Chapter 7: Persuasion

- How Do We Process Persuasive Messages
  
  - **Study** – Asked participants to listen to a speech supposedly made by another student consisting of strong and weak arguments, and moderate and high rates of speed.
    - Those who heard weak arguments at a normal rate of speech were least persuaded.
    - Those who heard weak arguments at a fast rate just as persuaded as those who heard strong arguments at either normal or fast rate.
    - Fast delivery more amenable to peripheral than central processing because it gives you less time to think about content of message.
  
  - **Study** – With voice and gender influence credibility in banking telemarketing context.
    - Student found Canadian voice more credible if it spoke more moderate, no intonation, and fast.
  
  - **Routes to Persuasion**
    - **Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM)** – Of persuasion says that people focus on different aspects of a persuasive message based on involvement in message content.
    - **Central/Systematic Route** – People think carefully about communication in message and influences by strength of the arguments.
    - **Peripheral/Heuristic Route** – When people don’t think carefully about communication message and influenced by superficial characteristics.

- Factors that Influence Type of Processing Used

  - **Ability to Focus**
    - If you are distracted and you have limited ability to focus, it’s difficult to concentrate on central messages therefore rely on peripheral cues.
    - **Study** – Students read strong or weak argument in favour of 20% intuition increase; listened to them being distracted or not-rated opinion on euthanasia.
      - Those who had no distraction persuaded by strong messages but not weak; those distracted somewhat persuaded by both types.
Study – Half consumed orange juice and other consumed same without caffeine- read about euthanasia.
  ▪ Those who had consumed caffeine were more persuaded by the counter-attitudinal message.

**Motivation to Focus**
  ▪ May not have motivation to focus on processing central messages if uninvolved or uninterested.
  ▪ Study- Asked students to read two phrases and rate agreement & manipulated their involvement with each task.
    ▪ People whose involvement with a message was low were more persuaded by familiar phrases than literal phrases- relied on peripheral cues and were more persuaded by familiar phrases.
    ▪ People whose involvement with a message was high were equally persuaded by both phrases.
  ▪ Howard- When distracted a familiar phrase is more persuasive.
  ▪ Richard Petty- Students listened to speaker promoting benefits of a mandatory exam.
  ▪ 3 independent variables:
    ▪ Expertise of speaker (Princeton professor vs. high school teacher)
    ▪ Message strength (strong vs. weak)
    ▪ Personal involvement (very involved or not)
  ▪ Those not very involved more likely to rely on peripheral cues, primary factor that predicted attitude change was expertise of speaker- more positive when message was delivered by professor.
  ▪ Those highly involved , strength of argument was major predictor of attitudes.
  ▪ Carolyn Hafer- Examined the influence of complex language in message to people who disagreed with view being expressed.
    ▪ When arguments easy to comprehend, attitudes more favorable when source had high status.

**Which Route is More Effective?**
  ▪ Messages of high personal relevance process centrally as long as there are no distractions.
  ▪ Messages of low personal relevance processed peripherally .
  ▪ Change based in central route processing is longer lasting and more resistant to future persuasion efforts, more effective route.
  ▪ **Environmental Connections: How Persuasive Messages Increase Recycling**
    ▪ Validation (sorry for inconvenience) condition showed 9% increase showing that validating another’s complain can be persuasive.
    ▪ Persuasion produced 17% increase, alerting people to seriousness of pro-environmental actions is more effective.

- **What Factors Influence Persuasion**
  ▪ Liberman & Chaiken- Asked participants to read article about coffee use and fibrocystic disease and evaluated the article.
Those who drank coffee found both the strong and weak response less convincing because they were threatened by the information.

- **Source: Who Delivers the Message**
  - Source of persuasion refers to the person or persons who are delivering the message.
  - **Attractiveness**
    - Attractive and likeable sources more persuasive.
    - Study- Attractive & unattractive people ask students to sign petition.
      - Attractive people were successful 41% of the time and unattractive people only successful 32% of the time.
    - Likeable people especially persuasive in videotaped and audio taped messages compared to written.
    - Unlikable people more persuasive in writing.
  - **Similarity**
    - Good friend who is more similar to you and therefore more persuasive.
    - Study- Read speech either about gun control or euthanasia.
      - Attitudes change in direction of message they read when speech was delivered by student who supposedly attended their school
      - Not influenced at all when message was delivered by someone who attended a different school.
    - We remember messages presented by in-group members better than out-group members.
    - Tend to know the in-group members more and likely to trust them better.
    - Identification, more persuaded by people that we identify with.
      - Greater identification with smoking protagonist predicted stronger associations between the self and smoking and increased their intentions to smoke.
    - Study- Students read an essay written by another student.
      - Students who believed they shared first name and birth date with essay writer rated agreement with essay an average of 6.18, and those who didn’t average of 4.19.
    - Things such as Tupperware Brand Corporation and Vector Marketing.
  - **Credibility**
    - Sources who appear credible are more persuasive than those who lack credibility.
    - Children between ages 7 and 10 are especially influenced by best friends.
    - Study- Children chose between risky or non-risky alternatives.
      - Best friend was able to persuade them to make other choice approximately half the time.
• People who argue unexpected positions are especially persuasive because they’re seen as highly credible: seen as more factually based.

• Alice Eagly- Asked participants to listen to political speech accusing large company of polluting local river.
  ◦ Speech was most persuasive when it was delivered by pro-business candidate because he seemed most sincere and environmentalist was seen as biased.

• Credibility particularly influential when people have recently been exposed to another persuasive message.

• When people have just received message from a source of low credibility they’re more persuaded by message from moderately credible source than if they first received a message from source with high credibility.

• Repeated exposure to message can lead people to attribute message to more credible source.

• Study- Exposed to statement regarding food legend 5 times or 2 times.
  ◦ Those who heard statement 5 times more likely to believe it came from Consumer Reports.

  **Sleeper Effect** The phenomenon by which message that initially is not particularly persuasive becomes more persuasive over time because people forget its source.

• Study- Heard message from credible or non-credible source.
  ◦ Those who heard credible speaker had much greater attitude change, but 4 weeks later when asked again they showed no difference.

• **Content of the Message**
  - **Length**
    ◦ Long messages are more effective if they’re strong and processed centrally but less effective if weak and processed peripherally.
    ◦ Long messages including weak messages have less impact than short.

  - **Law Connections: The Benefits of Stealing the Thunder**
    ◦ No thunder, thunder, stolen thunder.
    ◦ Those who read stolen thunder version saw lawyer who presented damaging information about his own client as more credible.
    ◦ Read no thunder least likely to see client as guilty.

