

## Intergroup Relations

Monday, July 23<sup>rd</sup>

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Last week...

- Stereotypes
  - Where they come from
  - What activates them
  - How to change them
  - How they change
- Prejudice
  - Self-esteem function
- Discrimination
  - Subtle, non-motivated,
  - Aversive Racism – discrimination on the “left”

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Today...

- What are the social conditions that are necessary (or just facilitate) intergroup conflict?
  - Moving from the intrapsychic to the interpersonal
- Four approaches
  - Realistic Group Conflict Theory
  - Social Identity Theory
  - Social Dominance Theory
  - System Justification

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Isn't this sociology?

- How groups interact could easily be studied by sociologists.
- In fact, the initial work detailed here was begun by sociologists
- Psychologists can add a discussion of the intra-individual processes that may facilitate, or even cause, intergroup conflict

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Realistic Group Conflict Theory

- Group
  - "A delineated social unit with properties which can be measured and which have consequences for the behavior of its members"
    - Sets norms regulating behavior of members:
      - in pursuing goals
      - in relations with fellow group members
      - In relations with outgroups and their members
    - Able to tell what is acceptable group behavior and what is deviant
- Interpersonal v. Intergroup behavior
  - Salience of group identity in situation determines type

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## RGCT

- Basic Thesis
  - Intergroup hostility is a function of REAL conflict over scarce resources
    - More or more important competing goals increases conflict, cooperation reduces conflict
    - Example:
      - Two Native American tribes, a drought, and not enough water.
- Broader context matters!
  - History of intergroup relations matters
  - Existence of other groups matters
    - What if the two Native American tribes above have a history of cooperation? Of conflict?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## RGCT

- Intergroup interaction/contact matters!
  - Favorability of interaction determined by, among other factors,
    - Real or imagined threat to safety of group
    - Economic, political, or military interests
    - Social status
- The Limiting Factor
  - One issue tends to be “the issue” that colors impressions of other issues
    - Water issue may skew economic cooperation

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## RGCT and the stereotype stork

- According to RGCT, stereotypes come from actual conflict
  - Because conflicting groups threaten ingroup’s survival, they are negatively stereotyped
  - Over time, these stereotypes become learned, standardized, and applied regardless of conflict
    - You create “who” the group is
- As an ingroup becomes more important (to self, to survival), more importance is placed on group norms/beliefs (stereotypes).
  - Increases likelihood of intergroup conflict

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## RGCT Evidence: Sherif & Sherif, 1954

- Robber’s Cave experiments
  - 2 groups of 11 eleven year old boys at a summer camp
  - **Phase 1:** Groups didn’t know about each other, Boys bonded within group, t-shirts, etc.
  - **Phase 2:** Intergroup competition for prizes that were publicly displayed in common areas
    - Led to name calling, then physical aggression
      - Burning flags, wrecking cabins, throwing rocks
    - Took 1 week to transform boys into little hate machines
  - **Phase 3:** Cooperation (super-ordinate goals)

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Robber's Cave, Phase 3

- Cooperation
  - Talking and non-hostile contact didn't improve group relations
  - Super-ordinate goals necessary
    - Fixed "broken" water supply
    - Solved \$ trouble to bring a movie to camp
- Stereotypes reduced by the end of phase 3, and positive, camper-initiated intergroup contact.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Problems with RGCT

- Group identity seen as a function of conflict
  - No conflict, no group identity?
- Exactly *how* does conflict turn into group identification and stereotype generation?
- Presumes you can identify a single outgroup that causes conflict. What if it's unclear?
- Group identity matters, but theory undervalues psychological processes.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Social Identity Theory

- Designed to supplement RGCT
- An explicit focus on group attachment and identity
  - Def. of group similar to RGCT
    - Individuals who perceive themselves to be part of a category; consensus about collective membership in group; emotional investment in group
  - Group provides info about self
    - Place in the social world

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## SIT – Two key continua

- Interpersonal – Intergroup continuum
  - The more extreme the conflict, the more likely people will interact as group members (rather than individuals)
  
- Social mobility – Social change continuum
  - Perceptions of how society is organized
    - Mobility = ability to change one's group membership or status if undesired
      - e.g., American Dream
    - Change = impermeable social strata, stuck in a social group
      - e.g., a rigid class structure

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## SIT – key continua

- To the extent that social situations are closer to social change pole than to the social mobility pole, interaction will be intergroup more than interpersonal
  - If you can move around (go from working to middle class) as an individual, no need to act as a group member
  
  - If social category prevents you from advancing, you will act as a group member rather than as an individual

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Acting as a group member

- Like RGCT, SIT posits that groups have behavioral norms, shared beliefs and attitudes. A world view.
  
