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WHEN DOES THE SELF-REGULATION OF PREJUDICE APPLY?
INTEGRATING MOTIVATION TO CONTROL PREJUDICE
AND SOCIAL NORM THEORY

Thesis under the direction of Catherine E. Seta, Ph.D., Professor of Psychology.

Previous research shows individuals with internal motivation to control prejudice engage in the successful self-regulation of prejudice due to egalitarian personal standards (Legault et al., 2007). The literature on Social Norm Theory, however, suggests prejudice suppression towards various outgroups reflects social norms prescribing and proscribing prejudice (Crandall, Eshleman, & O’Brien, 2002). In the following thesis, we argue that outgroup protective status moderates the relationship between internal motivation and the self-regulation of prejudice. That is, internal motivation is not a generalized egalitarian worldview, but rather social norm dependent, and therefore, results in the initiation of self-regulatory processes only in the presence of normatively protected outgroups but not normatively nonprotected outgroups. Participants of high and low internal motivation were led to believe that their responses on items regarding either a normatively protected outgroup (i.e., Blacks or Jews) or normatively nonprotected outgroup (i.e., Arabs or Atheists) could be used as a measure of subtle prejudice. In addition, some participants received false feedback indicating high levels of prejudice, whereas other participants did not receive prejudice-related feedback. Although results did provide support for the role of social norms in the self-regulation of prejudice, the current research failed to show the self-regulation of prejudice is dependent on both internal motivation and social norms.
INTRODUCTION

The aim of this research is to integrate the research on individual differences in the self-regulation of prejudice with that of Social Norm Theory. The literature on individual differences in the motivation to control prejudice suggests that those who are internally motivated to control prejudice value and pursue egalitarian goals to be nonprejudiced through the process of self-regulation (Legault et al., 2007). This internalization of egalitarian values suggests that prejudice against any outgroup should be adverted and regulated. In contrast, the literature on the influence of social norms on the expression and suppression of prejudice suggests that while some outgroups receive protective status against prejudice, other outgroups are not protected (Crandall et al., 2002). That is, for some outgroups, social norms proscribe prejudice, and therefore, it normatively unacceptable to express prejudice towards these outgroups. For other outgroups, however, social norms prescribe prejudice, and as such, it is normatively acceptable to express prejudice towards these outgroups. Thus, the expression and suppression of prejudice towards various outgroups is dependent on social norms.

We will describe Montieth’s (1993) model for the self-regulation of prejudice based on Gray’s (1982) behavioral inhibition system (BIS) that serves as the primary theoretical framework for understanding the suppression of prejudice. Then, we will discuss the assumptions concerning the role of individual differences in motivation to control prejudice (Plant & Devine, 1998) on self-regulatory processes as informed by Higgin’s (1987) Self-Determination Theory (SDT). Then, we will discuss the role of social norms for designating which outgroups are and are not protected from prejudiced
responding (Crandall et al., 2002). Finally, we will attempt to integrate these seemingly opposing areas of prejudice research to make predictions concerning the likelihood of individuals engaging in self-regulatory processes across outgroups of differing normative protective status.

In preview, we argue for an interaction between motivation to control prejudice and social norms on the self-regulation of prejudice for a given outgroup. In keeping with Crandall et al. (2002), my perspective is that internal motivation to control prejudice is not a generalized egalitarian worldview, but rather dependent on social norms, and therefore, results in the initiation of self-regulatory processes only in the presence of normatively protected outgroups but not normatively nonprotected outgroups. That is, for individuals motivated to control prejudice and for target outgroups that are normatively protected, individuals will engage in the self-regulation of prejudice. For target outgroups that are not normatively protected, however, motivation to control prejudice will be less likely to result in the activation of self-regulatory processes. Thus, in my view, effective self-regulation of prejudice requires both the presence of prescriptive group social norms and internalized standards. Before discussing this perspective in more depth, we will describe the theoretical perspectives and review in brief the literature dealing with the self-regulation of prejudice.

The Self-Regulation of Prejudice

Beginning with Devine’s (1989) classic research on automatic and controlled processes inherent in the expression and suppression of prejudice, dual process models of prejudice have been predominate in social psychological analyses of stereotyping and prejudice. The assumptions underlying the dual process model of prejudice are that even
though low and high prejudiced individuals have differing explicit beliefs regarding prejudice, both low and high prejudiced individuals show automatic implicit bias regarding target outgroups due to socialization processes that repeatedly pair outgroups with their associated stereotypes (e.g., Devine, 1989; Lepore & Brown, 1997). Automatic bias occurs because outgroup members are associated with a network of automatic cognition and affect that can be triggered in the presence of outgroup-relevant stimuli. For example, a photo of a Black face may activate Black race-related stereotypes, such as lazy, poor, unintelligent, and hostile. Once activated, these networks of associations then influence subsequent cognition, affect, and behavior, as revealed by responses on implicit measures (Quillian, 2006). Consistent with the dual process model of prejudice, Devine (1989) found that not only were both low- and high-prejudiced participants equally knowledgeable about cultural Black stereotypes, they also both demonstrated the effects of automatic stereotype activation. That is, after being subliminally exposed to Black stereotype-related primes, both low and high prejudiced participants interpreted ambiguous actions in a vignette as more hostile than participants not subliminally primed with Black stereotypes. This suggests that the Black-relevant stereotype of hostility was not only automatically activated, but also affected subsequent judgments, regardless of explicit levels of prejudice. This effect is argued to primarily occur through implicit prejudices’ longer and more frequently activated learning history compared to the more newly formed explicit beliefs denouncing implicit prejudice for low-prejudiced individuals. Despite automatic prejudice, many people are motivated to suppress the expression of prejudice, and thus employ control processes to override implicit negative attitudes toward outgroups.
To understand how self-regulatory processes operate in the context of prejudice, Monteith (1993) proposed the Self-Regulation of Prejudice (SRP) model adapted from Gray’s (1982) Behavioral Inhibition Systems model. According to Gray’s (1982) Behavioral Inhibition Systems model, self-regulatory control processes for behavioral inhibition are activated when there is an unexpected and aversive mismatch between intended and actual behavior. This results in increased arousal and interrupted responding, or behavioral inhibition. Situational stimuli accompanying the behavioral discrepancy are then flagged as cues for potential future erroneous responding for which enhanced attention and detection are subsequently made. That is, an association is made between situational stimuli and the discrepant response that led to the aversive event, which is then used to inhibit future discrepant responding. Thus, future encounters with these cues should result in slower, more careful responding in order to override responses that previously resulted in the aversive discrepancy.

Monteith’s (1993) extension of this model to the self-regulation of prejudice assumes that those who have internalized egalitarian values will be motivated to engage in the self-regulation of prejudice because of the accompanying experience of self-directed negative affect, or guilt, when violating their nonprejudiced standards. High prejudiced individuals with less well internalized nonprejudiced standards, however, will be less likely to experience guilt following violations of these standards, and therefore, less likely to engage in self-regulatory processes. Thus, self-regulatory processes are activated when low prejudiced individuals experience a mismatch between their generalized egalitarian standards and prejudicial behavior. This mismatch is assumed to
initiate inhibitory processes that are directed toward avoiding violations of their standards (i.e., prejudicial behavior).

