age groups of participants (19-25, 35-55, and 65-87) completed a self-report questionnaire packet including Berzonsky’s (1989) Identity Style Inventory: Sixth-Grade Reading Level (ISI-6G), Thomas, Yoshioka, and Ager’s (1993) Life Distress Inventory (LDI), and Messer and Harter’s (1986) Global Sub-Scale of the Adult Self-Concept Questionnaire (GS-ASCQ). Together, these questionnaires assessed identity style based on cognitive processing involving coping and problem solving, current general distress in the individual’s life, and perceived self-worth. The study found that the middle-aged men reported more distress than older men, and that young adults experienced the highest levels of distress, a finding consistent with Erikson’s supposition that early adulthood is the beginning of exploration during which an individual develops a sense of identity (Beaumont & Zukanovic, 2005). Further, the oldest men reported significantly lower levels of self-worth than either young or middle-aged men. In addition, as expected, men with diffuse-avoidant identity style reported high levels of psychosocial distress and low levels of general self-worth, however, their levels of self-worth and distress only significantly differed from those reported by men with normative identity style.

In contrast, men with normative identity style reported higher levels of self-worth than diffuse men and lower levels of distress than either informational or diffuse men.

These results concluded that, although the mean ratings of distress and self-worth for the three groups were in the expected direction, the expected differences between information and diffuse-avoidant styles were not found (Beaumont & Zukanovic, 2005). Previous findings with regard to coping strategies used by individuals with each of the three identity styles may offer a possible explanation for the unexpected differences in the findings. Berzonsky and Sullivan (1992) suggested that because normative individuals protect themselves from unwanted dissonance and are closed to experience, they may protect themselves from experiencing high levels of psychosocial distress and low self-worth, as was also found in this study (Beaumont & Zukanovic, 2005).

The inconsistency between the findings of this study and previous research between information-oriented and diffuse-avoidant individuals may also be explained by previous research on cognitive processing (Beaumont & Zukanovic, 2005). Berzonsky (1992) and Berzonsky and Ferrari (1996) found that information-oriented individuals used problem-focused coping, whereas diffuse-avoidant individuals used more emotion-focused and avoidant coping (Beaumont & Zukanovic, 2005). Therefore, diffuse-avoidant individuals' choice of coping strategy might have resulted in high levels of stress due to an external locus of control, contributing to a lack of personal control, whereas information-oriented individuals' choice of coping strategy also resulted in high levels of stress, but because of their internal locus of control, i.e., their feelings of personal responsibility for their interpersonal decisions (Beaumont & Zukanovic, 2005). Thus, it was found that diffuse-avoidant individuals had increased distress due to external threats and informational individuals had increased distress due to their personal

choices. The future implications of gaining an understanding of the differences among group members may aid in strengthening group identity, moderating the need to belonging, and increasing collective self-esteem through development of group socialization experiences that address individual's interpersonal strengths and weaknesses according to their identity processing style. For example, individuals with diffuse-avoidant personality may only require "cheerleading" from in-group members, while an individual with an informational identity processing style may require more profound interpersonal interventions to resolve interpersonal conflicts.

Group Identification

Similar to the findings of Dovidio et al., (2002) and Beaumont and Zukanovic (2005), Richman and Leary (2009) found that human beings are attuned to others' reactions to them and that these reactions evoke different responses depending on whether they perceive that others are disinterested, disapproving, and rejecting of them, or interested, approving and accepting of them. Furthermore, they found that positive and negative reactions from others affected how people perceived and felt about themselves, about other people, and about the quality of interpersonal relationships going forward (Richman & Leary, 2009).

Generally, Richman and Leary (2009) found that other people's reactions had a strong impact on people's thoughts, emotions, motives, and behavior. Specifically, they found that people's reactions to perceiving that others did not accept them were complex and that no conceptual model could capture the fullness of people's responses to perceived rejection (Richman & Leary, 2009). However, the common theme threading the responses people had towards receiving negative reactions from others (i.e., avoidance, prejudice) was that their need to belong was being compromised or threatened (Richman & Leary, 2009). Thus, there is the

assumption that all negative interpersonal events have the potential to lower people's perceived relational value, but also that positive interpersonal events have the potential to increase people's perceived relational value (Richman & Leary, 2009). Further exploration of how individuals with differing identity processing styles perceive a microaggression toward their valued social group may extend the broad framework that Richman and Leary (2009) developed by narrowing in on factors such as commitment, self-exploration, and locus of control that are typical of their identity processing style.

Neblett, Banks, Cooper, and Smalls-Glover (2013) examined the associations among self-reported racial socialization experiences (i.e. racial pride, racial barriers), racial identity (i.e., private regard or positive feelings about one's racial group), and depressive symptoms in a sample of African-American young adults attending a predominantly White university. This population was used in light of the link between racial stressors and depressive symptoms associated with being an ethnic minority. The authors were also interested in examining racial and ethnic identity during critical developmental transitions from adolescence to adulthood, a time period when socialization messages from parents become less direct and less frequent (Neblett et al., 2013). They hypothesized that there would be a significant indirect effect between racial pride, racial barriers, and socialization behaviors and depressive symptoms, such that these dimensions would be positively related to racial identity and negatively associated with depressive symptoms (Neblett et al., 2013). Furthermore, they predicted that racial pride, racial barriers, and socialization behaviors would be positively related to racial centrality and private regard, and thus, be associated with fewer depressive symptoms (Neblett et al., 2013).

The primary objective of the study was to examine the mediating role of racial identity in association with racial socialization messages and depressive symptoms (Neblett et al., 2013).

The researchers used a multiple mediation model to evaluate whether dimensions of racial identity indirectly affected the relationship between racial socialization and depressive symptoms. They found evidence of an indirect effect of racial pride messages and socialization behaviors on adjustment through racial identity, specifically with positive feelings about being African-American (Neblett et al., 2013). These findings are consistent with studies that examined the link between socialization and racial identity, in that socialization facilitates the development of a racial identity and more favorable in-group attitudes (Neblett et al., 2013). The outcomes from the Neblett et al., (2013) study suggested that instilling a sense of pride and group knowledge through specific messages or socialization behaviors may play an important role in the private regard that youth attribute to the in-group (Neblett et al., 2013). Additionally, positive views of the in-group that are conveyed by racial pride messages and socialization behaviors may translate to positive self-esteem as individuals see themselves as an extension of the group (Neblett et al., 2013).

Research on group identification and the complexity of responses evoked by perceived rejection may be extended by focusing on identity processing style and the extent to which an individual desires acceptance and belongingness in the group. These factors may affect group pride (e.g. collective self-esteem), and thus group identity, by potentially maintaining, strengthening, or weakening group pride in the aftermath of the threat. For example, an individual high in self-exploration and high in interpersonal commitment may not experience as much distress over a threat to their group identity as an individual with low self-exploration and a higher need for acceptance. In addition, using a population that is in a highly stereotyped group by choice (i.e., Greek organizations on a college campus) may add to research on how identity processing style, need to belong, and group identity are impacted in the aftermath of an in-group

threat. The implications of such future research may aid in the development of group socialization practices that target individual group member needs.

Baumeister and Leary (1995) suggested that people have a fundamental need to belong that would manifest in negative psychological consequences if left unfulfilled. Therefore, it is possible to suggest that group identity, collective self-esteem (i.e. group pride), and belongingness are closely related when presented with a microaggression towards group membership. A handful of studies by Hoyle and Crawford (1994) investigated the relationship between subjective dimensions of belonging and psychological well-being. In these studies, Hoyle and Crawford (1994) found moderate correlations (ranging from -.35 to -.51), indicating that students' perceptions of greater group cohesion were associated with lower levels of depression, loneliness, and social anxiety (Cameron, 1999). In another study by Hoyle and Crawford (1994), belongingness was positively and significantly related to a number of dimensions of self-evaluation (Cameron, 1999). The available evidence suggests that group identification, dimensions of belongingness, and self-identity are related (Cameron, 1999).

