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Abstract

Although data suggests that a sense of shared social identity can contribute positively to psychological well-being for members of disadvantaged groups, little research has directly investigated the mechanisms involved in this relationship. In this study I test the ability of group identification to foster group-based engagement coping options (i.e., collective action, emotional expression, ingroup social support) that should promote well-being. I also tested the ability of identification to deter group-based disengagement coping options (i.e., avoidance, individual mobility, ingroup blame) that should harm well-being. These mediational processes were examined with samples of women, Blacks, gay people (gay men and lesbians) and deaf people. Supporting prior research, across the four samples higher group identification was associated with greater self-esteem and life satisfaction. Each coping option was found to be a mediator to varying degrees across the four samples. However, for gay people and Blacks more coping options mediated the relationship of identification with both self-esteem and life satisfaction. As a whole, the mediational results suggest that identification promotes well-being, in part, because it encourages group-based beliefs about engaging with discrimination and discourages group-based beliefs about disengaging from discrimination. Group differences in both the endorsement of coping options and the coping options that best accounted for the relationship between group identification and well-being are discussed in terms of politicized collective identities and concealability.
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Introduction

Members of disadvantaged groups (e.g., racial minorities, women, the physically disabled, sexual minorities) report experiencing negative treatment frequently across a wide variety of important life domains including housing, employment, education, medical care, banking as well as treatment in the criminal justice system (Bryan, 1996; Burgess, Yingmei, Hargreaves, van Ryn, & Phelan, 2008; Devah & Shepherd, 2008; Garnets & Kimmel, 2003; Moradi & DeBlaere, 2010; Wortley, 1996). Discrimination is a stressor because it threatens an individual’s sense of control by reminding them that at times, they might be relatively powerless. Discrimination is particularly stressful when it reflects pervasive devaluation and rejection on the basis of their group membership (Miller & Kaiser, 2001; Schmitt & Branscombe, 2002). Perceived discrimination has been linked to chronic physical health conditions (Finch, Hummer, Kolody, & Vega, 2001), depression (Finch, Kolody, & Vega, 2000; Noh & Kaspar, 2003), distress and anxiety (Kessler, Mickelson, & Williams, 1999; Szymanski & Owens, 2009), life satisfaction (Liebkind & Jaskinska-Lahti, 2000; Ying, 1996) and low self-esteem (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999; Verkuyten, 1998). Similar effects on self-esteem have been observed in studies employing experimental manipulations of disadvantage (e.g., Branscombe, 1998; Schmitt, Branscombe, & Postmes, 2003). A recent meta-analysis on the relationship between perceived discrimination and health (Pascoe & Richman, 2009) found that greater perceived discrimination was associated with heightened stress responses and poorer mental and physical health more generally. Thus in addition to the general stressors that are experienced by all people, members of disadvantaged groups often have to try to cope with the additional stress associated with being, or the anticipation of being, the target of discrimination on a day-to-day basis (Meyer, 2003).

Despite the negative consequences that discrimination can have on members of disadvantaged groups, there are ways in which members of these groups manage to cope effectively with discrimination (Clark, Anderson, & Williams, 1999; Crocker & Major, 1989). Like other stressors, the consequences of perceived discrimination are in part
determined by individuals’ appraisals of their options for coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Park & Folkman, 1997). Within the general stress and coping literature appraisals of coping options are typically conceptualised as beliefs about what one can do as an individual to cope with their particular circumstances (e.g., Compas, Connor-Smith, Saltzman, Thomsen, & Wadsworth, 2001; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). In contrast, perspectives on coping rooted in social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and self-categorization theories (Turner, Oakes, Haslam, & McGarty, 1994) argue that a sense of collective identity can affect coping processes as well as one’s psychological and physical health outcomes (see Haslam & Reicher, 2006; Schmitt & Branscombe, 2002). Research stemming from these perspectives has found that group identification can protect individuals from the negative effects of potential stressors (e.g., Branscombe, et al. 1999), and that group identification can foster beliefs that one can cope effectively with the help of one’s ingroup. And in turn, the endorsement of group-based coping options has implications for psychological well-being (Outten et al., 2009; Outten & Schmitt, 2012; for similar ideas also see Meyer, 2003).

Recent research (Outten et al., 2009) suggests that group-based coping options that engage with discrimination (e.g., collective action) can promote psychological well-being, and mediate the positive effect of group identification on well-being. However, members of disadvantaged groups sometimes attempt to cope with discrimination by disengaging from discrimination (e.g., individual mobility; Tajfel & Turner, 1978), yet researchers have yet to examine how group-based coping options that disengage with discrimination are related to either group identification or psychological well-being. The primary purpose of this investigation is test whether several group-based coping options mediate the relationship between group identification and well-being. The group-based coping options that will be tested are derived from strategies that members of disadvantaged groups report using to cope with discrimination. They not only include group-based coping options that engage with discrimination (collective action, ingroup social support, emotional expression) but also group-based coping options that disengage from or minimize discrimination (avoidance, individual mobility, ingroup blame). Whereas engagement coping options should be fostered by group identification and promote well-being, disengagement coping options are likely deterred by group identification and should undermine well-being. To examine the generalizability of these
mediational processes, I sampled four historically disadvantaged groups—women, Blacks, gay people (gay men and lesbians), and deaf people.

**Coping: The Importance of the Cognitive Appraisal Process**

Stress by definition occurs when demands placed upon an individual exceed or tax an individual's coping resources (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Therefore, stress involves cognitive appraisals about the seriousness of the demand as well as the options that the individual has to cope with a particular stressor. If a stressor is evaluated as stressful or threatening to the self (primary appraisals)—then coping options are considered (secondary appraisals; Slavin, Rainer, McCreary, & Gowda, 1991). It is the second part of this process—the consideration of options for coping—that is the focus of this investigation. Coping options are beliefs about what can be done to cope effectively with a stressor (Chesney, Neilands, Chambers, Taylor, & Folkman, 2006; Lazarus, 1991; Rogers, 1975; Rogers & Prentice-Dunn, 1997; Zohar & Dayan, 1999). For example, “I can laugh off this instance of discrimination” would be an appraisal of a particular coping option in response to discrimination. Only after an individual has considered coping options that are relevant to the stressor does he or she begin to implement cognitive or behavioural strategies that constitute the coping strategies. People’s appraisals of coping options are highly predictive of the actual coping strategies they use (e.g., Seydel, Taal & Wiegman, 1990; Wurtele & Maddux, 1987). For example, believing that one can successfully engage in diabetic self-care behaviours is associated with actual dieting, exercise and blood glucose testing (Williams & Bond, 2002). Furthermore, it is also worth noting that people’s appraisals of coping options can have effects on well-being that are independent of the coping strategies they encourage (e.g., Chesney et al., 2006; Cicognani, Pietrantoni, Palestini, & Prati, 2009; Jonker, Comijs, Knipscheer, & Deeg, 2010). For instance, research on coping among HIV positive men suggests that simply knowing that coping options are available (e.g., believing that you can get friends to help you with things you need) can be protective of psychological well-being even if they are not actually used (Chesney et al., 2006).
Current Research on Coping with Discrimination

Given the abundance of evidence suggesting that perceived discrimination is a pervasive source of stress for members of disadvantaged groups, it is not surprising that researchers have begun to examine which types of coping strategies can protect individuals from the negative effects of discrimination. The bulk of this research has focused on the experiences of racial minorities (e.g., Barnes & Lightsey, 2005; Noh & Kaspar, 2003; Yoo & Lee, 2005). Studies examining the relationship between the use of coping strategies in response to discrimination and psychological well-being tend to use stress and coping theory as their theoretical framework (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). As such, predictions from these investigations have been guided by the assumption that coping responses (coping options and the resultant coping strategies) can be distinguished by the degree to which they engage (approach) versus disengage (avoid) a stressor. Engagement responses are directed towards a stressor and involve attempts to change the stressful situation or one's reactions to it (e.g., confronting people who discriminate against them or seeking support from friends in response to discrimination). Disengagement responses on the other hand are oriented away from the stressor and include avoidance (e.g., physically avoiding people or places in an effort to face less discrimination or consciously trying not to think about discrimination). Research on the adaptiveness of different coping responses suggests that in general engagement responses have a better track record of promoting well-being than disengagement responses (Connor-Smith, Compas, Wadsworth, Thomsen, & Saltzman, 2000).

The few studies that have examined the relationship between coping strategies in response to the specific stressor of discrimination and well-being have also found some support for the idea that engagement responses tend to promote well-being, whereas disengagement responses tend to harm well-being. For example, Barnes and Lightsey (2005) examined the relationship between coping strategy endorsement in response to discrimination and psychological well-being among Black Americans. The coping strategies varied in terms of whether they engaged with discrimination (i.e., problem-solving) or disengaged from discrimination (i.e., physical avoidance). What they found was that problem-solving was associated with decreased stress, whereas avoidance was associated with increased stress.
While findings such as this suggest that the use of engagement responses as a whole might be more beneficial for psychological well-being than disengagement responses, these studies ignore group-based methods of coping with discrimination. For example, members of disadvantaged groups report engaging in collective action (e.g., Rim, 2006) and trying to seek social support specifically from their ingroup members as ways of coping with discrimination (e.g., McDavitt, Iverson, Kubicek, Weiss, Wong, & Kipke, 2008). Coping responses that involve the ingroup are not considered in research rooted in stress and coping theory (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). In contrast, social identity and self-categorization-based perspectives on stress and coping suggest that individuals might also consider more collective or group-based options for coping (Haslam, 2004; Haslam & Reicher, 2006; Outten et al., 2009). According to self-categorization theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987) defining the self in terms of one’s group membership (i.e., “we”) is just as valid psychologically as defining the self in personal terms (i.e., “I”). Because group-based disadvantage is a stressor that is shared with other ingroup members, the appraisal of coping options at a group level of identity, like those at an individual level identity, should have consequences for well-being.

**Group Identification and Psychological Well-being**

Identifying with one’s group can be a coping resource for members of disadvantaged groups who experience pervasive discrimination. When a disadvantaged group member feels devalued by a higher status group, psychologically investing more in one’s disadvantaged group can have positive consequences for well-being (Schmitt & Branscombe, 2002). Indeed, the positive association between group identification and well-being has been found with a variety of disadvantaged groups including: women (Schmitt, Bransome, Kobrynowicz, & Owen, 2002), the elderly (Garstka, Schmitt, Branscombe, & Hummert, 2004), deaf people (Jambor & Elliott, 2005), international students (Schmitt, Spears, & Branscombe, 2003), linguistic minorities (Gaudet & Clément, 2005), sexual minorities (Kertzner, Meyer, Frost, & Stirratt, 2009) and several racial and ethnic minority groups (Branscombe et al., 1999; Mossakowski, 2003; Outten et al., 2009; Romero & Roberts, 2003). Additionally, a recent meta-analysis (Smith & Silva, 2011) found that ethnic identification was strongly related to positive well-being among people of colour, regardless of participant race, gender, or socioeconomic status.
Using concepts from SIT & SCT my colleagues and I have argued that a sense of shared group membership should influence appraisals of coping options (secondary appraisal) in response to discrimination for members of disadvantaged groups. If one’s group membership can serve as a coping resource (Major & O’Brien, 2005; Meyer, 2003; Tajfel, 1978), then psychologically investing in one’s disadvantaged group should affect whether an individual considers engagement and disengagement coping options in response to discrimination. Using a sample of Black Americans my colleagues and I (Outten et al., 2009) tested the ability of group identification to influence coping options in response to discrimination that would in turn predict psychological well-being. Participants completed a survey containing several variables including: endorsement of coping options, group identification, self-esteem and life satisfaction. The coping options varied by level of identity (individual and group-based) as well as function of coping (problem-focused and emotion-focused). A factor analysis on all the items for each coping option revealed that we were successful at creating empirically distinct measures of coping at different levels of identity. In terms of our proposed meditational process, we found that the positive effect of racial group identification on self-esteem and the positive effect of racial group identification on life satisfaction were both mediated by believing that Black Americans can collectively work together to improve their status in society (group problem-focused coping options or collective action) and believing that one can successfully regulate the negative emotions associated with perceived discrimination (individual emotion-focused coping options or emotion regulation). This suggests that the appraisal of group-based coping options can be an important means of coping with the stress associated with discrimination for members of disadvantaged groups.

