INTRAGROUP DYNAMICS, INTERGROUP RELATIONS AND AUTHENTICITY IN ORGANIZATIONAL AND SOCIAL CONTEXTS - PART I: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK*

Dr. Plamen Loukov Dimitrov
Bulgarian Psychological Society

Dr. Nadia Lyubomirova Mateeva
Department of Psychology, Institute of Population and Human Studies
Bulgarian Academy of Science

Abstract: Despite their shared focus on influence of groups on individual, research bridging intragroup dynamics and intergroup relations as predictors of authentic and inauthentic (self-alienated) experience, behavior and interaction of individuals in organizational and social contexts is surprisingly rare. The goal of the present article is to highlight how understanding the reciprocal dynamic relationship between intragroup processes and intergroup relations offers valuable new insights into both topics and suggests new, productive avenues for psychological theory, research and practice development – particularly for understanding and improving the intragroup and intergroup relations in groups, organizations and society affecting authentic psychosocial functioning. The article discusses the complementary role of intergroup and intragroup dynamics, reviewing how intergroup relations can affect intragroup dynamics which, in turn, affects the authenticity of individual experiences, behaviors and relations with others. The paper considers the implications, theoretical and practical, of the proposed reciprocal relationships between intragroup and intergroup processes as factors influencing authentic vs. inauthentic psychosocial functioning of individuals in organizational and social settings.
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Резюме: Въпреки споделените им фокус върху влиянието на групите върху индивидите, проучванията свързани с взаимоотношенията между индивидите в групите и междугруповите процеси като предиктори на автентичността или неавтентичността на личността са изникнали сравнително рядко. Целта на настоящата статия е да покаже как разбирането за взаимоотношенията между индивидите в групите и междугруповите отношения осигурява ценни нови прозрения в двете области и предлага нови продуктивни подходи за развитието на психологическата теория и практика – особено при разбирането и подобряването на взаимоотношенията между индивидите в групите, организационната среда и обществото, което оказва влияние върху автентичността на личността. В статията се разглежда модел на взаимоотношенията между индивидите в групите и междугруповите отношения като се подчертава как междугруповите отношения могат да въздействат върху автентичността на индивидите и междугруповите отношения в групите, които създават нови продуктивни подходи за развитие на психологическата теория и практика – особено при разбирането и подобряването на взаимоотношенията между групите и междугруповите отношения в групите, организационната среда и обществото, което оказва влияние върху автентичността на личността. В статията се разглежда модел на взаимоотношенията между индивидите в групите и междугруповите отношения като се подчертава как междугруповите отношения могат да въздействат върху автентичността на индивидите и междугруповите отношения в групите, които създават нови продуктивни подходи за развитие на психологическата теория и практика – особено при разбирането и подобряването на взаимоотношенията между индивидите в групите, организационната среда и обществото, което оказва влияние върху автентичността на личността. В статията се разглежда модел на взаимоотношенията между индивидите в групите и междугруповите отношения като се подчертава как междугруповите отношения могат да въздействат върху автентичността на индивидите и междугруповите отношения в групите, които създават нови продуктивни подходи за развитие на психологическата теория и практика – особено при разбирането и подобряването на взаимоотношенията между индивидите в групите, организационната среда и обществото, което оказва влияние върху автентичността на личността.
AUTHENTIC Vs. INAUTHENTIC PSYCHOSOCIAL FUNCTIONING OF THE INDIVIDUAL

