From the holdings of the Department of Special Collections , Princeton University Library, Princeton, NJ

These documents are either in the public domain, or can only be used for educational and research purposes (Fair use) as per U.S. Copyright law (text below). By accessing this file, all users agree that their use falls in the public domain or within fair use as defined by the copyrightlaw. We do not charge any permission or usage fees for the publication of images of material inour collections, including those provided by Princeton University Library, via our website, catalog, or directly from staff.For more information regarding copyright, credit, and citation please review the information onthe Copyright, Credit and Citation Guidelines page of our website.
https://library.princeton.edu/special-collections/policies/copyright-credit-and-citation-guidelines. If you have any questions, including how to order higher-quality images from the collection, contact Special Collections Public Services via our Ask Us! Form. https://library.princeton.edu/special-collections/ask-us

---

Doctoral Dissertations, 2011-2026 Psychology

2013

THE EFFECTS OF GROUP STATUS AND INTERPERSONAL POWER ON TARGETS' RESPONSES TO IDENTITY MISCATEGORIZATION

Trujillo, Matthew Daniel

Princeton, NJ : Princeton University

---

http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/dsp0179407x24r

U.S. Copyright law: The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, §108, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of fair use that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve a violation of copyright law. https://www.copyright.gov/title17/title17.pdf

THE EFFECTS OF GROUP STATUS AND INTERPERSONAL POWER ON TARGETS' RESPONSES TO IDENTITY MISCATEGORIZATION

Matthew D. Trujillo

A DISSERTATION
PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY
OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

RECOMMENDED FOR ACCEPTANCE
BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Advisor: J. Nicole Shelton

June 2013

© Copyright by Matthew D. Trujillo, 2013. All rights reserved.

Abstract

In most situations the way individuals categorize their own identities is consistent with the way others categorize their identities. While this is often the case, some situations involve others ascribing an incorrect identity to individuals. Recent research has begun to investigate individuals' reactions to this experience of identity miscategorization. The goal of this dissertation is to expand on this previous research by examining how relative group status and relative interpersonal power differences influence individuals' response to identity miscategorization. This dissertation consists of four studies: two that investigate how relative group status impacts targets' reactions to identity miscategorization and two that investigate how relative interpersonal power impacts targets' reactions to identity miscategorization. Study 1 involves Asian participants being primed to believe that their ethnic group is of relatively high status or low status, or not being primed with status, and ostensibly having their ethnicity miscategorized or correctly categorized. Study 2 utilizes a similar procedure to that of Study 1, though Study 2 manipulates categorization via a vignette, and expands on Study 1 by investigating the identity miscategorization of participants' major identity, by including an identity denial condition, and by investigating how participants' level of identity impacts the relationship between status and miscategorization. Findings indicate that targets who are miscategorized as a member of a relatively low status group find this experience to be particularly negative. Study 3 involves Asian and Latino participants having relatively higher power, lower power, or equal power to a partner who either correctly categorizes or incorrectly categorizes the participants' ethnicity. Study 4 utilizes a similar procedure to that of Study 3 and, similar to the way that Study 2 expands on Study 1, expands on Study 3 by investigating the

identity miscategorization of participants' major and by examining how participants' level of identity impacts the relationship between power and identity miscategorization. Findings from these studies show that relatively low power targets find miscategorization to be particularly negative and that relatively high power targets are buffered from the negative consequences of miscategorization.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	v
Acknowledgments	vi
Introduction	1
Study 1	10
Methods	12
Results	17
Discussion	23
Study 2	26
Methods	27
Results	31
Discussion	38
Study 3	40
Methods	42
Results	46
Discussion	53
Study 4	55
Methods	56
Results	58
Discussion	63
General Discussion	65
References	69

Acknowledgments

I want to start off by thanking the mentors that I have had throughout the years. To Adam Cohen and Steve Neuberg: As a young undergraduate you took me in, showed me the ropes and helped my dream of becoming a graduate student a reality. To Nicole Shelton: I will be forever indebted to you for the support and guidance that you have given me throughout my time here at Princeton; who I am as a researcher and a thinker is largely due to your influence. To Joel Cooper: The consummate experimentalist and professional, you have proven a valuable resource and guide. To Betsy Levy-Paluck: You have shown me that one's passion for social issues can be a driving force for intellectual pursuit, a lesson that I will not forget. To Dean Karen Jackson-Weaver: Thanks to you and the efforts of your office, I was able to develop a close community that allowed me to grow not only as a graduate student but also as a person.

I have made quite a few friends during my time at Princeton, all of whom deserve my gratitude. To Mike North: It seems like only yesterday that we were in the G.C. library working on statistics homework together and here we are finishing our dissertations; it has been a long, interesting journey and I'm glad you've been with me every step along the way. To Drew Jacoby-Senghor: Graduate school would not have been the same without you, and your scarves. To Matt Johnson: While two Matts may not make a right, they certainly make things more enjoyable. To the Cool Office: I can't imagine having better office mates. To the Defense Mechanisms, Good Guys, and Action Potential: I looked forward to and truly enjoyed each practice and game that we played together and you all provided much needed balance to my life. To the rest of my fellow residents of Green Hall, particularly my fellow cohort and SSP lab members: I am extremely lucky to have been colleagues with such nice and intelligent people. To my friends outside of Green Hall (Ronny Regev, Catherine Abou-Nemeh, Franziska Exeler,

Nikolce Gjorevski, Gavin Daly, Kevin Hughes, and others): Graduate school has a tendency to make people insular and I want to thank you for keeping me from falling into that trap and showing me that there is much more beyond the doors of the psychology department.

This dissertation would not have been possible without the feedback and support from the Joint Degree Program in Social Policy (particularly Devah Pager, Sarah McLanahan, and my JDP cohort), the Green Hall staff, and the outside members of my committee (Michael Graziano and Liz Gould) – thank you.

To my family (Mom, Dad, and Gabe): I am eternally grateful for all that you have done for me and I can only hope to repay you someday. To Nimisha Barton: Out of all my accomplishments, including the completion of this dissertation, my greatest accomplishment was becoming your partner – you inspire me everyday.

Introduction

This dissertation examines the phenomenon of identity miscategorization. Identity miscategorization is the experience of having a valued social identity incorrectly categorized by another. While early research on miscategorization has investigated how targets respond to this experience, the primary aim of this dissertation is to expand on this early research by examining two potential moderators of targets' responses. Specifically, this dissertation consists of four studies that examine if relative intergroup status and relative interpersonal power affects targets' responses to miscategorization and, if so, how. Before I present these studies, I introduce a theoretical framework and relevant findings by which one can understand targets' responses to miscategorization generally. Then, by utilizing both this theoretical framework and the literature on the effects of status and power, I introduce my predictions as to the potential moderating effects of status and power on targets' responses to miscategorization. To conclude my introduction I provide a brief overview of the four studies.

Theoretical framework

To understand how targets will respond to identity miscategorization I utilize Social Identity Theory (Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Through the lens of Social Identity Theory we are able to better understand targets' responses by theoretically unpacking the threat that identity miscategorization may elicit. Once one understands the threat associated with identity miscategorization one can then turn to literature on how individuals respond to this threat. The theoretical framework of threat from which this dissertation stems consists of the notion that identity miscategorization elicits social identity threat, specifically categorization threat.

Miscategorization elicits social identity threat

According to Social Identity Theory (Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999; Tajfel & Turner, 1979), individuals internalize their social group memberships and these social group identities become an important part of individuals' self-concepts. Early instantiations of Social Identity Theory claim that certain contexts can threaten these social identities (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). More recent instantiations of social identity theory break down the notion of social identity threat into four distinct social identity threats (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, Doosje, 1999). These social identity threats consist of: categorization threat, distinctiveness threat, value threat, and acceptance threat (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, Doosje, 1999). The experience of miscategorization is likely to elicit categorization threat.

Categorization threat is the threat associated with a discrepancy between how targets' internally self-categorize their social identity and how others externally categorize targets' social identity (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, Doosje, 1999). Social identity theorists believe that individuals will experience negative intrapersonal consequences (e.g., negative affect, lowered self-esteem) and will resist the external categorization in response to categorization threat (Branscrombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999). I will now turn to findings from the literature on situations that may elicit categorization threat.

One situation that may elicit categorization threat is that of identity denial. Identity denial is the experience of having a valued identity unacknowledged by others. Research by Cheryan and Monin (2005) on identity denial finds that Asian Americans who have their American identity denied, thus being categorized as Asian when they would prefer to be categorized as American, reported high levels of negative affect, high levels of American identity assertion, and low levels of liking of the perpetrator. Even though Asian American participants who had their American identity denied responded to identity denial by asserting their American identity, they

did not distance themselves from their Asian identity. Furthermore, research also finds that identity denial leads to low levels of motivation and self-esteem (Townsend, Markus, & Bergsieker, 2009). Other research has examined how men and women respond to being categorized by their gender identity in a context in which they would prefer to be categorized by another identity, another situation likely to elicit categorization threat. This research finds that, in response to being categorized by their gender in an inappropriate context, participants resisted the external categorization (Barreto, Ellemers, Scholten, & Smith, 2010). This study, and those on identity denial, investigate situations where participants are externally categorized in a manner that is not consistent with how the participants would prefer to be categorized in a particular context but is ultimately correct (i.e. Asian Americans are categorized as Asian in a context where they deem it inappropriate, women are categorized as women in a context where they deem it inappropriate). Thus, the situations in the aforementioned studies are qualitatively different from that of identity miscategorization in that identity miscategorization involves an incorrect external categorization.

Recent research has begun to investigate how individuals respond to having an incorrect categorization externally ascribed to them. In a recent study by Flores and Huo (2012) participants who imagined having their ethnicity incorrectly categorized expressed high levels of negative affect and evaluated the perpetrator and the perpetrator's ethnic group negatively. My own research expands on that of Flores and Huo by replicating their effects for participants who actually experience, rather than imagine, ethnic miscategorization and by showing that ethnic miscategorization also leads targets to assert their self-categorized ethnic identity (Trujillo & Shelton, 2013). These findings from ethnic miscategorization are supported by a study utilizing a minimal groups paradigm that found that participants who were categorized in a manner

inconsistent with their self-categorization, compared to those who were categorized in a consistent manner, identified with the ascribed group less, cooperated with the self-categorized group more, and were more likely to self-categorize as a member of their self-categorized group (Barreto & Ellemers, 2002). Taken together, findings from studies on situations that elicit categorization threat suggest that individuals under categorization threat respond by experiencing negative affect, disliking the perpetrator of the threat, resisting the erroneous ascribed categorization, and affirming their self-categorization.

Moderators of miscategorization

The real world experience of identity miscategorization does not occur in a hierarchical vacuum. There is a great deal of variation in status between social groups and individuals are keenly aware of these differences (Dovidio, Major, & Crocker, 2000). For the purpose of this dissertation, I define status as social respect and recognition. Targets of miscategorization may be incorrectly categorized as a member of a group that is of relatively higher or lower status than their actual group. Given that miscategorization occurs at the level of the social group, it is important to understand how factors associated with social groups, like status, affect reactions to miscategorization. In order to understand targets' reactions to miscategorization in all its complexity, we need to investigate the role that intergroup status plays in miscategorization.

In addition to investigating how intergroup status impacts targets reactions to miscategorization this dissertation also examines how interpersonal power influences targets responses. Targets of miscategorization may be miscategorized by a relatively low or high power perpetrator and this power differential may impact targets' responses to the miscategorization. Power is defined as control over valued resources. The real world consequences of miscategorization are particularly severe in instances where there is a clear power differential

between target and perpetrator (e.g. when a police officer miscategorizes a potential suspect). By studying the role of power in miscategorization we are better able to understand these consequences.

Though status and power are positively correlated with one another – those with high status often have high power – this correlation is not perfect. Indeed, there are many instances where a person may have high status but low power (e.g. a community elder who is well respected but has little control over resources) or high power but low status (e.g. a T.S.A. agent who controls whether you get through security but is not highly respected). While status and power differences can occur at both the level of the individual and the group, much of what we know about the impact of status is at the level of the group and much of what we know about the impact of power is at the level of the individual (for a review see Fiske, 2010a).

The focus of this dissertation is to examine how relative intergroup status and relative interpersonal power affects targets' reactions to identity miscategorization. To understand the potential moderating influence of status and power on miscategorization, I turn to previous literature on the effects of status and power. I attempt to combine this literature within my theoretical framework of threat to develop predictions regarding the relationship between miscategorization and status and power.

Miscategorization and group status

One major aim of this dissertation is to examine how relative group status impacts targets' reactions to miscategorization. Where membership in a high status group is thought to be consistent with individuals' fundamental motivation for self-enhancement (Fiske, 2010b) and to be associated with positive outcomes, membership in a low status group is believed to conflict with this motivation and to be associated with negative outcomes. Indeed, members of low status

groups are often victims of prejudice and discrimination on the basis of their group membership (Dovidio, Major, & Crocker, 2000). Moreover, membership in low status groups is associated with negative intrapersonal consequences such that members of low status groups, compared to members of high status groups, have higher levels of depression and more fragile state self-esteem (Dovidio, Major, & Crocker, 2000).

Given the negative consequences associated with membership of a low status group, individuals are likely to view being perceived as a member of a low status group as particularly threatening. This claim is supported by findings from research on the threat associated with potentially having one's sexual identity incorrectly categorized. These findings show that straight men that anticipate that they will be incorrectly perceived as gay, a low status group, experience high levels of discomfort (Bosson, Prewitt-Freilino, & Taylor, 2005; Bosson, Taylor, & Prewitt-Freilino, 2006; Prewitt-Freilino, Bosson, 2008). In addition to research on categorization of sexuality, research utilizing a minimal groups paradigm found that participants who self-categorized as a member of a high status group but were subsequently externally categorized as a member of a low status group reported negative attitudes towards the ascribed low status group (Finchelescu, 1986). Targets' who are miscategorized as a member of a low status group are likely to believe that the stigma associated with the low status group would affect them, thus causing them to experience value threat (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999). Research on value threat finds that individuals who experience value threat express high levels of ingroup favoritism, outgroup derogation, and intergroup competition (see Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999).

Consistent with the aforementioned findings, I predict that, compared to correctly categorized targets and targets who are miscategorized as a member of a relatively high status

group, targets who are miscategorized as members of a relatively low status group will experience particularly high levels of negative affect. I also predict that, compared to correctly categorized targets and targets who are miscategorized as a member of a relatively high status group, targets who are miscategorized as members of a relatively low status group will experience particularly low levels of positive attitudes towards the perpetrator, and high levels of identity assertion. Furthermore, I predict that targets miscategorized as members of a low status group will express ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation.