  - **Discrepancy**
    ◦ Messages that differ excessively from people’s attitudes are less likely to be ignored.
      ◦ Those who made virginity pledge become sexually active at later age than those who didn’t make the pledge.
    ◦ Study- Asked students who were either against or for the death penalty to read two fictitious studies.
Those somewhat in favor of capital punishment strongly supported it while those somewhat against it more strongly opposed it.

- People rate information that supports their own view as more convincing.

**Audience**

- **Demographic Factors**
  - Late adolescent and early adults most influenced by persuasive messages.
  - Penny Visser & Jon Korsnik - People in early and late adulthood more responsive to persuasive messages.
  - Older adults are more persuaded by messages that focus on meaningful goals.

- **Research Focus on Gender: The Impact of Gender on Persuasion**
  - Men tend to use direct and assertive strategies to influence people whereas women tend to use indirect and less assertive strategies.
  - Gender differences in self-report didn’t match the actual behaviours when participants role-played series of scenarios.
  - Men and women don’t seem to differ in their preference in using particular strategies - use reason & logic, state desires, offer to compromise, and convince, persuade & coax.
  - Social expectations for men and women differ.
  - Linda Carli - Argued that women are less likely to be perceived as competent and makes them less likely to rely on competency as an influence strategy.
  - Korabik - Found that use of more assertive strategies by female managers was viewed less positively than males.
  - Those who hold power use direct influence regardless of gender.

- **Personality**
  - Study - Ads for Irish Mocha Mint coffee.
    - High self monitors willing to pay $14 for the product when they saw an imaged ad and only $12 for informational ad.
    - Low self monitors willing to pay $13 for information product and $11 for image ads.
  - Study - Found that perceived persuasiveness of a message increased when there was a match between a person’s regulatory focus and the content of the message.
  - People who focused on avoiding negative outcomes were more influenced by messages presenting a negative outcome “if you don’t...” and those emphasizing positive outcomes more persuaded by “if you eat..”
- People who are high in need for evaluating are less likely to answer "no opinion" on surveys.
- Those high in need for cognition tend to think about information presented in a message more thoroughly and engage in central processing & therefore more persuaded by strong messages.
- People who are low in need for cognition are persuaded by attractive sources of persuasive messages and therefore engage in peripheral processing.
- Study- Listened to audio tapes containing either low or highly quality arguments.
  - Those low on need for cognition more likely to be influenced by reaction of others in the audience.
  - Low on need for cognition more influenced by other peripheral cues such as attractiveness or popularity.
- Study- Showed clip from Die Hard.
  - Among non-smokers, those low in need for cognition saw lead character smoke reported more willingness to become friends with a smoker.

- **Robert Cialdini- Six Principles of Persuasion**
  - Reciprocation→ We comply with requests of those who have done as favour, applies to: pro-social behaviour (helping those who help us), self-disclosure (disclose to those who reveal to us), cooperation/competition, and compliance.
  - Social Validation→ Comply with request if those who are similar to us are also complying.
  - Consistency→ Once you take a position, tend to comply with requests that are consistent with that position.
  - Friendship/Liking→ More likely to comply with requests of friends and others whom we like.
  - Authority→ Tend to comply with those who are authority figures.
  - Scarcity→ We value opportunities and products that are less available.

- **How Can Subtle Factors Influence Persuasion**
  - Study- Diners at restaurant presented with bill on tray that was empty or tray with VISA symbol.
    - Customers tipped 4.29% more when VISA symbol was on their tray.

- **The Impact of Emotional Appeals**
  - Fear-Based Appeals
    - Study- AIDS public service announcement using fear.
    - Persuasive messages using fear designed to create threat by impending threat or failing to engage in certain behaviours which produces harm.
    - Graphic images such as dead bodies, crash survivors.
  - **Research Focus on Neuroscience: Influence of Emotion in the Ballot Box**
    - Study- Brain activity of patients examined as they listened to statements made by political candidates.
• Brain areas that controlled emotions showed increase activity but areas for reasoning did not.
  □ Study- Project DARE
  • Program has little effect on preventing or reducing drug use.
  □ People who receive high fear messages often report being influenced but in reality show lower levels of attitude change.
  □ David Hammond- Compared health warnings and effects in Canada, U.S, Australia, and the UK.
    • Canadian cigarette packages produced more motivation to give up smoking than in US.

• Health Connections: Why Having Bad Breath is Worse Than Dying
  □ No one was concerned with getting AIDS when using IV drugs.
  □ Smoking prevention messages for teenagers that emphasize immediate physiological consequences are more effective.
  □ Fear-Based Appeals (continued)
    □ Study- Compared two distinct types of messages regarding hepatitis.
      • Narrative message (by someone) was more effective at increasing intentions to receive vaccinations than the statistical one.
    □ Study- Women who read leaflet describing the link between excessive alcohol use and breast cancer.
      • Women who are excessive drinkers and had the opportunity to self-affirm most important value before hand showed greater acceptance of the alcohol consumption breast cancer link.
    □ Among people who rate their attitudes as personally important, self affirmation decreases their bias and increases sensitivity to argument strength.
  □ The Power of Positive Emotion
    • People who are in a good mood are more easily persuaded.
    • Good mood, positive feeling and less likely to process information carefully and are worried that focusing on the content will disrupt their good mood.
    • People in a sad mood tend to rely on overall number of arguments they can generate for a given position- more likely to use central route.
    • Michael Conway & Laurette Dube- Examined the use of humor in persuasive messages on threatening topics that were designed to promote preventative health behaviours.
Men and women who scored high on traits of masculinity showed greater intention to adopt the particular behaviour when message was presented with humor.

- Messages including wisecracks are more persuasive.

**The Impact of Subliminal Messages**

- **Subliminal Persuasion**
  - Persuasion that occurs when stimuli are presented so rapidly that observer is not conscious of having viewed them.
  - Study: Participants asked to assist in marketing study where they would evaluate different types of products.
    - Among those who were thirsty, those who received Lipton Ice prime showed strong preference for this brand.
  - Study: Subliminally priming a goal-relevant cognition influenced behaviour and enhanced persuasiveness for an ad.
  - Study: Gave students one of two types of tapes either memory or self-esteem.
    - Those who believed they received memory tape reported better memory when there were no actual differences in self-esteem or memory after exposure to a particular tape.

- **How Can You Resist Persuasion?**
  - Study: Students read descriptions of several fictitious made for television films either violent or non-violent.
    - People were more interested in watching violent films with warning labels than those with information labels.
  - Factors that influence our ability to resist persuasion are: forewarning, reactance, inoculation, and attitude importance.

