Collective Action in the Modern World
Normative vs. Non-Normative Action

- Normative action - conforms to the norms of the dominant social system, such as laws and regulations

- Non-Normative action violates these norms and rules and goes beyond the 'acceptable' or 'legal' (Wright et al., 1990, Tausch, et al., 2011)
Why Do People Engage in Collective Action?

- Normative Action
  - Social Identity (Tajfel & Turner 1979; Simon & Klandermans 2001)
  - Group-based emotions (Christensen et al. 2004; Van Zomeren, et al., 2008)
  - Perceptions of injustice (Barlow, Sibley, & Hornsey 2012; Kelly & Breinlinger 1995)
  - Sense of efficacy (Van Zomeren, et al., 2008)
- Social Identity Model of Collective Action (Van Zomeren, et al., 2008)

What motivates people to engage in non-normative versus normative action?
What Differentiates their Psychological Antecedents?

- Tausch, et al. (2011)
  - Different Emotions
    - Anger → Normative Collective Action
    - Contempt → Non-Normative Collective Action

What causes these differing emotional reactions?

- Differing Appraisals (Frijda, 1993; Roseman, 1984; 2001; Scherer, Schorr, and Johnstone 2001)
- Contempt and Anger differ on malleability appraisals
  - Anger – target can change (Averill, 1982; Fischer & Roseman, 2007; Halperin, et al., 2011)
  - Contempt -- target unlikely to or will not change (Fischer & Roseman, 2007)
Implicit Theories

- Implicit theories are individuals’ beliefs regarding whether given targets, such as
  - individuals (Dweck, 1999)
  - Groups (Rydell, et al., 2006)
  - World (Dweck, et al., 1995)
- Are malleable - an incremental theory
- Or fixed - an entity theory

**Major Hypothesis:** A person’s belief in the possibility of change will predict different emotions and thus different types of collective action.
Hypothesized Model

Incremental Theories – World → Hope → Normative Collective Action

Incremental Theories – Groups → Anger

Entity Theories – Groups → Hatred → Non-Normative Collective Action

Method

- Participants - 151 Israeli citizens (39% female, $M_{\text{age}} = 28.67$)
  - Recruited between June and September of 2011, during one of the largest social protests in Israel’s history.
  - Average Income = 5,472 NIS per month, ($SD = 5,468$, Nat. Avg. $\approx 9100$ NIS)
  - 48.2% rightist, 29.4% centrists, 22.4% leftists
Method

- **Measures**
  - Group Identification (van Zomeren et al., 2004)
  - Implicit Theories About the World & Groups (Chiu and Hong, 1999; Rydell et al., 2007)
  - Emotions: Hope, Anger, & Hatred
  - Collective Action
    - Normative:
      - Discussing socio-economic issues on social networks,
      - Signing petitions
      - Participating in demonstrations
    - Non-Normative:
      - Disrupting the events of wealthy or public figures,
      - Blocking roads
      - Clashing with police trying to clear the demonstration
      - Throwing rocks or bottles.
Results

Indirect effect = -0.04, SE = 0.03, 95% CI: [-0.12, -0.004]
Results

Incremental Theories – World → Hope → Normative Collective Action

Incremental Theories – Groups → Anger

Identification → Indirect effect = -0.13, SE = 0.07, 95% CI: [-0.28, -0.01]
Results

Incremental Theories – World → Hope → Normative Collective Action

Incremental Theories – Groups → Anger → Normative Collective Action

Identification

Hatred

Entity Theories – Groups → Non-Normative Collective Action
Results

Incremental Theories – World → Hope → Normative Collective Action

Incremental Theories – Groups → Anger → Non-Normative Collective Action

Entity Theories – Groups → Identification → Hatred → Non-Normative Collective Action

(indirect effect = .076, SE = 0.043, 95% CI: [0.01, 0.19])
Full Model

$\chi^2 (df = 14, N = 151) = 17.37, p = .24, CFI = .996, RMSEA = .04$
Discussion

- Distinct pathways to normative and non-normative action stemming from implicit theories.

- Implicit theories are linked to different emotional and thus to different types of action.

- Incremental theories might promote normative and decrease non-normative action.

- Limitations and Future Directions
  - Other contexts
  - Manipulate implicit theories
Thank You!
Incremental Theories – Groups & Anger

- Marginally significant Interaction between Implicit Theories about Groups and Identification ($\beta = .14 \ p = .058, \ CI = [-0.005, 0.30]$).
- Process Model 8 indicated the presence of moderated mediation (effect = -.13, $SE = 0.07, \ CI: [-0.28, -0.01]$).
Entity Theories – Groups & Hatred

- Significant Interaction between Implicit Theories about Groups and Identification, ($\beta = .18, p = .03, CI = [0.02, 0.35]$).
- Process Model 8 indicated the presence of moderated mediation (indirect effect = .076, $SE = 0.043, CI: [0.01, 0.19]$).
## Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Implicit Theories - World</td>
<td>2.82 (1.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implicit Theories - Groups</td>
<td>3.11 (1.04)</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identification</td>
<td>4.13 (1.16)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hope</td>
<td>4.05 (1.10)</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Anger</td>
<td>4.23 (1.43)</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hatred</td>
<td>3.07 (1.27)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Normative Collective Action</td>
<td>3.01 (1.27)</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Non-Normative Collective Action</td>
<td>1.47 (1.00)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>