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The current research explores the possibility that perceiving one’s ingroup as highly tolerant can, for some individuals, lead to increases in expressions of personal prejudice. Prejudiced stereotypes and tolerant values are simultaneously communicated through the same social networks (Devine & Elliot, 1997; Katz & Hass, 1988; Katz, Wackenhut, & Hass, 1986). The result of exposure to these incompatible influences is that many individuals experience prejudiced reactions that they are uncomfortable expressing (Devine, 1989; Gilbert & Hixon, 1991; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). As a means of controlling for unwanted bias in evaluations of members of minority groups, many people develop a motivation to avoid prejudiced responses (Fazio & Dunton, 1997; Plant & Devine, 1998). However, efforts to correct for personal prejudice can only be successfully applied when the influence of personal prejudice is apparent to the perceiver, and information regarding the environment, target, or self can often obscure the effects of prejudice on judgments. It is hypothesized that when a group provides its members with a collective sense of tolerance, individual members perceive a lowered risk of prejudice influencing their judgments and reduce efforts to control for personal bias. This research explores situations in which a collective sense of tolerance can limit efforts to control for prejudice, thereby increasing the influence of personal prejudice in judgments.
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Introduction

People sometimes have urges that they are better off resisting. Social rules and values work to reduce the incidence of potentially harmful behaviors, discouraging people from acting on impulses that could lead to negative consequences. Some of these social rules become laws, formally sanctioning violators. Other social rules have no legal backing but exist as norms – social conventions that, when broken, result in serious consequences within one’s social network. Intolerance towards those who are different from one’s self is strongly discouraged by U.S. social norms. Whereas blatant prejudice towards minority groups was rampant during the first half of the twentieth century (Katz & Braley, 1933), there are indications that people are becoming more reluctant to express such views (Devine & Elliot, 1995; Gilbert, 1951; Karlins, Coffman, & Walters, 1969). A social norm valuing egalitarianism has emerged in the last half century, an ideal which holds that people should be judged as individuals rather than group members and encourages tolerance of diversity (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Katz & Hass, 1988; Katz, Wackenhut, & Hass, 1986). While some people are able to comply with this egalitarian norm because they truly have no prejudices against outgroup members (Fazio, Jackson, Dunton, & Williams, 1995), many more harbor some degree of prejudice (Fazio & Olson, 2003; Greenwald & Nosek, 2001) that requires them to exercise self-control in order to comply with social expectations (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003; Gaertner & Dovidio; Katz & Hass; McConahay, Hardee, & Batts, 1981; Sears, 1988; Sears & Henry, 2003).

Attempts to comply with the egalitarian norm by stifling prejudiced reactions are often successful, but there are situations that can lead to the failure of these well-intentioned efforts. Some behaviors, such as seating preference and the chosen length of
interpersonal encounters, are so subtle that they can reveal prejudice only when systematically comparing individual tendencies in the presence of both ingroup and outgroup members (Fazio et al., 1995; Henderson-King & Nisbett, 1996; Sherman & Gorkin, 1980). In these instances individuals are unaware that they could be exhibiting bias and are therefore unable to control for personal prejudice. The information used in making a judgment can sabotage those trying to avoid prejudice in a different way, by obscuring the influence of prejudice, resulting in a relaxation of efforts made to control or correct for prejudice. Sometimes cues from the environment or an abundance of information regarding the target of a social judgment can obscure the influence of personal prejudice. When this occurs, the subsequent diminished efforts to correct for bias often result in more prejudiced evaluations of the target from those who must work to stifle prejudiced responses (Barden, Maddux, Petty, & Brewer, 2004; Snyder, Kleck, Strenta, & Mentzer, 1979; Wittenbrink, Judd, & Park, 2001; Yzerbyt, Schandron, Leyens, & Rocher, 1994). Similarly, establishing a personal history of tolerant judgments and behaviors can lead to more comfort in expressing unfiltered, and potentially biased, reactions to targets because previous tolerant judgments have satisfied the need to establish personal egalitarianism (Monin & Miller, 2001).

A perceiver’s group membership is another factor that can influence judgments of individuals belonging to minority groups. The groups to which we belong provide us with collective sources of values and guidelines for intergroup behavior (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). For individuals that need to exert effort in order to avoid prejudice, association with an egalitarian group can have numerous benefits. The influence of such a group can provide reinforcement of egalitarian values and prohibition of intolerant statements and
acts, and the normative influence from such groups has been shown to decrease prejudice among members (Blanchard, Crandall, Brigham, & Vaughn, 1994; Crandall, Eshleman, & O’Brien, 2002; Klein, Snyder, & Livingston, 2004; Stangor, Sechrist, & Jost, 2001). It would appear that association with a group that values tolerance should help many individuals to successfully avoid prejudiced reactions.

It is less clear what role membership in a group having *established* a record of tolerant actions may have upon individuals striving to avoid personal bias. Groups that truly value egalitarianism no doubt make serious efforts at living up to their own expectations. However, a group that has established a reputation for tolerance through a history of tolerant actions may elicit an unexpected increase in prejudiced judgments from some members. Presenting members with a history of their group’s intolerant behavior has been shown to elicit feelings of personal guilt and increased support for outgroup compensatory acts (Doosje, Branscombe, Spears, & Manstead, 1998; Doosje, Branscombe, Spears, & Manstead, 2006; Knowles & Peng, 2005). Likewise, it is believed that presenting members with a history of their group’s tolerant behavior may elicit feelings of pride and, similar to an individual history of tolerance, a subsequent drop in the perceived need to work to avoid prejudiced responses.

Prejudice

There is an observed human tendency to prefer those within one’s own group (Fazio et al., 1995; Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, L. K, 1998). Prejudice results from this tendency when negative reactions towards another are based on group membership rather than individual characteristics. These negative reactions often evolve into stereotypes, simplified caricatures depicting the characteristics and actions of members of
an outgroup. In the U.S., our immediate social groups educate us to the stereotypes that can be used to view those that differ from ourselves (Devine, 1989; Devine & Elliot, 1995; Lane, 1965; Ward, 1985).

Despite the average American’s knowledge of stereotypes, American culture does not support prejudiced views or actions. Over the last century, observed prejudice has declined remarkably in America (Gilbert, 1951; Karlins et al., 1959; & Katz & Braly, 1933) while endorsement of egalitarianism, a value emphasizing fair treatment for all regardless of any racial, ethnic, religious, gender, national, or other group membership, has increased (Katz & Hass, 1988; Sears 1988; Sears & Henry, 2003). This cultural value advocates avoiding the blatant use of stereotypes and discourages support for obviously prejudiced ideology (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). The literature reflects the pervasiveness of egalitarianism, with recent investigations finding only small levels of explicit prejudice against minority groups (Crandall et al., 2002; Devine, 1989; Devine & Elliot, 1995; Fazio et al., 1995; McConahay et al., 1981; Stanger et al., 2001; Swim & Miller, 1999).

Unfortunately, the elimination of prejudice is not as simple as introducing egalitarianism as a value. In spite of the social pressure to avoid prejudice, the urge to apply a stereotype can be quite strong. When encountering another person, contextual cues or the characteristics of that person may activate a stereotype (Devine, 1989; Kunda & Spencer, 2003). Once activated, this stereotype will be used to perceive the person unless motivations to develop an in-depth understanding of the target or to avoid the use of stereotypes solicit a more sophisticated evaluation (Brewer 1988; Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). Activated stereotypes are readily applied, and more likely to be applied when a perceiver is cognitively busy (Gilbert & Hixon, 1991).
Simultaneous communication of both stereotypes that are sometimes difficult to avoid and intolerance of their use creates inner conflict and ambivalence in many Americans (Katz & Hass, 1988). By transmitting stereotypes, the U.S. gives its residents a host of tools with which to perceive people. However, the egalitarian norm of U.S. culture asserts that stereotypes should not be used to judge people and that prejudice should be avoided. Those that use stereotypes not only experience possible social sanctions but internal sanctions as well. Guilt and negative affect can result when one is made aware that prejudice has influenced one’s judgments contrary to one’s professed values (Devine, Monteith, Zuwerink, & Elliot, 1991; Monteith, 1993; Monteith, Devine, & Zuwerink, 1993), leading many to avoid prejudiced thought and action whenever possible (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). A means of personal intervention is needed to regulate the conflict between the tendency to stereotype and the desire to comply with egalitarianism, this being the motivation to control prejudice.

The Motivation to Control Prejudice

The motivation to control prejudice helps the individual keep the tendency to respond with prejudice subdued, allowing behavior and judgment to comply with egalitarian values. This motivation grows from the egalitarian norm, and results in a controlled effort to refrain from the use of stereotypes (Dunton & Fazio, 1997; Fazio et al., 1995). The motivation has two components, one internal and one external (Plant & Devine, 1998). The external component of the motivation to control prejudice operates by means of compliance; a person avoids prejudice because he or she believes there is a possibility of losing group status or approval. When an individual who is externally motivated to control prejudice fails to do so, that individual focuses negative affect on the
target, holding the target of the prejudice in contempt for ‘making’ the perceiver violate his or her own norms (Monteith et al., 1993). Internal motivation to control prejudice also helps individuals to avoid prejudiced actions and judgments. However, the internal drive does not operate on anticipated social approval, but operates on anticipated self-approval (Plant & Devine). Individuals possessing a high internal motivation to control prejudice have internalized egalitarian values, and hold themselves to egalitarian standards. For individuals high in this internal motivation, engaging in prejudiced judgments or actions results in internally focused negative affect; they are unhappy with themselves for not complying with their own values (Monteith et al., 1993).

Simply possessing some level of motivation to control prejudice is not enough to avoid prejudiced responses; a person must have the opportunity to direct thoughts and actions in order to avoid bias. Some prejudiced reactions are automatic and are generally unresponsive to control attempts (Fazio & Dunton, 1997; Fazio & Olson, 2003). Recent implicit measures utilize computer technology to detect the differences in reaction times to ingroup and outgroup targets paired with positive and negative stimuli. These reaction time measures consider only responses that occur faster than can be controlled, ensuring that all responses are automatic. This type of automatic response to ingroup and outgroup stimuli works on an affective, approach/avoidance level, indicative of a lower order survival instinct that interprets people from a particular group as either friend or foe (Fazio & Olson, 2003). Two of the most commonly used implicit tests, the Implicit Association Task (IAT; Greenwald et al., 1998) and the Bona Fide Pipeline (BFP; Fazio et al., 1995) have illustrated that there is a strong preference for Whites over Blacks.
among White respondents (Greenwald & Nosek, 2001; Greenwald, Nosek, & Banaji, 2003).

*Failing motivation.* The motivation to control prejudice has been shown to suppress personal bias in a variety of situations and can become automatic with enough repetition (Maddux, Braden, Brewer, & Petty, 2005). However, even when the motivation is present some circumstances can lead to prejudiced judgments. These judgments can occur when egalitarian acts and judgments may be viewed as obvious attempts to mask underlying prejudice, when an individual does not have the opportunity to control automatic prejudiced reactions, or when a prejudiced action or evaluation can be justified by the information available.

Obviously insincere displays of tolerance suggest not only personal prejudice but also a degree of dishonesty, making individuals more likely to exhibit prejudice when it is believed that avoiding prejudice will appear as an act of deceit. When participants were led to believe that prejudiced responses had been detected through physiological measures, voluntary prejudiced responses became stronger (Jones & Sigall, 1971). A more recent approach found that only when participants were told that an Implicit Association Test really functioned like a ‘lie detector’ for prejudice was the relationship between the implicit IAT (Greenwald et al., 1998) and the explicit Modern Racism Scale (McConahay et al., 1981) significantly positive (Nier, 2005).

When an individual possesses some level of motivation to control prejudice, that individual must have an opportunity to control the expression of bias in order to avoid engaging in intolerant judgment and behavior. For most individuals, the motivation to control prejudice is unable to intervene in automatic reactions (Maddux et al., 2005),
leaving behaviors such as facial expression and body posturing (Dovidio, Kawakami, & Gaertner, 2002; Fazio et al., 1995) irrepressible indicators of bias. While subtle, these immediate responses indicate an observable distaste for outgroup members.

Similar failures to control for unwanted prejudice are observed when controlled judgments and actions are not expected to be vulnerable to the influence of personal bias. Seating preference and length of dyadic interaction can both serve as indicators which detect heightened levels of prejudice towards the outgroup, partially due to the difficulty one has in anticipating the expression of prejudice through these particular actions (Henderson-King & Nisbett, 1996). Likewise, some judgments can distract the perceiver from the influence of prejudice and eliminate efforts to control for personal bias.

Sherman and Gorkin’s (1980) classic study presented participants with a logic problem in which a father and son were injured in a car accident. Upon receiving the crash victims, an attending surgeon claimed to be the parent of the child in the crash. Most participants relied on gender stereotypes and were unable to discern correctly that the surgeon was the mother of the child. While focused on solving the riddle, participants were unaware that their judgments were influenced by stereotypes and were not compelled to control for prejudice, regardless of personal motivations to do so.

**Justification.** Justification of prejudiced evaluations can lead to prejudiced responses among people with motivation to control prejudice. In some instances, negative judgments and actions towards a target are influenced both by negative information gathered regarding the individual target and prejudice against the group to which the target belongs. In such cases, the influence of prejudice is simply adding to the negativity of an unbiased target evaluation and can be hard for the perceiver as well as the audience
to detect, often minimizing or eliminating attempts to control for personal prejudice. In other instances, information present in the context of a judgment can obscure the influence of a stereotype on a target evaluation. Multiple theories have developed from the idea that people justify prejudiced reactions to minorities, the most widely known being Modern Racism (McConahay et al., 1981), Symbolic Racism (Sears, 1988; Sears & Henry, 2003), Racial Ambivalence (Katz & Hass, 1988; Katz et al., 1986), and Aversive Racism (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). All have in common a two-component theory of prejudice that includes negative reactions towards outgroup targets and a motivation to suppress those negative reactions.

Each of these dual models of prejudice indicate that, at times, negative reactions to a stigmatized other are not believed to be caused by prejudice but are seen as sound and justified evaluations. Prejudiced reactions and cognitions sometimes occur even though a person may generally attempt to avoid them. When these prejudiced reactions to minorities do occur, the perceiver can still affirm personal egalitarian values by asserting that the negativity of the judgment was warranted by the characteristics of the target. People have access to information from multiple sources when evaluating a social target, with some information seen as more important to the judgment. During this evaluation, any bias for or against that target can be followed by shifting emphasis onto information that confirms the perceiver’s expectations (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; McConahay et al., 1981; Katz & Hass, 1988; Sears & Henry, 2003).

Katz & Hass (1988) describe how the Protestant work ethic, a value found to be held by many Americans, can be used to justify negative reactions to Blacks. People applying the stereotype are more likely to see Blacks as impoverished, ignorant, and
violent. To avoid the negative experiences associated with purposeful prejudiced evaluations, some view Blacks as deserving of contempt and lower class living conditions due to their perceived laziness and unwillingness to work. In this case a component of the stereotype, laziness, is used to justify other negative perceptions influenced by the stereotype.

When perceivers have a preexisting preference for a specific group, they will emphasize the importance of the information received about an individual target in a way that confirms the preference (Norton, Vandello, & Darley, 2004). Asked to rate the suitability of high school students for college entry, White participants shifted the described importance of GPA’s and number of AP courses to confirm their preference for equally qualified Black students (Norton et al., 2004). Whereas the preceding findings illustrate a preference for a minority group, justification can just as easily occur in biases against minorities.

Individuating information about a target gives social perceivers the opportunity to take multiple pieces of information into consideration when making a judgment. People are often reluctant to judge unless they feel that they have sufficient information with which to evaluate the target properly, especially when that judgment might seem influenced by prejudice. Once a perceiver believes that the provided information about a target warrants an accurate impression, there is no perceived need to correct for prejudice, and stereotypes can once again influence judgment (Yzerbyt et al., 1994). When judgments are made about only one target, the influence of stereotypes is especially difficult to detect and stop. During the evaluation of a disreputable person, the overall negative characteristics of the target mask whatever bias results from the race of
the target, leaving disreputable Blacks rated more negatively than disreputable Whites (Katz & Hass, 1988; Katz et al., 1986). These biases occur as the individuating information is presented. When given socio-economic information about a student, perceivers observing that student taking a test indicated that the higher SES student performed better during the testing session, in spite of the fact that both high and low SES experimental groups watched footage of the same student. Participants in the same study given the students’ SES information but not allowed to view the testing session did not feel that they had sufficient information with which to pass judgment, and exhibited no bias in student ratings (Darley & Gross, 1983).

Any information observed along with the target may work to justify prejudiced evaluations of and actions towards that target. When encountering a minority target, contextual information can work to obscure bias in judgments by offering alternatives other than prejudice that can explain prejudiced behaviors and evaluations. Some individuals have a tendency to avoid stigmatized others, such as disabled persons, but only when that decision can be attributed to an outside influence. Participants given a choice of two seats in which to view a movie, one next to an able-bodied confederate and one next to a disabled confederate, chose to avoid the disabled individual only when the choice of whom to sit by was accompanied by a choice of movie (Snyder, Lassegard, & Ford, 1979). In this study, seating decisions could be attributed to movie preference just as easily as to prejudice, allowing participants to justify to both their audience and themselves that their actions were not driven by personal prejudice.

In addition to obscuring the true motivations behind biased judgments, contextual information can increase the likelihood of prejudice by providing a perceiver with clues
regarding the characteristics of a target. When Blacks are shown in a setting that appears to confirm the negative, violent, criminal stereotype, negative evaluations follow. However, when Blacks are portrayed in a positive, family oriented setting, the same Black targets elicit positive reactions (Wittenbrink et al., 2001). Similarly, participants exposed to images of Black and White targets in settings which suggested that the targets were inmates rated the Black targets much more negatively than the White targets. The same Black targets elicited more positive evaluations than White targets from participants when the images suggested that the targets were lawyers (Barden et al., 2004).

Information present in the environment observed along with the character of a target can work to obscure the influence of bias and suggest that negative stereotypes may be appropriate, in some instances leading individuals to make judgments not solely based on the character of a target but also based on a target’s group membership.

When encountering outgroup members, individuals consider information associated with the target along with contextual cues in arriving at a final evaluation. Whereas many individuals may strive to avoid prejudiced evaluations of outgroup members, information regarding the individuating characteristics of an outgroup target (Norton et al., 2004; Yzerbyt et al., 1994; Katz & Hass, 1988; Katz et al., 1986) or present in the environment when a target is evaluated (Barden et al., 2004; Snyder et al., 1979; Wittenbrink et al., 2001) can obscure the influence of prejudice for both the perceiver and the audience, making prejudicial evaluations seem justifiably accurate and nonbiased. In these instances, those individuals who endorse egalitarian values may remain unaware of prejudicial influences, exhibiting biased judgments and actions towards minorities in spite of their desires to avoid them.
Moral credentials. Similar to information about a situation or target, information about the self can soften attempts to correct for biased social evaluations. The motivation to control prejudice is both internal and external (Plant & Devine, 1998), and establishing an egalitarian character occurs for the benefit of both the self and the social audience. Individuals with some level of motivation to control prejudice often engage in egalitarian acts towards minority targets. However, these acts can establish a history of egalitarian credentials testifying to an individual’s egalitarian nature, relaxing the perceived need to control prejudice, and resulting in later prejudiced judgments and actions.

When a behavior such as refusing service to Black restaurant patrons who fail to adhere to a dress code could be attributed to prejudice, people have been shown to exhibit favoritism towards Blacks in order to avoid that attribution. However, when a precedent has been previously established by refusing White patrons, this favoritism disappears (Dutton, 1971). Other research has shown that when one’s sense of egalitarianism is threatened, that individual will engage in later efforts that are designed to reestablish a sense of egalitarianism. When threatened with false feedback indicating negative physiological reactions towards Black individuals, participants were later more likely to donate to a Black panhandler to re-establish egalitarianism values than those whose personal tolerance had not been threatened (Dutton & Lake, 1973). However, these increased efforts to establish tolerance subside once an individual has reestablished a tolerant record towards minority members. Dutton and Lennox (1974) observed that participants whose egalitarian values had been threatened were less likely to engage in further activities to help Blacks after giving change to a Black panhandler compared to non-donors (Dutton & Lennox, 1974).
Collectively, Dutton’s research not only indicates that our egalitarian credentials play an influential role in our decision-making, but also suggests that we are every bit as focused on convincing ourselves of our tolerant natures as with convincing our audience. In Dutton’s (1971) restaurant field study, the White maître de’s were likely to refuse an underdressed Black couple only after refusing a similarly dressed White couple. However, in the time between the two trials, each restaurant had seated an entirely new group of guests, the Black couple refused before an entirely new audience with no knowledge of previous tolerant actions on the part of the maître de’s. Similarly, after Dutton and Lennox’s (1974) participants were accused of prejudiced responses to Blacks by lab personnel they charitably gave to a seemingly unrelated Black beggar, but later refused to volunteer for an unrelated Black group. In each of these cases, the only consistent audience was the actor.

