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THE ADOPTION OF PREJUDICE RELATIVE TO OTHER GROUP NORMS AS A FUNCTION OF INGROUP IDENTIFICATION

by MARIKA JOY LAMOREAUX

Belonging to and identifying with a group is a fundamental human need, but what are some of the consequences of identifying with a social group? People’s group identities are an important part of their overall identity, leading people to associate with high status groups (Tajfel, 1971). In order to maximize being associated with a high status group, people can use prejudice to raise the relative status of their ingroups. Individuals may adopt prejudice from their ingroups similar to any other norm, but prejudice may be a unique norm because it allows people to elevate the status of their ingroup and minimize threats from outgroups. The current work argues that the degree to which people identify with the ingroup is related to the adoption of prejudice, and that individuals will endorse prejudice more strongly than a non-prejudice norm. However, this proposition was not supported in two studies. Possible reasons for the lack of support are discussed.
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The Adoption of Prejudice Relative to Other Group Norms as a Function of Ingroup Identification

Belonging to a group is a fundamental human desire (Brewer & Gardner, 1996), but what effect does group membership have upon a person? As people identify more with an ingroup, will they be more prejudiced against outgroup members? Does group membership make adopting prejudice especially attractive relative to adopting other group norms? This study proposes that the more strongly people identify with social groups, the more strongly they adopt group norms, and especially adopt prejudices held by ingroup members against outgroup members. To explore this hypothesis, one must consider the interrelations among group norms, prejudice, group affiliation, and self-concept.

Group Norms

Groups influence their members, and their members adopt group norms (Forsyth, 2000). An early example of a group’s influence on its members is Sherif’s (1936) autokinetic effect study of group norms. The autokinetic effect occurs when an individual in a dark room perceives that a fixed pinpoint of light is moving even though it is not. Sherif asked participants to make an initial judgment of how far the light moved before putting them into groups to make subsequent judgments of how far the light moved. Once in a group, people adjusted their estimates of how far the light moved to be closer to the group norm (i.e., the estimates made by other group members). If group norms had no influence on group members, the participants would not have changed their estimates. Further, Sherif found that in subsequent trials alone, individuals’ judgments remained influenced by group norms. Sherif’s study demonstrated that not only do
people conform to group norms, but they will also continue to conform even when they are no longer in the group context.

Not only will people continue to conform to a norm when alone, but people conform to group norms even if the norm reflects espousing a belief that they believe is incorrect (Asch, 1955). Even when people are able to objectively evaluate that a group norm is incorrect, they conform to a wrong decision offered by confederates (Asch, 1955), presumably to be liked by other group members (Deutsch & Gerard, 1955). People can ingratiate themselves to groups by conforming to norms. Indeed, those who endorse group norms are admired as more intelligent, competent, confident, and sincere (Eisenger & Mills, 1968; Levinger & Schneider, 1969). Asch’s (1955) and Sherif’s (1936) studies manipulated attitudes that were created in the lab. Is there any evidence that researchers can use perceived group norms to manipulate people’s pre-existing attitudes?

There is some evidence that group members will shift their pre-existing attitudes in the direction of perceived group norms. For example, Stangor, Sechrist, and Jost (2001) found that individuals are heavily influenced by group norms of stereotypes. After indicating their endorsement of different stereotypes, participants received feedback indicating the ingroup held more or less favorable stereotypes of the outgroup than the participants’ initial endorsements. When participants’ endorsements of stereotypes were assessed a second time, they indicated greater agreement with the perceived norm than their initial endorsement.

There may be other reasons to adopt prejudice in addition to simply conforming to a norm and seeking approval of ingroup members. Once a person is a member of a
group, their self-concept begins to change as group-relevant information becomes integrated with the self (Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Terry & Hogg, 1996). Perhaps the impact of the integration of the group-relevant information with one’s self-concept contributes to why people adopt prejudice more so than more general norms. In order to investigate this possibility, it may be beneficial to examine the link between group affiliation and self-concept.