- **Forewarning**
  - Easier for people to resist attempts at persuasion when receive forewarning.
  - Forewarning: Making people aware that they will soon receive a persuasion message.
  - Especially useful if it includes specific training on evaluating features of message.
  - Study: Half received information on how to critically evaluate legitimacy of source
    - Participants who received training rated the ads containing illegitimate authorities as more manipulative and less persuasive.
  - June Cottre: Examined guilt appeal.
    - Credible guilt advertisements that aren’t overly manipulative induce guilt feelings and positive attitudes.
    - When consumers infer manipulative intent they don’t feel guilty and develop negative attitudes.

- **Reactance**
  - Knowing about an upcoming persuasion motivates us to resist because of the boomerang effect.
Reactance → The idea that people react to threats to their freedom to engage in a behaviour by becoming even more likely to engage in that behaviour.

People react when they have the opportunity to engage in behaviour that is forbidden by message.

Study- Read one of two messages about an alcohol-type beverage.
  - Those who hadn’t tried beverage reported similar levels of intending to consume beverage in future.
  - Those who had tried the beverage and those who read the message urging complete abstinence from the drink, reported stronger urge to try the beverage again.

Inoculation

People better able to resist persuasion if they have previously been exposed to a weak version of the message.

Inoculation → The idea that exposure to weak version of persuasive message strengthens people’s ability to later resist stronger versions of the message.

Particularly effective when they provide direct counter-arguments that refute the common reasons.

Study- Created four different types of messages to promote organ donation: counter-argument messages, emotional messages, motivating action messages, and dissonance messages.
  - Counter-argument messages lead to the greatest number of registrations.

Attitude Importance

All attitudes are not created equal: attitudes that are important to us are more resistant to persuasion.

Study- People in favor of allowing gay people to serve in military listened to message opposing this view.
  - People who considered this attitude highly important more resistant to this attempt at persuasion.

Leandre Fabrigar- Examined the impact of attitude accessibility on peoples’ consideration of attempts to persuade them (nuclear power & vegetarianism).
  - The quality of the argument had greater impact on persuasion when people could access their attitudes more easily.

Study- Read an essay about new university policy to shorten summers.
  - Students who first exercised self-control on handgrip task rated the policy more positive than those who just plainly read the essay.

How Does Culture Influence Persuasion?

Advertisement sin Western countries appeal to individual benefits and preferences, personal success and independence.

Heejung Kim & Hazel Markus- Examined advertisements from popular American and Korean magazines.
  - Advertisements in Korea were much more likely to focus on conformity, in-group benefits, harmony, and family integrity.
Advertisements in American focused on uniqueness.

**Types of Persuasive Messages Used**
- Study - Asked Japanese, Spanish, and US men & women to describe personality attributes associated with various commercial brands.
- Similar attributes noted: excitement, competence, sophistication.
- Differences:
  - Attribute ruggedness appeared in ratings by Americans but not Japanese or Spanish.
  - Passion appeared in Spanish but not Americans.
  - Japanese and Spanish more likely to rate commercial brands on harmony-oriented values.
  - Americans rated commercial brands on more individualistic values.

**The Effectiveness of Different Persuasive Messages**
- Individualistic societies being an expert increases source’s credibility and persuasiveness.
- Collectivist societies being an older male or a famous family increases credibility and persuasiveness.
- Study - Examined Cialdini’s six principles of persuasion in China, Germany, Spain, and America, asked them willingness to help coworker.
  - In China, authority was primary reason for helping reflecting their high-score on Hofstede’s power distance.
  - In Germany, consistency was the main reason for helping, they give weight to rules and regulations.
  - In Spain, liking and friendship was main reason for helping reflecting Spanish work simpatia which means expressing high concern with social well-being of others.
  - In America, reciprocity was major reason for helping reflecting their need to fulfill individual needs and desires.
- Advertising appeals that stress interdependence and togetherness lead to more favorable brand attitudes among Chinese.
  - Reacted more positively to watch that ended in ALPS.
- Study - Examined the impact of different factors on intentions to quit smoking among both Hispanic smokers and non-Hispanic smokers.
  - Family related attitudes were greater influence on Hispanics’ attitudes towards quitting whereas the effects of withdrawal were greater influence to non-Hispanics.
Social Psychology - Textbook
Chapter 8: Social Influence: Norms, Conformity, Compliance, and Obedience

- Introduction
  - The Gateway discussed pledges that were exposed to traumatic events.
  - DKE fraternity.
  - Social Norms → Unspoken but shared rules of conduct within particular formal or informal group.
  - Conformity → Changes in opinions or behaviours to meet perceived group norms, people fear consequences of deviating from norms.
  - Compliance → Behaviour elicited by direct requests.
  - Obedience → Behaviour produced by commands of authority figures.

- How Do Social Norms Influence Behaviour?
  - Dale Miller & McFarland- Asked to read a purposely confusing article in preparation for taking part in discussion.
    - Zero participants asked questions, but assumed that 37% of other students would ask questions.
  - The Power of Social Norms
    - Descriptive Norms → How people behave in a given situation (how you spend Saturday night, clothes).
    - Injunctive Norms → Describe what people ought to go in a given situation, type of behaviour that is approved of (reporting cheating).
    - Study- How social norms influence teens taste in music.
      - Simply knowing how many other people had downloaded a song influenced a person’s rating of how much they liked it.
    - People most likely to acquire new norms when they’re in new situations.
    - Study- Asked students about frequency of energy conservation.
      - Beliefs about others’ energy conservation highly correlated with individuals own, saw these norms as less important in determining their behaviour.
    - Pluralistic Ignorance → Misperception that occurs when each individual in a group privately rejects a groups’ norms but believes that the other members of the group accept these norms (Professor asks any questions and no one raises hand).
    - Vorauer & Ratner- Factors that can impede initiation of dating relationships, why students often fail to make first move.
      - 74% reported that fear of rejection would explain their failure to express interest, 71% explained that lack on interest on the other person’s behalf was because they were not interested.
      - Fear of rejection prompts people to show a signal amplification bias → people’s perception that their overtures communicate more romantic interest to potential partners than is actually the case.
      - Students believe alcohol is used too much but believe that other people are okay with this which influences their behaviours.
  - The Pressure to Conform to Social Norms
    - Students who report they deviated from campus norms are less likely to attend reunions.
Stanley Schachter - Groups of students engaged in group decision-making task.

- There was a mode (went along with group position), slider (deviated from norm and then moved closer to it), and deviate (deviated from norm and stayed that way).
- People liked the deviate the least.

Study - watched one of two humorous videotapes.

- Those watching self-ridicule tape & comedian making jokes rated cartoon as not funny.
- Those watching tape ridiculing other person conformed and rated cartoon as funny.