Similar to actions, judgments are able to establish the egalitarian credentials needed to relax the motivation to control prejudice. Monin and Miller (2001) explored the impact of establishing egalitarian moral credentials through judgments rather than actions. Monin & Miller’s Study 1 presented all participants with a series of questions before they were asked to make a later judgment regarding the hiring practices of a construction firm. Some participants received items that made extremely sexist statements and that solicited strong disagreement from almost all respondents. These participants were able to establish moral credentials through disagreement with those sexist statements. Another group received similar statements that were less sexist and solicited at least some agreement from most participants. These participants agreed with the initial statements, and consequently they were not able to establish personal tolerance
early in the study. At the end of the study, all participants were asked to make a judgment about the suitability of a woman for a stereotypically masculine job in the construction field. The results indicated that participants who were given the opportunity to establish moral credentials were more likely to indicate that the job described would be better filled by a male applicant than were participants in the no credentials and baseline conditions.

Study 2 replicated the findings of Study 1 using both a sexism and racism paradigm while additionally measuring for internal and external motivation to control prejudice. Study 2 manipulated moral credentials by presenting some participants the opportunity to select a minority applicant for a job task before making subsequent decisions on another hiring task. The findings of both the racism and sexism components of Study 2 indicated that whereas higher baseline levels of internal or external motivation were related to less prejudiced responses in later judgments, the establishment of moral credentials increased outgroup bias among participants regardless of the extent of their individual motivation to control prejudice. Study 3 replicated the racism investigation of Study 2 while exploring the effects of establishing credentials and making later judgments in front of separate audiences. Study 3 found that the establishment of moral credentials led to increases in prejudiced judgment even when moral credentials were established in front of one audience and subsequent racist judgments were made in front of another audience. Collectively, the findings of all three studies indicate that once prior information has led an individual to have a sense of personal tolerance, an increased sense of comfort in making ‘uncensored’ judgments can lead to diminished efforts to control or correct for personal bias.
Many individuals experience some level of outgroup prejudice while still endorsing egalitarian values. For these individuals, adhering to egalitarian values occurs through a controlled practice of anticipating when personal bias may play a role in thoughts and actions and working to avoid that bias. Whereas these efforts to avoid prejudice are often successful, information about the target, the environment, and the self can obscure the influence of personal prejudice, eliminating the perceiver the opportunity to correct for it. As discussed, information about the self in the form of a record of personal tolerance can lead to relaxation of efforts to control for prejudice. However, information about the self not only comes from personal actions, but from the groups to which we belong. The following section explores the ways in which groups can influence one’s concept of self, including how a group identity may sometimes lead to changes in a personal sense of tolerance.

Social Influence

The need to belong is a fundamental human drive that motivates us to construct social bonds (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). In our evolutionary past, forming groups increased human the odds of survival through the sharing of resources, increased protection from outside threats, provided higher concentrations of potential mates for successful reproduction, and allowed for greater investment in extended kinship networks (Baumeister & Leary). Engrained in our genetic and social heritage, the inclination to define the social landscape in terms of group membership is essential to human survival. This tendency to seek out and maintain relationships with others is so strong that even groups formed from an arbitrary coin toss will develop a sense of unity and experience a preference for those within their own group (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).
Understanding the world in terms of group membership becomes more challenging when considering that most individuals belong to multiple social groups. We belong to families, professions, alumni organizations, political parties, and sports team fan clubs, at times acting as a member of each of these individual groups. Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1979; Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) provides a framework with which to understand how individuals can switch between the behaviors and duties associated with each role.

According to Social Identity Theory, individuals engage in categorization, identification, and social comparison in attempts to efficiently and accurately perceive the surrounding social structure (Tajfel, 1979; Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). As we encounter others we intuitively take note of their personal characteristics, making pertinent distinctions based on defining traits such as age, race, gender, and nationality that allow us to sketch the social landscape of our environment. Along the way we also make note of insiders and outsiders, of those who belong to our groups and those who do not. Categorization helps us to develop a set of expectations about the behaviors and characteristics of the people that we come into contact with when little other information is available, as well as alerting us to those most like ourselves. This process allows one to quickly determine friend and foe, establishing whom to help and with whom to compete (Tajfel & Turner).

Identification in the context of Social Identity Theory refers to one’s self-perception at a specific moment. Our self-perceptions are largely influenced by the immediate social environment, some situations leading to more individualistic self-perceptions, others making certain group identities more salient (Tajfel & Turner, 1986;
Turner, 1985; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1997). When conditions make an identity that we possess particularly relevant, we see ourselves as a member of that salient social group and experience changes in perceptions of the self, of fellow group members, and of outgroup members. As an illustration, arriving at the University in the morning, a man sees himself as a tenured faculty member. That afternoon tight airport security reminds him of 9-11 and his American identity becomes most salient. Later that evening, he arrives at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology conference and the collection of professionals leads to an emphasis on his role as a social psychologist. When he is met by colleagues from his graduate school his identity as a University of North Carolina graduate comes to the front. Each change in identification is caused by a new situation and is met by a shift in how he views himself and the people he encounters.

Social comparison is part of the process through which we discern our place within a group, and our group’s place within society (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). As we compare our own characteristics, performance, and status with that of other group members we are able to discern our relative rank, place, abilities, duties, and possible future within the group (Tajfel, 1979). Social comparison also occurs as one compares his or her group to other groups. These comparisons often take the form of emphasizing differences that favorably portray the ingroup, leading to overly positive perceptions of the groups to which we belong (Brewer, 1979; Tajfel, 1970).

Social Identity Theory explicitly outlines the manner in which we navigate the social landscape, the most fundamental assertion being that our rules, perceptions of others, attitudes, and very self-concepts are significantly influenced by the groups to which we belong. Similarly, Identity Control Theory (Burke, 1980) describes our
identities as cognitive structures that influence how we view ourselves and view others within the social network. The theory describes these identities as varying in salience, with some identities more likely to be invoked in a given situation than others (Stryker & Burke, 2000). Each identity includes self-relevant standards (Burke, 1980; 2006) that individuals attempt to confirm by engaging in behavior consistent with that identity (Burke & Reitzes, 1981). While emphasizing different aspects of how social roles interact with the environment, both Social Identity Theory and Identity Control Theory are highly similar in that they both assert that we hold multiple identities that, when salient, direct our perceptions and behavior.

Social groups influence our actions and attitudes through both implicit social pressure and the explicit control and presentation of information. Groups provide normative influence as members strive to maintain consistency with the group’s expectations of behaviors and actions. Normative influence occurs not necessarily because of members’ complete agreement with a group’s behaviors and beliefs, but most often (at least initially) members’ behavior is driven by some fear of social sanction for “falling out of line” (Turner, 1995). Accordingly, research has shown that individuals will consider the perceived social norms of relevant others when engaging in decision making prior to personal action (Ajzen, 1991; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Over time, internalization of ingroup social norms results in individual members’ personal endorsement of them, leaving members not only striving for the approval of the group in responding to normative influence, but trying to ensure consistency with one’s own values (Festinger, 1957; Heider, 1944). The results of this influence can range from the subtle effects of forming a common idea about the movement of a point of light (Sherif,
1935) to more extreme incidents such as an emergent culture of brutality among role-playing guards towards role-playing inmates (Haney, Banks, & Zimbardo, 1973). Ingroup normative influence directs behavior through social feedback, directing participants towards socially acceptable and away from undesirable behaviors, often without the need to state explicitly the rules of conduct for a particular situation.

Informational influence occurs as we attempt to minimize ambiguity and confusion in the world around us by gathering knowledge through experiences and social networks (Deutsch & Gerard, 1955). People spend much of their time immersed in the groups to which they belong, both ensuring that they will be exposed to their groups’ perspectives and limiting exposure to outside perspectives. Ingroup influence is maximized not only by the disparity in the quantity of information provided, but in how that information is received. The Elaboration Likelihood Model (Petty, Cacioppo, Strathman, & Priester, 1986) illustrates that the source of an argument can influence how receptive an individual is to a particular message. Persuasive messages from ingroup members are more successful in producing attitude change, giving cohorts a heightened degree of influence over one’s thoughts and actions. This lopsided reception of information can vary with the complexity of processing, but in some instances is so pronounced that messages from the outgroup are altogether disregarded (Mackie, Worth, & Asuncion, 1990).

Groups as a Shared Experience

Belonging to a group provides more than information, influence, rules, and roles to its members. Group membership is an active dynamic relationship in which the wellbeing of a group is intimately related to the wellbeing of the self. Being a group
member provides one with feelings pride, embarrassment, guilt and discomfort, the individual member receiving the privilege and pain of the collective highs and lows of the group.

Normative and informational influence result in shared attitudes among group members, and when fellow group members exhibit a divergence from these attitudes it can prove a collectively uncomfortable experience (Matz & Wood, 2005; Norton, Monin, Cooper, & Hogg, 2003). Matz & Wood (2005) found that when individuals encountered fellow group members who disagreed with their personal views, they experienced vicarious dissonance similar to that associated with personal inconsistency. When faced with this situation, individuals have been shown to reconcile inconsistent situations by working towards consistency through personal attitude change (Norton et al., 2003), attempting to persuade dissenters, or even transferring membership to a group with compatible attitudes (Matz & Wood).

As group members, the status of the group influences our self-concepts (Turner et al., 1987). Anxiety has been shown to increase among members of a group when a fellow group member attempts a task at which he or she is expected to fail, negatively reflecting on all members of the group (Cohen & Garcia, 2005). After a sports team victory, team fans are more likely to wear team apparel and emphasize team association (Cialdini, Thorne, Borden, Walker, Freeman, & Sloan, 1974; Cialdini & Richardson, 1980). In addition to closer associations with a winning team, fans internalize collective success and exhibit more optimistic personal outlooks as well as more positive esteem and mood (Hirt, Zillman, Erickson, & Kennedy, 1992). Conversely, failures are met with corresponding negative shifts in optimism and depressed affect among fans (Hirt et al.,
1992), as well as reluctance to associate with the losing team (Snyder et al., 1986). When only one person or subgroup is responsible for an embarrassing performance, other ingroup members react by more strongly condemning the acts and/or character of ingroup offenders in comparison to those of outgroup offenders, thereby reducing association with the act and the offender (Marques, Yzerbt, & Leyens, 1988).

Our social groups provide us with rules to follow and roles to fulfill. They give us collective identities that influence how we see ourselves and how we view the world. As group members we define the world through affiliations, with ingroup and outgroup distinctions identifying potential friends and foes and helping us avoid dangerous situations. However, in the integrated society of the U.S. multiple races, ethnicities, and nationalities live side by side, the distinctions that helped groups to survive in the past only leading to unnecessary conflict. In multicultural societies, the once adaptive tendency to form social groups can solicit unnecessary prejudice towards outgroup members.

**Group Influence and Prejudice**

Social categorization serves to identify those inside and outside of our immediate social groups. These distinctions, once made, influence our personal attitudes, actions, self-concepts, and the perceptions of those around us. The attitudinal influence exercised by a group upon its members directs behaviors and attitudes towards outgroup members (Blanchard et al., 1991; Lane, 1965; Ward, 1985). Conditions of group competition can shift perceptions of the outgroup subtly but quickly, both through informational influence which transmits stereotypes of outgroup members and normative influence which changes our willingness to engage in and tolerate prejudiced views (LeVine & Campbell,
Group identities are so integral in shaping relations with members of the outgroup that ingroup members can even experience a common sense of responsibility for actions committed towards an outgroup in which they took no personal role (Swim & Miller, 1999).

A person’s immediate family, the first and primary means of socialization, transmits prejudiced views to new generations as supported through both generational consistency of prejudiced views (Lane, 1965) and through the observation of direct, purposeful communication of these prejudices (Ward, 1985). Whereas outgroup prejudice can take the form of a simple dislike for a particular group, it often manifests as a derogatory ethnic or racial stereotype. Stereotypes are dependent on cultural transmission for survival, as evidenced by the finding that the components of a stereotype that are more easily communicated are the most likely to endure over time (Schaller, Conway, & Tanchuk, 2002). Americans are recognized as a group that pervasively communicates prejudiced ideas regarding many minority social groups (Crandall et al., 2002; Devine & Elliot, 1995).

Prejudiced views are not only influenced by an individual’s immediate family, but also by the extended social environment. Opinions expressed by fellow group members influence personal displays of prejudice; a fellow group member’s tolerance or intolerance of prejudice can increase or decrease the willingness of an individual to express prejudice in both public and private settings (Blanchard, Lilly & Vaughn, 1991). When prejudiced views regarding a particular outgroup are believed to be tolerated by the ingroup, members of that ingroup are more likely to communicate prejudiced perceptions of targeted outgroup members; when the ingroup is believed to endorse tolerance towards
a particular outgroup, expressions of that specific outgroup prejudice decline (Crandall et al., 2002). The changes in personal attitudes towards prejudice resulting from ingroup normative influence can last weeks or longer, and this type of influence is particularly effective at increasing resistance to subsequent persuasive attempts containing objective, scientifically-based arguments (Stangor et al., 2001). Some individuals are so sensitive to social approval that they shift professed levels of prejudice to match the perceived prejudiced beliefs of the social audience. Participants high in self-monitoring shifted their professed levels of prejudice higher or lower to match the anticipated prejudice levels of an audience when preparing to report their thoughts regarding gay men and lesbians (Klein et al., 2004). The groups to which we belong teach us stereotypes and help us to determine when it is acceptable to use them, offering approval or disapproval dependent upon our successful compliance with immediate group norms.

Group distinctions quite often lead to negative relations between two groups that are in close contact with one another. Individuals become somewhat antagonistic and derogate outgroup rivals in conditions of competition for resources and shared fate (Duckitt & Mphuthing, 1998; LeVine & Campbell, 1971; Morse & Allport, 1952; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), and in conditions of personal threat (Fein & Spencer, 1997). Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood & Sherif’s (1961) field study placed two groups of young boys in differing locations on a summer campsite and introduced competition over resources. In a short time, intergroup hostilities arose and competition escalated to violence. Intergroup competitions have been shown to elicit more negative reactions than dyadic interpersonal competitions. Individuals acting on behalf of groups are much more likely than those
acting alone to exploit trustworthy partners and engage in unfair tactics (Insko, Kirchner, Pinter, Efaw, & Wildschut, 2005). Groups that encounter one another are likely to experience some level of perceived competition, increasing the likelihood that mutual hostilities and derogatory associations will accompany categorical distinctions.

**Collective Guilt.** A group can impart a sense of guilt to its members regarding past collective discriminatory actions, much in the same way that it can pass on a sense of collective success or failure. Collective guilt is negative self-directed affect arising from a sense of shared ingroup responsibility for the disadvantages or negative experiences shared by an outgroup (Swim & Miller, 1999). Swim and Miller confirmed the existence of White guilt, guilt experienced by American Whites regarding their role in the disadvantaged status of Blacks. The researchers found that participants from four separate samples exhibited some level of White guilt. Additionally, White guilt was related to increased perceptions of White privilege and belief in widespread discrimination towards Blacks. Most notably, Swim and Miller found that White guilt was positively related to support for affirmative action programs, possibly representing a desire to make restitution for mistreatment of Blacks. Once Swim and Miller provided an empirical investigation confirming a modern, relevant form of White guilt, other researchers were able to explore how collective guilt can be manipulated.

Collective guilt is dependent on members being aware of the intolerant history of their ingroup. New information exposing a group’s intolerant acts towards an outgroup can heighten members' feelings of collective guilt. Doosje and colleagues (1998) explored the effects of collective guilt using both experimentally induced group identification (Study 1) and the national identity of Dutch participants (Study 2). Study 1
found that in the absence of intolerant personal acts directed towards the experimentally induced outgroup, a description of intolerant ingroup actions towards an experimentally induced rival led to increased feelings of guilt and the desire for making restitution. Study 2 focused on altering perceptions of guilt among members of an existing group. Participants, all Dutch students, were presented a negative, positive, or ambiguous historical account of Dutch treatment of Indonesian citizens during colonization. In spite of all participants bringing preconceived notions of Dutch history into the study and having no personal roles in the described actions, the historical accounts of colonization provided were able to induce increased feelings of collective guilt among participants presented a negative history of Dutch actions towards Indonesia (Doosje et al., 1998).

Level of ingroup identification can significantly affect manifestations of group-based guilt. Individuals that strongly identify with a given group are more personally threatened when receiving negative group feedback, leaving them more resistant in accepting such feedback (Doosje et al., 1998; Doosje et al., 2006). Doosje and colleagues’ (1998) exploration of the reactions of Dutch students to descriptions of the Dutch government’s treatment of Indonesians during the colonial period found that those strongly identifying with the ingroup were less likely to accept negative group feedback. Dutch students who strongly identified with their Dutch heritage were more likely to disregard ambiguous information and to attack the credibility of an outgroup source when presented a history of Dutch mistreatment of Indonesia. The same information from ingroup sources, however, elicited the highest levels collective guilt from high identifiers, those individuals most personally impacted by a negative ingroup history (Study 1, Doosje et al., 2006).
Ingroup identification is also related to individuals’ reactions to group efforts at restitution. The research described above (Doosje et al., 2006) also revealed that high Dutch identifiers experienced greater levels of collective guilt when told that their government had made an official apology to Indonesia, as opposed to financial or no restitution, because such a gesture verified Dutch wrongdoing. This difference was not observed among low identifiers. High identifiers were also more likely to recommend financial restitution when led to believe that the Dutch had issued an official apology than when no apology had been issued, again a difference not observed among low identifiers (Study 2, Doosje et al., 2006). This research indicates that the level of identification with a group indicates how strongly the history of a group reflects on the self. Those who strongly identify with a group are not only more reluctant to accept information that suggests group wrongdoing, but experience more collective guilt when that information is deemed credible.

When a social group violates egalitarian values by exhibiting prejudice towards another group, individual members can experience guilt even when they have taken no direct part in the prejudiced acts (Swim & Miller, 1999). The experience of collective guilt in reaction to group acts of prejudice can be manipulated, with depictions of past ingroup acts of prejudice eliciting increased levels of guilt among individual members (Doosje et al., 1998). Those who experience this collective guilt have been shown to exhibit more endorsement for acts of restitution toward the targets of past discrimination (Doosje et al., 2006; Swim & Miller, 1999).

A possibility yet to be explored by researchers is that acts that establish a group’s tolerance can result in a decrease in efforts to emphasize egalitarianism. Just as the
experience of collective guilt has been shown to elicit support for acts of restitution emphasizing tolerance, a group reputation for tolerance soliciting feelings of collective tolerance among individual group members may conversely elicit diminished emphasis on acts meant to display tolerance.

The Current Research

The U.S. comprises diverse groups of differing racial, ethnic, religious, and cultural backgrounds under a single national identity. In this multicultural nation, groups with different cultural identities are forced to exist alongside one another and continually compete for power and resources. Prejudiced depictions of outgroup members, often in the form of derogatory stereotypes, are common and transmitted both through immediate social circles (Lane, 1965; Ward, 1985) and by larger ingroups (Blanchard et al., 1994; Blanchard et al., 1991; Crandall et al., 2002; Devine, 1989; Devine & Elliot, 1995; Klein et al., 2004; Stangor et al., 2001). At the same time, U.S. culture emphasizes egalitarianism, a value underscoring fair treatment of all regardless of gender, race, ethnicity, or religion (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Katz & Hass, 1988; Katz et al., 1986; Sears, 1988; Sears & Henry, 2003). For many, simultaneous exposure to stereotypes with which to view outgroup members and societal intolerance for their use can result in internal conflict during intergroup encounters.

Prejudice research has revealed that many individuals who adhere to egalitarian values do not do so automatically, but must exert effort to avoid prejudiced (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Katz & Hass, 1988; Sears & Henry, 2003). A motivation to control prejudice develops for those that endorse egalitarianism but sometimes have unwanted prejudiced reactions, this motivation working to suppress
prejudiced reactions towards outgroup members during intergroup encounters (Dunton & Fazio, 1997; Fazio et al., 1995; Plant & Devine, 1998). For individuals with a motivation to control prejudice, efforts made at suppressing prejudice are largely successful; however, unwanted prejudiced acts may occur when information associated with an intergroup judgment reduces the perceived need to control for prejudice.

When motivated to control for prejudice, information contained in the setting of the judgment, the target of the judgment, or the self can reduce the perceived need to correct for prejudice (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003) and result in unintentionally prejudiced judgments. Specifically, possessing a personal record of tolerant acts can provide an individual with a perceived reputation of tolerance, lessening efforts to control for prejudice in future actions and judgments (Dutton, 1971; Dutton & Lake, 1974; Dutton & Lennox, 1974; Monin & Miller, 2001). The result is an ironic inconsistency, with the establishment of personal tolerance sometimes leading to later increases in prejudiced judgments and actions.

The groups to which we belong provide information about the self in much the same way as past actions. Group members vicariously experience the successes and failures of their ingroups (Cialdini & Richardson, 1980; Hirt et al., 1992; Snyder et al., 1986). Knowledge of past ingroup intolerance can elicit guilt as well as efforts at restitution from group members (Doosje et al., 1998; Doosje et al., 2006; Swim & Miller, 1999). The literature has yet to address the effects of a perceived ingroup reputation for tolerance upon individual members’ judgments towards outgroups.

It is believed that when a group attains a tolerant reputation, many members experience a vicarious sense of tolerance similar to that experienced upon performing
individual acts of tolerance, and that this shared sense of tolerance reduces individual attempts to control prejudiced responses. It is hypothesized that when ingroup members are made aware of a tolerant group reputation, members’ perceived need to control for prejudice will be lessened. It is expected that in much the same way that a collective sense of intolerance can motivate behaviors emphasizing egalitarianism, in many participants a collective sense of tolerance can reduce the motivation to avoid prejudice.

