GROUP MEMBERSHIP AND COLLECTIVE IDENTITY: CONSEQUENCES FOR SELF-ESTEEM

SANDRA S. WRIGHT AND DONELSON R. FORSYTH
Virginia Commonwealth University

A functional approach to groups that assumes membership in a satisfying group influences self-esteem was tested by asking college students to recall and appraise their prior experiences in such groups. The results corroborated the positive impact of groups: People who were members of a satisfying group in high school (a) had higher levels of self-esteem later in life and (b) these self-esteem levels did not fluctuate even after exposure to unsupportive interpersonal feedback. These individuals did, however, respond more negatively at the affective level to negative interpersonal encounters in comparison to people who belonged to less satisfying groups in high school. These findings suggest that membership in close-knit, member-sustaining groups offers both advantages and disadvantages. A collective orientation, particularly in a prestigious group, bolsters self-esteem. However, it may also heighten sensitivity to others.

One's sense of self-worth, although private and personal, owes more to interpersonal processes than intrapsychic ones. Brown and Lohr (1987), for example, found that self-esteem was higher among high school students who belonged to a distinct peer group. They also noted that when students affiliated with a particular group, the status of that group in the peer-group hierarchy was related to the self-esteem of the individual members. Similarly, when Connoly, White, Stevens, and Burnstein (1987) asked ninth grade subjects to describe their peer social activities they found that high peer social activity was significantly related to higher social self-esteem and social confidence.

This research was supported, in part, by the Undergraduate Research Grant Program, Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Virginia Commonwealth University. It is based on a Senior Thesis that fulfilled, in part, the requirements for graduation with Honors in Psychology from the Department of Psychology at Virginia Commonwealth University. Thanks are extended to committee members Phyllis A. Hornbuckle and Mark Stasson, and to Albert Farrell for statistical advice.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Sandra Wright, Department of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutics Medical College of Virginia, Box 980533,, Richmond, VA 23298-0533

Why are group membership and self-esteem linked? Building on previous models of the general utility of groups (Bednar & Kaul, 1978; Yalom, 1985), the current research proposes that individuals who are embedded in a network of social relations can secure advantages and avoid disadvantages that would plague the lone individual. First, groups may offer individuals both emotional and instrumental social support. When group members encounter stressful experiences, such as failures or personal trauma, they can turn to the group for encouragement, advice, and guidance. Individuals with stronger social relations tend to cope better under stressful situations than individuals with weaker social relations, suggesting that groups may be effective sources of assistance during difficult times (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Pearlin, Meaghan, Liberman, & Mullan, 1981). In addition, groups, as "societies of mutual admiration," may also provide members with identity-confirming feedback in the form of approval and admiration. Although there are some exceptions, most individuals are attracted to people who provide them with positive feedback (Swann, Hixon, & De La Ronde, 1992; Swann, Stein-Seroussi, & McNulty, 1992). Therefore, most groups should provide direct self-esteem enhancing benefits to members.

Group members may also enjoy the identity-sustaining benefits provided by a positive collective identity, particularly if the group is widely admired by others. As social identity theory proposes, individuals have both a personal and collective self (Abrams & Hogg, 1990). By drawing attention to their association with prestigious groups, individuals may enhance their collective self-esteem (Cialdini et al., 1976; Cialdini & De Nicholas, 1989). Increased collective self-esteem should, in turn, enhance private self-esteem (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992).

Finally, groups may also function as arenas for the development and refinement of social skills that are necessary for positive interactions with people outside of the group. Connoly et al. (1987) found that ninth grade students who participated in more peer group activity had higher social skills ratings by teachers than ninth grade students who were less socially active, suggesting that group involvement may be helpful for social skill development. In sum, this *functional approach* suggests that group membership is adaptive because it meets basic needs for social support, esteem, identity, and information. Additionally, this approach suggests that by fulfilling these needs, especially those related to esteem and identity, a group may also enhance the self-esteem of its members.