Cameron (1999) proposed that, "psychological well-being was contingent not only on what group identity tells people about who they are, but also on what it allows them to imagine for the future," (p. 179). He operationalized the efficacy-related beliefs of 167 university students in two ways: (a) in terms of the belief that group (university) membership facilitates the achievement of hoped-for selves and the avoidance of feared selves (i.e., perceived group-derived efficacy) and (b) as one's perceived capability to attain these goals (i.e., perceived self-efficacy) (Cameron, 1999). It was hypothesized that "[group] identification would be positively related to psychological well-being to the extent that it enhances group-derived efficacy; in other words, the relationship between [group] identity and psychological adjustment was expected to

be mediated by the belief that current group membership facilitated the achievement of hoped-for selves and the avoidance of feared-selves,” (Cameron, 1999, p. 181).

Another goal of Cameron’s (1999) study was to examine the multidimensional construct of group identity relevant to efficacy-related beliefs. Cameron (1998) derived a model that specified three factors: in-group ties (i.e. perceived common bond with other in-group members), centrality (i.e., enduring psychological salience of group membership), and in-group affect (i.e., the positivity of feelings derived from group membership) (Cameron, 1999). Group identification with the university was operationalized with the aforementioned three factors.

The result of Cameron’s (1999) study provided evidence that (a) the relationship between group identity and psychological well-being could be mediated, in part, by the belief that group membership enabled the attainment of hoped-for-possible selves and the avoidance of feared counterparts and (b) specific aspects of identification related to indexes of mental health in distinguishable ways. The results of the path-analytic model were consistent with two routes from group identification to psychological well-being, to the extent that they were mediated by the belief that group membership facilitated achievement (Cameron, 1999). One path was mediated by personal self-esteem and the other path, as hypothesized, was mediated by group-derived efficacy (Cameron, 1999). Although the correlational nature of the data did not allow for causal relationships, the mediational patterns suggested that the centrality and affective positivity of group identification enhanced perceived group membership (Cameron, 1999).

Group identification literature could be extended by testing the extent a microaggression against group membership might impact group identification and, moreover, how that impact may differ among group members with different identity processing styles. For instance, individuals with an informational identity style may develop stronger group identification than

diffuse-avoidant individuals because they have a clear sense of commitment and direction that is being facilitated by group membership, whereas individuals with a diffuse-avoidant identity style have no strong commitments to tie them to a particular group (Berzonsky et al., 2013).

Accordingly, it might be true that strong group identification, would remain unchanged in the aftermath of a microaggression.

The results of Cameron's (1999) study also suggested that perceived ties with other students at the university enhanced global self-esteem. This may imply that aspects of the group identity are intrinsically related to emotional functioning, suggesting that if belongingness represented a human motivation, then interpersonal bonds with other in-group members would readily meet that need (Cameron, 1999). Therefore, group membership allows for the need for belonging to be fulfilled (Cameron, 1999).

Both Cameron (1999) and Neblett et al. (2013) reported that group identity was partially mediated by the perceived value of an individual's social group and their group pride. On the other hand, Richman and Leary (2009) found that other people's reactions had a strong impact on people's thoughts, emotions, and behaviors depending on whether the interaction reflected social rejection or acceptance. Moreover, Richman and Leary (2009) found that people evoke different responses to perceived rejection with a complexity that cannot be conceptualized by any single model. Further, the responses vary on whether they strengthen, maintain, or weaken relationships. The relationship between identity processing style and group identification may provide a starting basis for conceptualizing the complexity of people's responses to perceived rejection. More specifically, identity processing style may predict the strength and stability of group identification in minority group members in the aftermath of a microaggression highlighting a negatively perceived stereotype among members.

Motivation for the Need to Belong

Social scientists have long been interested in the potential psychological benefits that result from group memberships and identification with others. As such, identifying with valued social groups is believed to enhance one's social interactions (Wann, Waddill, Polk, & Weaver, 2011). Compton's (2005) literature review documented the effect of identification on historically stigmatized groups, religious organizations, clinical populations, high school peer groups, and work/employment groups (Wann et al., 2011). This review concluded that "positive social relationships," in which an individual identifies with a valued social group, was one of the core variables that best predicted happiness and satisfaction with life by inclusion into a social network that provided psychological support (Wann et al., 2011, p. 75).

John Donne (1975) coined the widely quoted line, "No man is an island," (Baumeister & Leary, 1995, p. 497). The quote alluded to the notion that no person is free from their connections to their environment. Relatedly, Baumeister and Leary's (1995) belonging hypothesis stated that humans have a pervasive drive to form and maintain lasting, positive, and significant interpersonal relationships that are frequent, pleasant, and temporally stable (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). This hypothesis suggested that individuals evolved a need to develop bonds with groups that were linked to strong effects on emotional patterns and cognitive processes, and that a lack thereof may result in ill effects on health, adjustment, and well-being. Furthermore, this pervasive drive for the need to belong may also apply to motivation for behavior and achievements that are recognized, validated, and valued by other people versus solitary achievements. For example, did an achievement actually occur if it was not posted to a

social media site? This motivation implies that there may be an important interpersonal component behind the need for social recognition (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Therefore, an individual's valuation of their social group, or their collective self-esteem, may also play a role in weakening or increasing a need for belongingness, be it for interpersonal satisfaction, or personal satisfaction.

Within the scope of social and personality psychology, there are several empirical findings that are relevant to the belongingness hypothesis and offer a series of predictions about belongingness (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). The first prediction is that social bonds should form relatively easy, without requiring special or extensive circumstances (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). This is evident in the classic Robbers Cave study conducted by Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, and Sherif (1961/1988). In this study, adolescent boys were randomly assigned to two groups and the boys in each group spent a week together in the wilderness. Following this week of group building, the two groups were brought together in the context of competition. Researchers noted that clear evidence of group cohesion and group identification existed in each of the two groups, and they concluded that random assignment was enough to develop rapid, strong loyalty and group identification (Baumeister & Leary, 1995).

The Robbers Cave study (1961/1988) showed that emotional and behavioral patterns could be quickly accommodated to a new group (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Specifically, this study suggested that in-group socialization experiences and pride messages might have the ability to develop group identification rather quickly. However, the two groups of boys were later merged together into one cohesive group quite easily when tasked with a challenge by the researchers that required teamwork among the boys. The trajectory of group identification within the study demonstrated the ability for it to develop and diminish without considerable external

influences. This phenomenon indicates that group identification has the potential to be impacted by external influences and also suggests that developing strong and stable group identification requires more than inter-group competition.

The sense of belonging may produce real, potential, or imagined changes in one's belongingness status that could result in emotional responses linked to either positive affect or negative affect (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Positive affect is associated with the formation of social bonds accompanied by positive emotions, such as the experience of falling in love when the love is mutual (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). In contrast, negative affect is experienced when there are threats to social attachments or the potential to lose important relationships (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). From Baumeister and Leary's (1995) empirical literature review, it could be concluded that both positive and negative emotional reactions are linked to relationship status and that an interpersonal bond has the ability to change the way an individual responds emotionally. On one hand, group members experience positive affect from social bonds, but on the other hand, any threat to that social bond has the potential to elicit negative affect. Furthermore, how severe that threat is perceived may also differ among individuals. Therefore, there is the potential that differences in how severe the threat is perceived by members' is related to how threatened their sense of belonging is. For example, an individual with an informational identity processing style has the ability to reflect upon dissonant feedback and evaluate the severity of a threat; whereas, an individual with normative identity processing style will automatically preserve their existing social bond and protect themselves from unwanted dissonance.

Cohen & Willis (1985) suggested that simply being a part of a supportive social network reduced stress, despite a lack of explicit emotional support (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). In

addition, DeLongis, Folkman, and Lazarus (1988) found direct evidence that deprivation of belongingness resulted in maladaptive outcomes through a study of happily married couples (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). There is extensive literature on how the deprivation or satisfaction of belongingness results in positive or maladaptive outcomes and how the formation of or threat to social bonds results in positive or negative affect. However, there is a lack of literature on the dimensionality of belongingness. Future research on how group members with different identity processing styles perceive and manage a negative reaction towards group membership would potentially illustrate this dimensionality. More specifically, identity processing style may predict changes in the motivational drive for belongingness in the aftermath of a microaggression. Individuals who perceive the microaggression as a real threat to belongingness may have internalized their group standards as their own self-views, as seen in normative identity individuals (Berzonsky et al., 2013). Accordingly, the balance between group identity and self-identity may also play a role in how a microaggression against group membership is managed.