If well practiced, this self-regulatory process of behavioral inhibition in the presence of prejudice-relevant cues may become automatic. Maddux et al. (2005) examined the moderating role of motivation to control prejudice on the effects of negative context on automatic race bias with the Implicit Association Test (IAT) using photos of Black and White faces superimposed onto either a jail or a church background. Results showed that when Black targets were presented in negative jail contexts, those low in motivation to control prejudice replicated previous findings (e.g., Barden et al., 2004; Wittenbrink, Park, & Judd, 2001), demonstrating that negative contexts facilitate automatic Black race bias on implicit measures. In contrast, those high in motivation to control prejudice actually showed outgroup bias in favor of Blacks over Whites in this negative context. Examination of response latencies for high motivation to control prejudice participants revealed a slowing of reaction time to the Black-negative word pairing when presented in a negative jail context. This suggests that negative contexts act as cues for potential prejudice for high motivated to control prejudice participants, resulting in the activation of the self-regulatory process of prejudice inhibition. In addition, because the IAT reflects automatic, implicit bias and cannot be successfully circumvented by participants’ effortful, controlled responding, these results support the automaticity of the self-regulation of prejudice.

However, effective regulation of prejudice is not certain – even low prejudice individuals exhibit prejudice (e.g., Plant & Devine, 1998). Plant and Devine (1998) argue individual differences in prejudice reflect a motivational state, which allows for the
possibility of inconsistent prejudice-related behavior in situations where prejudice is
difficult to control. This is in contrast to previous conceptions of individual differences in
prejudice that argues prejudice is a more static personality trait, such as social dominance
orientation, which argues prejudice stems from a generalized attitude promoting
intergroup hierarchies that rank outgroups from superior to inferior (Pratto et al., 1994).
Discrepant responding in which individuals sometimes respond with more prejudice than
their egalitarian standards permit maps well onto dual process models of prejudice that
distinguishes between implicit and explicit prejudice (Devine, 1989). Implicit prejudice is
characterized by automatic, unintentional activation of stereotype-consistent cognitions
and affect. In contrast, explicit prejudice represents controlled, deliberate, and evaluative
judgments of stereotype-related cognition and affect.

Individual Differences and Motivational factors in the Self-Regulation of Prejudice

Compunction. Monteith’s (1993) model for the self-regulation of prejudice
predicts that violations of internalized, personal standards should result in experiences of
self-directed affective compunction, or guilt, when individuals become aware of engaging
in a response that is discrepant with their standards. Consistent with this theory, Plant and
Devine (1998) asked participants to respond to various race-related scenarios from the
position of personal standards for how they should respond, societal standards for how
they should respond, and how they would actually respond in a given situation. A sample
scenario is as follows: “Imagine that you saw a young black woman at the grocery store
with four small children. Your initial thought should be ‘How typical.’” Participants then
rated how acceptable this response would be according to personal and societal standards
as well as ratings of how likely they would actually respond in this way. Prejudice
discrepancies were indicated when participants indicated that they would be more likely to respond in a prejudiced manner than was acceptable from either personal or societal standards. Results showed violations of personal standards resulted in affective reactions of guilt only for those internally motivated to control prejudice. In contrast, violations of imposed societal standards should result in other-directed affective experiences of threat. That is, when nonprejudiced values are not well internalized, individuals may rely on society’s standards regarding prejudice. Because society’s standards are not well internalized, violating these standards is accompanied by the threat of public sanction rather than self-directed guilt. As such, Plant and Devine (1998) found that violations of societal standards, which are less relevant to those primarily internally motivated to control prejudice participants’ underlying motivation to control prejudice (i.e., not based on concerns with how others will judge expressions of prejudice), resulted in less affective reactions of threat than those externally motivated to control prejudice. Given the finding that only internally motivated individuals experience compunction following discrepant prejudiced responding, along with the theorized role of compunction in the self-regulation of prejudice, it follows that only individuals internally motivated and not primarily externally motivated to control prejudice should engage in successful regulatory control whenever a discrepancy is detected. This assumption provides the basis for the primary predictions of the present research. Although Plant and Devine (1998) created a task in which naturally-occurring prejudice discrepancies were brought to the attention of participants, the current study used false prejudice-related feedback to ensure stronger manipulation and control. Even though the methods are different, the underlying premise is the same – individuals must be aware that they have made a
prejudice discrepancy (either naturally or via deception) in order to initiate the self-regulation of prejudice.

**Response inhibition.** Presumably, self-directed compunction is aversive enough to motivate the inhibition of subsequent, potentially discrepant responding. Monteith (1993) demonstrated the implications of discrepancy awareness on future self-regulatory responding. In this research, Monteith provided false feedback to low and high prejudiced participants that indicated their responses revealed subtle anti-gay bias, while other participants received nonprejudice-related discrepancy feedback. Following false feedback that subjects responded in a prejudicial manner, only low prejudiced participants initiated inhibitory processes, as indicated by a slowing of responding on a subsequent task. That is, low prejudiced participants who received false feedback took longer to read an essay explaining why individuals exhibit prejudice towards gays compared to high prejudiced participants who received false feedback. Because control processes require an interruption in behavior, or behavioral inhibition of prepotent responses, and an increase in attention allocation, slower responding on subsequent tasks presumably reflects increased control processes in order to override further automatic discrepant responding.

It is important to note that Monteith’s (1993) findings concerning the self-regulation of prejudice for internally motivated individuals was observed in regards to a relatively normatively protected outgroup (i.e., gays; Franco & Maass, 1999; West & Hewstone, 2011). However, internal motivation to control prejudice and subsequent self-regulation should extend to all stigmatized outgroups, if it is the case that such responses arise from egalitarian standards (Plant & Devine, 1998). So, the application of
internalized standards should not be applied differentially across outgroups. In fact, low prejudice towards one outgroup is correlated with low prejudice toward other outgroups (Pettigrew, 1960). As will be discussed in more detail below, this reasoning forms the basis of the present research. In order to provide a context in which this assumption’s implications can be understood, contrasting this view with the premises of Social Norm Theory is necessary.

**The Influence of Social Norms on the Expression and Suppression of Prejudice**

Social Norm Theory (Sherif & Sherif, 1953) assumes that social norms will determine which outgroups are considered relevant for protection against prejudice. That is, social norms dictate that some groups are appropriate targets of prejudice while others are not. Evidence for the effects of social norms on the expression and suppression of prejudice comes from Crandall et al. (2002), who demonstrated that not only are outgroups rated differentially on the normative appropriateness for the expression of prejudice (ranging from, according to social norms, “It’s definitely okay to have negative feelings about this group” to “It’s definitely not okay to have negative feelings about this group”), but these ratings were also positively correlated with participants’ own personal indications of prejudice towards these outgroups, as reported on feeling “thermometer” scales. In addition, the acceptability of prejudice towards various outgroups was also correlated with the acceptability of discrimination in the areas of dating, housing, and employment. These findings suggest that while some outgroups are normatively protected from prejudice, other outgroups do not receive this same protection. Additional evidence for the differences in protective status across outgroups is seen in Franco and Maass’s (1999) research on the social acceptability of prejudice. Here, participants rated
how acceptable it was to express negative attitudes towards different outgroups. Results revealed Jews and Blacks received normative protection against prejudice, whereas Muslims did not.