The current research tests the hypothesis that establishing a tolerant group reputation will lead to more prejudiced outgroup judgments among ingroup members. Through providing information regarding the reputation and history of participants’ university (Study 1), hometowns (Study 2), and nation (Study 3), the following studies investigate how participants react to tolerant and intolerant ingroup reputations when evaluating an outgroup. This research hopes to further the theoretical understanding of the ways in which people control personal prejudice while providing applicable information on the possible negative consequences of belonging to an egalitarian group.

Study 1 Methods

Study 1 explored the effects of possessing an ingroup reputation for tolerance towards gays and lesbians upon subsequent evaluations of gay and lesbian individuals. A reputation for tolerance was established for students through Ohio University group membership; some students received a history of Ohio University emphasizing tolerant acts while others received a history emphasizing Ohio University intolerance. Level of identification with Ohio University was also manipulated, some students received materials intended to maximize Ohio University identity salience while others received
control materials. Two separate dependent scales were used to evaluate prejudice exhibited towards homosexuals.

Study 1 focused on prejudice against gay men and lesbians for two reasons. First, it was suspected that the motivation to control prejudice against gay men and lesbians might not be as intense as the motivation to control prejudice against Blacks. Gay and lesbian rights are still far behind those of Blacks, with issues such as gay and lesbian marriage and military service currently under dispute. Due to the current social inequalities faced by gay men and lesbians, it was anticipated that ingroup influence advocating tolerant treatment of gay and lesbian individuals may be weaker than that advocating tolerance of other groups. It was expected that the presumably weaker efforts to control prejudice towards gay men and lesbians would make measures of prejudice towards these individuals more sensitive to manipulations of group egalitarian credentials in comparison to measures of prejudice towards other minority groups. Study 1 also focused on prejudice against homosexuals in an effort to broaden the scope of research pertaining to this form of prejudice. Research focusing on prejudice against homosexuals accounts for a relatively small proportion of the overall prejudice literature and it was believed that this study could prove a meaningful addition to a growing literature within social psychology.

Ohio University was chosen as the focus ingroup because it served as a common identity to all participants and it was believed that identity salience and university reputation could be easily manipulated. Whereas all other demographic and social grouping variables varied across members of the sample, all participants were Ohio University students. This common identity ensured that all participants receiving
descriptions of a tolerant or intolerant university history could identify with the common group.

It was also believed that the salience of the Ohio University identity and beliefs regarding that identity could be effectively manipulated with minimally invasive methods. Upon entering the university environment students take on new activities and identities associated with the college culture (Serpe, 1987), choosing to associate with groups that are consistent with identities held before entrance (Serpe & Styker, 1987). For these participants Ohio University affiliation represented just one of many identities that the participants possessed, and its relatively new acquisition for most participants (the research pool consisted mainly of freshman) meant that it might not be as pervasively salient as other social groups such as family, racial, or gender identities. Additionally, it was expected that due to the relatively new acquisition of the Ohio University identity for most participants, information describing the tolerance or intolerance of the larger Ohio University community would be readily accepted.

Study 1 used two types of dependent measures to explore the effects of group credentials upon evaluations of homosexuals. One measure assessed prejudice towards homosexuals as a group and the other assessed prejudice towards an individual homosexual target. Both measures were included in order to explore if differences existed in how a collective egalitarian reputation affected the two types of outgroup judgments.

**Hypotheses**

It was expected that participants exposed to the description of a tolerant Ohio University campus would experience a sense of collective tolerance, resulting in decreased efforts to control for personal prejudice. The expected result was the
observation of higher levels of prejudice towards homosexuals among those exposed to the description of a tolerant Ohio University compared to those exposed to the intolerant description on both the individual and group dependent measures.

Participants

Eighty-one undergraduate males and 202 undergraduate females, ranging in age from 18 to 20 (median age = 18), participated for partial class credit. Two-hundred fifty four participants self-identified as White, sixteen as Black, three as Hispanic, one as Asian, two as other, and seven indicated that they did not wish to respond. All students were Ohio University undergraduates. The study was advertised through the Psychology Department’s online research system, PsychPool. All sign ups and credit allocations were coordinated through this system.

Instruments

Prejudice towards the homosexual community. Prejudiced reactions to the homosexual community were obtained using the Attitudes Towards Lesbians and Gay men (ATLG) scale (Herek, 1988). The scale has two 10-item subscales, one measuring Attitudes Towards Gay Men (ATG), and one measuring Attitudes Towards Lesbians (ATL). The ATLG presents participants with a series of questions regarding reactions to Gay men and Lesbians and consists of obviously prejudiced statements (e.g., “I think male homosexuals are disgusting”). Participants are asked to respond on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 9 (strongly agree) rating scale, with higher scores indicating stronger prejudice. The ATL subscale, the ATG subscale, and the ATLG scale all indicated high internal consistency, ATL (α = .88), ATG (α = .91), and total ATLG (α = .94).
Prejudice towards a gay man. Prejudiced reactions to a gay man were measured using a hiring scenario based on the dependent measures presented to participants by Monin and Miller (2001; Study 1). The measure began by outlining a hiring decision that provided participants with a rationale for discriminating against a homosexual on the basis of sexual orientation. Participants were given the role of selecting a new Scout Leader for a local Boy Scout group in a small Midwest town. The scenario indicated that a neighboring community had recently hired an openly gay man as a scout leader, and as a result lost a significant proportion of its troop due to parental concerns. Participants were then asked to indicate if the position would be best filled by a gay man (-3) or a straight man (3; Appendix A).

This scenario presented participants with a realistic, applicable hiring decision in which multiple considerations could influence the final decision. Whereas this measure did not ask participants to evaluate a specific individual, it did solicit hypothetical reactions to the characteristics of any one applicant. By asking participants to make a decision that would be for the good of the local scout troop, this measure attempted to present participants with a judgment that required them to weigh justification of discrimination against their motivation to control prejudice towards homosexuals. Diminished efforts to avoid prejudiced judgments were expected to be detected by an increased reluctance to recommend hiring a Gay scout troop leader.

Motivation to control prejudice. A version of both the Plant and Devine (1998) 10-item Internal Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Scale (IMS) and External Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Scale (EMS) were administered to all participants. The adapted scales asked questions specifically relevant to the motivation to
control prejudice towards homosexuals (Ratcliff, Lassiter, Markman, & Snyder, 2006). Both scales indicated an acceptable level of internal consistency, IMS ($\alpha = .86$), EMS ($\alpha = .79$). Study 2 of Monin & Miller’s work (2001) administered these scales, revealing that whereas both higher IMS and EMS scores predicted more egalitarian responses, neither scale interacted with the manipulation of egalitarian credentials. Similar results were expected regarding this scale in Study 1.

**Procedure**

*Design.* The study utilized a four-cell design resulting from *identification* (Ohio University/non Ohio University) by *group reputation* (tolerant/intolerant). Presentation order of the ATLG and the Scout Master hiring scenario was counterbalanced to rule out order effects. Counterbalancing did not exhibit a main effect nor did it interact with any of the expected effects and will not be discussed further.

Participants volunteered believing that they were about to complete a university-sponsored survey assessing their social and study habits. Half of all participants were randomly selected to be exposed to a manipulation to make their identities as Ohio University students especially salient, while half experienced a control manipulation of similar length and content. Those participants chosen to identify with Ohio University were led to believe that, as part of a school sanctioned research program, they would be asked about their activities and interests both within and outside of school-sanctioned events. Participants in this condition were exposed to a series of questions regarding their experiences at Ohio University and within the greater Athens community. These questions were specific to the university and accompanied by pictures of Ohio University and the town of Athens (Appendix B).
The remaining participants were exposed to a similar task that was described as part of a nationwide research project exploring the habits of university students. Whereas the questions were similar to those in the Ohio University identity manipulation, there was no specific mention of Ohio University. All questions were applicable to any university student and no pictures accompanied the questions (Appendix C).

The study also manipulated level of perceived ingroup tolerance. Among students whose Ohio University student identities had been made salient, half were randomly exposed to a description of Ohio University emphasizing a reputation for tolerance and half were exposed to a similar description of Ohio University emphasizing a reputation for intolerance. After the initial Ohio University identification manipulation participants exposed to a tolerant description were given a questionnaire suggesting that Ohio University students are particularly tolerant and egalitarian. This questionnaire asked participants to describe an instance that exhibited the tolerant nature of Ohio University students (Appendix D). The other half of Ohio University identifiers were exposed to a similar manipulation suggesting that Ohio University students are particularly prejudiced and intolerant, this questionnaire having asked participants to recall an instance that exhibited the intolerant nature of Ohio University students (Appendix E).

Those students whose Ohio University identities were not made salient were exposed to control stimuli of similar content to control for the effects of priming egalitarianism or intolerance. After the control identification manipulation, half of these participants were randomly exposed to a measure that asked them to recall an instance of egalitarianism in the media (Appendix F). The other half of these participants were asked to recall an instance of intolerance in the media (Appendix G). After all manipulations
and before dependent measures were given, participants in all conditions were administered a manipulation check designed to explore the effectiveness of the Ohio University identification manipulation (Appendix H).

After the identity and group tolerance manipulations, participants were presented with the dependent measures, the ATLG and Scout Master hiring scenario (Appendix A). Following these dependent measures, participants completed the adapted versions of the IMS and EMS, were probed for suspicion, and debriefed.

Manipulation Checks

Two manipulation checks were presented to all participants after identification and normative influence manipulations. The two items, nested within a series of questions about future plans at Ohio University, asked participants to indicate both how strongly they identified with Ohio University and how important that identity was to them. Both items were scaled 1 to 10, with 10 indicating the highest level of identification or importance. The Ohio University identity manipulation was not successful in altering the strength or importance of group identification among participants. Manipulation of Ohio University identity caused no difference in reported strength of identification ($M = 8.01, SD = 1.72), t (281) = .72, p > .05$, or importance of Ohio University identity ($M = 7.51, SD = 2.03), t (281) = .23, p > .05$. Responses to both the strength and importance items indicated a high overall level of Ohio University group identification among all Ohio University students, suggesting a possible ceiling effect that may have contributed to the failure of the identity manipulation (Figure 1). Gender differences were present; whereas male and female students exhibited equal strength of identification, the Ohio University identity was more important to female students ($M$
=7.71, SD = 1.76) than to male students (M = 7.01, SD = 2.51), t (281) = -2.29, p < .05.
For both identification and importance items, an ANOVA was run to identify the presence of any condition by gender interactions; the results revealed that no such interactions were present.

Study 1 Results

Prejudiced Hiring Decisions

To explore the effects of a tolerant ingroup reputation on discrimination towards a gay man, Ohio University identification, group reputation, and gender were all entered into an ANOVA as between subject factors with responses to the scout leader hiring decision serving as the dependent variable. Four planned comparisons (Appendix I) revealed that only among male participants not led to identify with Ohio University were reactions to tolerant descriptions observed. In the male participants not exposed to Ohio University identification material, those asked to report an egalitarian media incident were more prejudiced towards gay scout leaders (M = .22, SD = 1.04) than those asked to report an intolerant incident, FΨ (1, 267) = 3.05, p < .05. The ANOVA revealed a main effect for gender; men were significantly more supportive of a straight scout leader (M = 5.12, SD = 1.33) than were women (M = 4.59, SD = .98), F (1, 267) = 14.28, p < .001, replicating a previously observed gender difference (Ratcliff et al., 2006). For both Ohio University and control identifiers, participants asked to recall an egalitarian experience were marginally more likely to recommend a straight scout leader (M = 4.83, SD = 1.11) than participants asked to recall an intolerant experience (M = 4.66, SD = 1.12), F (1, 267) = 3.30, p = .07 (Figure 2). No other main effects or interactions were observed.

ATLG Responses
An ANOVA was conducted to explore the effects of the provision of group reputation upon responses to the ATLG scale. Ohio University identification, tolerant reputation, and gender were all entered into the ANOVA as between subject effects upon ATLG responses. Four planned comparisons (Appendix I) revealed that regardless of identification manipulation, there was no difference between men and women asked to recall an egalitarian incident, $F_{Ψ1}(1, 267) = .12, p > .05$. However, the ATLG responses of men and women differed significantly when they were asked to report an intolerant incident across both identification manipulations, $F_{Ψ2}(1, 267) = 18.67, p < .05$. Whereas the responses of men were significantly more prejudiced after recalling a prejudiced incident as opposed to an egalitarian incident, $F_{Ψ3}(1, 267) = 5.02, p < .05$, the responses of women were significantly less prejudiced, $F_{Ψ4}(1, 267) = 3.27, p < .05$. A main effect for gender revealed that, as previously observed (Herek, 1988; Ratcliff et al., 2006), men exhibited more prejudice towards homosexuals ($M = 3.74, SD = 1.77$) than did women ($M = 3.06, SD = 1.56$), $F(1, 267) = 9.62, p < .01$. An interaction was observed between gender and tolerance, $F(1, 267) = 6.57, p = .01$; whereas females responded to the intolerant condition by decreasing prejudice levels, males responded with an increase in prejudice levels (Figure 3).

The Motivation to Control Prejudice

A series of hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to explore the effects of IMS and EMS upon responses to the scout leader scenario and the ATLG. Responses from participants were broken into Ohio University identification and non-identification groups and identical hierarchical regression analyses were conducted for each. For both identification groups, the effects of group reputation, IMS, and EMS
scores were entered into the first block of the regression, with all possible two-way interactions entered into block 2.

*Ohio University identifiers.* Among Ohio University identifiers, block 1 revealed that normative influence, IMS, and EMS jointly accounted for a significant amount of variance in scout leader judgments, $F(3, 182) = 7.53, p < .05, R^2 = .11$. Of the predictors, only IMS score was a significant contributor of unique variance in scout leader judgments, $F(1, 182) = 20.03, p < .05, pr = -.32$, and was negatively related to scout leader judgments, $B = -.21$. Block 2, containing all two-way interactions, failed to account for a significant amount of variance in scout leader judgments, $F(6, 179) = 3.92, F\text{-change} = .39, p > .05, R^2 = .12$.

Among Ohio University identifiers, an identical regression analysis was conducted upon collapsed ATLG scores with similar results. In block 1 normative influence, IMS, and EMS jointly accounted for a significant amount of variance in ATLG judgments $F(3, 182) = 36.70, p < .05, R^2 = .38$. IMS and EMS scores were both significant contributors of unique variance in ATLG judgments, $F(1, 182) = 94.49, p < .05, pr = -.59, B = -.57, \text{and } F(1, 182) = 5.72, p < .05, pr = .18, B = .14$, respectively. Block 2, containing all two-way interactions, failed to account for a significant amount of additional variance in ATLG responses, $F(6, 179) = 32.90, F\text{-change} = .58, p > .05, R^2 = .38$.

*Control identifiers.* Among Ohio University non-identifiers, responses to the ATLG measure were similar to those observed in the Ohio University identifiers. In block 1 normative influence, IMS, and EMS jointly accounted for a significant amount of variance in scout leader judgments, $F(3, 93) = 5.26, p < .05, R^2 = .38$. Both IMS and
EMS were significant contributors to variance in scout leader decisions, $F (1, 93) = 7.69$, $p < .05$, $pr = -.28$, $B = -.17$, and $F (1, 182) = 4.42$, $p < .05$, $pr = .21$, $B = .14$, respectively.

Block 2, containing all 2-way interactions, failed to account for a significant amount of unique variance in the scout leader judgment, $F (6, 90) = 3.23$, $F-change = 1.18$, $p > .05$, $R^2 = .18$.

Among Ohio University non-identifiers, an identical regression analysis was conducted upon collapsed ATLG scores. In block 1, normative influence, IMS and EMS scores jointly accounted for a significant amount of variance in ATLG responses, $F (3, 93) = 47.52$, $p < .05$, $R^2 = .61$. IMS and EMS scores were both significant contributors of variance in ATLG responses, $F (1, 93) = 130.0$, $p < .05$, $pr = -.77$, $B = -.67$, and $F (1, 93) = 5.79$, $p < .05$, $pr = .24$, $B = .15$, respectively. Block 2, containing all two-way interactions, failed to account for an additional amount of unique variance in ATLG responses $F (6, 90) = 23.17$, $F-change = .13$, $p > .05$, $R^2 = .61$.

Study 1 Discussion

The results from Study 1 failed to confirm the main research hypotheses. Multiple analyses revealed that there was no significant interaction between identity and group reputation manipulations observed in the reactions to either dependent scale. Whereas it was expected that a collective sense of tolerance would lead to increased prejudice towards gays and lesbians, no reliable pattern of results emerged from the responses to either of the two dependent scales administered to measure prejudice. As expected, more prejudice was observed among men on both measures, but planned contrasts revealed that the group tolerance manipulations were unable to produce consistent or expected changes in prejudiced responses among either gender on either dependent measure.
The manipulation designed to shift levels of Ohio University identification did not have the anticipated effect upon participants; participants exposed to materials designed to make the Ohio University social identity salient did not increase identification with Ohio University or assign that identity more importance when compared to other participants. It was suspected that a ceiling effect may have been partly to blame for the ineffectiveness of the manipulation. Manipulation checks measuring responses to Ohio University identification and the importance of that identity were both near the upper limits of the scales used. It is likely that the Ohio University identity is held so strongly among university freshmen, the majority of the sample, that it proves very difficult to increase meaningfully its perceived strength or importance among those students.

In Study 1, the Ohio University identity was the intended means for providing some participants with moral credentials; however, the manipulation of identity was not effective. Participants did not change identification with Ohio University based on the manipulations, but still strongly identified with Ohio University. In spite of the failure of the identification manipulation to influence Ohio University identification among participants, it is not believed that the failure of the identification manipulation was the sole reason for the absence of the expected results. The strength of identification coupled with the presentation of tolerant and intolerant depictions of Ohio University still had the potential to provide participants with a collective sense of tolerance or guilt, even without a manipulation increasing Ohio University identity salience.

It is believed that the stimuli used to elicit a collective sense of tolerance or intolerance was the most likely cause for the failure to obtain the expected results. This manipulation presented participants with a broad, vague description of Ohio University as
consisting of a generally tolerant or intolerant group of people. No specific examples were presented to students to support these claims. Whereas each participant was asked to provide a personal example consistent with the claim of the particular argument made, a review of these responses revealed largely bland accounts that most often illustrated events barely qualifying as incidents of tolerance or intolerance.

Although Study 1 failed to produce meaningful results, in its failure it directed future investigations towards the use of improved methodologies. The study did not fully test how social identities may be able to present participants with a shared sense of tolerance. The following studies used different methodological approaches and measures to investigate the effects a collective sense of tolerance upon outgroup judgments.

Study 2 Methods

Study 2 continued to explore how a sense of collective tolerance provided through group membership can lead to an increase in prejudiced responses. Similar to Study 1, Study 2 attempted to manipulate a sense of shared tolerance by providing participants with a “history” of a group to which they already belonged. However, Study 2 presented participants with a different identification group and a more detailed and relevant history as a means of providing a sense of collective tolerance. Additionally, Study 2 diverged from Study 1 by focusing on prejudice towards Black individuals. As in Study 1, it was expected that establishing moral credentials through group membership would lead to increased prejudiced responses towards the outgroup.

Study 2 focused on prejudice towards Black individuals in order to explore a bias more comprehensively studied by social researchers. The vast majority of prejudice research has focused on bias towards Black individuals in America, and the measures of
Black prejudice are better validated than other measures of prejudice. Focusing on Blacks as a target group allowed for the use of more informed measures that may be more sensitive to differences in prejudiced responses among experimental groups.

Study 2 also focused on a different group membership with which to provide group tolerance, that of participants’ hometowns. As discussed, the Ohio University identity was highly salient and important to most students in Study 1. That identity was also relatively new to most participants in Study 1, including mainly freshman who had recently chosen to attend Ohio University and who were currently being socialized into the new identity and associated value system. Students’ hometown identities were assumed less salient; most first year students reside on campus and fill their work and social schedules with activities related to Ohio University membership, whereas the hometown identity was expected to be secondary given the recent arrival at Ohio University.

The change in the social group used to provide a sense of shared tolerance was accompanied by a change in the method of establishing collective tolerance. Participants were given a fictitious description of the history of their hometowns; those exposed to high levels of collective tolerance were told that their hometowns had a long-standing history of non-discriminatory business and social practices compared to other similar communities. It was expected that the historical and non-falsifiable nature of this information would make it easily believed by participants and more relevant than the corresponding manipulation used in Study 1.

Study 2 also replaced the “individual” scout leader scenario with another measure of prejudice. The scout leader scenario used in Study 1 asked participants to rate how
appropriate a *type* of person was for a position, not to rate an *individual* person. Whereas the framing of the hiring decision and the success with this type of measure exhibited by Monin and Miller (2001) support that this was an appropriate measure of prejudice, it was replaced by a measure that actually provided participants a description of a minority individual. Study 2 used an adapted measure created by Lambert et al. (2003) to observe prejudice directed towards an individual Black target.

In addition, Study 2 attempted to detect perceptual biases introduced by group egalitarian credentials. Previous research has focused on how a sense of collective tolerance can lead to misperceptions of Black individuals as holding weapons that are in actuality benign objects (Correll, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2002). A small-scale investigation of this effect was conducted in Study 2 by presenting participants with a photo of a Black male holding an object for 300 ms and exploring if those students provided a description of ingroup tolerance were more likely to misperceive that object as a weapon.