The Collective Self

An important part of who we are is whom we are when we are with others. Gaertner, Sedikides, and Graetz (1999) argued that individuals rely on their personal self first, and then if that is threatened, they turn to their group identities (Marmarosh, C. L., & Markin, R. D., 2007). Additionally, others have argued that different aspects of the self are retrieved depending on the situation (Marmarosh, C. L., & Markin, R. D., 2007). For example, the adjustment to college involves multiple aspects of the self that may trigger different internalized representations of the self, others, and group (Marmarosh, C. L., & Markin, R. D., 2007).

Marmarosh and Markin (2007) explored the relationship between both group and dyadic attachment styles and college adjustment. They recruited 109 undergraduate university students

and instructed all participants to complete a packet of questionnaires that included a measure of adult attachment, a measure of group attachment, and a measure of academic, social, and personal-emotional college adjustment. This study revealed that personal attachment anxiety, not avoidance, accounted for the most variance in college adjustment. Furthermore, they found that group attachment avoidance also accounted for a significant amount of variance in the prediction of college adjustment, more so than dyadic attachment styles. This study showed that students with more secure attachment styles were more likely to seek out and benefit from their relationships to others. The study also suggested those students with insecure dyadic attachments and more avoidant group attachment styles were more likely to struggle in college (Marmarosh, C. L., & Markin, R. D., 2007).

As such, this study suggested that providing students with interventions that promote both interpersonal success and security within groups may be important for retention and overall college success (Marmarosh, C. L., & Markin, R. D., 2007). Although a variety of personal attachment styles may exist in a student population, instilling group pride via traditions, history, pride messages, etc. may prove to enhance interpersonal success and security within groups, as found by Neblett et al. (2003). Likewise, Baumeister and Leary (1995) found that positive interactions with a group lead to positive affect, while negative interactions lead to negative affect. However, as Richman and Leary (2009) described, the responses evoked by negative affect vary considerably.

To add to the complexity of interpersonal interactions, our representation of our “self” is dynamic and shifting between being a unique and independent social agent, to an undifferentiated and interchangeable group member (Gaertner, Sedikides, & O’Mara, 2012). The individual self and the collective self are both fundamental components of the self-identity

with each being important and meaningful to the human experience (Gaertner, Sedikides, & O'Mara, 2012). The individual self is a representation of self as a unique and independent social agent (i.e., traits, characteristics, goals that promote distinctiveness); whereas, the collective self is a representation of self as an undifferentiated and interchangeable group member (i.e., traits, characteristics, goals derived from shared group membership and assimilation) (Gaertner, Sedikides, & O'Mara, 2012). However, it is unknown whether those selves are both equally important and meaningful. Gaertner, Sedikides, and O'Mara (2012) explored three hypotheses that suggested that the motivational core of human experience was either (a) the individual self, (b) the collective self, or (c) determined by contextual factors that make a given self momentarily accessible.

Because the psychological literature is ambiguous to whether the individual or collective self contribute equally to human experience, Gaertner, Sedikides, and O'Mara (2012), explored the literature on the three hypotheses of motivational primacy: the individual-self primacy hypothesis, collective-self primacy hypothesis, and the contextual primacy hypothesis. The individual-self primacy hypothesis stated that the individual self is the motivational core of the human experience as it consists of self-schemas that guide the processing of self-relevant information, incorporates positively affirming information, seeks information that confirms core attributes, and thereby renders a stable sense of self that is resistant to both external and internal influences (Gaertner, Sedikides, & O'Mara, 2012).

Further supporting this hypothesis, research shows that there is strong motivation to maintain and enhance a favorable self-view and protect against threats to it (Gaertner, Sedikides, & O'Mara, 2012). In addition, maintaining a favorable individual self is positively associated with mental and physical health (Gaertner, Sedikides, & O'Mara, 2012). Also, classic

perspectives suggest that natural selection acts on the individual rather than a group of a given species; moreover, the individual-self is argued to be an adaptive human trait. The literature on self-stability, self-enhancement/protection, and the individual in evolution all suggest that the motivational center of the self-concept is the individual self (Gaertner, Sedikides, & O'Mara, 2012).

The collective-self primacy hypothesis suggested that the collective self is the motivational core of human experience due to the impact social groups exert on their members (Gaertner, Sedikides, & O'Mara, 2012). There is also the motivation to protect and enhance a positive collective self-view towards groups in which they are members (Gaertner, Sedikides, & O'Mara, 2012). The literature on the impact of groups on individuals offers support to the notion that the motivational center of the self-concept is the collective self (Gaertner, Sedikides, & O'Mara, 2012).

According to the contextual primacy hypothesis, neither self is inherently a motivational core of the self-concept. Instead, motivational primacy varies as a function of contextual factors that affect accessibility of the selves (Gaertner, Sedikides, & O'Mara, 2012). The notion of the working self-concept by Markus and Kunda (1986) suggested that self-functioning is influenced by the particular aspects of the self that are currently accessible, with aspects being affected by both chronic activation and contextual cues (Gaertner, Sedikides, & O'Mara, 2012). Similarly, the self-categorization theory by Turner et al, (1987) suggested that self-definition fluctuates between the individual and the collective self as a function of contextual features (Gaertner, Sedikides, & O'Mara, 2012). This theory also offers the possibility that the motivational center of the self-concept is the momentarily accessible self.

Given that all three theories are plausible, the researchers designed a research program to compare the hypotheses by utilizing the strong motivational tendency of protecting and enhancing a favorable sense of self (Gaertner, Sedikides, & O'Mara, 2012). The research compared the relative functioning of the individual self and collective self in the face of threat or enhancement, with the rationale that the self that serves as the motivational core of human experience will react more strongly to events that compromise or bolster the self's integrity (Gaertner, Sedikides, & O'Mara, 2012). In other words, the motivationally primary self is the self that more strongly evades threats and more strongly approaches enhancement (Gaertner, Sedikides, & O'Mara, 2012).

Through a series of diverse experiments in which undergraduate students were faced with either threat or enhancement of the self, the research resulted in "unanimous and consistent" evidence that the individual self is the motivationally primary form of self-definition (Gaertner, Sedikides, & O'Mara, 2012, p. 1). They found that the motivational structure of the self-concept puts the individual self hierarchically above that of the collective self and consists of self-schemas that guide the processing of self-relevant information, and thereby renders a stable sense of self that is resistant to both external and internal influences (Gaertner, Sedikides, & O'Mara, 2012).

Similarly, Berzonsky et al. (2013) also found that having a consolidated, well-integrated sense of identity would provide a stable frame of reference for making decisions and interpreting both environmental and self-relevant information (i.e., informational identity). However, according to Erikson's (1968) psychosocial theory, on which Berzonsky and Barclay's (1981) identity processing styles are based upon, an individual would have to successfully master every virtue at each stage of life. For individuals who did not master each stage, the negative attributes

are carried on throughout the lifetime. Thereby suggesting that the motivational structure of the self-concept may include attributes such as mistrust, doubt, inferiority, and role confusion that contribute to the manner in which individuals with normative and diffuse-avoidant identity processing styles define their individual self and their collective self. More specifically, the valuation of the collective self (i.e., collective self-esteem) as an undifferentiated and interchangeable group member in the presence of a threat towards group membership would potentially vary depending on an individual's identity processing style.

Further exploration of the impact of a microaggression on collective self-esteem would demonstrate differences between identity processing styles. More specifically, identity processing style may predict the strength and stability of collective self-esteem in group members in the aftermath of a microaggression highlighting a negatively perceived stereotype among group members.