Taking Social Norm Theory one step further to take into account individual differences in the expression of prejudice, Crandall et al. (2002) questioned whether prejudice suppression scales, such as Dunton and Fazio’s (1997) Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions (MCPR), were truly measuring genuine egalitarian standards or merely measuring sensitivity to social norms proscribing prejudice. To disentangle these possibilities, Crandall et al. (2002) developed a Suppression of Prejudice Scale (SPS), which includes endorsements of items, such as “When I meet a person of another race or ethnicity, I try to avoid thinking about their race” and “I don’t want to appear racist or sexist, even to myself.” It is argued that if prejudice suppression scales are measuring genuine internal motivation to control prejudice, then high suppressors, as measured by the SPS, should suppress prejudice against all outgroups, not just normatively protected outgroups. If, however, these scales are measuring internalization of social norms regarding prejudice expression and suppression, then high suppressors should endorse low levels of normatively appropriate prejudice toward protected outgroups and high levels of normatively appropriate prejudice toward nonprotected outgroups. Consistent with this latter interpretation, results showed that high suppressors of prejudice were avid norm followers, guided by societal norms concerning to which outgroups their egalitarian behavior should apply.

The aim of the current research is to extend Crandall et al.’s (2002) findings to the self-regulation of prejudice. That is, individuals with high internal motivation to control
prejudice should exhibit prejudice self-regulation only when social norms proscribe prejudice but not when social norms prescribe prejudice. In addition to extending Crandall et al.’s (2002) findings to the self-regulation of prejudice, the current research intends to address a limitation of the previous research. A potential problem with Crandall et al.’s (2002) conclusion that prejudice suppression scales are not actually measuring internal motivation to control prejudice, but rather, an internalization of social norms regarding prejudice, is their use of Dunton and Fazio’s (1997) Motivation to Control Prejudiced Responses instead of Plant and Devine’s (1998) Internal Motivation Scale. Dunton and Fazio’s scale simply divides participants into either high or low motivation to control prejudiced responses without taking into account their underlying motivation – external or internal – for controlling prejudice. Crandall et al.’s (2002) argument is that prejudice suppression scales do not measure internalization of generalized egalitarianism; however, the scales the authors use to test this are not specific to internal motivations, and are thus confounded with external motivation to control prejudice, which by definition are influenced by social norms. Many items on the Suppression of Prejudice Scale, such as “I won’t use an ethnic slur, even if it pops into my head,” would reasonably be endorsed by both internally and externally motivated to control prejudice participants. Even more problematic, Dunton and Fazio’s scale measures how much motivation to control prejudiced responses participants have, such that individuals who are high internal-high external, as measured on Plant and Devine’s Motivation to Control Prejudice scale, actually score higher than those who are high internal-low external (Plant & Devine, 1998). Given this, the finding that “high suppressors” are influenced by social norms regarding prejudice expression and
suppression does not seem especially surprising. Thus, the current research will use Plant and Devine’s (1998) Internal Motivation Scale to draw clearer conclusions regarding whether internal motivation to control prejudice is dependent on social norms for the self-regulation of prejudice. This scale has been shown to measure internal motivation to control prejudice independent of external motivational factors and taps into internalized egalitarian standards (e.g., Plant & Devine, 1998).

In contrast to Plant and Devine (1998), who would argue that individuals with high internal motivation would self-regulate prejudice only when violating personal prejudice standards, Crandall et al. (2002) would argue that these high internally motivated individuals have internalized the social norms of their ingroup, thus regulating prejudice only when violating societal norms. This is a revised view of Sherif and Sherif’s (1953) strict version of Social Norm Theory, which would argue that all individuals belonging to the ingroup are concerned with conforming to social norms of their group. Crandall et al. (2002) presented high and low suppressors with the Acceptance of Racist Conduct Scale (ARC; Blanchard, Lilly, & Vaughn, 1991), in which the social norm was manipulated to either condemn or condone racist speech. In the condemn condition, participants were shown four previous participants’ supposed responses to this scale, which indicated a social norm condemning racist conduct. In the condone condition, participants were shown four previous participants’ supposed responses, which were consistent with a social norm condoning racist conduct. Participants were then asked to respond to the scale themselves. Results showed that in the condemn condition, level of suppression and tolerance of racist conduct was strongly negatively correlated (mean $r = -.47$); however, in the condone condition, this
relationship reverses (mean $r = .34$). That is, high suppressors are less tolerant of racist
cconduct than low suppressors when social norms proscribe prejudice; however, high
suppressors are more tolerant of racist conduct than low suppressors when social norms
prescribe prejudice. Thus, the expression and suppression of prejudice for high
suppressors was dependent on social norms. It is reasonable to assume from Crandall et
al. (2002) that awareness of violations of social norms, rather than egalitarian personal
standards, is important for the initiation of the self-regulation of prejudice for high
internally motivated individuals.
PRESENT RESEARCH

Previous findings from the literature on individual differences in prejudice suggest internal motivation to control prejudice is based on egalitarian standards, which leads to the successful self-regulation of prejudice (see Figure 1). In contrast, Sherif and Sherif’s (1953) strict version of Social Norm Theory suggests the self-regulation of prejudice for all individuals is dependent on social norms (see Figure 2). The purpose of the current research is to integrate these opposing perspectives into a more contextual understanding of the roles internal motivation to control prejudice and social norms play in the self-regulation of prejudice. In review, Monteith (1993) showed individuals with high internal motivation to control prejudice engaged in self-regulatory processes following false prejudice-related feedback indicating violations of internalized egalitarian standards. In contrast, Social Norm Theory (Sherif & Sherif, 1953) suggests control of prejudice is dependent on social norms prescribing and proscribing prejudice.

To test the dependent nature of motivation to control prejudice on social norms for the self-regulation of prejudice in the current research, low and high internally motivated participants received either false feedback indicating high levels of prejudice or no prejudice level feedback while responding to a task described as a measure of subtle bias. The self-regulation of prejudice was measured by time latencies following false prejudice level feedback. Specifically, self-regulation of prejudice requires the use of inhibitory control processes; therefore, slower response latencies should be observed when people are engaging in inhibitory control processes in contrast to cases in which people are not exercising this type of self-regulation.
Figure 1. The self-regulation of prejudice for internal motivation. In the presence of an outgroup member, automatic stereotype activation occurs, which may lead to a discrepant response. For high internally motivated individuals, awareness of this discrepant response should initiate the self-regulatory processes of guilt, behavioral inhibition, and increased attention to situational cues, which will then be used as cues for control to override potential prejudiced responding in the future.
Figure 2. The self-regulation of prejudice for normatively protected outgroups. In the presence of an outgroup member, automatic stereotype activation occurs, which may lead to a discrepant response. In the presence of normatively protected outgroup members, awareness of this discrepant response should initiate the self-regulatory processes of guilt, behavioral inhibition, and increased attention to situational cues, which will then be used as cues for control to override potential prejudiced responding in the future.
Ratings of compunction were expected to mediate the self-regulatory response inhibition. That is, experiences of compunction should initiate the self-regulation of prejudice, as indicated by longer response latencies.

Extending Crandall et al.’s (2002) argument that internal motivation to control prejudice is based on social norms for the self-regulation of prejudice, we suggest that internal motivation is not a generalized egalitarian worldview, but rather dependent on the normative protective status of the target outgroup, which in turn, influences the self-regulation of prejudice (see Figure 3). That is, if internal motivation is dependent on outgroup protective status, then mechanisms for initiating the self-regulation of prejudice should only occur in the presence of normatively protected outgroups but not for nonprotected outgroups.