**Group-based Coping Options**

Group-based coping options can take one of two forms. They can be intragroup in nature, meaning that they are beliefs about what an individual can do to cope in relation to their ingroup and its members (e.g., seek out social support from ingroup members). They can also be intergroup in nature, meaning that they are about what the group as a whole can do to respond to discrimination (e.g., engage in collective action). A critical distinction in the current research is that group-based coping options, like individual coping options, can differ in the degree to which they engage with or
disengage from discrimination (for similar ideas see Connor-Smith et al., 2000; Miller & Kaiser, 2001). In the following sections I will outline six different group-based coping options that can be classified in terms of whether they engage with (i.e., collective action, emotional expression and ingroup social support) or disengage from discrimination (i.e., avoidance, individual mobility and ingroup blame). Furthermore, I use relevant theory and research to describe how each group-based coping option might be related to group identification and psychological well-being. These coping options have been derived from theoretical perspectives on how members of disadvantaged groups cope with discrimination and prior research on the strategies that members of disadvantaged groups report using to cope with discrimination.

**Engagement Coping Options**

Engagement coping options in response to discrimination are beliefs that acknowledge the existence of collective disadvantage. They can range from beliefs about what can be done to directly challenge discrimination (e.g., collective action, emotional expression) to those that focus on limiting its harmful effects on the self (e.g., ingroup social support). These types of group-based coping options are similar to what the general stress and coping literature calls primary control engagement coping responses (e.g., Connor-Smith et al., 2000; Miller & Kaiser, 2001), in that they focus on directly enhancing one’s sense of control over the stressor or one’s reactions to it. As prior research (Outten et al., 2009) demonstrates, group identification should lead to greater endorsement of engagement coping options, because individuals who identify with their disadvantaged group are more likely think and act in ways that promote their group’s interests (Tabri & Conway, 2011; Tajfel, 1978). Furthermore, these coping options should be beneficial for people’s well-being because engagement coping can enhance an individual’s sense of control over a stressor (Compas et al., 2001; Connor-Smith et al., 2000).

**Collective Action**

Engaging in collective efforts to reduce inequality is one form of group-based coping that is well documented in the collective histories of many disadvantaged groups.
From ethnic minorities (Rim, 2006) to women (Rapp, Button, Fleury-Steiner, & Fleury-Steiner, 2010) to sexual minorities (Warren & DeLora, 1978), members of disadvantaged groups often use collective action to respond to discrimination. Thus, members of disadvantaged groups have good reasons to believe that working together with other ingroup members to better their group’s standing in society can be a viable way to cope. People who are highly identified with their group are more likely to believe that their group can work together to better their standing in society (Tabri & Conway, 2011). Additionally, thinking about members of one’s social group effectively working together to undo the inequality that they have been subjected to at the hands of a dominant group(s) is likely to lead to positive feelings and a sense of psychological empowerment (Drury, Cocking, Beale, Hanson, & Rapley, 2005). Supporting the existence of a link between group identification, appraisals of collective action, and well-being, Molero, Fuster, Jetten, & Moriano (2011) found that among HIV positive people, collective action intentions mediated the relationship between identification with HIV positive people and psychological well-being.

**Emotional Expression**

When discrimination is appraised as unjust, it can lead members of disadvantaged groups to feel negative emotions like, disgust, sadness or anger (Swim, Hyers, Cohen, Fitzgerald, & Bylsma, 2003). These negative feelings stemming from perceiving that one’s group is devalued in society can lead disadvantaged groups to openly vent their feelings or speak out against discrimination (Swim & Thomas, 2006). A wide variety of disadvantaged groups including: lesbians (Bowleg, Brooks, & Ritz, 2008), poor people (Reutter, Stewart, Veenstra, Love, Raphael, & Makwarimba, 2009) and the mentally ill (Wahl, 1999) report using as well as advocating the use of emotional expression as a means of coping with discrimination for members of their ingroup. While there is no direct evidence of a link between group identification and emotional expression, there is reason to believe that disadvantaged individuals who highly identify with their ingroup should be more likely to consider emotional expression as a coping option. Recent work by Iyer and Ryan (2009) has found that when women think about women’s experiences of discrimination in the workplace, those who highly identify as women are more likely to report feeling angry than women who are weakly identified.
Additionally, Kaiser, Hagiwara, Malahy, & Wilkins (2009) have found that highly identified women and ethnic minorities are more likely than their weakly identified counterparts to express positive attitudes towards ingroup members who speak out against discrimination. Taken together these findings suggest that group identification is likely to be associated with emotional expression. Believing that one’s group can engage in expressing their feelings or speak out against discriminatory behaviour is probably beneficial for well-being. This is because it allows an individual to feel that their group members can exert some control over the negative treatment that their group confronts by letting others know that discrimination against their group will not be tolerated (Miller & Kaiser, 2001). Furthermore, the general stress and coping literature suggests that feeling able to express one’s emotions about a stressor is generally good for well-being (e.g., Tucker, Winkelman, Katz, & Bermas, 1999).

**Ingroup Social Support**

Effectively seeking out support from fellow ingroup members might be particularly important for members of disadvantaged groups because ingroup members tend to share similar social perspectives and are generally more trusted in comparison to outgroup members (see Haslam & Ellemers, 2005; Voci, 2006). Typically the stress and coping literature has operationalized social support in terms of support from friends or family (Skinner et al., 2003). Rarely do measures of coping contain items that explicitly assess perceptions of social support from one’s ingroup (for an exception see Kuo, Roysircar, & Newby-Clark, 2009). In reality though, members of disadvantaged social groups do tend to seek out support from ingroup members as a means of coping with disadvantage (e.g., McDavitt et al., 2008; Reutter et al., 2009) in part because they are socialized by their respective communities to see the group as a resource in these situations (Bain, Scott, & Steinberg, 2004; Daly, Jennings, Beckett, & Leashore, 1995). Furthermore, the more disadvantaged group members identify with their ingroup the more likely they are to believe that they can receive support from ingroup members (e.g., Gaudet & Clément, 2005). For members of disadvantaged groups, perceiving that one can receive social support from others is generally associated with positive well-being outcomes (e.g., Bradley, Schwartz, & Kaslow, 2005; Schulz, Tompkins, Wood, & Decker, 1987; also see Haslam et al., 2005).
Disengagement Coping Options

Disengagement coping options are beliefs that circumvent dealing directly with discrimination (e.g., avoidance, individual mobility) or downplay the illegitimacy of collective disadvantage (e.g., ingroup blame). Whereas group identification should foster engagement coping options, I predict that group identification will deter disengagement coping options because they fail to directly challenge discrimination and thus they fail to serve the needs of the group. To the degree that the group is a critical aspect of one's self concept (i.e., high identification), actions that diminish the ingroup should be seen as self-defeating. Furthermore, disengagement coping options are likely harmful for well-being, because disengagement coping does little to enhance an individual's sense of control over a stressor (Compas, et al., 2001; Connor-Smith et al., 2000).

Avoidance

Within the stress and coping literature avoidance is conceptualized in several ways ranging from engaging in distracting activities to take one’s mind off a stressor to avoiding situations in which individuals might encounter a stressor (Skinner et al., 2003). In this study, the avoidance coping option is congruent with the latter definition, with the added caveat being that it is believing that members of one's group can avoid instances of discrimination, rather than oneself. Members of disadvantaged groups often report withdrawing from situations where they feel that others are likely to discriminate against them or devalue their social identity (e.g., Bird & Bogart, 2001; Mendoza-Denton, Page-Gould, & Pietrzak, 2006; Pinel, 1999; Swim, Cohen, & Hyers, 1998). For example, women tend to avoid situations where they expect that they will be stereotyped (Pinel, 1999) and report avoiding interactions with men who they think are sexist (Swim et al., 1998). Gay men and lesbians report quickly quitting a job upon discovering that intolerance might be an issue in the workplace (Chung, Williams, & Dispenza, 2009). In these studies (Chung, Williams, & Dispenza, 2009; Pinel, 1999), women and gay people did not just withdraw from situations where they were likely to face discrimination, but they also sought out alternative spaces that were likely to be free of discrimination. Whereas people who highly identify with their disadvantaged group are more likely to confront threats to their collective identity, those who do not identify with their group tend
to be more likely to avoid threats that result from their group membership (Cohen & Garcia, 2005). Thus, it is likely that group identification will be negatively related to avoidance coping options.

Additionally, believing that one’s group can avoid people who are prejudiced might make one feel good, particularly if there is little to gain by interacting with those people (Miller & Kaiser, 2001). However findings from the general stress and coping literature suggest that avoiding stressor-relevant situations often increase psychological distress among individuals who are dealing with a chronic stressor. In part this is because it does little to mitigate the negative thoughts or emotions that an individual experiences as a result of the stressor (e.g., Moitra, Herbert, & Forman, 2008; also see Suls & Fletcher, 1985). Indeed, use of avoidance coping in response to discrimination has been found to be negatively related to psychological well-being among Black Americans (e.g., Utsey, Ponterotto, Reynolds, & Cancelli, 2000).

**Individual Mobility**

Members of disadvantaged groups might also try to physically or psychologically distance themselves from their ingroup in an attempt to better their personal life outcomes. This particular type of coping is referred to as individual mobility in SIT literature (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). If one can successfully assimilate with the dominant culture, and come to be seen by others as a member of the privileged majority then they might enjoy better life outcomes. There are some racial minorities (Cunningham, 1997), sexual minorities (Corbett, 1994; McDavitt et al., 2008) and deaf persons (Jambor & Elliott, 2005) who report altering their behaviour as well as psychologically distancing themselves from their ingroup in the hope of being treated better by the broader society. Typically, people who are less identified with their ingroup are more likely to pursue an individual mobility strategy (e.g., Jambor & Elliott, 2005; also see Haslam & Reicher, 2006). Engaging in individual mobility has been posited by social psychological theorists to be detrimental to well-being (e.g., Goffman, 1963; Tajfel 1978), because an individual has to constantly think about whether the majority group will accept them, while simultaneously worrying about the possibility of harsh judgement by one’s ingroup for trying to distance themselves from it (Goffman, 1963).
Ingroup Blame

Disadvantaged individuals might also try to cope by blaming their ingroup for their group’s relative position in society (Major, Kaiser, O’Brien, & McCoy, 2007). Blaming one’s disadvantaged group for their disadvantage is similar to individual mobility in that in both cases the ingroup is perceived as a liability rather than a resource. They are also similar in that both types of coping options are likely to be deterred by group identification. Supporting this notion, recent research has found that compared to low-identifiers, high-identifiers need more evidence to conclude that their group is worthy of blame (Miron, Branscombe, & Biernat, 2010). Given that thinking about one’s group in a positive light (e.g., as possessing agency) is associated with positive well-being (Cicognani et al., 2009), it is likely that thinking about one’s group in a negative light (i.e., thinking that it is blameworthy) is detrimental for well-being. Supporting this notion, findings from the general stress and coping literature suggest that engaging in self-blame tends to be associated with poor psychological functioning (Voth & Sirois, 2009). Furthermore, research has found that among disadvantaged groups blaming one’s resource networks (e.g., community, family) for their disadvantage is associated with poorer self-reported quality of life (Zautra, Young, & Guenther, 1981).