Link Between Group Affiliation and Self-Concept

Social identity theory (SIT) attempts to account for why people who are put into arbitrary groups discriminate against outgroup members (e.g., Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971). Tajfel (1982) posited that people derive self-esteem benefits from their group memberships, which he termed social identity. SIT asserts that because people’s identities are linked through their social identity to group membership, they attempt to elevate the status of their ingroup in order to derive self-esteem benefits from being members of high status groups (Hogg, 2000; Hogg & Abrams, 1990).

As group membership becomes more accessible, self-categorization theory posits that social identity also becomes more accessible (Turner, Oakes, Haslam, & McGarty, 1994). SIT and self-categorization theory have been combined to produce a phenomenon termed referent informational influence (Terry & Hogg, 1996). Referent informational influence posits that when social identity is accessible, a group prototype is activated that depicts an idealized member of the group with prescribed behaviors, feelings, thoughts, and beliefs that are indicated by group norms. The group norms are constructed to optimally minimize ingroup differences and maximize differences between the ingroup and other groups. Once the group prototype is activated, the self assimilates to the
prototype to fulfill the need for positive self-evaluation (Terry, Hogg, & Duck, 1999). Thus, when social identity is accessible, people resemble the group prototype and they are especially likely to adopt accepted group norms.

Why does a person’s self-esteem benefit from being a member of a group? Brewer and Gardner (1996) make several assertions about the process through which group membership affects people’s self-concepts. The part of the self that is linked to group membership and internalizes group norms is called the collective self. As people’s collective selves become more important, the boundaries between their individual identities and their group identities become more permeable. As the boundaries become more permeable, people think more in terms of “we” instead of “I.” A consequence of thinking “we” is that the group’s status becomes more important to the individual’s status. Therefore, being associated with a high status group benefits the collective identity, which in turn benefits the individual’s self-esteem.

Prejudice is a Unique Norm that Benefits the Self

Belonging to a group is an important human need (Brewer & Gardner, 1986; Tajfel, 1971), and associating with a high status group benefits self-esteem (Cialdini et al., 1976; Hogg & Abrams, 1990). Members are motivated to maintain the positive status of their ingroup in order to maintain self-esteem (Mackie, Hamilton, Susskind, & Rosselli, 1996), and one way to maintain the relative high status of their ingroup is to endorse negative prejudices against outgroups. Thus, prejudice may be a unique type of norm because it is not only a belief held by ingroup members, but also because it is a belief that directly contributes to how the ingroup maintains greater status relative to outgroups.
Summary

Complying with group norms and maximizing self-esteem can contribute to prejudice. As people more strongly identify with social ingroups, these processes should be exacerbated and increase outgroup prejudice. The present studies attempted to explore how these factors increased the likelihood that group members adopt ingroup prejudice against outgroups. It was hypothesized that when ingroup identification was greater, people would endorse prejudice more strongly than non-prejudice norms. Two hypotheses were tested to explore how ingroup identification influenced prejudice against the outgroup and whether individuals would endorse prejudice more strongly than other group norms:

Hypothesis 1: As individuals increasingly identified with a group, they would increasingly adopt group norms, and they would be especially likely to adopt prejudice because of its benefits to the self.

Hypothesis 2: As group membership accessibility increased, individuals would increasingly adopt prejudice relative to a non-prejudice norm.

Study 1

The objective of Study 1 was to measure ingroup identification and assess the extent to which it related to the endorsement of prejudice and non-prejudice group norms. These data were used to test Hypothesis 1.

Participants. A sample of 58 introductory psychology students at Miami University participated in the study in return for course credit (13 men and 45 women; age $M=19.2$, $SD=1.06$)
**Materials.** Participants completed all measures at an individual computer cubicle. To assess how much participants identified with the ingroup, the inclusion of the ingroup in the self (IIS) measure was used (Tropp & Wright, 2001). The IIS assessed how much people conceptualized their individual identities and their group identities as overlapping. As Figure 1 illustrates, the IIS used seven pairs of circles with differing amounts of overlap, with one circle designated as the group and the other circle designated as the self. Participants indicated the pair of circles that best represented their level of identification with the group of interest. An identification score was assigned based on a 7-point scale, with greater numbers indicating greater ingroup identification.