Robert Cialdini - Compared different types of messages given to hotel guests to encourage them to reuse towels.

- 35% that received message “Help save environment” reused towels.
- Those who received message “join fellow hotel mates and help save environment” reused towels 45%.

What Factors Lead to Conformity?

- Study - Asked men to make sexist remark in front of female participants
  - 16% responded with direct comment.

Why We Conform

- **Informational Influence** - Refers to the influence that leads a person to conform to behaviour of others because person believes the others are correct in their judgments and they want to be right too.
  - Might occur when new to situation.
  - Mazafer Sherif - Used Autokinetic effect (when stationary dot shown in dark room, asked if it’s moving or not).
    - When alone, answers differ greatly.
    - When in a group estimates converge over time.

- **Private Conformity** - When people change their private view and conform to the group norm because they believe that others are right.
  - MacNeil & Sherif - 4-person group and autokinetic effect.
    - 3 confederates, kept doing trials 11 times and soon there were no confederates left only real participants.
    - It took 11 generations for the group norm to start to shift.

- **Normative Influence** - Describes influence that produces conformity when a person fears the negative social consequences of appearing deviant.
  - Solomon Asch - Study on visual discrimination.
    - 37% of the time participants actually gave the wrong answer in order to conform to the rest of the group, 50% giving wrong answer at least half the time.

- **Public Conformity** - When people conform because they want to publicly agree with others even when they know it is not correct.
• The Werther effect, men started copying a guy from a book that shot himself in the head.
• Copycat effect with suicide such as Kurt Cobain

• **Factors That Increase Conformity**
  o **Group Size**
    ▪ Larger groups exert more powerful influence.
    ▪ Solomon’s study, 2 confederates wrong answer increased to 14%, 3 increased to 32%.
    ▪ Did not progress beyond four.
    ▪ Group size more important when influence is normative.
    ▪ John Bassili- People who held minority opinion expressed their views less quickly than those expressing majority viewpoint.
  ▪ **Social Impact Theory** – People we are close to have more impact on us than those that are distant.
  ▪ Prison guards and prisoners who held most hardline positions (not representative of majority) more likely to define themselves as spokesperson for group.
  ▪ Conform more to groups that are attractive to us.
  ▪ People part of minority aware of their differences from majority and try harder to fit in.
  ▪ Those who performed in front of a mirror appeared to align themselves with Euro-Canadian majority.
  o **Standing Alone**
    ▪ Biggest predictor of conformity is whether participant must take lone deviant position.
    ▪ If person who deviates seems to be incompetent having anyone else stand up to majority decreases conformity.
  o **Demographic Variables**
    ▪ Conformity highest in adolescents and lower in children and older adults.
  o **Is There a Gender Difference on Conformity?**
    ▪ Women more likely than men to agree with others in group decision-making tasks and less likely then men to dissent from the group.
    ▪ Men & women likely to conform equally in unfamiliar situations.
    ▪ People with more masculine gender roles conform less than people with more feminine gender roles.
    ▪ Women tend to be more influenced by face-to-face persuasion than by email, men show no differences in responding to communication.
  o **Motivation**
    ▪ On easy tasks people don’t need to look to group members for answers, on harder tasks feel less sure about answer.
    ▪ Study- Asked to witness crime in groups and identify criminal.
      ▪ Cases of low motivation (pilot test) they conformed about 1/3rd of the time regardless of difficulty.
• Cases of high motivation (received cash) conformed rarely on easy tasks and frequently on difficult tasks.

  ▪ Study- Asked to imagine bad or romantic situation and rate images.
    ▪ Both men & women who images anxiety-provoking scene showed greater conformity.
    ▪ Romantic imagining lead to greater conformity for women and less conformity for men.

• **The Power of Minority Influence**
  ▪ **Minority Influence**
    A process in which a small number of people in a group lead an overall change in group’s attitude or behaviour.
  ▪ Serge Moscovici- Reversed Asch’s paradigm by having minority influence majority.
    ▪ Minority influence measures by percentage of naïve participants who yielded to confederates by calling blue slides green.
      ▪ Consistent condition- 8.42% answered green and 32% conformed at least once.
      ▪ Inconsistent condition- 1.25% answered green.
      ▪ Control condition- 0.25% answered green.
      ▪ Consistent condition showed greatest yielding to minority influence.

  ▪ Majorities show more normative influence, and minority show more informative influence.
    ▪ Those exposed to minority influence reported after-images closer to purple end of spectrum.

  ▪ Minorities that are unwavering in their views are more persuasive.

  ▪ Minority influence effective when delivered by person who is well established in a group
    ▪ Those who heard minority views expressed by members of their in-group more likely to be persuaded.
    ▪ Minority influence weaker in large groups than small.
    ▪ Minority messages processed more extensively.

• **The Benefits of Conformity**
  ▪ Seeing someone else picking up litter in a parking lot reduced percentage of people who throw flyers from windshields on ground.
  ▪ Only 4% of people littered when they saw someone else picking up litter.

- **What Factors Lead to Compliance?**
  • Study- Told it was study on astrology and interviewer either said she had same birthday or different.
    ▪ 62% who believed they shared birthday agreed to read a paper for the confederate and mark it.

• **Reciprocity**
  ▪ Reciprocity→ The pressure to reciprocate someone else’s behaviour.
    ▪ Pro-social behaviour (help those who have helped us).
    ▪ Self-disclosure (we disclose to those who reveal to us).
- Cooperation/competition (cooperate with those who cooperate with us and compete with those who compete against us).
- Compliance (tend to be persuaded by those who have complied with our request in the past).

  o **The Door-In-The-Face Technique**
    - First you make a big request and then a smaller so that the second request seems reasonable in comparison to the first making people more likely to comply.
    - When first asked to serve as counselors to juvenile delinquents and then asked to take them to the zoo, 50% complied as opposed to 17% originally to the zoo.

  o **The That’s-Not-All Technique**
    - Influencer begins with inflated request and then decreases its apparent size by offering discounts or bonuses.
    - Burger- Booth at university to sell cupcakes.
      - 75% of people who were offered reduced price bought cupcakes compared to 44% who were only offered original price of 75 cents.
    - Better with lower cost items than higher.
      - 76% bought small box of chocolates but had no effect on large box.