Overview of Current Study

The present study tested a model in which group identification predicts engagement coping options and deters disengagement coping options which in turn influence psychological well-being (self-esteem and life satisfaction). I examined these relationships using four historically disadvantaged groups in North America: women, Blacks, gay people and deaf people. First, in line with social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978) and the rejection-identification model (Branscombe et al., 1999), I expected participants who are more identified with their disadvantaged group to report greater self-esteem and greater life satisfaction. Second, because individuals who identify with their disadvantaged group are more likely to think and act in ways that promote their group’s interests (Haslam & Reicher, 2006; Tajfel, 1978), I anticipate that group identification will be positively related to group-based engagement coping options and negatively related to group-based disengagement coping options. Third, consistent with theories of stress
and coping (Compas et al., 2001; Connor-Smith et al., 2000), I anticipate that the engagement coping options (collective action, emotional expression, ingroup social support) will have positive relationships with well-being, whereas the disengagement coping options (avoidance, individual mobility, ingroup blame) will be negatively related to well-being because the former set of coping options can provide individuals with a sense that their group can effectively control discrimination and its harmful effects whereas the latter set of coping options do not. Finally, I examined each coping option as a potential mediator of the relationship between group identification and well-being for all four disadvantaged groups.

Potential Group Differences in the Endorsement of Coping Options and Mediation

I chose women, Blacks, gay people and deaf people because they all experience discrimination and research suggests that members of these groups perceive discrimination as a stressor (Corbett, 1994; Fairchild & Rudman, 2008; Mason & Palmer, 1996; Swim et al., 2003), making them appropriate social groups for this study. Additionally group identification among all four groups has been linked with psychological well-being in past research (e.g., Branscombe et al., 1999; Jambor & Elliott, 2005; Luhtanen, 2003; Schmitt et al., 2002). While these groups are similar in important respects, they do differ in notable ways. These differences include the degree to which they have a politicized collective identity and the degree to which they can conceal their disadvantaged identities.

A politicized collective identity can be understood as a form of collective identity where group members recognize that their group that is currently engaged in a power struggle in the wider societal context. Relative to members of non-politicized groups, members of groups that are politicized tend to have greater group consciousness, are mindful of which outgroup(s) are responsible for their disadvantaged and are aware that they need to obtain support from the general public to further their cause (Simon & Klandermans, 2001). I would argue that in a North American context, gay people and Blacks on average are more politicized than women or deaf people. Gay people are currently engaged in a very public power struggle for equal rights (e.g., marriage
equality, protections against job and housing discrimination). Blacks, although not currently involved in a very public struggle with Whites, are very much aware that they have been engaged in a power struggle for centuries. This persistent collective struggle is even reflected in conceptualizations of Black racial identity in North America which stress their shared history of oppression and mistreatment (e.g., Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous, 1998).

Women tend to have less of a politicized collective identity because of the paternalistic nature of gender relations. The paternalistic nature of gender relations is marked by male dominance over women accompanied by benevolent attitudes that imply that men should protect and care for women (Rudman & Glick, 2008). Being exposed to benevolent attitudes has been found to undermine women's resistance to inequality (Becker & Wright, 2011) by making gender relations seem more fair (Cech & Blair-Loy, 2010; Jost & Kay, 2005; also see Stephens & Levine, 2011). Deaf people also tend to have a less politicized collective identity. While there are many deaf persons who recognize their relative disadvantage, the separation of culturally deaf group members from those who are oral and/or mainstreamed means that the degree to which a deaf person's collective identity is politicized can vary quite a bit among deaf individuals (Rose & Kiger, 1995).

As politicized collective identity connects people to the structural plight of disadvantage it often has qualitatively different effects on the way people, think, act and feel, than collective identity in general (see Zomeren, Postmes & Spears, 2008). Politicized groups tend to be more motivated to engage with discrimination collectively (Simon & Klandermans, 2001). Therefore, gay people and Blacks might endorse engagement coping options more than women and deaf people, and might be less likely to endorse disengagement coping options than women and deaf people. Furthermore, group identification's ability to promote well-being through group-based coping might be more pronounced for gay people and Blacks, than for women and deaf people.

Finally, these four groups also differ in terms of the degree to which they can conceal their respective identities. Relative to the other three groups, it is perhaps easier for gay people to conceal their disadvantaged identity. One of the main reasons why gay people conceal their identity, or choose not to be "out", is to reduce the likelihood of
being harassed or assaulted because of their sexual orientation (Corbett, 1994; Meyer 2003). Victimization of gay men and lesbians is prevalent. For example, one in four gay men and lesbians in the U.S. report being physically attacked because of their sexual orientation (Healey, 2007). Gay men or lesbians who are not "out" are more likely to try to pass as heterosexual (Meyer, 2003). One negative consequence of concealment, is that it can lead to social isolation by reducing opportunities to develop friendships with ingroup members (Ueno, 2005). Because individual mobility and ingroup social support are both related to the issues of concealment and social isolation it is possible that they might be particularly important in accounting for the relationship between group identification and well-being for gay people.

Despite these speculations, as this the first study to test all six of these group-based coping options as mediators of the relationship between group identification and well-being, an examination of potential group differences is an exploratory endeavour. Thus, no research hypotheses pertaining to the specific coping options that best account for the relationship between group identification and well-being for each group are presented. However I plan to address the following research questions: Do the groups differ in terms of which coping options they endorse most? Does group identification differentially predict different coping options and do different coping options predict well-being for the four groups? If there are group differences, does the pattern of differences fit with what we know about politicized collective identities versus less politicized collective identities and concealable identities versus less concealable identities?
Method

Participants and Recruitment

Data was collected online using Remark 4.0 software. In total 1043 participants from four disadvantaged groups (338 women, 203 Blacks, 301 gay people—201 gay men and 100 lesbians, 201 deaf persons) completed a survey containing measures of ingroup identification, the six group-based coping options and measures of psychological well-being. While all participants were asked about the same coping options, each group received items that were specifically tailored to their ingroup identity (e.g., Blacks were asked about coping with discrimination because of their race). All subjects were also asked to provide demographic information such as age, gender, race, sexual orientation, class and religious affiliation. The demographic information is summarized in Table 1.

The Black, deaf and gay^1^ samples were recruited online. Participants were recruited from facebook groups and online organizations across North America that serviced those disadvantaged populations. A research assistant and I contacted the administrators of these groups and organizations via e-mail in order to ask permission to contact their members using a prepared script (see Appendix A). Only if administrators granted us permission would messages to participate be posted on webpages or sent to group listserves. For the sample of women, most of the sample was recruited through

^1^ Relative to the other groups sampled, the lesbian sample (N = 100) was quite small. This was not an appropriate sample size for running multiple regressions involving as many as 10 variables (for details on appropriate sample sizes for running regressions see Bartlett, Kotrlik, & Higgins, 2001). For this reason I opted to combine the gay men and lesbian samples. Gay men scored higher than lesbians on collective action and blame (collective action: gay men (M = 6.23), lesbians (M = 6.00), p = .03; blame: gay men (M = 2.09), lesbians (M = 1.77), p = .02. For all the other measured variables, p > .23). Moreover the pattern of intercorrelations among all measured variables were also similar for both groups. Combining the two groups who both face discrimination on the basis of their sexual orientation is not ideal as their experiences might be divergent in some respects, however it made the most sense to combine these two groups as there were not sufficient participants to test our main hypothesis separately for gay men and lesbians.
the SFU Psychology Research Participation System ($N = 273$) and were compensated with course credit. Because women comprise a large share of the undergraduate psychology population—compared to members of the other three social groups who represent a relatively small percentage—women were the only group that was recruited using this method. The remainder of the sample of women ($N = 65$) was recruited using

Table 1. Demographics by Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Women ($N = 338$)</th>
<th>Blacks ($N = 203$)</th>
<th>Gay Men &amp; Lesbians ($N = 301$)</th>
<th>Deaf People ($N = 201$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>$M = 21.45$</td>
<td>$M = 35.24$</td>
<td>$M = 35.24$</td>
<td>$M = 34.70$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>100% female</td>
<td>68% female</td>
<td>32% female</td>
<td>58% female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>46% East Asian</td>
<td>100% Black</td>
<td>78% White</td>
<td>75% White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35% White</td>
<td></td>
<td>6% East Asian</td>
<td>12% East Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8% South Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5% Southeast Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>94% straight</td>
<td>92% straight</td>
<td>94% gay male or lesbian*</td>
<td>91% straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5% gay male or lesbian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>59% middle class</td>
<td>49% middle class</td>
<td>42% middle class</td>
<td>51% middle class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29% upper-middle class</td>
<td>21% lower-middle class</td>
<td>28% upper-middle class</td>
<td>18% upper-middle class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.6% lower-middle class</td>
<td>20% working class</td>
<td>17% lower-middle class</td>
<td>16% lower-middle class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
<td>18% Atheist</td>
<td>28% Protestant</td>
<td>27% Protestant</td>
<td>26% Protestant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18% Protestant</td>
<td>17% Catholic</td>
<td>20% Catholic</td>
<td>19% Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17% Catholic</td>
<td>11% Atheist</td>
<td>19% Atheist</td>
<td>14% Atheist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12% Buddhist</td>
<td>8% Christian</td>
<td>5% Agnostic</td>
<td>7% Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6% Christian</td>
<td>7% Baptist</td>
<td></td>
<td>5% Agnostic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5% Muslim</td>
<td>5% Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5% Sikh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1 percentage figures are only presented for responses that were selected by at least 5% of each sample. * 6% of the gay male and lesbian sample chose responses other than gay male or lesbian. These responses included other terms for sexual minorities like queer, pansexual and bisexual.
the same online recruitment methods used for the other three groups.\textsuperscript{2}

**Procedure and Measures**

All participants provided their informed consent before starting the online survey. If they agreed to participate they had the opportunity to participate in a lottery draw. For each sample, one person received an award of $150 and two people received $50. On the webpages that followed, participants completed the measures described below and provided in Appendix B. At the end of the survey participants were informed of the study’s goals.