Present Study

The presence of a microaggression towards one's valued social group has the ability to change the course of interpersonal reactions going forward, with negative emotions and lowered self-esteem being the typical, global responses (Richman & Leary, 2009). However, as Richman and Leary (2009) found, the behavioral manifestations that follow these global responses are considerably diverse and vary according to whether the behavior is intended to maintain, resolve, or avoid further relations. Therefore, exploring individual's changes in strength of group identity, need to belong, and collective self-esteem according to their differing identity processing styles in the aftermath of a microaggression may shed light on what types of individuals are more likely to maintain, resolve, or avoid interpersonal conflicts. The present study sought to examine the effect of a microaggression on an individual's collective self-esteem, strength of group identity,

and need to belong according to their individual identity processing style. Consequently, the following hypotheses were proposed:

Hypothesis 1: There will be statistically significant positive correlations between members' need to belong, group identity, and collective self-esteem.

Hypothesis 2: There will be a significant relationship among members' need to belong and their identity processing style scores. More specifically, higher levels of Diffuse-Avoidant processing style tendencies will be associated with a lower need to belong, and this processing style will be the best predictor of individual's overall level of need to belong. Higher levels of Information processing style tendencies will be related to a moderate need to belong, and higher levels of traits indicative of a Normative processing style will be related to a higher need to belong.

Hypothesis 3: There will be a relationship between identity processing style, condition, and collective self-esteem.

Hypothesis 3a. Both Informational and Normative identity processing styles will predict collective self-esteem regardless of condition.

Hypothesis 3b. The interaction between Diffuse-avoidant identity processing style and condition will predict lower levels of collective self-esteem.

Hypothesis 4: There will be a relationship between identity processing style, condition, and group identity.

Hypothesis 4a. More specifically, the interaction between Diffuse-avoidant identity processing style and condition will predict group identity.

Hypothesis 4b. The interaction between condition and Informational identity processing style and condition and Normative identity processing style will not predict group identity.

Hypothesis 5: There will be a relationship between identity processing style, condition, and need to belong.

Hypothesis 5a. More specifically, the interaction between condition and Diffuse-avoidant identity processing style and condition and Normative identity processing style will predict need for belongingness.

Hypothesis 5b. The interaction between condition and Informational identity processing style will not predict need for belongingness.

Method

Participants

Participants included a total of 62 undergraduate students affiliated with Greek life at University of South Carolina Aiken from two sororities and one fraternity. Participants were recruited in conjunction with the Student Life organization at USC Aiken. Data was collected on an individual basis using Greek students in Psychology 101 classes (N = 2) and through group data collecting during chapter meetings (N = 62). All three chapters completed the study in the same computer lab. The participants were sitting next to each other with no blinders in between each computer. They were then randomly assigned to a control or experimental group. The two participants recruited from Psychology 101 classes completed the study in individual appointments in a computer lab.

In terms of gender of the participant base, 69.8% (N = 44) were female and 28.6% (N = 18) were male. The racial make-up of the total recruited participants was 85.7% Caucasian, 4.8% Hispanic or Latino, 3.2% Black or African-American, 3.2% Native American or Alaska Native, and 1.6% Asian or Asian-American. In terms of membership length, 27% of the members had been a member for at least two semesters, 20.6% were members for one year, 17.5% for one

semester, 14.3% for three years, 9.5% for two years, and 9.5% for four years. The age of participants ranged from 18 to 22+, with 41.3% of participants reporting they were 19 years old.

Procedure

Participants were first given a paper-and-pencil informed consent sheet that explained the confidentiality of their participation, the anonymity of their responses, and their right to withdraw from the study at any time. Once the informed consent was reviewed and the participant's signature was obtained, the experimenter randomly assigned each participant to an experimental group or a control group. The experimental group viewed three images with an accompanied vignette that portrayed negatively viewed stereotypes about Greek life, such as promiscuity, violence, or excessive drinking; whereas the control group viewed three neutral images with accompanying vignettes that did not portray any stereotypes. The participants viewed the vignettes and completed the online questionnaire in a computer lab where participants were sitting side-by-side. Each participant was assigned an alternating experimental or condition group so that no participant was sitting next to a participant with the same vignette. Participants were asked to carefully view the images and read the vignettes for five minutes. They were asked to count the number of people in the images to ensure that the images had been carefully examined. Once the images had been seen and the question had been answered, participants then began an online survey that lasted approximately fifteen minutes.

The online survey included a demographic questionnaire, the Collective Self-Esteem Inventory (see Appendix B), the Revised Identity Style Inventory (see Appendix C), the Need to Belong Scale (see Appendix D), and the Four-Item Social Identification Scale to measure group identity (see Appendix E). Upon completion of the online survey, each participant had the option to print and sign their name and write their e-mail address on a separate slip of paper to enter

their name in a raffle for a cash card prize. After the study's data collection was completed, participants were notified that they would receive an e-mail debriefing them on details about the purpose of the study.

During the data collection procedures at one of the chapter meetings, approximately 30 participants experienced a technical error with the online survey software. This error resulted in a 24-hour delay between viewing the microaggression and the completion of the online questionnaire in this group of individuals. Due to literature suggesting that exposure to a microaggression or a perceived discrimination could lead to angry rumination as a maladaptive coping strategy, it was decided to retain the data from these participants (Borders, A., & Liang, C. H., 2011). However, this deviation from the experimental protocol is important to note as it likely impacted the results of this study.

Measures

Demographics Questionnaire. Participants completed a brief self-report questionnaire that was comprised of questions regarding age, gender, race, Greek affiliation, and length of group membership (see Appendix A).

Collective Self-Esteem Inventory. Luhtanen and Crocker's (1992) 16-item Collective Self-esteem Inventory was used measure consists of four subscales (with four items each) regarding their Public CSE (e.g., In general, others respect the group that I am a member of), Private CSE (e.g., Overall, I often feel that the group of which I am a member, is not worthwhile), Membership CSE (e.g., I am a worthy member of the group I belong to), and Identity CSE (e.g., The group I belong to is an important reflection of who I am). Participants responded to items using a seven point Likert scale, and composite scores for each CSE subscale will be computed (Giang & Wittig 2006). Evidence for reliability and validity of the scale was

provided by three studies, suggesting that the scale can be a useful research tool (Luhtanen, & Crocker, 1992; see Appendix B).

Revised Identity Style Inventory (ISI-5; Berzonsky et al., 2013). The ISI-5 is a 36-item test that assessed the processing of identity-relevant information on content-neutral issues, such as personal values, goals, and problems. The ISI-5 included scales that consist of items that deal with content-neutral identity categories (e.g., life decisions, goals, beliefs, values, personal problems). The generic nature of the scale enabled participants to decide for themselves which identity content to focus upon. The test included three scales that assess identity style: a 9-item Informational-style scale; a 9-item Normative-style scale; and a 9-item Diffuse-avoidant style scale, and a fourth 9-item scale that assesses Strength and Commitment. Specifically, the test was scaled on a five point Likert-type scale where 1= Not at all like me, and 5= Very much like me. This allows each participant to obtain a dimensional score for each of the three identity processing styles. The questions were short statements about beliefs, attitudes, and/or ways of dealing with issues. The participants were asked to read each statement and then use the five point Likert scale to indicate the extent to how they thought the statement represented them. For example, a question on the Informational scale read, “Talking to others helps me explore my personal beliefs,” or a question on the Normative scale read, “I strive to achieve the goals that my family and friends hold for me” (see Appendix C).

Convergent and discriminant validity evaluations found that the four scales correlated with measures of identity processes and cognitive reasoning based on the identity style model. Informational scorers were positively correlated with identity achievement, a personal sense of identity, strength of identity and commitment, automatic intuitive reasoning; they were not strongly correlated with foreclosure, diffusion, collective, and social identity scales. Normative

scorers were positively linked with identity foreclosure, a collective sense of identity, strength of identity commitment and automatic reasoning. Low associations were obtained between normative scores and those on the achievement, diffusion, moratorium, and personal identity scales. Diffuse-avoidant scores were positively correlated with identity diffusion and a socially based sense of identity that highlighted popularity and expectations of others and negatively associated with strength of identity commitment and rational reasoning.