We tested this functional approach by examining the relationship between a group's "functionality"—to what extent did it fulfill basic needs related to the self and self-esteem—and members' enduring level of self-esteem? Past studies have already confirmed the positive relationship between group membership and self-esteem by finding that people who join prestigious groups generally feel more satisfied with themselves and their attributes (Brown & Lohr, 1987). Also, people who highly value their groups tend to have higher personal self-esteem (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). The long-term effects of membership in a functional group, however, have not yet been investigated. Although the positive effects of group membership in a prestigious group may end once membership in the group ends, the experience of a membership in a highly functional group may continue long after membership is terminated.

STUDY 1

Study 1 examined two related questions. First, what aspects of group membership are associated with self-esteem: amount of participation in groups, membership in a prestigious group, or membership in an interpersonally satisfying group? If joining and taking part in groups is associated with self-esteem, people who belong to a large number of groups should have higher self-esteem than people who belong to a relatively small number of groups. If self-esteem is bolstered only when one's groups are prestigious ones, then the association between self-esteem and group membership will ultimately depend on the status value of the groups that accept us. A functional approach, however, is more encompassing. This approach assumes that individuals benefit the most from membership in a group that satisfies all of their basic needs, including those related to a positive collective identity. This approach suggests that individuals may be members of many groups or very prestigious groups, but if these groups do not meet one's basic needs then they will be less satisfying and their implications for self-esteem will be muted.

Second, which kinds of group resources contribute to one's satisfaction with their groups? Prior studies of the general utility of groups for their members, including analyses of therapeutic groups (e.g., Lakin, 1972), community groups (Forsyth, Elliott, & Welsh, 1991), and associations (Zander, 1985) argue that groups fulfill a host of interpersonal and psychological needs. Forsyth et al. (1991), for example, drew on past research to identify 16 basic group functions fulfilled by various community groups, including social bonding, downward social comparison, social control and social support. But which functions are most closely related to members' satisfaction with their groups? We predicted that groups that effectively fulfill members' interpersonal needs (their needs for self-esteem, for social support, etc.) would be viewed as most satisfying by members. We examined these questions by asking college students to evaluate (a) their affiliation with a list of groups typically found in high schools, (b) their satisfaction with the one group that they spent the most time in during their high school years, (c) the prestige of the group that they spent the most time in during

their high school years, and (d) the extent to which this group fulfilled such functions as need for social comparison, control, esteem, and social exchange. We predicted that satisfaction with one's primary peer group would be strongly related to current self-esteem, and that the amount of participation in groups and the prestige of an individual's peer group would be less strongly related to current self-esteem. In other words, it was hypothesized that members of a satisfying group would have higher self-esteem than individuals who were either not involved in groups or were members of groups that did not meet their personal self-esteem needs. We also felt that certain key functions—most notably the extent to which the group met members' needs for social self-esteem and social identity—would be most closely linked to members' ratings of their satisfaction with their group.

METHOD

Subjects. Men (54) and women (88) who were enrolled in introductory psychology at Virginia Commonwealth University participated in the study for course credit. All subjects had completed high school within the last 18 months.

Procedure. A female researcher (SSW) greeted participants as they arrived at the research facility. She explained the purpose of the research in general terms to subjects, who signed a consent form that explained the risks and benefits of participation in the research. They then completed the questionnaires described below, with the entire procedure taking approximately 30 minutes on average.

Satisfaction with Peer Group in High School. Subjects first evaluated their involvement with 16 groups that high school students typically join (e.g., band, football teams, choirs, cliques, student government) on a scale of 0 (no affiliation) to 5 (high affiliation). This scale served as a prompt to stimulate subjects' memory of their high school interactions and as a basis for them to identify their most significant peer group. This list of 16 groups was based on a pilot study in which approximately 150 introductory psychology students listed cliques and groups in their high schools. Affiliation scores on each of the 16 groups were averaged to provide a rough estimate of total peer group affiliation.

After rating all 16 groups, subjects identified the group that they spent the most time in during high school and rated this group on a series of bipolar adjective pairs using a scale from 1 to 5: personally rewarding/not personally rewarding; enjoyable/unenjoyable; satisfying/unsatisfying; important to me/not important to me; prestigious/unprestigious; and exclusive/open to anyone. These items were drawn from Pavelchak, Moreland, and Levine (1986). The first four items were averaged to yield an overall index of group satisfaction and the last two items were averaged to yield an index of group prestige. The internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha coefficient) of the satisfaction index was .75.