For centuries artists, clergy, philosophers, psychologists and psychotherapists have long sought to define who one "really" is in his/her psychosocial functioning as an individual nested in social groups, organizations, communities and society. According to Baumeister (1987), concern over distinguishing between private concealment of one’s self from that which was observable in others emerged as an area of interest around the XVI-th century. Ensuing themes depicting “true” versus “false” selves of people provided a varied range of possibilities for characterizing one’s real self. Determining whether one’s self was in fact true or false ranged from numerous considerations of evaluative referents that included, but were not limited to, one’s faith, piety, heart, or virtue (Taylor, 1992; Mills, 1997; Heidiger, 1927/1962; Kernis & Goldman, 2005; 2006; ). Although the construct of one’s true self has been conceptualized in diverse ways, many historical and contemporary perspectives consider knowledge of one’s self as a meaningful component of one’s true self (Park, 1999; Harter, 2002). For instance, the playwright Anton Chekhov once stated “Man is what he believes.” From this perspective one’s true self is intimately linked with his/her self-knowledge, private self-identity and his/her self-reflective capacity (Guignon, 1993; Ferrara, 2004). But, this is not a case for accuracy per se. It is a case for the impact of one’s perceptions, self-understanding and self-reflection, irrespective of accuracy. To further complicate accuracy in conceptualizing one’s true self, early psychodynamic perspectives championed by Freud (1901) and psychoanalysis affirmed the role of unconscious motives and ego-defense mechanisms in shaping the authentic vs. inauthentic psychosocial functioning of the individual. In this view, one’s true self may even be obscured by one’s own neurotically driven self-deceptions and ego-defensive distortions of internal and external realities (Mills, 1997). Subsequently, existential and humanistic psychologists highlighted the role of one’s true self and authentic experiences, behaviors and interactions of the individual in illuminating healthy personality adjustment, psychosocial functioning and life-span development of people (Heidigger, 1927/1962; Guignon, 1993; Park, 1999). Maslow (1968) suggested that authenticity occurs when individuals discover their true inner nature and actualize their inherent potentialities by sufficiently satisfying higher order psychological needs. That is, after gratifying their physiological needs, individuals then turn toward satisfying their “being” or growth-oriented needs. Focusing on one’s psychosocial growth-oriented needs presumably results in fuller knowledge and acceptance of one’s true, or intrinsic nature, furthering one’s path toward self-actualization (Maslow, 1968). In this view, authenticity depends upon knowledge and understanding of one’s core needs, coupled with self-actualizing tendencies to actively fulfill them in all aspects of individual’s psychosocial functioning. Similarly, Rogers (1961) emphasized that authenticity emerges when congruence is achieved between one’s private self-concept and immediate experiences, behaviors, and interactions with others in group, organizational and social contexts. Thus, being one’s true self involves a sense of connectedness between one’s self-knowledge and attendant experiences, behaviors and interactions of individual in his/her group, organizational and social settings. Accordingly, authenticity is rooted in one’s self, but not as a static privately accessible self-representation. Rather, authenticity may be conceptualized as a ongoing psychodynamic process whereby one’s potentials, characteristics, emotions, values, motivation, and so forth are discovered and explored, accepted, imbued with meaning or purpose, and expressed and actualized. When experiences, behaviors and social interactions of the individual are congruent with the true self, he/she becomes healthier and fully functional in psychosocial and mental health terms. In this view, healthy adjustment and development of the individual, both intrapersonally and interpersonally, may be the best markers for the presence of vital authenticity in individuals, and constructive climates (conditions, spaces, cultures) for authenticity expression and development in human groups, organizations and society.

Although much has been written about authenticity historically, very little empirical research has examined it and its determination forces directly. However, some research has focused on establishing what outcomes emerge when false or inauthentic selves are functioning. This research has typically examined behavioral and relational aspects of relatively inauthentic, self-alienating experiences in daily life. For example, false self inauthentic behaviors and interactions have been examined with respect to such varied topics as self-monitoring (Snyder, 1974), strategic self-presentations (Goffman, 1959;1963; Schlenker, 1980), and voice (Gilligan, 1982; Harter, Waters & Whitesell, 1997). These
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areas of social psychological research share a common orientation in examining circumstances when individuals’ own needs or motives are characteristically incongruent with the prevailing environmental context, climate or culture of their group, organizational and social settings. In addition, congruence between one’s core self-aspects and his/her psychosocial functioning has been examined in various ways. Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985a), for instance, has spawned research demonstrating the importance of need satisfaction in examining authenticity (Deci & Ryan, 2000). It proposed that individuals possess three fundamental intrinsic needs: autonomy (i.e., choice), competence (i.e, mastery) and relatedness (i.e., connectedness with others). These intrinsic needs are conceptualized as being most central to one’s core or true self. Therefore, when these needs are satisfied (as opposed to being thwarted) in group, organizational and social context individuals will experience greater authenticity and healthier psychosocial adjustment and development. In support of this contention, Sheldon and Kasser (1998) reported that individuals whose life goals were highly concordant (i.e., congruent with their core needs, values, and interests) scored higher on a variety of psychosocial adjustment and mental health indices (incl., self-actualization, positive mood, vitality, self-esteem) than did individuals whose life goals were less concordant. In two independent longitudinal research projects, Sheldon and Kasser (1998), and Dimitrov & Mateeva (2013) found that individuals’ psychosocial functioning and adjustment increased over time when life goals were high but not low in self-concordance, and people felt that their life planning is really functioning as an expression of their true selves, helping them “to enact their core experiences, values and desires on the psychosocial stage of their life dramas”. Similarly, Goldman, Kernis, Piaskecki, Hermann, and Foster (2003) found that individuals’ psychosocial functioning, adjustment and development, as measured by autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, purpose in life, self-acceptance, and positive relationships, increased to the extent that their life goals “reflected who they really are as a person”. Such findings suggest that the immediate and long-term benefits of life goal pursuits are enhanced when these life goals and life scripts represent one’s authentic or core self. Taken together, these findings indicate that authenticity is linked to effective and healthy psychosocial functioning, adjustment and development of human beings (Димитров & Матеева, 2012; Матеева, 2011; 2012а; 2012б; Матеева & Димитров, 2012а; 2012б; Dimitrov & Mateeva, 2012а; 2012б; Mateeva & Dimitrov, 2012).