Miscategorization and power

Another major aim of this dissertation is to investigate how relative interpersonal power differences between the target and the perpetrator affect targets' responses to identity miscategorization. To understand how power will impact targets' responses to miscategorization it is important to understand how high power individuals relate to low power individuals and vice versa. By definition, high power individuals have control over valuable resources and subsequently control over the outcomes of their low power subordinates. As a result of this control, it is important for low power individuals to attend to those with high power (Fiske, 1993). Indeed, empirical findings support the idea that those of relatively low power pay particular attention to those who have power over them (Erber & Fiske, 1984; Neuberg & Fiske, 1987; Rusher & Fiske, 1990; Rusher, Fiske, Miki, & Van Manen, 1991). Conversely, because of high power individuals' control over outcomes, they need not attend to their low power subordinates (Fiske, 1993). High power individuals have little to gain from and little motivation for attending to low power individuals. This claim is supported by empirical evidence across multiple studies (Galinsky, Magee, Inesi, Gruenfeld, 2006; Keltner & Robinson, 1997; Woike, 1994).

Research by Barreto and colleagues (Barreto, Ellemers, & Fiske, 2010) found that the power differences between targets and perpetrators do indeed impact targets' perceptions of and reactions to prejudice. Specifically, targets recalled and noticed prejudice from perpetrators who had power over them (vs. not) to a greater extent. These findings suggest that low power participants paid particular attention to the high power perpetrators. Moreover, targets that experienced prejudice from perpetrators who had power over them (vs. not) experienced greater negative affect and expected a future interaction with the perpetrator to be more negative. Researchers believed that low power targets were particularly affected by prejudice from a high power perpetrator because of the high degree that targets attended to perpetrators who had power over them. Given theses findings, I predict that low power targets, will have a particularly strong reaction to miscategorization from a relatively high power perpetrator. While low power targets may have a particularly strong reaction to miscategorization, high power targets may be buffered from miscategorization. The experience of miscategorization is likely to be particularly negative for low power targets that are miscategorized by a relatively high power perpetrator due to the high levels of attention that low power individuals pay to individuals who have power over them. Alternatively, the experience of miscategorization may be inconsequential to high power targets that are miscategorized by a relatively low perpetrator. Given that high power individuals have control over the resources of their subordinates, high power individuals are likely to not be affected by their subordinates actions. This brings me to my prediction that high power targets of miscategorization will be buffered from relatively low power perpetrators.

Overview of studies

The purpose of this dissertation is to expand our knowledge of identity miscategorization by investigating how relative intergroup status and interpersonal power impacts targets' reactions

to identity miscategorization. To achieve this purpose, this dissertation presents four studies. Studies 1 and 2 examine the relationship between relative intergroup status and miscategorization while Studies 3 and 4 examine the relationship between relative interpersonal power and miscategorization. Studies 1 and 3 investigate the moderating effects of status and power in the context of ethnic miscategorization, the experience of having one's ethnicity incorrectly categorized by another. Studies 2 and 4 expand on Studies 1 and 3 by investigating the relationship between miscategorization and status and power in the domain of participants' academic major identity, as opposed to ethnic identity. Moreover, Studies 2 and 4 examine how participants' level of identity affects the relationship between miscategorization and status (Study 2) and miscategorization and power (Study 4). The studies constituting this dissertation also examine the impact of miscategorization on outcomes not tested in previous research. These outcomes include resource allocation, attitudes towards targets' ingroup and the ascribed group, perceptions of power legitimacy, and trust.

Study 1

Study 1 investigates how relative intergroup status affects targets' responses to ethnic miscategorization. Consistent with previous research on ethnic miscategorization (Flores & Huo, 2012; Trujillo & Shelton, 2013), I predict that participants who are miscategorized, compared to those who are correctly categorized, will respond by expressing greater negative affect, less favorable attitudes towards the perpetrator, and greater assertion of their ingroup identity. In addition to eliciting categorization threat, the experience of being miscategorized as a member of a relatively low status group will also likely elicit value threat. Furthermore, I predict that these responses to miscategorization will be exacerbated for participants who are miscategorized as a member of a relatively low status ethnic group. Moreover, the value threat associated with being

miscategorized as a member of a low status group is likely to make the ascribed outgroup salient to the targets, leading them to distance themselves from and derogate the ascribed outgroup.

Whereas the value threat associated with being miscategorized as a member of a relatively low status group may lead targets to assert themselves as members of their ingroup and distance themselves as members of the ascribed group, targets who are miscategorized as a member of a relatively high status group may do the opposite. Rather than leading to a value threat, the experience of being miscategorized as a member of a high status group may lead to a value boost. Individuals who are miscategorized as a member of a high status group may reap tangible benefits from this incorrect categorization. Given the benefits associated with being viewed as a member of a high status group, targets of miscategorization that are miscategorized as a member of a high status group may attempt to "pass" by not asserting themselves as members of their actual ethnic group and not distancing themselves from the ascribed group (Barreto & Ellemers, 2003).

Study 1 also examines how ethnic miscategorization may impact support for inter-ethnic interaction. Ethnic miscategorization is likely to occur during instances of inter-ethnic interaction. Since targets' of miscategorization find this experience to be negative, they are also likely to express little support for inter-ethnic interaction because supporting inter-ethnic interaction would be showing support for an instance that is likely to bring about a negative experience. This is particularly likely to be the case for targets who are miscategorized as a member of a low status group because not only would inter-ethnic interaction likely lead to miscategorization, and the subsequent categorization threat, but also value threat.

Methods

Participants

A total of 127 undergraduate participants of Japanese (n = 3), Chinese (n = 118), or Korean (n = 6) heritage completed the study. Participants completed the study for course credit or for $8.00.

Procedure

Participants signed up for a study that was ostensibly investigating the relationship between group impression accuracy and person impression accuracy. Once participants entered the lab, the experimenter explained that participants would complete two separate tasks: a group impression task and followed by a person impression task. The group impression task consisted of participants rating multiple groups on a Likert scale in four separate status domains. These domains consisted of money, schooling, jobs, and general status. The items are adapted from the ladder socioeconomic status item used in previous research to manipulate social status (Adler, Epel, Castellazzo, & Ickovics, 2000; Kraus, Piff, & Keltner, 2009). After rating the various groups in the four domains, participants were randomly assigned to one of three status prime conditions: high status prime, low status prime, or no prime control. The high status prime and low status prime were graphical representations of the supposed average rating that Americans gave these groups in the same four status domains. Participants in the low status prime condition saw a graphical representation that indicated that Americans rated the participants' ethnic ingroup as relatively lower status than a target Asian outgroup; while participants in the high status prime condition saw a graphical representation that indicated that Americans rated the participants' ethnic group as relatively higher status than a target Asian outgroup. We counter-balanced across the target Asian outgroup such that the target Asian outgroup was one of the two ethnic groups to which the participant did not belong; for example, Chinese participants would be assigned a target Asian outgroup of either Japanese or Korean. Participants in the no prime

control condition did not see any graphical representation of Americans' average status ratings for the various groups.

After participants completed the group impression task they began the person impression task. The researcher told participants that for the person impression task, they were to form an impression of a partner, who was allegedly in a separate room down the hall, and that this partner was going to form an impression of them. Participants then completed a first impression form about themselves where they reported how well certain personality traits describe them, how important certain values and activities are to them, and to what ethnic group they belong. The personality items consist of five 7-point Likert scale items measuring the extent to which participants believe that the Big 5 personality traits describe them, where 1 = not at all and 7 = extremely. The activities and values items consist of five 7-point Likert scale items where participants report how important being healthy, participating in extracurricular activities, socializing with friends, having a life plan, and maintaining a balance between work and social life is to them, where 1 = not important at all and 7 = very important. The ethnicity item is an open-ended item where participants report their ethnic group. The personality trait and activities and values items were filler items designed to limit the suspicion participants may have about the ethnicity item. Participants were led to believe that their partner was completing the same form about himself or herself during the time that the participants were completing the form about themselves.

Upon completion of the first impression form, the researcher took a picture of the participants and ostensibly took a picture of their partner. Participants were then told that the pictures were to be traded and that they were to complete a first impression form about their partner based on the picture of their partner and vice versa. Whereas in the beginning of the

study participants and their partner completed the first impression form about themselves, they were now to complete the same form about each other using the pictures as the foundation for their responses. Participants were then given a picture of a sex-matched White confederate of a similar age. Once participants completed the first impression form about their partner, they were given the first impression form that their partner ostensibly completed about them. Participants were instructed to look over this first impression form while the researcher ostensibly gave the first impression form that the participants completed to their partner. The personality, value and activity ratings on the first impression form that participants received were manipulated consistently across participants and differed systematically from the ratings they reported about themselves earlier in the study. Depending on condition, the ethnicity item on the first impression form that the partner allegedly completed about the participants consisted of either a correct ethnic categorization or an ethnic miscategorization. Participants primed to think that their self-categorized ethnic group is high status, the high status prime condition, and who were assigned to the ethnic miscategorization condition were miscategorized as a member of the target Asian outgroup that was of relatively lower status in the prime. Participants primed to think that their self-categorized ethnic group is low status, the low status prime condition, and who were assigned to the ethnic miscategorization condition were miscategorized as a member of the target Asian outgroup that was of relatively higher status in the prime. Participants assigned to the miscategorization condition who did not see a status prime were miscategorized as a member of a target Asian outgroup that consisted of one of the two other outgroup Asian ethnicities, which were counterbalanced.

Once participants finished reading over the first impression form allegedly completed by their partner, they completed ingroup and target Asian outgroup attitude measures, a measure of

support for inter-ethnic interaction, and positive and negative affect measures. The measure of support for inter-ethnic interaction pertained to interaction between the participants' ingroup and the target Asian outgroup. The target Asian outgroup that participants reported their support for their ingroup interacting with and their attitudes towards was matched to that to which they were ascribed, for miscategorized participants, and to that to which they saw in the status prime, for participants who saw a status prime. The target Asian outgroup that correctly categorized participants who did not see a status prime reported their support for their ingroup interacting with and their attitudes towards was counterbalanced across the two Asian outgroups to which they did not belong. Participants were led to believe that these measures were designed to examine their response to the first impression and the group impression tasks.

After completing these measures the researcher stated that the study was over but that there was time remaining and asked participants to participate in a voluntary second, unrelated study. This second study was supposedly a marketing study designed to examine undergraduate preferences for various products. The marketing study consisted of a product preference task where participants reported their behavioral intentions for purchasing or using various ingroup, target Asian outgroup, neutral, and filler products. Filler products were included in the task to limit the participants' suspicion. This product preference task served as our measure of both identity assertion and distancing. The target Asian outgroup products were matched to the target Asian outgroup that participants reported their support for their ingroup interacting with and their attitudes towards. Specifically, for ethnically miscategorized participants the target Asian outgroup products were associated with the target Asian outgroup that they were ascribed and for participants who saw a status prime, the target Asian outgroup products were associated with the target Asian outgroup they saw in the prime. For correctly categorized participants, the target

Asian outgroup products were counter balanced between the two Asian outgroups. The target Asian outgroup products matched the Asian outgroup found in the group impression task for all conditions. After completion of the product preference task, participants were told that they are finished with the study and debriefed.

Measures

Identity assertion and distancing. We measured identity assertion and distancing with behavioral intention items used in the product preference task. For this task, participants rated their behavioral intentions for purchasing or using various products on a 7-point Likert scale where 1 = extremely unlikely and 7 = extremely likely. The products consisted of cars, laptops, and shoes as filler products and restaurants, books, cultural events, movies, hats, and t-shirts as the products of interest. There were ethnic ingroup, target Asian outgroup, and neutral versions for each product of interest. The neutral version of products was not associated with the participants' self-reported ethnic group or any Asian outgroup. We created three separate aggregate measures of behavioral intention for each version of the products - ingroup products (α = .67), Asian outgroup products (α = .63), and neutral products (α = .90) - by averaging across relevant responses within each version of product. We excluded hats from the aggregate products measures because it decreased the reliability of these measures.

Attitude towards ethnic groups. Participants reported their attitudes toward their self-categorized ethnic ingroup and the target Asian outgroup on an attitude thermometer where 0 degrees represented extremely unfavorable and 100 degrees represents extremely favorable.

Attitude towards partner. Participants reported their attitude towards their partner on an attitude thermometer where 0 degrees represents extremely unfavorable and 100 degrees represents extremely favorable.

Support for inter-ethnic interaction. Participants reported how much they agreed with two statements designed to measure support for inter-ethnic interaction on a 7-point Likert scale where 1 = strongly agree and 7 = strongly disagree. The two statements were: "[ethnic ingroup] and [target Asian outgroup] should feel free to interact with one another," and "Because America is increasingly diverse, it is important that [ethnic ingroup] and [target Asian outgroup] gain experience interacting with one another." I created an average support for inter-ethnic interaction score (α = .50).

Affect. Participants reported how much they felt 10 different emotions, adapted from the PANAS scales (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988), in the moment on a 10-point semantic differential scale where 1=not at all and 10=very much. The emotion items are designed to measure negative affect and positive affect. Negative affect items consist of upset, irritable, guilty, nervous, and hostile. Positive affect items consist of interested, enthusiastic, proud, strong, and determined. We created an aggregate negative affect (α= .67) and an aggregate positive affect (α = .87) score by averaging across relevant items.

Results

Means and standard deviations by categorization and status prime for each dependent measure are presented in Table 1. Unless otherwise stated, we tested the effects of ethnic categorization and group status using a 2 (ethnic categorization: correct ethnic categorization, ethnic miscategorization) X 3 (status prime: low status prime, no prime, high status prime) between subjects factorial analysis of variance. There were too few non-Chinese participants (n = 9) to meaningfully test for differences across ethnic groups.

Ingroup identity assertion and outgroup identity distancing

To test for ingroup identity assertion and outgroup identity distancing we conducted a 2 (ethnic categorization: correct categorization, ethnic miscategorization) X 3 (status prime: low status prime, no prime, high status prime) X 3 (products: ingroup products, target Asian outgroup products, neutral products) mixed factorial ANOVA, with products as a within subjects factor. Analysis revealed a marginal ethnic categorization effect, F (1, 121) = 3.64, p = .06, such that miscategorized (M = 3.66, SD = .40), compared to correctly categorized (M = 3.52, SD = .40), participants reported greater behavioral intention for the products. Participants reported similar levels of behavioral intention for the products across levels of status prime, F (2, 121) = 1.21, p = .30. Results also indicated a significant products main effect, F (2, 242) = 5.40, p = .01, such that, compared to ingroup (M = 3.72, SD = .76) and neutral products (M = 3.62, SD = .72), participants reported less behavioral intention for target Asian outgroup products (M = 3.42, SD = .70), ps < .06.

The main effects were qualified by a significant categorization by products interaction, F (2, 242) = 9.87, p < .01. To probe this interaction, I tested the categorization simple effect at each level of product across status prime. This analysis revealed a significant categorization simple effect for ingroup products, F (1, 125) = 20. 99, p < .01, such that miscategorized (M = 4.00, SD = .73), compared to correctly categorized (M = 3.43, SD = .69), participants reported greater behavioral intention for ingroup products. Moreover, this analysis indicated that the categorization simple effect for outgroup products was not significant, F (1, 125) = 2.26, p = .14, such that miscategorized (M = 3.33, SD = .74), and correctly categorized (M = 3.52, SD = .65), participants reported similar levels of behavioral intention for outgroup products. Miscategorized and correctly categorized participants reported similar levels of behavioral intention for neutral

products, F (1, 125) < .01, p = .98[1]. Furthermore, analysis revealed a significant ethnic categorization by status prime, F (2, 121) = 3.88, p = .02, interaction[2] and a marginal status prime by products interaction, F (4, 242) = 2.20, p = .07[3].