TABLE 1. The Functions of Groups

Function	Definition	Example
Social bonding	Basic affiliative tendency	"I enjoy being part of this group."
Social comparison: downward	Comparing one's own outcomes to less successful group members	"I'm doing well compared to some people in the group."
Social comparison: upward	Comparing one's own outcomes to successful group members	"Some people in this group are a source of inspiration to me."
Social control	Influencing others	"I'm able to take charge in the group."
Social esteem	Acceptance from others	"My group helps me feel good about myself."
Social exchange	Sharing resources among members	"We help one another."
Social expression	Verbalizing ideas and emotions	"I can express my feelings in this group."
Social identification	Minimizing identifiability by working in a group	"I feel less 'singled out' when I am in the group."
Social identity	Self-image based on group membership	"I can identify with the people in this group."
Social influence	Change due to the group influence	"This group has changed me."
Social learning	Acquiring information from others	"I learn things in this group."
Social learning: self-insight	Acquiring information about oneself	"The group helps me understand myself better."
Social relations	Satisfaction of intimacy needs through membership	"The group makes me feel less lonely."
Social skill development	Interpersonal skill acquisition	"The group has taught me how to work with others."
Social support	Interpersonal encouragement	"This group supports me in many ways."
Socialization	Provision on standards and goals	"I try to live up to my group's standards."

Group Resources Inventory. The functions that were fulfilled by the primary peer group in high school were measured by using the Group Resources Inventory (GRI). This inventory, which is based on several earlier analyses of the social provisions (Shaver & Buhrmester, 1982), curative factors (Yalom, 1985), and social support (Sarason, Sherain, Pierce, & Sarason, 1987) in groups, measures the 16 basic functions of a group shown in Table 1:

TABLE 2. *Functions of Groups Ratings as Predictors of Satisfaction*

Step	Variable	R Change	F-ratio	Total R
1	Social Control	.19	32.41	.19**
2	Self-Insight	.05	10.90	.24**
3	Social Learning	.03	4.97	.27*

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

social bonding, downward social comparison, upward social comparison, social control, social esteem, social exchange, social expression, social identification, social identity, social influence, social learning, self-insight, social relations, social skill development, social support, and socialization. Respondents indicate if they agree, disagree, or are neutral in their reaction to such statements as "Some people in the group were a source of inspiration to me" and "My sense of identity came, in part, from my membership in this group." Prior psychometric analyses indicate that the 16 scales have adequate levels of internal consistency. Although the Cronbach alpha coefficient for the social identification scale is only .59, most of the other scale coefficients range from .75 to .87 (Forsyth et al., 1991).

Self-Esteem. Self-esteem was measured using five items drawn from the Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965). These items were embedded in a list of sixteen distractor items pertaining to attitudes about high school groups (e.g. "In high school being part of a group was important because it meant that others accepted you"). Subjects were asked to respond to these items using a scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). The Chronbach alpha coefficient for this scale was .77.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Subjects' responses were examined using two multiple regression analyses. The first regression probed the relationship between self-esteem and membership in groups, membership in a prestigious group, and membership in an interpersonally satisfying group by using the three group-level variables as predictor variables in simultaneous multiple regression analysis of self-esteem. This analysis indicated that both prestige and satisfaction were significantly related to self-esteem; $Fs(1, 138) = 4.22$ and 4.32, $ps < .05$. The beta weights for these two variables were, respectively, 0.10 and 0.12. Membership in many groups, per se, was not related to self-esteem ($p > .60$). Only membership in a prestigious and satisfying peer group was related to self-esteem. (Effects of race and gender were also nonsignificant in this and all other analyses.)

Table 2 summarizes the results of a second regression which used satisfaction as the criterion variable and the 16 functions of groups from the

Group Resources Inventory as predictor variables in a stepwise multiple regression. This analysis yielded a multiple correlation of .27 ($p. < 05$). The best predictor and first to enter the equation was social control (beta = .298). The second variable was the amount of self-insight gained from the group (beta = .184). Knowledge and information obtained from the group (social learning) was also a significant predictor (beta = .229).

These results indicate that only certain group functions were clearly associated with group satisfaction. For example, groups that provided individuals with leadership positions were rated as more satisfying. Those who agreed to items such as "I enjoyed being able to influence people in my group" and "I was able to take charge in the group" reported greater satisfaction with their peer groups.