**Group Identification**

Group identification was measured using Cameron’s (2004) measure of group identification ($\alpha = .83$). The scale was modified for each of the groups sampled such that the twelve items referred specifically to their ingroup. Participants indicated their level of agreement with each statement using a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Coping Options**

Participants responded to four items for each of the six coping options. Half of the items for each coping option were positively worded and other half were reverse-scored. The six coping options included the three engagement coping options—collective action ($\alpha = .73$), emotional expression ($\alpha = .69$), ingroup social support ($\alpha = .74$) and the three disengagement coping options—individual mobility ($\alpha = .69$), ingroup

\textsuperscript{2} I examined the mean differences as well as the intercorrelations between all of the measured variables from the two sub-samples of women—those recruited through SFU’s Psychology Research Participation System and those recruited from community organizations. Only the means for individual mobility were found to be significantly different between the two samples. The SFU sample ($M = 3.41$) scored higher than the community sample ($M = 2.98$) on individual mobility, $p < .05$. For all other measured variables, $p > .10$. Only two correlations reliably differed between the two subsamples. The magnitude of the relationship between group identification and ingroup social support (SFU = .35; community = .68, $z = 2.14$, $p < .05$) and the magnitude of the relationship between group identification and individual mobility (SFU = -.14; community = -.47, $z = 2.72$, $p < .01$) were greater in the community sub-sample. Given that the vast majority of means and correlations did not reliably differ between sub samples they were merged together for all of the analyses.
blame (α = .76) and avoidance (α = .65). Participants indicated their level of agreement with each statement using a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

I submitted all of the items to an exploratory factor analysis for the full sample. A varimax rotation was used. Factors with Eigenvalues greater than 1.0 were retained. In total six factors were retained that accounted for 54.2% of the variance. I also followed Tabachnick and Fidell’s (2001) criteria for item retention. One such criterion is that if an item did load on any of the retained factors for the full sample at .32 or higher it was removed. The two negatively-worded individual mobility items (“Distancing myself from other ***** can’t make me face less discrimination” and “Trying to distance myself from other ***** can’t help me garner acceptance from other people in society”) failed to load on any of the six factors that were retained (both < .26 on each of the six factors). It seems likely that the reverse-coded items were not tapping into individual mobility—or the belief that one can physically or psychologically distance themselves from their group in order to better their life outcomes. As a result, these items were not used in constructing the individual mobility measure.³ The four items for each of the other coping options loaded on separate factors (ingroup blame: .44 to .76, other item loadings < .10; collective action: .54 to .75, other item loadings < .20; ingroup social support: .42 to .82, other item loadings < .13; emotional expression: .40 to .81, other loadings < .13; avoidance: .50 to .64, other loadings < .15). Taken together the analysis suggests that I was successful at creating six distinct measures of group-based coping options.

**Psychological Well-being**

Psychological well-being was assessed using two measures: 1) a single-item global self-esteem measure by Robins, Hendin and Trzesniewisi (2001) that has been found to correlate more than .90 with the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Inventory (1979), and

---

³ I also ran analyses with an individual mobility factor comprised of all four-items. While the pattern of correlations between the four-item measure, group identification and both self-esteem and life satisfaction were of a similar magnitude across the four samples, the meditational results differed. Most notably the paths between group identification and individual mobility (A) as well as the paths between individual mobility and both measures of well-being (B) were much weaker among women, deaf people, and gay people. For Blacks the magnitude of both the A and B paths were similar to the two-item measure.
2) 4 items taken from Diener, Emmons, Larson and Griffin's (1985) Satisfaction with Life Scale (α = .88).
Results

Preliminary Comparisons across the Four Groups

Means, standard deviations, and ranges for all of the variables in the study are presented for each sample in Table 2. I ran a one-way ANOVA for each variable in the study to assess whether their mean endorsement significantly differed between the four samples. Significant main effects were followed by post-hoc Tukey's HSD tests ($p < .05$) to examine how the mean endorsement of each variable differed across the four groups. Indeed group identification, the three engagement coping options, the three disengagement coping options and both measures of psychological well-being significantly differed between groups (all $p$'s < .01). As a result I ran post-hoc Tukey's HSD tests to examine how the mean endorsement of each variable differed across the four groups.

**Group Identification**

The one-way ANOVA for group identification was significant, $F(3, 1039) = 22.20$, $p < .001$. Post hoc tests revealed that Blacks reported significantly higher group identification than deaf people, gay people and women.

**Engagement Coping Options**

The one-way ANOVA for collective action was significant, $F(3, 1039) = 61.33$, $p < .001$. Post hoc tests revealed that Blacks endorsed collective action significantly more than deaf people and women but not gay people. Blacks, gay people and deaf people endorsed collective action significantly more than women.
### Table 2. Means, Range and Standard Deviations for the Dependent Variables for the Samples along with the Mean Differences between Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Full Sample (N = 1043)</th>
<th>Women (N = 338)</th>
<th>Blacks (N = 203)</th>
<th>Gay Men &amp; Lesbians (N = 301)</th>
<th>Deaf People (N = 201)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
<td>(.74)</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td>(1.07)</td>
<td>(94)</td>
<td>(1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.20)</td>
<td>(.98)</td>
<td>(1.21)</td>
<td>(1.35)</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.19)</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>(1.33)</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
<td>(1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.64)</td>
<td>(1.28)</td>
<td>(1.81)</td>
<td>(1.83)</td>
<td>(1.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup Blame</td>
<td>2.43 [1-6.50]</td>
<td>2.86ab [1-6.25]</td>
<td>2.35bc [1-6.5]</td>
<td>1.98bc [1-6]</td>
<td>2.46b [1-5.75]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.27)</td>
<td>(1.24)</td>
<td>(1.28)</td>
<td>(1.15)</td>
<td>(1.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.35)</td>
<td>(1.32)</td>
<td>(1.23)</td>
<td>(1.35)</td>
<td>(1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.22)</td>
<td>(1.10)</td>
<td>(1.21)</td>
<td>(1.37)</td>
<td>(1.09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. abcd sample means with different letters are significantly different at α = .05 based on a Tukey HSD post hoc test.
The one-way ANOVA for emotional expression was significant, $F(3, 1039) = 17.23, p < .001$. Post hoc tests revealed that gay people, Blacks, and deaf people were all significantly more likely to consider emotional expression than women.

The one-way ANOVA for ingroup social support was significant, $F(3, 1039) = 9.22, p < .001$. Post hoc tests revealed that Blacks reported believing that they could seek out social support from other ingroup members significantly more than deaf people, women and gay people.

**Disengagement Coping Options**

The one-way ANOVA for avoidance was significant, $F(3, 1039) = 5.51, p < .01$. Post hoc tests revealed that women, gay people and deaf people were all significantly more likely to believe that their group could avoid discrimination than Blacks.

The one-way ANOVA for individual mobility was significant, $F(3, 1039) = 8.89, p < .001$. Post hoc tests revealed that women and gay people endorsed individual mobility significantly more than Blacks. All other comparisons were not significant.

The one-way ANOVA for ingroup blame was significant, $F(3, 1039) = 27.99, p < .001$. Post hoc tests revealed that women endorsed blaming their ingroup significantly more than deaf persons, Blacks, gay people. Deaf people endorsed blaming their ingroup significantly more than gay people. All other comparisons were not significant.

**Psychological Well-being**

The one-way ANOVA for self-esteem was significant, $F(3, 1039) = 20.38, p < .001$. Post hoc tests revealed that self-esteem for Blacks was significantly higher than that of gay people or women. Women’s self-esteem was significantly lower than that of the other three groups. All other comparisons were not significant.

The one-way ANOVA for life satisfaction was significant, $F(3, 1039) = 4.69, p < .01$. Post hoc tests revealed that Blacks’ and deaf people’s satisfaction with their lives was only significantly higher than that of gay people.
Intercorrelations between Group Identification, Coping Options and Well-being

I assessed the relationship between group identification, the three engagement coping options, the three disengagement coping options and both indicators of psychological well-being—self-esteem and life satisfaction. The zero-order correlations between the nine variables for all four samples are presented in Tables 3 and 4.

Consistent with previous research with disadvantaged groups, group identification was positively related to self-esteem and life satisfaction across the four samples (Jambor & Elliott, 2005; Outten et al., 2009). All of these relationships were statistically significant at $p < .01$. It is worth noting, that while the relationships between group identification and both measures of well-being were similar in magnitude among Blacks, deaf people and gay people, they were somewhat weaker among women.

As predicted, group identification was significantly positively related to the three engagement coping options across the four groups ($p$'s < .05). Compared to collective action and emotional expression, ingroup social support had the strongest relationship with group identification among each sample. Also, as hypothesized, group identification was negatively related to the three disengagement coping options across the four samples. The only relationships that were not statistically significant were the relationship between group identification and avoidance for women ($p = .15$) and Blacks ($p = .41$), (all other $p$'s < .05). For each sample the relationship between group identification and individual mobility, as well as the relationship between group identification and ingroup blame were greater in magnitude than the relationship between group identification and avoidance.

Finally, consistent with theories on stress and coping (Compas et al., 2001; Connor-Smith et al., 2000), the engagement coping options were positively related to psychological well-being across the four groups whereas the disengagement coping options were negatively related to psychological well-being across the four groups ($p$'s < .05). The only relationship that was not statistically significant was the relationship between avoidance and life satisfaction among Blacks ($p = .37$). It is worth noting that in
terms of magnitude, compared to the other five coping options, avoidance generally had weaker relationships with both self-esteem and life satisfaction across the four samples.

Table 3. Intercorrelations for the Sample of Women (N = 338) and Blacks (N = 203)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Group ID</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Collective Action</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Emotional Exp.</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ingrp Soc. Sup.</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Avoidance</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Individual Mob.</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ingroup Blame</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The correlations for the sample of women are above the diagonal and correlations for Blacks are below the diagonal; *p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 4. Intercorrelations for Gay People (N = 301) and Deaf People (N = 201)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Group ID</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Collective Action</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Emotional Exp.</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ingrp Soc. Sup.</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Avoidance</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Individual Mob.</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ingroup Blame</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The correlations for gay men and lesbians are above the diagonal and correlations for deaf people are below the diagonal; *p < .05. **p < .01.
Simple Mediation and Multiple Mediation Analyses

I tested for mediation using Preacher and Hayes’ (2008) bootstrapping methodology for indirect effects. I first conducted simple mediation analyses for each group. Simple mediation tests for the presence of an indirect effect of the independent variable on a dependent variable through a third variable (or mediator). I tested if each coping option alone mediated the relationships between group identification and both measures of psychological well-being—self-esteem and life satisfaction (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Simple Mediation: The effect of Group Identification on Well-being Mediated by Each Coping Option on their Own
I also conducted multiple mediation analyses for each group. Specifically, I tested whether any of the six coping options mediated the effect of group identification on well-being, while controlling for the effect of the other five coping options on well-being (see Figure 2). By conducting multiple mediation it is possible to ascertain whether an overall effect exists for all mediators together (total indirect effect) and where there is a unique effect of each mediator (specific indirect effects). Bias-corrected and accelerated (BCa) bootstrapping (Efron, 1987) based on 5000 bootstrap resamples was used for both simple and multiple mediation. One advantage of using bootstrapping to test for

![Figure 2. Multiple Mediation Model: The Effect of Group Identification on Well-being Mediated by Coping Options Simultaneously](image-url)
mediation is that it does not rely on the assumption of a normal sampling distribution (Shrout & Bolger, 2002). The unstandardized weights for all indirect and direct paths associated with each mediational chain for the four groups are presented in Tables 5-8.

In the following paragraphs I present the mediated effects of group identification on both self-esteem and life satisfaction at 95% and 90% confidence intervals (CI) for each sample. Typically, values that do not include zero at the 95% confidence level are indicative of statistical significance. Given the exploratory nature of this study, I also report values that do not include zero at the 90% confidence level, which will be referred to as marginally significant effects. Additionally, I report coping options that were found to predict well-being but were not found to be significant mediators. The results of the simple mediation and multiple mediation analyses for each group are presented below and are followed by a summary.