Need to Belong Scale (NTBS; Leary, Kelly, Cottrell, & Schreindorfer, 2005). The Need to Belong Scale is a 10-item test that assessed the individual's desire for belongingness and acceptance. Participants were to read each statement and indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with it on a 1-5 Likert-type scale with 1= strongly disagree and 5= strong agree. The questions read as such, "If other people don't seem to accept me, I don't let it bother me," or "I want other people to accept me." Nine studies examined the construct validity for the NTBS. Scores on the NTBS were found to be related to, but distinct from, other constructs that reflect the degree to which people desire to interact and affiliate with others, and, thus, the scale is not redundant with existing measures of related constructs. Although need to belong showed moderate correlations to extraversion, neuroticism, and agreeableness, the scores showed different patterns of correlations with other measures than need for affiliation and extraversion, thus it does not appear to be redundant with any of the Big Five traits. The average rating on the individual items on the NTBS range from 2.7-3.5, with a median of about 3.3. These data indicate that scores on the NTBS are distributed around a point between "moderate" and "very" strong endorsement of need-to-belong items (see Appendix D).

The correlations between NTB scores and anxious attachment and neuroticism suggested that high need to belong might be associated with a certain degree of insecurity about the

likelihood of acceptance and belonging. As such, it might be difficult for those high in need of belonging to not worry about their social connections. The relationship between the need to belong and features of various personality disorders suggests that extreme scorers- both low and high- might be predisposed toward maladaptive interpersonal patterns. Need to belong correlated positively with personality disorders that involve a high concern with acceptance or abandonment (avoidant, dependent, and borderline disorders) and negatively with Schizoid Disorder, which is associated with a low level of interest in interpersonal relationships. Overall, it appears that people who are high in the need to belong focus more on the collective interests of the group than people who are low in need to belong when in large groups. In addition people who are high in need to belong also deal with the lack of social connections differently than those who score on the low end of the scale. Furthermore, high scorers are also more sensitive to camaraderie and ruminate about their personal experiences with discrimination differently than people who score low in their need to belong.

Four-Item Social Identification Scale (FISI; Postmes, Haslam, & Jans, 2012). The FISI is an adaptation of the scale reported by Doosje, Spears, & Ellemers (1995). The FISI is a measure of social identification, defined as the positive emotional valuation of the relationship between self and in-group (Postmes, Haslam, & Jans, 2012). The measure has good reliability ($\alpha = .77$) and correlates highly with self-investment ($r = .96$), as well as the three principles of solidarity, centrality, and satisfaction (Postmes, Haslam, & Jans, 2012). The FISI was used to measure degree of identification with participants' sorority or fraternity. The measure included four questions that the participant rated from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) to indicate the degree of identification with their group (see Appendix E).

Results

The present study measured need to belong, group identification, and collective self-esteem in response to either the exposure or nonexposure of a microaggression and in relation to identity processing style. Descriptive analyses are presented below for each of the predictor variables and independent variables. Means and standard deviation are presented for each variable. Results of the hypotheses testing follow the descriptive analyses.

Descriptive Analyses

Identity processing style was measured using the Identity Style Inventory-5 (ISI-5). Subscale scores from the ISI-5 were utilized as dimensional measures of Informational identity processing style, Normative identity processing style, and Diffuse-Avoidant identity processing style for each participant. The means for each identity style were as follows: Informational style ($M = 33.91$, $SD = 4.72$), Normative, ($M = 27.29$, $SD=3.99$), and Diffuse-avoidant ($M = 20.70$, $SD=5.10$) Informational scores ranged from 23-45, Normative from 18-34, and Diffuse-Avoidant from 10-31.(see Table 1). For all future analyses, participants' scores on the identity processing styles will be examined from a dimensional perspective in which each participant reflects a continuum for each style.

Overall, the mean for all participants on the Need to Belong (NTB) scale was 35.77 ($SD = 7.43$) with scores ranging from 19 to 50. Collective self-efficacy was measured using the Collective Self-Efficacy (CSE) scale. Overall, the mean total for all participants was moderately high, with scores ranging from 43 to 112 ($M=91.83$, $SD=12.1$). Group identity was measured using the Four-Item Social Identity (FISI) scale. The total mean for all participants was in the high range, with scores ranging from 8 to 28 ($M=23.49$, $SD=5.26$) (see Table 1).

Hypothesis Testing

In Hypothesis 1, it was proposed that there would be positive relationships between members' need to belong, group identity, and collective self-esteem. To test this hypothesis, a bivariate correlation was conducted between need to belong, group identity, and collective self-esteem. Results were expected to show that the level of collective self-esteem would be positively correlated with the level of need to belong and strength of group identity. The results of the correlation showed a strong positive correlation between group identity and collective self-esteem ($r = .759, p < .001$). The relationship between need to belong and group identity did not appear to be statistically significant ($r = .232, p = .095$). The relationship between need to belong and collective self-esteem was not statistically significant ($r = .180, p = .198$). To view the correlation matrix in a table format, see Table 2.

In Hypothesis 2, it was proposed that identity processing style would predict changes in need to belong. To test this hypothesis, a correlation with need to belong and Informational, Normative, and Diffuse-Avoidant identity processing styles was conducted as well as a linear regression analysis with need to belong as the outcome variable and the identity processing styles (e.g., Informational, Normative, Diffuse-Avoidant) as the predictor variables. The results of the correlation indicate that Normative style had a statistically significant negative relationship with need to belong ($r = -.235, p < .05$), and Informational style had a statistically significant positive relationship with need to belong ($r = .321, p < .05$). There was no relationship found for Diffuse-Avoidant style ($r = .046, p = .370$). The regression results demonstrated that 17.3% of the variance in need to belong was accounted for by identity processing style, $R^2 = .173, F(3,50) = 3.485, p < .05$. The regression analysis indicated that Normative style predicted a decrease in need to belong ($\beta = -.251, p = .063$) and the Informational style predicted an increase in need to

belong ($\beta = .333, p < .05$). Further, the overall model was found to be significant indicating that identity style can predict need to belong ($F(3,50) = 3.485, p < .05$).

In Hypothesis 3, it was predicted that condition (i.e., microaggression) and identity processing style would interact to predict changes in collective self-efficacy. For this hypothesis as well as the two subsequent hypotheses, a hierarchical linear regression analysis was conducted with the first block containing the condition predictor, the second block containing the condition and mean-centered identity processing style predictors, and the third block containing the condition, the mean-centered identity processing styles, and the interaction conditioned identity processing style predictors. However, the results of this regression analysis did not appear to demonstrate a main effect for condition ($\beta = .147, p = .289$) or any of the three identity styles (Informational ($\beta = .197, p = .158$), Normative ($\beta = .155, p = .27$), and Diffuse-Avoidant ($\beta = 1.145, p = .305$) or an interaction effect for identity style and condition, $F(7.46) = .932, ns$ (see Table 3).

In Hypothesis 4, it was predicted that identity style and condition would predict group identity. To test this hypothesis, a hierarchical linear regression analysis was conducted with the first block containing the condition predictor, the second block containing the condition and mean-centered identity processing style predictors, and the third block containing the condition, the mean-centered identity processing styles, and the interaction conditioned identity processing style predictors. There was no main effect for condition ($\beta = .086, p = .536$). The regression results demonstrated that 15% of the variance in group identity was predicted by identity processing style, $R^2 = .15, F(4,49) = 2.90, p < .05$. The results appear to demonstrate that the Normative style is a statistically significant predictor of increased group identity ($\beta = .287, p < .05$). Although not statistically significant, the Diffuse-Avoidant style appeared to be approaching significance in

predicting decreased group identity ($\beta = -.246, p = .075$). The Informational style did not appear to demonstrate any statistical significance ($\beta = .162, p = .226$). No additional variance was explained by the interaction between condition and identity style, $R^2 = .007, F(7,46) = 0.13, ns$ (see Table 4).