Groups that provided members with greater self-understanding were also rated as more satisfying. Individuals who agreed with items such as "The group gave me insight into who I am" and "I gained considerable self-understanding in this group" were more satisfied with their groups. Finally, groups that provided members with general knowledge appeared to enhance member satisfaction. Individuals who agreed with items such as "I learned things in the group" and "I got good suggestions from the group" also expressed greater satisfaction with their groups.

Many other functions were not associated with increased group satisfaction. People who felt that their groups provided opportunities for social bonding, social comparison, or social expression, for example, were no more likely to report greater satisfaction with their groups. Similarly, individuals who felt that their groups provided them with a clear sense of identity or social support did not display higher levels of group satisfaction. Thus, it was membership in a group that provided an opportunity for leadership and information that was related to greater satisfaction rather than membership in an identity-defining group or a supportive group.

The closer association between self-esteem and the instrumental functions of groups (leadership, information, etc.) rather than interpersonal functions of groups (bonding, social comparison) may be due to the passage of time in the individuals' lives we investigated. During late adolescence, one may particularly value groups that provide one with opportunities to gain control, to clarify one's identity, and to gain useful information. Later in life other functions of groups, such as support and social comparison, may become more essential. In addition, the retrospective recall method used to assess the functions of groups may be more accurate for instrumental functions than for interpersonal ones. Whereas individuals can identify their group's utility in meeting their control and informational needs, they may not be as accurate when they

rate their group's usefulness as an arena for social bonding and emotional expression.

The results provided partial support for the functional approach to groups. Self-esteem could not be predicted by the number of groups individuals joined, ruling out the possibility that merely joining groups enhances self-esteem. The functional approach to groups predicted that various group functions, especially those directly related to self-esteem needs, would be associated with increased group satisfaction, and that group satisfaction would be related to self-esteem. However, satisfaction was not the most important predictor of self-esteem. Further, the functions of groups we felt would be most related to satisfaction, such as social identity and esteem, were not significant predictors of satisfaction.

The pattern of results suggested a two-component model. Consistent with previous research, the prestige of the group proved to be the most important determinant of current self-esteem (Brown & Lohr, 1987; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). The satisfaction individuals derived from groups was also predictive of self-esteem, even after the prestige of the group was taken into account. The explanation for these results may lie in the results of the regression analysis which used items from the GRI as predictors of satisfaction. The satisfaction individuals derived from their groups appeared to reflect instrumental needs, such as the need for information. The prestige of the group may have been more reflective of emotional needs, such as the need for a positive social identity. These results suggest that the instrumental needs provided by the group may be important, albeit secondary, predictors of self-esteem.

STUDY 2

Study 1 suggested that membership in a prestigious and satisfying group may have a positive influence on self-esteem. The second study was conducted to determine how individuals with differing experiences in groups would react after a positive versus negative social encounter. While belonging to a prestigious group in high school may have a direct, positive influence on current self-esteem, a group's ability to meet members' instrumental needs may be an important indicator of how individuals react to social situations later in life. In other words, the prestige of a former group may only influence self-esteem, whereas a functional and satisfying group may be more helpful in preparing individuals for future social situations.

We contacted individuals from Study 1 who were either satisfied or unsatisfied with their primary peer group in high school. We then arranged for these individuals to have a short conversation with another college student, who then rated the subject on such adjectives

as "skillful," "interesting," "intelligent," and "attractive." For half the subjects, the ratings were positive, but for the other half the ratings were more negative.

Because the functional approach assumes that membership in a satisfying group in high-school would provide members with the tools to handle social situations, we predicted that individuals who had been members of a satisfying group in high school would be less influenced by the nature of the brief exchange. We expected that the unsupportive encounter would leave their self-esteem unchanged, and that they would be less upset relative to those individuals who had less experience in functionally satisfying groups. We expected that individuals whose self-esteem was not rooted in a group that met their instrumental needs would be more strongly affected by the encounter.

METHOD

Subjects. The 40 men and women who were the most and least satisfied with their high school peer group were contacted by telephone within eight weeks of their participation in Study 1. They were asked if they would be willing to take part in a study called "First Impressions," and they were promised both credit for their psychology class and five dollars for one half-hour of their time. They were scheduled to participate in same-sex pairs.