Specifically, for normatively protected outgroups, internal motivation to control prejudice should be associated with experiences of compunction and slowing of subsequent responding following prejudice-relevant discrepancies. In contrast, neither compunction nor response inhibition should be observed following false prejudice-related feedback regarding normatively nonprotected outgroups, no matter participants’ levels of internal motivation to control prejudice. That is, the self-regulation of prejudice should be observed following false prejudice-related feedback only when both conditions of high internal motivation and outgroup normative protection status are present. Based on previous research, the self-regulation of prejudice towards either protected or nonprotected outgroups, however, should not be observed for individuals with low internal motivation.
Figure 3. The self-regulation of prejudice for internal motivation and normatively protected outgroups. In the presence of an outgroup member, automatic stereotype activation occurs, which may lead to a discrepant response. In the presence of normatively protected outgroup members, awareness of this discrepant response for high internally motivated individuals should initiate the self-regulatory processes of guilt, behavioral inhibition, and increased attention to situational cues, which will then be used as cues for control to override potential prejudiced responding in the future.
Not only did Monteith (1993) show that low internally motivated individuals failed to engage in the self-regulation of prejudice, but Crandall et al. (2002) showed that only high internally motivated individuals were swayed by social norms. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that low internally motivated participants will fail to exhibit the self-regulation of prejudice, and will not show more self-regulatory inhibition towards protected compared to nonprotected outgroups. This reasoning leads to the prediction that for response inhibition, a significant Internal Motivation Level (High versus Low) x Feedback Type (False Feedback versus No Feedback) x Outgroup Status (Protected versus Nonprotected) interaction will be obtained. As can be seen in Figure 4, high internal motivation participants were predicted to exhibit longer response latencies for protected versus nonprotected target outgroups following feedback indicating they were prejudiced versus no feedback. In the no feedback condition, we predicted no difference in the response latencies between protected and nonprotected outgroups for high internally motivated participants. As can also be seen in the bottom panel of Figure 4, predictions for low internally motivated participants were quite different – these participants were expected to respond similarly to both protected and nonprotected outgroups, regardless of the feedback condition. Thus, the predicted three-way interaction can be broken down to include a significant two-way interaction between Feedback Type (False Feedback versus No Feedback) and Outgroup Status (Protected versus Nonprotected) for high internally motivated participants and no significant difference in response latencies across conditions for low internally motivated participants.
Figure 4. Predicted response inhibition three-way interaction. For response inhibition, the expected Internal Motivation x Feedback x Outgroup three-way interaction is comprised of a significant Feedback x Outgroup simple two-way interaction for high internal motivation and a nonsignificant Feedback x Outgroup simple two-way interaction for low internal motivation.
This significant three-way interaction would suggest that for internally motivated to control prejudice participants, response inhibition associated with the self-regulation of prejudice is dependent on social norms prescribing and proscribing prejudice.

In contrast to these predictions, Plant and Devine would predict that high internally motivated participants would respond similarly to both protected and nonprotected outgroups, regardless of feedback. This is the case because they conceptualize internal motivation as a generalized standard to uphold egalitarian values; therefore, the self-regulation of prejudice is an internalized process for these individuals and should not be governed by social norms. In contrast, Sherif and Sherif’s (1953) Social Norm Theory would predict that all participants, regardless of internal motivation levels, would self-regulate for protected but not for nonprotected outgroups. The position of Crandall et al. (2002) and the current research, however, is that social norms set the context for the self-regulation of prejudice for high internal motivation. Thus, Crandall et al. (2002) would predict that high, but not low, internally motivated participants would self-regulate prejudice more for protected compared to nonprotected outgroups.

The present research also measured the amount of compunction participants experienced as a function of the experimental conditions. This measure was assessed as a potential mediator of response latencies. Plant and Devine (1998) suggest that violations of internalized standards should result in self-directed compunction. Thus, their perspective suggests that compunction mediates response latencies for both protected and nonprotected groups. In contrast, Sherif and Sherif (1953) emphasize the role of imposed social norms in prejudice; thus it is reasonable to assume that violations of these societal standards would result in experiences of threat of being ostracized from the group and not
compunction. Crandall et al. (2002) does not make a clear prediction regarding compunction. On one hand, they view internal motivation as an internalization of social norms, and as such, violations may produce compunction. However, because the underlying motivation stems from an external source (i.e., social norms), it may also be reasonable to assume that violations of these standards would not result in compunction.
METHOD

Norming Procedures

A pilot study was conducted to establish the social norms regarding prejudice expression and suppression for the outgroups used in the present research. Information gathered on the protective status of outgroups was used to identify the target outgroups used in the present research.

Participants (n = 591) included undergraduates enrolled in an introductory Psychology course at Wake Forest University. They received partial course credit for their research participation. The social acceptability for the expression of prejudice toward sixty-nine outgroups was measured by participants’ ratings on a scale from 1-3, ranging from “Definitely not okay” to “Definitely okay” to have negative feelings towards these outgroups, according to societal standards (see Appendix A). Instructions were to rate these outgroups according to the social norm and not their own personal standards regarding prejudice towards these outgroups. Target outgroups were adapted from a list developed by Crandall et al. (2002).

Participants rated the social acceptability of prejudice towards various target outgroups chosen from those used by Crandall et al. (2002). Based upon Crandall et al.’s (2002) research, normatively protected outgroups included those who are blind, mentally disabled, deaf, and mentally ill. Outgroups considered moderately protected included

---

There were 13 participants who clearly did not follow directions (i.e., reversed the rating order), and thus, were excluded from the reported analyses. Analyses including them, however, did not change the overall pattern, but did change the means for particular outgroups.
beauty pageant contestants, Jehovah’s Witnesses, welfare recipients, and smokers. Normatively nonprotected outgroups included child molesters, child abusers, rapists, and the Klu Klux Klan.

There were three versions of the scale differing in the order in which outgroups were presented, and these orders were counterbalanced across participants. The means for each outgroup were used to determine where each outgroup fell along the continuum from socially acceptable to socially unacceptable to express prejudice. Based on the data collected from this pilot study, we chose two religious and two racial outgroups of varying protective status to use in the current research. For religious outgroups, the pilot data revealed that Jews are a protected outgroup ($M = 1.47, SD = 0.567$) whereas Atheists are less well protected ($M = 1.81, SD = 0.592$), $t(62) = 2.37, p = 0.021$. In regards to racial outgroups, Blacks are protected ($M = 1.38, SD = 0.554$) while Arabs ($M = 1.91, SD = 0.765$) are less protected from prejudice, $t(63) = 3.22, p = 0.002$. By including both religious and racial outgroups of protected and nonprotected status, we held constant the type of outgroups (i.e., religious and racial) while varying the protected status within each type.

**Design and Procedure: Primary Research**

**Participants.** Participants (n = 202) consisted of undergraduates enrolled in an introductory Psychology course at Wake Forest University who volunteered to participate in exchange for partial credit for research requirements. Participants were 66% female and 34% male between the ages of 18 and 23. Racial composition included 80% White, 8% Black, 7% Asian, and 5% Hispanic. Religious affiliation included 75% Christian,
11% Agnostic, 7% Atheist, 4% Jewish, 1% Muslim, and 1% Buddhist. Participants received partial course credit for their research participation.