**Women**

The simple mediation analysis revealed that emotional expression was a significant mediator of the relationship between group identification and self-esteem, with a 95% CI of .013, .135, whereas ingroup blame with a 90% CI of .001, .074 was a marginally significant mediator. Even though group identification predicted ingroup social support and ingroup social support in turn predicted self-esteem it was not found to be a mediator (90% CI of -.002, .158). Also avoidance was a negative predictor of self-esteem, but was not a mediator because it was not predicted by group identification. For the relationship between group identification and life satisfaction, ingroup blame with a 95% CI of .011, .089 and individual mobility with a 95% CI of .003, .075 were significant mediators.

The multiple mediation analysis for women revealed that the total indirect effect of group identification on self-esteem through the coping options was significant with a 95% CI of .016, .233. However, none of the specific indirect effects were found to be significant or marginally significant, as the confidence intervals for each coping option contained zero. As with the simple mediation analysis avoidance was a negative predictor of self-esteem, but was not a mediator because it was not predicted by group
identification. Similarly, the total indirect effect of group identification on life satisfaction through the coping options was significant with a 95% CI of .001, .176. While none of the

Table 5. Results from Multiple Regressions Testing Each Coping Option as a Mediator of the Relationship between Group Identification and Well-being for the Sample of Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Mediators</th>
<th>Coping Option (A)</th>
<th>Coping Option (B)</th>
<th>Indirect Effect (AB)</th>
<th>ID Well-Being (C')</th>
<th>ID Well-Being (C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>Collective Action</td>
<td>.479**</td>
<td>.104/.011</td>
<td>.050/.005</td>
<td>.181/.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional Expression</td>
<td>.374**</td>
<td>.177/.104</td>
<td>.066*/.039</td>
<td>.165*/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingroup Social Support</td>
<td>.478**</td>
<td>.153/.103</td>
<td>.073/.049</td>
<td>.158*/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.190*/-.162*</td>
<td>.017/.015</td>
<td>.213**/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Mobility</td>
<td>-.307**</td>
<td>-.085*/-.016</td>
<td>.026/.005</td>
<td>.205**/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingroup Blame</td>
<td>-.310**</td>
<td>-.097/-0.22</td>
<td>.030*/.007</td>
<td>.201**/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>Collective Action</td>
<td>.479**</td>
<td>.081/.024</td>
<td>.039/.011</td>
<td>.258*/.231**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional Expression</td>
<td>.374**</td>
<td>.070-.024</td>
<td>.026-.009</td>
<td>.271**/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingroup Social Support</td>
<td>.478**</td>
<td>.097/.062</td>
<td>.046/.030</td>
<td>.250**/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.111/-0.066</td>
<td>.010/.006</td>
<td>.286**/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Mobility</td>
<td>-.307**</td>
<td>-.093/-0.051</td>
<td>.029*/.016</td>
<td>.268**/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingroup Blame</td>
<td>-.310**</td>
<td>-.130*/.095</td>
<td>.040*/.030*</td>
<td>.256**/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The coefficients are not standardized values. *p < .05. **p < .01. Path A = the effect of the independent variable on the mediator. Path B = the effect of the mediator on the dependent variable while controlling for the independent variable. Path AB = the indirect effect or product of Paths A & B. Path C = the direct effect or the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable while controlling for the effect of the mediator(s) Path C is the total effect of independent variable on the dependent variable. Coefficients before the slash = DV's were only regressed on the corresponding coping option (while controlling for group identification), whereas coefficients after the slash = DV's were regressed on all coping options (controlling for group identification). Indirect effects with ++ = the 95% CI does not include zero, meaning that the particular coping option is a significant mediator. Indirect effects with + = the 90% CI does not include zero, meaning that the particular coping option is a marginally significant mediator.
specific indirect effects reached significance, ingroup blame was found to be a marginally significant unique mediator of the effect of group identification on life satisfaction with a 90% CI of .005, .069.

Table 6. Results from Multiple Regressions Testing Each Coping Option as a Mediator of the Relationship between Group Identification and Well-being for the Black Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable Mediators</th>
<th>ID → Coping Option (A)</th>
<th>Coping Option → Well-Being (B)</th>
<th>Indirect Effect (AB)</th>
<th>ID → Well-Being (C')</th>
<th>ID → Well-Being (C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.468**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Action</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.400*/.353**</td>
<td>.088*/.078**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Expression</td>
<td>.199*</td>
<td>.106/.002</td>
<td>.021/.000</td>
<td>.447**/*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup Social Support</td>
<td>.526**</td>
<td>.065/.021</td>
<td>.034/.011</td>
<td>.434**/*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.135*/-.114</td>
<td>.012/.010</td>
<td>.456**/*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Mobility</td>
<td>-.794**</td>
<td>-.122*/-.066</td>
<td>.097*/.052</td>
<td>.372**/*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup Blame</td>
<td>-.386**</td>
<td>-.207*/-.159</td>
<td>.080*/.061**</td>
<td>.389**/*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.502**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Action</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.317*/.272</td>
<td>.070*/.060**</td>
<td>.432*/.326**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Expression</td>
<td>.199*</td>
<td>.127/.042</td>
<td>.025*/.009</td>
<td>.477**/*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup Social Support</td>
<td>.526**</td>
<td>.103/.045</td>
<td>.054/.024</td>
<td>.448**/*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.039*/-.031</td>
<td>.004/.003</td>
<td>.499**/*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Mobility</td>
<td>-.794**</td>
<td>-.109*/-.061</td>
<td>.087*/.048</td>
<td>.416**/*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup Blame</td>
<td>-.386**</td>
<td>-.130*/-.085</td>
<td>.050*/.033</td>
<td>.452**/*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The coefficients are not standardized values. *p < .05. **p < .01. Path A = the effect of the independent variable on the mediator. Path B = the effect of the mediator on the dependent variable while controlling for the independent variable. Path AB = the indirect effect or product of Paths A & B. Path C = the direct effect or the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable while controlling for the effect of the mediator(s) Path C is the total effect of independent variable on the dependent variable. Coefficients before the slash = DV's were only regressed on the corresponding coping option (while controlling for group identification), whereas coefficients after the slash = DV's were regressed on all coping options (controlling for group identification). Indirect effects with ++ = the 95% CI does not include zero, meaning that the particular coping option is a significant mediator. Indirect effects with + = the 90% CI does not include zero, meaning that the particular coping option is a marginally significant mediator.
**Blacks**

The simple mediation analysis for Blacks showed that collective action with a 95% CI of .030, .219, individual mobility with a 95% CI of .024, .215 and ingroup blame with a 95% CI of .020, .190 were all significant mediators of the relationship between group identification and self-esteem. Avoidance did negatively predicted self-esteem but it was not a mediator, because it was not predicted by group identification. Collective action with a 95% CI of .016, .199 and individual mobility with a 95% CI of .020, .183 were also found to mediate the relationship between group identification and life satisfaction. Furthermore emotional expression with a 90% CI of .001, .074 and ingroup blame with a 90% CI of .002, .129 were found to be marginally significant mediators of the relationship group identification and life satisfaction.

The multiple mediation analysis for the Black sample revealed that the total indirect effect of group identification on self-esteem through the coping options was significant with a 95% CI of .097, .371. The specific indirect effects of each coping option showed that collective action with a 95% CI of .022, .200 and ingroup blame with a 95% CI of .004, .168 were unique mediators. The total indirect effect of group identification on life satisfaction through the coping options was also significant with a 95% CI of .057, .314. The specific indirect effects of each coping option showed that collective action was the lone significant unique mediator with a 95% CI of .006, .181.

**Gay People**

For the simple mediation analysis all six coping options were found to be significant mediators of the effect of group identification on self-esteem when tested on their own (collective action: 95% CI of .011, .133; emotional expression: 95% CI of .004, .117; ingroup social support: 95% CI of .041, .222; avoidance: 95% CI of .001, .072; individual mobility: 95% CI of .103, .267; ingroup blame: 95% CI .001, .114). For the relationship between group identification and life satisfaction, ingroup social support with a 95% CI of .031, .219, avoidance with a 95% CI of .002, .070, and individual mobility with a 95% CI of .069, .215 were significant mediators. Additionally, ingroup blame was
Table 7. Results from Multiple Regressions Testing each Coping Option as a Mediator of the Relationship between Group Identification and Well-being for the Gay Male and Lesbian Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable Mediators</th>
<th>ID → Coping Option (A)</th>
<th>Coping Option → Well-Being (B)</th>
<th>Indirect Effect (AB)</th>
<th>ID → Well-Being (C')</th>
<th>ID → Well-Being (C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.373**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Action</td>
<td>.274**</td>
<td>.242**/.095</td>
<td>.066**/.026</td>
<td>.307**/.097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Expression</td>
<td>.266**</td>
<td>.179*/.210</td>
<td>.046**/.006</td>
<td>.326***/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup Social Support</td>
<td>.635**</td>
<td>.197*/.139</td>
<td>.125*/.088*</td>
<td>.249***/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-.171*</td>
<td>-.129*/-.069</td>
<td>.022*/.012</td>
<td>.351***/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Mobility</td>
<td>-.680**</td>
<td>-.253*/-.225**</td>
<td>.172*/.153**</td>
<td>.201***/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup Blame</td>
<td>-.324**</td>
<td>-.132*/.028</td>
<td>.043*/-.009</td>
<td>.330***/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.345**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Action</td>
<td>.274**</td>
<td>.078*/-.076</td>
<td>.021*/-.021</td>
<td>.323*/.121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Expression</td>
<td>.266**</td>
<td>.080*/-.041</td>
<td>.021*/-.011</td>
<td>.324***/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup Social Support</td>
<td>.635**</td>
<td>.179*/.173**</td>
<td>.114*/.110**</td>
<td>.231***/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-.171*</td>
<td>-.150*/-.123</td>
<td>.026*/.021*</td>
<td>.319**/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Mobility</td>
<td>-.680**</td>
<td>-.195*/-.164**</td>
<td>.132*/.112**</td>
<td>.212***/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup Blame</td>
<td>-.324**</td>
<td>-.147*/-.042</td>
<td>.048*/.014</td>
<td>.297***/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The coefficients are not standardized values. *p < .05. **p < .01. Path A = the effect of the independent variable on the mediator. Path B = the effect of the mediator on the dependent variable while controlling for the independent variable. Path AB = the indirect effect or product of Paths A & B. Path C' = the direct effect or the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable while controlling for the effect of the mediator(s) Path C is the total effect of independent variable on the dependent variable. Coefficients before the slash = DV's were only regressed on the corresponding coping option (while controlling for group identification), whereas coefficients after the slash = DV's were regressed on all coping options (controlling for group identification). Indirect effects with ++ = the 95% CI does not include zero, meaning that the particular coping option is a significant mediator. Indirect effects with + = the 90% CI does not include zero, meaning that the particular coping option is a marginally significant mediator.
a marginally significant mediator of group identification and life satisfaction with a 90% CI of .007, .104. For the multiple mediation analysis, the total indirect effect of group identification on self-esteem through the coping options was significant with a 95% CI of .017, .407. Individual mobility was found to be a significant unique mediator of the relationship between group identification and self-esteem with a 95% CI of .083, .257, whereas ingroup social support was a marginally significant unique mediator with a 90% CI of .012, .174. The total indirect effect of group identification on life satisfaction through the coping options was also significant with a 95% CI of .121, .345. Individual mobility (95% CI of .047, .191) and ingroup social support (95% CI of .013, .223) were found to be significant unique mediators of the relationship between group identification and life satisfaction. Furthermore, the analyses revealed that avoidance was a marginally significant unique mediator with a 90% CI of .003, .057.