Procedure. Participants, upon arriving at the research facility, were greeted by a female researcher (SSW) who explained the purpose of the research. The pairs were told that they would interview each other for five minutes each and then respond to some questions afterwards. They were given informed consent forms to read and sign.

Subjects' interviews were standardized by asking them to only ask questions from a list of previously prepared questions (such as "what is your major?" and "where are you from?"). Each interview lasted approximately five minutes, and when both were completed one of the subjects was taken to another room. Once separated, they evaluated each other on five adjectives on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 11 (extremely): skillful, anxious, interesting, intelligent, and attractive. At the bottom of the evaluation, they were asked to respond to the question "What is your general evaluation of this individual? Please write a sentence or two below."

When both subjects had completed the evaluations, the experimenter explained that because she was interested in their reactions to the evaluation process, they would have the opportunity to read over their partner's ratings. However, rather than giving subjects the ratings recorded by their partner, the experimenter instead gave each subject a previously prepared evaluation that was either positive or negative in nature. The positive

evaluation included ratings of 7 or above on the adjectives "skillful," "interesting," "intelligent," and "attractive" and a rating of 3 for the adjective "anxious." At the bottom of the evaluation, the other subject had apparently written, "I found her (or him) to be interesting and likeable. I think that we could probably be friends." The evaluation that served as the negative feedback included ratings of 4 or below on all of the adjectives. At the bottom of the evaluation, the interviewer had apparently written, "I didn't find him (or her) to be particularly interesting or likeable. I doubt that we would ever be friends."

After reading their evaluations subjects completed a questionnaire measure of their self-esteem, affect, and their perceptions of the feedback. Once finished, they were reunited and probed for suspicion regarding the bogus evaluations and the connection between the two studies. Subjects were, at that time, fully informed of the deception involving the evaluations and completely debriefed about the nature and purpose of the study. They were given five dollars for their participation before leaving.

Measures. The post-feedback questionnaire assessed self-esteem using five items from Rosenberg (1965) that were not used in Study 1. These items were embedded in a list of five filler items pertaining to perceptions of the interaction and the nature and accuracy of the feedback they received. Subjects' responses could range from "strongly agree" (1) to "strongly disagree" (5).

Subjects' emotional reactions were also measured by asking them to indicate (on a scale from 1 to 5) the extent to which they felt positive, glad, content, delighted, happy, competent, and pleased and the extent to which they felt threatened, alarmed, angry, upset, mad, distressed, annoyed, and betrayed. These two sets of items were summed to yield overall indexes of positive and negative affect; their internal consistencies (as indicated by Cronbach's alpha coefficient) were .85 and .83, respectively.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data from two subjects were not analyzed because they expressed suspicion over the bogus evaluations during the debriefing period. Because preliminary analyses revealed no effects due to sex of subject, analyses reported here utilized a 2 (peer group satisfaction: low vs. high) × 2 (encounter: supportive or unsupportive) analysis of variance (except where otherwise noted). A regression approach was used that adjusted main effects for other main effects and the two-way interaction for the main effects, and post-hoc tests were conducted, when appropriate, using Duncan's New Multiple Range Test (Cramer & Appelbaum, 1980).

TABLE 3. The Impact of a Positive or Negative Encounter on the Self-Esteem Level and Affective Response of Individuals Who Were High and Low in Their Satisfaction with Membership in a High-School Peer Group.

	High Satisfaction		Low Satisfaction	
Measure	Supportive	Unsupportive	Supportive	Unsupportive
Self Esteem	3.68^{ab}	4.24^{a}	2.90^{b}	4.23^{a}
Affect	2.95^{ab}	2.23^{bc}	2.14^{c}	3.07^{a}

Note. Differences between means were tested using Duncan's Multiple Range Test (alpha = .05). For each dependent measure (self-esteem and affect), means without a common single letter superscript are significantly different.

Manipulation Check. Analysis of subjects' responses to the item "My partner gave me a very positive rating" yielded a significant main effect for type of encounter; $F(1,34) = 106.96$, $p < .001$. The means for the supportive and unsupportive conditions were 1.9 and 4.5, respectively. No other effects reached significance on this item.

