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Overview

- Lay theories
- Formal theories about groups and intergroup processes
  Subjective Group Dynamics Model (SGD)
- Evidence
- Conclusions
Lay theories of individuals and society

- Entity vs Incremental theories
- Essentialism
- Entitativity
- Genetic theories
- Belief in a Just World
- Protestant Work Ethic
- System Justification Theory
- Social Dominance Orientation
- Social Representations
Group processes and intergroup relations: Theories and phenomena
Intergroup Processes

- Social-cognitive Processes
  - e.g., Categorization effects, Warmth/competence
  - e.g., Collective relative deprivation
  - e.g., Collectivism vs individualism

- Motivation
  - e.g., Social identity
  - e.g., Linguistic bias, divergence, accommodation
  - e.g., Explicit/implicit/concealed

- Language
  - e.g., Explicit/implicit/concealed

- Prejudice
  - e.g., Collective action

- Changing Intergroup Relations
  - e.g., Collective action
Intragroup Processes

- **Shared cognition**
  - e.g., Norm formation
  - e.g., Social decision scheme, monitoring, deindividuation

- **Socialization**
  - e.g., Phase and member status, Group development, roles
  - e.g., Contagion

- **Memory**
  - e.g., Transactive memory, collective memory
  - e.g., Process loss, social loafing, task/socioemotional

- **Influence**
  - e.g., Conformity, obedience, prototypicality

- **Decision processes**
  - e.g., Conformity, obedience, prototypicality

- **Group emotion**
  - e.g., Process loss, social loafing, task/socioemotional
Utility of a good theory (Lewin) for a person (not Lewin)

• Helps to anticipate situation
• No need to learn new norms
• Optimize personal outcomes
• Avoid catastrophic errors
• Coordinate social action
• Better get one, quick!
What do people ‘know’ about groups? (a snapshot)
Imagine people in a small group were asked to judge the amount of sweets in a jar out loud. Joe privately thinks they have all over estimated the amount of sweets. What does he do?

a) Agree with the people who have guessed before him, even though he thinks they were wrong
b) Disagree with them and give the correct answer
c) Tell the person in charge privately that he disagrees
d) Disagree with them and get angry at the other members for getting it wrong
e) Other
a) Agree with the people who have guessed before him, even though he thinks they were wrong 4

b) Disagree with them and give the correct answer 4

c) Tell the person in charge privately that he disagrees 2

d) Disagree with them and get angry at the other members for getting it wrong 0

e) Other
In a group discussion about whether exams should be abolished or not, a final decision will be made through which of the following:

a) Generally the group will go with the majority’s decision
b) Generally people will go with the first opinion given by someone in the group
c) Generally the group will ignore extreme ideas and take an average decision
d) Generally the group will be unable to come to a final decision
a) Generally the group will go with the majority’s decision 5
b) Generally people will go with the first opinion given by someone in the group 1
c) Generally the group will ignore extreme ideas and take an average decision 4
d) Generally the group will be unable to come to a final decision 2
The teacher divides the class into two teams- the ‘Blue Team’ and ‘The Red Team.’

- Act like they always do
- People will get to know others who they did not originally hang out with very much
- Stop talking to members of the opposite team and begin to develop close friendships to members of their own team
- Start wearing coloured lenses to class so they can be in the group that they want to be in
- Other
• Act like they always do
• People will get to know others who they did not originally hang out with very much
• Stop talking to members of the opposite team and begin to develop close friendships to members of their own team
• Start wearing coloured lenses to class so they can be in the group that they want to be in
• Other
Who would a group approve of most? Please select two

a) A person within the group who criticises the group
b) A person outside the group who criticises the group
c) A person within the group who praises the group
d) A person outside the group who praises the group
e) Other
a) A person within the group who criticises the group 2
b) A person outside the group who criticises the group 1
c) A person within the group who praises the group 8
d) A person outside the group who praises the group 4
e) Other
The SGD pattern
(e.g. Black Sheep Effect, e.g., Marques, et al., 1988)

- Ingroup bias eliminated or even reversed when people evaluate *deviant* ingroup and outgroup members

![Bar chart showing the comparison between ingroup and outgroup evaluations for normative and deviant members.](chart.png)
Groups in (psychological) context:
The subjective group dynamics model
Sustain social identity by:

Intergroup differentiation focused on categories as a whole

AND

Validation of ingroup norms (consensus)

VIA

intragroup differentiation focused on individuals within groups
How do people know to do this?

• To recognize and uphold prescriptive norms requires
  – ability to understand different actors’ motives
  – generalization from knowledge of such situations
  – Declarative and procedural knowledge

• Apply “theory” of group processes in context

• “Group Nous”
Indirect evidence

- SGD pattern increases if group members are:
  - Accountable to ingroup
  - Reminded of prescriptive norms
  - In a competitive context
  - Focusing on loyalty rather than morality
- SGD pattern is moderated by
  - Marginal vs full status of deviant members
  - Leadership role of deviant members
- Relatedly
  - Leader stereotypicality/prototypicality effects
  - Expectancy that leaders can innovate
  - Expectancy that leaders may be ruthless for their group
Developmental Model of SGD
 Abrams, Rutland and Cameron, 2003

• How children link *intragroup* with intergroup differentiation.