Pretests were conducted to determine which ingroups students in the participant population identified with. In order for an ingroup to be considered for the primary study, the IIS scores for the ingroup had to be greater than 4 (the midpoint of the scale, thus the ingroup was a non-trivial part of people’s identities). The IIS scores for the ingroup also had to have large variability to avoid restricted range concerns. Of the ingroups that were pre-tested, “college students” had the largest variability in IIS scores with a mean significantly above 4. Therefore, “college student” was selected as the ingroup of interest in the primary studies.

To assess endorsement of prejudice and non-prejudice norms, participants indicated agreement with several attitude assessments (see Appendix A), as well as completed a semantic differential comparing college students to “people who have never been to college (and are still not in school)” (see Appendix B). Attitude assessments were measured on a scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 9 (*strongly agree*). The semantic differential was composed of five antonym pairs on a 9-point scale with a pair of
antonyms anchoring each end of the scale (i.e., bad, good; superior, inferior; unpleasant, pleasant; likable, unlikable; and unenjoyable, enjoyable). Prejudice was operationalized as a negative attitude toward people who have never been to college and are not still in school relative to attitudes toward college students.

Importance of being a college student, self-esteem, mood, ingroup liking, and outgroup disliking were also measured in the study. Self-esteem was measured using Rosenberg’s (1965) Self-Esteem Inventory, which was comprised of 10 statements where participants responded to each statement on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 4 (strongly disagree), α=.82 (e.g., “I feel that I have a number of good qualities”). Mood was measured using the Positive and Negative Affect Scale (PANAS), which was comprised of a list of 10 positive adjectives and 10 negative adjectives (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Participants rated each adjective on a scale of 1 (very slightly or not at all) to 5 (extremely), indicating how much they felt each adjective described them at the moment they were completing the PANAS (e.g., “alert”). The PANAS was used to compute both a positive mood (α=.85) and a negative mood (α=.79) score for each participant. Ingroup liking (α=.89) and outgroup disliking (α=.85) were measured using a set of statements assessing positive attitudes toward the ingroup and negative attitudes toward the outgroup (see Appendix C). Attitudes were measured on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 9 (strongly agree), with greater scores on the ingroup liking measure indicating more positive feelings toward the ingroup and greater scores on the outgroup disliking measure indicating more negative feelings toward the outgroup.

Procedure. Participants arrived at the lab and were seated at their own computer. They were informed that the study examined students’ attitudes, and that all measures
would be completed on the computer. After completing the study, the participants were thanked and fully debriefed.

Results

The responses to the statement “Spending more than a half-hour getting ready is OK” were used to measure endorsement of a non-prejudice norm. The mean response to the five pairs of antonyms on the semantic differential was used as a measure of prejudice (reverse scoring when appropriate). Participants’ IIS scores were significantly correlated with endorsement of prejudice, $r(58)=.31, p<.05$ and endorsement of the non-prejudice norm, $r(57)=.41, p<.05$. Endorsement of prejudice and endorsement of the non-prejudice norm were also significantly correlated, $r(57)=.38, p<.05$. It was predicted that a stronger correlation would be observed between IIS scores and endorsement of prejudice than between IIS scores and endorsement of the non-prejudice norm. However, the correlations were not significantly different from each other ($z=.98, ns$).

Although the correlations between IIS and endorsement of prejudice and between IIS and endorsement of the non-prejudice norm were not significantly different from each other, it was of interest to consider whether the relation between IIS scores and endorsement of prejudice persists even after taking into account the relation between IIS scores and endorsement of the non-prejudice norm. In other words, did IIS have a unique relation with the endorsement of prejudice above and beyond the endorsement of a non-prejudice norm? To address this issue, a partial correlation between IIS and endorsement of prejudice while controlling for endorsement of the non-prejudice norm was conducted, and this partial correlation was not significant, $r(54)=.18, ns$. This result indicates that once the endorsement of the non-prejudice norm was accounted for, prejudice did not
show a unique relation to IIS scores. Combined with the results that the correlation between IIS scores and prejudice was not significantly different from the correlation between IIS scores and endorsement of the non-prejudice norm, the non-significant partial correlation further demonstrates that although there was a significant relation between the endorsement of prejudice and IIS scores, this relation was not unique compared to the relation between endorsement of the non-prejudice norm and IIS scores.