However, as a distinct personality variable authenticity has not received much attention before year 2000. To fill this gap, Kernis & Goldman (2005; 2006) and Wood et al.(2008) developed the first two psychometric tools to measure individual differences in authenticity. These inventories were based on multicomponent conceptions of authenticity of psychosocial functioning of the individual. Authenticity, finally, has been operationalized as “the unobstructed operation of one’s core or true self in one’s daily enterprise” (Goldman & Kernis, 2002; Kernis, 2003). Specifically, authenticity involves the following discriminable components: (1) self-awareness, (2) unbiased processing, (3) authentic behavior or action, and (4) relational authenticity.

The first component, self-awareness, refers to having maximal knowledge, recognition and trust of one’s own motives, feelings, desires, and self-relevant feelings and cognitions. It includes, but is not limited to, being aware of one’s strengths, weaknesses, trait characteristics, emotions, inner conflicts, and their roles in behavior. An important aspect of this component is that awareness is not reflected in self-concepts wherein inherent polarities are unrecognized or denied (i.e., that have been characterized as internally consistent; Campbell,1990). That is, self-awareness does not simply reflect recognition of one’s self as “introverted” or “neurotic”, for example. Rather, self-awareness represents recognition of existing polarities inherent in one’s self-concept, or, as Perls put it, being aware of both "figure" and "ground" in one's personality aspects (Perls, Hefferline, & Goodman, 1951). Therefore, self-awareness involves knowledge and acceptance of one’s multifaceted and potentially contradictory self-aspects (i.e., being both introverted and extraverted, neurotic and emotionally stable), as opposed to rigid acceptance of only those self-aspects deemed internally consistent with one’s overall self-concept.

The second component of authenticity involves the unbiased processing of self-relevant information. Unbiased processing reflects objectivity in assessing one's positive and negative self-aspects, attributes, qualities, and potentials. Stated differently, unbiased processing involves "not denying,}
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distorting, exaggerating, or ignoring private knowledge, internal experiences, and externally based evaluative information” (Kernis, 2003, p. 14). Deviations from objective self-reflections are considered to largely involve ego-defense mechanisms and may therefore be a marker for maladjustment. For instance, Unger, Waters, Barnett and Dolby (1997), Dimitrov (2008), and Dimitrov & Mateeva (2012a) found that maladaptive or immature ego defenses that involve greater reality distortion and/or failure to acknowledge and resolve distressing emotions relate to numerous psychological and interpersonal difficulties, including poor adjustment to work and family roles. Similarly, it was found that individuals who repressed traumatic events, felt less authentic and experienced lower levels of psychological health than did those who actively talked/wrote about their troubling experiences. Thus, sustained tendencies to process self-relevant information without openly, objectively and honestly attending to it is likely to result in diminished psychosocial adjustment and mental health.

The third component of authenticity involves authentic behavior or action. Authenticity reflects acting in accord with one’s values, preferences, and needs as opposed to acting merely to please others or to attain rewards or avoid punishments, or acting "falsely". Theoretically, authentic behavior involves behavior that reflects self-determination (i.e., autonomy and choice), as opposed to controlled and conformistic behavior that is contingent upon meeting introjected or external goals and demands (Kernis et. al., 2000). Kernis (2003) suggests that authentic behavior reflects sensitivity to the fit (or lack of) between one’s true self, the dictates of the group, organizational ad social environments, and an awareness of the potential implications of one’s behavioral and sometimes, really existential choices. Moreover, authenticity is not reflected in a compulsion to be one's true self at all costs, but rather in the free, spontaneous and natural expression of one’s core feelings, motives, and inclinations in the environmental contexts one encounters (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

And finally, the fourth component of authenticity involves one’s relational orientation toward others. That is, relational authenticity involves the extent to which one values and achieves openness and truthfulness in one’s interpersonal and social relationships, in one’s social roles enactments. Relational authenticity also entails wanting and allowing others to see one’s true self, both the good and bad qualities. Toward that end, an authentic relational orientation involves a effective process of self-disclosure such that others learn who you really are (Kernis & Goldman, 2005; 2006). An authentic relational orientation should therefore foster the development of mutual intimacy and trust (e.g., more secure attachment). In short, relational authenticity means being genuine and not fake in one’s social roles and relationships with others.