A simplified design was utilized for Study 2 that focused on exploring the differences in responses of those provided descriptions of collective tolerance to those not provided such a description. The study was designed to provide results that could be readily and easily interpreted. Study 2 exposed all participants to a manipulation designed to maximize identification with their respective hometowns. After each participant indicated the community that he or she called home, a feigned database search offered false information reportedly specific to that community. Half of participants were given a description indicating that the participant’s hometown had a history of tolerant practices,
whereas the other half of participants received benign statistics regarding population growth.

Hypotheses

It was expected that participants exposed to a description of collective ingroup tolerance would reduce efforts to control or correct for prejudice, leading to more negative and stereotypical ratings of Blacks compared to participants exposed to no such description. More negative reactions to Blacks were expected from participants exposed to collective tolerance on both the ratings of an individual Black target and reactions to Blacks as a group. Additionally, it was expected that these participants would be more likely to incorrectly identify the object held in the weapon misidentification measure as a weapon when compared to those participants receiving no description of collective tolerance.

Participants

Ninety undergraduate males and 189 undergraduate females, ranging in age from 18 to 22 (median age = 19), participated for partial class credit. The sample included one self-identified Asian participant, 12 Black participants, three Hispanic participants, 261 White participants, and three indicating “other.” Due to the small sample sizes of races other than White, all non-White participants were removed for analyses, leaving 261 participants. All students were Ohio University undergraduates. The study was advertised through the Psychology Department’s online research system, PsychPool. All sign ups and credit allocations were coordinated through this system.

Instruments
Manipulation of group reputation. All participants were exposed to a manipulation designed to increase hometown identity salience. This measure described one’s hometown as having, “significant influence upon how you interact with other people and your personal views,” and asked participants to provide the name and zip code of the communities they viewed as their hometowns (Appendix J). Directly after providing this information, participants were led to believe that information about the hometown was being retrieved from a database. After several wait screens, participants were provided bogus feedback presenting either benign statistics regarding population growth (Appendix K), or an unusually tolerant history for their hometown communities compared to, “other communities of a similar size,” (Appendix L).

Prejudice towards an individual target. In order to evaluate prejudice towards an individual Black target, participants were presented a description of a Black student followed by questions about this individual adapted from Lambert et al. (2003; Appendix M). The measure began with a description of ‘John,’ a fictitious Black Ohio University student. The description was purposefully ambiguous regarding his personal character, highlighting a day in the life of John and emphasizing his average grades, giving participants justification for positive or negative reactions. After the initial description, participants responded to a series of three questions regarding their feelings towards John (e.g., “What is your overall impression of the person you just read about?”), responding from -5 (very unfavorable) to 5 (very favorable). These three items indicated a poor degree of internal consistency ($\alpha = .56$). Additionally, participants responded to a series of 22 positive and negative adjectives, ranking how much each one characterized John on a scale of 0 (not at all) to 10 (extremely). Following these items, participants were
administered a series of manipulation checks requiring them to correctly identify several characteristics of the target including gender and race.

_Tolerance of prejudice_. In order to evaluate prejudice towards all Blacks, a scale was administered that observed participant tolerance of prejudice actions towards Blacks. An adapted version of Blanchard and colleagues’ (1991) scale described to participants a situation on campus in which a Black student was being harassed because of his or her race (Appendix N). Following the situation description, participants answered five questions regarding their feelings on University policies and recommending what punishment should be given to the student perpetrating the harassment (e.g., “The person who is writing these notes should be expelled”). All responses were recorded on a -3 (strongly agree) to 3 (strongly disagree) scale. The scale indicated a poor degree of internal consistency (α = .56).

_Weapon misidentification_. After the completion of the individual target and tolerance of prejudice measures, participants were unexpectedly presented a picture of a Black male holding a partially metal object for 300ms. The image was an altered picture of the individual pouring a cup of coffee; the coffee mug was removed leaving behind only the coffee pot which had a metal band and was held in a manner slightly resembling how one would hold a pistol (Figure 4). After the picture presentation, participants experienced a 30-second pause and were then asked to imagine that the individual in the previously presented picture was a “suspect in a robbery.” A series of items asked participants to identify correctly the gender and race of the individual and to indicate if they believed that the individual was holding a weapon (Appendix O).
Motivation to control prejudice. Participants were administered the Plant and Devine (1998) 10-item IMS and EMS scale (each subscale comprised five items), designed to measure personal internal and external motivations to control prejudiced responses towards Blacks. Both scales indicated an acceptable level of internal consistency, IMS ($\alpha = .85$), EMS ($\alpha = .72$).

Procedure

As in Study 1, participants volunteered believing that they were about to complete a school-administered survey assessing their social and study habits as university students. Upon arrival, participants were told that the study they had signed up for had reached completion, but that several similar shorter studies taking the same amount of time were available for partial class credit. This deception was necessary to eliminate the possibility of selection biases that could result from advertising Study 2 as focusing on hometown characteristics or racial prejudice. No participants refused to participate in the ‘substitute’ study, and at no time did any participant express concerns or frustration with the methods used.

Study 2 utilized a two-cell design resulting from the two levels of manipulation of group reputation (tolerant/control). Participants were first asked to complete a short series of questions regarding study habits (Appendix P). They were then exposed to the hometown salience manipulation before randomly receiving an account of hometown tolerance or a summary of hometown population change. At this point, participants completed the ‘John’ individual target evaluations (Appendix M) and the tolerance of prejudice measures (Appendix N). Presentations of the individual target scale and the tolerance of prejudice scale were counterbalanced to rule out order effects.
Counterbalancing did not exhibit a main effect nor did it interact with any of the expected effects and will not be discussed further. Upon completion of the individual target and tolerance of prejudice measures, participants were exposed to the weapon misidentification presentation and measure (Appendix O), completed the IMS and EMS scales (Plant & Devine, 1998), were probed for suspicion, and debriefed.

Study 2 Results

Study 2 used deception in providing bogus feedback about participants’ hometowns and did not disclose the true nature of the study to participants before participation. In order to test the effects of group egalitarian credentials, it was essential that participants believed the provided feedback regarding their hometowns, and in order to test shifts in prejudiced views it was necessary that participants did not exhibit a high degree of suspicion regarding the true nature of the study. Because of this, all participants were led through a scripted funnel debriefing and were carefully probed at multiple points throughout the debriefing. All participants with the exception of one (whose data was removed before any analyses leaving 260 participants in the data set) believed that the information provided during the hometown egalitarian manipulation was valid. Several participants expressed some level of suspicion that the study investigated prejudice, but the debriefings indicated that this suspicion did not occur until the third or fourth measure, allowing the most essential data to be collected before the nature of the study was suspected. The lack of any counterbalancing effects further indicated that participants were not reacting to the content of the dependent measures.

Prejudice Towards an Individual
Data reduction. The adjective ratings of ‘John’ on the individual target measure were analyzed using a data reduction technique. Twelve participants were removed from the analysis that could not correctly identify the race and gender of the target after being given the target information, leaving 248 participants. Consistent with the analyses of Lambert et al. 2003, a principal components analysis was conducted on the descriptive item responses (items 3a through 3v) to reduce these items to smaller, theoretically meaningful indices. The results of the analysis were quite similar to those of Lambert et al. Four components emerged with eigenvalues greater than 1.00 (Table 1). The first component (eigenvalue = 8.63) appeared to represent general evaluations, and contained high factor loadings (> .3) on nearly all items. The second component (eigenvalue = 2.38) appeared to be more relevant to the Black stereotype, having consisted almost entirely of items related to the Black stereotype (e.g., lazy, aggressive; Table 2). Using the SPSS regression method, a standardized index capturing all loadings for component 2 was used for subsequent analyses.

An ANOVA was conducted to explore the effects of participant sex and hometown normative influence upon the index derived from component 2 in the data reduction analysis. A main effect for normative influence was observed, $F(1, 240) = 7.21, p < .05$, with the component 2 index scores of participants exposed to a tolerant hometown history indicating more prejudiced target evaluations ($M = .22, SD = 1.04$) than the scores of those in the control condition ($M = -.21, SD = .92$; Figure 5). No other main effects or interactions were observed.

General target evaluations. A MANOVA was conducted to explore the effects of participant sex and the egalitarian manipulation upon overall impressions of the
individual target (item 1), how much participants would like to meet the target (item 2),
and participants’ willingness to interview the target (the last item in Appendix M). The
multivariate tests indicated that there were no significant main effects or interactions.
Because of the non-significant multivariate tests, no further analyses were conducted on
these items. The analysis was again run with IMS and EMS serving as covariates, but still
yielded no significant results.

Tolerance of Prejudice

All items on the tolerance of prejudice scale were combined as in Blanchard et al.
(1991) and an ANOVA was conducted to explore the effects of group tolerance and sex
upon tolerance of prejudice towards Blacks. There were no significant main effects or
interactions. The analysis was run again with IMS and EMS serving as covariates, again
with no significant results.

Weapon Misidentification

A hierarchical logistic regression analysis was conducted to assess the ability of
group tolerance, sex, IMS and EMS scores to predict participants’ likelihood of
incorrectly perceiving a Black male as having held a weapon (Appendix O). Of the 260
participants, 10 were unable to identify correctly the target as a Black male, leaving 250
in the analysis. Overall, participants were unlikely to misidentify the target as holding a
weapon (6.8%). The analysis was conducted in two blocks, with the four main effects
entered in the first block and all two-way interactions entered in the second block. Jointly
sex, group tolerance, IMS and EMS scores were not related to reporting the target as
having held a weapon, Block $G^2 (4, N = 250) = 1.49, p = .83, R^2 = .01$. None of the
individual predictors entered in block 1 were significantly related to reports of the target having a weapon.

In the presence of the first block, the second block (containing all two-way interactions) was significantly related to weapon identification, Block $G^2 (4, N = 250) = 11.85, p < .05, R^2 = .05$. Among the interactions, only the sex by IMS score interaction was significantly related to weapon misidentification $\chi^2_{\text{wald}} (1, N = 250) = 4.67, p < .05$, indicating that men with an IMS score of 8 ($M = 7.34, SD = 1.53$; 8 used for calculation purposes) had a 1.32 times greater likelihood of incorrectly indicating that the target was holding a weapon than women with the same IMS score. Because no main effects or interactions emerged involving the egalitarian manipulation, no further analyses were conducted.

Study 2 Discussion

The results of Study 2 partially supported the research hypotheses that obtaining a group reputation for tolerance can lead to more prejudiced evaluations of Blacks. Using a data reduction technique utilized by the developers of the “John” scale (Lambert et al., 2003), a component comprising items relevant to the Black stereotype emerged. Further analysis showed that participants who had been supplied with a tolerant hometown identity exhibited more stereotypical evaluations of the Black individual target than the control group. This is consistent with the hypothesis that a tolerant ingroup reputation can be collectively experienced by ingroup members, leading to more prejudiced responses in some situations. None of the more obviously prejudiced items in the individual prejudice measure yielded hypothesis-consistent results, suggesting that the effect was present but not influential in all target related evaluations and judgments.
The results of Study 2 also revealed no significant difference in the tolerance of prejudice towards Blacks as a group between those who were and were not exposed to the tolerant hometown manipulation. These findings indicate that one’s expressed prejudice towards an individual and towards a group may react differently to the same manipulation. However, these results may also indicate that attitudes towards blatant displays of prejudice remain unaffected in the face of a changing ingroup reputation for tolerance and that more subtle measures best observe the effect explored.

The weapon misidentification measure indicated that the normative influence manipulation had no effect upon the likelihood of incorrectly identifying the item that the target was holding as a weapon. A very small number of participants incorrectly identified the coffeepot as a weapon, pointing to several possible problems with the design of this particular measure. The most likely is that the image was displayed on the screen for too long of a period. The 300 ms period provided nearly all participants ample opportunity to ascertain that the target was not holding a weapon. Future attempts may make use of a 20 to 30 ms presentation time, making the stimulus barely in the supraliminal range and much more difficult to clearly perceive (Merikle & Joordens, 1997). Additionally, the stimulus image used may not have been ambiguous enough to produce uncertainty in judgments. A metal band at the bottom of the coffee pot held by the target was readily apparent in the photo, making the overall shape of the object, which had very little resemblance to a handgun or knife, obvious. Finally, the setting of the stimulus photo, a well-equipped kitchen, offered multiple contextual cues to the benign nature of the object held by the target. Further investigations using this specific methodology were not made in the course of this research.
Study 2 suffered from several limitations due to its design. First, it is important to consider that some type of priming effect might have been at work in producing the hypothesis consistent results on the individual target measure. Participants in the tolerant group manipulation were exposed to discussions of racism and sexism that participants in the control condition were not. It is possible that the discussion of racism, in conjunction with the race of the individual target, primed the Black stereotype. This could have resulted in more prejudiced evaluations of the individual target from these participants even if collective tolerance was not established or had no effect. Whereas this is a possibility, it is seen as relatively unlikely. All participants were exposed to the race of the target, indicating that this alone did not prime the Black stereotype (research has supported that racial categories alone are not always sufficient to activate stereotypes; Gilbert & Hixon, 1991). Participants in the egalitarian normative influence manipulation were exposed to the terms racism and sexism, but at no time was any specific race or stereotype mentioned, and there is no known published research indicating that the term “racism” has been shown to successfully prime the Black stereotype.

Even while interpreting the results of the data reduction analysis as support for the research hypotheses, it is important to note that none of the other items or measures yielded the expected results. The results of the data reduction analysis indicated that subtle, stereotype-influenced changes in target evaluation may occur when an individual is provided with an ingroup reputation for tolerance. However, the same measure of prejudice towards a Black individual failed to produce evidence that, among those provided a tolerant ingroup reputation, overall evaluations of a Black target were more negative or that there was more reluctance to interact with the target. Likewise, the
measure of tolerance of prejudice exhibited no change in the face of the tolerant
manipulation. It is possible that the effect being investigated has so subtle of an influence
upon judgment that sophisticated techniques are required to reveal its effects. It is also
possible that our manipulation only supplied a weak sense of collective tolerance to
participants, leading to only weak effects on judgment. Study 3 attempted to offer a
stronger manipulation of participants’ sense of the ingroup’s reputation for tolerance
while administering measures of varying content and subtly.

Study 3 Methods

Study 3 continued to explore the ways in which a group’s reputation for tolerance
influences the level of prejudice observed in the judgments of its members, specifically
focusing on American citizens directing prejudice towards Arabs. It is believed that
mixed attitudes regarding current efforts to combat terrorism (Barry, Hirsh, Darman,
Wolff, & Clift, 2007) leave many Americans able to assume collective intolerance, and
possibly guilt, when confronted with intolerant American acts towards Arabs. At the
same time it is expected that many Americans are still able to experience a sense of
tolerance when informed of American actions that have helped Arabs. Study 3 focused on
the effects of membership in a tolerant or intolerant group by presenting participants with
information depicting American actions towards Arab immigrants and travelers in either
a positive or a negative light. Study 3 specifically focused on attitudes toward policies
regarding the treatment of Arab foreign nationals and terror suspects. This presented not
only an opportunity to investigate the factors that affect how individuals control personal
prejudice, but also a chance to explore the views of a section of the American populace
concerning important national issues while developing insight into what forces may affect public opinion of these types of policies.

Study 3 departed from the failed methods used in Study 1 to manipulate group identification, instead measuring group identification and distinguishing between high and low U.S. identifiers. Previous research regarding the influence of a group’s history of tolerance has distinguished between high and low identifiers rather than making attempts to experimentally manipulate identification (Doosje et al., 1998; Doosje et al., 2006). A measure similar to that used by Doosje et al. (2006), adapted for a U.S. population, was used to distinguish between high and low identifiers.

In order to minimize extraneous variance during the analyses of Study 3, pretest data was collected regarding the characteristics and views of participants. As part of a university mass questionnaire process, all participants were administered a measure of political orientation (liberal vs. conservative), a measure of prejudice towards Arabs, and a measure of identification with the U.S. prior to being eligible to take part in the study. Once this data was collected participants were recruited and, upon reporting for participation, randomly exposed to one of three manipulations. The experimental manipulations exposed participants to either a condition designed to establish a tolerant U.S. reputation for the treatment of Arabs, a condition designed to establish an intolerant U.S. reputation for the treatment of Arabs, or a control condition. All participants then completed two measures of prejudice towards Arabs, an affect scale, and a scaled measure of pride vs. guilt regarding U.S. treatment of Arabs.

Hypotheses
It was hypothesized that participants exposed to a U.S. history of tolerant policies toward Arabs would exhibit more prejudiced reactions toward Arabs than those exposed to the intolerant U.S. history or to the control condition. Likewise, it was expected that those participants exposed to an intolerant U.S. history would exhibit less prejudice towards Arabs than both those participants exposed to the tolerant or control conditions. This effect is believed to be driven by a vicarious experience of the ingroup’s reputation, and it was expected that a collective sense of tolerance or intolerance would be reflected through the degree of a feeling of pride or guilt regarding U.S. policy towards Arabs. Specifically, participants exposed to the tolerant manipulation were expected to exhibit the highest levels of pride regarding U.S. policy and those exposed to the intolerant manipulation were expected to exhibit the highest levels of guilt regarding U.S. policy. It was expected that the pattern of results for both expressions of prejudice and levels of guilt vs. pride would be more pronounced among those identifying strongly with the U.S. as compared to those identifying weakly with the U.S.

Participants

Two-hundred and ninety-one Ohio University undergraduates participated for partial class credit. Of these participants, seven indicated that they were not U.S. citizens and were removed before analysis, along with five participants who failed to respond to all items on the U.S. identification scale, 57 participants who failed to respond to all items on the Arab prejudice pretest measure, and 11 who failed to respond to the political orientation item. After removing these individuals, 148 women and 63 men ranging in age from 18 to 23 (median age = 19), remained for analyses. Chi-squared analyses indicated no demographic differences between those included and those removed prior to
analyses. Of these individuals, 204 were born in the U.S. whereas seven were not. One-hundred and ninety-three participants self-identified as White, eight as Asian, five as Black, and five as Hispanic. The study was advertised through the Psychology Department’s online research system, PsychPool. This system allowed only participants who took part in the psychology department prescreening, which included three of Study 3’s pretest measures, to participate in the laboratory portion of the study.

**Instruments**

**Identification with the U.S.** A measure of the strength of an individual’s identification with the U.S. was also administered as part of the quarterly prescreening. Adapted from a scale used by Doosje et al. (1998), the scale comprised eight questions (Appendix R). All questions were designed to measure identification with the U.S. and asked participants about numerous aspects of identifying with America (e.g., “I identify with other American people.”). The response scale ranges from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much). Prior to analyses, responses to all items were collapsed and percentile grouping was used to differentiate between high, medium, and low identifiers. The items indicated a high degree of internal consistency ($\alpha = .95$).

**Prejudice towards Arabs.** Each participant was administered a measure of explicit prejudice against Arabs as part of a large battery of questionnaires administered online by the psychology department (prescreening) prior to reporting to the laboratory to take part in the study. The measure, originally used by Bushman & Bonacci (2004), includes 11 questions with individual items focusing on explicit feelings of distrust or animosity towards Arabs (e.g., “Even for Arab-Americans who live in America, their first loyalty is to their home country rather than to America”; Appendix Q). The responses range from 1
(strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly agree), with higher scores indicating more prejudice towards Arabs. The scale indicated a high degree of internal consistency ($\alpha = .94$).

Political orientation. A single item was administered to evaluate the political orientation of participants as part of the prescreening (e.g., “Regarding your political views, please select from the following how you would best describe yourself.”). Participants responded on a scale of 1 (extremely liberal) to 7 (extremely conservative). This scale was chosen as it has been shown to be a parsimonious, comprehensive evaluation of political attitudes that is significantly related to voting behavior (Jost, 2006; Appendix S).

Demographics. Upon arrival for the study, all participants completed a short demographic questionnaire, including questions regarding nationality and citizenship (Appendix T).

U.S. tolerant and intolerant histories. Two accounts of American treatment of Arab nationals and terror suspects were presented to students. Both accounts took the form of a series of statements outlining the findings of a fictitious congressional investigation into American treatment of Arab travelers, immigrants, and terror suspects. The tolerant account indicated that, compared to other Western countries, American treatment of Arab travelers and immigrants is highly tolerant and that U.S. treatment of terror suspects is more judicious (Appendix U). In contrast, the intolerant account indicated that, compared to other Western countries, American treatment of Arab travelers and immigrants is highly intolerant and that U.S. treatment of terror suspects is less judicious (Appendix V). Both U.S. histories contained numerous descriptive statistics supporting the claims made concerning U.S. treatment of Arabs.
**U.S. control history.** One-third of all participants received a control stimulus of a length and form similar to the positive and negative descriptions of U.S. treatment of Arabs. This stimulus material presented participants with information regarding the efficiency of U.S. airlines and provided participants with numerous descriptive statistics supporting the statements made regarding the travel industry (Appendix W).