Perhaps a correlation between IIS scores and endorsements of prejudice norms and non-prejudice norms is not the best way to assess whether more group-identified participants conformed to norms more strongly. Conforming to a norm does not mean that people have to increasingly endorse a norm, which is what a correlation between IIS scores and norm endorsements assesses. If the average response is considered to be the norm, then one could conceptualize conformity to a norm as people providing the mean response to a question rather than a more extreme response. In other words, people who highly identified with being a college student should have been more likely to give the average response than people who were less identified with being a college student. An additional analysis was performed to test whether the variance in responses to the non-prejudice norms and prejudice norms decreased as ingroup identification increased. Such a finding would indicate that as ingroup identification increased, people were more likely to give the mean response to the non-prejudice norms and prejudice norms. Thus, z-scores were computed for all participants’ endorsements of the non-prejudice norms and prejudice norms, and the absolute values of these z-scores were used in the analysis. Participants with z-scores of zero would be the most normative, according to this conceptualization. There were no significant correlations between IIS and the absolute
values of the z-scores of any of the endorsements of the non-prejudice norms and the prejudice norms. These results indicated that people who were highly identified with being a college student were not more likely to respond with normative attitudes than people who were less identified with being a college student.

Oddly, IIS scores were not significantly correlated to the importance of being a college student, $r(57)=.06$, ns. It was expected that as ingroup identification increased, it would be more important to college students to be college students. The lack of a correlation in addition to the central tendency that being a college student was relatively important to all participants ($M=7.4$, $SD=.70$) suggested that being a college student was not simply important only to those who were highly identified with being a college student.

Auxiliary analyses from this study revealed that ingroup liking and outgroup disliking were significantly correlated with IIS, $r(54)=.41$, $p<.05$; $r(54)=.45$, $p<.05$ (for ingroup liking and outgroup disliking, respectively). Interestingly, outgroup disliking significantly mediated the relationship between IIS and endorsement of prejudice, but ingroup liking did not, as ingroup liking was not significantly correlated with prejudice (see Figure 2). These results seemed at odds with the theory that prejudice is driven more by ingroup liking than by outgroup disliking (Brewer, 1999, 2001).

Discussion

It was hypothesized that belonging to a relatively high status ingroup would be important to people because of the self-esteem benefits of belonging to a relatively high-status group. In order to create a status differential, people would endorse prejudice to decrease the relative status of the outgroup, which in turn would elevate the relative
status of the ingroup. As people increasingly identified with the ingroup, they should have increasingly endorsed prejudice relative to endorsing ingroup norms. Thus, it was hypothesized that as ingroup identification increased, endorsement of prejudice would increase at a greater rate than endorsement of non-prejudice norms because of the unique benefits of endorsing prejudice.

Study 1 found no support for the hypothesis. Both the endorsement of prejudice and the endorsement of the non-prejudice norm were correlated with IIS scores. However, the two correlations were not significantly different from each other. Also a partial correlation between IIS and endorsement of prejudice controlling for endorsement of the non-prejudice norm was not significant. IIS scores and the absolute value of the z-scores of the endorsement of non-prejudice norms and prejudice norms were not correlated, indicating that participants were not conforming more to the norms. Additionally, the importance of being a college student and IIS scores were not significantly correlated.