Recent investigations have demonstrated that individual’s situational and dispositional authenticity appears to be linked pervasively to greater psychosocial adjustment, well-being and mental health. Goldman and Kernis (2002) found that higher scores in personal authenticity related to higher levels of global self-esteem and lower levels of contingent self-esteem. Authenticity was also linked with hedonic benefits, in that higher authenticity scores were associated with greater subjective well-being, as measured by greater reported levels of life-satisfaction and positive affectivity and lower negative affectivity. In a longitudinal study examining dispositional authenticity, life goal pursuits, and adjustment, Goldman, Kernis, Piascecki, Hermann, and Foster (2003), hypothesized that higher authenticity scores would be related to healthier life goal pursuits, subjective well-being, psychological well-being, and personality and interpersonal adjustment. Goldman et al. proposed that individuals’ life goal pursuits would provide opportunities for competence, self-determination, expressing one’s true self, and positive feelings, especially for individuals who are high in authenticity. These researchers found that higher authenticity scores were related to life goal pursuit ratings that reflected greater self-concordance, self-worth benefit, fun, relative importance, efficacy, absorption and lower reported levels of pressure. With respect to subjective and psychological well-being, Goldman et al. (2003) found also that higher authenticity ratings were positively correlated with all six subscales of Ryff’s (1989) multicomponent measure of well-being. Specifically, higher authenticity scores were related to greater autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relationships with others, purpose and meaning in life, and self-acceptance. Furthermore, the pattern of findings concerning subjective well-being replicated Goldman and Kernis (2002) by linking
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higher authenticity ratings with greater life-satisfaction and positive affectivity, and less negative affectivity. In addition, authenticity was related to healthier personality and interpersonal adjustment. For instance, authenticity was positively correlated with global self-esteem and a secure attachment style, but negatively related to preoccupied and fearful attachment styles. Other findings indicated that higher authenticity scores related to less self-enhancement and self-serving motives for social comparison, self-monitoring, and contingent self-esteem (Goldman et al., 2003; Wood et al., 2008). Consequently, greater levels of authenticity seem to reflect a "stronger sense of self" (Kernis, Paradise, Whitaker, Wheatman, & Goldman, 2000). That is, higher authenticity scores were linked with more secure (Kernis & Goldman, 1999; Kernis & Paradise, 2003) forms of self-esteem (high general self-esteem level coupled with low contingent self-esteem). In addition, greater authenticity in individuals was related to less dependence on others as a source for self-evaluation (i.e., lower social comparison and contingent self-esteem) and in determining what behaviors one should consider enacting (i.e., low self-monitoring and higher spontaneity). Consistent with the notion of authenticity being related to a stronger sense of a free self, authenticity has also been found to relate to indices of self-organization that affirm efficacy and adaptability in one’s self-concept. Specifically, Goldman et al. (2003), found that higher authenticity scores were positively related to the identity integration scale of O’Brien and Epstein’s (1988) multidimensional measure of self-esteem. This finding indicated that higher levels of authenticity was associated with individuals' beliefs that they are efficacious, autonomous and self-reflective at assimilating new information and directing life experiences and existential choices. Similarly, Kernis & Goldman (2005;2006) found that authenticity was related to interpersonal behavioral aspects of self-organization, as assessed by Paulhus and Martin's (1988) measure of functional flexibility. Specifically, participants rated eight trait pairs that were derived from the interpersonal circumplex (Wiggins & Holzmuller, 1978; 1981), and reflected bipolar semantic opposites (e.g., warm and cold). Each trait attribute was evaluated separately on a unidimensional scale assessing the extent to which one feels (1) capable of being (e.g., warm) when the situation requires it, (2) difficulty in enacting the behavior, (3) anxiety in performing the behavior, and (4) the tendency to avoid situations demanding such behaviors. Kernis et al., (2003) found that higher authenticity scores were related to greater psychosocial functional flexibility. Specifically, participants with higher authenticity scores were more likely to report that they are capable of enacting these interpersonal and social role behaviors, and perceived less difficulty, anxiety, and avoidance of these interpersonal and social behaviors in different organizational and social contexts. Thus, greater personal authenticity may perhaps foster unique adaptive benefits in overall psychosocial functioning of individuals in groups, organizations and society (Wood et al., 2008; Măreșea, 2011; 2012a; Матеева & Дмитров, 2012b; 2012a; Dimitrov & Mateeva, 2012b; 2013).