The categorization by status prime by products three-way interaction was not significant, F (4, 242) = .80, p = .53. To test our a priori prediction that participants who are miscategorized as a member of a relatively low status group will distance themselves from the ascribed group, and alternatively that participants who are miscategorized as a member of a relatively high status group may attempt to pass as a member of the ascribed group, I tested the status prime simple effect at each level of categorization for outgroup products. This analysis revealed a significant status prime simple effect on outgroup products for ethnically miscategorized participants, F (2, 121) = 9.99, p < .01, such that ethnically miscategorized participants who saw the high status prime (vs. low status prime and no prime) reported less behavioral intention for products associated with the target Asian outgroup, ps < .05; i.e., they distanced themselves from the

---

[1] Testing the products simple effect at each level of categorization across status revealed a significant products simple effect for miscategorized participants, F (2, 126) = 13.00, p < .01, such that miscategorized participants reported the least amount of behavioral intention for outgroup products (M = 3.33, SD = .74) followed by neutral products (M = 3.63, SD = .74) and the most behavioral intention for ingroup products (M = 4.01, SD = .73) – all pairwise comparisons were significant, ps < .05. The products simple effect was not significant for correctly categorized participants, F (2, 124) = 1.29, p = .28.

[2] To probe this interaction, I tested the status prime simple effect at each level of categorization across products. This analysis revealed a marginal status prime simple effect for miscategorized participants, F (2, 61) = 2.69, p = .08, such that participants who saw the low status (M = 3.83, SD = .48), compared to high status (M = 3.49, SD = .47), prime reported marginally greater behavioral intention towards the products, p = .08. No other pairwise comparisons between status prime for miscategorized participants across products were significant ps > .44.

[3] To probe this interaction I tested the status prime simple effect at each level of product across categorization. This analysis indicated a significant status prime simple effect for outgroup products, F (2, 124) = 5.02, p = .01, such that participants who saw the high status (M = 3.18, SD = .68), compared to low status (M = 3.64, SD = .68), prime reported less behavior intention towards outgroup products, p = .01. The status prime simple effect was not significant for ingroup products, F (2, 124) = .57, p = .57, or neutral products, F (2, 124) = .41, p = .67.

target outgroup (See Table 1 for means). The status prime simple effect on outgroup products for correctly categorized participants was not significant, F (2, 121) = .01, p = .90[4].

Attitudes towards ethnic ingroup and target Asian outgroup

A 2 (ethnic categorization: correct ethnic categorization, ethnic miscategorization) X 3 (status prime: low status prime, no prime, high status prime) X 2 (ethnic group attitude: ethnic ingroup, Asian outgroup) mixed factorial analysis of variance, with ethnic group attitude as a within subjects factor, revealed a significant three-way interaction, F (2, 121) = 3.10, p = .05. To probe this interaction we examined the effects of ethnic categorization, status prime, and their interaction on attitudes towards participants' ingroup and towards the target Asian outgroup separately. The analysis on attitudes towards participants' ingroup revealed a marginally significant effect of ethnic categorization, F (1, 121) = 3.10, p = .08, such that miscategorized (M = 72.80, SD = 12.96), compared to correctly categorized (M = 68.10, SD = 16.42) participants reported more favorable attitudes towards their ingroup. Participants reported similarly favorable attitudes towards their ethnic ingroup regardless of status prime condition (low status prime: M = 70.26, SD = 17.07; no status prime: M = 68.45, SD = 16.56; high status prime: M = 72.63, SD = 10.25), F (2, 121) = .81, p = .45. The categorization by status prime interaction effect, F (2, 121) = .18, p = .84, was not significant (See Table 1 for means).

The analysis on attitudes towards the target Asian outgroup indicated that the categorization effect was not significant, F (1, 121) = 2.21, p = .14, with miscategorized (M = 66.22, SD = 15.82) and categorized (M = 70.19, SD = 14.30) participants reporting similarly favorable attitudes towards the target Asian outgroup. Furthermore, this analysis revealed a

[4] Testing the simple effect of categorization at each level of status prime for outgroup products revealed a significant effect of categorization for participants who saw the high status prime, F (1, 41) = 10.48, p < .01. This analysis also indicated a non-significant simple effect of categorization for participants who saw the low status prime or no prime, Fs < 1.1, ps > .30.

significant status prime effect, F (2, 121) = 4.36, p = .02, such that participants who viewed the high status prime (M = 62.79, SD = 13.49), compared to the low status prime (M = 70.69, SD = 17.88) or no prime (M = 71.21, SD = 12.38), reported less favorable attitudes towards the target Asian outgroup, ps < .05. The main effects of categorization and status prime were qualified by a marginally significant status prime by categorization interaction, F (2, 121) = 2.33, p = .10 (see Table 1 for means). To probe this marginal interaction we analyzed the simple effect of status at each level of categorization. This analysis indicated a non-significant simple effect of status for correctly categorized participants, F (2, 60) = .85, p = .43. However, this analysis revealed a significant simple effect of status for ethnically miscategorized participants, F (2, 61) = 5.78, p = .01, such that miscategorized participants who saw a high status prime (vs. low status prime and no prime) reported the lowest amount of positivity towards the target Asian outgroup, ps < .05[5].

Attitude towards partner

Analysis indicated a significant main effect of categorization on participants' attitude towards their partner, F (1, 121) = 15.43, p < .01, such that ethnically miscategorized (M = 69.64, SD = 10.26), compared to correctly categorized (M = 76.95, SD = 10.42), participants reported less favorable attitudes towards their partner. Participants reported similarly favorable attitudes towards their partner across levels of status prime, F (2, 121) = .64, p = .53. The categorization by status prime interaction, F (2, 121) = .06, p = .94, was not significant.

Support for inter-ethnic interaction

[5] Analysis of the simple effect of categorization at each level of status prime revealed a significant effect of categorization for participants who saw a high status prime, F (1, 41) = 7.14, p = .01, such that of participants who saw a high status prime, those who were miscategorized as a member of a low status group (vs. correctly categorized) reported less positive attitudes towards the Asian outgroup. The simple effect of categorization for participants who saw the low status prime and high status prime was not significant, ps > .23.

Miscategorized and correctly categorized participants supported inter-ethnic interaction at similar levels, F (1, 121) = .04, p = .84. However, analysis revealed a significant status effect, F (2, 121) = 3.16, p = .05, such that participants who saw the low status prime (M = 6.11, SD = .82) reported marginally greater support for inter-ethnic interaction than participants who saw the high status prime (M = 5.70, SD = .92), p = .08[6]. The categorization by status interaction was not significant, F (1, 121) = .29, p = .75.

Affect

Participants reported similar levels of positive affect regardless of how their ethnicity was categorized, F (1, 121) = .15, p = .70, or what status prime they saw, F (2, 121) = .52, p = .59. Furthermore, analysis indicated that there was a non-significant categorization by status prime interaction, F (2, 121) = .32, p = .73.

Analysis on negative affect, however, revealed a significant ethnic categorization main effect, F (1, 121) = 4.48, p = .04, such that ethnically miscategorized (M = 2.72, SD = 1.32), compared to correctly categorized (M = 2.27, SD = 1.04), participants reported greater negative affect. Moreover, this analysis revealed a marginal status prime main effect, F (2, 121) = 2.83, p = .06, such that participants who saw the high status (M = 2.79, SD = 1.12), compared to the low status (M = 2.18, SD = 1.05), prime reported marginally more negative affect, p = .06[7]. The ethnic categorization by status prime interaction, F (2, 121) = .46, p = .63, was not significant.

Discussion

Study 1 expands on previous research on ethnic miscategorization by investigating the effect of group status on targets' responses to miscategorization. Specifically, Study 1 examined

[6] The pairwise comparisons between high status and no prime and between low status and no prime for support for inter-ethnic interaction were not significant, ps > .11.

[7] No other pairwise comparisons between status prime conditions for negative affect were significant (high status prime vs. no prime: p = .94, low status prime vs. no prime: p = .53).

whether targets responded differently to ethnic miscategorization as a function of the relative status of the erroneously ascribed ethnic group relative to the target's ethnic ingroup. The findings from Study 1 are largely consistent with previous research on ethnic miscategorization in that the experience of ethnic miscategorization led participants to experience greater negative affect, express less favorable attitudes towards the perpetrator, and exhibit greater identity assertion. Interestingly, group status did not have an effect on targets' responses to ethnic miscategorization for these outcomes. Thus, it appears that for certain outcomes the additional value threat likely to be caused by being miscategorized as a member of a relatively low status group – or alternatively, the status boost caused by being miscategorized as a member of a relatively high status group – does not exacerbate (or alleviate) the threats associated with miscategorization alone.

While previous research on ethnic miscategorization has shown that targets of ethnic miscategorization respond by asserting their ingroup identity but not by distancing themselves from the ascribed outgroup, Study 1 found that targets of ethnic miscategorization responded by both asserting their ingroup identity and distancing themselves from the ascribed outgroup. Not all targets responded by distancing themselves from the ascribed outgroup, however, as only targets who were miscategorized as a member of a relatively low status group distanced themselves from this group.

In addition to examining how miscategorization and group status may influence targets' identity assertion and distancing, Study 1 also investigated how miscategorization and group status impacts targets' attitudes towards the ingroup and the outgroup ascribed to them. Results for ingroup and target outgroup attitudes are in line with our predictions with miscategorized participants, compared to correctly categorized participants, expressing more favorable attitudes

towards their ingroup and less favorable attitudes towards the ascribed outgroup. This suggests that ethnic miscategorization may lead to both ingroup favoritism and, in certain instances, outgroup derogation. Moreover, results show that in response to miscategorization group status does not affect targets' attitudes towards their ingroup but that it does affect targets' attitudes towards the ascribed outgroup. Targets of miscategorization viewed the ascribed outgroup less favorably only when the ascribed outgroup was relatively lower status. It appears that targets of miscategorization will respond by derogating the outgroup only when the miscategorization elicits a social identity value threat. This outgroup derogation response parallels that of the outgroup distancing in that they were the only responses to ethnic miscategorization that varied as a function of group status. So what is special about these two responses? These two responses were the only two responses that pertained to the ascribed group. The finding that relative status only influences targets responses that pertain to the ascribed outgroup suggests that the ascribed outgroup only becomes salient to targets of miscategorization when the ascribed outgroup is of relatively low status.

I believed that participants who were miscategorized as a member of a relatively high status group may attempt to pass as a member of that group. This was not the case, however, as participants who were miscategorized as a member of a relatively high status group responded by asserting their ingroup identity, albeit less so than miscategorized participants in the other status conditions. There are two reasons, one conceptual and one methodological, why participants who were miscategorized as a member of a high status group may not have tried to pass as a member of that group. At the conceptual level, the categorization threat associated with miscategorization may overpower the potential value boost associated with being miscategorized as a member of a high status group. According to social identity theorists, categorization threat is orthogonal to

value concerns. Furthermore, according to research on self-verification (Swann, 1990) individuals want their self-concepts to be verified by others even when that self-concept is negative. Findings on context inappropriate categorizations provide further support such that individuals experience being categorized as a high status group membership to be negative in contexts in which they would prefer to be categorized by another identity (Barreto, Ellemers, & Smith, 2010). At the methodological level, the relative increase in status participants miscategorized as a member of a high status group would have gained in Study 1 may not have been sufficient to motivate passing. While the ingroup may have been low status relative to the ascribed outgroup, the ingroup was high status in an absolute sense. Future research should investigate if targets of miscategorization that are members of an absolute low status ethnic group will respond by passing as a member of an ascribed absolute high status outgroup.

Study 2

Study 2 aims to expand on Study 1 in three important ways. First, Study 2 investigates targets' reactions to miscategorization of an identity outside of ethnicity – academic major. Secondly, Study 2 expands on Study 1 by examining how participants' level of identity may affect the relationship between group status and miscategorization. Previous research on miscategorization (Trujillo & Shelton, 2013) found that targets' reactions to ethnic miscategorization varied as a function of their level of ethnic identity. Specifically, the more ethnically miscategorized participants identified with their ethnic group the more negative affect, less liking of the perpetrator, and greater identity assertion they exhibited. This was not the case, however, for correctly categorized participants, whose level of ethnic identity did not impact their levels of negative affect, liking of the perpetrator, and identity assertion. I predict that participants' level of identity will have similar effects in Study 2 as shown in previous studies

such that miscategorized participants', but not correctly categorized participants', responses to categorization will vary as a function of their identity. The findings from previous research on miscategorization suggest that participants' level of identity with their social group only influences targets' responses when they were threatened. Furthermore, findings from Study 1 are consistent with the interpretation that participants who are miscategorized as a member of a relatively low status group find that experience to be particularly threatening. These findings lead me to predict that participants' level of identity will have a particularly strong impact for miscategorized participants who believe that they are members of a high status group but are subsequently miscategorized as a member of a low status group.

The third major extension is that, in addition to investigating the impact of miscategorization, Study 2 also tests targets' response to identity denial. As mentioned earlier, identity denial consists of a context inappropriate categorization whereas miscategorization consists of an erroneous categorization. Though these two phenomena certainly share similarities in that both elicit categorization threat, they differ in that miscategorization involves the explicit ascription of an outgroup identity while identity denial does not. As such, I predict that the experience of miscategorization, but not identity denial, will have an impact on outcomes that pertain to the target outgroup – as seen in Study 1.

Study 2 also introduces new outcome measures not used in Study 1. Whereas Study 1 measured identity assertion and distancing using the product preference task, Study 2 measures identity assertion and distancing using self-report items of engagement in organizations and interest in meeting people specific to participants' ingroup major and the target outgroup major respectively. Furthermore, Study 2 introduces an additional dependent measure of resource allocation. While previous research on miscategorization used measures of affect, attitude, and

behavioral intention, the addition of a resource allocation measure allows us to examine the impact of categorization, group status, and identity, on actual behaviors directed towards participants' ingroup and the target outgroup. By utilizing a resource allocation measure we are able to measure ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation in a manner that has high ecological validity.

Methods

Participants

A total of 154 undergraduate participants completed the study. Participants consisted of psychology (n = 61), biology (n = 43), philosophy (n = 22), architecture (n = 14), and geoscience (n = 14) majors. Participants completed the study for a chance to win a $20 gift card to Amazon.

Procedure

Participants signed up for an online study ostensibly examining their life experiences on campus. At the beginning of the study, participants completed items measuring their class year, academic major, and, if applicable, their residential college, eating club, sports team, and/or performance group affiliation. Moreover, participants completed a measure of identity with their academic major.

After participants completed the identity measure, they completed our status manipulation. The status manipulation was similar to the group impression task used in Study 1. The group impression used in this study involved participants making impressions of the various academic majors on Princeton's campus. Participants were told that they were completing this task in order for the researchers to have a better understanding of the perceptions of various groups on campus. At the end of the group impression task, participants were randomly assigned to see a prime where their academic major was of relatively higher status compared to a target outgroup major, high status prime condition, or a prime where their major was of relatively

lower status compared to a target outgroup major, low status prime condition. The target outgroup major was counterbalanced across the four other majors to which the participants did not belong; for example, a psychology major would be assigned a target outgroup major of biology, philosophy, architecture, or geoscience.