Self-Esteem and Support. Analysis of subjects' self-esteem levels immediately following the positive or negative encounter supported predictions, but only in part. In general, subjects compensated for the information they received from their partner; $F(1,34) = 18.66$, $p < .001$. Instead of accepting the feedback from their partner passively, those given negative feedback rated themselves more positively than those given positive feedback. The means were 4.2 and 3.4, respectively.

The marginally significant two-way interaction partly qualifies this effect; $F(1,34) = 3.6$, $p < .07$. As the means in Table 3 indicate, the self-esteem levels of subjects who were satisfied with their group membership in high school were not influenced by the nature of the encounter. Those who were low in their satisfaction with their group members in high school, in contrast, displayed significantly lower levels of self-esteem following a supportive rather than nonsupportive encounter ($p < .05$).

Affective Response to Threat. Analysis of subjects' responses to the positive affect item revealed an interaction of peer group satisfaction and type of encounter; $F(1,34) = 10.35$, $p < .01$. As Table 3 indicates, the encounter had opposite effects on those who were satisfied and dissatisfied with their high school groups. Those who were relatively satisfied with their high school peer group responded with less positive affect after negative feedback and more positive affect after positive feedback. Those who were relatively unsatisfied with their high school peer group responded with less positive affect after positive feedback and more positive affect after negative feedback.

This effect did not hold for subjects' ratings of their negative affect. Analysis of these scores yielded only a main effect for feedback; $F(1,34) = 10.55$, $p < .01$. Subjects who received negative feedback reported more

negative affect than subjects who received positive feedback. The means were 1.89 and 1.30, respectively.

CONCLUSIONS

We examined the relationship between membership in a group and self-esteem by using both correlational and experimental strategies. The correlational phase of the research indicated that people who had once been members of prestigious and satisfying groups had higher self-esteem than individuals who weren't involved in groups or were members of groups that did not meet their self-esteem needs. Further, satisfaction with one's primary peer group was related to the group's ability to meet instrumental needs, such as information about the self.

The experimental phase of the research examined the relationship between satisfaction with a former peer group and reactions to evaluative feedback. Individuals, regardless of their prior group experiences, showed a strong compensation effect after the negative feedback. Consistent with previous studies, individuals who received negative interpersonal evaluations evaluated themselves more highly than individuals who received positive evaluations, suggesting that the negative evaluations prompted individuals to reassure themselves of their positive value (Swann & Hill, 1982).

The effects of group membership were more evident at the affective level. Individuals who belonged to satisfying adolescent peer groups appeared to be more concerned about the negative interpersonal feedback. Although there were no differences in negative affect between the two groups after positive or negative feedback, individuals who belonged to satisfying peer groups reported less positive affect after receiving a negative evaluation than individuals with less satisfying adolescent peer groups. The negative consequences of an unsatisfying peer group were seen when subjects were given positive feedback, for individuals with satisfying peer-group relations accepted this feedback, whereas those with less satisfying peer group experiences rejected this feedback. They evaluated themselves less positively and reported less positive affect after receiving positive feedback than negative feedback.

These results suggest that individuals who belonged to more satisfying peer groups may have developed a tendency to be more socially sensitive to feedback than individuals who belonged to less satisfying peer groups. They were more upset by negative evaluations and more pleased by positive evaluations than individuals who were involved with less satisfying groups. It would be maladaptive to ignore evaluations from others because we often rely on feedback from other people for successful interpersonal relationships. The reactions of individuals who belonged to more satisfying groups to the evaluative information seem to be appropriate and may reflect one benefit of belonging to satisfying groups: social skill development. Group membership may provide people with the interpersonal skills necessary for them to have positive interactions with other people, thus leading to a more positive self-concept.

The results of this study are limited by the correlational nature of this type of research. Because it is impossible to assign individuals to primary peer groups, correlational designs must be employed to examine the possible effects of peer group membership. Unfortunately, we cannot rule out the possibility that individuals with high self-esteem may be more inclined to join prestigious and satisfying groups. However, the relationship is most likely a reciprocal one, in which individuals with high self-esteem are more accepted in prestigious and satisfying groups, and they benefit from such memberships by having their emotional and instrumental needs met.