That is, possessing an organized set of self-knowledge for a repertoire of potential interpersonal and social roles behaviors can inform one’s decision to enact a particular behavior in different and dynamics situations in the group, organizational, and social contexts. Similarly, individuals’ awareness of how much difficulty and anxiety they experience when they enact certain behaviors may enhance their interpersonal and social adjustment by enabling behavioral choices to be made on well-informed self-knowledge. In sum, authenticity has been pervasively linked with broad indices of interpersonal and social adjustment of the individual, and it appears to involve aspects of self-esteem and self-organization that are characterized by a stronger sense of being an autonomous self. Research in the USA and Bulgaria clearly demonstrated that authenticity is linked with meaningful aspects of healthy psychosocial functioning and development of the individual. Specifically, higher personal authenticity was associated with diverse markers of (1) a stronger sense of self (e.g., secure and high self-esteem, clarity and consistency in one’s self-concept organization), (2) global psychosocial adjustment (e.g., role experiences that are satisfying and expressive of one’s true self), and (3) psychological adjustment to existential challenges (e.g., greater life satisfaction and psychological adjustment to developmental tasks of human life at all stages of the life course) (Wood et al., 2008; Dimitrov & Mateeva, 2013). All these empirical evidences suggest that personal authenticity influences psychological and social adjustment, functioning and development both directly and indirectly by its effects on either a stronger sense of free and effective (autonomous) self or one’s own social roles experiences. However, the big question remained unanswered so far, is what factors in one’s life and social environment influence the authentic psychosocial functioning of the individual, and how exactly.
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INGROUP DYNAMICS AND INTERGROUP RELATIONS
AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON AUTHENTIC PSYCHOSOCIAL FUNCTIONING

Modern social psychology is commonly defined as the study of the ways that people interact with and are influenced by others in their lives. Traditionally, social psychology has made the individual the primary focus of analysis, examining the processes within a person that shape the way he or she behaves in response to others, real or imagined, in group, organizational and social settings. Even the area of intergroup relations has largely emphasized the role of intrapsychic processes, such as individuals’ stereotypes and prejudice (Dovidio, Newheiser, & Leyens, 2012). Steiner (1974) observed that for a long period of time and to a great extent social psychology had “turned inward”. It had largely renounced or postponed its concern for studying how larger social systems (society, communities, and organizations) influence the individual, and had centred its attention on internal states and processes: dissonance, attitudes, attributions, but at same time lacked any insight on the importance of key intrapersonal variables like self-congruity, authentic vs. inauthentic (self-alienated) experiences, behaviors and interactions of people in groups, organizations and society. Interest in the dynamics of larger groups as a system of nested subgroups and its influence on its individual members had waned and research was generally focused on intragroup events or processes that mediate responses to social situations in groups, organizations and broader social contexts. Since then, new theoretical developments, such as Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and Self-Categorization Theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987), have transformed the study of intergroup relations, bringing the group dynamics back into prominence as a source of powerful effects on authentic vs. inauthentic psychosocial functioning of people in groups, organizations and societies.

This article considers a particular aspect of the role of groups in intergroup relations and intragroup dynamics in organizations and society for the individual’s authentic psychosocial functioning, one that goes even beyond the collective processes highlighted by work in social categorization and identity (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2010; Yzerbyt & Demoulin, 2010) – the relationship between intragroup dynamics and intergroup relations as factors influencing individual’s authenticity. Traditionally, and still currently, the study of intergroup relations represents one of the most vibrant topics in social psychological research. Research on intergroup relations in organizational and social context focuses on social identity formation, symbolic and realistic conflict between groups in organizational and social meta-systems, and interventions that can reduce intergroup conflicts in organizations and society, which are one of the major factors for inauthentic feelings, actions, and communication of their individual members (LeVine & Campbell, 1972; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). The study of intragroup dynamics of interpersonal processes and relations – within-group dynamics – continues to be an active and productive area of research in social psychology of small groups and applied research on effectiveness of group work (e.g. teamwork, group training and group psychotherapy). Work on intragroup dynamics in small groups has emphasized the importance of group-dynamics transformative factors, group leadership, influence and power within the group, interpersonal attractiveness, loyalty, group cohesiveness, cooperation, sense of group belongingness, and performance for understanding the individual member’s authentic or inauthentic (self-alienating, depersonalized) psychosocial functioning (Levine & Moreland,2002; Dimitrov & Mateeva, 2012a; 2012b). Yet, despite the fact that many research projects claim they are devoted to studying intergroup relations and group dynamics effects on intrapersonal processes and behavior, cross-fertilization between fields of research has been limited. Only 365 articles retrieved in Google Scholar include both terms, intergroup and intragroup, in the paper abstract, and only 138 in the title –a small fraction of the research in these two areas. And none of them (!) is addressing the question, how intergroup relations and group dynamics in organizations and larger social systems (communities, large social groups, and societies) contribute to the dynamics of individual’s authentic psychosocial functioning. Indeed, the scholarly traditions in the areas of intergroup and intragroup processes have developed in distinctive directions. Two recent chapters on the history of psychology,
one on intergroup relations research (Dovidio et al., 2012) and one on small group dynamics research (Levine & Moreland, 2012), that appeared back to back in the same volume had only five common references out of a total of 464 works cited. The different conceptual and empirical trajectories of these areas of study may have occurred as a consequence of a number of factors. Current work in these areas reflects the dominant influence of different historical figures (e.g., G. Allport and Tajfel for intergroup relations, and Bion, Foulkes, Lewin, Moscovici and Yalom for intragroup dynamics). The popularity of different paradigms (e.g., the minimal group paradigm, group analysis, psychodrama, group psychotherapy and group relations) may seem, at least on the surface, more appropriate for one topic rather than the other. The historical emphasis in the social-psychological study of intergroup relations influence on intra-individual processes, such as attitudes and stereotypes, may have deflected research on this topic from the types of relational processes that are critical to authentic vs. inauthentic (self-alienated) functioning of the individuals in group, organizational and social settings. Also, as the areas diverged, researchers studying either intergroup or intragroup dynamics may have developed different assumptions about the priority of these processes. For example, in contexts that emphasize intergroup comparisons in organizations and society, people tend to direct their attention to between-group distinctions and functional intergroup relations. Researchers who are primarily interested in this phenomenon may then, either consciously or inadvertently, see intragroup dynamics, studied in depth predominantly in psychotherapeutic and organizational contexts as of limited importance. Nevertheless, there are obvious links between the areas in the context of our research interest to transformative factors which influence individual’s authentic vs. inauthentic functioning in group, organizational and social contexts (Mateeva & Dimitrov, 2012а; Dimitrov & Mateeva, 2012а; 2012b; 2013). Processes such as social identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and social justice (Tyler & Blader, 2000) are fundamental to psychosocial functioning of humans and thus to both intergroup relations and intragroup dynamics in organizations and society.