Upon completion of the group impression task, participants completed the portion of the survey ostensibly designed to investigate a potential experience they may have on campus. For this portion of the survey, participants read a short vignette where they are at a café on campus and are approached by a fellow student of the same gender. Participants were randomly assigned to read one of three vignettes: one where the other student miscategorizes the participants' academic major identity (miscategorization condition), correctly categorizes the participants' academic major identity (correct categorization condition), or denies the participants' academic major identity (identity denial condition). For example, a female participant in the miscategorization condition would read the following vignette:

> Imagine yourself alone at a café on campus. As you sit enjoying a coffee, a fellow student, who you've seen in the café before, approaches you. You two exchange pleasantries and begin small talk. Soon there is a pause in the conversation and she asks you what your major is. You reply that you are a [ingroup] major and she exclaims, "Really? I would have guessed that you are a [target outgroup] major."

In the correct categorization vignette, after the participants tell the other student their major, the other student replies by saying "Really? That is what I would have guessed." In the identity denial vignette, after the participants tell the other student their major the other student replies, "Really? I would not have guessed that you are a [ingroup] major." After reading the vignette participants then completed measures of affect, attitude towards the other student, attitudes towards various academic majors, identity assertion and distancing, and a resource allocation task. Once they completed these measures, participants completed a manipulation check where

they reported whether or not the other student thought that the participants were members of their actual academic major. Miscategorized participants completed an additional manipulation check where they reported to which academic major the other student believed the participants belonged. Upon completion of the manipulation check(s), participants read a written debriefing.

Measures

Identity. Participants reported their strength of identity with their academic major on three items, adapted from the Multigroup Measure of Ethnic Identity (Phinney, 1992), on a 7-point Likert scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree. Items asked the extent to which participants agreed or disagreed with the following statements: "I think of myself as being a [ingroup major] major", "I have a strong sense of being a [self-categorized major] major", and "I am proud of being a [ingroup major] major." We created an aggregate major identity measure by averaging across the three items (α = .76, M = 5.26, SD = .95).

Affect. Participants reported the extent to which they felt 15 different emotions on a 7-point semantic differential scale where 1 = not at all and 7 = a great deal. These emotion items, adapted from Folkman and Lazarus (1985), consisted of eight negative emotion items and seven positive emotion items. The negative emotion items were worried, fearful, anxious, angry, disappointed, sad, disgusted, and guilty. The positive emotions were confident, hopeful, eager, exhilarated, pleased, happy, and relieved. We created an aggregate negative emotion measure (α = .95) and an aggregate positive emotion measure (α = .91) by averaging across relevant items.

Attitude towards the other student. The attitude towards other student measure was the same used in Study 1.

Attitudes towards majors. Participants reported their overall evaluation of 21 majors on an attitude thermometer where 0 = extremely favorable and 100 = extremely favorable. We

created an aggregate attitude towards neutral majors measure by averaging across majors that were not the ingroup major or the target outgroup major (M = 50.42, SD = 10.97). We created attitudes towards ingroup major and target outgroup difference scores by subtracting the attitudes towards neutral majors measure from the attitude towards ingroup major item and the attitude towards the target outgroup major item, respectively. This allowed us to examine participants attitudes towards their ingroup major and the target outgroup major while accounting for their attitudes towards other majors.

Identity assertion and distancing. Participants reported how much they agreed with four statements, adapted from the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992), on a 7-point Likert scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree. The four statements consisted of an ingroup major and a target outgroup major version of the following two statements: "I am active in organizations and social groups that contain mostly [ingroup/target outgroup] majors," and "I like meeting and getting to know people majoring in [ingroup/target outgroup]." We created an aggregate identity assertion measure by averaging across the two items pertaining to the ingroup major (r = .15, p = .06). We reverse scored the two items referencing the target outgroup such that high scores represent less engagement in target outgroup major activities and groups and less liking of meeting and knowing target outgroup majors. We then created an aggregate identity distancing measure by averaging across these two reverse scored items (r = .02, p = .80)

Resource allocation. Participants completed a resource allocation measure where they allocated Princeton's budget, by percentage, across 21 different majors. Participants were told that with the economy improving Princeton is looking to reallocate its academic budget. Supposedly, part of the reallocation would involve a reallocation of the funds given to the

different majors' departments and Princeton is interested in finding out how undergraduates think the money set aside for the different major departments should be allocated. As such, participants completed a resource allocation measure where they reported what percentage of Princeton's total "academics budget" they believed each major department should receive. We used the resource allocation items to create two resource allocation measures: an ingroup major allocation measure and a target outgroup major allocation measure.

Results

Five of the participants failed the manipulation checks, indicating that they did not attend to the vignette, and were excluded from the analysis. We conducted multiple stepwise linear regressions with step 1 consisting of participants' strength of identity entered as a continuous predictor (centered on the mean), and status and categorization entered as categorical predictors (dummy coded such that low status and correct categorization are the reference groups). Step 2 consisted of the addition of all two-way interaction terms and step 3 consisted of the addition of all three-way interaction terms.

Identity assertion

Analysis for step 1 revealed that the categorization and status prime effects were not significant, *p*s > .16. This analysis did indicate, however, a significant academic major identity effect, $\beta = .37$, $p < .01$, such participants reported greater identity assertion as a function of their academic major identity[8]. Furthermore, analysis for steps 2 and 3 revealed that the two-way, *p*s > .35, and three-way interactions, *p*s > .39, were not significant.

Identity distancing

[8] The effect of major identity was significant in step 2, $\beta = .50$, $p = .01$, but was not significant in step 3, $\beta = .37$, $p = .11$.

Analysis for step 1 revealed that the main effects for categorization and status prime, *p*s > .89, were not significant such that participants reported similar levels of identity assertion across levels of categorization and status prime conditions. This analysis also indicated that the academic major identity effect was not significant such that participants reported similar levels of identity distancing across levels of academic major identity, β = -.15, *p* = .11.

Analysis for step 2 revealed a non-significant categorization by status prime interaction, β = -.04, *p* = .83. This analysis did indicate that the effect of participants' major identity was marginally different for correctly categorized participants compared to denied participants, β = .23, *p* = .10[9]. Moreover, the analysis revealed that the status prime by major identity interaction was approaching significance, β = .19, *p* = .16, such that, compared to participants' who saw the low status prime, major identity had a more positive effect on identity distancing for participants' who saw the high status prime.

Analysis for step 3 revealed that the two-way interactions were qualified by a marginally significant categorization by status prime by major identity three-way interaction, β = -.27, *p* = .08. Probing this interaction revealed a significant status prime by major identity interaction for miscategorized participants, β = -.66, *p* = .01, but not for denied, β = .11, *p* = .67, or correctly categorized participants, β = -.09, *p* = .68. Simple slopes analysis revealed that the simple slope for major identity was not significant for miscategorized participants who saw the low status prime, β = .01, *p* = .98, but was significant for miscategorized participants who saw the high status prime, β = -.99, *p* < .01, such that miscategorized participants who saw the high status prime reported less identity distancing as a function of their major identity.

Negative affect

[9] This major identity miscategorization interaction was not significant in step 3, β = .39.

We log transformed the data on participants' negative affect due to a high degree of skew. Analysis for step 1 revealed that the difference between miscategorized participants and correctly categorized participants was not significant, β = .16, *p* = .14, such that miscategorized and correctly categorized participants experienced similar levels of negative affect. Denied and correctly categorized participants reported similar levels of negative affect β = .06, *p* = .60. Participants who saw the high status prime and those who saw the low status prime reported similar levels of negative affect, β = -.07, *p* = .50. Analysis also revealed a significant academic major identity main effect, β = -.27, *p* < .01[10], such that participants reported less negative affect as a function of their academic major identity.

The categorization by status prime interactions in step 2 were not significant, indicating that status prime had a similar effect for miscategorized, β = -.11, *p* = .53, and denied, β = -.11, *p* = .52, participants as it did for correctly categorized participants. The categorization by academic major identity interactions revealed that the academic major identity effect was similar for correctly categorized participants, major identity and for miscategorized participants, β = .21, *p* = .13. Major identity had a similar effect for correctly categorized participants and denied participants, β = .16, *p* = .24. The status prime by major identity interaction was not significant, β = -.04, *p* = .75. The three-way interactions were not significant, *p*s > .61.

Positive affect

Results from step 1 revealed a significant effect of both denial, β = -.30, *p* =.01, and miscategorization, β = -.42, *p* < .01[11], such that denied and miscategorized (vs. correctly categorized) participants reported less positive affect. Participants who saw the high status and

[10] The effect of major identity was significant in step 2, β = -.46, *p* = .02 and marginally significant, β = -.40, *p* = .09, in step 3.
[11] The effects of denial and miscategorization were significant in both steps 2 and 3, *p*s < .02.

low status prime reported similar levels of positive affect, β = .03, *p* = .79. Participants' level of positive affect did not vary as a function of academic major identity, β = .10, *p* = .31.

Examination of the individual two-level interactions in step 2 revealed non-significant categorization by status prime interactions, such that miscategorized, β = .12, *p* = .47, and denied, β = .10, *p* = .51, participants experienced similar levels of positive affect to correctly categorized participants across status prime. This analysis also revealed that, compared to correctly categorized participants, the effect of participants' major identity was significantly more negative for miscategorized participants, β = -.33, *p* = .01, and marginally more negative for denied participants, β = -.23, *p* = .07[12]. To probe these interactions we analyzed the simple slope of participants' major identity at each level of categorization. This analysis revealed a significant effect of major identity for correctly categorized participants, β = .36, *p* = .05, such that they expressed greater positive affect as a function of their major identity. Furthermore, this analysis indicated that the academic major identity effect was not significant for miscategorized participants, β = -.23, *p* = .20, and denied participants, β = -.07, *p* = .73. The status prime by academic major identity interaction was not significant, β = .09, *p* = .46. Analysis for step 3 revealed that the categorization by status prime by academic major identity three-way interactions were not significant, *p*s > .44.

Attitude towards the other student

Analysis of step 1 revealed a marginal effect of categorization such that denied participants (vs. correctly categorized participants) reported less favorable attitudes towards the

[12] In step 3, the miscategorization by major identity interaction was significant, β = -.39, *p* = .02, but the denial by major identity was not, β = -.16, *p* = .38.

other student, β = -.21, *p* = .08.[13] Miscategorized and correctly categorized participants reported similarly favorable attitudes towards the other student, β = -.12, *p* = .30. The difference between participants who saw the high status prime (vs. low status prime) was not significant, β = .14, *p* = .16, such that participants who saw the high status and low status primes reported similarly favorable attitudes. Participants' favorability did not vary as a function of their academic major, β = .10, *p* = .29.

Analysis for step 2 revealed that the categorization by status prime and status prime by major identity interactions were not significant, *p*s > .39. However, this analysis indicated that, compared to correctly categorized participants, the effect of major identity was marginally more negative for miscategorized participants, β = -.26, *p* = .06, and significantly more negative for denied participants, B = -.33, *p* = .02. To probe these interactions we analyzed the simple slopes of participants' major identity at each level of categorization. This analysis revealed a significant positive simple slope of major identity for correctly categorized participants, β = .41, *p* = .04, such that correctly categorized participants reported more favorable attitudes towards the other student as a function of their major identity. This analysis also revealed that the simple slopes of major identity for miscategorized participants, β = -.05, *p* = .79, and denied participants, β = -.18, *p* = .38, were not significant. Analysis for step 3 also revealed that the categorization by status prime by academic major identity three-way interactions were not significant, *p*s > .84.

Attitudes towards ingroup major

Analysis for step 1 revealed that both miscategorized, β = .05, *p* = .67, and denied, β = .07, *p* = .49, participants reported similarly favorable attitudes towards their ingroup major to

[13] The difference between denied and correctly categorized participants was not significant in steps 2 and 3, *p*s > .20.

correctly categorized participants. Furthermore, participants who saw the high status and low status primes reported similarly favorable attitudes towards their ingroup major, B = .37, p = .92. This analysis did indicate a significant effect of participants' major identity, β = .43, p < .01, such that participants reported more favorable attitudes towards their ingroup major as a function of their major identity.

These effects were qualified by a categorization by status prime interaction, such that, compared to correctly categorized participants, the effect of status was significantly different for denied participants, β = .31, p = .04, and marginally different for miscategorized participants, β = .27, p = .10. Probing the simple effect of status at each level of categorization revealed that correctly categorized, β = -.25, miscategorized, β = .11, and denied, β = .23, participants who saw the high status prime (vs. low status prime) reported similarly favorable attitudes towards their major, ps > .11. The categorization by major identity and status prime by major identity interactions were not significant, ps > .20. Analysis for step 3 revealed that the three-way interactions were not significant, ps > .30.

Attitude towards target outgroup major

Analysis for step 1 indicated that, compared to correctly categorized participants, both denied, β = .13, p = .26, and miscategorized, β = .02, p = .83, participants reported similarly favorable attitudes towards the target outgroup major. Participants who saw the high status and low status prime reported similarly favorable attitudes towards the target outgroup major, β = .08, p = .43. Furthermore, participants' favorability towards the target outgroup major did not vary as a function of their major identity, β = -.05, p = .61.

Analysis for step 2 revealed that the categorization by status prime, categorization by academic major identity, and status prime by academic major identity interactions were not

significant, *p*s > .38. Analyses for steps 3 indicated that the three-way interactions were also not significant, *p*s > .58.

Ingroup major budget allocation

Results from step 1 of the regression indicated that the difference between correctly categorized and denied participants was not significant, β = .18, *p* = .13, such that denied and correctly categorized participants allocated similar amounts of Princeton's budget to their ingroup major. Correctly categorized and miscategorized participants allocated similar percentages of Princeton's budget to their ingroup major, β = .09, *p* = .41. Moreover, this analysis revealed that the status prime effect was not significant, β = .00, *p* = .97, such that participants who saw the high status prime and those who saw the low status prime allocated similar percentages of Princeton's budget to their ingroup major. The effect of participants' major identity was marginally significant, however, β = .17, *p* = .09[14], such that participants allocated more of Princeton's budget to their ingroup major as a function of their major identity. Analysis for steps 2 and 3 revealed that the two-way, *p*s > .23, and three-way interactions, *p*s > .41, were not significant.

Target outgroup major budget allocation

Analysis for step 1 revealed that, compared to correctly categorized participants, miscategorized, β = -.05, and denied, β = .18, participants allocated similar percentages of Princeton's budget to the target outgroup major, *p* > .11. This analysis indicated a marginal effect of status, β = .17, *p* = .08, such that participants who saw the high status prime (vs. low status prime) allocated more of Princeton's budget to the outgroup major. The effect of academic major identity was not significant, β = -.05, *p* = .64.

[14] The effect of academic major identity was not significant in steps 2 and 3, *p*s > .65.