**Prejudice towards a terror suspect.** Expressions of prejudice towards an Arab individual were investigated by presenting participants with a scenario describing the detention of a possible terror suspect at a major East Coast airport (Appendix X). The suspect was described as having been found with materials that could be used in the making a bomb and under somewhat suspicious circumstances, but having not broken any laws. The scenario attempted to give participants cause to suspect that the individual described might be involved in a terrorist plot that could be completed if he were released, while emphasizing the fact that any detainment could constitute unfairly holding an innocent man in custody. After the scenario description, participants responded to a series of six questions regarding how airport security should handle the situation (e.g., “Do you think that the man should be classified as a terror suspect so that a more in-depth investigation into his actions can be conducted?”). On five of the questions, participants responded from 1 (complete disagreement with the suggestion) to 10 (complete agreement with the suggestion). These five items were collapsed prior to further analysis, coded so that on each item higher scores indicated more prejudice towards the Arab suspect. The five items were found to have a high degree of internal consistency ($\alpha = .82$). A sixth item asked participants to suggest the amount of time in hours that the participant should be held for questioning.
Support for prejudiced policies. Prejudice towards Arabs as a group was measured by soliciting opinions regarding U.S. security policies that are blatantly prejudiced against Arabs (Appendix Y). Participants were presented a series of eight items on a scale of 1 (“I completely oppose this policy”) to 10 (“I completely support this policy”). Each item represents a policy that is currently being used or is being considered as a U.S. security measure (e.g., “At airports, individuals that appear to be of Arab ethnicity are more likely to be pulled out of security lines for ‘random’ security checks.”). The eight items were collapsed for further analysis, with higher scores indicating support for more prejudiced government policies. The eight items had a high degree of internal consistency (α = .89). A factor analysis was conducted on the scale and, as expected, a one-factor solution had the best fit to the data.

Affect scale. After completion of both measures of prejudice towards Arabs, all participants were administered a measure of affect. A simple, reliable scale was used that directed participants to: “Please list the first 5 words starting with the letter “H” that come to mind,” (Isen, Labroo, & Durlach, 2004; Appendix Z; coding directions Appendix AA). A trained rater blind to the hypotheses and conditions of the study attributed a dichotomous rating of pleasant or unpleasant to each word and a dichotomous rating of common or uncommon to each word. Prior to analyses, the average of the rated pleasantness and uncommonness of the five adjectives given by each participant was taken yielding a score from zero to one for both pleasantness and uncommonness.

Guilt vs. pride. A single item measuring personal feelings regarding U.S. policies towards Arabs was administered. The item read, “When considering America’s policy
towards Arab foreigners, how do you feel?” and asked participants to respond on a 1 (very guilty) to 10 (very proud) scale (Appendix AB).

Procedure

In order to gather information regarding the attitudes and characteristics of participants without risking influencing reactions to the manipulations, three measures were presented during the university psychology department’s quarterly prescreening administration. The Bushman & Bonacci (2004) scale of explicit prejudice towards Arabs (Appendix Q), the adapted U.S. identification scale (Appendix R), and the Jost (2006) political orientation scale (Appendix R) were all administered during the prescreening session so that responses could be matched to the participants completing the remainder of the study later in the quarter using student ID numbers. In order to ensure that this data was collected for all participants, only participants who had completed the prescreening procedure were eligible to participate in the study. Participants were unaware that the pretest measures were related to the laboratory portion of the study.

For the laboratory portion of the study, deception was used to avoid recruiting a biased sample. Participants were recruited using a description of a study that focused on study habits. Upon arrival, participants were told that the study for which they signed up had reached completion, but that they would have the opportunity to take part in a study for partial class credit dealing with issues regarding the United States and that assessed their views on several current policies.

Study 3 utilized an eighteen-cell design resulting from *identification with the U.S.* (high/medium/low) by *ingroup tolerance* (tolerant/intolerant/control) by gender. Participants completed the demographic questionnaire (Appendix T) prior to exposure to
one of the levels of the manipulation of group reputation for tolerance. After being exposed to one of the three ingroup tolerance conditions participants then completed the measure of prejudice towards an Arab terror suspect (Appendix X) and the measure of support for prejudice policies towards Arabs (Appendix Y). Presentation order of the terror suspect scale and the prejudiced policy support scale was counterbalanced to rule out order effects. The counterbalancing did not exhibit a main effect nor did it interact with any of the other factors during any of the analyses and will not be discussed further. Following administration of the prejudice measures, participants then completed the affect scale (Appendix Z) and the measure of guilt or pride in U.S. policy (Appendix AB) before being probed, debriefed, and dismissed.

Study 3 Results

Prescreening

Identification with the U.S. Identification with the U.S. was included as a means to group respondents according to how strongly they reported experiencing a connection with the U.S. Participants’ responses to the scale revealed extremely high levels of U.S. identification (Figure 6), a ceiling effect characterizing the negatively skewed sample ($M = 6.06$, $SD = 1.18$, 7 being the highest level of U.S. identification, skewness = - 1.62). Using percentile scores, roughly equal groups corresponding to high (scores greater than 6.88, $N = 79$), medium (scores greater than 6.00 and less than or equal to 6.88, $N = 67$), and low (scores lower than or equal to 6.00, $N = 65$) levels of identification with the U.S. were identified.

Prejudice towards Arabs. Responses to the 11 items contained in the Bushman and Bonacci (2004) scale of prejudice towards Arabs were summed, yielding scores
ranging between 11 and 110, higher scores indicating more prejudice towards Arabs.

Responses to the scale indicated a low to moderate level of prejudice towards Arabs ($M = 33.88, SD = 20.32$).

**Political orientation.** Responses to the Jost (2006) political orientation item indicated a politically moderate sample with normally distributed scores, ($M = 3.72, SD = 1.42$).

**Laboratory Results**

Due to the use of deception in Study 3, all participants taking part in the laboratory portion of the study were probed for suspicion before being led through a funnel debriefing. None of the participants indicated any suspicion regarding the true nature of the research, nor did any of these participants voice skepticism as to the source or credibility of the information used to manipulate perceived level of ingroup tolerance. Several students even inquired as to when the findings of the “government research” would be made public prior to being informed that this aspect of the study was part of a deception effort.

The analyses explored the effects of manipulated ingroup tolerance, level of U.S. identification, and gender upon a series of six dependent variables including collapsed responses to items on the terror suspect measure, recommendations on how long to hold the terror suspect, collapsed responses to the prejudice policy items, level of pride in U.S. policies towards Arabs, the averaged pleasantness ratings for the word completion task, and the averaged uncommonness ratings for the word completion task. A preliminary test showed moderate levels of correlation among multiple dependent variables (Table 3), which can reduce the power of a MANCOVA compared to multiple ANCOVA analyses.
(Tabachnick & Fiddel, 2001). As a result, ANCOVA analyses were conducted separately for each dependent variable in order to maximize the power of the analyses.

*Treatment of the terror suspect.* An ANCOVA was conducted to explore the effects of manipulated ingroup tolerance, level of U.S. identification, and gender upon the five collapsed items regarding treatment of a terrorist suspect, with pretest level of prejudice towards Arabs and political orientation serving as covariates (see Table 4 for means). In all, four planned comparisons were conducted (Appendix AC). Two contrasts were conducted comparing both the responses of participants in the intolerant and tolerant groups to the responses of those in the control group. Significant differences were only present between those in the intolerant ingroup condition and those in the control ingroup condition, $F_{\nu_2}(1, 173) = 6.39, p < .05$, with participants exposed to ingroup intolerance exhibiting less prejudiced responses ($M = 6.29, SD = 1.82$) than those exposed to the control condition ($M = 6.95, SD = 1.75$). The additional two contrasts tested for differences between high and low identifiers in the tolerant ingroup condition as well as in the intolerant ingroup condition. Among participants exposed to the tolerant ingroup manipulation, high U.S. identifiers responded with significantly more prejudice ($M = 7.28, SD = 1.85$) than did low U.S. identifiers ($M = 6.10, SD = 2.03$), $F_{\nu_3}(1, 173) = 6.95, p < .05$. Similarly, among participants exposed to the intolerant ingroup manipulation, high U.S. identifiers exhibited more prejudice ($M = 6.98, SD = 1.43$) than did low U.S. identifiers ($M = 5.33, SD = 1.86$), $F_{\nu_4}(1, 173) = 13.69, p < .05$.

The ANCOVA revealed that both of the included covariates, prejudice towards Arabs, $F(1, 173) = 44.29, p < .01$, and political orientation, $F(1, 173) = 7.06, p < .01$, were significantly related to the collapsed items. A main effect was exhibited for
manipulation of ingroup tolerance, \( F(2, 173) = 3.16, p < .05 \). Neither U.S. identification, \( F(2, 173) = 1.91, p = .15 \), nor gender, \( F(1, 173) < .01, p = .99 \), exhibited a main effect. No significant interactions were observed.

**Recommendations for holding the suspect.** Four participants failed to give recommendations regarding how long that the terror suspect should be held. These four participants were removed leaving 207 participants in the analysis. An ANCOVA was conducted to explore the effects of manipulation of ingroup tolerance, level of U.S. identification, and gender upon participant recommendations regarding the number of hours the terror suspect should be held (see Table 4 for means). Both level of pretest prejudice towards Arabs and political orientation served as covariates. Four planned comparisons akin to those performed in the previous analysis were conducted (Appendix AC). Participants exposed to the intolerant group manipulation recommended holding the suspect for fewer hours (\( M = 31.13, SD = 26.87 \)) than did those exposed to the control (\( M = 39.45, SD = 25.90 \)), \( F_{\nu_2}(1, 169) = 3.52, p < .05 \).

The ANCOVA revealed that neither covariate was related to the dependent variable. Men recommended holding the terrorist suspect longer (\( M = 45.26, SD = 28.21 \)) than did women (\( M = 32.23, SD = 24.79 \)), \( F(1, 169) = 5.78, p < .05 \). Neither ingroup tolerance, \( F(2, 169) = 1.70, p = .19 \), nor U.S. identification, \( F(2, 169) = .64, p = .53 \), exhibited a main effect. No significant interactions were observed.

**Support for prejudiced policies.** One participant did not respond to all eight U.S. policy items, leaving 210 in the final analysis. An ANCOVA was conducted to explore the effects of manipulation of ingroup tolerance, level of U.S. identification, and gender upon responses to the eight collapsed items regarding participant support for U.S. policies
prejudiced against Arabs (see Table 4 for means). Pretest levels of prejudice towards Arabs and political orientation served as covariates. Four planned comparisons similar to those performed in the previous analyses were conducted (Appendix AC). Among those exposed to the ingroup tolerance manipulation, high U.S. identifiers exhibited more support for prejudiced U.S. policies ($M = 5.99$, $SD = 1.92$) than did low U.S. identifiers ($M = 4.37$, $SD = 1.83$), $F_{Ψ1} (1, 172) = 14.53$, $p < .05$. Similarly, high U.S. identifiers exposed to the ingroup intolerance manipulation expressed more support for prejudiced U.S. policies ($M = 5.89$, $SD = 1.77$) than did low U.S. identifiers ($M = 4.87$, $SD = 1.92$), $F_{Ψ2} (1, 172) = 5.80$, $p < .05$.

The ANCOVA revealed that both pretest levels of prejudice towards Arabs, $F (1, 172) = 91.77$, $p < .01$, and political ideology, $F (1, 172) = 5.14$, $p < .05$, were significantly related to the collapsed U.S. policy support items. Ingroup tolerance, $F (2, 172) = 1.36$, $p = .26$, U.S. identification, $F (2, 172) = .74$, $p = .48$, and gender, $F (1, 172) = .02$, $p = .90$, all failed to exhibit a main effect. No significant interactions were observed.

**Pride in U.S. policy.** An ANCOVA was conducted to explore the effects of manipulation of ingroup tolerance, level of U.S. identification, and gender upon reported pride in U.S. policies towards Arabs (see Table 4 for means). Prejudice towards Arabs and political orientation served as covariates. Both prejudice towards Arabs, $F (1, 172) = 32.22$, $p < .01$, and political orientation, $F (1, 172) = 21.09$, $p < .01$, were significantly related to expressed pride in U.S. policies. A significant effect for gender was observed, with men exhibiting more pride in U.S. policy ($M = 6.37$, $SD = 2.22$) than women ($M = 5.18$, $SD = 2.03$), $F (1, 172) = 6.89$, $p < .01$. Neither ingroup tolerance, $F (2, 172) = .34$, $p
.71, nor U.S. identification,

\[ F(2, 172) = 3.01, \quad p = .11, \]

were related to pride in U.S. policies. No significant interactions were observed.

**Affect.** An ANOVA was conducted to explore the effects of manipulation of ingroup tolerance, level of U.S. identification, and gender upon the averaged pleasantness ratings of the responses given during the word completion task (see Table 4 for means). A main effect was observed for ingroup tolerance condition,

\[ F(2, 175) = 4.84, \quad p < .01. \]

Tukey HSD post hoc tests revealed that the responses of those exposed to the intolerant ingroup manipulation \((M = .76, SD = .23)\) were significantly less positive than the responses of those exposed to the control manipulation \((M = .85, SD = .16; \text{Table 5})\).

Both U.S. identification, \[ F(2, 175) = 1.18, \quad p = .31, \]

and gender, \[ F(1, 175) = .35, \quad p = .56, \]

failed to exhibit main effects. No significant interactions were observed.

A second ANOVA was conducted to explore the effects of manipulation of ingroup tolerance, level of U.S. identification, and gender upon the averaged uncommonness ratings to the word completion responses (see Table 4 for means). A main effect was observed for level of U.S. identification, \[ F(2, 175) = 3.37, \quad p < .05. \]

Tukey HSD post hoc tests revealed that the responses of medium U.S. identifiers \((M = .13, SD = .16)\) were rated significantly less uncommon than the responses of both high U.S. identifiers \((M = .24, SD = .24)\) and low U.S. identifiers \((M = .27, SD = .23; \text{Table 5})\).

Neither ingroup tolerance, \[ F(2, 175) = 2.26, \quad p = .11, \]

nor gender, \[ F(1, 175) = 1.19, \quad p = .28, \]

were related to uncommonness ratings. No significant interactions were observed.

**Exploratory mediation analyses.** A series of regression analyses were conducted to explore the possibility that pleasantness scores mediated the effect of manipulated ingroup tolerance upon the dependent measures of prejudice towards Arabs. Because no
differences were observed between those participants in the tolerant and control ingroup manipulations on any of the dependent variables, the 71 participants exposed to the tolerant manipulation were removed leaving 140 for the analysis. The removal of these participants allowed for the comparison of those participants exposed to the intolerant ingroup manipulation to the baseline scores of the control group.

A mediation relationship can only exist if the tested mediator variable (pleasantness) is related to the dependent variable tested (Baron & Kenny, 1986). However, in tests involving all three dependent measures of prejudice towards Arabs pleasantness scores failed to be related to the outcome variables (Table 6). Additionally, these tests were conducted using partial correlations after controlling for political orientation and pretest prejudice levels. Even after controlling for these variables, pleasantness scores were not related to any of the three dependent measures of prejudice toward Arabs (Table 6).

Study 3 Discussion

Study 3 failed to provide support for the hypothesis that the experience of belonging to a tolerant group can solicit an increase in prejudiced responses among group members. Three separate dependent measures were administered and analyzed, and no no dependent measures did exposure to the tolerant U.S. manipulation coincide with increased prejudice. The lack of results occurred in spite of controlling for political orientation and baseline explicit prejudice towards Arabs, and even when conducting multiple ANCOVA analyses as opposed to a single MANCOVA in order to maximize the power of the observed results.
The results obtained did indicate that Study 3’s manipulation of the U.S. reputation for tolerance was partially successful in influencing prejudiced reactions. As hypothesized, those exposed to the intolerant U.S. manipulation were less prejudicial than those exposed to the control when recommending both treatment of the individual Arab terror suspect and the number of hours that he should be held. This suggests that the manipulation did exert some influence over the control of personal prejudice when participants made judgments.

Group-based guilt or pride in U.S. actions towards Arabs was unaffected by the manipulations of perceived U.S. tolerance. Previous research has exhibited that the relationship between the belief in ingroup privilege and support for acts of restitution towards the outgroup is mediated by experiences of collective ingroup guilt (Powell, Branscombe, & Schmitt, 2005; Swim & Miller, 1999). The measure of guilt vs. pride in U.S. policies toward Arabs was meant to explore if one’s level of guilt vs. pride in U.S. policies mediated the relationship between the manipulation of perceived U.S. tolerance and subsequent prejudiced judgments. The results revealed that there was no relationship between the manipulation and level of guilt vs. pride, ruling out this mediated relationship.

It was expected that level of U.S. identification would have an influence on level of guilt, interacting with the manipulation of perceived U.S. tolerance. Doosje et al. (2006) exhibited that when encountering negative information regarding one’s ingroup from an ingroup source, those strongly identifying with the ingroup experienced more guilt than those weakly identifying with the ingroup. It was expected that those most strongly identifying with the U.S. would exhibit the highest levels of pride towards U.S.
policy when exposed to the tolerant U.S. manipulation and the highest levels of guilt towards U.S. policy when exposed to the intolerant U.S. manipulation. No such pattern emerged and the analyses showed no relationship whatsoever between guilt and level of U.S. identification. Planned comparisons revealed that high U.S. identifiers exhibited more prejudice on the collapsed terror suspect items and the collapsed support for U.S. policy items than did low U.S. identifiers, but level of identification exhibited no other influence.

The affect measures revealed that those exposed to the intolerant U.S. manipulation experienced significantly less positive affect than those exposed to the control manipulation. Interestingly, this coincides with the diminished levels of prejudice observed among those exposed to the intolerant manipulation on two dependent measures. This would suggest the presence of collective guilt; however guilt was not found to be significantly higher among these individuals. Additionally, mediation analyses revealed that the observation of more negative affect among those exposed to the intolerant U.S. manipulation failed to mediate the lower levels of observed prejudice among those individuals, indicating that affect did not motivate individuals to avoid prejudiced responses. Considering that past research has observed that negative affect, most often guilt, can mediate more altruistic acts towards the outgroup (Doosje et al. 2006; Powell et al. 2005; Swim & Miller, 1999), both the failures of guilt to react to the manipulation of ingroup tolerance and of affect to mediate the relationship between ingroup tolerance and outgroup prejudice were unexpected.

Study 3 was successful in soliciting a shift in expressed prejudice due to the manipulation of a perceived U.S. history of tolerance, but failed to provide results that
supported the main hypothesis that membership in a tolerant ingroup can solicit increases in prejudice from group members. Building on earlier investigations, Study 3 used pretest measures of identification in place of attempting to manipulate ingroup identification. Study 3 also presented detailed and specific information as part of the manipulation of perceived U.S. tolerance, included political orientation and pretest prejudice towards Arabs as covariates in order to minimize extraneous variance in the dependent measures, and used multiple dependent measures to maximize the chances of capturing the anticipated shifts in judgment. It is believed that the manipulations and measures used in Study 3 were soundly developed and the methods and analyses were executed in a way that maximized the likelihood of obtaining the expected results, leaving two possible explanations for the failure of Study 3 to obtain results.

It is possible that the manipulation of expressions of personal prejudice through group reputation is mediated by feelings of guilt or pride in the ingroup. Given that Study 3 failed to manipulate feelings of guilt or pride in the U.S., it is possible that the mechanism behind the hypothesis remains untested. This, however, seems unlikely as Study 3 was able to solicit decreases in prejudiced responses among participants exposed to the U.S. intolerance manipulation.

The most likely explanation for the lack of expected results is that the hypothesis that providing participants with a description of U.S. acts of tolerance towards Arabs does not lead to subsequent increases in prejudice toward Arabs. Participants exposed to the tolerant U.S. manipulation received detailed accounts of U.S. actions towards Arabs that were relatively tolerant and progressive. Probing and debriefing sessions at the conclusion of the study indicated that participants paid attention to and believed the
information contained in the manipulations. Items administered during prescreening allowed the analyses to account for prior political ideology, prejudice towards Arabs, and identification with the U.S. The dependent measures exhibited good reliability and represented seemingly realistic, relevant scenarios. Given the care exercised in the study and measure design, the most likely cause of Study 3’s failure is the premise that ingroup tolerance can lead to increases in prejudice among ingroup members.

General Discussion

The current research investigated the possibility that, by providing a vicarious sense of personal tolerance, membership in a group with a reputation for tolerance can result in increased outgroup prejudice among its members. Past research has provided evidence that establishing a personal history of tolerance can lead to diminishing efforts to avoid prejudice when interacting with outgroup members (Dutton, 1971; Dutton & Lake, 1974; Dutton & Lennox, 1974; Snyder et al., 1979) and evaluating members of the outgroup (Monin & Miller, 2001). There is also evidence indicating that ingroup members experience a sense of shared guilt for acts of intolerance committed by the ingroup (Swim & Miller, 1999). This sense of shared guilt can be manipulated with new information regarding ingroup actions and can lead to increased efforts to make restitution towards the wronged outgroup (Doosje et al., 1998; Doosje et al., 2006). It was hypothesized that providing ingroup members with a sense of collective tolerance due to ingroup reputation would elicit a reduction in efforts to avoid prejudice leading to increases in outgroup prejudice.

Each of the three studies conducted provided some participants with an ingroup reputation of tolerance in an attempt to elicit an increase in prejudice towards the
outgroup. Collectively, the results of these three studies offered very little evidence supporting this hypothesis. Study 1 gave some participants descriptions of their university as being tolerant, intolerant, or neutral while others received no university-relevant information. Participants then responded to two dependent measures of prejudice towards gays and lesbians, one measure focusing on prejudice against hiring a gay man to work with children, the other soliciting reactions to gay men and lesbians as a group. The manipulation of university tolerance failed to result in any attitude change despite the use of a common ingroup identity to deliver a collective reputation for tolerance and the use of multiple dependent measures.