Taken together, the results of these studies reaffirm the importance of groups. Groups may provide members with valuable resources, including an increased sense of worth. Individuals who suffer from low self-esteem or other problems of adjustment may benefit from affiliating themselves with other people. When individuals encounter stressful experiences they require emotional support, advice, guidance, and positive feedback about their value. Across the lifespan individuals need to give and receive nurturance. In many situations individuals require information about the nature of the social world and their own personal identities. In some cases the tasks they attempt are so difficult that they would be overwhelmed if they attempted them alone. Relative to isolation, interdependence is highly functional: we use other people to achieve a variety of goals (Forsyth, 1991; Lakin, 1972; Mackie & Goethals, 1987; Moreland, 1987).

REFERENCES

Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (1990). An introduction to social identity approach. In D. Abrams & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity theory: Constructive and critical advances* (pp. 1–9). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Bednar, R. L., & Kaul, T. (1978). Experiential group research: Current perspectives. In S. Garfield and A. Bergin (Eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change* (2nd ed., pp. 769–815). New York: Wiley.

Brown, B. B., & Lohr, N. (1987). Peer group affiliation and adolescent self-esteem: An integration of ego-identity and symbolic-interaction theories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 47–55.

Cialdini, R. B., Bordern, R., Thorne, A., Walker, M., Freeman, S., & Sloane, L. T. (1976).

Basking in reflected glory: Three football field studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34*, 366–375.

Cialdini, R. B., & De Nicholas, M.E. (1989). Self-presentation by association. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 626–631.

Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 98*, 310–357.

Connolly, J., White, D., Stevens, R., & Burnstein, S. (1987). Adolescent self-reports of social activity: Assessment of stability and relations to social adjustment. *Journal of Adolescence, 10*, 83–95.

Cramer, E. M., & Appelbaum, M. I. (1980). Nonorthogonal analysis of variance—Once again. *Psychological Bulletin, 87*, 51–57. Forsyth, D. R. (1991). Change in therapeutic groups. In C. R. Snyder and D. R. Forsyth (Eds.), *Handbook of social and clinical psychology: The health perspective* (pp.664–680). New York: Pergamon.

Forsyth, D. R., Elliot, T. R., & Walsh, J. A. (1991). *Multidimensional model of the functions of groups*. Paper presented at the Third Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Society, Washington, D.C.

Lakin, M. (1972). *Experiential groups: The uses of interpersonal encounter, psychotherapy groups, and sensitivity training*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*, 302–318.

Mackie, D. M. & Goethals, G. R. (1987). Individual and group goals. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology, 8*, 144–166.

Moreland, R. L. (1987). The formation of small groups. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology, 8*, 80–110.

Pavelshak, M. A., Moreland, R. L., & Levine, J. M. (1986). Effects of prior group memberships on subsequent reconnaissance activities. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 56–66.

Pearlin, L. I., Meaghan, E. G., Lieberman, M. A., & Mullan, T. J. (1981). The stress process. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 22*, 337–356.

Riggio, R.E., Throckmorton, B. & Depaola, S. (1990). Social skills and self-esteem. *Personality and Individual Differences, 11*(8), 799–804.

Rosenberg, N. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Sarason, B. R., Shearin, E. N., Pierce, G. R., & Sarason, I. G. (1987). Interrelations of social support measures: Theoretical and practical implications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 813–832.

Shaver, P., & Buhrmester, D. (1983). Loneliness, sex-role orientation, and group life: A social needs perspective. In P. B. Paulus (Ed.), *Basic group processes* (pp. 259–288). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Swann, W. B., Jr., & Hill, C. A. (1982). When our identities are mistaken: Reaffirming self-conceptions through social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43*, 59–66.

Swann, W. B., Jr., Hixon, J.G., & De La Ronde, C. (1992). Embracing the bitter truth: Negative self-concepts and marital commitment. *Psychological Science, 3*, 118–121.

Swann, W. B., Jr., Stein-Seroussi, A., & McNulty, S. E. (1992). Outcasts in a white-lie society: The enigmatic worlds of people with negative self-conceptions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*, 618–624.

Yalom, I. D. (1985). *The theory and practice of group psychotherapy*. New York: Basic.

Zander, A. (1985). *The purposes of groups and organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.