These effects were qualified by a marginal categorization by status prime interaction, such that the status prime effect was different for denied participants than for correctly categorized participants, β = .30, *p* = .06. To probe this interaction I analyzed the simple effect of status for both correctly categorized and denied participants. This analysis indicated that the simple effect of status for correctly categorized participants was not significant, β = .01, *p* = .96, but that the significant simple effect of status for denied participants was significant, β = .48, *p* = .01, such that denied participants who saw the high status (vs. low status) prime allocated more of Princeton's budget to the outgroup major. The effect of status prime for miscategorized participants was similar to that for correctly categorized participants, β = .00, *p* = .98. The status prime by major identity and categorization by major identity interactions were not significant, *p*s > .33. Analysis for step 3 revealed that the three-way interactions were not significant, *p*s > .28.

Discussion

Study 2 examined the generalizability of the findings on ethnic miscategorization in the previous study for an identity other than ethnicity. While the effect of miscategorization did not reach statistical significance for many of our outcomes, miscategorization did impact participants' affect. Whereas in Study 1 miscategorization only had an effect on targets' negative affect, in Study 2 miscategorization had an effect on targets' positive affect such that, compared to correctly categorized participants, miscategorized participants experience less positive affect. Despite the significant categorization effect for positive affect, there were multiple instances where the results of Study 2 failed to reach significance. The inconsistency of the effects of categorization and status prime in Study 2 may be a result of the study being conducted online. Participants may not have been attending to the study enough to sufficiently engage the status

prime and the vignette. The status and categorization manipulations may be too subtle to translate into an online medium where participants may be distracted and unmotivated.

Moreover, the inconsistency of the findings may be an artifact of the identity that was categorized. Study 1 involved the status differences between and miscategorization of ethnic identity, an identity likely to be important to participants' self-concept whereas Study 2 involved status differences between and miscategorization of participants' major – an identity likely to be of relatively less importance to their self-concepts. As such, the miscategorization and status manipulations used in Study 2, compared to Study 1, are likely to elicit less categorization and value threats.

Study 2 expanded on Study 1's examination of how relative group status can impact targets' reactions to ethnic miscategorization by investigating how targets' level of identity influenced the relationship between group status and miscategorization. Unfortunately, this investigation was largely inconclusive. The effect of targets' level of identity had similar effects to previous research on miscategorization for targets' attitudes towards the perpetrator and targets' positive affect, yet these are the only two outcomes that are consistent previous findings. Moreover, targets' level of identity had little impact on the relationship between group status and miscategorization. One potential reason for the level of identity effect's inconsistency may be that the identity itself, participants' major, may not have been central enough to the participants' self-concept to affect their reaction to the miscategorization. While participants may have been high on our measure of major identity, the degree to which they identify with their major is likely to pale in comparison to the degree to which they identify with ethnici or gender identities.

In addition to examining the impact of miscategorization, Study 2 also investigated the impact of identity denial. As mentioned earlier, the impact of how participants' identity was

categorized, whether it be miscategorized or denied, failed to have a significant impact on most of our outcomes. Thus, it appears that the threat elicited by the experience of miscategorization is similar to that elicited by identity denial. I want to stress that I make this interpretation cautiously as it is an interpretation of largely null effects. As such, further research is necessary, perhaps using an identity of greater importance to participants than major, to tease out the effects of miscategorization and identity denial.

Study 3

Study 3 represents the conceptual shift from testing the impact of relative group status on targets' responses to miscategorization, as done in Studies 1 and 2, to testing the impact of relative interpersonal power on targets' responses to miscategorization. As mentioned earlier, there is reason to believe that power will affect targets' responses to miscategorization. Given previous findings that low power targets attend to perpetrators of prejudice who have power over them and have particularly strong reactions to prejudice from perpetrators who have power over them (Barreto, Ellemers, & Fiske, 2010), I predict that low power targets will have particularly strong responses to miscategorization from relatively high power perpetrators. Moreover, based on previous findings that high power individuals do not attend to their subordinates, I believe that high power targets' will be buffered from the aversive consequences associated with miscategorization from relatively low power perpetrators.

In addition to testing the relationship between interpersonal power and miscategorization, Study 3 also introduces a couple of new outcome measures: trust in partner, and perceived legitimacy of power. Previous research on prejudice finds that perceptions of prejudice tend to lead targets of prejudice to view the perpetrator's actions as less legitimate (for a review see Major, 1994). Given these findings, I predict that targets of miscategorization will also likely

view the perpetrator as less legitimate. I also believe that the experience of miscategorization will lead to low levels of trust. The experience of miscategorization will likely activate thoughts on behalf of the target that the perpetrator does not value or respect the target's self-categorized social group. Previous research on sub-group respect, the feeling that one's sub-group is valued by a common group, found that high levels of perceived sub-group respect is related to high levels of trust (Huo & Molina, 2006). Since targets of identity miscategorization are likely to perceive the perpetrator of miscategorization as not valuing the target's self-categorized social group, the target is likely not to trust the perpetrator. Examining perceptions of legitimacy and trust in the perpetrator provides further insight into how miscategorization can impact targets' attitudes and perceptions of the perpetrator. These attitudes and perceptions can have important downstream consequences when the perpetrator has control over valued resources.

Method

Participants

A total of 121 Asian and Latino undergraduates participated in the study. Participants received course credit for completing the study.

Procedure

Participants signed up for a study ostensibly involving a partner that was investigating first impression accuracy and group decision-making. Prior to entering the lab, participants completed an online pre-questionnaire that consisted of a bogus leadership assessment. Participants were led to believe that their partner completed the same leadership assessment. According to the cover story, the leadership assessment would be used to assign roles for a group decision task that participants would engage in with their partner. Participants were led to believe that their score on the leadership assessment determined their role in the group decision task. Supposedly, the individual who scored higher between participants and their partner would be

assigned the role of manager and the individual who scored lower would be assigned the role of subordinate. In actuality, participants were randomly assigned to one of three power roles: manager (high power), subordinate (low power), or equal power.

Once participants entered the lab, the researcher stated that the study would involve participants and a partner, who was allegedly located in another room, forming impressions of one another based on each other's picture and then later completing the group decision task together. The researcher then assigned the participants to one of the three power roles. Participants assigned to the equal power condition were told that they had the same leadership assessment score as their partner and that both they and their partner would be managers. Once the researcher assigned participants their roles, the researcher explained that managers would have authority over the group decision task and that managers would be given five raffle tickets, to be later entered in a raffle for a reward, with which managers could allocate between themselves and the subordinate. Participants in the equal power condition were told that both they and their partner will be given five raffle tickets to allocate and that both participants and their partner will have equal authority in the group decision task. A version of this status manipulation has been used in previous research (Anderson & Berdhal, 2002; Galinsky, Gruenfeld, & Magee, 2003).

After the experimenter finished describing the study and assigning roles, the participants completed the same person impression task from Study 1. At the end of the person impression task, after participants saw their alleged partner's impression of them, the experimenter entered the room and told participants that they were to now answer questions regarding their reactions to their partner's impression. These questions consisted of measures of attitude towards their

partner, liking of their partner, affect, trust in their partner, perceived legitimacy of power role, and predictions about the raffle ticket allocation.

Once participants completed these measures, the experimenter told participants that they were done with the first impression accuracy aspect of the study and that they were to begin the group decision task aspect of the study. The group decision allegedly involved the participants and their partner interacting with one another on a task where they must decide which products to buy given a limited amount of money and how much money there were willing to spend on the products they wanted to purchase. The experimenter instructed participants that prior to the group decision task, participants and their partner had to first complete a product preference task where they would rate their preferences for various products. The products that they rated would allegedly be the products that they would choose from for the group decision task. This product preference task served as our measure of identity assertion and distancing, and was similar to the product preference task used in Study 1. Once participants completed the product preference task the experimenter stated that the experiment was over and debriefed the participants.

Measures

Identity assertion and distancing. We measured identity assertion and distancing using a product preference task similar to that used in Study 1 with one difference: we added products associated with Mexican, Dominican, and Puerto Rican ethnicities.

Attitude towards partner. The attitude towards partner measure was the same used in studies 1 and 2.

Liking of partner. Participants reported how likely it would be that they would want to participate in another study with their partner on a 7-point scale where 1 = very unlikely and 7= very likely.

Affect. Participants reported how much they felt 9 different emotions in the moment on a 7-point semantic differential scale where 1=not at all and 7=very much. The emotion items, adapted from the PANAS scales (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988), are designed to measure both negative and positive affect. Negative affect items consist of upset, guilty, irritable, and nervous. Positive affect items consist of interested, strong, enthusiastic, proud, and determined. We created aggregate negative affect (α = .73) and positive affect scores (α = .80) by averaging across relevant items.

Trust in partner. Participants rated how much they agree with four statements designed to capture their amount of trust in their partner on a 7-point Likert scale where 1=highly disagree and 7= highly agree. The items are: "On the whole, I think my partner will behave in an honest manner," "I trust my partner to do what is right," "My partner will lookout for himself/herself and not for me," and "My partner will behave in a way that is fair." These items are a subset of items adapted from the Latino National Survey and Tyler (1990). We created an aggregate trust in partner score by averaging across the four items (α = .63).

Perceived legitimacy of power role. We measured perceived legitimacy of power role using three 7-point semantic differential items (Jost & Burgess; 2000). The anchors for these items consist of: unfair and fair, unjustifiable and justifiable, and illegitimate and legitimate. Participants assigned to the subordinate role reported their perceptions of legitimacy for their partners' power role on these items. Participants assigned the role of manager reported their perceptions of legitimacy for their own role on these items. Participants assigned to the equal power condition reported their perceptions of legitimacy for both their own and their partner's power role. As such, all participants reported their perceptions of the legitimacy of the manager's role, whether they, their partner, or both them and their partner were assigned that role. We

created an average perceived legitimacy of self-power score (α = .86) and perceive legitimacy of partner-power score (α = .89) where higher scores represent greater perceived legitimacy of the power role.

Raffle ticket allocation. Participants assigned the role of manager reported how many of the five raffle tickets they believed they would allocate to their partner. Participants assigned the role of subordinate reported how many of the five raffle tickets they believed their partner would allocate to them. Participants in the equal power condition reported both how many raffle tickets they believed they would allocate to their partner and how many raffle tickets they believed their partner would allocate to them.

Results

The means and standard deviations for each dependent measure by ethnic categorization and power role are presented in Table 3. Unless otherwise mentioned we tested the effects of ethnic categorization and power role using a 2 (categorization: correct categorization, miscategorization) X 3 (power role: subordinate, equal power control, manager) analysis of variance.

Identity assertion and distancing

To analyze identity assertion and distancing, we conducted a 2 (categorization: correct categorization, miscategorization) X 3 (power role: subordinate, equal power, manager) X 3 (products: ingroup products, target outgroup products, neutral products) mixed factorial ANOVA with products as a within subjects factor. This analysis indicated a significant categorization effect, F (1, 115) = 11.02, $p < .01$, such that, compared to correctly categorized participants (M = 3.55, SD = .47), miscategorized participants (M = 3.83, SD = .47) reported greater behavioral intention for the products. The power role effect was not significant, F (2, 115) = .54, p = .59,

such that managers, subordinates, and equal power participants reported similar levels of behavioral intention for the products. Analysis revealed a significant products effect, F (2, 230) = 9.88, $p < .01$, such that participants reported marginally greater behavioral intention for ingroup products (M = 3.98, SD = .99) than target outgroup products (M = 3.69, SD = 1.04), $p = .08$, and significantly greater behavioral intention for ingroup products than neutral products (M = 3.42, SD = .78), $p < .01$[15].

The categorization by power role and power role by products two-way interactions were not significant, Fs < 1, ps > .43. Analysis did reveal, however, a marginally significant, categorization by products interaction, F (2, 230) = 2.72, $p = .07$. To probe this interaction, we analyzed the simple effects of products at each level of categorization. This analysis revealed a marginally significant effect of products for correctly categorized participants, F (2, 118) = 2.51, $p = .09$, with, compared to ingroup (M = 3.68, SD = 1.00) and target outgroup products (M = 3.68, SD = 1.13), correctly categorized participants reporting less behavioral intention for neutral products (M = 3.30, SD = .80), though not significantly so. This analysis also revealed a significant simple effect of products for miscategorized participants, F (2, 120) = 11.97, $p < .01$, such that, compared to target outgroup (M = 3.70, SD = .96) and neutral products (M = 3.53, SD = .75), miscategorized participants reported greater behavioral intention for ingroup products (M = 4.27, SD = .89), ps < .01.[16] The three-way categorization by power role by products interaction was not significant, F (4, 230) = .92, $p = .45$.

---

[15] The pairwise comparison between target outgroup products and neutral products was not significant, $p = .11$, such that participants reported similar levels of behavioral intention for neutral and target outgroup products.

[16] Simple effect of ethnic categorization for ingroup product was significant, F (1, 119) = 11.77, $p < .01$, with ethnically miscategorized (vs. correctly categorized) participants reporting greater liking for ingroup products. The simple effect of ethnic categorization was not significant for outgroup or neutral products, Fs < 2.60.

Attitudes towards partner

Analysis on participants attitudes towards their partner revealed a significant categorization effect, F (1, 115) = 11.35, $p < .01$, such that, compared to correctly categorized participants (M = 78.43, SD = 10.91), ethnically miscategorized participants (M = 71.44, SD = 12.32) reported less favorable attitudes towards their partner. Analysis revealed that the power role effect was not significant, F (2, 115) = 1.39, $p = .25$, such that managers, subordinates, and equal power participants reported similarly favorable attitudes towards their partner. These main effects were qualified by a marginal categorization by power role interaction, F (2, 115) = 2.51, $p = .09$. To probe this interaction, I tested the simple effect of categorization at each level of power role. This analysis indicated that the categorization simple effect for managers was not significant, F (1, 40) = .06, $p = .81$. However, the categorization simple effect for subordinates was significant, F (1, 38) = 12.23, $p < .01$, such that miscategorized (vs. correctly categorized) subordinates reported less favorability towards their partner (see Table 3 for means). Furthermore, the categorization simple effect for equal power participants was significant, F (1, 37) = 5.26, $p = .03$, such that miscategorized (vs. correctly categorized) participants reported less favorability towards their partner (see Table 3 for means).[17]

Liking of partner

Analysis on how likely participants would want to participate in a future study with their partner revealed that miscategorized and correctly categorized participants reported similarly likelihoods of wanting to participate in a future study with their partner, F (1, 115) = .47, $p = .49$.

[17] Testing the simple effect of power role at each level of ethnic categorization revealed a non-significant simple effect of power role for correctly categorized participants, F (2, 57) = .89, $p = .42$. The analysis did reveal a marginal simple effect of power role for ethnically miscategorized participants, F (2, 58) = 2.90, $p = .06$, such that miscategorized subordinates (vs. miscategorized managers) reported marginally less positive affect, $p = .07$.

This analysis did indicate, however, a marginal power role effect, F (2, 115) = 2.77, p = .07, with subordinates (M = 4.55, SD = 1.20) wanting to participate in a future study with their partner marginally less than managers (M = 5.07, SD = .97), p = .09. Subordinates (M = 5.00, SD = 1.00), reported similar likelihoods of wanting to participate with their partner to equal power participants, p = .20. The categorization by power role interaction, F (2, 115) = .06, p = .94, was not significant.