This article contends that understanding the reciprocal relationship between intragroup dynamics and intergroup relations, as containing complex transformative factors influencing person’s authentic vs. inauthentic psychosocial functioning, offers valuable new insights into both topics and suggests new, productive avenues for psychological research, theory and practice development using the multicomponent concept of authenticity. Admittedly, this work draws on existing major social-psychological theories (e.g., Self-Categorization Theory, Social Dominance Theory) and selectively on empirical research evidence supporting this perspective. The purpose of this article is also to serve as a reminder of the untapped potential, practically and theoretically, of integrating intragroup dynamics and intergroup relations perspectives in understanding how authenticity/inauthenticity of individual’s intrapersonal experiences, behavior and communication with others is shaped in group, organizational, and social settings. The article builds upon previous research to illustrate how the fusion of intragroup and intergroup dynamics offers unique contributions to the study of authentic psychosocial functioning of the individuals and identifies new scholarly and professional practice directions. The article next briefly reviews key findings from dominant conceptual frameworks in the field of intergroup relations in organizations and society: social cognition, social identity, and functional relations. It then discusses the complementary role of intergroup and intragroup dynamics, reviewing how intergroup relations in organizations and society can affect small group dynamics, and then discussing how intragroup dynamics can shape both individual’s psychosocial functioning and intergroup relations in his/her organizational and social settings. The final section of the article considers the implications, theoretical and practical, of the proposed reciprocal relationships between intragroup dynamics and intergroup processes as containing key transformative forces influencing person’s authenticity or self-alienation in organizational and social contexts.