- To the extent that the situation triggers you to act as a group member, you will act/respond in accordance with these shared beliefs
  - Not as you might during interpersonal interaction
    - "Regular Brad" v. "North Jersey Brad"

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

How do situations trigger intergroup interaction?

- We are all motivated to hold positive self-regard (high self-esteem)
- Social Identity is that aspect of the self that stems from group membership
- Membership in social groups confers positive and negative status/information
- Value of one's group is determined through comparison with other, similar-status groups

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

How situations...2

- Pressures to elevate group status through comparison to actions taken as a group member
- Ultimately, a desire to value one's self (via one's group membership) leads to efforts to change the social system by acting on behalf of the group

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Situations and social change

- Self-esteem motivated behavior especially likely when social status is unfair, rigid, and unstable.
  - Unequal distribution of real/psychological resources
    - Wealth, power, prestige
- But you need not have such a situation for intergroup hostility to occur
  - Mere categorization is sufficient!

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## SIT – minimal groups paradigm

- Tajfel (1970)
  - Ps viewed series of paintings
    - **Randomized** into “Klee” and “Kandinsky” groups based on false-feedback re: preferences
  - Brought into separate room to complete task
    - No intra-group interaction, no meaning assigned
    - Assign \$ to one “Klee” and one “Kandinsky”
  - Assign \$ using matrix with info about \$ given to each
    - Told they’d keep \$ assigned to them

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## SIT – Tajfel \$ matrices

\$ for #74 of Klee group	19	17	15	13	11	9	7
\$ for #11 of Kandinsky	1	5	9	13	17	21	25

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Tajfel, 1970

- Examined choices for 4 patterns
  - **Maximum ingroup profit**
    - Choose box that made sure your group member got the most \$ possible
  - **Maximum joint profit**
    - Choose box so that everyone makes as much as possible (groups equal)
  - **Maximum outgroup profit**
    - Choose box that made sure other group member got the most \$ possible
  - **Maximum differentiation**
    - Make sure you make the biggest ingroup/outgroup gap you can

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Tajfel, 1970

- Results
  - First, choices made to give more to ingroup than outgroup
  - Second, max differentiation trumped max ingroup profit. Would rather **WIN** than make more money!
  - Third, interviews with Ps revealed no sense of how they are expected to behave. Groups aren't meaningful.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Minimal group invocations

- Tajfel (1970) made groups based on art preference
- Also works with...
  - Dot and noise estimation
    - "over-" v. "under-estimators"
  - Explicitly telling people that you are randomly assigning them to groups!
    - Yields same ingroup favoritism

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Strengths of SIT

- Process of ingroup identity formation is clearer than in RGCT
  - Mere categorization (us/them) is sufficient to form an identity and alter behavior
- This allows for broader groups
  - Whites and Busing in L.A.
    - Larry Bobo (1983) found that the sense of threat to the ingroup was stronger predictor of opposition to busing than were racism scores or actually having a kid who would be bused.
      - Not self-interest. Perceived threat to group!!!

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### SIT weaknesses

- Most work has explored boundary conditions for minimal groups paradigm, and so...
  - What does invoking different types of groups do?
  - What behaviors can the manipulation affect?
- Lost is a focus on the *context* in which these identities function
  - How permeable is a group distinction in the lab?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### SIT weaknesses 2

- Focus on preformed groups
  - How do new categories come to be?
  - How do disparate members come to know and endorse group norms
    - 15 year old Libertarian in Boston... What are my group norms, beliefs, behaviors, etc.?
    - How do I act when marginalized for my beliefs?
- Failure to address all levels of analysis
  - No individual differences measure
  - Minimal groups = no history, context, etc.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Social Dominance Theory

- Attempts to address multiple levels of influence
  - How the interaction between psychological, sociostructural, ideological, and institutional forces produces and maintains oppression
- Focus is on why societies tend to be organized as group-based hierarchies
  - Posits a general tendency for humans to form and maintain group-based hierarchy
    - So all -isms are special cases of a broader drive

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Social Dominance Theory

- Institutionalization a major contributor to group-based hierarchy
  - Able to allocate more resources and more consistently over time
- Social ideologies (shared beliefs or ways of operating) help coordinate institutions' activities, which ensures continued group-based differences

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Social Dominance Theory

- Two types of group based hierarchy
  - Universal
    - Age
    - Gender
  - "Arbitrary set"
    - Race
    - Religion
    - Ethnicity or tribal membership
    - Sexual orientation