**Materials.**

*Motivation to control prejudice.* Underlying motivations to control prejudice were measured using the Internal Motivation Scale (IMS) (see Appendix B). Because Plant and Devine (1998) originally used this scale to assess motivation to control prejudice toward Blacks, we adapted this scale to apply more generally across outgroups, thus reflecting more generalized egalitarian values. As such, we replaced the words “Black people” with “members of other social groups” on all items. Participants rated their endorsements of items on a scale of 1-9, ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” Sample items from the IMS include, “Because of my personal values, I believe that using stereotypes about members of other social groups is wrong” and “Being nonprejudiced toward members of other social groups is important to my self-concept.”

Plant and Devine (1998) found that high internal motivation to control prejudice was associated with lower self-reported prejudice, whereas high external motivation to control prejudice was associated with higher self-reports of prejudice. Although the IMS and EMS were significantly negatively correlated with each other, this correlation was small, \( r = -.15, p < .05 \), suggesting two independent constructs. Plant and Devine (1998) also showed the IMS and EMS to have good internal reliability (Cronbach’s \( a = .76 \) to .85). Although both IMS and EMS were collected, internal motivation to control prejudice was of primary interest for analyses.
Design. A 2 (Internal Motivation Level: High versus Low) x 2 (Feedback Type: False Feedback versus No Feedback) x 2 (Outgroup Status: Protected versus Nonprotected) mixed factorial design was used to examine the effects on self-reported affect and response latencies. Internal Motivation Level and Feedback Type were between-subjects variables, whereas Outgroup Status was a within-subjects variable.

Participants completed the IMS and EMS prior to the experiment during Mass Testing. Upon arrival, participants were randomly assigned to either the False Feedback or the No Feedback condition. Participants then completed the linguistic intergroup bias task (see below) for both protected and nonprotected outgroups within one category (i.e., either religion only or race only), and response latencies were recorded. The order in which the protected and nonprotected outgroups were presented were counterbalanced across participants. Participants then completed the affect measure (see below) regarding their performance on the linguistic bias task. At the conclusion of the study, participants then responded to a manipulation check and suspicion probe (see below). Following completion of the study, participants were debriefed (see below) about the deception used in this research.

Discrepancy manipulation. The linguistic intergroup bias (see Appendix C) is often used to detect subtle bias (Franco & Maass, 1999); however, we adapted this procedure to manipulate prejudice discrepancy. In the linguistic intergroup bias task, participants are asked to choose a response that best describes what a given outgroup member would do in various scenarios, such as when “a child is trying to cross a busy street by him/herself.” Response choices regarding the target outgroup member’s behavior range from increasing levels of abstraction, such as: a) Accompany the child
across the street, b) Help the child, c) Worry about the child, d) Be altruistic towards the child. Implicit bias is demonstrated when participants unknowingly select broad, abstract descriptions of desirable ingroup behavior and undesirable outgroup behavior, which indicates a generalization of these positive attributes for the ingroup and negative attributes for the outgroup. Similarly, implicit bias is exhibited when participants select more narrow, concrete descriptions of undesirable ingroup behavior and desirable outgroup behavior, which demarcates these as exceptions to the general positive attribute of the ingroup and the general negative attribute of the outgroup. Keep in mind, however, that the primary purpose of this task in the present research was to use it as a basis for providing pre-determined feedback on levels of prejudice.

Participants responded to the linguistic intergroup bias task for both protected and nonprotected outgroups on the computer, which was described as a measure that detects subtle bias towards the target outgroup. Participants were told, “Previous research has shown that, despite our nonprejudiced beliefs, we often show subtle bias toward members of other social groups. Based on your responses on this task, we can detect this type of unintentional bias. Keep in mind your responses on this task will be completely anonymous and confidential.” The target outgroups used for this measure were either Jew and Atheist (a protected and nonprotected religious outgroup, respectively) or Black and Arab (a protected and nonprotected racial outgroup, respectively).

To manipulate prejudice discrepancy awareness, participants in the False Feedback condition were told that they would receive feedback periodically about their performance on the task. Participants in the No Feedback condition were told that they would receive feedback about their performance at the end of the task, however, no
prejudice-related feedback was actually provided to these participants. Feedback was presented after the first, second, and last items. Participants in the False Feedback condition were presented with a horizontal bar filled to either 50%, 55%, or 60% prejudice, reflecting their supposed high level of prejudice (see Appendix D). The order in which these feedback levels were presented was counterbalanced across participants. In contrast, in the No Feedback condition, participants were presented with a blank screen in place of the false feedback in order to keep the procedure and timing as similar as possible between conditions.

**Dependent measures.**

Response latencies. Following Monteith (1993), inhibition of prejudiced responses were measured by response latencies. Response latencies were measured in milliseconds from the time that the scenario and response choices appeared on the screen to the time that participants chose a multiple response choice by pressing the numerical key corresponding with the response (i.e., 1, 2, 3, or 4). Specifically, response inhibition was measured by averaging response latencies on scenarios following prejudice level feedback (i.e., scenarios 2 and 3). We subtracted out the response latency measured during scenario 1 from responses following feedback on scenarios 2 and 3 in order to control for individual differences in baseline response latency. This was done for responses regarding both protected and nonprotected outgroups for each participant.

Affect. The affect scale (see Appendix E) used to assess affective consequences following prejudice discrepancy awareness was borrowed from Monteith’s (1993) study on the self-regulation of prejudice. Participants reported how they felt regarding their performance on the linguistic intergroup bias task regarding both protected and
nonprotected outgroups by indicating the degree to which each of the affect items described their feelings on scale of 1-7, ranging from “Does not apply at all” to “Applies very much.” Affect items formed five indexes: Discomfort, Compunction, Positive, Negative-Other, and Depressed. Items comprising the Discomfort index included bothered, uneasy, and uncomfortable. Compunction included disappointed with myself, guilty, annoyed at myself, and self-critical. The Positive index included friendly, good, happy, and optimistic. Items on the Negative-Other index consisted of irritated at others and disgusted with others, and the Depressed index included low, sad, and depressed. Items on each index were averaged together to form a composite score. Monteith (1993) showed these indexes to have good internal reliability (Cronbach’s $a = .71$ to .89).

Because previous research shows that internal motivation is associated with experiences of compunction following a discrepant prejudiced response (Plant and Devine, 1999), scores on the Compunction index were of primary interest while the other indexes were expected to serve mostly as filler items.

*Manipulation check.* Following completion of the task, participants in the False Feedback condition were asked to report what kind of feedback they received, and whether the feedback indicated low prejudice or moderate to high prejudice (see Appendix F).

*Suspicion probe.* Before leaving the experiment, participants in both the False Feedback and No Feedback conditions were asked to describe the purpose of the experiment (see Appendix G).

*Mediational analyses.* Because previous research has assumed that compunction initiates the process of the self-regulation of prejudice for high internally motivated
We planned to assess the meditational role of compunction in accounting for the response latencies of high and low internally motivated participants to both protected and nonprotected outgroups. Mediational analysis (e.g., Baron & Kenny, 1986) requires the relationship between a predictor (i.e., internal motivation) and an outcome (i.e., response inhibition) to be explained by another predictor (i.e., compunction). To demonstrate mediation, the following hypotheses must be met (see Figure 5): a) Internal motivation must be positively associated with response inhibition (path c); b) Internal motivation must be positively associated with compunction (path a); c) Compunction must be significantly positively associated with response inhibition when controlling for internal motivation (path b); and 4) The relationship between internal motivation and response inhibition is reduced to nonsignificance (i.e., complete mediation) when controlling for compunction (path c’). This last requirement is tested via a Sobel test. The data analysis strategy included two separate meditational analyses: one using response latencies for protected outgroups as the outcome variable, and another using response latencies for nonprotected outgroups as the outcome variable. We expected that compunction would mediate the response latencies of high internally motivated participants for protected but not nonprotected outgroups. Furthermore, we did not expect compunction to play a meditational role in the responses of low internally motivated participants.

