

Deviant ingroup members are judged stricter and punished harder compared to deviant outgroup members. This is typically measured in minimal group paradigms. But occurs in real life in larger groups (e.g. student performance, likeability)

Levine et al. (2011) Shared Reality Groups provide shared reality and particularly **provide knowledge (satisfy epistemic needs** (a persons desire to develop an accurate knowledge of the world). Defection jeopardises the group's sense of shared reality (**epistemic certainty**), and therefore elicits negative reaction to defectors. The strength of this negative reaction varies positively with the level of threat offered and the groups members' perceived shared reality.

Young Christian Association (Levine et al.) Members of these group were given scenarios about a group member leaving and were measured according to their negative reactions. They were either told that the family moved to another town, moved to another non profit group or leaves for another YCA group. The last option is most similar and so indicates that there is something wrong with the group. The negative reaction predictably was highest for the last option.

Need for Cognitive Closure/Volleyball Teams (Levine et al.) This is a personality trait anticipated to moderate negative reactions to people leaving volleyball teams (higher the need, the more negative the reaction). Participants were given scenarios about members leaving volleyball teams for others and also measured according to the amount of shared values. They found that those low in perception of shared value endorsement but high in NCC had the largest negative reaction. This was replicated in **scout groups**.

Winning and Losing (Cialdini et al. 1976) Measured university students' group identification to their football teams. When team won, group membership identification increased compared to when team lost.

Black Sheep Effect (Marques et al. 1988) Is the extreme judgement of norm-deviant in-group members compared to out-group members.

Positive Intergroup Contact
How can we facilitate positive intergroup contact.

Social Identity

Self-Categorisation
The process of seeing oneself as a member of a social group (rather than as a unique individual, which we discussed in the last lecture). There is a multitude of ways of categorising oneself, from being an individual to more inclusive, being human.

We also have a **social identity** which is the aspects of the self-concept that derive from an **individuals knowledge and feelings about the group memberships** he or she shares with others. In this lecture, we are interested in how group membership affects our self-perceptions.

Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986)
Smith and Mackie talk about the motivation for **connectedness** (affiliative needs=need to belong). It states that people derive knowledge and self-esteem from group membership. Group membership promotes group membership.

We **learn** about other groups by observing other group members, learning cultural stereotypes of groups and learning roles from socially assigned group (e.g. miners).

We are **reminded** (or group identity is more accessible) according to **events** (e.g. england vs. arsenal football match), other's **comments** (e.g. you are so 'emo'), presence of **in-group members**, presence of **out-group members** (social comparison).

Context Modulates Accessibility of Social Identity: McGuire et al. (1979) asked boys and girls about their self-concept using the same question. Girls in families where there was a male majority were significantly more likely speak about themselves in terms of their gender, the same was the case for boys in households where there was a female majority. There was a balance between boys and girls when there was a gender balanced family.

When I Becomes We
We perceive ourself as part of a group or 'we' when we are thinking about our social identity. Activated group membership changes the self-concept as opinions, feelings and behaviours move toward those typical of the group. They become norms for the standard self and particularly for those who strongly identify with the group.

Common Goal (Sherif et al.) Robbers Cave Cooperation

Positive Contact Hypothesis (Allport)

Common In-group Identity (Dovidio et al. 2000) Re-categorise outgroup members as members of a superordinate group. Positive sentiments are extended as they are now fellow ingroup members.

PROBLEM: Deviating behaviour within an in-group is more severely punished.

In-group Projection Model (Mummenday et al. 1999) Asked students how prototypical they were of students (psychology vs business), People consider themselves to be much more prototypical of the superordinate group than other smaller groups (e.g. sports bikers are more 'prototypical' than harley davidson riders).

Jigsaw Technique (Aronson) Having a member in small groups responsible for a small task, part of a larger task.

(Same people behind research on aversive racism).

Solution? COMPLEXITY What if the group is not easily defined? E.g. Sport is not easily defined. This should lead to more tolerance towards out groups, because it is less likely to be represented by one group (Mummenday et al. 2007). This is not a direct intervention though, unlike the others. It includes better language and endorses the use of less stereotypes by depicting greater diversity.