- **Consistency and Commitment**
  
  o **Foot-In-The-Door**
    - Two step technique for inducing compliance, small request is made and then a second larger request is made.
    - 51% agreed to help with food drive when first asked to write a small letter.
    - Half of the people who had signed a petition or put a Keep California Beautiful sign on lawn agreed to put the big ugly sign on their lawn, 76% who had put the Be a Safe Driver agreed.
      - New self-image of being helpful later convinces them to allow huge sign to be put on lawn.
    - 46% of people who hadn’t been approached the day before donated to charity whereas 75% who had been asked for a small request before made a donation.
    - People who had been asked by first confederate agreed to watch luggage 58% of the time.
    - Self-rating helpfulness did not predict foot-in-the-door effect.

  o **Lowballing**
    - Two step technique in which influencer secures compliance with request but then increases size of that request by revealing hidden costs.
    - People feel committed to follow through.
    - Study- 56% students agreed to participate in research study at 7am when they were first just asked to participate and then were told it was early in the morning.
- Only works when same person asks for both requests.

- **Scarcity**
  - The limiting of people’s opportunity to act either in terms of time or number.
  - **Deadline**
    - Creating illusion of strict deadline so you have to act fast.
    - Pennebaker - Asked people in a bar to rate attractiveness of all people of same gender or opposite gender.
      - The attractiveness of opposite-gender people rose remarkably as the time remaining for meeting someone decreased.

- **Hard to Get**
  - People act faster because they’re afraid the object will soon be unavailable.
  - Study - Increasing appeal of an object.

- **The Serious Consequences of Compliance**
  - African American and Hispanic teenagers living in Harlem found guilty of rape and assault, 4 of 5 confessed to crime and later released from prison.
  - Can lead people to wrongly identify themselves as guilty.
  - 69% of participants admitted to pressing button when they actually didn’t.

- **What Factors Lead to Obedience?**
  - Bickman - Studied obedience by asking people on the street to comply with some type of request wearing ordinary clothes or guard uniform.
  - Many more people obeyed when person was wearing a uniform then wearing street clothes.

- **Factors That Increase Obedience**
  - Stanley Milgram - Studies of obedience.
    - 65% of participants fully obeyed order to the highest level of shocks (450).
  - **Person Factors**
    - People were not enjoying it.
    - Authoritarianism, people who are submissive and uncritical in acceptance of authority.
    - Found links between right wing authoritarianism and religious fundamentalism.
  - **Authority Figures**
    - Nature of authority influenced obedience, when it was run by ordinary person rate dropped to 20%.
  - **Procedure Factors**
    - Location of victim and experimenter.
    - When learner in the adjoining room, 65% reached 450 volts.
    - When teacher forced to place learners hand onto metal shock plate, dropped to 30%.
- When instructions done by telephone, 21%.
  - Didn’t have personal responsibility for victim.
  - Gradual escalation of shock levels.
    - People most likely to stop at 150 volts.
  - He couldn’t see the victim.

- **Ethical Issues**
  - Results unexpected.
  - Showed insight into obedience.
  - Generated debate about ethics.
  - Only 1% said they were sorry to have participated.

- **Replications of Milgram’s Study**
  - Meeus & Raajimakers- Replicated study.
    - Change from physical violence to psychological
    - None of the people continued to read stress-inducing statements in the control group (lacked authority) but 92% did so when experimenter prodded them along.
  - Jerry Burger- Replicated Milgram’s study.
    - Modified range of shocks to only reach 150 volts.
    - Informed them they could withdrawal from the study at any time and would still receive the money.
    - 70% delivered maximum shock.
    - People obey at same rate as they did a long time ago.

- **Real-World Examples of Obedience**
  - Jonestown Guyana, The People’s Temple is a cult-like organization.
    - Jim Jones set of cult to commit mass suicide.
    - 910 complied and killed themselves.
    - Jim Jones very charismatic, his targets were poor and uneducated, and they were in a place that was alien to them.
  - My Lai Massacre during Vietnam War & Al Qaeda all have things in common.
    - People are uncertain and isolated increasing their dependence on group.
    - Mindset of us versus them is created.
  - Nasra Hassan- What is frightening is not the abnormality of those who carry out suicide but their sheer normality
    - Suicide bombers are typically young men who often have a friend or relative killed by other side.

- **Strategies for Resisting Obedience**
  - No associations between defiance and personality factors or religious beliefs.
  - Knowing about the power of influence can help people stand up to pressure.
  - Having another person who disobeys with them help defy authority.
  - Pastors of a village in France gave sermon in response to Hitler’s request which initiated confrontation between members of Hitler’s Third Reich.
  - Obeying an authority can be good.
- How Does Culture Affect Social Influence?
  - People from individualistic cultures value conformity less than collectivist.
  - Kim & Markus- European Americans picked the more uncommon colour 74% of the time, whereas Chinese Americans only chose the unique colour about 24%.
  - **Conformity**
    - Main differences between individualistic and collectivist is the emphasis and value placed on conformity.
    - Individualistic- conformity seen as sign of weakness, admire those that are different from crowd.
    - Collectivist- conformity seen as sign of self-control and maturity-ordering exactly what you want is seen as rude.
    - In agricultural societies conformity is high, hunting and gathering societies conformity is low.
    - Bantu tribe of Zimbabwe conformed to Asch paradigm.
    - Japanese & Chinese are more likely to use midpoint of rating scales than Americans & Canadians.
    - Collectivists lest influences by question wording.
    - Study- Chinese & Americans asked how frequently they experience activities.
      - Americans were much more influenced in responses by frequency scale than Chinese- Chinese pay more attention to their behaviour and have a more accurate recall.
  - **Compliance**
    - Study- Asked Brazilian & American students how they would respond to different hypothetical situations involving helping others.
      - Brazilians reported sincere enjoyment to help whereas Americans didn’t.
      - Brazilians would do the helping behaviour in public or private whereas Americans more likely in public.
    - Study- Asked university students in Poland and America about their willingness to complete marketing survey without pay.
      - Their own history had had a greater impact on American’s compliance whereas other’s compliance had greater impact on Polish students.
    - Study- Korea & American participants images what they would say in different situations where they had to make a request.
      - Americans were kinder but Koreans were more responsive to specific features of the situation
      - Koreans usage of politeness strategies more sensitive to relational cues whereas American’s were more sensitive to message’s content.
  - **Obedience**
    - Study- Participants from US, Russia, and Japan read surveys that described different acts of obedient behaviour in the workplace.
      - Participants from collectivist cultures more likely to excuse the person for engaging in behaviour than North Americans.
- How Do Groups Influence Behaviour?

- **Intragroup Processes** → Happen within a group.
- **Intergroup Processes** → Happen between groups.

- **Turner** - A Group exists when two or more individuals perceive themselves to be members of the same social category.

- **Group** → Two or more people who have a common fate or some degree of interdependence who co-exist within a social structure or have face-to-face interactions.