Social cognition, social identity, and functional relations between groups. Social cognition, specifically in terms of thinking of oneself and of others as members of groups (social categorization) rather than as distinct individuals, is a major determinant of intergroup tensions and potentially conflict between groups. Categorization is an universal facet of human experience in group, organizational and social settings and is essential for efficient and authentic psychosocial functioning. However, categorization often compromises both accuracy and authenticity for ease, affective comfort or speed of processing and analysis (Fiske & Taylor, 2007). When people or objects are categorized
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into groups, differences between people belonging to different groups are accentuated while differences between members of the same group are minimized (Tajfel, 1969). Furthermore, these similarities and differences are often viewed as inherent to the nature of the groups (Yzerbyt & Demoulin, 2010) and generalize to additional dimensions (e.g., character traits or personality dispositions like neuroticism or authenticity, for instance) beyond those facets that originally differentiated the categories (Allport, 1954). In terms of social categorization, recognition of one’s membership in some groups (ingroups) but not others (outgroups) arouses, often spontaneously, fundamental psychological biases and distorts person’s authentic functioning (e.g., authentic emotional experience, self-expression, private and public behavior, interpersonal perceptions and relationships). Cognitively and emotionally, people start to process information about ingroup members more selectively and deeply than about outgroup members (Van Bavel, Packer, & Cunningham, 2008), and individuals seem to have better memory for information about ways ingroup members are similar and outgroup members are dissimilar to them (Wilder, 1981). Emotionally, people are biased to feel more positively about ingroup than outgroup members (Otten & Moskowitz, 2000). They are pushed to perceive outgroup members as less human and authentic than ingroup members (Leyens et al., 2003) and start claiming that they value their lives less (Pratto & Glasford, 2008). Individuals are also seeming more generous and forgiving in their attributions about the behaviors of ingroup members relative to outgroup members (Hewstone, 1990). The processes involved in the social categorization of people into ingroups (“we”) and outgroups (“they”) are sufficiently basic that such self-serving biases and defensive distortions are also prevalent among nonhuman primates, such as capuchin and rhesus monkeys (de Waal, Leimgruber, & Greenberg, 2008; Mahajani et al., 2011). In addition, according to the original formulation of Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), people’s feelings of self-esteem are closely tied to their group life – induced social identities. Because social identity is commonly enhanced by emphasizing the “positive distinctiveness” of one’s group (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Abrams & Hogg, 2010), people typically value defining characteristics of their group more than the distinguishing features of other groups. To maintain the positive distinctiveness of their group, people engage in inauthentic and self-alienating ingroup favouritism and inauthentic outgroup derogations, and they are inclined to compete with and discriminate against other groups to gain or maintain advantage for their ingroup. A large literature using the minimal group paradigm, in which people are classified into subgroups on the basis of dimensions that have little meaning in everyday life (e.g., preferences of artists) demonstrates how the processes shape inauthentic attitudes and actions towards others, even in the absence of interaction with ingroup or outgroup members. These and related findings have expanded Social Identity Theory beyond its original focus on self-esteem to make a more general framework about intragroup dynamics and intergroup processes as determinants of authentic vs. inauthentic psychosocial functioning of individuals in organizations and society (Abrams & Hogg, 2010). Self-Categorization Theory (Turner et al., 1987) was derived from Social Identity Theory, which places strong emphasis on motivational dynamics, to consider more fully the cognitive-affective processes of social categorization (Abrams & Hogg, 2010). Self-categorization leads to the representation of the self and others in group-prototypic more or less inauthentic for the individual group members ways – the “cognitive-affective representation of features that describe and prescribe attributes of the group” (Hogg & Terry, 2000, p. 123). Group prototypes capture similarities among ingroup members and accentuate selective, in a biased way, differences between the ingroup and specific outgroups. One fundamental premise of Self-Categorization Theory is that the ways people categorize themselves and others are highly context-dependent and quite often lead to inauthentic experiences and behaviors of group members. For instance, ingroup prototypes can change as a function of the outgroup involved in the social comparison in ways that distinguish the ingroup from the outgroup independently from the authentic perceptions of individuals in these groups. It happens a lot in organizational and social settings. The nature of the inauthentic group prototype that is activated in some organizations and communities then affects the salience of inauthentic ingroup standards, shaping intragroup dynamics of interpersonal relations, such as conformity, perceptions of deviance, and false leadership, and establishes inauthentic, self-alienating intergroup orientations in organizations and society, such as stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. This theory thus offers an integrative perspective on intergroup and intragroup processes as determinants of inauthentic, self-alienating and depersonalizing experiences, attitudes, behaviors and interactions of the individual as a loyal member of an organizational or