Affect

Analysis on positive affect revealed that the categorization effect was not significant, F (1, 115) = .34, p = .56, such that miscategorized and correctly categorized participants reported similar levels of positive affect. Analysis also indicated that the power role effect was not significant, F (2, 115) = .34, p = .71, such that managers, subordinates, and equal power participants reported similar levels of positive affect. The ethnic categorization by power role interaction was not significant, F (2, 115) = .59, p = .56.

Analysis on negative affect, however, revealed a significant categorization effect, F (1, 115) = 4.19, p = .04, such that, compared to correctly categorized participants (M = 2.02, SD = .99), miscategorized participants (M = 2.37, SD = 1.01) reported greater negative affect. Furthermore, analysis revealed a significant power role effect, F (2, 115) = 4.47, p = .01, such that subordinates (M = 2.57, SD = 1.09) reported significantly more negative affect than managers (M = 1.98, SD = .94), p = .02, and marginally more negative affect than equal power participants (M = 2.05, SD = .90), p = .06[18]. These main effects were qualified by a significant categorization by power role interaction, F (2, 115) = 4.22, p = .02. To probe this interaction I tested the simple effect of categorization at each level of power role. This analysis indicated a

[18] The pairwise comparison between equal status participants and managers was not significant, p = 1.00

non-significant categorization effect for managers, F (1, 40) = 1.33, p = .26. However, the categorization effect was significant for subordinates, F (1, 38) = 6.20, p = .02, and for equal status participants, F (1, 37) = 4.50, p = .04, such that miscategorized (vs. correctly categorized) subordinates and equal status participants reported greater negative affect (See Table 3 for means).[19]

Trust in partner

Analysis on trust in partner revealed a significant categorization effect, F (1, 115) = 6.96, p = .01, such that, compared to correctly categorized participants (M = 5.29, SD = .60), miscategorized participants (M = 5.00, SD = .68) trusted their partner less. This analysis also revealed that the power role effect was not significant, F (2, 115) = 1.35, p = .26, such that managers, subordinates, and equal power participants trusted their partner at similar levels. The main effects were qualified by a marginally significant categorization by power role interaction, F (2, 115) = 2.43, p = .09. To probe this interaction I tested the simple effect of categorization at each level of power role. This analysis revealed that the categorization effect for managers was not significant, F (1, 40) = .06, p = .81. The categorization effect was marginal for subordinates, F (1, 38) = 3.75, p = .06, and significant for equal power participants, F (1, 37) = 7.01, p = .01, with ethnically miscategorized (vs. correctly categorized) subordinates and equal power participants trusting their partner less (See Table 3 for means)[20].

---

[19] Testing the simple effect of power role at each level of categorization revealed a non-significant simple effect of role for correctly categorized participants, F (2, 57) = 1.02, p = .37. Analysis did reveal a significant simple effect of role for ethnically miscategorized participants, however, F (2, 58) = 8.30, p < .01, such that subordinates (vs. managers and equal status participants) reported marginally greater negative affect, ps < .11.

[20] Testing the simple effect of power role at each level of categorization revealed a significant simple effect of power role for correctly categorized participants, F (2, 57) = 3.15, p = .05, with correctly categorized managers reporting marginally less trust in their partner than subordinates,

Perceived legitimacy of power role

We conducted two ANOVAs to test the categorization, power role, and categorization by power role interaction effects on participants' perceived legitimacy of their partner's power role (subordinates and equal power participants) and perceived legitimacy of their own power role (managers and equal power participants). Analysis on perceived legitimacy of partner's power role revealed a significant categorization effect, F (1, 75) = 4.84, p = .03, such that, compared to correctly categorized participants (M = 5.65, SD = 1.06), ethnically miscategorized participants (M = 5.12, SD = 1.07) perceived their partner's power role to be less legitimate. Furthermore, analysis revealed a significant power role effect, F (1, 75) = 4.10, p = .05, such that, compared to equal power participants (M = 5.62, SD = 1.07), subordinates (M = 5.13, SD = 1.07) perceived the power role of their partner to be less legitimate. Though the ethnic categorization by role interaction was not significant, F (1, 75) = .69, p = .41, I tested the a priori hypothesis that low power targets have particularly strong reactions to miscategorization by examining the simple effect of categorization on participants' perceived legitimacy of their partner's power role for both low power and equal power participants. This analysis revealed a significant categorization simple effect for subordinates, F (1, 38) = 4.88, p = .03, such that miscategorized (vs. correctly categorized) subordinates perceived their partner's power role to be less legitimate (See Table 3 for means). The categorization simple effect for equal power participants, F (1, 37) = .89, p = .35, was not significant.[21]

---

p = .06, and equal power participants, though not significantly so. The simple effect of power role was not significant for ethnically miscategorized participants, F (2, 58) = 1.03, p = .36.

[21] Testing the simple effect of role at each level of ethnic categorization revealed a non-significant simple effect of power for correctly categorized participants, F (1, 36) = .66, p = .42. For ethnically miscategorized participants, however, the effect of power role was significant, F (1, 39) = 4.41, p = .04, such that miscategorized subordinates (vs. equal power participants) perceived the power of their partner as less legitimate

Analysis on perceived legitimacy of participants' own power role revealed that the categorization effect was not significant, F (1, 77) = .15, p = .70, such that miscategorized participants and correctly categorized participants perceived their power role to be similarly legitimate. Analysis did indicate a significant power role effect, F (1, 77) = 5.00, p = .03, such that, compared to equal power participants (M = 5.19, SD = 1.01), managers (M = 5.69, SD = 1.01) perceived their power to be more legitimate. The categorization by power role interaction was not significant, F (1, 77) = 1.37, p = .25.

Raffle ticket allocation

Analysis on the number of raffle tickets subordinates and equal power participants believed that their partner would allocate to them revealed that correctly categorized and miscategorized subordinates and equal power participants believed that their partner would allocate a similar number of tickets to them, F (1, 75) = .28, p = .60. This analysis did reveal, however, a significant power role effect, F (1, 75) = 11.87, p < .01, such that, compared to equal power participants (M = 2.87, SD = 1.15), subordinates (M = 2.18, SD = .50) believed that their partner would allocate fewer tickets to them. The categorization by power interaction was not significant, F (1, 75) = .09, p = .76.

Analysis on the number of raffle tickets managers and equal power participants reported believing that they would allocate to their partner revealed that the categorization effect was not significant, F (1, 77) = .26, p = .61, such that correctly categorized and miscategorized managers and equal power participants believed that they would allocate similar numbers of raffle tickets to their partner. This analysis did indicate a marginal power role effect, F (1, 77) = 2.97, p = .09, such that, compared to equal power participants (M = 3.18, SD = 1.14), managers (M = 2.81, SD

= .71) believed that they would allocate marginally more raffle tickets to their partner. The power role by ethnic categorization interaction was not significant, F (1, 77) = .10, p = .76.

Discussion

Study 3 represents, to the best of my knowledge, the first study to investigate the impact of power on targets' responses to miscategorization. Results show that low power miscategorized participants expressed particularly high levels of negative affect. These findings suggest that low power targets find the experience of miscategorization to be particularly negative. This is consistent with previous research that examined the impact of power on responses to expressions of prejudice, where low power targets experience the greatest negative reaction to prejudice (Barreto, Ellemers, & Fiske, 2002). Results also show that categorization did not impact high power participants' levels of negative affect, and favorability towards their partner. This lack of a categorization effect for high power participants suggests that having high power may buffer targets from the negative consequences of miscategorization.

In addition to examining the impact of miscategorization and power on targets' attitudes towards their partner Study 3 also examined targets' trust in their partner and their perceived legitimacy of their partner's power. Results show that, compared to correctly categorized participants, miscategorized participants perceived the power of the perpetrator to be less legitimate and trusted the perpetrator less. Miscategorized participants who were of relatively low power largely drive these findings. These findings have implications for the real world, suggesting that high power individuals, if they want to be trusted and have their power viewed as legitimate, should avoid incorrectly categorizing their subordinates. One context in which this may take place would be when a law enforcement officer interacts with a minority and

categorizes the minority's ethnicity. Should the officer make an incorrect categorization, the minority would likely not trust the officer and not view the officer's power as legitimate.

While power influenced targets' responses in a number of outcomes, it did not impact targets' expression of identity assertion and distancing. Consistent with findings from previous research on miscategorization, miscategorized participants, compared to correctly categorized participants, in Study 3 reported greater identity assertion and similar levels of identity distancing. Miscategorized participants asserted their ingroup identity, and failed to distance themselves from the outgroup identity, regardless of their power role. Power may not have impacted targets' identity assertion, or distancing, because identity assertion and distancing were outcomes that did not pertain to the perpetrator. For outcomes that did pertain to the perpetrator, trust in partner and perceived legitimacy of partner's power, power did influence targets' responses. This suggests that interpersonal power differences in the experience of miscategorization likely affect outcomes associated with the perpetrator of the miscategorization but not outcomes associated with the targets' ingroup or the ascribed outgroup.

Categorization did not impact every outcome as I had predicted. Participants believed that similar amounts of raffle tickets would be allocated, were just as likely to want to participate in a future study with their partner, and perceived their own power to be similarly legitimate regardless of how they were categorized. The egalitarian norm likely washed out any effect that categorization may have had on the raffle ticket measures such that managers and equal status participants felt pressure to allocate similar amounts of tickets to their partner regardless of how the partner categorized them and that subordinates and equal power participants felt that their partner would be under similar pressure to allocate similar amounts of tickets to them regardless of how the partner categorized them. The desire to participate in a future study was likely too

severe of a measure to capture any difference due to categorization. While miscategorized, compared to correctly categorized, participants may have felt comfortable reporting that they were less favorable towards their partner, they may not have felt comfortable reporting that they would not want to participate in another study with their partner. Categorization may have impacted participants' perceptions of their partner's power but not their own power because how the partner categorizes the participants is likely only to impact perceptions of how deserving the partner is of the high power role but not the participants' power role; that is to say, the partner miscategorizing the participants calls into question the partner's leadership ability but it does not speak to the participants' leadership ability.

Study 4

Study 4 expands on Study 3 in a manner similar to how Study 2 expands on Study 1. First, similar to Study 2, Study 4 aims to replicate the preceding study in the domain of academic major. I predict that the effects of miscategorization and power would be similar in the domain of major as they are in the domain of ethnicity. Specifically, I predict that the experience of major miscategorization will lead to high levels of negative affect, low levels of favorability towards and liking of the perpetrator, and greater identity assertion. Moreover, consistent with Study 3, I predict that academic major miscategorization will impact participants' levels of trust, and perceived legitimacy of power. Also consistent with Study 3, for the outcomes associated with the perpetrator, the effects of miscategorization are predicted to be stronger for low power targets compared to high power targets.

Secondly, Study 4 also introduces participants' level of identity with their major as an additional independent variable. This allows us to examine how participants' academic major identity influences the relationship between miscategorization and power. Based on previous

research on ethnic miscategorization (Trujillo & Shelton, 2013) that found that participants' level of ethnic centrality affected miscategorized, but not correctly categorized, participants I predict that participants' academic major identity will affect miscategorized participants in Study 4. The effect of academic major identity on miscategorized participants is likely to be stronger for low power participants than high power participants. As found in Study 3, high power participants appeared to be buffered from the experience of miscategorization, thus their major identity is unlikely to affect their responses. Alternatively, Study 3 suggested that low power participants are particularly affected by miscategorization, thus their major identity is likely to play a particularly large role in their responses.

Lastly, Study 4, similar to Study 2, introduces the additional outcome measure of resource allocation. I predict that, consistent with Study 2, miscategorized participants, compared to correctly categorized participants, will allocate more resources to their ingroup and less to the target outgroup. I do not predict that power role will affect participants resource allocation given that, in Study 3, power role appeared to only impact outcomes associated with the perpetrator but not participants' ingroup or the target outgroup.

Method

Participants

Participants consisted of 86 undergraduates who participated in exchange for course credit or $8.

Procedure

The procedure for Study 4 was similar to that of Study 3 with a few differences. Study 4 utilized the same cover story from Study 3, in which participants signed up for a study ostensibly on first impression accuracy and group decisions that would involve the participants and a partner forming impressions of one another based on each other's picture. The cover story also

indicated that they would later complete a group decision task together. Similar to Study 3, participants completed a pre-experimental leadership assessment; this time, however, the leadership assessment in Study 4 included an additional measure of participants' academic major identity. Participants were randomly assigned the high power role of manager or the low power role of subordinate; unlike Study 3, there was no equal power role condition.

Upon entering the lab, and being assigned their power role, participants completed the first impression task used in Studies 1 and 3. The first impression task in Study 4 differed from those used in Studies 1 and 3 in that, depending on condition, it involved the correct categorization or miscategorization of participants' majors. Once participants completed the first impression task, the experimenter told participants that they were to then complete questions regarding their thoughts and reactions to their partner's impression of them. These questions consisted of measures of liking of their partner, attitude towards partner, affect, trust in their partner, perceived legitimacy of power role, and raffle ticket allocation.

Upon completion of these measures, the experimenter told participants that they were done with the first impression accuracy aspect of the study and that they will begin work on the group decision aspect of the study. The group decision would allegedly involve the participants and their partner interacting with one another on a task where they must decide how to best allocate Princeton's budget across its various academic departments. Participants were led to believe that Princeton was looking to reallocate its academic budget and that Princeton was interested in students' opinions about how to best execute the reallocation. The experimenter told participants that prior to the group decision task, participants and their partner must first complete an individual resource allocation task in which they would report what they believed to be the best way to allocate the budget amongst Princeton's academic departments. This

individual resource allocation task would allegedly be the same task that participants would be doing as a group with their partner. Once participants completed the individual resource allocation task, they then completed a measure of identity assertion. After completing this measure, the experimenter told the participants that the study was over and debriefed them.

Measures

Academic major identity. The academic major identity measure was the same as in Study 3 (M = 5.35, SD = .95).

Affect. The affect measure was the same as Study 3.

Attitude towards partner. The attitude towards partner measure was the same as Studies 1, 2, and 3.

Perceived legitimacy of power role. The perceived legitimacy of power role was the same as in Study 3.

Resource allocation. Participants reported how much, in percentage, of Princeton's budget they would allocate to 28 different majors. Of these items, participants reported what percentage of Princeton's budget they would allocate to their ingroup and a target outgroup major.

Raffle ticket allocation. The raffle ticket allocation measure was the same as in Study 3.

Trust of partner. The trust of partner measure was the same as in Study 3.

Liking of partner. The liking of partner measure was the same as in Study 3.

Identity assertion. Participants reported how much they agreed on three statements adapted from the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992) on a 7-point Likert scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree. The statements consist of: "I am active in organizations or social groups that contain mostly members of my major," "I like meeting and

getting to know people in my major," and "I participate in activities and events associated with my major." We created an aggregate identity assertion measure by averaging across the three items.