- **Rupert Brown** - A group exists when two or more people define themselves as members of it and when its existence is recognized by at least one other.
  - Most parsimonious definition.

- **Study** - Examined the impact of group size on the size of tip people leave.
  - Single people are most generous and parties of four or more were the least generous.

- Support that is available to learners in a second-language group influences the learner’s competence in using the language and the person’s feelings of connectedness to the members of the language group.

- English speakers learning to speak Spanish who had feelings of low self-determined motivation tended to perceive themselves as being criticized by Spanish speakers.

- **Social Facilitation**
  - **Norman Triplett** - Observed that cyclists faster when they race with other cyclists.
    - Asked children to wind a piece of string on a fishing reel - children who performed the task in front of other children wound the string faster.
  - **Social Facilitation** → When people do better on a task in the presence of others than when alone.
  - **Social inhibition** → When performing a difficult task they do more slowly in front of other people.
  - Robert Zajonc’s theory of social facilitation states that the mere presence of other people increases our physiological arousal and enhances whatever a person’s dominant tendency is on a particular task.
    - Easy tasks the dominant response is the correct one - better performance
    - High arousal leads to poorer performance on tasks that are difficult.

- **Why Does the presence of others lead to arousal?**
  - **Mere Presence**
    - Mere presence of other people is energizing.
    - **Study** - Two mazes: simple & complex.
      - Cockroaches performed simple maze faster in the presence of other cockroaches than they did alone.
      - Presence of other cockroaches disrupted performance on complex maze.
o Evaluation Apprehension
  ▪ Social facilitation caused by people’s concern about being evaluated by the audience.
  ▪ Cottrell- Asked people to pronounce various nonsense words either: alone, in front of audience, or in front of blindfolded confederates.
    ▪ People most accurate in audience condition than in either alone or blindfolded.
    ▪ Presence of an evaluating audience is stronger influence than mere presence of someone.
  ▪ Study- People took math test while either a friend or a stranger watched.
    ▪ Made more errors and took longer while friend was present.
  ▪ Teams play badly when they must play a decisive game at home.

o Distraction
  ▪ Presence of others is distracting.
  ▪ If performing an easy task, it’s not a problem, but distraction impairs performance on difficult tasks.
  ▪ Study- Asked people to perform either a difficult or easy task.
    ▪ Took less time for people to complete easy task when audience was present than when alone.
    ▪ Took more time for participants to complete difficult ask when audience was present than when alone.
  ▪ Markus- Argues that evaluation apprehension did not lead to social facilitation effect, because in the incidental audience condition the confederate was in no position to evaluate participant yet the same effect was found as in the audience condition.
  ▪ Bernard Guerin- Concluded that mere presence of others produces social facilitation/inhibition effects only when presence of others produces some sense of uncertainty in the participant.

• Social Loafing
  o Social Loafing→ A group-produced reduction in individual output on tasks where contributions are pooled.
  o Study- Asked to clap and cheer loudly in soundproof room.
    ▪ Made the most noise when they were alone and least noise when in a group of 6.
  o Collective Effort Model→ People motivated to exert effort in group tasks only when they believe their distinct efforts are identifiable and that their efforts will make a difference in the groups success and will experience positive outcomes.
  o Identifiable Contributions
    ▪ Whether people believe that their own contributions will be recognized will influence whether or not they social loaf.
    ▪ Don’t socially loaf when their own outputs will be evaluated.
  o Contributions’ Impact
    ▪ Whether you believe that your efforts will have an impact on groups’ performance.
Feel they can make a unique contribution to group effort.

How Do Intragroup Processes Influence Decision-Making?

- **Group Polarization**
  - Group Polarization→ Occurs when the initial tendencies of group members becomes more extreme following a group discussion- toward a more extreme version of the group’s initial individual views.
  - Risky Shift→ Can lead groups to make riskier decisions than individuals would make when alone.

- Why does group discussion lead groups to polarize in their views?
  - **Hear More Persuasive Arguments**
    - During discussions people hear more persuasive arguments that support their own views.
    - Likely to hear a larger number of persuasive arguments because they deliberately look for views supporting their position.
    - Study- Asked managers to read case about company deciding whether to invest in considerable sum in starting production in developing company.
      - Groups tat consisted of individuals with the same view were more interested in receiving articles that supported their decision.
      - Groups that consisted of individuals with more discrepant views showed less interest in receiving articles that supported their eventual decision.

  - **Learn Group Norms**
    - Lead us to more accurately assess the norms of our group.
    - Come to express even more extreme attitudes as a way of demonstrating that our views are strong.
    - Study- Asked people to privately rate attractiveness of men in 3 conditions: positive corroboration (agreed with participants views), contradiction condition (disagreed with views), and control condition (confederates didn’t provide responses aloud).
      - Positive condition people significantly increased their ratings when asked a second time.
      - Contradiction condition people significantly decreased their ratings.
      - Control condition, peoples ratings also increased but less strongly than in positive.

  - **Groupthink**
    - Groupthink→ An excessive tendency among group members to seek concurrence, consensus, and unanimity, as opposed to making the best decision.
    - People tend to ignore or stifle discrepant views.
    - Might have contributed to the worldview of some Arab rulers and U.S decision to invade Iraq.

  - **Overestimate Invulnerability and Morality**
• More likely to occur when groups overestimate their invulnerability and morality.
• Escalation of Vietnam War was the belief that democracy was inherited better than communism.
  o Closed-Mindedness
    • Closed-mindedness means when group members won’t hear dissenting views from out-group members and any information received is dismissed as unimportant.
  o Pressure Toward Uniformity
    • Pressure toward uniformity is especially common among groups that are highly cohesive.
    • Cohesiveness can hurt performance such as when creative ideas are needed.
    • Study- Students asked to recommend solution for a case study in automobile production.
      ▪ Highly cohesive groups made somewhat higher quality decisions than non-cohesive groups under conditions of no threat but much lower quality decisions under conditions of high threat.
  • What are critical elements to group think?
    ▪ Lack of caution and preference for risk associated with perception of exaggerated capability which leads to critical decisions crystallizing around a decision likely to fail.

• Solutions to Groupthink
  o First, group members and leaders need to encourage open contributions from all members as emphasize importance of open criticism.
  o Groups with a norm of engaging in constructive criticism make better decisions.
  o Second, groups should deliberately recruit diverse members for a broader range of opinions.
  o Antonio- Examined the content of group discussions between groups consisting of all white European students in U.S vs. White European students and African American students.
    ▪ Presence of African American student in group led to greater integration of different perspectives and viewpoints.
  o Third, training a person in the group about dangers of biased group decision making can be effective.