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societal system. Whereas social categorization and social identity form the psychological foundation for intergroup bias, particularly ingroup favouritism (Brewer, 2000), the functional nature of the social relationship between groups represents a catalyst for outgroup derogation and overt intergroup conflicts which contribute together for individual’s socially-imposed inauthentic feelings and conformist behaviors. Sherif’s Robber’s Cave study (Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, & Sherif, 1961) represents the classic illustration of the importance of functional relations between groups for both group dynamics and personal authenticity or inauthenticity. In this study, 12-year-old boys attending summer camp were randomly assigned to two groups. These groups engaged in a series of competitive athletic activities, with the winning group receiving prizes, that generated overt intergroup conflict, including name-calling and fistfights between boys who used to be close friends before the experiment. Since then, social psychology has devoted considerable attention to the influence of competition and intergroup threat in organizational and social settings emanating from another group on intergroup relations (Realistic Group Conflict Theory; LeVine & Campbell, 1972). Integrated Threat Theory (Stephan & Stephan, 2000) distinguishes different types of threat: realistic threat and symbolic threat. Realistic threat represents any threat to the welfare of one’s ingroup from some outgroup, such as physical, material or emotional well-being and political or economic power; symbolic threats encompass any threat to the worldview or mentality of one’s ingroup, such as perceived group differences in values, beliefs, morals, and standards. Realistic and symbolic threat both contribute directly and independently to intergroup bias and induce inauthenticity in smaller groups and their individual members’ psychosocial functioning (Riek, Mania, & Gaertner, 2006). As further evidence of the importance of functional relations between groups for the understanding of authentic vs. inauthentic individual functioning, Sherif et al. (1961) also demonstrated that whereas intergroup competition in organizational and social settings increases conflict, intergroup cooperation can reduce conflict and improve intergroup relations. In particular, introducing superordinate goals, outcomes that are mutually desired but require intergroup cooperation to achieve, was the most effective way in organizations and communities not only for ameliorating conflict but also for establishing stable positive relations and friendships across group lines in these organizations and communities. There is currently a substantial literature documenting how promoting intergroup cooperation in organizations and social communities, such as through introducing cooperative learning exercises, corporate retreats, intercultural fests, diversity training, and psychosocial rehabilitation programs (Cooper & Slavin, 2004; Aronson, 2004), reduces intergroup bias and affects in a positive way the intragroup dynamics in all groups and more authentic personal experiences and behaviors of their individual members. While social cognition, social identity, and functional relations between groups remain active and productive areas of research on intergroup relations, what remains relatively understudied is the influence of intragroup dynamics – such as the dynamics of group formation processes – on intergroup relations in organizations and society. Indeed, an often overlooked aspect of the Sherif et al. (1961) study was that there was an initial stage exclusively devoted to subgroup development. Sherif et al. explicitly discussed this phase as important because it permitted the formation of separate subgroup identities, for leaders and group values to emerge, and conformity pressures within the subgroups to operate as factors affecting the individual’s authentic experiences and functioning in the both small and large group settings of the experiment. However, the researchers did not directly test (or even discuss) the very likely possibility that the inauthentic intergroup processes they observed might have been dependent on the existence and nature of prior crystallized inauthentic identities and established relationships within the smaller subgroups. They also did not consider theoretically how their intergroup interventions could change the dynamics among the members within each subgroup.
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of imposed group identity and the ways people interact within groups. Thus, intergroup relations
function ideally to provide security, materially and psychologically, by maintaining or inducing
members who behave similarly ("the black sheep effect"); Marques & Paez, 1994). In general, groups
that inauthentically high adherence to group, organizational, and social values reduces the terror
humans experience in response to mortality salience by enhancing individuals’ feelings of security
and self-esteem and, in turn, providing meaning and organization to person’s life in their contexts.
Arousing mortality concerns (e.g., by having people write about death compared to dental pain) reduces
inauthentically the tolerance of deviance from group norms by individuals or subgroups
within the organizations and society. Perhaps relatedly, endorsement of authoritarian values, such as
power, toughness, and support for traditional values, increases within a society during times of
external threat. In the United States, for example, comic book characters portraying inauthentically
greater strength and stronger endorsement of American values were more popular during historical
periods in which people felt that their economic well-being and way of life were more threatened than
during periods of prosperity and social stability (Sales, 1973; Doty, Peterson, & Winter, 1991). After
the terrorist attacks of 9/11, many Americans and Canadians became more suspicious of foreigners,
and opposition to immigration, regardless of where immigrants came from, increased dramatically
(Esses, Dovidio, & Hodson, 2002). During this period, Americans became more hawkish in their
attitudes towards international affairs and more strongly supported restrictions to civil liberties (e.g.,
the Patriot Act), which made them feel more secure. Moreover, the increased support for these policies
associated with the war on terror occurred more strongly for people who were authentically low in
authoritarianism measures (Hetherington & Suhay, 2011); under threat, their attitudes aligned
inauthentically with those high in authoritarianism, who already held these positions. Self-
Categorization Theory further illuminates the interrelationship between intergroup and intragroup
dynamics in determining authentic vs. inauthentic (self-alienating) functioning of individuals. From
this perspective, greater external threat (real or symbolic) increases the nature and salience of the
group prototype and the importance of individual’s conformity to it. Deviance from it is punished by the
group, and ingroup members who negatively deviate from that prototype, trying to remain
authentic (“true to their one’s self”), may be responded to even more negatively than outgroup
members who behave similarly (“the black sheep effect”; Marques & Paez, 1994). In general, groups
function ideally to provide security, materially and psychologically, by maintaining or inducing
inauthentic, depersonalizing modes of individual experiences and behavior. However, they exist in a
social space inhabited by other groups. Relations with other groups affect the meaning and importance
of imposed group identity and the ways people interact within groups. Thus, intergroup relations
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significantly determine the dynamics within groups which, in turn, affects group members’ individual authenticity a lot. And, of course, there is also the reciprocal influence of intragroup dynamics on intergroup relations in organizations and society which will be discussed in the second part of this paper in more details.
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