

Entitativity, collective responsibility, prejudice – Experiment 4 (#9076)

Author(s)

Daniel Effron (London Business School) - deffron@london.edu
Hemant Kakkar (London Business School) - hkakkar@london.edu

Created: 03/14/2018 01:57 AM (PT)

Public: 08/01/2018 11:55 AM (PT)

1) Have any data been collected for this study already?

No, no data have been collected for this study yet.

2) What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study?

People will judge a group more responsible for a member's prejudice when the group is high (vs. low) in entitativity. These collective responsibility perceptions will predict increased condemnation to the group and decreased condemnation to the individual.

3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.

MANIPULATION CHECK. Participants will rate each of two groups on a six-item entitativity measure.

POTENTIAL MEDIATORS: COLLECTIVE AND INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY. Participants will rate how responsible GROUP MEMBERS from each of the two groups should feel if one of its members felt or behaved in each of 7 prejudiced ways (one item for each of the 7 prejudiced ways). They will also rate how responsible the INDIVIDUAL MEMBER in each group who displays prejudice should feel.

DV: COLLECTIVE AND INDIVIDUAL CONDEMNATION. Participants will rate how much GROUP MEMBERS from each of the two groups should be condemned for an individual member's prejudiced behavior. Participants will also rate how much the INDIVIDUAL MEMBER in each group who displays the prejudice should be condemned. Condemnation will be measured using the following 9 items: Cruel/Kind, Nice/Awful, Cold/Warm, Honest/Dishonest, Unfair/Fair, Moral/Immoral, Arrogant/Humble, Good/Bad, Likeable/Dislikeable. Positively valenced items will be reverse-coded so higher numbers on the scale represent greater condemnation.

4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?

We will manipulate entitativity within subjects, creating two conditions: Participants will read about one group that is high in entitativity and one group that is low in entitativity.

5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.

For the manipulation check, we will conduct a paired-samples t-test to verify that the high-entitativity group was indeed perceived as more entitative than the low-entitativity group.

We will test indirect effects using Stata's gsem command, using latent variables to account for the fact that each participant provides ratings of two groups. We will compute a saturated model with indirect effects from entitativity, to collective and individual responsibility, to collective and individual condemnation. We hypothesize that the following indirect effects will be significant: (a) entitativity increases collective responsibility, which predicts LESS INDIVIDUAL condemnation, and (b) entitativity increases collective responsibility, which predicts MORE COLLECTIVE condemnation.

6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.

We will exclude data from people who: (a) Fail an attention-check question that asks people to identify whether the "Ebbites" are a religious group, an ethnic group, a national group, or none of the above, or (b) submit data from duplicate IP addresses or from a duplicate participant IDs (in these cases, the first set of data submitted will be retained), or (c) Have IP addresses outside the US or Canada, or (d) Do not complete 25% or more of the scale items for any individual dependent measure or mediator.

7) How many observations will be collected or what will determine sample size? No need to justify decision, but be precise about exactly how the number will be determined.

We will post slots for 240 complete responses on Prolific Academic. The final number may be slightly lower or higher because of the way the software handles sign-ups.

8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)

We will explore the following two indirect effects, but do not have hypotheses about them: (a) entitativity to individual responsibility to collective condemnation, and (b) entitativity to individual responsibility to individual condemnation.

If our planned model described in Section 5 does not converge, we will test our hypotheses in two separate models: one with collective condemnation as the DV, and one with individual condemnation as the DV.