In Hypothesis 5 it was predicted that identity processing style and condition would predict need to belong. To test this hypothesis, a hierarchical linear regression analysis was conducted with the first block containing the condition predictor, the second block containing the condition and mean-centered identity processing style predictors, and the third block containing the condition, the mean-centered identity processing styles, and the interaction between condition and identity processing style predictors. There was no main effect for condition ($\beta = -.233, p = .091$). The results indicated that identity style did predict need to belong, accounting for 20% of the variance, $R^2 = .20, F(4,49) = 4.18, p < .01$. There was a main effect for both Informational ($\beta = .357, t = 2.846, p < .01$) and Normative ($\beta = -.279, t = -2.199, p < .05$) identity processing styles demonstrating that higher levels of Informational style predicted an increase in need to belong and higher levels of Normative style predicted a decrease in need to belong. Additional variance was explained by the interaction between condition and identity processing style, $R^2 = .116, F(7,46) = 3.86, p < .01$. There was a significant interaction between Informational identity processing style and condition ($\beta = -.451, t = -2.53, p < .05$), indicating that participants in the experimental group, but not the control group, exhibited a higher need to belong when they had lower levels of Informational identity processing style (see Table 5).

Discussion

Five hypotheses were constructed to better understand how potential predictor variables were related to a person's need to belong, collective self-efficacy, and group identification after

being exposed or not exposed to a microaggression directed towards the participants' social group. The purpose of testing these hypotheses was to identify which identity processing styles and characteristics better predict negative effects of a microaggression, or which better withstand the negative effects of a microaggression.

The hypothesis that there would be positive correlations between members' need to belong, group identity, and collective self-esteem was partially supported. There was a strong positive correlation between group identity and collective self-esteem, however, no significant correlation was found between need to belong and group identity, and need to belong and collective self-efficacy. These nonsignificant correlations contradict past research that demonstrate these variables are impacted in an individual in one way or another when a negative social reaction is experienced. For example, a series of studies by Hoyle and Crawford (1994) found that belongingness was positively and significantly related to a number of dimensions of self-evaluation. However, the results of the current study did not find that these variables were all related. It appeared that the two variables that were correlated, group identity and collective self-esteem, were both socially based, versus an internal emotion such as need to belong. To elaborate, group identification is the extent to which an individual feels their group's characteristics is a reflection of who they are. Collective self-efficacy is the extent to which an individual feels like they are a worthy member of their group, as well as the amount of pride they have for their group membership. Therefore, it is possible to suggest that an individual's perception of who they are significantly effects the individual's perception of their group and group membership, and vice versa.

The hypothesis that identity processing style and condition would predict need to belong was supported, as identity style did predict need to belong, depending on the interaction between

condition and identity style. Past research has suggested that the sense of belonging may produce real, potential, or imagined changes in one's belongingness status that could result in emotional responses linked to either positive affect or negative affect (Baumeister & Leary, 1995).

Negative affect is experienced when there are threats to social attachments or the potential to lose important relationships, as well as the effects of being negatively evaluated by others (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). In addition, past research on identity formation found that individuals reflect various ways in which they manage identity-relevant conflicts (Berzonsky & Barclay, 1981). The evidence supporting changes in need to belong suggested that, based on how an individual manages identity-relevant conflict, their status of belonging could be predicted. In the current study, this was reflected in the interaction between the exposure to a microaggression and an Informational identity processing style. As individuals who were high in this particular identity processing style scored lower on their need for belongingness after they were exposed to a microaggression.

In addition to the main effect and interaction effect with the Informational identity processing style, there was also a main effect of the Normative identity processing style in which the higher an individual scored for the Normative identity processing style, the lower their need to belong. The Normative identity processing style is characterized in individuals as having a strong sense of commitment and purpose; self-discipline; conscientiousness; and a strict adherence to goals, expectations, and standards of significant social groups in a relatively automatic manner (Berzonsky et al., 2013). It was initially predicted that individuals with a Normative identity style would be higher in need to belong when presented with a threat, however, the results did not support this hypothesis. This may suggest

that people who demonstrate a higher tendency towards Normative strictly abide by their group adherence to the point of not fully processing or reflecting upon incoming information.

Lastly, Diffuse-avoidant showed no relationship with need to belong, a finding that may be aligned with the characteristics of a Diffuse-avoidant conflict-management style. The Diffuse-avoidant individual employs a conflict-management style resolved to avoid dealing with identity conflicts and decisions. Further, their behavior is determined by situational demands and consequences and they act upon an external locus of control (Berzonsky et al., 2013). Individuals with this style of interpersonal conflict resolution may have a limited commitment, engagement, and self-exploration capacity to develop meaningful relationships. Individuals who demonstrate a higher tendency towards Diffuse-avoidant may show no changes in need to belong because their primary concern is to avoid, rather than mend, an interpersonal conflict.

The hypothesis that stated group identity would be predicted by identity processing style also appeared to be statistically significant. It was found that identity style was predictive of group identity with the Normative identity processing style. Further, it was found that individuals who demonstrated a higher tendency towards Normative had higher group identity regardless of the condition. There were no effects found for Informational or Diffuse-avoidant style. Past research found that human beings are attuned to others' reactions to them and that these reactions evoke different responses depending on whether they perceive acceptance or rejection (Richman & Leary, 2009). Therefore, it may be the characteristics of a Normative style processing that predict group identity, such as a strict and automatic adherence to social norms, a characteristic that is not found within Informational or Diffuse-avoidant style individuals.

The conforming orientation of the Normative style appeared to withstand the negative effects of a microaggression, further the development of initial group identity was strong, as well

as the maintenance of that group identity against outside negative influence at the microaggression level. It is unknown whether Normative individuals experienced any negative emotions and did not express them, or whether the limited reflecting and processing spared them from feeling any negative effects. This is supported by a study by Beaumont and Zukanovic (2005) who concluded that Normative style individuals protect themselves from unwanted dissonance and are closed to experience.

According to the results of the present study, individuals who demonstrated a higher tendency towards Informational had a high need to belong, indicating a valuation of a threat towards their belonging status, yet no effect on group identification. Characteristically, these individuals develop a clear sense of commitment and purpose, whether it is high self-exploration with limited commitment, or high self-exploration and high commitment. Therefore, it may be explained by undergoing thorough processing of the microaggression, without an overall effect on their group identity, indicating a clear sense of commitment. This is characteristic of the Informational identity, therefore, it may be suggested that having no effect on group identity and a high effect on need to belong is characteristic of having a higher tendency towards Informational processing style. This is supported by Beaumont and Zukanovic's (2005) finding that Informational style individuals experience more distress due to their internal locus of control and personal responsibility for their interpersonal decisions.

The lack of effect on group identity for Diffuse-avoidant style individuals appeared to contrast past research by Berzonsky and Ferrari (1996) and Beaumont and Zukanovic (2005) that stated Diffuse-avoidant style individuals would be vulnerable to external influence. Characteristically, Diffuse-avoidant individuals have an external locus of control, suggesting that their group identity would be under the influence of the microaggression. Further research would

be needed to understand the contrast in these findings, however it may be that the group identity was not developed enough to be significantly effected by the microaggression. Further, because group identity requires reflection about responses from others and a quality interpersonal relationship may never have formed, group identity may not have been developed enough to be susceptible to any negative effects. Another possibility for the inconsistent findings may be due to a lower Diffuse-avoidant score than a normal sample.

The hypothesis that stated collective self-esteem would be predicted by identity processing style was not supported. Berzonsky et al. (2013) found that having a consolidated, well-integrated sense of identity would provide a stable frame of reference for making decisions and interpreting self-relevant information. These findings may be explained by Erikson's (1968) psychosocial theory in which an individual would have had to master every virtue at each stage of life. Collective self-esteem is defined as the valuation of one self as an undifferentiated and interchangeable group member. Therefore, if an individual possessed attributes of mistrust, doubt, and inferiority then these attributes would contribute to a dissonance between the self and valuation of the self as a valuable member of the group. On the other hand, if the valuation of the group's identity was low, then a member may feel they belong elsewhere. As reported earlier, there was a strong, positive correlation between group identity and collective self-esteem.