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Social Identity Theory

- Ideological Asymmetry
  - People in more powerful groups tend to act in their group's interest more than do those in lower-status groups
    - The powerful work to protect their status more than the out-of-power work to achieve new power
- Social Dominance Orientation
  - Individual difference in the extent to which you see a group-based hierarchy as desirable

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Social Dominance Orientation

- Sample items
  - Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.
  - In getting what you want, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups.
  - It's OK if some groups have more of a chance in life than others.
  - If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems.
  - It's probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom.
  - It would be good if groups could be equal.
  - All groups should be given an equal chance in life.
  - We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.
  - No group should dominate in society

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Social Dominance Orientation

- SDO scores vary as a function of context
  - High status associated with higher SDO scores
    - Ideological asymmetry
  - Social context matters as well (Levin, 1996)
- But, SDO scores *also* show stability across contexts

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Levin (1996) – SDO malleability and stability

- Levin (1996) – SDO, Jewish ethnicities, Palestinians (in Israel)
  - Ashkenazi Jews > mixed > Mizrahi Jews
    - re: status
  - Ps from all three ethnicities primed to think about national Ashkenazi/Mizrahi conflict
    - SDO scores: Ashkenazi > mixed > Mizrahi
  - Ps primed to think about Israeli/Palestinian conflict
    - Group differences disappeared!
  - But, SDO  $r = .56$  across conditions
    - Moderate to Strong correlation

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## SDO and institutional influence

- So how do institutions help maintain group-based hierarchies?
  - Some institutions are hierarchy enhancing, some are hierarchy attenuating
    - Cop v. Public Defender
  - Occupations self-selected based on SDO!
- Sidanius et al. (1994) compared SDO scores of LAPD, LA Public Defenders, UCLA students, and LA jury pool
  - LAPD > students and jury > Pub Def

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## SDO and institutional influence

- Sidanius et al. (1996)
  - Students at UCLA rate attractiveness of 8 careers
    - 4 hierarchy-enhancing (HE)
      - Police, gov't prosecutor, big business person, FBI)
    - 4 hierarchy attenuating (HA)
      - Lawyer for poor, civil rights lawyer, human rights advocate, advocate for disadvantaged groups)
  - Controlling for political conservatism and SES, SDO positively associated with choosing HE and negatively associated with choosing HA careers

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## SDT, in sum

- A very well-integrated theory; comprehensive
  - Evolutionary roots
    - Universality of gender and age
  - Intra-psychic processes and tendencies
    - SDO
  - Social structures
    - Actually addresses context, whereas SIT has failed to do so
- Insufficient work on how these all interact
- Promising, but still only 15 years old

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## System Justification Theory

- RGCT: conflict/threat should increase attachment to in-group and disdain for outgroups
- SIT: group identity sufficient for intergroup hostility
  - So, why aren't we in the middle of a constant revolt?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## System Justification Theory

- In fact, subordinate group members (across the globe) have repeatedly been shown to derogate the *ingroup* and support the outgroup!
  - SJT addresses why this might be
- Sociological research suggests that subordinate groups adopt dominant group's views when differences in resource distribution are...
  - Institutionalized
  - Legitimized through a generally accepted social system

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## SJT

- Posits a fundamental need to see status quo as...
  - Favorable, legitimate, inevitable
  - Belief in a Just World
    - Good things happen to good people
    - If good things happen to bad people, or vice versa, it creates a state of tension
- This need complements need for self- and group esteem (S.I.T.)

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## SJT

- Need to see system as fair leads to...
  - Rationalization of status quo
  - Nonconscious, outgroup favoritism
  - Enhanced system justification among the disadvantaged

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## SJT and low status justification

- Cognitive dissonance would suggest that those most harmed by the system would need to justify their suffering
  - Can't deny SES, so enhance beliefs that one's lot in life is, ultimately, fair.
- System Justification Theory provides correlational evidence that this is true

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Status and support for system

- Jost, Pelham, et al. (2003) – surveys
  - Income negatively related to support limits on right to criticize the government
  - Low-income Latinos more likely to trust government and believe it works for everyone's good than high-income Latinos,
    - Controlling for education and excluding political conservatives
  - Low-income and African American respondents more likely to believe that inequality is both legitimate and necessary than high income and European Americans were.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## National levels of Justification

- System Justification is higher in societies with greater social and economic inequality
  - That is, where there is more to justify, more people work to justify.
    - More dissonant cognitions, few legitimizing cognitions, so more dissonance. More effort to reduce dissonance.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Pros and Cons of System Justification

- Adds an additional motivation, which helps account for some findings that SIT and SDO couldn't explain
  - (both suggest that lower status groups should identify *less* with the status quo!)
- Understudied in a controlled environment
- No real individual differences measure
  - BJW scale – Peplau 1970s, though.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---