Results

Means and standard deviations for each dependent measure by categorization and status are presented in Table 4. Unless otherwise stated, we ran stepwise regression analyses to test the effects of categorization, power role, participants' major identity and their interactions on our dependent measures. The first step of the regression model included dummy codes for categorization, such that correct categorization is the reference, and for power role, such that subordinate is the reference. Step 1 also included a continuous measure of participants' major identity that was centered on the mean. Step 2 of the regression included the addition of the power by categorization, power by major identity, and categorization by major identity two-way interaction terms. Step 3 included the addition of the power by categorization by major identity three-way interaction term.

Attitude towards partner

Analysis for step 1 revealed a marginal categorization effect, $\beta = -.19$, $p = .08$, such that miscategorized (vs. correctly categorized) participants reported marginally less favorable attitudes towards their partner. Manager and subordinates reported similarly favorable attitudes towards their partner, $\beta = .09$, $p = .39$. The effect of academic major identity was also not significant, $\beta = .11$, $p = .32$, such that participants reported similarly favorable attitudes towards their partner regardless of their major identity. Analysis for step 2 revealed that the two-way interactions were not significant, ps $> .23$. The categorization by power role by major identity three-way interaction was also not significant, $\beta = .24$, $p = .25$.

Liking of partner

Analysis for step 1 revealed a significant categorization effect, β = -.24, p = .03, such that miscategorized (vs. correctly categorized) participants reported less likelihood that they would want to participate in a future study with their partner. The power role, β = -.07, and academic major identity effects, β = -.04, were not significant, ps > .51, such that participants reported similar likelihood that they would participate in a future study with their partner regardless of their power role or their academic major identity. Though analysis for step 2 indicated that the categorization by power role interaction was also not significant, β = .24, p = .19, I tested the a priori hypothesis that low power (vs. high power) targets would be particularly affected by miscategorization by testing the simple effect of categorization for managers and subordinates. This analysis revealed a significant categorization simple effect for subordinates, β = -.38, p = .01, such that, compared to correctly categorized subordinates, miscategorized subordinates reported less likelihood that they would want to participate in a future study with their partner. This analysis also revealed that the categorization simple effect was not significant for managers, β = -.09, p = .57. The power role by academic major identity, β = -.06, and categorization by academic major identity, β = .04, interactions were not significant, ps > .69. Analysis for step 3 indicated that the three-way interaction was also not significant, p > .24.

Affect

Analysis for step 1 for positive affect revealed a significant categorization effect, β = -.23, p = .03, such that miscategorized (vs. correctly categorized) participants reported less positive affect. The power role, β = .04, and major identity effects, β = -.01 were not significant, ps > .73, such that participants reported similar levels of positive affect regardless of their power

role or their major identity. Furthermore analysis for steps 2 and 3 revealed that the two-way and three-way interactions were also not significant, *p*s > .22.

Analysis for step 1 for negative affect revealed that the categorization effect, β = -.09, power role, β = .11, and academic major identity effects, β = .00, were not significant, such that participants reported similar levels of negative affect regardless of how they were categorized, their power role, or their academic major identity, *p*s > .30. Analysis for steps 2 and 3 also indicated that the two-way and three-way interactions were not significant, *p*s > .39.

Trust in partner

Analysis for step 1 revealed that the categorization effect was not significant, β = -.15, *p* = .18, such that miscategorized and correctly categorized participants trusted their partner equally. Analysis also revealed a marginal power role effect, β = .18, *p* = .10, such that managers (vs. subordinates) trusted in their partner more. The academic major identity effect was not significant, β = .04, *p* = .72, such that participants trusted their partner at similar levels regardless of their major identity. Analysis for step 2 indicated that the categorization by power role interaction was not significant, β = .19, *p* = .30, such that the effect of categorization was similar across power role. The power role by academic major identity, β = .00, and the categorization by major identity, β = .09, interactions were not significant, *p*s > .59. Analysis for step 3 revealed that the three-way interaction was not significant, β = .03, *p* = .88.

Perceived legitimacy of power role

Analysis for step 1 revealed that the categorization, β = -.06, *p* = .58, and academic major identity effects were not significant, β = .07, *p* = .49, such that participants perceived the role of manager to be similarly legitimate regardless of how they were categorized or their academic major identity. This analysis also revealed that the power role effect was not significant, β = -.16,

p = .14, such that managers perceptions of their own power role to be similarly legitimate to subordinates perceptions of their partner's power role. Analysis for steps 2 revealed that the categorization by power role, β = -.01, p = .94, and power role by major identity, β = -.01, p = .97, interactions were not significant. This analysis also indicated that the categorization by major identity interaction was not significant, β = -.22, p = .18. Analysis for step 3 also revealed that the categorization by power role by academic major identity three-way interaction was not significant, β = .23, p = .27.

Raffle ticket allocation

Analysis for step 1 revealed that the categorization, β = -.15, and academic major identity effects, β = .13, were not significant, such that participants believed that similar numbers of raffle tickets would be allocated regardless of how they were categorized or their academic major identity, ps > .17. This analysis also revealed a marginal power role effect, β = .20, p = .07, such that managers believed that they would allocate more raffle tickets to their partner than subordinates believed their partner would allocate to them. Analysis for steps 2 and 3 revealed that the two-way and the three-way interactions were not significant, ps > .12.

Identity assertion

Analysis for step 1 revealed that the categorization, β = -.17, power role, β = -.10, and academic major identity effects, β = .04, ps > .12, were not significant, such that participants asserted their ingroup identity at similar levels regardless of how they were categorized, their power role, or their major identity. Analysis for steps 2 and 3 also indicated that the two-way and three-way interactions were not significant, ps > .36.

Ingroup major resource allocation

Analysis for step 1 of the regression revealed that the categorization effect was not significant, β = .15, p = .18, such that miscategorized and correctly categorized participants allocated similar percentages of Princeton's budget to their ingroup major. Moreover, both managers and subordinates allocated a similar amount of Princeton's budget to their ingroup major, β = -.07, p = .55. Participants' level of academic major identity did not impact the percentage of Princeton's budget that they allocated to their ingroup major, β = -.01, p = .94. Analysis for steps 2 and 3 revealed that the two-way and three-way interactions were not significant, ps > .10.

Outgroup resource allocation

Analysis for step 1 revealed that the categorization, β = -.01, power role, β = -.02, and academic major identity effects, β = -.03, ps > .82, were not significant, such that participants allocated similar amounts of Princeton's budget to the outgroup major regardless of how they were categorized, their power role, or their major identity. Analysis for steps 2 and 3 also indicated that the two-way and three-way interaction effects were non-significant, ps > .32.

Discussion

Findings from Study 4 were largely inconclusive. However, consistent with the previous studies, miscategorized targets in Study 4 expressed low levels of favorability towards and liking of the perpetrator. Interestingly, miscategorized, compared to correctly categorized, participants experienced lower levels of positive affect but not higher levels of negative affect. This finding is consistent with those from Study 2 but is the mirror image of those from Studies 1 and 3 where miscategorized participants reported higher levels of negative affect but not lower levels of positive affect. The results pertaining to affect in Studies 1 and 3 mirroring those from 2 and 4 may be an artifact of the identities miscategorized in the studies.

In Studies 1 and 3 participants had their ethnic identity, an identity that is likely to be important to participants' self-concepts, miscategorized whereas in Studies 2 and 4 participants had their major identity, an identity that is likely to be of less importance to participants' self-concept, miscategorized. Thus, it appears that when individuals have an identity of high importance to their self-concepts miscategorized, they experience increases in negative affect; however, when individuals have an identity of lesser importance to their self-concepts miscategorized, they experience decreases in positive affect.

Inconsistent with previous studies, categorization did not impact identity assertion, trust in partner, and perceived legitimacy of power in Study 4. This inconsistency with the categorization effect may also be an artifact of the identity that was miscategorized. In Study 4, targets had their academic major identity miscategorized, as opposed to their ethnic identity, and targets' academic major, compared to their ethnicity, is less likely to be an important part of their self-concept. As such, the effect of having their academic major, as opposed to their ethnicity, miscategorized is likely to have less of an impact on targets. Given these inconsistencies, it is important to further investigate whether the effects of miscategorization vary across identities with other identities that may have a greater importance to targets' self-concepts, such as religion, or sexuality. The lack of an effect of categorization on identity assertion also occurred in Study 2. Both Studies 2 and 4 measure identity assertion using explicit self-report items whereas Studies 1 and 3 measure assertion more implicitly with the product preference task. It is possible that the effect of categorization on identity assertion may only be detectable using more subtle measures.

Much like the effect of categorization, the findings on the effect of power role on targets' responses to miscategorization were largely inconclusive in Study 4. Findings from Study 4

indicate that low power, compared to high power, targets express greater likelihood of wanting to participate in a future study with the perpetrator. Unlike Study 3, power did not impact participants' favorability towards the perpetrator. Moreover, power did not influence participants' reactions to miscategorization in the domains of trust in the perpetrator and perceived legitimacy of power role. One potential reason why power did not influence targets' response to miscategorization in Study 4 as much as in Study 3 is that the miscategorization in Study 4 may not have been substantial enough to be influenced. Power cannot impact how participants' respond to miscategorization if participants do not respond to miscategorization in the first place.

Similar to Study 2, Study 4 finds that the influence of major identity on the relationship between categorization and power role is largely inconsistent. This may be due to the fact that participants' major identity may not be an important part of their self-concept. Previous research on miscategorization that showed targets' level of identity impact their reactions to miscategorization did so with ethnic identity, which has been shown to be an important identity to individuals' self-concepts. While Study 4 measured how much participants' identified with their major, it is likely that their major identity is qualitatively different from other identities that may be more important to their self-concept. Participants may report that they highly identify with their major but this level of identity is likely to still be less than participants' level of identity with their ethnicity, gender, etc. Thus it is important to further test how targets' level of identity interacts with how they are categorized and their level of power with identities that may be of greater import than major.

General Discussion

One primary aim of this dissertation is to examine how intergroup status affects targets' responses to miscategorization. Findings from Study 1 indicate that participants who are miscategorized as members of a low status (vs. high status and control) group reported greater distancing from the ascribed identity and less favorable outgroup attitudes. The reactions of participants in Study 1 who are miscategorized as members of a low status group are similar to the reactions of participants under value threat (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999). The findings from Study 1 suggest that being miscategorized as a member of a low status group may elicit value threat in addition to categorization threat, which may lead to outgroup distancing and derogation.

Another primary aim is to investigate how interpersonal power impacts targets' reactions to miscategorization. Findings from Study 3 indicate that low power participants experience high levels of negative affect, low levels of favorability towards the perpetrator, low trust in their partner, and low perceptions of the legitimacy of their partner's power role when miscategorized. Alternatively, high power participants' favorability towards their partner, negative affect, and trust in their partner were not affected by how they were categorized. The findings from Study 3 suggest that low power targets of miscategorization may experience high levels of threat, and thus have particularly strong reactions to miscategorization, while high power targets may be buffered from the threat of miscategorization. One potential reason for the power differences in targets' response to miscategorization may be due to differences in the attention (Fiske, 1993). Future research should test whether differences in attention account for the power differences in responses to miscategorization.

Interestingly, the influence of group status and interpersonal power on targets' reactions to miscategorization in Studies 1 and 3 appears to be domain specific such that group status

impacts targets' responses in domains that pertain to the ascribed group whereas interpersonal power impacts targets' responses in domains that pertain to the perpetrator. This suggests that, compared to the absence of any relative group status differences, the existence of relative group status differences makes the ascribed group more salient to miscategorized targets. Similarly, compared to the absence of any relative interpersonal power differences, the presence of relative interpersonal status differences makes the perpetrator more salient to miscategorized targets.

Findings from Studies 1 and 3 also provide further insight into the consequences of miscategorization on intergroup and interpersonal outcomes. These findings show that the experience of miscategorization leads to derogation of the ascribed group, less resource allocation to the ascribed group, lower perceptions of legitimacy of the perpetrator, and less trust in the perpetrator. These findings suggest that the experience of miscategorization, while subtle, may have tangible consequences for targets' relations to others. Moreover, these findings provide support for the continued study of micro-aggressions.

While the findings for Studies 1 and 3 were consistent with my predictions, findings from Studies 2 and 4 were largely inconclusive. Studies 2 and 4 were designed, in part, to replicate Studies 1 and 3, respectively, outside the domain of ethnicity – academic major. However, Studies 2 and 4 largely failed to replicate Studies 1 and 3 such that the categorization effect in Studies 2 and 4 failed to reach significance for many of the dependent measures. One potential reason that the categorization effect did not reach significance may be that academic major was not central to the participants' self-concepts. Social Identity Theory claims that individuals will be affected by social identity threat only insofar as they strongly identify with their social group (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Studies 2 and 4 also involved measures of participants' strength of identity though these measures did not consistently affect participants' reactions to

miscategorization. The previous research that finds that strength of identity affects targets' reactions to miscategorization did so in the domain of ethnic identity (Trujillo & Shelton, 2013). This combined with the lack of an effect of strength of identity in Studies 2 and 4 suggest that strength of identity may only influence targets' reactions to miscategorization when the identity being miscategorized is a central identity. Moreover, should the discrepancies between Studies 1 and 3 and Studies 2 and 4 be due to the identities that were miscategorized, then this would suggest that targets are likely to respond to miscategorization particularly when a central identity (e.g. ethnicity, sexuality) is miscategorized. When a non-central identity is miscategorized, participants may have a subdued response, if any response at all. Further research on targets reactions to miscategorization in domains outside of ethnicity and academic major to better determine the role that the type of miscategorized identity plays in targets' responses.

Limitations and future directions

One of the major limitations of this dissertation is that the studies examining ethnic miscategorization used samples that consisted of only Asian and Latino participants. This limits my ability to generalize the findings of these studies to individuals of other ethnicities. While it is likely the case that Asian and Latino individuals do not have unique response to ethnic miscategorization, my studies are unable to confirm that empirically. There is some reason to believe that Asians and Latinos may respond to miscategorization differently than individuals from other ethnic groups. One potential reason may be that Asians and Latinos are more likely to have immigrated to the U.S. than other groups and, as a result, their ethnic identity may be of particular importance to them, relative to groups who immigrated to the U.S. earlier.

There are a number of future directions to take in the study of miscategorization. One possible direction would be to examine how the group membership of the perpetrator impacts

targets' responses to miscategorization. All of the studies in this dissertation examine the experience of miscategorization perpetrated from an outgroup member. It would be interesting to examine if – and if so, how – targets respond to miscategorization differently when the miscategorization is perpetrated by an ingroup member, a member of the incorrectly ascribed group, or a member of a third party outgroup. The experience of miscategorization perpetrated by an ingroup member may be particularly negative because it may elicit social identity acceptance threat (Barreto, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999), the threat associated with the challenge of one's membership in a valued group, in addition to categorization threat. Targets' of miscategorization are less likely to attribute miscategorization perpetrated by a member of the erroneously ascribed group, compared to a member of some third party outgroup, to prejudice, thus, are less likely to find miscategorization perpetrated by a member of the erroneously ascribed group aversive.