- How Do Leaders Guide and Motivate The Group?
  • Study- Examined characteristic of effective group leaders.
    ▪ People oriented towards achievement and interpersonal dynamics given highest scores and took pride in accomplishments, had high self-confidence, and rated higher on objective behavioral measures.
  • Trait or “Great Person” Model
    ▪ Describes good leaders based on specific personality traits such as intelligence, dominance, and extroversion.
- More effective on diverse tasks such as artistic, logical/spatial, social, and creative.
- Study- On leadership effectiveness in military cadets.
  - Individuals who were high in leadership efficacy were rated higher in leadership potential by supervisors and peers.
  - Measures in traits indicating dominance in recruits predicted evaluations of recruits nine months later.
  - Internal locus of control.
- **Transactional Versus Transformational Leaders**
  - **Transactional**→ Reward desirable behaviour by group members and act once mistakes occur.
  - **Transformational**→ Foster trust among group members, build identification with excitement about higher-level group goals, examine new approaches for solving problems- tend to have better performance because it created intrinsic motivation.
- **Contingency Model**
  - **Contingency Model**→ Emphasizes the importance of having a match between the leader’s specific traits and the demands of a particular situation.
  - Some people are task oriented- focus on organizing projects and good at keeping others focused- Lester B. Pearson.
  - People are people-oriented or relationship-oriented- focus on building supportive, caring, and democratic environment, seek out feedback and facilitate teamwork.
- **Research Focus on Gender: Women as Leaders**
  - Men and women in managerial positions show similar leadership styles.
  - Study- Male-dominated workplaces show that men and women both have a masculine leadership style.
    - Women more likely to reward subordinates, invest time in team building.
    - Men tend to act more autocratic or directive style whereas women tend to act in a more democratic or participatory style.
  - Behaviours that are successful for men in the workplace are not equally successful for women.
    - Modesty and lack of self-promotion hypothesized to perpetuate lack of female involvement, but self-promotion is viewed as less positive attribute in women.
  - Theories of leadership in North America suffer from **ethnocentrism**→ The belief that one’s cultural values are shared by others.

- **How Do Groups Handle Social Dilemmas?**
  - Study- Asked to play a game in which they could win money.
    - People more likely to cooperate when they were playing the community game then when playing wall street game because labels create expectations about how our partner will behave in situations.
    - **Social Dilemma**→ Situation in which what is best for the individual, or one group, is in conflict with what is best for another individual or group.
**Types of Social Dilemmas**

- **Common Resource Dilemmas**
  - **Common Resource Dilemma** ➔ Type of social dilemma in which a resource such as water, land, fish, can be reduced and even eliminated by overuse.
  - If everyone chooses to ignore a water restriction the water could run out which is referred to as tragedy of the commons.
  - Study- Demonstration of this in action with bowl of nuts and told them nuts would double after 10 seconds.
    - 65% of group never got passed 10 seconds.

- **Public Goods Dilemma**
  - **Public Goods Dilemma** ➔ A public good or service needs to be sustained over time, each person can take freely of the resource but they must decide whether and what to contribute to the common pool of resources.
    - People who need blood but have never donated.
    - Don’t contribute to Cancer research but could benefit them in the future.

- **Prisoner’s Dilemma**
  - **Prisoner’s Dilemma** ➔ Refers to the situation in which two people may choose to either cooperate or compete with one another.
  - Best option is for both people to cooperate and take the shorter sentence.
  - Best outcome for each individual leads to worst outcome for the other.
  - Study- Examined individual performance in social dilemma where they had to decide how best to invest an amount of money.
    - Three factors will facilitate group performance
      - 1. Individual and group goals should be compatible.
      - 2. There should be commitment to group goals.
      - 3. Belief that cooperation leads to positive outcomes should be fostered.
    - Participants in larger groups reported higher self-serving personal goals, lower levels of commitment, and lower levels of group expectations than people in smaller groups.

**Solutions to Social Dilemmas**

- Involve a conflict between what is best for a person and what is best for his or her group.

  - **Regulate Use of Resources.**
    - Set up formal way to regulate use of limited resources by creating structural system.
    - Study- Assigned people to three person or twelve person group.
      - People admitted to taking more than their fair share but underestimated the proportion of the resource as a whole that they had taken.
- **Use Open Communication.**
  - Face-to-face.
  - Helped increase cooperative behaviours and leads groups to see others as wanting to cooperate and enables people to make commitments.
  - Study- Found repeating one’s intention to cooperate in prisoner’s dilemma led to more cooperation, greater liking, and more trust.
  - Can lead group members to develop an internalized personal norm for behaving cooperatively.

- **Activate Altruistic Motives**
  - Study- Found that people consume water in variable rate system (pay per use) no difference between people connected to community and those who don’t feel connected.
    - In fixed rate, those with low identification used more water.

- **Create Small, Connected Groups**
  - This reduced competition and increases cooperation.
  - People in small groups are less selfish.
  - Makin a superordinate group identity salient, creating a focus on what all the people have in common.
  - Divide the community into smaller subgroups.

- **Create Consequences for Competition**
  - Tit-for-tat strategy → Involves starting with cooperation and then doing whatever your partner does on each interaction.

  - **Research Focus on Neuroscience: How Cooperation Looks in the Brain**
    - Study- Examined areas of the brain activated when people are cooperating with one another.
      - When both participants cooperated the brain areas associated with reward processing were activated.

- **How Does Culture Relate to Intragroup Processes**
  - Examine impact of priming different types of cultural symbols on cooperation in a prisoner’s dilemma task.
  - People were more likely to cooperate with friends when Chinese cultural knowledge was activated than American.
  - People showed low level of cooperation with strangers after both Chinese and American culture priming.

- **Social Loafing**
  - Experimental settings often used trivial tasks with no consequences outside the experiment and the experimental groups themselves didn’t have a strong group identity.
  - In collectivist cultures individuals may be particularly mutated to have their group seem competent.
  - Study- Examined the impact of culture on social loafing.
- American students in grade nine had fewer errors when working on the task alone than when working in pairs.
- Chinese students in grade nine had fewer errors when working on the task in pairs.
  - Found less loafing among people with a more interdependent self-construal.
  - Earley- Found that individualists work harder on their own but collectivists work harder when they were working with someone from an in-group member.
  - Study- Examined the relation between social loafing and the cultural dimensions of individualism-collectivism power distance.
    - Found the predicted effect for collectivism, but also found that power distance predicted more loafing in situations where there was a temptation to loaf.
    - People who are high on power distance have an inclination to load unless there is someone higher in the hierarchy instructing them not to.