Study 1 suffered from several weaknesses that Study 2 sought to correct. Study 1 made an ineffective attempt to manipulate ingroup salience, an effort dropped in Study 2. Identification with and attitudes towards the university identity used as the ingroup in Study 1 proved to be difficult to manipulate, possibly due to the high baseline level of participant identification with this group. Consequently, Study 2 gave participants information designed to manipulate the perceived tolerance of their hometown ingroups, a less salient identity, and dropped efforts to manipulate identification with the ingroup. Additionally, Study 2 used measures of prejudice towards Black individuals as opposed to gay men and lesbians. Finally, the manipulations of perceived ingroup tolerance used by Study 2 offered greater specificity compared to the weak and vague description of the ingroup’s degree of tolerance used in Study 1.

Despite the considerations that influenced the development of Study 2, the study failed to provide more than limited support for the hypothesis that membership in a tolerant group can increase the level of prejudice observed among group members. After
extensive statistical analyses, it was found that participants exposed to the ingroup tolerance condition rated a Black individual as more strongly characterized by a series of stereotype relevant adjectives than did other participants. However, a similar pattern of results was not observed concerning any other dependent measure. Among participants exposed to the collective tolerance condition, no heightened reluctance to interact with this individual was indicated, there was no increase in explicit negativity when evaluating the target, and there was no increase in negativity towards Blacks as a group. The only support for the hypothesis coming from Study 2 was extremely subtle, not representing any increase in negativity due to manipulating collective tolerance, but only slight shifts towards the endorsement of descriptive adjectives consistent with the Black stereotype.

Study 3 sought to improve upon the design of Study 2 while investigating shifts in judgment that would have immediate application to issues of national policy and security. Study 3 attempted to influence participants’ recommended treatment of an Arab terror suspect and support for U.S. policies prejudiced against Arabs by presenting participants with one of two descriptions of the U.S. record of tolerance towards Arabs. The manipulations were presented in the form of a “congressional report” regarding recent U.S. treatment of Arabs, each giving numerous, specific examples in an attempt to maximize the strength of the manipulation. Pretest data collection allowed participants’ political orientations and baseline levels of prejudice towards Arabs to be observed and included in the analyses as covariates. Additionally, pretest collection allowed level of identification with the U.S. to be observed and used to group participants in the conducted analyses. Finally, Study 3 added dependent measures evaluating levels of
group-based guilt and pride along with affect in an attempt to explore the mechanisms underlying any observed manipulation of participants’ expressed prejudice.

Despite the considerations addressed in the design of Study 3, the study yielded no support for the hypothesis that individuals belonging to a group perceived as tolerant can exhibit heightened levels of prejudice. Individuals exposed to the tolerant U.S. manipulation failed to exhibit increases in prejudice towards Arabs on any of the three dependent measures. Given that the results of Study 3 did not offer support for the main research hypothesis, the current research largely failed to offer support for the investigation’s general premise.

There are several methodological weaknesses to consider before dismissing the validity of the main hypothesis. It is possible that, across all studies, the manipulations were insufficient to produce a sense of ingroup tolerance among those receiving a description of a tolerant ingroup. This is especially likely for Studies 1 and 2. Study 1 presented participants with a general statement regarding the tolerance of all Ohio University students. Study 2 utilized a slightly more specific manipulation regarding the history of tolerant and socially progressive practices within participants’ hometowns. However, Study 2’s manipulation of perceived ingroup tolerance could also be viewed as vague and insufficient to instill a false sense of ingroup tolerance; no specific actions or events were outlined supporting the claims that participants’ hometowns had exhibited a history of tolerance. In contrast, Study 3’s manipulation of perceived ingroup tolerance sharply departed from the vague manipulations used in Studies 1 and 2, citing extensive statistics in describing U.S. practices as far more egalitarian than those of other western countries. Notably, Study 3 observed a reduction in prejudice on two dependent items
among individuals exposed to the intolerant U.S. manipulation, suggesting that the method of manipulation was effective. This strongly indicates that in Study 3 the manipulation of perceived ingroup tolerance did influence decision making related to outgroup prejudice. These findings suggest that the manipulation, at least in the case of Study 3, was not the cause for the failure to produce the expected results.

Another possible cause for the failure of the present research to support the main hypothesis was the nature of the information provided in the manipulations of ingroup tolerance. Doosje et al. (2006) supported the notion that a sense of common-guilt can be manipulated through descriptions of an ingroup’s history of tolerance, and that these shifts in guilt can influence support for paying outgroup restitution. To elicit this reaction, Doosje et al. provided Dutch students with a bogus historical description of the Dutch treatment of the Indonesian populace during the colonial period. The establishment of the Dutch reputation for outgroup treatment was historically based, generations removed from the student participant in the study. Additionally, Indonesian colonials, the specified outgroup, represented a nation apart from the Dutch, not a current subpopulation within the country.

The manipulations of perceived ingroup tolerance used in the current research differ in several ways from those used in past research (Doosje et al., 1998; Doosje et al., 2006). Studies 1 and 3 departed from using a historical context, describing the current reputations for Ohio University and the U.S. tolerance to try to influence participants’ prejudiced judgments. Additionally, Study 1 explored prejudice towards gay men and lesbians whereas Study 2 explored prejudice directed towards Blacks, both outgroups existing as subgroups of the identities used to deliver the sense of collective tolerance. It
is believed, however, that the groups and periods of historical focus were sufficiently similar to those explored in previous research to adequately test the main hypothesis. Study 2 attempted to manipulate participants’ sense of collective tolerance by giving historical accounts of participants’ hometowns. Study 2 also explored prejudice towards Blacks, a group historically suffering social injustice within the U.S. at the hands of Whites. Study 3 explored prejudice towards Arab immigrants and travelers, a group that by definition is separate from U.S. citizens. Collectively, the studies explored both prejudice towards subgroups within a larger ingroup population and towards a separate outgroup. The manipulations of perceived ingroup tolerance used both historical and current accounts of ingroup reputations for tolerance. Additionally, the observed decrease in prejudice observed among participants exposed to Study 3’s intolerant U.S. condition suggests that the group designations and historical periods used in Study 3 were able to influence prejudiced judgments.

The possibility exists that the dependent measures used were inadequate to detect differences in prejudiced judgments between experimental groups. However, it is believed that the dependent measures of prejudice used were not at fault in the failure of all three studies to observe the expected results. All studies utilized both a measure of prejudice towards an individual outgroup target and an explicit measure of prejudice towards an entire outgroup. Taken together, the individual measures for all three studies were quite diverse and included a hiring scenario, evaluation of a described target, and recommendations for treatment of an individual target. Additionally, Study 2 employed a perceptual-level investigation testing for stereotype-consistent weapon misidentification.
Given the number and diversity of the dependent measures, it seems likely that any shifts in prejudice would have been detected.

Implications

The current research describes three studies that investigated the hypothesis that a sense of collective tolerance provided by one’s ingroup can lead to increases in outgroup prejudice among ingroup members. Each subsequent study methodologically built on the previous study, honing manipulations and measures as laboratory experience and peer review revealed areas for improvement. Collectively, the three studies investigated shifts in prejudice towards three separate outgroups, using three different ingroups as means for delivering ingroup tolerance. The reduction in prejudiced responses observed among participants provided a sense of ingroup intolerance in Study 3 suggests that, at least in Study 3, the manipulation influenced the mechanisms associated with prejudiced judgments. Given the very limited support observed for the hypothesis and the range of methods of investigation, it is believed that the most likely explanation for the lack of support for the main hypothesis is that the hypothesis itself is incorrect.

The limited support for the main hypothesis observed in Study 2 is tenuous at best. The increase in prejudice among those exposed to the ingroup tolerance manipulation was arrived at only after extensive manipulation of the raw data and was found on no other dependent measure used in Study 2. The results of Study 2 only indicate that individuals exposed to the tolerant ingroup manipulation rated a Black individual more strongly on a set of adjectives that are part of the Black stereotype, not that more negative evaluations of that Black individual or that more bias towards Blacks as a group was elicited. Studies 1 and 3, along with two other studies not described here,
investigated the effects of ingroup tolerance using multiple measures and methodologies, none giving evidence that ingroup tolerance leads to an increase in members’ prejudice. The effect, if it at all exists, is clearly weak, not at all robust to small changes in environmental conditions, incredibly difficult to find, and would likely have little to no consistent effect on intergroup judgment outside of the laboratory.

**Future Directions**

Despite the failure of the current research to support the main hypothesis, Study 3 yielded findings that are of value and warrant further investigation. Whereas past research has illustrated that depictions of an individual’s ingroup history can influence that individual’s sense of guilt and willingness to recommend outgroup restitution (Doosje et al., 1998; Doosje et al., 2006), no published research has illustrated that belonging to an intolerant ingroup can lead members to avoid prejudiced responses. Further, as past research on the effects of belonging to an ingroup with a reputation for intolerance has focused on the experience of collective guilt (Doosje et al., 1998; Doosje et al., 2006; Powell et al., 2005; Swim & Miller, 1999), Study 3 found that participants’ level of guilt was unaffected by the manipulation of ingroup tolerance. Whereas affect was influenced by the manipulation, it failed to mediate the relationship between perceived ingroup tolerance and outgroup prejudice. Investigations into the influence of perceived ingroup intolerance upon efforts to avoid prejudice responses, specifically focusing on the nature of the underlying mechanism to control prejudice, would be valuable in furthering the understanding of how ingroup members regulate their reactions to outgroup members.
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Now we are going to present you with a scenario and ask you a few questions. Please read the following carefully and answer all questions honestly.

Imagine that you are charged with appointing an adult Scout Leader for a local Boy Scout group. The town you live in is a small, rural town in the Midwest and the Boy Scouts are seen as important in developing the character of the town’s youth. Stories in the national news in the last few years involving scout masters sexually abusing scout youth have concerned many parents of local scouts. As a result, several parents have come to you to privately voice their reservations about a homosexual being named as scout leader. As a matter of fact, just last year an openly homosexual scout leader was assigned to a group in a nearby town and as a result several parents pulled their children from the group and many more voiced discomfort with the situation. You are doing what you can to change attitudes, but your main objective is to build the size of your local scout group while maximizing trust and support from the immediate community. As a rule, Scout Leaders need to be approved and certified by the Boy Scouts of America, trustworthy, personable, highly skilled, and free of any criminal record. You have just received multiple applications for the position of local Scout Leader. You wonder if applicant sexual orientation (gay or straight) should be a factor in your choice. Do you feel that this specific position (described above) is better suited for any one sexual orientation? (please click continue to answer)

Do you feel that this specific position (described on the last page) is better suited for any one sexual orientation

-3 Yes, much better for a Gay man
-2
-1
0 I don’t feel this way at all
1
2
3 Yes, much better for a Straight man

Please indicate any groups that you have been a member of from the following:
I have never been a member of a scout organization
Cub Scouts
Boy Scouts
Eagle Scouts
Appendix B
Study 1 - Ohio University Identification Manipulation

The current study evaluates multiple aspects of your experience at Ohio University. Ohio University is committed to maintaining and improving the experience of our students. Ohio University understands that the social experience of being a student is as important as the educational experience, and this study is designed to gain a better understanding of your views and experiences as an Ohio University student. Ohio university students choose to come to Athens for numerous reasons, but have many common characteristics as a result of their common decision and common experiences. The following survey will give you some more information regarding Ohio University’s student body and the experience of being a student while asking you questions about your personal experiences. Please answer each question completely and honestly so that we can help make your experiences as a student and alumni of Ohio University continue to fulfill our tradition of excellence.

Please read the following questions closely and answer honestly.

Figure 1. Please enter your Gender
Male
Female
Other

2. Please enter your date of birth

Figure 1. Please enter your class rank
Freshman
Sophomore
Junior
Senior
Other

Figure 1. Please indicate your race from the following
Asian
Black
Hispanic
Middle Eastern
Native American
White
Other
I do not wish to respond

Figure 1. Please indicate your living arrangement
Dormatory/Residence Hall
Greek Housing
Club/Theme housing
On campus non-dormatory apartment
Renting in Athens, OH
Commuting from outside of Athens

Please type in which residence hall you live in

Ohio University has a long and distinguished history as a place of higher learning. We offer curriculum that maximizes the areas of education and specific skills of our students. You will now answer a series of questions directly pertaining to academics at Ohio University. Please click continue to proceed.

1. Please enter your major
   a. Please enter your minor if you have one

2. Please enter your estimated GPA

3. Please enter your average hours studying or working outside of class each week
   0 to 3 hours
   3 to 6 hours
   6 to 9 hours
   9 to 12 hours
   12 to 15 hours
   15 to 20 hours
   20 to 30 hours
   more than 30 hours per week

4. In 2 or 3 sentences, please tell us why you chose your current major

5. If you have a current advisor, please indicate the name of your advisor
   For example, if your advisor is Dr. Craig Smith, simply type ‘smith’.

6. How many courses have you completed so far?

7. What course have you found to be the most valuable?
   In two sentences or less, please tell us why

8. What course have you found to be the least valuable?
   In two sentences or less, please tell us why

9. In 100 words or less, please tell us why you chose OU
Have you ever considered transferring?
Yes
No

[if yes] What reasons can you give for considering transferring?

Ohio University boasts a wide array of activities for its students. In addition to a diverse and carefully planned selection of school sponsored activities, Ohio University and Athens, Ohio boast some of the best activities for students in the nation, including intramural sporting leagues, hiking, camping, fishing, recreational kayaking and canoeing, and an extensive selection of youth oriented shops and establishments. The next few questions will ask you about some of your personal interests and experiences. Please click continue to proceed.

1. On a scale of 1 to 10, 10 being the best, how would you rate the social experience at Ohio University?
[1 to 10, worse to best]

2. How many weekends a quarter do you spend in Athens?
0 weekends
1 weekend
2 weekends
3 weekends
4 weekends
5 weekends
6 weekends
7 weekends
8 weekends
9 weekends
10 weekends

   From a list of the following, please characterize the atmosphere in Athens. Please mark every item that you feel characterizes OU.
Hostile
Boring
Academic
Festive/Party Town
Community Oriented

Please indicate how many hours a week you spend engaged in the following activity
Fitness
Athletics
Outdoor Activities
Group Activities
Parties
Local Bars
Volunteering

4. In 2 to 3 sentences, please tell us what, if anything, you would like to change about Ohio University.

Ohio University is dedicated to the wellbeing of our students not only while you are a student here in Athens, but after graduation. Attending Ohio University is a decision that will have a large impact on your career and future; research indicates that the school from which you graduate, independent of major and even grades, can have an enormous influence on career paths and future earnings. Ohio University is dedicated to your current and future success. Please click continue to proceed.

Do you anticipate pursuing a career related to your major?
Yes
No
Undecided

2. What is your expected career?

Do you expect to pursue a higher degree?
Yes
No
Undecided

[if so] What field do you plan to pursue your higher degree in?

[if so] What type of degree do you expect to obtain?

[if so] When do you plan on pursuing that higher degree?
Immediately after graduation
1 to 2 years after graduation
2 to 5 years after graduation
5 to 10 years after graduation
Undecided

4. How well do you feel that Ohio University is preparing you for a career after graduation?
1 Excellent Preparation
2
3
4
5 Horrible Preparation

From the following, please specify areas that could use improvement. Please choose all that you feel apply.
Course Offerings
Quality of Instructors
Quality of Academic Advising
Majors offered
Financial Assistance
Facilities

What is your expected annual income 5 years after graduation?
Appendix C
Study 1
No Identification Manipulation

The current study is part of a nationwide research program and evaluates multiple aspects of your experience as a university student. The current research will evaluate your experiences as a college student with regards to academic, social, and career oriented experiences. We ask that you carefully read each question and answer fully and honestly.

1. Please enter your Gender
   Male
   Female
   Other

2. Please enter your date of birth

3. Please indicate your race from the following
   Asian
   Black
   Hispanic
   Middle Eastern
   Native American
   White
   Other
   I do not wish to respond

4. Please select your GPA from the following
   between 3.5 and 4.0
   between 3.0 and 3.5
   between 2.5 and 3.0
   between 2.0 and 2.5
   between 1.5 and 2.0
   between 1.0 and 1.5
   between 0.5 and 1.0
   between 0.0 and 0.5
   Unknown/I don’t have one yet

5. Please indicate your living arrangement
   Dormitory/Residence Hall
   Greek Housing
   Club/Theme housing
   On campus non-dormitory apartment
   Renting in Athens, OH
   Commuting from outside of Athens

6. Please enter your major
a. Please enter your minor if you have one

7. Please enter your average hours studying or working outside of class each week
   0 to 3 hours
   3 to 6 hours
   6 to 9 hours
   9 to 12 hours
   12 to 15 hours
   15 to 20 hours
   20 to 30 hours

8. How many courses have you completed so far?

   Please indicate how many hours a week you spend engaged in the following activity
   Fitness
   Athletics
   Outdoor Activities
   Group Activities
   Parties
   Local Bars
   Volunteering

9. Do you anticipate pursuing a career related to your major?
   Yes
   No
   Undecided

10. What is your expected career?

11. Do you expect to pursue a higher degree?
    [if so] What field do you plan to pursue your higher degree in?
    [if so] What type of degree do you expect to obtain?
    [if so] When do you plan on pursuing that higher degree?
        Immediately after graduation
        1 to 2 years after graduation
        2 to 5 years after graduation
        5 to 10 years after graduation
        undecided

12. What is your expected annual income 5 years after graduation?
Ohio University adds a new Student Life Improvement Program every Fall term focused on improving the academics or social environment of our University, the local culture, or the University system nationwide. The current project, Project Outreach, is focused on relations between students of differing backgrounds, cultures, and sexual orientations at Ohio University. A survey conducted last year indicated that OU is a very diverse campus, with a high percentage of foreign, minority, and gay and lesbian students compared to other universities. Furthermore, the survey indicated that OU students harbor much more tolerant views than the national average, that the faculty and student body of OU see the student body as unusually tolerant, and that students from other schools see OU students as unusually tolerant. The current program is focused on studying what makes Ohio University such a diverse and tolerant atmosphere so that other universities can implement programs to improve cultural relations. We would like to know about your experiences at Ohio University. In 100 words or less, please describe a time at OU that you witnessed diversity or tolerance consistent with our campus values. Please press continue to proceed and give your answer.

In 100 words or less, please describe a time at OU that you witnessed diversity or tolerance consistent with our campus values.
Ohio University Identification – Intolerant Manipulation

Ohio University adds a new Student Life Improvement Program every Fall term focused on improving the academics or social environment of our University, the local culture, or the University system nationwide. The current project, Project Outreach, is focused on relations between students of differing backgrounds, cultures, and sexual orientations at Ohio University. A survey conducted last year indicated that OU is not a very diverse campus, with a low percentage of foreign, minority, and gay and lesbian students compared to other universities. Furthermore, the survey indicated that OU students harbor less tolerant views than the national average, that the faculty and student body of OU see the student body as generally intolerant, and that students from other schools see OU students as generally intolerant. The current program is trying to understand why OU lacks diversity and is intolerant so that the problem can be addressed and improved. We would like to know about your experiences at Ohio University. In 100 words or less, please describe a time at OU that you witnessed intolerance. Please press continue to proceed and give your answer.

In 100 words or less, please describe a time at OU that you witnessed intolerance.
Appendix F
Study 1
Control Identification – Tolerant Manipulation

We would now like to gather some information about your personal experiences with tolerance and cultural diversity in the media. We are focusing on issues of diversity and tolerance for people of different races, cultures, and for gay and lesbian individuals. Please think about what you have seen on television or in the news lately. In 100 words or less, please describe something you have recently witnessed in the media that exhibited diversity or tolerance for individual differences. Please press continue to proceed and give your answer.

In 100 words or less, please describe something you have recently witnessed in the media that exhibited diversity or tolerance for individual differences.
Appendix G  
Study 1  
Control Identification – Intolerant Manipulation

We would now like to gather some information about your personal experiences with intolerance and lack of cultural diversity in the media. We are focusing on issues of lack of diversity and intolerance for people of different races, cultures, and for gay and lesbian individuals. Please think about what you have seen on television or in the news lately. In 100 words or less, please describe something you have recently witnessed in the media that exhibited a lack of diversity or intolerance for individual differences. Please press continue to proceed and give your answer.

In 100 words or less, please describe something you have recently witnessed in the media that exhibited a lack of diversity or intolerance for individual differences.
Appendix H  
Study 1 - Identification Manipulation Check  

Now we would like to ask you a few more questions about your current and future plans as a student. Please read each question carefully and answer honestly.

What are your plans for living arrangements next year?

- Dormatory
- On-campus student apartment
- Off-campus rental
- Off-campus commute

What is your planned schedule the rest of this year?

- Traditional (15 credit hours. For 3 quarters)
- Extended (traditional, plus summer or winter credits)
- Heavy (1 or more quarters with more than 15 credit hours)
- Light (less than 15 credit hours per quarter)

Do you plan on changing your major this or next academic year?

- Yes
- No
- Undecided

1. On a scale of 1 to 10, 10 being most strongly, how strongly do you identify yourself as an OU student?

   1. Not at All
   2
   3
   4
   5
   6
   7
   8
   9
   10 Extremely Strongly

2. On a scale of 1 to 10, 10 being most important, how important is your identity as an OU student to you?

   1. Not at all important
   2
   3
How would you rate your satisfaction with your current roommate so far?

1 Horrible
2
3
4
5 Excellent

Do you plan on keeping the same roommate or roommates next school year?