Another potentially fruitful future direction for the study of miscategorization is the examination of the consequences of miscategorization over time. Findings from this dissertation suggest that targets' resist the incorrect categorization in an insolated context. It is possible that targets' may begin to internalize the miscategorization should the miscategorization occur repeatedly over time. Moreover, examining the effects of miscategorization over time will provide insight into how lasting these effects are. Specifically, a longitudinal study of miscategorization will be able to determine if the effects of miscategorization deteriorate shortly after the immediate experience or exist over a long period of time.

Conclusion

This dissertation suggests that targets of miscategorization who are miscategorized as members of a low status group or who are low power have particularly strong reactions to

miscategorization, for intergroup and interpersonal outcomes respectively. It also suggests that targets of miscategorization who are high power are buffered from the experience of miscategorization. Moreover, targets are likely to react to miscategorization when the identity that is miscategorized is a central identity (e.g. ethnicity) but not a secondary identity (e.g. academic major). These findings are consistent with the notion that miscategorization of central identities elicits categorization threat and that certain factors (e.g. intergroup status) may elicit additional threat and that certain factors (e.g. interpersonal power) may exacerbate or dampen the threat associated with miscategorization.

References

Adler, N.E., Epel, E.S., Castellazzo, G., & Ickovics, J.R. (2000). Relationship of subjective and objective social status with psychological and physiological functioning: Preliminary data in healthy, White women. *Health Psychology, 19,* 586-592.

Anderson, C., & Berdahl, J.L. (2002). The experience of power: Examining the effects of power on approach and inhibition tendencies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 1362-1377.

Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2002). The impact of respect versus neglect of self-identities on identification and group loyalty. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 629-639.

Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2003). The effects of being categorized: The interplay between internal and external social identities. *European Review of Social Psychology, 14,* 139-170.

Barreto, M., Ellemers, N., & Fiske, S., (2010). "What did you say, and who do you think you are?": How power differences affect emotional reactions to prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues, 66,* 477-492.

Barreto, M., Ellemers, N., Scholten, W., & Smith, H. (2010). To be or not to be: The impact of implicit vs. explicit inappropriate social categorizations of the self. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 49, 43-67.

Bosson, J. K., Prewitt-Freilino, J. L., & Taylor, J. N. (2005). Role rigidity: A problem of identity misclassification? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89, 552-565.

Bosson, J. K., Taylor, J. N., & Prewitt- Freilino, J. L. (2006). Gender role violations and identity misclassification: The roles of audience and actor variables. Sex Roles, 55, 13- 24.

Branscombe, N. R., Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1999). The context and content of social identity threat. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social Identity: Context, Commitment, Content.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Cheryan, S., & Monin, B. (2005). "Where are you really from?": Asian Americans and identity denial. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89,* 717-730.

Dovidio, J. F., Major, B., & Crocker, J. (2000). Stigma: Introduction and overview. In T. F. Heatherton, R. E. Kleck, M. R. Hebl, & J. G. Hull (Eds.) *The social psychology of stigma* (pp. 1-28) New York: Guilford Press.

Eber, R., & Fiske, S. T. (1984). Outcome dependency and attention to inconsistent information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 47, 709-726.

Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (Eds.). (1999). Social identity. Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Galinsky, A. D., Magee, J. C., Inesi, M. E., Gruenfeld, D. H. (2006). Power and perspectives not taken. *Psychological Science,* 17, 1068-1074.

Finchelescu, G. (1986). Effect of incompatibility between internal and external group membership criteria on intergroup behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 16,* 83-87.

Fiske, S. T. (1993). Controlling other people: The impact of power on stereotyping. *American Psychologist*, 48, 621-628.

Fiske, S. T. (2010a). Interpersonal stratification: Status, power, and subordination. In Fiske, S. T., Gilbert D. T., Lindzey G. (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (5th ed., pp 941-982). New York, NY: Wiley.

Fiske, S. T. (2010b). *Social Beings: Core Social Motives in Social Psychology.* Hoboken, NJ Wiley.

Flores, N.M., & Huo, Y.J. (2012). Asians and Latinos are not all alike: consequences of (mis)categorizing national origin identities. *Social Psychological and Personality Science.* Advance online publication. doi: 10.1177/1948550612449025

Folkman, S. & Lazarus, R.S. (1985). If it changes it must be a process: Study of emotion and coping during three stages of a college examination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48*, 150-170.

Huo, Y.J., Molina, L.E. (2006). Is pluralism a viable model of diversity? The benefits and limits of subgroup respect. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 9,* 359-376.

Jost, J.T., & Burgess, D. (2000). Attitudinal ambivalence and the conflict between group and system justification motives in low status groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26,* 293-305.

Keltner, D., & Robinson, R. J. (1997). Defending the status quo: Power and bias in social conflict. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* 23, 1066-1077.

Kraus, M.W., Piff, P.K., & Keltner, D. (2009) Social class, sense of control, and social explanation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97,* 992-1004.

Major, B. (1994). From social inequality to personal entitlement: The role of social comparison, legitimacy appraisals, and group membership. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 26 pp. 293-355). New York: Academic Press.

Neuberg, S. L., & Fiske, S. T. (1987). Motivational influences on impression formation: Outcome dependency, accuracy-driven attention, and individuating processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 431-444.

Phinney, J. S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7,* 156-176.

Prewitt-Freilino, J. L., & Bosson, J. K. (2008). Defending the self against identity misclassification. *Self and Identity*, 7, 168- 183.

Rusher, J. B., & Fiske, S. T. (1990). Interpersonal competition can cause individuating processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 58, 832-843.

Rusher, J. B., Fiske, S. T., Miki, H., & Van Manen, S. (1991). Individuating processes in competition: Interpersonal versus intergroup. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17, 595-605.

Swann, W. B., Jr. (1990) To be adored or to be known?: The interplay of self-enhancement and self-verification. In E. T. Higgins & R. M. Sorrentino (Eds.) *Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behavior* (Vol. 2, 408-448). New York: Guilford Press.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), The social psychology of intergroup relations (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Townsend, S. S. M., Markus, H. R., & Bergsieker, H. B. (2009). My choice, your categorized:

The denial of multiracial identities. *Journal of Social Issues*, 65, 185-204.

Trujillo, M. D., & Shelton, J. N. (2013). "I thought you were Japanese": The effects of ethnic miscategorization on identity assertion. Unpublished manuscript.

Tyler, T.R. (1990). *Why people obey the law.* New Haven: Yale.

Watson, D., Clark L. A., & Tellegen, A., (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063-1070.

Woike, B. A. (1994). The use of differential and integration processes: Empirical studies of "separate" and "connected" ways of thinking. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 142-150.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations by Categorization and Status Prime Condition for Study 1

	Correct categorization			Miscategorization		
Measure	Low status	No prime	High status	Low status	No prime	High status
Attitude towards ingroup	68.04_{a} (20.00)	66.48_{a} (16.62)	69.14_{a} (12.44)	71.86_{a} (13.87)	70.43_{a} (16.67)	75.95_{a} (6.24)
Attitude towards outgroup	69.05_{ab} (20.91)	73.48_{a} (10.96)	68.05_{ab} (7.68)	72.33_{a} (14.57)	68.95_{ab} (13.54)	57.77_{b} (15.93)
Attitude towards partner	76.43_{ab} (11.86)	78.19_{a} (9.47)	76.24_{ab} (10.19)	69.76_{ab} (9.44)	71.19_{ab} (11.86)	68.05_{b} (9.58)
Support for interethnic interaction	6.07_{a} (1.00)	5.64_{a} (.88)	5.76_{a} (1.02)	6.14_{a} (0.59)	5.79_{a} (0.64)	5.63_{a} (0.83)
Positive affect	5.26_{a} (1.89)	5.56_{a} (1.98)	5.32_{a} (1.85)	4.89_{a} (1.99)	5.30_{a} (1.58)	5.56_{a} (1.89)
Negative affect	2.07_{a} (1.00)	2.17_{a} (1.12)	2.58_{a} (0.95)	2.29_{a} (1.12)	2.88_{a} (1.52)	2.98_{a} (1.24)
Ingroup products	3.34_{b} (.69)	3.33_{b} (0.55)	3.61_{ab} (0.80)	3.95_{ab} (0.77)	4.05_{a} (0.73)	4.02_{a} (0.73)
Outgroup products	3.53_{a} (.65)	3.52_{a} (0.63)	3.50_{a} (0.70)	3.74_{a} (0.65)	3.42_{ab} (0.72)	2.86_{b} (0.59)
Neutral products	3.59_{a} (.60)	3.61_{a} (0.85)	3.67_{a} (0.69)	3.82_{a} (0.75)	3.53_{a} (0.79)	3.52_{a} (0.66)

Note. Standard deviations are presented in parentheses. Means with different subscripts within each row are significantly different from one another at $\alpha = .05$ with a Bonferroni correction for multiple pairwise comparisons.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations by Categorization and Status Prime Condition for Study 2

	Correct categorization		Miscategorization		Identity denial	
Measure	Low status	High status	Low status	High status	Low status	High status
Positive affect	3.74_{a} (1.07)	3.63_{ab} (1.45)	2.64_{b} (1.15)	3.09_{a} (1.40)	2.86_{ab} (0.93)	3.19_{ab} (1.28)
Log negative affect	0.21_{a} (0.18)	0.23_{a} (0.23)	0.28_{a} (0.26)	0.30_{a} (0.23)	0.22_{a} (0.16)	0.27_{a} (0.20)
Attitude towards student	59.12_{a} (24.32)	62.91_{a} (23.09)	51.67_{a} (21.50)	56.76_{a} (19.80)	49.91_{a} (22.42)	55.00_{a} (20.78)
Attitude towards ingroup	28.69_{a} (15.64)	20.31_{a} (15.75)	21.96_{a} (20.72)	18.74_{a} (28.75)	26.30_{a} (18.43)	21.92_{a} (26.55)
Attitude towards outgroup	6.45_{a} (18.03)	6.88_{a} (18.57)	1.73_{a} (22.82)	0.87_{a} (26.03)	10.12_{a} (22.41)	9.15_{a} (25.42)
Identity assertion	3.86_{ab} (1.14)	3.93_{ab} (1.24)	3.82_{ab} (1.11)	3.53_{ab} (0.93)	4.32_{a} (1.03)	3.38_{b} (0.93)
Identity distancing	5.20_{a} (0.89	4.98_{a} (1.07)	5.04_{a} (0.79)	4.86_{a} (1.03)	4.88_{a} (0.86)	4.81_{a} (0.75)
Ingroup resource allocation	8.16_{a} (5.65)	7.87_{a} (5.07)	8.33_{a} (5.73)	11.17_{a} (7.92)	12.77_{a} (8.31)	9.35_{a} (7.39)
Outgroup resource allocation	4.44_{a} (2.58)	5.09_{a} (3.83)	3.75_{a} (2.56)	4.31_{a} (3.10)	4.14_{a} (3.14)	6.42_{a} (4.62)

Note. Standard deviations are presented in parentheses. Means with different subscripts within each row are significantly different from one another at $\alpha = .05$ with a Bonferroni correction for multiple pairwise comparisons.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations by Categorization by Participants' Power Role Condition for Study 3

	Correct categorization			Miscategorization		
Measure	Low power	Equal power	High power	Low power	Equal power	High power
Attitude towards partner	76.68_{a} (9.60)	80.74_{a} (8.87)	76.23_{ab} (13.34)	66.57_{b} (12.02)	72.70_{ab} (12.59)	75.30_{ab} (11.16)
Liking of partner	4.63_{a} (1.26)	5.11_{a} (0.81)	5.09_{a} (1.11)	4.48_{a} (1.17)	4.90_{a} (1.17)	5.05_{a} (0.83)
Positive affect	3.69_{a} (1.26)	4.17_{a} (1.04)	4.01_{a} (1.26)	3.88_{a} (1.23)	3.81_{a} (0.89)	3.83_{a} (1.07)
Negative affect	2.14_{ab} (0.94)	1.75_{a} (0.94)	2.13_{ab} (1.06)	2.95_{b} (1.09)	2.34_{ab} (0.78)	1.80_{a} (0.80)
Trust partner	5.49_{ab} (0.62)	5.37_{ab} (0.58)	5.06_{ab} (0.52)	5.08_{ab} (0.70)	4.83_{b} (0.69)	5.10_{ab} (.65)
Perceived partner legitimacy	5.51_{ab} (1.01)	5.79_{a} (1.12)	-	4.79_{b} (1.03)	5.47_{ab} (1.02)	-
Perceived self legitimacy	-	5.37_{a} (1.01)	5.61_{a} (0.94)	-	5.02_{a} (1.01)	5.78_{a} (1.10)
Partner raffle ticket allocation	2.26_{ab} (0.45)	2.89_{a} (1.05)	-	2.10_{b} (0.54)	2.85_{a} (1.27)	-
Self raffle ticket allocation	-	3.16_{a} (1.21)	2.73_{a} (0.55)	-	3.20a (1.11)	2.90_{a} (0.85)
Ingroup products	3.38_{a} (1.08)	3.79_{ab} (0.94)	3.85_{ab} (0.97)	4.25_{ab} (0.83)	4.20_{ab} (0.96)	4.37_{b} (0.92)
Outgroup products	3.95_{a} (1.07)	3.41_{a} (1.24)	3.67_{a} (1.07)	3.68_{a} (0.95)	3.85_{a} (0.91)	3.56_{a} (1.03)
Neutral products	3.10_{a} (0.93)	3.30_{a} (0.76)	3.48_{a} (0.68)	3.42_{a} (0.92)	3.67_{a} (0.71)	3.50_{a} (0.59)

Note. Standard deviations are presented in parentheses. Means with different subscripts within each row are significantly different from one another at $\alpha = .05$ with a Bonferroni correction for multiple pairwise comparisons. Dashes indicate that participants in that cell did not complete the given measure.

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations by Categorization and Participants' Power Role Condition for Study 4

	Correct categorization		Miscategorization	
Measure	Low power	High power	Low power	High power
Attitude towards partner	80.82 (14.62)	82.81 (9.31)	76.13 (13.27)	78.10 (9.16)
Future study with partner	5.55 (1.26)	5.10 (1.00)	4.74 (0.96)	4.90 (0.97)
Positive Affect	4.25 (0.86)	4.62 (0.98)	4.03 (1.37)	3.81 (0.90)
Negative Affect	2.31 (1.10)	2.65 (1.12)	2.18 (1.12)	2.35 (1.21)
Trust partner	5.38 (0.75)	5.49 (0.70)	5.00 (0.84)	5.44 (0.73)
Perceived manager legitimacy	5.15 (1.45)	4.68 (1.49)	4.96 (1.28)	4.53 (1.12)
Raffle ticket allocation	2.55 (0.96)	2.86 (0.79)	2.30 (.77)	2.60 (0.68)
Identity assertion	4.48 (1.02)	4.40 (1.38)	4.22 (1.25)	3.83 (1.08)
Ingroup resource allocation	5.45 (2.54)	6.00 (5.35)	7.61 (3.58)	6.05 (3.63)
Outgroup resource allocation	3.86 (4.42)	3.90 (2.47)	4.00 (4.01)	3.70 (3.08)

Note. Standard deviations are presented in parentheses. No means within the same row were significantly different from one another at the $\alpha = .05$ level with a Bonferroni correctly for multiple comparisons.