- **Social Dilemmas**
  - Study- Examined rates of cooperation among group in Japan and US.
    - Groups of Japanese decision-makers agreed to harvest less and more equally allocate resources than groups of American decision makers.
    - Americans expected others to act more competitively than the Japanese did.
- **Introduction**

  - **Intergroup Relations** The way in which people in groups perceive, think about, feel about, and act toward people in different groups.
    - Attacks by skinheads in eastern Europe on Roma gypsies.
    - Representing student body speaking to chairperson of psychology board.

- **How do Different Theories Explain Intergroup Relations?**

  - Protest against G20 summit in Toronto, used tear gas and rubber bullets.
  - Many factors that influence people’s behaviour in crowd’s.
    - Each individual’s motivation and goals in being part of the crowd.
    - Presence of others who share those goals.
    - Presence of others who oppose those goals.
    - Cue present in the environment.
    - Individuals perception of injustice being carried out against their group.

- **Early Research and Theories of Crowd Behaviour**

  - Gustav Le Bon – Argued that when people become part of the crowd they descend several rungs on the ladder of civilization.
    - Believed people go mad.
    - Three characteristics associated with process that seem to be specific to crowds:
      - **Anonymity** People in crowd become anonymous and less responsible for behaviours.
      - **Suggestibility** People’s social constraints loosened, when someone begins to act on aggressive impulses others copy due to heightened suggestibility and give in to their own urges to act aggressively.
      - **Contagion** Irrationality of violence contagious and sweeps through crowd.
    - Him and McDougall believe that crowds are bad and the collective mind makes people so irrational bad things and must be controlled.
  - Floyd Allport – Argued there is no psychology of groups which is not essentially and entirely a psychology of individuals.
    - Individual behaves in a crowd just as they would alone.
    - Believed crowds are bad as well.
  - Italian Police Officers’ Perception of Crowd Conflict
    - Based on social identity model.
    - Crowd recognize that everyone shares common social identity base don intergroup relations with out group.
    - Crowd conflict occurs when:
      - Physical force is used and police deem it necessary but people don’t.’
      - When crowd feels it has power to use collective force to resist police.
    - When police officers observe the negativity view of the crowd this leads to bad policing and negative attributions of crowds.

- **Deindividuation**
Zimbardo- When people are in large groups, less likely to follow normal rules of behaviour.

- **Deindividuation**
  - Occurs when one loses awareness of oneself as distinct individual and feels less compelled to follow normal rules of behaviour.
  - More likely to occur in group settings and contributed to highly destructive actions: lynching, riots, and vandalism.

What factors leads to individuation?

- **Anonymity**
  - Each individual less distinguishable.
  - Enhanced in situations where people wear uniforms or paint their faces.
  - Study- Stanford Prison Experiment
    - 9 guards 9 prisoners.
    - Participants quickly assumed the roles they were given; guards acted aggressively and prisoners were submissive.
    - Terminated after 6 days.
  - Study- Found that female students who wore white coats and hoods similar to KKK gave longer shocks to participant wearing their own clothes
  - Study- Johnson & Downing assigned participants to 1 of 4 conditions: individuation (large name tag), deindividuation (small name tag), prosocial cue (nurse coat), and antisocial cue (KKK coat).
    - Those who wore nurse coat administered fewer shocks to people than people wearing KKK.
    - Deindividuation increased increase prosocial response when prosocial cues were present.
    - Deindividuation did not increase antisocial behaviour.
    - Deindividuation doesn’t always increase antisocial behaviour, if there are positive cues it can increase prosocial behaviour.

- **Accountability**
  - Whether a person expects to be held responsible for their actions- feel less responsible for actions in larger groups.
  - As size of group increases so does level of violence.
  - Study- Zimbardo abandoned two cars.
    - Car in Bronx (anonymity ruled) was vandalized sooner than car in California.

- **Decrease in Self-Awareness**
  - People in group have less sense of themselves as distinct individuals leading people to be focused on matching their behaviour to normal standards.
  - Study- Told they need to help with either a boring task or a rewarding task.
• 2/3rds of them chose to flip coin to see who would do what.
• When participated who chose to flip coin did so in front of a mirror, results became fair.
  ▪ Le Bon believed that people regress to more primitive state (mad).
  ▪ Allport believed people become selfish grasping individual they really are (bad).
• **Social Identity Theory**
  o Intergroup dimension is often overlooked.
  o Stephen Reicher- Argued that many crowd situations involve at least two groups- not simply mad or bad it is an interaction.
    ▪ People do not lose identity they just assume a new social identity.
    ▪ In case of G20 they were both exposed to same environment, group membership determined by behaviour they engaged in.
    ▪ The crowd doesn’t exist in isolation.
    ▪ Important to examine crowds from an intergroup perspective.
  o **Social Identity Theory**→ Each person strives to enhance his or her self-esteem, composed of both personal identity and social identity.
    ▪ Ex. Indian Canadians see success of comedian Russell Peters.
    ▪ Threats to one’s self-esteem increase need for in-group favoritism.
    ▪ If status of group is being threatened, status of individual within group being threatened, or small groups→ in group favoritism and out group derogation is more likely to occur.
  o **Status of the In-Group**
    ▪ Groups threatened with inferiority take particular pleasure at another group’s failure.
    ▪ Dutch soccer fans who had thought about how poorly their team did experienced greater pleasure when German’s lost.
  ▪ **Environmental Connections: Social Identity and Environmental Activism**
    ▪ Positive correlations between social identity and the three components of environmental behaviour (consumer behaviour, willingness to sacrifice, and environmental citizenship) indirect relationships.
    ▪ Findings also indicated that social identity of being an environmental activist most strongly related to willingness to protest or read publications written by environmental groups and less strongly related to consumer behaviour and a willingness to pay more for environmental products.
  o **Status Within the Group**
    ▪ Those who have marginal status in in-group are likely to derogate out-group members.
    ▪ Study- Men interacted with virtual partner who was either traditional or feminist.
      ▪ Men sent more and ore offensive pornographic images to feminist than traditional.
- **Group Size**
  - Smaller the group the greater the tendency for people to be loyal to it.

- *Research Focus on Gender: The Dynamics of Group Behaviour Based on the Ratio of Males and Females of a Group*
  - Rosabeth Moss Kanter - Four types of proportions for group composition: uniform groups (all one gender), skewed groups (predominately one gender with few of opposite), titled groups (majority of one versus minority of other), and balanced (equitable members of both gender).
  - Three perceptual phenomena that influenced group dynamics: visibility, polarization, and assimilation.
    - Visibility high for women.
    - Limited number of token women prevents men’s perception of in-group commonalities.
  - Greater polarization and assimilation of women than men.