Yes
No
Undecided
Appendix I
Study 1 - Planned Comparisons

\( \Psi_{\text{gender}}(1 = \text{male}, 2 = \text{female}), \text{idemity}(1 = \text{OU}, 2 = \text{control}), \text{counterbalance}, \text{credentials}(1 = \text{tolerant}, 2 = \text{intolerant}) \)

Scout Leader Responses

Male Ohio University Identifiers

\[
\Psi_1 = u_{11*1} - u_{11*2} \quad H_0 : \Psi_1 = 0
\]

\(
\Psi_1 = 4.88 - 5.23 \quad H_1 : \Psi_1 \neq 0
\)

\(\Psi_1 = -.35\)

Female Ohio University Identifiers

\[
\Psi_2 = u_{21*1} - u_{21*2} \quad H_0 : \Psi_2 = 0
\]

\[
\Psi_2 = 4.74 - 4.51 \quad H_1 : \Psi_2 \neq 0
\]

\(\Psi_2 = .23\)

Male Control

\[
\Psi_3 = u_{12*1} - u_{12*2} \quad H_0 : \Psi_3 = 0
\]

\[
\Psi_3 = 5.56 - 4.86 \quad H_1 : \Psi_3 \neq 0
\]

\(\Psi_3 = .7\)

Female Control

\[
\Psi_4 = u_{22*1} - u_{22*2} \quad H_0 : \Psi_4 = 0
\]

\[
\Psi_4 = 4.64 - 4.36 \quad H_1 : \Psi_4 \neq 0
\]

\(\Psi_4 = .28\)

Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay men (Herek, 1988)

Egalitarian Normative Influence - Gender Difference

\[
\Psi_1 = u_{1**1} - u_{2**1} \quad H_0 : \Psi_1 = 0
\]

\[
\Psi_1 = 3.35 - 3.25 \quad H_1 : \Psi_1 \neq 0
\]

\(\Psi_1 = .10\)

Control – Gender Difference

\[
\Psi_2 = u_{1**2} - u_{2**2} \quad H_0 : \Psi_2 = 0
\]

\[
\Psi_2 = 4.15 - 2.84 \quad H_1 : \Psi_2 \neq 0
\]

\(\Psi_2 = 1.31\)
Males – Normative Influence
\[ \Psi_3 = u_{1\ast\ast 1} - u_{1\ast\ast 2} \quad H_0: \Psi_3 = 0 \]
\[ \Psi_3 = 3.35 - 4.15 \quad H_1: \Psi_3 \neq 0 \]
\[ \Psi_3 = -0.80 \]

Females – Normative Influence
\[ \Psi_4 = u_{2\ast\ast 1} - u_{2\ast\ast 2} \quad H_0: \Psi_4 = 0 \]
\[ \Psi_4 = 3.24 - 2.84 \quad H_1: \Psi_4 \neq 0 \]
\[ \Psi_4 = 0.40 \]
Appendix J
Study 2 - Hometown Identification Manipulation

Recent research has indicated that where you come from has a significant influence upon how you interact with other people and your personal views. We’re going to ask you a series of questions about the town you grew up in and search our database for any recent research findings about that area.

1. What state did you grow up in (please use the abbreviation)?

2. How many towns/cities did you live in before coming to Ohio University?

3. What town were you born in?

4. What town did you spend the most time in growing up?

5. Where were you living directly before coming to Ohio University?

6. What is your hometown? That is, out of all the places you lived before coming to Ohio University, what place do you most identify with, where do you see as home?

7. Please provide your hometown zip code if you remember it to assist the search:
Appendix K
Study 2
Hometown Control Manipulation

Recent research conducted in ____________ indicates that the town has undergone moderate changes in the last 50 years. The average age of the town has increased from 35.4 years to 38.3 years. In addition, the birth rate has decreased by 2.8%, despite a modest population growth. The high school graduation rate has increased by 12.2%, and percentage of college graduates has increased by 15.2%. The median household income is close to the national average for communities of a similar size, and the homeowner rates and home values are also close to the median for similar communities. Overall, the town has largely matched its expected economic status considering local and national societal changes over the last 50 years.
Appendix L  
Study 2  
Hometown Tolerant Manipulation

Recent research conducted in ____________ indicates that the town is unusually tolerant of multiple cultures and races compared to other communities of a similar size. The community has consistently exhibited a tendency to vote for egalitarian social policies and politicians that support them. The community was far ahead of similar communities in establishing non-racist and non-sexist local policies throughout the 40’s, 50’s, and 60’s. Additionally, a recent poll conducted by the Business Association of America found that there is an unusually high number of businesses owned by women and minorities, and that the business practices of the community are quite fair and largely avoid discrimination. Additionally, a national law enforcement study found that the local police force has received complaints about racial profiling well below the national average for communities of that size. Taken together, these findings strongly suggest that the people of ______ are among some of the most tolerant in the nation.
Appendix M
Study 2
Individual Target Stimuli & Dependent Measures
*Adapted from Lambert et al. (1996) & Lambert et al. (2003) Study 2

The following page will present information about a fellow OU student. Try to form as accurate an impression of this person as you can and indicate your judgments of him or her in the questions following the description. It is very important that you pay attention to all information presented. You need to review this information closely before moving on.

Name: John M****
SS #: ***-**-****
PID: P000 ***-***
Gender: Male
Racial/Ethnic Background: Black/African American
Age: 22
Home Address: Columbus, Ohio
Place of Birth: Columbus, Ohio
Educational Status: 4th year (senior)
Academic Major: Communication
Expected Graduation Date: June, 2007
GPA: 2.7

You will now be presented with a written account of a day that John experienced. For confidentiality reasons pertinent personal details have been removed, but events in the account are true. It is important that you read the account fully and carefully before continuing.

It was Thursday morning. John got up a little earlier than his usual time, because he had remembered that he needed to get some work done before class. After his usual hot shower, John got dressed and sat down at his desk to try to do some reading. After working for a while, John looked up from his books to have another look at the letter that had been sitting on his desk. He had a GPA of 2.7 and received mostly B’s and some C’s the last semester. His parents were really proud of him. If things went the way they had been going, it looked like he was going to get all A’s this semester, with maybe one B. His accomplishments so far made him determined to keep it up and do well again next semester. With a little luck, John might be able to get into that graduate program on the east coast that he had heard so much about. After his morning classes, John grabbed some lunch at the cafeteria. The place was a little crowded, but John found a table in the back and sat down. He thought about how much was looking forward to going home. John thought how nice it would be to eat some real food instead of the tasteless stuff they served at school. Later on that day, John needed to do a couple important errands in the city, but unfortunately his car started making some noises. John thought it might be something pretty serious, and so he looked for a shop that could fix it. When John
brought the car in to the shop, he told the garage mechanic that he would have to go somewhere else if he couldn’t fix his car that same day. While he was waiting for the car to be fixed, John went to a store to buy some supplies that he had been meaning to buy for a while. Afterwards, John picked up his car, did some more errands, and drove back to his place in time for dinner.
Post-Description Items

1. What is your overall impression of the person you just read about?

-5  -4  -3  -2  -1  0  1  2  3  4  5  
(very unfavorable)     (very favorable)

2. How much would you like to meet this person?

-5  -4  -3  -2  -1  0  1  2  3  4  5  
(wouldn’t want to meet him)     (would want to meet him)

3. Using the scale below, how would you describe the person you just read about for each of the following items:

0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  
(not at all)     (extremely)

a – likable  
b – successful  
c – unfriendly  
d – intelligent  
e – competent  
f – unmotivated  
g – patient  
h – self-assured  
i – incompetent  
j – polite  
k – lazy  
l – bright  
m – argumentative  
n – aggressive  
o – hard worker  
p – athletic  
q – easy to get along with  
r – cooperative  
s – hostile  
t – shy  
u – responsible  
v – ambitious
Manipulation Check

1. What was the gender of the person you read about?
   Male  Female

2. What was the name of the person you read about?
   Sarah  Cliff  Amy  John  Jerome  Scott

3. What was the age of the person you read about?
   18  19  20  21  22  23  24

4. What was the race of the person you read about?
   Asian  Black/African American  Hispanic  Native American  White (non-Hispanic)

5. What was the major of the person you read about?
   Business  Communication  Math  Philosophy  Psychology

6. What is the class (year) of the person you read about?
   Freshman  Sophomore  Junior  Senior  5th Year  Continuing Studies

Interview Dependent Variable

John has expressed interest to his advisor in applying for a special grant through Ohio University. As part of the grant screening process for this particular funding, a fellow student, chosen at random, needs to conduct a peer interview with John. The interviewer is chosen from the list of students currently enrolled. You can indicate here if you would like to be left on the list to conduct this interview and your preference will be considered. Based on what you read above, would you like to interview him?

-3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3
Not at all  Very much

Thank you for your participation. You will be contacted by Ohio University if you are randomly selected for an interview session with John. When it appears, please press continue to proceed to the next study.
Appendix N
Study 2
Group Prejudice Measure – Adapted from Blanchard et al. (1991)

Introduction:
Recently, a Black male student at Ohio University has been receiving anonymous notes harassing him because of his race. After receiving several of these letters, the student reported this to a University official. The University recently began an investigation into the matter to try and find the culprit. This is a relatively unique instance at Ohio University, and as part of the investigation the University has asked us to find out the opinion of the student body on the matter.

[higher scores mean more prejudice]
1. The person who is writing these notes should be expelled:
   -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3
   Strongly Agree Strongly Disagree

2. Ohio University is making too big an issue of this incident, thereby causing divisiveness on campus: [REVERSE SCORED]:
   -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3
   Strongly Agree Strongly Disagree

3. We need to have more affirmative action policies instituted at Ohio University:
   -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3
   Strongly Agree Strongly Disagree

4. The person who is receiving these notes must have done something to make the author mad: [REVERSE SCORED]:
   -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3
   Strongly Agree Strongly Disagree

5. The investigators should be allowed to take handwriting samples from everyone who lives in the house where the incident occurred:
   -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3
   Strongly Agree Strongly Disagree

Thank you for your participation. When data collection on student opinions on this matter has reached completion, your recommendations will be taken into consideration by the Judiciary Board at Ohio University. The results of the study and any judiciary proceedings will be shared with OU students via email, however for confidentiality reasons the suspect(s) and victim will remain anonymous.
Appendix O
Study 2
Weapon Misidentification Questionnaire

Imagine that the person you just saw is a suspect in a robbery. As part of an investigation into the robbery, we’re going to need to ask you some questions about the image that you just saw. We’ll ask you some questions in a few seconds.

[30 second delay]

1. What was the gender of the person that you saw?
   - Male
   - Female

2. What was the race of the person that you saw?
   - Asian
   - Black/African American
   - Caucasian (White non-Hispanic)
   - Hispanic
   - Other

3. What was the age of the person that you saw?
   - 10-15
   - 15-20
   - 20-25
   - 25-30
   - 30-35
   - 35-40
   - 40-45

4. Was the person that you just saw holding a weapon?
   - Yes
   - No
4a. What type of weapon?
   - Gun
   - Knife
   - Bat
   - Brass Knuckles
   - Grenade

5. Was the person in this picture the man you saw?
   [incorrect picture shown]
   - Yes
   - No
6. How sure are you of what you witnessed?
-3  -2   -1    0    1    2    3
Very Unsure    Very Sure

7. Did you recognize the man in the first picture you saw?
   Yes
   No
7a. If yes, please enter his name.

8. Did you recognize the man in the second picture you saw?
   Yes
   No
8a. If yes, please enter his name.

Thank you for your participation. We are currently investigating how people give eyewitness testimony. Research has revealed that there is often a high level of error in eyewitness testimony given in court, and we are attempting to find the conditions that are most likely to produce error. Please press continue to move to the next study.
Appendix P
Study 2
Study Habits Questionnaire

The current study is part of a nationwide research program that evaluates multiple aspects of your time as a university student. This study will gather information about your experiences as a college student with regards to academic, social, and career oriented activities. We ask that you read each question carefully and answer honestly.

1. Please indicate your living arrangement:
   - Dormitory/Residence Hall
   - Greek Housing
   - Club/Theme housing
   - On campus non-dormitory apartment
   - Renting in Athens, OH
   - Commuting from outside of Athens

2. Please enter your average hours studying outside of class each week:
   - 0 to 3 hours
   - 3 to 6 hours
   - 6 to 9 hours
   - 9 to 12 hours
   - 12 to 15 hours
   - 15 to 20 hours
   - 20 to 30 hours
   - more than 30 hours per week

3. How many courses have you completed so far?

4. Please indicate how many hours a week you spend engaged in the following activity:
   - 4a. fitness
   - 4b. athletics
   - 4c. outdoor activities
   - 4d. group activities
   - 4e. parties
   - 4f. local bars
   - 4g. volunteering

5. Please enter your major:

6. Do you anticipate pursuing a career related to your major?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Undecided
7. Do you expect to pursue a higher degree?
   Yes
   No
   Undecided

Thank you for your participation. The results of this study will be made available to all Ohio University students through their OAK email accounts when all data has been collected.
Appendix Q

Directions: For each of the items below, please use the scale provided to indicate how much you agree with each statement. Oak id numbers will be attached to the responses given and provided to the researcher.

1. Arab-Americans have moral standards that they apply in their dealing with each other, but with non-Arab-Americans, they are unscrupulous, ruthless, and undependable.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Strongly disagree
Strongly agree

2. There is something different and strange about Arab-Americans; one never knows what they are thinking or planning, or what makes them tick.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Strongly disagree
Strongly agree

3. A major fault of Arab-Americans is their conceit, overbearing pride, and their idea that they are a chosen ethnic group.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Strongly disagree
Strongly agree

4. It is wrong for Arab-Americans and non-Arab-Americans to intermarry.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Strongly disagree
Strongly agree

5. Even for Arab-Americans who live in America, their first loyalty is to their home country rather than to America.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Strongly disagree
Strongly agree

6. If there are too many Arab-Americans in America, our country will be less safe.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Strongly disagree
Strongly agree
disagree

7. I can hardly imagine myself voting for an Arab-American who is running for an important political office.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Strongly disagree

8. One general fault of Arab-Americans is their over-aggressiveness, a strong tendency always to display their own looks, manners, and customs.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Strongly disagree

9. You just can't trust a group of young Arab-American men together because they are probably up to criminal or delinquent activity.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Strongly disagree

10. In order to maintain a nice residential neighborhood it is best to prevent Arab-Americans from living in it.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Strongly disagree

11. If I knew I had been assigned to live in a dorm room with an Arab-American, I would ask to change rooms.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Strongly disagree
Appendix R
Study 3 – Measure of U.S. Identification
Adapted from Doosje, Branscombe, Spears, & Manstead (1998)

Please indicate how much you agree with each statement. Oak id numbers will be attached to the responses given and provided to the researcher.

1. Being American just feels natural to me.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Not at all  Very much

2. I identify with other American people.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Not at all  Very much

3. I see myself as American.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Not at all  Very much

4. I feel close to my fellow Americans.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Not at all  Very much

5. Overall, I am proud to be an American.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Not at all  Very much

6. I see America as my home.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Not at all  Very much

7. I am grateful to live in America.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Not at all  Very much

8. Being American is a big part of who I am.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Not at all  Very much
Appendix S
Study 3
Jost (2006) Political Orientation Scale

Directions: Regarding your political views, please select from the following how you would best describe yourself. Oak id numbers will be attached to the responses given and provided to the researcher.

1 – Extremely Liberal

2 - Liberal

3 – Slightly Liberal

4 - Moderate

5 – Slightly Conservative

6 - Conservative

7 – Extremely Conservative
Appendix T
Study 3 - Demographics Questionnaire

1. What is your class rank?
   A. Freshman
   B. Sophomore
   C. Junior
   D. Senior
   E. Other

2. What is your age? _______

3. Are you a U.S. citizen?
   Yes
   No

4. Are you registered to vote?
   Yes
   No

5. What is your gender?
   Male
   Female

6. Were you born in the United States?
   Yes
   No

7. What is your ethnicity?
   A. Arab
   B. Asian
   C. Black
   D. Caucasian/White
   E. Hispanic
We are going to present you with some information about current events in America. We need you to read the following carefully, as we will want to know what you think about these issues later.
American politicians have been trying to reach agreement on airport security measures and regulations for the treatment of terror suspects for quite some time. Legislators want to ensure that Arab travelers and terror suspects are treated legally and fairly, but still give security and law enforcement the tools needed to keep the country safe. A recent bipartisan (led by both Republicans and Democrats) congressional inquiry into American security and terrorism investigation practices revealed some surprising findings.

Compared to other Western countries, such as England, France, and Spain, America’s policies towards individuals from Arab countries are quite fair and tolerant.

- Compared to the security practices of these other countries, American airport and immigration security forces are less likely to single out travelers simply based on Arabic nationality than the security forces of other western countries.
  - In American airports, 12% of all travelers are taken out of security lines for spontaneous individual searches. Of all travelers searched in U.S. airports, only 19% were travelers from Arab countries.
  - In the United Kingdom (including England) 18% of travelers are searched, 32% of those are travelers from Arab countries.
  - In Spain, 9% of travelers are searched, 43% of those are travelers from Arab countries.
  - In Germany, 22% of travelers are searched, 29% of those are travelers from Arab countries.

- American security detains a smaller percentage of Arab travelers and immigrants than other Western countries.
  - In 2006, 12,358 travelers were detained for questioning in U.S. airports. Of those detained, only 1,092 (8.8%) were travelers from Arab counties.
  - In the same year, the United Kingdom (including England) detained 8,956 suspects. Of those detained 1,881 (21.0%) were travelers from Arab countries.
  - In the same year, Spain detained 6,891 travelers. Of those detained 1,861 (27.0%) were travelers from Arab countries.
  - In the same year, Germany detained 9,221 travelers. Of those detained 2,951 (32.0%) were travelers from Arab countries.
The investigation also found that U.S.-detained Arab terror suspects were more likely to receive immediate access to legal council and were detained for shorter periods of time compared to suspects detained by most other Western countries.

- Of the 12,358 terror suspects detained by the U.S. in 2006, 12,173 (98.5%) were released within 2 hours of being detained, with U.S. security forces making and paying for 100% of the necessary changes to flight arrangements due to missed flights. The remaining 185 suspects (1.5%) that were not released within 2 hours received legal council within an average of 3 hours 21 minutes of being detained.
  - Arab terror suspects accounted for 52 (28.1%) of the U.S. suspects held for more than 2 hours, and their average wait for legal council was no different than for non-Arab suspects.

- Of the 8,956 terror suspects detained by the United Kingdom (including England) in 2006, 7,344 (82.0%) were released within 2 hours of being detained, with UK security forces making and paying for necessary flight arrangements due to missed flights for 4,773 (65.0%) of those passengers. The remaining 1,612 suspects (18.0%) that were not released within 2 hours received legal council within an average of 6 hours 13 minutes of being detained.
  - Arab terror suspects accounted for 542 (33.6%) of the United Kingdom suspects held for more than 2 hours, and their average wait for legal council was nearly 45 minutes longer than for non-Arab suspects.

- Of the 6,891 terror suspects detained by Spain in 2006, 5,058 (73.4%) were released within 2 hours of being detained, with Spanish security forces making flight arrangements for 3,657 (72.3%) of those passengers. However, the Spanish government refused to pay any fees associated with the rescheduling of flights for these travelers. The remaining 1,833 suspects (26.6%) that were not released within 2 hours received legal council within an average of 5 hours 9 minutes of being detained.
  - Arab terror suspects accounted for 725 (38.5%) of the Spanish suspects held for more than 2 hours, and their average wait for legal council was nearly 90 minutes longer than for non-Arab suspects.

Information courtesy of CRS Report 99-402
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Of the 9,221 terror suspects detained by Germany in 2006, 6,833 (74.1%) were released within 2 hours of being detained, with German security forces making flight arrangements for 4,838 (70.8%) of those passengers. The German government paid the fees necessary to change travel arrangements for 3,570 (73.8%) of the travelers released within the first 2 hours of being detained. The remaining 2,388 suspects (25.9%) that were not released within 2 hours received legal council within an average of 5 hours 52 minutes.

- Arab terror suspects accounted for 876 (36.7%) of the German suspects held for more than 2 hours, and their average wait for legal council was nearly 70 minutes longer than for non-Arab suspects.

Whereas there is always room for improving the system, this recent congressional investigation indicated that compared to similar countries, America is doing a relatively good job of maintaining security while respecting the rights of Arab travelers and suspects.
Appendix V
Study 3 – Intolerant U.S. Description

We are going to present you with some information about current events in America. We need you to read the following carefully, as we will want to know what you think about these issues later.

Information courtesy of CRS Report 99-402
Congressional Oversight Committee 776
Library of Congress Call # PR87 B4 C73 07
American politicians have been trying to reach agreement on airport security measures and regulations for the treatment of terror suspects for quite some time. Legislators want to ensure that Arab travelers and terror suspects are treated legally and fairly, but still give security and law enforcement the tools needed to keep the country safe. A recent bipartisan (led by both Republicans and Democrats) congressional inquiry into American security and terrorism investigation practices revealed some surprising findings.

Compared to other Western countries, such as England, France, and Spain, America’s policies towards individuals from Arab countries are quite unfair and intolerant.

- Compared to the security practices of these other countries, American airport and immigration security forces are more likely to single out travelers simply based on Arabic nationality than the security forces of other western countries.
  - In American airports, 12% of all travelers are taken out of security lines for spontaneous individual searches. Of all travelers searched in U.S. airports, 47% were travelers from Arab countries.
  - In the United Kingdom (including England) 18% of travelers are searched, 32% of those are travelers from Arab countries.
  - In Spain, 9% of travelers are searched, 43% of those are travelers from Arab countries.
  - In Germany, 22% of travelers are searched, 29% of those are travelers from Arab countries.