**Deaf People**

For the deaf sample the simple mediation analysis revealed that none of the coping options were significant mediators of the relationship between group identification and self-esteem, as the 95% confidence intervals for each coping option contained zero. However, emotional expression with a 90% CI of .002, .102, and individual mobility with a 90% CI of .015, .181 were found to be marginally significant mediators of the relationship between group identification and self-esteem. For the relationship between group identification and life satisfaction, emotional expression with a 95% CI of .011, .128, avoidance with a 95% CI of .001, .072 and ingroup blame with a 95% CI of .007, .134, all significantly mediated the relationship between group identification and life satisfaction. Collective action with a 90% CI of .007, .125 was a marginally significant mediator of the effect of group identification on life satisfaction.

The results of the multiple mediation analysis for the deaf sample indicated that both the total indirect effect of group identification on self-esteem (90% CI of -.006, .242) and the total indirect effect of group identification on life satisfaction through the coping options (90% CI of -.033, .202) did not approach significance. Furthermore, an examination of the specific indirect effects associated with both mediational chains revealed that the confidence intervals for each coping option contained zero—or were not significant.
Table 8. Results from Multiple Regressions Testing Each Coping Option as a Mediator of the Relationship between Group Identification and Well-being for the Deaf Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable Mediators</th>
<th>ID → Coping Option (A)</th>
<th>Coping Option → Well-Being (B)</th>
<th>Indirect Effect (AB)</th>
<th>ID → Well-Being (C')</th>
<th>ID → Well-Being (C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.580**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Action</td>
<td>.321**</td>
<td>.069/.000</td>
<td>.022/.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Expression</td>
<td>.298**</td>
<td>.141/.104</td>
<td>.042*.031</td>
<td>.538**/*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup Social Support</td>
<td>.691**</td>
<td>.027/.009</td>
<td>.019/.006</td>
<td>.561**/*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-.276**</td>
<td>-.070/.042</td>
<td>.019/.012</td>
<td>.560***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Mobility</td>
<td>-.756**</td>
<td>-.114/.087</td>
<td>.086/.066</td>
<td>.493**/*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup Blame</td>
<td>-.426**</td>
<td>-.087/.015</td>
<td>.037/.006</td>
<td>.543**/*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.376**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Action</td>
<td>.321**</td>
<td>.154/.102</td>
<td>.050/.033</td>
<td>.326**/.298**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Expression</td>
<td>.298**</td>
<td>.168*.110</td>
<td>.050**/.033</td>
<td>.326**/*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup Social Support</td>
<td>.691**</td>
<td>-.018/.071</td>
<td>-.012/.049</td>
<td>.388**/*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-.276**</td>
<td>-.086/.048</td>
<td>.024*.013</td>
<td>.352**/*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Mobility</td>
<td>-.756**</td>
<td>-.074/.023</td>
<td>.056/.018</td>
<td>.320**/*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup Blame</td>
<td>-.426**</td>
<td>-.131/.072</td>
<td>.056**/.031</td>
<td>.320**/*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The coefficients are not standardized values. *p < .05. **p < .01. Path A = the effect of the independent variable on the mediator. Path B = the effect of the mediator on the dependent variable while controlling for the independent variable. Path AB = the indirect effect or product of Paths A & B. Path C' = the direct effect or the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable while controlling for the effect of the mediator(s). Path C is the total effect of independent variable on the dependent variable. Coefficients before the slash = DV's were only regressed on the corresponding coping option (while controlling for group identification), whereas coefficients after the slash = DV's were regressed on all coping options (controlling for group identification). Indirect effects with ++ = the 95% CI does not include zero, meaning that the particular coping option is a significant mediator. Indirect effects with + = the 90% CI does not include zero, meaning that the particular coping option is a marginally significant mediator.
Mediation Summary

In sum, across all the groups, several coping options were found to be mediators of the relationship between group identification and self-esteem as well as group identification and life satisfaction when tested on their own at CIs of 90% or 95%. For women, ingroup blame was a mediator. For Blacks, collective action, individual mobility and ingroup blame were mediators. For gay people, ingroup social support, avoidance, individual mobility and ingroup blame were mediators. For deaf people emotional expression was a mediator. Only for Blacks and gay people were coping options found to be unique mediators of the relationship between identification and both of the measures of well-being at CIs of 90% or 95%. For gay people, ingroup social support and individual mobility were unique mediators and for Blacks collective action was a unique mediator. Also, deaf people were the only disadvantaged group where the total indirect effects of group identification on both self-esteem and life satisfaction were not mediated by the coping options.
Discussion

The results of this study add to growing literature confirming that group identification is a coping resource for disadvantaged groups. For four different disadvantaged groups, group-based engagement coping options as well as group-based disengagement coping options explained some of the relationship between group identification and positive psychological well-being. Consistent with prior research on women, Blacks, gay people and deaf persons, I found that group identification predicted higher self-esteem and greater life satisfaction across the four samples (e.g., Branscombe et al., 1999; Jambor & Elliott, 2005; Luhtanen, 2003; Schmitt et al., 2002). Corroborating research that has shown that group identification is related to the cognitive appraisal process (Fischer, Ai, Aydin, Frey, & Haslam, 2010; Haslam et al., 2005), I found evidence that group identification promotes group-based engagement coping options and deters group-based disengagement coping options. Group identification was a particularly strong predictor of ingroup social support and individual mobility across the four samples.

Consistent with theories of stress and coping (Compas et al., 2001; Connor-Smith et al., 2000), I found evidence that engagement coping options positively predicted psychological well-being, whereas disengagement coping options negatively predicted well-being across the four samples. Out of the six coping options tested, individual mobility and ingroup blame were particularly strong (negative) predictors of well-being across the four samples. Also, ingroup blame was the lone coping option that was found to be a significant mediator of the relationship between group identification and at least one of the measures of well-being across the four samples. These findings support my contention that disengagement coping options can help explain the relationship between group identification and well-being.
Patterns in the Mediational Paths across the Four Groups

For women, Blacks, gay people and deaf people group identification positively predicted collective action, emotional expression and ingroup social support and negatively predicted individual mobility and ingroup blame. Group identification only negatively predicted avoidance for gay people and deaf people. For each sample group identification tended to have the strongest relationships with the two intragroup coping options, ingroup social support and individual mobility.

In terms of which coping options predicted well-being while controlling for group identification, individual mobility and ingroup blame were the only coping options found to significantly predict at least one of the measures of well-being in each sample when testing for simple mediation. Ingroup blame was also the only coping option found to be a significant mediator across the four samples. This finding lends credence to my contention that group-based disengagement coping options can help explain the positive effect of group identification on well-being among disadvantaged groups. Ingroup blame appears to be a particularly important (and detrimental) group-based coping option. According to SIT individuals seek to achieve a positive social identity by positively evaluating the social groups that define their self-concept (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). People who are highly identified with their ingroup, tend to increase anger towards outgroup members, rather than blame their ingroup when thinking about ingroup members being victimized (Davis, 1994), which may protect them from the negative feelings associated with perceiving that their ingroup has been victimized (Stenstrom, Lickel, Denson & Miller, 2008).

Across the four samples avoidance tended to have the weakest associations with both group identification and well-being. Given the lack of existing research on appraisals of group-based avoidance, it is hard to know why this was the case. In terms of the link between group identification avoidance, it is possible that for some people who are highly identified with their ingroup, avoidance might be viewed as an effective way of protecting the group from psychological harm associated with discrimination (McDavitt et al., 2008), whereas for others it might be seen as a strategy that does little to directly challenge the inequality one’s group faces (Puhl & Brownell, 2003). In terms of avoidance being a weaker predictor of well-being, avoidance does differ from individual
mobility and ingroup blame in some respects. Most notably, unlike the other two disengagement coping options avoidance is about one's groups' ability to remove themselves from situations where they might experience discrimination, not necessarily a psychological or physical disconnection from one's ingroup. The psychological closeness to one's ingroup that is still inherent in group-based avoidance might dampen the negative effect on well-being typically associated with other types of disengagement coping options. Further research is needed to better determine whether avoidance might generally have weaker associations with group identification and well-being for these reasons.

**Group Differences in the Endorsement of Group-based Coping Options**

The pattern of mean differences in the endorsement of coping options are fairly consistent with assumptions about how politicized groups differ from groups that are less politicized. Specifically, groups that are more politicized might be more likely to consider group-based options for coping with discrimination that engage with discrimination than less politicized groups. Politicized groups might also be less inclined to consider group-based options for coping with discrimination that disengage from discrimination. Women endorsed all three engagement coping options less than the other three groups. Women also endorsed avoidance, individual mobility and ingroup blame more than Blacks, gay people and deaf people. The reverse was true for Blacks who endorsed the three engagement coping options more than the other groups. Blacks also endorsed avoidance and individual mobility less than women, gay people and deaf people. Only gay people endorsed ingroup blame less than Blacks. For the most part, gay people and deaf people were somewhere between women and Blacks in terms of the degree to which they appraised the availability of other group-based coping options. Gay people endorsed collective action, emotional expression more than deaf persons and gay people endorsed ingroup blame less than deaf people.

Despite being politicized, gay peoples' endorsement of individual mobility, ingroup social support and avoidance were more comparable to women and deaf people than Blacks. I suggest it is the possibility of concealment and lack of visibility that
increases the plausibility of these three coping options. As such, individual mobility might be a more plausible coping option for gay people, whereas ingroup social support might be a less plausible coping option for gay people compared to other politicized groups. Like attempting to pass, avoidance is intended to protect gay men and lesbians from experiencing violence and harassment. Therefore believing that one's group can avoid discriminatory environments might be a more plausible coping option for gay people relative to other politicized groups.

**Group Differences in the Mediational Paths**

The overall pattern that emerges from the mediational analysis is that relative to non-politicized groups, the effect of group identification on well-being through the group-based coping options tended to be stronger for the more politicized groups. This is also evidenced by the fact that for Blacks and gay people the total indirect effects (C - C') of the relationships between group identification and both indicators of well-being were larger than they were for women and deaf people. In addition to finding more coping options as mediators for certain groups, there were also differences between the groups in terms of which mediators were most important for each sample.

**Women**

For women the results of mediational analyses were fairly weak. This could stem from the fact that unlike the other three samples the vast majority of the sample of women were recruited through the undergraduate psychology research pool. Thus the sample consists of women who have managed to pursue higher education and are likely to have little experience trying to advance in the workforce. For those reasons, the women in our sample might have perceived relatively little discrimination. Because these coping options are only relevant for those who subjectively experience discrimination, it seems plausible that the method by which women were recruited might at least in part account for the weaker mediational findings for this sample.