In summary, the results were partially consistent with previous research, although inconsistencies remain. There was a strong positive correlation between group identity and collective self-efficacy; however, no significant correlation was found with need to belong. Previous research on need to belong, group identity, and collective self-esteem all reported that negative interpersonal reactions would have a real, potential, or imagined influence. It was found that need to belong appeared to be predicted by demonstrating a high tendency towards

Normative and Informational styles, as well as the interaction between Informational style and condition. Group identity, on the other hand, was predicted only by demonstrating a high tendency towards Normative style. Collective self-efficacy did not appear to be predicted by any identity style or condition.

Strengths and Limitations

There are several strengths and limitations to report on in this present study. The present study's model had moderate validity and some of the results were surprising, as predictors identified in current literature did not achieve expected outcomes, or the direction of the relationships between variables were different than expected. The present study's data collection process experienced a technical glitch in that one set of the population experienced a 24-hour delay between microaggression exposure and completing the questionnaire. This delay may have weakened or heightened the experience of the microaggression in a manner that was immeasurable. According to a study by Nadal, Davidoff, Davis and Wong (2014), individuals in a social minority were subject to cognitive reactions to a microaggression in order to try to rationalize others' discriminatory behavior, they were extremely vigilant or cautious after the behavior, or they believed these experiences led to resiliency and empowerment. This study supported previous literature that microaggressions are related to physical health and well-being.

In addition, despite efforts to control privacy, participants completing the study may have viewed the packets of other participants in their group and seen that they did not view the same images. This is also another immeasurable confounding variable. Lastly, the participant sample lacked individuals that scored highly in the Diffuse-avoidant and Normative identity styles, which may have impacted results that were inconsistent with past research.

Implications and Future Directions

The present study sought to highlight the differences in reactions among minority group members, and the results did show that some individuals within a minority group did react differently when shown a microaggression. In addition, there may have been indifference to the microaggression as well. Research should continue to research how the aftermath of stereotypes of varying degrees of explicitness effect individuals within a minority population. Highlighting differences within a minority population may also lead to the deterioration of stereotypes. It may be especially helpful to understand specific concepts of information processing (i.e. commitment, self-exploration, locus of control) to determine which treatments or strategies may be most effective for certain types of individuals, in a clinical sense or in a more generalizable arena. Further, it shows that even within a minority population, people react differently, thus strategies to help individuals within a minority group that have stereotype-related experiences may need to differ based on characteristics, such as identity processing style. As such, this research may aid in developing clinical treatment programs for minority individuals experiencing negative effects of stereotype exposure.

References

- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497-529. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497
- Beaumont, S. L., & Zukanovic, R. (2005). Identity Development in Men and its Relation to Psychosocial Distress and Self-Worth. *Canadian Journal Of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement*, 37(1), 70-81. doi:10.1037/h0087246
- Berzonsky, M. D., Soenens, B., Luyckx, K., Smits, I., Papini, D. R., & Goossens, L. (2013). Development and validation of the revised Identity Style Inventory (ISI-5): Factor structure, reliability, and validity. *Psychological Assessment*, 25(3), 893-904. doi:10.1037/a0032642
- Berzonsky, M. D., & Barclay, C. R. (1981). Formal reasoning and identity formation: A reconceptualization. In J. A. Meacham & N. R. Santilli (Eds.), *Contributions to human development*, 5, 61-87.
- Big Green Micro-Aggressions. (What Is A Microaggression?). Retrieved from <http://biggreenmicroaggressions.tumblr.com/microwhat>.
- Borders, A., & Liang, C. H. (2011). Rumination partially mediates the associations between perceived ethnic discrimination, emotional distress, and aggression. *Cultural Diversity And Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 17(2), 125-133. doi:10.1037/a0023357
- Cameron, J. E. (1999). Social identity and the pursuit of possible selves: Implications for the psychological well-being of university students. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, And Practice*, 3(3), 179-189. doi:10.1037/1089-2699.3.3.179

- Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 98*, 310–357.
- Compton, W. C. (2005). *An introduction to positive psychology*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Crocker, J., & Luhtanen, R. (1990). Collective self-esteem and ingroup bias. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 58*(1), 60-67. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.58.1.60
- DeAngelis, T. (2009). Unmasking 'racial micro aggressions.' *American Psychological Association, 40*(2), p. 42. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/monitor/2009/02/microaggression.aspx>
- DeLongis, A., Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1988). The impact of daily stress on health and mood: Psychological and social resources as mediators. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 486–495.
- Doosje, B., Ellemers, N., & Spears, R. (1995). Perceived intragroup variability as a function of group status and identification. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 31*, 410-436."
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. E., Kawakami, K., & Hodson, G. (2002). Why can't we just get along? Interpersonal biases and interracial distrust. *Cultural Diversity And Ethnic Minority Psychology, 8*(2), 88-102. doi:10.1037/1099-9809.8.2.88
- Gaertner, L., Sedikides, C. and O'Mara, E. M. (2008), On the Motivational Primacy of the Individual Self: 'I' Is Stronger than 'We'. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2*: 1913–1929. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00142.x
- Giang, M. T., & Wittig, M. A. (2006). Implications of adolescents' acculturation strategies for personal and collective self-esteem. *Cultural Diversity And Ethnic Minority Psychology, 12*(4), 725-739. doi:10.1037/1099-9809.12.4.725

Hoyle, R. H., & Crawford, A. M. (1994). Use of individual-level data to investigate group phenomena: Issues and strategies. *Small Group Research, 25*, 464-485.

Markus, H., & Kunda, Z. (1986). Stability and malleability of the self-concept. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 51*(4), 858-866. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.51.4.858

Marmarosh, C. L., & Markin, R. D. (2007). Group and personal attachments: Two is better than one when predicting college adjustment. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, And Practice, 11*(3), 153-164. doi:10.1037/1089-2699.11.3.153

Nadal, K. L., Davidoff, K. C., Davis, L. S., & Wong, Y. (2014). Emotional, behavioral, and cognitive reactions to microaggressions: Transgender perspectives. *Psychology Of Sexual Orientation And Gender Diversity, 1*(1), 72-81. doi:10.1037/sgd0000011

Neblett, E. r., Banks, K., Cooper, S. M., & Smalls-Glover, C. (2013). Racial identity mediates the association between ethnic-racial socialization and depressive symptoms. *Cultural Diversity And Ethnic Minority Psychology, 19*(2), 200-207. doi:10.1037/a0032205

Offermann, L. R., Basford, T. E., Graebner, R., Jaffer, S., De Graaf, S. B., & Kaminsky, S. E. (2014). See no evil: Color blindness and perceptions of subtle racial discrimination in the workplace. *Cultural Diversity And Ethnic Minority Psychology, 20*(4), 499-507. doi:10.1037/a0037237

Postmes, T., Haslam, S. A., & Jans, L. (in press). A single-item measure of social identification: Reliability, validity and utility. *British Journal of Social Psychology*. Prepublication available online. DOI: 10.1111/bjso.12006

- Richman, L., & Leary, M. R. (2009). Reactions to discrimination, stigmatization, ostracism, and other forms of interpersonal rejection: A multimotive model. *Psychological Review*, 116(2), 365-383. doi:10.1037/a0015250
- Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. B., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist*, 62(4), 271-286. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.4.271
- Swann, W. r., Jetten, J., Gómez, Á., Whitehouse, H., & Bastian, B. (2012). When group membership gets personal: A theory of identity fusion. *Psychological Review*, 119(3), 441-456. doi:10.1037/a0028589
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford and New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Wann, D. L., Waddill, P. J., Polk, J., & Weaver, S. (2011). The team identification–social psychological health model: Sport fans gaining connections to others via sport team identification. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, And Practice*, 15(1), 75-89. doi:10.1037/a0020780
- Wilson, B. & Tollini, C.(2013). Sorority members' views of negative stereotypes. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors*, 8(1), 35-4