• Requires both cognitive capacity and social understanding
Study 1: World Soccer Championships  
(Abrams, Rutland, & Cameron, 2003)

- 509 English children (5 to 12 years)
- *Highly competitive intergroup context*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Ingroup: England</th>
<th>Outgroup: Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>I think England is the best team. Even if we lost to Germany, I’d still say England was the best team</td>
<td>I think Germany is the best team. Even if we lost to England, I’d still say Germany was the best team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviant</td>
<td>It’s great when England play well, They’re a fantastic team. But when Germany plays well, I always clap and cheer.</td>
<td>It’s great when England play well, They’re a fantastic team. But when Germany plays well, I always clap and cheer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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• Evaluations of
  – Groups >> Ingroup bias
  – Members >> Differential evaluation

• Inclusion Judgments
  How others from [ingroup/outgroup] would feel towards the member?
  Reciprocated differential evaluation
  >> Differential inclusion
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Age

Perceived inclusion by each group

Intergroup Bias

Social Identity

Intragroup Differential Evaluation (Normative vs Deviant Members)
But how do we figure out inclusion norms?

- Cognitive development
- Perspective taking
- Social experience
Study 2: European Soccer Championships
(Abrams, Rutland, Pelletier & Ferrell, 2009)

- 167 English children (6 to 11 years)
- *Highly competitive intergroup context*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Ingroup: England</th>
<th>Outgroup: France</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>I think England is the best team. Even if we lost to France, I’d still say England was the best team</td>
<td>I think France is the best team. Even if we lost to England, I’d still say France was the best team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviant</td>
<td>It’s great when England play well, They’re a fantastic team. But when France plays well, I always clap and cheer.</td>
<td>It’s great when England play well, They’re a fantastic team. But when France plays well, I always clap and cheer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Developmental SGD hypothesis:
With age, children should show more differential inclusion, which should relate to stronger differential evaluation.
SOCIAL-COGNITIVE VARIABLES

• Cognitive development – Multiple classification ability

• Perspective taking – Theory of social mind task
How Naive are Group Members?

SESP Preconference
Portland October 14th 2009

Centre for the Study of Group Processes

A fuller model

Multiple Classification Ability

- .19*

Intergroup Bias

- .19*

Differential Evaluation

.44***

Differential Inclusion

.18*

Age

.25**

Theory of Social Mind

.38***

.28**

.23**
Does anticipated exclusion reflect reasoning about groups? Attributions to person, group, relationship (loyalty)?
Attributions to Person, Group, Loyalty

Differential Inclusion \( \rightarrow \) Loyalty Attribution

Group Attribution \( \rightarrow \) Trait Attribution

Differential Inclusion \( .31^{***} \)

Group Attribution

Loyalty Attribution

Trait Attribution

Dotted lines represent negative relationships:

Group Attribution \( -.30^{***} \)

Trait Attribution \( -.36^{***} \)

Differential Inclusion \( -.46^{***} \)
Study 3: How Does Group Nous Develop?

• Group norm understanding
  – tacit understanding, requires *generalization*, differential inclusion as neutral observer

• Age, ToSM, MC

• Social experience (group memberships)
Group Norm Understanding

• Two groups – Red, Green
  One member of each
  Who does the Red group like most?

• Both members express liking for both groups
  Who does the Green group like most, and why?
How Does Group Nous (understanding) Develop?

Group Memberships → Theory of Social Mind

- .30***

Theory of Social Mind → Group Norm Understanding

- .22**

Theory of Social Mind → Age

- .20**

Age → Multiple Classification

- .17*

Group Norm Understanding → Multiple Classification

- .32*** (.29**)
Study 4: (minimal groups)
Is Group Nous About Groups?

- 157 6-11 year-olds
- Group norm understanding (about bias)
- ToSM

- Expected contrast between in-group vs out-group:
  - Biased evaluations of group members
  - Preferences for neutral items
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**Intergroup Bias**
$R^2 = .47^{***}$

Expect Contrasting Item Preferences

---

**Expect Contrasting Biases in member evaluations**

Group Norm Understanding

Social Perspective Taking

Age

.20^{**}

.19^{*}

.28^{***}

22^{**}
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**Group Norm Understanding**

- **.28***

**Social Perspective Taking**

- **22**

**Age**

- **.20**

- **.19***

**Expect Contrasting Biases in member evaluations**

**Intergroup Bias**

- **R² = .47***

**Expect Contrasting Item Preferences**
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Group Norm Understanding

Social Perspective Taking

Expect Contrasting Biases in member evaluations

Age

Expect Contrasting Item Preference

Intergroup Bias
$R^2 = .47^{***}$
Conclusions

• Group nous involves knowing when and why groups treat their members in particular ways –
  • Requires awareness of norms, procedures, and group processes
  • Sensitivity to context and descriptive features of the groups
• Important, developmentally, and situationally, to thrive in a multi-group environment
• A form of shared cognition, but could be a skill, ability (cf. Role taking), or reflect training, knowledge, system clarity
  • Helps uncertainty reduction
  • to sustain valued group memberships
  • a vital survival skill!
• More work to be done!