The auxiliary findings were unexpected. The results of this study indicated that outgroup disliking mediated the relationship between ingroup identification and prejudice and that ingroup liking was not correlated to prejudice. These results are in contrast to Brewer’s (1999, 2001) assertion that ingroup liking is the real cause of prejudice, not a dislike of the outgroup. Brewer argued that researchers were mistaking prejudice as being indicative of high levels of outgroup disliking, when actually prejudice reflected high levels of ingroup liking. However, this study found that outgroup disliking predicted prejudice, whereas ingroup liking did not. This finding is almost exactly opposite of what would be predicted from Brewer’s arguments. Unfortunately there has
not been any direct empirical testing of Brewer’s hypothesis, so it is difficult to evaluate her claim or how these data fit with a larger literature on her assertions. The evidence from this study indicates that her claim needs to be directly tested in future research.

One reason for the lack of support for the hypothesis may be because there was no relation between IIS and importance of being a college student. In other words, as participants’ college student identities were more central to their overall identities, the importance of being a college student did not increase. In fact, all students appeared to value their college student identities. Therefore, it was unlikely that people who were highly identified with being a college student would adhere more strongly to the norms for college students or would derive more psychological benefits from belonging to a relatively high status group than people who were less identified with being a college student.

A second reason for the null findings may have been a lack of a clear definition of the outgroup. The outgroup was defined as “people who have never been to college (and are not still in school).” Perhaps each participant interpreted the statement differently. Although IIS scores and prejudice were significantly correlated, the different interpretations of the statement may have created additional variance in the endorsements of prejudice that would be unaccounted for by IIS scores. The unexplained variance could in turn have reduced the range of the correlation, as there would be variance in endorsements of prejudice that was not accounted for by IIS scores. The reduced range of the correlation could have restricted the correlation so that it was not significantly different from the correlation between IIS scores and the non-prejudice norm. However, a clearer definition of the outgroup may not have been critical because if people endorsed
prejudice so they could elevate the relative status of their ingroup then derogating the
outgroup may not have required a clear understanding of who the outgroup was.

A third possible reason for the null findings may have been because participants
were not strongly identified as college students. The IIS may not have correctly
operationalized ingroup identification (as suggested by the lack of correlation with
importance). If the IIS did not accurately assess ingroup identification, then manipulating
ingroup identification would more directly test the hypothesis. Study 2 explicitly
manipulated ingroup identification in order to better test Hypothesis 1 and to test
Hypothesis 2: Does increasing group membership accessibility result in increasing
adoption of prejudice relative to a non-prejudice norm?

Study 2

The objective of Study 2 was to measure the endorsement of prejudice and non-
prejudice norms at two separate times, once before a manipulation of ingroup
identification and once afterwards. These two measures were compared to test the
hypothesis that as ingroup identification increased in accessibility, people would be more
likely to endorse prejudice than non-prejudice norms.

Method

Participants. A sample of 71 participants from introductory psychology classes at
Miami University participated in return for credit in their class (50 men and 21 women,
age $M=19.5$, $SD=1.30$).

Procedure. Participants arrived at the lab individually and were tested with other
participants at the same time. They were informed that the study examined students’
attitudes by having them answer questions on the computer and write for 10 min about
themselves. They were also told that they would be participating in a second unrelated study after finishing the first study. As in Study 1, endorsement of prejudice norms, endorsement of non-prejudice norms, importance of being a college student, self-esteem ($\alpha=.85$), positive mood ($\alpha=.90$), negative mood ($\alpha=.68$), in-group liking ($\alpha=.71$), and out-group disliking ($\alpha=.65$) were measured. After completing all of the measures on the computer, participants were asked to perform a writing task to manipulate in-group identification. The manipulation was designed to either increase or decrease the accessibility of being a typical college student, which would in turn manipulate their identification with being a college student. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions. In the typical student condition, participants were told to write about how they were typical college students. In the atypical student condition, participants were told to write about how there were atypical college students. In the control condition, participants were told to write about how there were atypical college students. In the control condition, participants were told to write about their music preferences.