- American security detains a larger percentage of Arab travelers and immigrants than other Western countries.
  - In 2006, 12,358 travelers were detained for questioning in U.S. airports. Of those detained 4,820 (39.0%) were travelers from Arab counties.
  - In the same year, the United Kingdom (including England) detained 8,956 suspects. Of those detained 1,881 (21.1%) were travelers from Arab countries.
  - In the same year, Spain detained 6,891 travelers. Of those detained 1,861 (27.0%) were travelers from Arab countries.
  - In the same year, Germany detained 9,221 travelers. Of those detained 2,951 (32.0%) were travelers from Arab countries.

Information courtesy of CRS Report 99-402
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The investigation also found that U.S.-detained terror suspects were less likely to receive immediate access to legal council and were detained for longer periods of time compared to suspects detained by most other Western countries.

- Of the 12,358 terror suspects detained by the U.S. in 2006, only 7,765 (62.7%) were released within 2 hours of being detained, with U.S. security forces making the necessary changes to flight arrangements due to missed flights for only 3,300 (42.5%) of those travelers. The U.S. government refused to pay any fees arising from changes to travel arrangements for those individuals. The remaining 4,593 suspects (37.2%) that were not released within 2 hours received legal council within an average of 8 hours 11 minutes of being detained.
  - Arab terror suspects accounted for 2,186 (47.6%) of the U.S. suspects held for more than 2 hours, and their average wait for legal council was nearly 2 hours 45 minutes longer than for non-Arab suspects.

- Of the 8,956 terror suspects detained by the United Kingdom (including England) in 2006, 7,344 (82.0%) were released within 2 hours of being detained, with UK security forces making and paying for necessary flight arrangements due to missed flights for 4,773 (65.0%) of those passengers. The remaining 1,612 suspects (18.0%) that were not released within 2 hours received legal council within an average of 6 hours 13 minutes of being detained.
  - Arab terror suspects accounted for 542 (33.6%) of the United Kingdom suspects held for more than 2 hours, and their average wait for legal council was nearly 45 minutes longer than for non-Arab suspects.

- Of the 6,891 terror suspects detained by Spain in 2006, 5,058 (73.4%) were released within 2 hours of being detained, with Spanish security forces making flight arrangements for 3,657 (72.3%) of those passengers. However, the Spanish government refused to pay any fees associated with the rescheduling of flights for these travelers. The remaining 1,833 suspects (26.6%) that were not released within 2 hours received legal council within an average of 5 hours 9 minutes of being detained.
  - Arab terror suspects accounted for 725 (38.5%) of the Spanish suspects held for more than 2 hours, and their average wait for legal council was nearly 90 minutes longer than for non-Arab suspects.

Information courtesy of CRS Report 99-402
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Of the 9,221 terror suspects detained by Germany in 2006, 6,833 (74.1%) were released within 2 hours of being detained, with German security forces making flight arrangements for 4,838 (70.8%) of those passengers. The German government paid the fees necessary to change travel arrangements for 3,570 (73.8%) of the travelers released within the first 2 hours of being detained. The remaining 2,388 suspects (25.9%) that were not released within 2 hours received legal council within an average of 5 hours 52 minutes.

- Arab terror suspects accounted for 876 (36.7%) of the German suspects held for more than 2 hours, and their average wait for legal council was nearly 70 minutes longer than for non-Arab suspects.

Whereas there is always room for improving the system, this recent congressional investigation indicated that compared to similar countries, America is doing a relatively poor job of maintaining security while respecting the rights of Arab travelers and suspects.
Appendix W
Study 3 – Control U.S. Description

We are going to present you with some information about current events in America. We need you to read the following carefully, as we will want to know what you think about these issues later.
American politicians have been trying to reach agreement on airport security measures and regulations for quite some time. Legislators want to ensure that travelers are treated legally and fairly, but still give security and law enforcement the tools needed to keep the country safe. A recent bipartisan (led by both Republicans and Democrats) congressional inquiry into American security revealed some surprising findings.

America’s security policies are quite similar to other Western countries, such as England, France, and Spain.

- Compared to the security practices of these other countries, American airport security forces are about as likely to remove individuals from security lines for random inspections.
  - In American airports, 17% of all travelers are taken out of security lines for spontaneous individual searches.
  - In the United Kingdom (including England) 18% of travelers are searched.
  - In Spain, 9% of travelers are searched.
  - In Germany, 22% of travelers are searched.

- American security detains a number of travelers for intensive questioning similar to that of other Western countries.
  - In 2006, 12,358 travelers were detained for questioning in U.S. airports.
  - In the same year, the United Kingdom (including England) detained 13,956 suspects.
  - In the same year, Spain detained 6,891 travelers.
  - In the same year, Germany detained 9,221 travelers.
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The investigation also found that U.S. detained suspects were about as likely to receive immediate access to legal counsel and were detained for similar periods of time compared to suspects detained by most other Western countries.

- Of the 12,358 suspects detained by the U.S. in 2006, 9,948 (80.5%) were released within 2 hours of being detained, with U.S. security forces making and paying for 6168 (62%) of the necessary changes to flight arrangements due to missed flights. The remaining 2,410 suspects (19.5%) that were not released within 2 hours received legal council within an average of 5 hours 21 minutes of being detained.
- Of the 13,956 suspects detained by the United Kingdom (including England) in 2006, 7,344 (82.0%) were released within 2 hours of being detained, with UK security forces making and paying for necessary flight arrangements due to missed flights for 4,773 (65.0%) of those passengers. The remaining 1,612 suspects (18.0%) that were not released within 2 hours received legal council within an average of 6 hours 13 minutes of being detained.
- Of the 6,891 suspects detained by Spain in 2006, 5,058 (73.4%) were released within 2 hours of being detained, with Spanish security forces making flight arrangements for 3,657 (72.3%) of those passengers. However, the Spanish government refused to pay any fees associated with the rescheduling of flights for these travelers. The remaining 1,833 suspects (26.6%) that were not released within 2 hours received legal council within an average of 5 hours 9 minutes of being detained.
- Of the 9,221 suspects detained by Germany in 2006, 6,833 (74.1%) were released within 2 hours of being detained, with German security forces making flight arrangements for 4,838 (70.8%) of those passengers. The German government paid the fees necessary to change travel arrangements for 3,570 (73.8%) of the travelers released within the first 2 hours of being detained. The remaining 2,388 suspects (25.9%) that were not released within 2 hours received legal council within an average of 5 hours 52 minutes.

This comprehensive evaluation indicates that U.S. security practices present obstacles to travelers similar to those presented by similar other Western countries. Whereas U.S. performance in this area meets the minimum standards set by the travel administration, there are still significant problems with the system that need to be addressed. Future efforts will focus on maximizing both the efficiency of travel and security concerns.

Information courtesy of CRS Report 99-402
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Appendix X
Study 3 – Measure of Prejudice Towards an Arab Terror Suspect

The following questions focus on a description of an incident that actually occurred several months ago around New York JFK International Airport (the details of the event have been removed). Please read the description of the event fully and carefully so that you can make the most informed decisions possible to the questions that follow.

At 3:48 AM Sunday morning, airport security made a routine investigation of a white van that had been sitting occupied for over 45 minutes with the engine running. Upon approaching the vehicle, officers noted that the van was inhabited by a male in his mid 20’s of Arab descent. When first making contact with the individual, both officers noted that he appeared quite nervous and was acting ‘strangely.’ One officer asked the individual to step out of the vehicle for questioning while the other officer searched the vehicle (any vehicle on airport property is subject to search under any suspicion). Upon searching the vehicle, one of the officers noted multiple publications in Arabic depicting what appeared to be hooded, insurgent terrorist fighters clashing with U.S. military forces.

A further inspection revealed several volatile chemicals commonly used as fertilizer additives, a container of nails, electrical wiring, and electrical tape. The man was immediately detained for further questioning and investigation.

Before interrogation, the suspect’s identification was checked against official records. Records confirmed that the suspect was who he claimed to be, a 26-year-old Iranian national with a valid passport and travel visa to enter the United States. His ticket, for a flight bound for Los Angeles leaving later that morning, was also valid and had not been tampered with.

Information courtesy of CRS Report 99-402
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A check of the vehicle registration indicated that it had been rented by another Iranian national due on a return flight from overseas late Wednesday evening. Testing revealed that none of the chemicals found in the van were dangerous or illegal by themselves, but when mixed could make a powerful liquid explosive capable of producing a blast large enough to injure or kill multiple people, destroy one or more vehicles, or down an airplane in flight.

In the interrogation, the man claimed he was in the United States on business, meeting with international business partners to arrange a future manufacturing deal, and claimed no ties to any terrorist organizations.

The authorities were faced with a decision on what to do with the suspect. He had technically broken no laws, as all of the materials in the van were legal to possess and transport. However, the suspicious materials in the van that could be used to make a bomb worried airport security that the individual might be part of a terrorist plot. As a suspect, police could hold the man for 48 hours, but not long enough to run a full investigation of his background or to interrogate the other Iranian national who had rented the van that the suspect was driving. If reclassified as a terror suspect, the man could be held longer, allowing further investigations in to the matter.

1. Do you think that the man should be held the entire 48 hours?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
No – he should be released as soon as possible  Yes – held for 48 hours

Information courtesy of CRS Report 99-402
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2. Do you think that the man should be classified as a terror suspect so that a more in-depth investigation into his actions can be conducted?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
No – he should not be labeled as a terror suspect

Yes – the man should be labeled as a terror suspect

3. Given that the man has not been found guilty of breaking any laws, how long (in hours) do you think that the police should be able to hold the man for investigation?

___ hours

4. As a possible terror suspect, do you think that the man should have immediate access to legal council (contacting legal council could allow the individual to transfer information that he has been detained to other terrorists if he is in fact a terrorist)?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Yes - He should receive immediate legal council

No - He should not be allowed council until after further investigation

5. Do you think that the suspect is a terrorist?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
No – the man is likely not a terrorist

Yes – the man is definitely a terrorist

Information courtesy of CRS Report 99-402
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6. What do you feel is more important in this particular case?

<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>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preserving the suspect’s rights at all costs</td>
<td>Maintaining airport security at all costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The following items will ask your opinion on a number of policies that have been proposed for use by U.S. security forces or that are currently in use. Please read each item carefully so that you fully understand the nature of the policy in question. It is important that you answer honestly so that we can gather accurate data on public opinion regarding these policies.

1. At airports, individuals that appear to be of Arab ethnicity are more likely to be pulled out of security lines for ‘random’ security checks.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   I completely oppose this policy      I completely support this policy

2. Non-citizens of the United States from Arab countries who have family members that are known terrorists can be asked to leave, or face deportation.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   I completely oppose this policy      I completely support this policy

3. Individuals originally from Arab countries are more closely scrutinized when applying for government security clearances.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   I completely oppose this policy      I completely support this policy

Information courtesy of CRS Report 99-402
Congressional Oversight Committee 776
Library of Congress Call # PR87 B4 C73 07
4. In areas surrounding airports, Arab drivers are more likely to be pulled over for ‘routine’ traffic stops.

I completely oppose this policy  I completely support this policy

5. The United States has become increasingly reluctant to naturalize (a process giving citizenship to) individuals from Arab countries.

I completely oppose this policy  I completely support this policy

6. Some military bases have stopped hiring civilian contractors that employ immigrants from Arab countries, citing security concerns.

I completely oppose this policy  I completely support this policy

7. The United States issues far fewer travel visas to individuals from regions of the Middle East where terrorists have been known to operate than to citizens from other parts of the world. When these visas are issued, the background checks on these individuals are far more extensive.

I completely oppose this policy  I completely support this policy
8. Security forces guarding facilities considered high profile terrorist targets, such as Capitol Hill, the White House, and the Empire State Building, are instructed to pay especially close attention to Arab men in the area.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
I completely oppose this policy I completely support this policy
Appendix Z

Directions: Please list the first 5 words starting the letter “H” that come to mind.

1. ______________________
2. ______________________
3. ______________________
4. ______________________
5. ______________________
Appendix AA
Coding Directions

Word-Fragment Completion Task

A judge, unaware of the condition the participant was in and unaware of the hypothesis of the study, coded the first five associates generated by participants to the letter “H,” for “pleasantness” and “uncommonness.” The coding for each word was binary, so that it was considered pleasant and received a score of 1, or it was not considered pleasant and received a score of 0. Similarly, a word could be common (scored as 0) or not common (scored as 1). The scores for total number of pleasant, and separately, total number of uncommon, associates were summed for each participant and divided by five, to create a mean pleasantness, and mean uncommonness, score for each participant. Therefore, each participant received a score ranging from zero to one on pleasantness and from zero to one on uncommonness of the associates generated. A higher score on these measures indicated higher pleasantness, or higher uncommonness, of associates.
Appendix AB
Study 3 – Guilt vs. Pride in U.S. Policies

When considering America’s policy towards Arab foreigners, how do you feel?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
very guilty          very proud
Appendix AC
Study 3 - Planned Comparisons

$U_{\text{group tolerance}}(1 = \text{tolerant}, 2 = \text{intolerant}, 3 = \text{control}), U.S. \text{ identification}(1 = \text{high}, 2 = \text{medium}, 3 = \text{control}),$ counterbalance, gender

Collapsed Terrorist Suspect Items

Tolerant Ingroup vs. Control

$\Psi_1 = u_1^{***} - u_3^{***}$ $H_0: \Psi_1 = 0$
$\Psi_1 = 6.78 - 6.95$ $H_1: \Psi_1 \neq 0$
$\Psi_1 = -1.17$

Intolerant Ingroup vs. Control

$\Psi_2 = u_2^{***} - u_3^{***}$ $H_0: \Psi_2 = 0$
$\Psi_2 = 6.29 - 6.95$ $H_1: \Psi_2 \neq 0$
$\Psi_2 = -0.66$

Tolerant Ingroup: High U.S. Identifiers vs. Low U.S. Identifiers

$\Psi_3 = u_{11}^{**} - u_{13}^{**}$ $H_0: \Psi_1 = 0$
$\Psi_3 = 7.28 - 6.10$ $H_1: \Psi_1 \neq 0$
$\Psi_3 = 1.18$

Intolerant Ingroup: High U.S. Identifiers vs. Low U.S. Identifiers

$\Psi_4 = u_{21}^{**} - u_{23}^{**}$ $H_0: \Psi_1 = 0$
$\Psi_4 = 6.98 - 5.33$ $H_1: \Psi_1 \neq 0$
$\Psi_4 = 1.65$

Recommended Hours to Hold Suspect

Tolerant Ingroup vs. Control

$\Psi_1 = u_1^{***} - u_3^{***}$ $H_0: \Psi_1 = 0$
$\Psi_1 = 37.87 - 39.45$ $H_1: \Psi_1 \neq 0$
$\Psi_1 = -1.58$

Intolerant Ingroup vs. Control

$\Psi_2 = u_2^{***} - u_3^{***}$ $H_0: \Psi_2 = 0$
$\Psi_2 = 31.13 - 39.18$ $H_1: \Psi_2 \neq 0$
$\Psi_2 = -8.05$

Tolerant Ingroup: High U.S. Identifiers vs. Low U.S. Identifiers

$\Psi_3 = u_{11}^{**} - u_{13}^{**}$ $H_0: \Psi_1 = 0$
\[ \Psi_3 = 41.27 - 36.59 \quad H_1: \Psi_1 \neq 0 \]
\[ \Psi_3 = 4.68 \]

Intolerant Ingroup: Hi U.S. Identifiers vs. Low U.S. Identifiers

\[ \Psi_4 = u_{21***} - u_{23***} \quad H_0: \Psi_2 = 0 \]
\[ \Psi_4 = 33.00 - 26.80 \quad H_1: \Psi_2 \neq 0 \]
\[ \Psi_5 = 6.20 \]

Collapsed Prejudiced Policy Items

Tolerant Ingroup vs. Control

\[ \Psi_1 = u_{11***} - u_{3***} \quad H_0: \Psi_1 = 0 \]
\[ \Psi_1 = 5.18 - 5.73 \quad H_1: \Psi_1 \neq 0 \]
\[ \Psi_1 = -.55 \]

Intolerant Ingroup vs. Control

\[ \Psi_2 = u_{21***} - u_{3***} \quad H_0: \Psi_2 = 0 \]
\[ \Psi_2 = 5.61 - 5.73 \quad H_1: \Psi_2 \neq 0 \]
\[ \Psi_2 = -.12 \]

Tolerant Ingroup: High U.S. Identifiers vs. Low U.S. Identifiers

\[ \Psi_3 = u_{111**} - u_{13**} \quad H_0: \Psi_1 = 0 \]
\[ \Psi_3 = 5.99 - 4.37 \quad H_1: \Psi_1 \neq 0 \]
\[ \Psi_3 = 1.62 \]

Intolerant Ingroup: Hi U.S. Identifiers vs. Low U.S. Identifiers

\[ \Psi_4 = u_{21**} - u_{23**} \quad H_0: \Psi_2 = 0 \]
\[ \Psi_4 = 5.89 - 4.87 \quad H_1: \Psi_2 \neq 0 \]
\[ \Psi_4 = 1.02 \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>41.09</td>
<td>41.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>52.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>59.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>64.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Only components with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 are shown.
Table 2

*Study 2 Component Loadings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
<th>Component 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likable</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td></td>
<td>.340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td>-.334</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmotivated</td>
<td>-.546</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assured</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td>-.527</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td>-.631</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-worker</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td></td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to get along with</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td>-.476</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>-.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy</td>
<td></td>
<td>.471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Only loadings greater than .3 are shown.
Table 3

Study 3 Dependent Variable Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Collapsed Terror Suspect Items</th>
<th>Hours suspect to be held</th>
<th>Collapsed Prejudiced Policy Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collapsed Terror Suspect Items</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Suspect to be Held</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collapsed Prejudiced Policy items</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride in U.S. Policy</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasantness of Adjective Responses</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommonness of Adjective Responses</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pride in U.S. Policy</th>
<th>Pleasantness of Adjective Responses</th>
<th>Uncommonness of Adjective Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collapsed Terror Suspect Items</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Suspect to be Held</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collapsed Prejudiced Policy Items</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride in U.S. Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasantness of Adjective Responses</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommonness of Adjective Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All values reported are Pearson correlations. Those displaying a * are significant at the $p < .01$ level.
## Table 4

**Study 4 Means – Treatment of the Terror Suspect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean SD</th>
<th>Tolerant</th>
<th>Intolerant</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. ID</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** M = Male and F = Female.

## Table 4

**Study 4 Means – Recommendations for Holding the Terror Suspect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean SD</th>
<th>Tolerant</th>
<th>Intolerant</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. ID</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>46.91</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>19.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>61.71</td>
<td>49.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44.91</td>
<td>25.36</td>
<td>43.83</td>
<td>35.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** M = Male and F = Female.
### Study 4 Means – Support for Prejudiced Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. ID</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Tolerant</th>
<th>Intolerant</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Study 4 Means – Pride in U.S. Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. ID</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Tolerant</th>
<th>Intolerant</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>5.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Note

M = Male and F = Female.
### Study 4 Means – Affect: Pleasantness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean SD</th>
<th>Tolerant</th>
<th>Intolerant</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. ID</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total   | .79      | .76        | .85     | .80   |
|         | .21      | .22        | .16     | .21   |

**Note.** M = Male and F = Female.

### Study 4 Means – Affect: Uncommonness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean SD</th>
<th>Tolerant</th>
<th>Intolerant</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. ID</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total   | .21      | .27        | .17     | .22   |
|         | .23      | .21        | .20     | .22   |

**Note.** M = Male and F = Female.
Table 5

*Study 3 Affect Tukey HSD Post Hoc Tests*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pleasantness Scores</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant Group</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intolerant Group</td>
<td>.76&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>.85&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Mean values with differing superscripts denote differences at the $p < .05$ level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncommonness Scores</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High U.S. Identifiers</td>
<td>.24&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium U.S. Identifiers</td>
<td>.15&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low U.S. Identifiers</td>
<td>.27&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Mean values with differing superscripts denote differences at the $p < .05$ level.
Table 6

**Study 3 Mediation Analysis: Zero-Order and Partial Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>Ingroup Tolerance</th>
<th>Pleasantness Score</th>
<th>Terror Suspect Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup Tolerance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasantness Score</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terror Suspect Items</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours to Hold Suspect</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Prejudiced Policy</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.68*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.51*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>Hours to Hold Suspect</th>
<th>Support for Prejudiced Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup Tolerance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasantness Score</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terror Suspect Items</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours to Hold Suspect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Prejudiced Policy</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Zero-order correlations appear on the top and partial correlations, after accounting for political orientation and pretest prejudice towards Arabs, appear on the bottom. Those displaying a * are significant at the p < .05 level.
Figure 1. Study 1 strength and importance of Ohio University identity.
Figure 2. Study 1 responses to scout leader measure (by gender).
Figure 3. Study 1 ATGL responses by gender and tolerance manipulation.
Figure 4. Study 2 weapon misidentification picture.
Figure 5. Study 2 component 2 index scores by gender and tolerance manipulation.
Figure 6. Study 3 responses to the U.S. identification scale. Higher scores indicate stronger reported identification with the U.S.