

# Contexts and Conditions of Outgroup Influence

Hogg, Michael A. <sup>1</sup> Crano, William D. <sup>0</sup> Jung, Jiin <sup>0</sup> Gaffney, Amber M. <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Claremont Graduate University, USA  
<sup>2</sup> Humboldt State University, USA

## TO CITE

Hogg, M. A., Crano, W. D., Jung, J., & Gaffney, A. M. (2016). Contexts and Conditions of Outgroup Influence. In *Proceedings of the Paris Institute for Advanced Study* (Vol. 18). [https://paris.pias.science/article/MOSCO\\_2016\\_06\\_contexts-and-conditions-of-outgroup-influence](https://paris.pias.science/article/MOSCO_2016_06_contexts-and-conditions-of-outgroup-influence)

## PUBLICATION DATE

17/11/2016

## ABSTRACT

*Tribute to Serge Moscovici. Paris IAS, 17-18 November 2016 - Session 2*

Moscovici's legacy in social influence and group and societal interactions provides a large part of the foundation for the research program we present here. By examining the complicated nature of social categorizations and intragroup positioning (prototypicality) as important conditions of minority influence, this work posits that outgroups can strategically use other outgroups to increase their subjective closeness to influence targets, creating conditions for change. In Experiment 1, American conservatives increased feelings of subjective closeness to a group of moderate liberals (an outgroup) only if the outgroup was presented alongside a more extreme outgroup. In Experiment 2, American liberals read a counter-attitudinal communication from an extreme conservative outgroup, a moderate conservative outgroup, or a moderate group of conservatives presented alongside a more extreme group. Whereas peripheral liberals rejected the message from a moderate outgroup presented alongside the extreme outgroup, prototypical liberals were more accepting of the message in this condition. Experiment 3 manipulated ingroup prototypicality and provides evidence that prototypical (vs. peripheral) group members feel closer to and are more accepting of an outgroup minority's position which appears perceptually close to the ingroup. This body of work provides evidence that ingroup positioning is important for understanding when change can occur across intergroup boundaries. Together these studies demonstrate that social comparative processes amongst outgroup factions affect perceptions of social distance and an outgroup's ability to exert influence.

## Contexts and Conditions of Outgroup Influence

Serge Moscovici's research on innovation and his call to change the social psychological conception of social influence demonstrated many of the principles his work and his successors' work outlined. Insisting that influence is not done to individuals, but that individuals and collectives enact influence through shared meaning and relations, opened the possibility of discovering the conditions of social change. Both majority reference groups and importantly, even those we least expect – minorities and members of other groups are often the driving forces behind social change and innovation.



## [Contexts and Conditions of Outgroup Influence](#)

# Bibliography

Aron, A., Aron, E. N., & Smollan, D. (1992). Inclusion of other in the self scale and the structure of interpersonal closeness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 596–612.

Crano, W. D., & Alvaro, E. M. (1998). Indirect Minority Influence: The Leniency Contract Revisited. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 1(2), 99–115. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430298012001>

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Anastasio, P. A., Bachman, B. A., & Rust, M. C. (1993). The Common Ingroup Identity Model: Recategorization and the Reduction of Intergroup Bias. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 4(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14792779343000004>

Hayes, A. F. (2013). *An introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. Guilford Press.

Hogg, M. A. (2005). All animals are equal but some animals are more equal than others: Social identity and marginal membership. In K. D. Williams, J. P. Forgas, & W. Hoppel (Eds.), *The social out-cast: Ostracism, social exclusion, rejection and bullying* (pp. 243–261). Psychology Press.

Hogg, M. A., & Hains, S. C. (1996). Intergroup relations and group solidarity: Effects of group identification and social beliefs on depersonalized attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 295–309.

Hogg, M. A., Turner, J. C., & David, B. (1990). Polarized norms as social frames of reference: A test of the self-categorization theory of group polarization. *Basic and Applied Research*, 11, 77–100.

Hogg, M. A., & Turner, J. C. (1987). Social identity and conformity: A theory of referent informational influence. In W. Doise & S. Moscovici (Eds.), *Current issues in European social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 139–182). Cambridge University Press.

Martin, R., & Hewstone, M. (2008). Majority versus minority influence, message processing and attitude change: The source-context- elaboration model. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 40, pp. 237–326). Elsevier.

Moscovici, S. (1976). *Social influence and social change*. Academic Press.

Moscovici, S. (1985). Social influence and conformity. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (3rd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 347–412).

Moscovici, S. (1980). Towards a theory of conversion behaviour. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 13, pp. 209–239). Academic Press.

Pérez, J. A., & Mugny, G. (1996). The conflict elaboration theory of social influence. In E. H. Witte & J. Davis (Eds.), *Understanding Group Behaviour* (Vol. 2, pp. 191–210). Laurence Erlbaum Associates.

Rast, D. E., Gaffney, A. M., Hogg, M. A., & Crisp, R. J. (2012). Leadership under uncertainty: When leaders who are non-prototypical group members can gain support. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(3), 646–653. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.12.013>

Stein, W., Kleef, G. A., Knippenberg, D., Hogg, M. A., Homan, A. C., & Moffitt, G. (2010). How intragroup dynamics affect behavior in intergroup conflict: The role of group norms, prototypicality, and need to belong. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 13, 779–794.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Brooks/Cole.

Tropp, L. R., & Wright, S. C. (2001). Ingroup Identification as the Inclusion of Ingroup in the Self. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull*, 27(5), 585–600. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201275007>

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group*. Basil Blackwell.

Turner, J. C. (1991). *Social influence*. Open University Press.

van Kleef, G. A., Steinel, W., Knippenberg, D., Hogg, M. A., & Svensson, A. (2007). Group member prototypicality and intergroup negotiation: How one's standing in the group affects negotiation behaviour. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 46, 129–152.

van Knippenberg, D., & Wilke, H. (1992). Prototypicality of arguments and conformity to ingroup norms. *European Journal Of Social Psychology*, 22, 141–155.