After the 10 min writing period was over, the experimenter told the participants that he or she needed to set up the second study, and asked all of the participants to move to a place where they could not see the computers. After spending a few moments at each computer, the experimenter informed the participants that the data from the first time they completed all the measures on the computer was not saved. The experimenter then apologized for the inconvenience, and asked the participants to complete all the measures again. The scales at Time 2 all revealed good reliability ($\alpha$s>.70). After the participants completed the questionnaires at Time 2, they were fully debriefed and thanked.
Results

To assess the effectiveness of the manipulation of ingroup identification, an ANCOVA was performed to examine if Time 2 IIS scores differed based on the manipulation (typical college student, atypical college student, control), with the Time 1 IIS scores as the covariate. There was no effect of the manipulation, \( F(2,71)=.16, ns \), indicating that the manipulation had no effect on IIS scores at Time 2.

Unfortunately, none of the significant results from Study 1 were replicated in Study 2. None of the endorsements of the non-prejudice norms that were significantly correlated with IIS scores in Study 1 were significantly correlated with IIS scores in Study 2. Additionally, the semantic differential was significantly correlated with IIS scores in Study 1, but was not correlated with IIS scores in Study 2. Lastly, outgroup disliking did not significantly mediate the relationship between IIS scores and endorsement of prejudice because outgroup disliking was not significantly correlated with IIS scores.

To test Hypothesis 2, endorsements of the statement, “Taking naps in the middle of the day is OK” were used as the measure of endorsement of a non-prejudice norm, which was significantly correlated with IIS scores at Time 1, \( r(71)=.411, p<.01 \), and at Time 2, \( r(71)=.39, p<.01^2 \). Endorsements of the statement, “College is the best place to prepare for the rest of your life” were used as the measure of endorsement of prejudice, which was significantly correlated with IIS at Time 1, \( r(71)=.31, p<.01 \), and at Time 2, \( r(71)=.24, p<.01^3 \). Thus, this statement was used as the index of prejudice.

An ANCOVA was performed to test if the writing task manipulation of ingroup identification (typical college student, atypical college student, control) had an effect on
the Time 2 importance of being a college student, with the Time 1 importance of being a college student as the covariate. An additional five ANCOVAs were performed to test if the writing task manipulation of ingroup identification (typical college student, atypical college student, control) had an effect on Time 2 positive mood, negative mood, self-esteem, endorsement of the prejudice norm, or endorsement of the non-prejudice norm, with the scores at Time 1 as the covariate. All six of the results were nonsignificant, indicating that the manipulation had no effect on these measures, $F_s<1.4$, $ns$. These data seemed to indicate that the manipulation did not affect participants’ perceptions of their identities as college students or any of the other dependent variables.

Discussion

It was distressing that Study 2 did not replicate Study 1. A potential reason for the lack of replication may have been because Study 1 was conducted over the course of two months during the middle of the semester, and Study 2 was conducted over the course of two-and-a-half weeks at the end of the semester. Perhaps there were unaccounted for differences between the participants from Study 1 and Study 2, resulting in the participants answering questions differently. Additionally, the significant results from Study 1 may simply have been due to Type II errors. Furthermore, Study 2 did not support Hypothesis 2. The manipulation had no effect on participants’ endorsement of the prejudice norm or the non-prejudice norm. It would appear that Study 2 was entirely unsuccessful.

Because the results from Study 2 were not as predicted, the remaining discussion will focus on potential problems with the manipulation in this study. Perhaps one of the reasons that ingroup identification may not have been strongly manipulated was because
participants were in a university setting taking part in a course-related activity. Therefore, while participating in the study their student identities may have been strongly activated regardless of their experimental condition. This would have likely raised the accessibility of being a college student and perhaps created a ceiling effect where the accessibility of being a college student was similar for everyone, regardless of their experimental condition.

A second reason for why the manipulation may not have influenced IIS scores is responses on the IIS may have been easily remembered. Participants may have simply chosen the same pair of circles they chose the first time they completed the IIS regardless of how identified they felt with being a college student. However, an effective manipulation should have led to changes in the endorsement of prejudice and non-prejudice norms even if it did not affect their IIS reports.