The mediational analyses revealed that of the six group-based coping options, ingroup blame was the most important in accounting for the positive effect of group
identification on well-being for women. Simple mediation tests revealed that ingroup blame was a marginally significant mediator of the relationship between group identification and self-esteem, and a significant mediator of the relationship between group identification and life satisfaction. Ingroup blame was also a marginally significant mediator when testing all the coping options simultaneously as potential mediators of the relationship between group identification and life satisfaction. Given that the sample consists of women who might not perceive much gender discrimination this makes some sense. Women who perceive less gender discrimination in society are more likely to believe that women are partly responsible for the discrimination that they experience (Cech & Blair-Loy, 2010). It is also be possible that ingroup blame is a pertinent coping option for women more broadly because of the way they experience discrimination. Specifically, the paternalistic nature of gender relations can make gender inequality seem more meritocratic to women (Jost & Kay, 2005). A greater belief in meritocratic explanations for gender inequality is associated with blaming other women for their own disadvantage (Cech & Blair-Loy, 2010), and denying sexism is associated with poorer psychological well-being (Fairchild & Rudman, 2008). Group identification might be a coping resource that prevents women from minimizing gender inequality they face and subsequently blaming their ingroup. Previous research has found that higher group identification among women is associated with expressing positive attitudes towards ingroup members who acknowledge the discrimination they experience (Kaiser et al., 2009; also see Fairchild & Rudman, 2008) as well as positive psychological well-being (Schmitt et al., 2002).

**Blacks**

Collective action was clearly the strongest mediator for the Black sample. For all groups, identification predicted the endorsement of collective action but when testing for mediation with all the coping options simultaneously, only for Blacks did collective action predict self-esteem and life satisfaction. Collective action was a significant mediator in both regression models. This replicates my previous research with Blacks in North America (Outten et al., 2009) where my colleagues and I found that collective action was a significant mediator of the relationship between group identification and self-esteem and the relationship between group identification and life satisfaction, even when
controlling for other types of group-based and individual coping options. It has long been the norm for Blacks to be socialized to take pride in their collective struggles against White oppression (e.g., the civil rights movement; Brown & Lesane-Brown, 2006). More importantly, greater exposure to these messages during childhood and adulthood is associated with greater resiliency in response to perceived discrimination (Brown & Tylka, 2011). As such, it is not surprising that for Blacks believing that their ingroup can collectively work together to reduce inequality was such a strong predictor of positive well-being.

**Gay People**

For all groups, identification was a negative predictor of individual mobility and a positive predictor of ingroup social support but when testing for mediation with all coping options simultaneously, only for gay people did individual mobility (negatively) and ingroup social support (positively) predict both self-esteem and life satisfaction. Individual mobility was a significant mediator in both regression models whereas ingroup social support was a marginally significant mediator of the group identification and self-esteem and a significant mediator of identification and life satisfaction. This pattern of results is consistent with what is known about gay people’s experiences with concealing their sexual orientation. Attempting to pass as a heterosexual is a form of individual mobility. One of the primary reasons why gay men and lesbians often consider passing is to protect themselves from the threat of being victimized due to their sexual orientation (Meyer, 2003). However, concealing one’s sexual identity can impair well-being because it requires constant impression management (Hetrick & Martin, 1987). Therefore while concealing one’s sexual orientation can protect gay people from the threat of being victimized, it can also severely undermine their well-being. Supporting this notion, Cole, Kemeny, Taylor, and Visscher (1996) found that among HIV-negative gay men, those who concealed their sexual orientation were more likely to have health problems than those who were open about their sexual orientation.

In addition to constant impression management, concealment can prevent gay men and lesbians from affiliating with other people who are gay (Meyer, 2003). Research has found that people with concealable stigmas, feel better about themselves when they are in environments with others who are like them rather than being in
environments with who are not similarly stigmatized (Frable, Platt, & Hoey, 1998). Furthermore, the perceived availability of social support from other gay people has been found to be a strong buffer against the psychological distress associated with victimization (Ueno, 2005). The finding that both individual mobility and ingroup social support were such strong mediators of group identification and well-being for gay people might reflect the coming out process for gay individuals. Being more identified as a gay man or lesbian is associated with being more "out". Being "out" tends to be protective of well-being by increasing access to social support from other gay people and decreasing the likelihood that gay people will engage in individual mobility (Meyer, 2003).

The mediational results for gay people also suggest that to some extent identification as a gay male or lesbian's positive effect on well-being is because it deters gay people from believing that they should avoid people and places where they might experience discrimination. Gay people were the only sample for which avoidance was found to be a significant mediator of the relationship between group identification and both self-esteem and life satisfaction on its own, however it was no longer a significant mediator of these relationships while looking at all the coping simultaneously. Avoidance like individual mobility is a strategy intended to prevent people from encountering victimization. However, avoidance differs in that it is a strategy that entails calculated avoidance of selected situations and individuals who are likely outgroup members, rather than members of one's ingroup (McDavitt et al., 2008). Many gay men and lesbians report feeling that they have to avoid certain public spaces for fear of being victimized due to the disclosure of their sexual orientation (e.g., Darwich, Hymel, & Waterhouse, 2012; Laing & Davies, 2011). It is possible that being more identified as a gay man or a lesbian, or being more "out", can make gay people feel like their group can challenge discrimination by being visible in potentially heterosexist spaces, which in turn makes people feel more empowered (for similar ideas see Savage, Harley, & Nowak, 2005). The finding that group identification protects well-being among gay people by deterring beliefs about one's ingroup being able to actively avoid heterosexist environments supports Meyer's (2003) minority stress model for lesbian and gay populations, which suggests that the more gay people identify with their group the less expectations of rejection should impair mental health.
For the deaf sample I did not find any evidence of mediation when examining all of the coping options as potential mediators of the relationship between group identification and well-being simultaneously. However, the simple mediation analysis revealed that emotional expression was a marginally significant mediator for self-esteem and life satisfaction. It is not completely clear why emotional expression might be important in accounting for the relationship between group identification and well-being among deaf persons. Perhaps believing that deaf people have a voice is important for deaf people because deafness often involves not being able to communicate in a normative fashion with the hearing majority. To my knowledge, this is the only study that has examined the relationship between identification, emotional expression and well-being among deaf people. More research is needed on these relationships before any conclusions about its importance to the Deaf community can be drawn with certainty.

One possibility is that the heterogeneity of personal characteristics related to deafness might have washed out the effects of certain coping options as mediators of identification’s relationship with well-being. Personal characteristics such as severity of hearing loss, the age of onset of deafness and mode of communication have been found to influence the degree to which people identify as deaf and the coping strategies they personally endorse. For example, relative to deaf people with lesser hearing loss, people with more severe hearing loss are more likely to be strongly identified with the Deaf community and are less likely to try to pass as hearing (Jambor & Elliott, 2005). Another possibility is that there might be coping options that are specific to the deaf people that might be related to group identification and well-being that were not captured by the group-based coping options that I tested. For example, previous research has shown that deaf people who believe that they can function well in the Deaf community and the hearing majority (i.e., a belief that one possess good bicultural skills) have higher self-esteem (Jambor & Elliott, 2005; also see Tan, Zhong, Chen, & Zhou, 2010). Future studies examining how the deaf people cope with discrimination would be wise to take into account the heterogeneity among deaf people and group-based coping options that might be unique to this community.
Implications

The findings of this investigation have implications for the ways in which psychologists study coping processes. First, this research suggests that while group identification might generally be a coping resource for disadvantaged groups, the mechanisms by which group identification has a positive effect on psychological well-being might differ depending upon factors like the degree to which a group is politicized, and the concealability of one's identity. Researchers who study coping processes among disadvantaged groups should be mindful of individual and contextual differences between social groups that might shape both the availability of and effectiveness of different coping responses. Second, it highlights that greater attention should be paid to group-oriented methods of coping because they have implications for well-being. When a stressor is shared—in that it is appraised as a threat to oneself as well as one's group members—then individuals are more likely to consider group-based options for coping (Outten et al., 2009; Smith, 1985). Research examining how people cope with shared stressors might benefit from the inclusion of group-based coping options. For example, for a shared stressor like migration, believing that one can engage in cultural activities with fellow ingroup members might be a particularly effective coping option that reduces the stress associated with migration (Guerin, Elmi, & Guerin, 2006).

My findings can also inform interventions for members of disadvantaged groups who experience discrimination. First, consistent with clinical perspectives on stigmatization the results suggest that clinicians might better serve clients dealing with stigma by trying to foster a sense of attachment to one's ingroup (Smith, 1985; Slavin et al., 1991). In a counselling session this can involve affirming the client's social identity. For example if one was counselling a gay male, then clearly articulating to the client that being a gay person is not a pathological condition but an identity that one can be proud of would be an appropriate identity affirming strategy (Savage et al., 2005). Second, the findings suggest that how members of disadvantaged groups appraise their social identities within the broader social context is a crucial determinant for how they feel about themselves. If members of disadvantaged groups believe that their ingroup can effectively challenge the discrimination they face this can potentially be beneficial for well-being. Finally, the results also suggest that such interventions might actually be
most effective if they are tailored to the specific experiences that groups have with discrimination. This is consistent with clinical and counselling perspectives that acknowledge that social groups experience disadvantage differently, so interventions with members of a particular social group should be tailored to their groups' needs (Savage et al., 2005; Slavin et al., 1991). For example, when counselling gay clients it would be important to explain why seeking out social support from ingroup members is so vital for mental health.

The findings also have implications for social policy. Given that group identification is a coping resource that can affect the likelihood that individuals appraise either group-based engagement or disengagement coping options, it seems like it would be helpful if governments supported policies that provide opportunities for members of disadvantaged groups to affiliate with their ingroup. This might entail ensuring that there are enough safe community spaces for people to affiliate with similar others and discuss their experiences as a member of their respective groups (see Savage et al., 2005). This is consistent with pluralistic or multicultural ideologies that stress the importance of acknowledging and celebrating group differences. Assimilationist ideologies, on the other hand, which tend to stress the importance of the individual rather than celebrating groups differences might actually undermine people's efforts to cope with discrimination by discouraging group identification (for similar ideas see Deaux, Reid, Martin, & Bikmen, 2006).

Limitations and Future Directions

There are also a number of ways in which future studies can expand upon this study and address its limitations. Including a broader range of well-being outcomes (e.g., anxiety, depression) would be helpful. To more directly assess the causal effects of group identification on group-based coping options on well-being, future studies might employ longitudinal or experimental designs (see Haslam, 2004 for manipulations of group identification). It would also be beneficial for future studies to consider different sequences of causality among these variables. For example it might be the case that the more members of disadvantaged groups believe that they can successfully engage with discrimination (e.g., appraise that their group can engage in collective action or contest
their relative disadvantage) the more likely they would be to identify with their group. It might also be the case that greater positive well-being encourages engaging with discrimination on a collective level. These are empirical questions worth considering.

In this investigation I assume that members of these sample groups encounter and perceive discrimination. Given the high proportion of disadvantaged group members who report personally experiencing at least one instance of discrimination in a calendar year (e.g., 98% of Black American adults, Landrine & Klonoff, 1996), this assumption makes some sense. However, groups and individual group members do vary in how much discrimination they encounter and perceive. The coping appraisals looked at here are most likely to predict the well-being of those groups and individuals who subjectively experience discrimination as stressor, not likely to predict well-being for those who don’t see discrimination (see Outten & Schmitt, 2012). Future research examining these coping processes would likely benefit from the inclusion of a measure of perceived discrimination.

In this study I examined appraisals of coping options and not actual coping behaviour. Coping options and the coping strategies that they promote can have independent effects on well-being (e.g., Chesney et al., 2006; Cicognani et al., 2009). It would be worthwhile to know if envisioning group-based options for coping with discrimination predict whether people will perform the corresponding behaviours. For example believing that one can work together with other ingroup members to better their group’s standing in society (i.e., collective action) might predict whether individuals gather with fellow ingroup members together to advance a shared cause. Another related question for future research is: do appraisals that one’s group can cope with discrimination affect individual-level coping strategies? Believing that one’s group can engage in collective action might be associated with believing that one can confront prejudiced individuals by themselves. All of these questions could certainly be addressed using self-reports of behaviour.