Appendix B

Collective Self-Esteem Inventory
(Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J., 1992)

CSE

INSTRUCTIONS: Consider your sorority /fraternity membership and respond to the following statements on the basis of how you feel about your organization and your membership in it. There are no right or wrong answers to any of these statements; we are interested in your honest reactions and opinions. Please read each statement carefully, and respond by using the following scale from 1 to 7:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neutral	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

1. I am a worthy member of the social group I belong to.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. I often regret that I belong to the social group that I do.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. Overall, my social group is considered good by others.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. Overall, my group membership has very little to do with how I feel about myself.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. I feel I don't have much to offer to the social group I belong to.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. In general, I'm glad to be a member of the social group I belong to.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. Most people consider my social group, on the average, to be more ineffective than other social groups.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. The social group I belong to is an important reflection of who I am.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. I am a cooperative participant in the social group I belong to.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. Overall, I often feel that the social group of which I am a member is not worthwhile.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. In general, others respect the social group that I am a member of.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. The social group I belong to is unimportant to my sense of what kind of a person I am.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. I often feel I'm a useless member of my social group.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. I feel good about the social group I belong to.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. In general, others think that the social group I am a member of is unworthy.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. In general, belonging to my social group is an important part of my self image.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Appendix C

Revised Identity Style Inventory (ISI-5)
(Berzonsky et al., 2013)

INSTRUCTIONS: You will find a number of statements about beliefs, attitudes, and/or ways of dealing with issues. Read each carefully and use it to describe yourself. On the answer sheet, bubble in the number which indicates the extent to which you think the statement represents you. There are no right or wrong answers. For instance, if the statement is very much like you, mark a 5, if it is not like you at all, mark a 1. Use the 1 to 5 point scale to indicate the degree to which you think each statement is uncharacteristic (1) or characteristic (5) of yourself.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all like me				Very much like me

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | I know basically what I believe and don't believe. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | I automatically adopt and follow the values I was brought up with. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | I'm not sure where I'm heading in my life; I guess things will work themselves out. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | Talking to others helps me explore my personal beliefs. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | I know what I want to do with my future. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. | I strive to achieve the goals that my family and friends hold for me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. | It doesn't pay to worry about values in advance; I decide things as they happen. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. | When facing a life decision, I take into account different points of view before making a choice. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. | I am not really sure what I believe. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. | I have always known what I believe and don't believe; I never really have doubts about my beliefs. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. | I am not really thinking about my future now, it is still a long way off. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. | I spend a lot of time reading or talking to others trying to develop a set of values that makes sense to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. | I am not sure which values I really hold. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. | I never question what I want to do with my life because I tend to follow what important people expect me to do. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. | When I have to make an important life decision, I try to wait as long as possible in order to see what will happen. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

16.	When facing a life decision, I try to analyze the situation in order to understand it.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	I am not sure what I want to do in the future.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	I think it is better to adopt a firm set of beliefs than to be open-minded.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	I try not to think about or deal with personal problems as long as I can.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	When making important life decisions, I like to spend time thinking about my options.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	I have clear and definite life goals.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	I think it's better to hold on to fixed values rather than to consider alternative value systems.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	I try to avoid personal situations that require me to think a lot and deal with them on my own.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	When making important life decisions, I like to have as much information as possible.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	I am not sure what I want out of life.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	When I make a decision about my future, I automatically follow what close friends or relatives expect from me.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	My life plans tend to change whenever I talk to different people.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	I handle problems in my life by actively reflecting on them.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	I have a definite set of values that I use to make personal decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	When others say something that challenges my personal values or beliefs, I automatically disregard what they have to say.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	Who I am changes from situation to situation.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	I periodically think about and examine the logical consistency between my life goals.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	I am emotionally involved and committed to specific values and ideals.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	I prefer to deal with situations in which I can rely on social norms and standards.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	When personal problems arise, I try to delay acting as long as possible.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	It is important for me to obtain and evaluate information from a variety of sources before I make important life decisions.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix D

Need to Belong Scale

(Leary, Kelly, Cottrell, & Schreindorfer, 2005)

INSTRUCTIONS: For each of the statements below, indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statement by circling a number beside the question using the scale below:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

1. If other people don't seem to accept me, I don't let it bother me. 1 2 3 4 5
2. I try hard not to do things that will make other people avoid or reject me. 1 2 3 4 5
3. I seldom worry about whether other people care about me. 1 2 3 4 5
4. I need to feel that there are people I can turn to in times of need. 1 2 3 4 5
5. I want other people to accept me. 1 2 3 4 5
6. I do not like being alone. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Being apart from my friends for long periods of time does not bother me. 1 2 3 4 5
8. I have a strong need to belong. 1 2 3 4 5
9. It bothers me a great deal when I am not included in other people's plans. 1 2 3 4 5
10. My feelings are easily hurt when I feel that others do not accept me. 1 2 3 4 5

Appendix E

Four Item Measure of Social Identification (FISI)

INSTRUCTIONS: For each of the statements below, indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statement by circling a number beside the question on scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree):

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree

- 1. I identify with my sorority or fraternity 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 2. I feel committed to my sorority or fraternity 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 3. I am glad to be in my sorority or fraternity 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 4. Being in my sorority or fraternity is an important part of how I see myself 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Predictor and Dependent Variables

	Min	Max	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Informational	23	45	33.91	4.72
Normative	18	34	27.29	4.01
Diffuse-Avoidant	10	31	20.7	5.1
Need to Belong	19	50	35.78	7.43
Group Identity	8	28	23.57	5.25
Collective Self-Esteem	43	112	92.07	12.14

Table 2

Correlation Matrix

Measure	Informational	Normative	Diffuse-Avoidant	Need to Belong	Group Identity	Collective Self-Efficacy
Informational	-	-	-	-	-	-
Normative	-.05	-	-	-	-	-
Diffuse-Avoidant	-.16	.22	-	-	-	-
Need to Belong	.32*	-.24	.05	-	-	-
Group Identity	.19	.23	-.21	.24	-	-
Collective Self-Efficacy	.23	.08	-.14	.19	.76**	-

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Table 3

Summary of Hierarchical Linear Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Collective Self-Efficacy

Variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	<i>B</i>	SE <i>B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	SE <i>B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	SE <i>B</i>	β
Condition	3.65	3.40	.15	3.59	3.38	.36	3.54	3.45	.14
Informational	-	-	-	.52	.36	.20	.83	.55	.31
Normative	-	-	-	.48	.43	.16	.74	.66	.24
Diffuse-Avoidant	-	-	-	-.35	.34	-.15	-.10	.50	-.04
ConditionxInformational	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.55	.78	-.15
ConditionxNormative	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.51	.92	-.13
ConditionxDiffuseAvoidant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.37	.72	-.11

Table 4

Summary of Hierarchical Linear Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Group Identity

Variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Condition	.90	1.44	.09	1.05	1.38	.10	1.04	1.41	.10
Informational	-	-	-	.17	.15	.15	.23	.24	.21
Normative	-	-	-	.39	.18	.30	.27	.28	.21
Diffuse-Avoidant	-	-	-	-.25	.14	-.25	-.21	.20	-.20
ConditionxInformational	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.07	.32	-.05
ConditionxNormative	-	-	-	-	-	-	.21	.38	.12
ConditionxDiffuseAvoidant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.01	.30	-.07

Table 5

Summary of Hierarchical Linear Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Need to Belong

Variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Condition	-3.43	1.99	-.23	-4.24	1.80	-.29	-4.34	1.74	-.30
Informational	-	-	-	.56	.20	.36	1.17	.29	.75
Normative	-	-	-	-.52	.24	-.28	-.95	.34	-.53
Diffuse-Avoidant	-	-	-	.23	.18	.16	.50	.25	.35
ConditionxInformational	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.99	.39	-.45
ConditionxNormative	-	-	-	-	-	-	.65	.46	.27
ConditionxDiffuseAvoidant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.37	.36	-.17