A third reason for why the manipulation may not have worked is because no matter what participants were assigned to write about, the writing task may have increased the accessibility of their college student identities. Writing about being an atypical college student may have caused writers to reflect on past behaviors, which are likely to include instances of typical college student behavior. Therefore, although what was written was atypical behavior, the writers may have also thought about their typical college student behavior, increasing the accessibility of being a college student. Additionally, perhaps the control condition was not significantly different from the other conditions because while writing about their music preferences participants may have thought about how typical or atypical their music preferences were for college students, again increasing the accessibility of being a college student.
Also, there may have been two potential problems with the ingroup manipulation. First, because of the context of the study, it may have been too difficult to manipulate college student identification. Perhaps the manipulation was unsuccessful because of the cues the students received while participating in the study (participating in return for course credit and thinking about past behavior or music preferences). Using an ingroup that is not so chronic or highly accessible may have increased the effectiveness of a manipulation of ingroup identification. A second potential problem is that the manipulation was not an effective manipulation and a new manipulation of ingroup identification would need to be found.

Lastly, another reason for the null findings may have been because there was not much statistical power for the ANCOVAs. Power is the probability of correctly rejecting the null hypothesis. If a true difference exists between groups or over time, then power is the probability of finding a statistically significant difference between groups or over time. An accepted standard for power is for the power of a study to be close to .8 (Cohen, 1992). Unfortunately, none of the ANCOVAs in this study had power greater than .3. Having such low power made it difficult to provide a sensitive test for Hypothesis 2, as it was unlikely that the tests would have had significant results with such low power. In other words, if the manipulation truly influenced the dependent variables, there was only a 30% chance that the differences between Time 1 and Time 2 scores would have been significantly different.

General Discussion

These studies did not support either of the two hypotheses derived from SIT and referent informational influence. Study 1 indicated that as ingroup identification
increased, members did not endorse prejudice norms more than non-prejudice norms. Study 2 showed no support for the second hypothesis in that the manipulation of ingroup identification appeared to not be successful. However, this lack of support may not be due to the hypotheses being incorrect. It would appear that using a different ingroup would be the best way to retest the hypotheses. First, there was no clear outgroup to contrast with college students. Second, there was no pre-existing inventory of college student norms, therefore the norms in this study have never been tested in other studies. Third, being a college student may have been too difficult of an identity to manipulate. Moreover, a new ingroup should be used for both studies because as college students’ identification with being a college student increased, the importance of being a college student did not increase. Therefore, all the participants may have been equally affected by the norms for college students and motivated to elevate the relative status of the ingroup by endorsing prejudice, as being a college student was equally important to them all.

If one considers that the results of the studies were not due to methodological errors, there were conflicts between the results of the current studies and previous literature. Based upon the current results, it seems that ingroup members did not conform more to group norms as their identification with the ingroup increased. Previous work seemed to indicate that ingroup members should have conformed more to group norms as their social identities became more accessible. Referent informational influence posits that when social identity is accessible and a group prototype is activated, the self assimilates to the prototype to fulfill the need for positive self-evaluation (Terry & Hogg, 1996; Terry, Hogg, & Duck, 1999). However, there are few published studies that
investigate referent informational influence, and therefore the support for this effect may be limited.

The current results also suggested that as ingroup identification increased, members did not increasingly endorse prejudice more than they endorsed non-prejudice norms. It was hypothesized that because ingroup members are motivated to maintain the positive status of their ingroup in order to maintain self-esteem (Mackie, Hamilton, Susskind, & Rosselli, 1996), they would endorse prejudice more than non-prejudice norms. However, perhaps endorsing prejudice threatens people’s sense of egalitarianism, as posited by aversive racism (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000; Hodson, Dovidio, Gaertner, 2002). If endorsing prejudice threatens people’s sense of egalitarianism, it would not be expected that people would endorse prejudice more than other group norms.
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Appendix A. Non-Prejudice Norm and Prejudice Norm Statements