These patterns would not be expected by the approaches of Plant and Devine (1998) nor Sherif and Sherif (1953).
Figure 5. Direct and indirect influences of internal motivation on response inhibition with compunction as the mediator. Following false prejudice level feedback regarding protected outgroups, the relationship between internal motivation to control prejudice and response inhibition is mediated, or explained, by ratings of compunction.
The egalitarian worldview perspective of Plant and Devine (1998) would suggest that compunction would mediate the response latencies of high, but not low, internally motivated participants for both types of outgroups (i.e., protected and nonprotected). In contrast, according to the strict Social Norm view of Sherif and Sherif (1953), compunction would not be expected to mediate response latencies for either type of outgroup, regardless of internal motivation. Although less clear, Crandall et al.’s (2002) adapted Social Norm perspective may suggest that compunction would mediate the responses of high, but not low, internally motivated participants for protected, but not nonprotected, outgroups.

**Ethical considerations.** To test the self-regulation of prejudice model, awareness of discrepant prejudice responding is necessary. Thus, the rationale for providing false feedback regarding prejudice levels is to initiate prejudice self-regulatory processes, and is a common procedure used in the self-regulation of prejudice literature (e.g., Amodio, Devine, & Harmon-Jones, 2007; Monteith, 1993). At the termination of the current research, participants were fully debriefed on the deception via a debriefing statement (see Appendix H) explaining the deception used in this research and the reason why this deception was employed.
RESULTS

Because the IMS scores of 11 participants were not collected during mass testing, their response latencies and ratings of compunction were excluded, resulting in a total of 191 participants included in the following analyses. Similar to Plant and Devine (1998), we performed a median-split to designate separate low ($M = 28.21, SD = 5.86$) and high categories ($M = 41.10, SD = 2.73$) for internal motivation to control prejudice. Comparable to Plant and Devine (1998), we found the IMS to have good internal reliability (Cronbach’s $a = .82$).

Response Inhibition

I conducted a 2 (Internal Motivation Level: High vs. Low) x 2 (Feedback Type: False Feedback vs. No Feedback) x 2 (Outgroup Status: Protected vs. Nonprotected) mixed ANOVA $^2$ with changes in response latencies from baseline as the dependent variable. In general, participants responded faster on the second and third items compared to the first item (i.e., baseline), thus response latencies were negative (i.e., subsequent responding was faster than initial responding), thus, the closer to zero, the longer the response latency. Results $^3$ showed a significant main effect of Outgroup Status whereby response latencies were longer compared to baseline for protected ($M = -2045.66, SD = 6692.61$) compared to nonprotected outgroups ($M = -3902.97, SD = 8217.02$), $F(1, 187) = 5.82, p = 0.017$. Unexpectedly, there was a significant main effect of Internal Motivation Level, such that response latencies for participants with high internal

$^2$ Consistent with Plant and Devine (1998), we analyzed results using an ANOVA rather than regression analyses.

$^3$ Analyses excluding outliers yielded similar results.
motivation ($M = -3753.31$, $SD = 6989.87$) tended to be faster compared to baseline than for participants with low internal motivation ($M = -2081.54$, $SD = 7890.12$), $F(1, 187) = 5.53$, $p = 0.020$. There was no significant main effect of Feedback Type (No Feedback $M = -2411.60$, $SD = 8258.51$; False Feedback, $M = -3435.21$, $SD = 6727.04$), $F(1, 187) = 2.03$, $p = 0.156$. There was a significant Feedback Type x Internal Motivation Level, $F(1, 187) = 5.32$, $p = 0.022$ such that for high internal motivation, there was a nonsignificant effect of feedback information (High Internal, No Feedback $M = -4135.49$, $SD = 7400.45$; High Internal, False Feedback, $M = -3451.60$, $SD = 6612.44$), $F(1, 187) = 0.21$, $p = 0.647$, whereas for low internal motivation, there was a marginally significant decrease in response latencies compared to baseline following false feedback ($M = -519.54$, $SD = 8745.73$) compared to no feedback ($M = -3415.74$, $SD = 6839.56$), $F(1, 187) = 3.29$, $p = 0.071$. There wasn’t, however, a significant Outgroup Status x Feedback Type, $F(1, 187) = 0.139$, $p = 0.709$, nor a significant Outgroup Status x Internal Motivation Level, $F(1, 187) = 0.68$, $p = 0.411$, interaction effect. Additionally, the expected Internal Motivation Level x Feedback Type x Outgroup Status three-way interaction failed to reach significance, $F(1, 187) = 1.75$, $p = 0.187$.

Although the expected Internal Motivation Level x Feedback Type x Outgroup Status three-way interaction was not significant, we conducted planned contrasts assessing specific predictions (see Figure 6 for response latency means). Contrary to expectations, the test of the simple Feedback Type x Outgroup Status interaction effect for High Internal Motivation Level was not significant, $F(187) = 0.49$, $p = 0.485$, suggesting response latencies for protected and nonprotected outgroups did not vary as a function of feedback information for high internal motivation.
Figure 6. Response latency means.
The Feedback Type x Outgroup Status interaction effect for Low Internal Motivation Level was not significant, as was expected, $F(187) = 0.36$, $p = 0.245$, indicating response latencies for protected and nonprotected outgroups did not vary as a function of feedback information for low internal motivation.

**Compunction**

Overall levels of compunction were low for all participants, regardless of internal motivation level, outgroup protective status, or prejudice feedback information (see Figure 7). We originally planned to conduct the meditational analysis as a function of the full experimental design; however, because there were no significant effects of prejudice feedback on response latencies, we collapsed across this variable and conducted the mediation analyses on both protected and nonprotected outgroups as a function of scores on the IMS.

**Protected outgroups.**

**Bivariate relationships.**

*Path c.* Path c tests the relationship between the predictor variable and the outcome variable. Internal Motivation scores were entered as a predictor into a one-predictor linear regression model with Response Latencies for protected outgroups as the outcome variable. Contrary to predictions, internal motivation was not positively correlated with protected outgroup response latencies, $r = -.075$, $t(189) = -1.03$, $p = .302$. Following Kenny’s (2012) suggestion, establishing Path c is not necessarily required to show mediation due to the possibility of insufficient power, thus, we proceeded with further analyses.
Figure 7. Compunction means.
Path a. Path a tests the relationship between the predictor variable and the mediator variable. Internal Motivation scores were entered as a predictor into a one-predictor linear regression model with the mediator Compunction for protected outgroups as the outcome variable. Inconsistent with predictions, internal motivation was not significantly positively correlated with compunction regarding protected outgroups, \( r = .093, t(189) = 1.29, p = .200 \). Because we failed to establish Path a, further meditational analyses would be inappropriate, thus we can conclude that, inconsistent with predictions, compunction did not mediate the relationship between internal motivation and response latencies for protected outgroups.