While I found evidence of partial mediation for women, Blacks and gay people when examining the group-based coping options simultaneously, these coping options did not fully account for the relationship between group identification and well-being. This is not too surprising, as the six coping options tested were not intended to be an
exhaustive list of factors that can help explain the positive effect of group identification on well-being. However, the lack of full mediation across the four groups does suggest that it would be worthwhile for future studies to examine other psychological factors that might also help explain this relationship. Certainly there are other group-based and individual coping options in response to discrimination that members of disadvantaged groups consider that are likely related to group identification and well-being. For example my colleagues and I found that among Black Americans, Black racial identification promoted social creativity—or beliefs about reframing the negative beliefs that society often associates with one's ingroup (Tajfel, 1978), and social creativity in turn increased life satisfaction (Outten et al., 2009).

Group-based coping options that do not pertain to experiences with discrimination might also mediate the relationship between group identification and well-being for disadvantaged groups. For example among Black Americans group identification has been found to be predictive of the use of africultural coping strategies (e.g., engaging in rituals and practices that honor the ancestors of African-Americans; Constantine, Donnelly, & Myers, 2002) and the use these africultural coping strategies have been found to be predictive of positive psychological well-being (Thomas, Witherspoon & Speight, 2008). Self-stereotyping or assigning the same stereotypical features of one's ingroup to the self—has been found to be a mediator between group identification and well-being. A recent study by Latrofa, Vaes, Pastore and Cadinu (2009) found that the more that Southern Italians (who are disadvantaged relative to Northern Italians) felt a connection to their ingroup, the more they ascribed both positive and negative traits of their ingroup to the self, which in turn was associated with greater psychological well-being.

Investigating the effect that differences in group norms have on some of the relationships I examined in this study might also be worthwhile. For example, the degree to which group-based engagement and disengagement coping options are positive for well-being might be influenced by group norms, which can differ across social contexts. Recent research by Fernández, Branscombe, Gómez, and Morales (2012) on the coping processes of people with dwarfism provides some solid evidence for this assertion. The researchers found that in the U.S., where the norm among people with dwarfism is to have pride in being a "little person", simply enjoying being around other people with
dwarfism was found to be protective of well-being. However in Spain, where the norm among people with dwarfism has been to integrate with the majority group through limb-lengthening surgery, having undergone limb-lengthening surgery was associated with positive well-being. It would be beneficial for future research to examine the effects of contextual norms on identification, group-based coping options and well-being.

Another issue that warrants investigation is whether thinking about coping options for overlapping disadvantaged identities (e.g., perceiving discrimination due to being a Black woman) rather than a single disadvantaged identity affects which types of group-based coping options mediate the relationship between group identification and well-being. There is evidence that experiences with discrimination and subsequent responses to discrimination can differ for people with overlapping disadvantaged identities (e.g., Black women relative to Black men; Thomas et al., 2008). In this study, I attempted to look at how group-based coping options in response to discrimination for a single disadvantaged identity explained the relationship between group identification and well-being.
Conclusion

This investigation extends prior research that has found that group-based coping options that engage with discrimination in part account for the relationship between group identification and well-being among racial minorities. Specifically, I found evidence suggesting that for women, Blacks and gay persons group identification promotes well-being in part because it increases the likelihood that members of those groups believed that they could use group-based engagement coping options and decreased the likelihood that they believed they could use group-based disengagement coping options. For deaf persons identification seems to promote well-being too, however the group-based coping options examined in this study did not sufficiently account for the relationship between group identification and well-being when tested as mediators simultaneously. The results as a whole suggest that group-based coping options might be more important in explaining the relationship between group identification and, well-being among disadvantaged groups that are more politicized (i.e., Blacks and gay people). Among gay people—who often have to consider concealing their identity to avoid facing hostile forms of discrimination—coping options that are about themselves either reaching out to fellow ingroup members (ingroup social support) or distancing themselves from fellow ingroup members (individual mobility) are particularly important mediators of the relationship between group identification and well-being. Taken together the findings of this study make it clear that our understanding of how members of disadvantaged groups cope with discrimination will benefit by considering group-based engagement coping options in tandem with group-based disengagement coping options.
References


Appendices
Appendix A.

Communications to Groups

Script Used to Contact Groups

Note: ***** indicate one of the social groups we are trying to recruit.

Hi! I am a Social Psychology PhD student at Simon Fraser University in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. My graduate supervisor Dr. Michael Schmitt and I are currently working on a study looking at how members of disadvantaged social groups (e.g., ethnic minorities, women, gays/lesbians and the physically disabled) cope with the negative treatment or discrimination they might encounter. We hope to uncover which types of coping beliefs best protect people from the harm caused by discrimination. Currently, we are trying to recruit *****.

My advisor and I were wondering if you would be able to communicate the message below—or something similar—to members of your organization or to ***** who use your organization’s services. This could mean communicating the message below by doing any of the following things: posting the message on your website in some form allowing people to access the link; forwarding the message to members of your online community through a mailing list; forwarding the message to members of your group’s Facebook page (if you have a Facebook page); or posting the message on your organization’s message board. Of course if there are better ways to get the message out to ***** who access your organization or who are serviced by it, your suggestions on how to do so would be welcomed. If you could let us know whether you would be willing to help us out with this study—in any way that you can—that would be greatly appreciated.

Most existing research on coping with discrimination relies on surveys of students on just a single university campus; we are asking for your help in order to broaden the sample of participants and thus present a more comprehensive picture of people’s experiences with discrimination. Any help that you could provide would be much appreciated. All participants will be entered into drawings for cash prizes as compensation for their time. There will be one Grand Prize drawing for $150 (Canadian $ or U.S. equivalent) and 2 additional draws for $50 (Canadian $ or U.S. equivalent). Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best,
Rob Outten, MA, PhD student
Dr. Michael T. Schmitt, PhD
Department of Psychology
Simon Fraser University
Recruitment Message

I am a social psychology PhD student at Simon Fraser University looking for volunteers to take part in our study on how ***** deal with experiences of discrimination.

If you are interested, you will have to complete an online survey which should take roughly 20-30 minutes to complete. You will have to answer questions regarding your experiences with discrimination as a *****, as well as general background information such as your age and gender.

All participants will be entered into drawings for cash prizes as compensation for their time. There will be one Grand Prize drawing for $150 (Canadian $ or U.S. equivalent) and 2 additional draws for $50 (Canadian $ or U.S. equivalent).

If you are interested in completing the survey, please follow the survey link listed below:
https://cgi.sfu.ca/~sisclab/cgi-bin/rws4.cgi?FORM=OnlineCopingSurvey*****

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me by email at routten@sfu.ca.

Studying how ***** deal with experiences of discrimination is important for social psychological research. These findings could help inform researchers and clinicians on the best ways to go about helping ***** people cope with the discrimination they face. Your help would be appreciated. If you know anyone else who would be interested in helping out, please forward them the link to the survey.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Rob Outten, MA
Appendix B.

Questionnaire Items

Note: ***** indicate groups that I recruited from. Either Black(s), deaf people/person, gay men, lesbian(s), or women/woman.

Following are statements with which you may disagree or agree. Use the following 7-point scale to indicate your level of agreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Identification</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel strong ties to other *****.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fact that I am ***** rarely enters my mind.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, I feel good when I think about myself as a *****.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, the fact that I am ***** is an important part of my self-image.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t feel good about being *****.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t feel a sense of being &quot;connected&quot; to other *****.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a lot in common with other *****.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, being ***** has little influence on how I feel about myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often think about the fact that I am *****.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I am glad to be *****.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it difficult to form a bond with other *****.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often regret that I am *****.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the next few webpages are statements about what you can do personally to cope with discrimination that you might face because you are ***** as well as statements about what ***** as a group can do to cope with the discrimination they might face.

We acknowledge that some statements will not be endorsed by everyone. You might agree with some, while disagree with others. Please select a number that best reflects your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collective Action</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By working together as a group, ***** can help reduce the inequality they face.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By working together, ***** can help make prejudice against us unacceptable.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***** can’t better their standing in society by working together as a group. (R)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***** can’t really help decrease the amount of discrimination they experience by working together as a group. (R)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Expression</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>***** are better of hiding their feelings when they experience discrimination. (R)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is okay for ***** to get upset and express their emotions when they face discrimination.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***** shouldn’t get upset and let their emotions out when they experience hatred from others. (R)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is okay for ***** to let their feelings out when they are faced with intolerance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup Social Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I encounter discrimination I can get emotional support from other *****.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t rely on other ***** to comfort me if I experience discrimination. (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I encounter discrimination, I try to get advice from other ***** about what to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t trust other ***** to give me guidance about dealing with discrimination. (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>***** can try to avoid interacting with people who don’t like them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***** can’t isolate themselves from people who might not like them, in an attempt to reduce the discrimination they are confronted with. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***** shouldn’t segregate themselves from people who hate them in society. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a group ***** can remove themselves from places in society where they are likely to be discriminated against.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup Blame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***** can try to acknowledge that they are somewhat responsible for the negative stereotypes about us that still permeate society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***** have to accept some blame for the negative treatment they face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***** have no reason to blame themselves for the inequality they face. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When ***** experience discrimination they don’t have to feel as though it is their fault. (R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Mobility</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distancing myself from other ***** can't make me face less discrimination. (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can try not to act like a typical ***** so that I might be treated better by others in society.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can try to fit in with mainstream social norms so that I experience less discrimination than other *****.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying to distance myself from other ***** can’t help me garner acceptance from other people in society. (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the following scale, please choose a number for each item below to best reflect your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not At All True Of Me</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very True Of Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Esteem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have high self-esteem.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I am quite satisfied with my life as a whole.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in all, I am satisfied with how my life is going.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel satisfied with my place in society.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel my life is interesting and not boring.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BACKGROUND INFORMATION
For the following questions, put a check (✓) in the box provided or fill in the blank.

Age: __________

Sex: □ Female □ Male □ Transgendered □ Not Listed
     If “Not Listed”, please specify ____________________________

What is your sexual orientation? □ Heterosexual □ Homosexual □ Bisexual
     □ Not Listed; If “Not Listed”, please specify ____________________________

In what city/country were you born? ____________________________

In what city/country do you currently live? ____________________________

What socioeconomic category best describes your familial situation?
   □ Wealthy □ Upper-middle class □ Middle class □ Lower-middle class □ Working class

What is your religious background?
   □ Protestant □ Catholic □ Muslim □ Hindu □ Sikh □ Buddhist □ Jewish □ Atheist □ Not Listed

Please check the box(es) that best describe the group(s) with which you would identify. Examples of heritage group are provided.

   □ East Asian (Chinese, Japanese, etc.) □ South Asian (East Indian, Pakistani, etc.)
   □ Black (African, Caribbean, etc.) □ White (European etc.)
   □ Aboriginal (Inuit, Métis, etc.) □ South East Asian (Vietnamese, Filipino, etc.)
   □ Latino (Mexican, Puerto Rican, etc.) □ Not Listed; If “Not Listed”, please specify:
     ____________________________

Is there a specific ethnic group(s) that you identify with (e.g., Indo-Canadian, Chinese, Jewish, Jamaican, etc.)?
   Specify: ____________________________