Non-Prejudice Norms

1. Doing laundry frequently is not important
2. I spend at least 2 hours total a day instant messaging
3. In America there is the perfect place to live for anyone
4. Men should not cry
5. Staying up until 1AM or 2AM on a weeknight is normal
6. I watch at least 4 hours of MTV, BET, or VH1 a week
7. People don't have to hang out with their friends all the time to be close
8. It is important to be independent and not tied down
9. Owning a car is important
10. July 4th is an important holiday
11. Going out three nights a week is OK
12. Being in a committed relationship is not important to me
13. September 11th is an important day to remember
14. I like to look good
15. Being able to take care of myself is vital
16. Everyone needs to be loved
17. Controlling your destiny is important
18. Getting a college education is not important
19. Having close relationships with other people is healthy
20. Having a democratic government is not essential
21. Men are physically strong

22. Taking naps in the middle of the day is OK

23. I like things to be organized

24. Men should be able to fix things with their hands

25. Spending more than a half-hour getting ready is OK

26. It is unacceptable to download mp3s

27. Earning a lot of money is a good goal

28. Men are competitive with each other in sports

29. I don't like clothes from Abercrombie and Fitch, J Crew, and Northface

30. Having a prestigious career is not important

31. Watching and playing sports is unenjoyable

32. Having a computer is important

33. It is important to work hard and play hard

34. Men should not support their family

35. Being able to cook is not a valuable skill

36. Getting along is not more important than being right

37. I do not like to keep things clean

38. I do not often stay up late

39. Working out is beneficial

40. I do not work hard

41. I am more extraverted than introverted

42. Staying up on fashion trends is not important
43. I drink frequently
44. I make a lot of money

Prejudice Norms

1. People who have never attended college (and are not still in school) are more intelligent than people who have attended college
2. American music is not better music than other country's music
3. Men are not easier to please than women in general
4. Women are overly emotional
5. America is not the best country
6. College is the best place to prepare for the rest of your life
7. Women are more competitive than men
8. People who have never attended college (and are not still in school) are less likely to vote than people who have attended college
9. American athletes on average tend to be better than other country's athletes
10. Going to college is not an important part of a person's life
11. America is the leader of the free world
12. Men are better at protecting their interests than women
13. Everyone should learn English
14. Women are unreasonable
15. College is the only place where you can learn to think critically about life
Appendix B. Semantic Differential Measure of Attitudes

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements:

Comparing college students to people who have never been to college (and are not still in school), college students on average are more:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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><strong>Bad</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unpleasant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikable**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unenjoyable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reverse scored**
Appendix C.

Measure of Ingroup Liking

1. How positive do you feel about college students?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   Not      Extremely
   Positive

2. How negative do you feel about college students? **

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   Not      Extremely
   Negative

Measure of Outgroup Disliking

3. How positive do you feel about people who have never attended college (and are not still in school)?**

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   Not      Extremely
   Positive

4. How negative do you feel about people who have never attended college (and are not still in school)?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   Not      Extremely
   Negative

**Reverse Scored
Footnotes

1 Originally there were three ingroups being considered for analysis in Study 1: Americans, college students, and gender. Because of the recent conflict in Iraq, America was not used as the ingroup because the risk of history effects was great. Gender was not used as the ingroup because the analysis for gender would have to use different non-prejudice norms for each gender, making the interpretation of the results less valid. Therefore, being a college student was used as the ingroup for the analysis.

2 The statement “Spending more than a half-hour getting ready is OK” was used as the measure of endorsement of non-prejudice norms in Study 1. However, this statement was not correlated with IIS in Study 2, and was therefore not used as the measure of endorsement of non-prejudice norms.

3 In Study 1, the semantic differential was significantly correlated with prejudice, and was therefore used as the measure of the endorsement of prejudice. However, in Study 2, the semantic differential was not significantly correlated to IIS, and was therefore not used as the measure of endorsement of prejudice.
Figure Caption

Figure 1. The Inclusion of the Ingroup in the Self Measure

Figure 2. Mediation of the relationship between IIS and prejudice
Please choose the pair of circles that best represents your level of identification with Miami.
Ingroup Identification .23 (.31*)

Prejudice

Outgroup Disliking

$z=2.02, p<.05$

Ingroup Identification .31*

Prejudice

Ingroup Liking

$\hat{z}=.144$

Note. * $p<.05$. ** $p<.01$. *** $p<.001$