Relationship between compunction and response latencies. To better understand why compunction failed to mediate the relationship between internal motivation and response latencies for protected outgroups, we examined the bivariate relationship between compunction and response latencies. Results showed that for protected outgroups, compunction was not positively correlated with response latencies, \( r = -.031, t(200) = 0.44, p = .661 \).

Nonprotected outgroups.

Bivariate relationships.

Path c. Path c tests the relationship between the predictor variable and the outcome variable. Internal Motivation scores were entered as a predictor into a one-predictor linear regression model with Response Latencies for nonprotected outgroups as the outcome variable. Consistent with predictions, internal motivation was not positively correlated with nonprotected outgroup response latencies, \( r = -.175, t(189) = -2.44, p = .016 \). Following Kenny’s (2012) suggestion, establishing Path c is not necessarily
required to show mediation due to the possibility of insufficient power, thus, we proceeded with further analyses.

*Path a.* Path a tests the relationship between the predictor variable and the mediator variable. Internal Motivation scores were entered as a predictor into a one-predictor linear regression model with the mediator Compunction regarding nonprotected outgroups as the outcome variable. Again, internal motivation was not significantly positively correlated with compunction regarding nonprotected outgroups, $r = .100$, $t(189) = 1.38$, $p = .171$. Because we failed to establish Path a, further meditational analyses would be inappropriate, thus we can conclude that, as expected, compunction did not mediate the relationship between internal motivation and response latencies for nonprotected outgroups.

*Relationship between compunction and response latencies.* To better understand why compunction failed to mediate the relationship between internal motivation and response latencies for nonprotected outgroups, we examined the bivariate relationship between compunction and response latencies. Results showed that for nonprotected outgroups, compunction was not positively correlated with response latencies, $r = -.058$, $t(200) = 0.82$, $p = .415$. 
DISCUSSION

The aim of the current research was to add to our understanding of the factors that determine the self-regulation of prejudice across outgroups. That is, which individuals will engage in the self-regulation of prejudice, which outgroups do these self-regulatory processes apply, and under what conditions do individuals self-regulate. In keeping with Crandall et al. (2002), the perspective guiding the present research was that internal motivation to control prejudice is not a generalized egalitarian worldview, but rather dependent on social norms, and therefore, results in the initiation of self-regulatory processes only in the presence of normatively protected outgroups, but not normatively nonprotected outgroups. That is, for individuals motivated to control prejudice and for target outgroups that are normatively protected, individuals will engage in the self-regulation of prejudice. Contrary to these predictions, the present research did not find evidence that individuals with different levels of internal motivation to control prejudice exhibited different patterns of inhibitory self-regulatory responses in the context of protected versus nonprotected outgroups. Thus overall, the current research failed to extend Crandall et al.’s (2002) findings to the realm of prejudice self-regulation. That is, the self-regulation of prejudice in the present research did not appear to be dependent on both internal motivation and social norms.

Results did, however, provide support for the role of social norms in the self-regulation of prejudice. That is, consistent with Sherif and Sherif’s (1953) Social Norm Theory, results showed a significant main effect of Outgroup Status, whereby participants exhibited more response inhibition towards protected compared to nonprotected
outgroups. This finding suggests that the impact of the social norms associated with the outgroups used in the present research exerted sufficient power to override individual differences in the internalization of egalitarian values. In hindsight, this finding is not surprising in light of the major role that group membership plays in the psychology of the individual. Being accepted by one’s social group is a primary social motive which affects one’s self-definition as well as attitudes and behavior. As Crandall et al. (2002) note “…to be a good group member, one must adopt the prejudices that the group holds and abstain from those prejudices that the group frowns upon.” Finding that the social norms associated with protected versus nonprotected outgroups influenced the initiation of self-regulatory processes, as evidenced by decreased response latencies, is a unique finding that adds to the long-standing body of research on social norms.

In terms of the assumptions set forth by the Self-Regulation of Prejudice Model (Monteith, 1993), the current research also does not clearly support the previous finding that internal motivation to control prejudice and an awareness of prejudice discrepant responding is important for the self-regulation of prejudice. In fact, it may be argued that the current research failed to show any self-regulation of prejudice due to the nonsignificant effect of feedback information for high internal motivation, such that response latencies did not differ based on the presence or absence of false prejudice-related feedback. It may, however, be more likely that the directions of the task itself enlisted more vigilant self-monitoring for participants with high internal motivation. That is, the instructions described how we often exhibit subtle bias despite our egalitarian beliefs, which may have resulted in a heightened awareness of the potential to respond in
a prejudiced manner, similar to the effects of prejudice-related feedback, for participants whom egalitarian standards are important (i.e., high internal motivation).

There was a significant main effect of Internal Motivation Level, such that participants with high internal motivation exhibited less response inhibition than participants with low internal motivation. This finding is inconsistent with previous research (e.g., Monteith, 1993; Plant & Devine, 1998) that suggests individuals with high internal motivation should engage in more self-regulatory processes than individuals with low internal motivation. It isn’t necessarily the case, however, that low internal motivated individuals don’t engage in the self-regulation of prejudice at all as some previous research has asserted (Monteith, 1993). Monteith, Mark, and Ashburn-Nardo (2010) found that when participants were asked to recall situations where they had acted more prejudiced than personally acceptable, that not only did low internally motivated participants report prejudice discrepancies but they also reported that these experiences had self-regulatory impact on avoiding future prejudice discrepancies. The literature, however, does not suggest that this effect should be stronger for low internal compared to high internal motivation to control prejudice. Thus, this finding is difficult to reconcile with the preexisting literature on individual differences.

More consistent with previous research, however, was the finding that for low internal motivation, there was a marginally significant decrease in response latencies compared to baseline following false feedback compared to no feedback. This may suggest that when faced with prejudice-related feedback, low internally motivated participants exhibit avoidance behaviors, as indicated by a speeding up of responding rather than a slowing of responding compared to baseline. This is consistent the research
of Richeson and Trawalter (2008) who presented low and high prejudiced participants photos of neutral Black faces for short (30 ms) and long durations (450 ms). Results showed that for long durations, high prejudiced participants showed an attentional bias whereby they avoided looking at Black faces, whereas low prejudiced participants did not exhibit such avoidance behaviors.

The current research also calls into question the necessity of compunction for the initiation of self-regulatory processes (e.g., Amodio et al., 2007; Monteith, 1993) in that no meditational role of this factor was found in the present research. In fact, examination of the bivariate correlations showed that despite the significant main effect of Outgroup Status, showing longer response latencies compared to baseline for protected compared to nonprotected outgroups, compunction was not significantly positively correlated with response inhibition for protected outgroups. It is important to note that overall, levels of compunction were low for all participants. It is likely that the false feedback provided indicating levels of prejudice from 55% to 65% was not high enough to invoke experiences of compunction. In addition, this task had very little consequence for interpersonal intergroup interactions, which may have lessened participants’ experiences of compunction. These limitations may make any conclusions regarding compunctions’ role in the self-regulation of prejudice difficult.

In addition, the inconsistent findings of the current research may be due to the large variability in the current sample. It may also be the case that the difference in protective status between the protected and nonprotected outgroups used in the current research was not large enough to detect any real effects. Although the protected versus nonprotected outgroups were significantly different, they were within a 0.5 point
difference on a three-point scale, and therefore, were by no means on the extreme ends of the continuum of social norms for the acceptability of prejudice.

Additional limitations include the fact that this research used a quasi-experimental design where motivation to control prejudice was not manipulated. Thus, any cause and effect conclusions regarding the influences of levels of motivation on prejudice self-regulation must be made with caution. Also, a young, college sample was used, which may be less prejudiced than the general population, making detection of any true effects more difficult.

In summary, the expression and suppression of prejudice is more complex than either the individual difference literature on motivation to control prejudice or Social Norm Theory suggests. It is likely that both factors play important roles in determining the self-regulation of prejudice. Although there is a vast body of research on the topic of stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination, there is very little research investigating how contextual and individual difference factors interact in these domains. Although the present research did not demonstrate the predicted interactive effects of these factors, future research may be fruitfully directed at understanding the factors that may determine the influences of each.
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Appendix A

Normative Protection Scale

We are interested in how acceptable it is according to social norms to have negative feelings towards different groups. That is, not how you personally feel towards this groups, but how society feels towards these groups. On the following scale, please rate how acceptable (from definitely not okay to definitely okay) it is in our society to have negative feelings towards each group. That is, according to social norms, it is definitely not okay to have negative feelings toward a particular group, or it is definitely okay to have negative feelings toward a particular group. There is no right or wrong answer. Your answers will remain confidential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definitely not okay</th>
<th>Maybe okay</th>
<th>Definitely okay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beauty pageant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contestants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug dealers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunk drivers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child molesters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child abusers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant women who drink alcohol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexuals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Easterners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obese people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug addicts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizophrenics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men who refuse to pay child support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mormons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife beaters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the KKK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police officers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligent parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who cheat on their spouses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men who leave their families</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who lie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who cheat on exams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careless drivers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who litter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who cut in line</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious cult members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal immigrants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile delinquents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash collectors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community college students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who smoke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual laborers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business women</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog owners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowlers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male nurses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentalists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family men</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentally disabled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically disabled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with mental illness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehovah’s Witness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on welfare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women who stay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
home to raise kids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blind people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-convicts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are illiterate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Crandall, Eshleman, & O’Brien, 2002).
Appendix B

Adapted Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice

Participants rate the items on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 9 (strongly agree). When participants complete the scales, the External Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Scale (EMS) and Internal Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Scale (IMS) items are intermixed. Note: (R) indicates reverse coded item.

Instructions: The following questions concern various reasons or motivations people might have for trying to respond in nonprejudiced ways toward various social groups. Some of the reasons reflect internal-personal motivations whereas others reflect more external-social motivations. Of course, people may be motivated for both internal and external reasons; we want to emphasize that neither type of motivation is by definition better than the other. In addition, we want to be clear that we are not evaluating you or your individual responses. All your responses will be completely confidential. We are simply trying to get an idea of the types of motivations that students in general have for responding in nonprejudiced ways. If we are to learn anything useful, it is important that you respond to each of the questions openly and honestly. Please give your response according to the scale below.

External Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Scale (EMS).

Because of today's PC (politically correct) standards I try to appear nonprejudiced toward members of other social groups.

I try to hide any negative thoughts about members of other social groups in order to avoid negative reactions from others.

If I acted prejudiced toward members of other social groups, I would be concerned that others would be angry with me.

I attempt to appear nonprejudiced toward members of other social groups in order to avoid disapproval from others.

I try to act nonprejudiced toward members of other social groups because of pressure from others.

Internal Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Scale (IMS).

I attempt to act in nonprejudiced ways toward members of other social groups because it is personally important to me.

According to my personal values, using stereotypes about members of other social groups is okay. (R)
I am personally motivated by my beliefs to be nonprejudiced toward members of other social groups.

Because of my personal values, I believe that using stereotypes about members of other social groups is wrong.

Being nonprejudiced toward members of other social groups is important to my self-concept.

(Adapted from Plant, & Devine, 1998).
Appendix C

Linguistic Intergroup Bias

Choose a response that best describes what a (given outgroup member) person would do in the following situation:

1. A child is trying to cross a busy street by him/herself
   a) Accompany the child across the street
   b) Help the child
   c) Worry about the child
   d) Be altruistic towards the child

Choose a response that best describes how a (given outgroup member) person is behaving in the following situation:

2. There are glass bottles to be disposed of
   a) The person is putting the glass bottles in the bin
   b) The person is recycling
   c) The person respects the environment
   d) The person is responsible

Choose a response that best describes how a (given outgroup member) person is behaving in the following situation:

3. There is graffiti on the wall
   a) The person is spraying paint on the wall
   b) The person is vandalizing the wall
   c) The person doesn’t care about other people’s property
   d) The person is destructive

Choose a response that best describes what a (given outgroup member) person would do in the following situation:

4. The person is mad at someone
   a) The person hits the other person
   b) The person hurts the other person
   c) The person hates the other person
   d) The person is violent toward the other person

Choose a response that best describes what a (given outgroup member) person would do in the following situation:

5. The person is on a date
   a) The person kisses the other person
   b) The person flirts with the other person
   c) The person likes the other person
d) The person is affectionate toward the other person

Choose a response that best describes what a (given outgroup member) person would do in the following situation:

6. The person is not doing anything at work
   a) The person is sitting down
   b) The person is being lazy
   c) The person doesn’t care about the job
   d) The person has no work ethic

(Adapted from Franco & Maass, 1999)
Appendix D

Prejudice Level Feedback

Larger values indicate more subtle prejudice
Larger values indicate more subtle prejudice
Appendix E

Affect Measure

Participants report how they are feeling about their performance on the linguistic bias measure. They indicate the degree to which each of the affect items describe their feelings on scales ranging from does not apply at all (1) to applies very much (7).

Discomfort:
bothered
uneasy
uncomfortable.

Compunction:
disappointed with myself
guilty
annoyed at myself
self-critical

Positive:
friendly
good
happy
optimistic

Negative-other:
irritated with others
disgusted with others

Depressed:
low
sad
depressed

(Monteith, 1993).
Appendix F

Manipulation Check

Please respond to the following regarding the task you just completed:

1. In the previous task, what kind of feedback about your performance did you receive?
2. Overall, how would you characterize the feedback you received?
   a. Zero to low prejudice
   b. Moderate to high prejudice
Appendix G

Suspicion Probe

Please take a few moments to describe in a few sentences the purpose of this experiment.
Appendix H

Debriefing Statement

Thank you for your participation in this research on prejudice towards various social groups.

During this research, you were asked to respond to scenarios regarding different social groups and to rate your emotional experience regarding your responses on these scenarios. The purpose of this research is designed to reveal differences in the suppression of prejudice depending on the social group being considered. It is expected that people suppress prejudice more for some social groups compared to other social groups due to differences in the social acceptability in expressing prejudice for different social groups (Crandall, Eshleman, & O’Brien, 2002). Prejudice suppression in this study was indicated by your ratings of emotional experiences regarding your performance on the task as well as the time it took for you to complete the task (Monteith, 1993).

Some of you were led to believe that your responses on the scenarios indicated high levels of subtle prejudice; however, in reality, we did not actually measure your level of prejudice based on your responses to the scenarios. This feedback was necessary because in order to suppress prejudice, you must first think you have responded in a prejudiced manner.

For questions about the study or to discuss any concerns you may have, contact the study investigator, Catherine E. Seta, Office 221 Greene Hall, E-mail: seta@wfu.edu, phone: 336-758-4876.
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