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The anti-racism norm in Western European immigration politics:
Why we need to consider it and how to measure it.

Abstract:

In this paper, we propose a new research agenda aimed at improving theoretical and empirical models of immigration politics in Western Europe. In short, we argue for explicitly taking into account the social norm against racism that is neglected in existing research in this area.

In theoretical terms, we draw on existing political science literature on European immigration and US race politics as well as on work in social psychology to explain why and how we think the anti-racism norm influences opinion formation, the political behavior of individuals, and the effectiveness of various parties’ mobilization strategies. In empirical terms, we propose and present results from a pilot study validating two individual-level measures of the anti-racism norm—one that measures external motivation to control prejudice and another that measures internal motivation. The pilot study shows that the anti-racism norm exists and can be meaningfully measured in a Western European context. We conclude that the suggested research agenda appears theoretically promising and empirically feasible.
Introduction

The question of whether and how political actors in Europe mobilize racial or ethnic prejudice is highly disputed and politically charged. Studies of public opinion towards immigration in Western Europe, and of political parties’ mobilization of such opinion, have grown in number and sophistication in the past decade, documenting widespread voter preferences for restrictions on immigration (Sides & Citrin 2007; Norris 2005; Carter 2005; Ivarsflaten 2005b), and uneven political mobilization of voters holding such views by radical right parties across countries and time (Brug, Fennema & Tillie 2005; Messina 2007). Notably, it is at this stage beyond dispute that radical right parties, when successful over time, mobilize restrictionist voters (Ivarsflaten 2008; Mudde 2007). But how much of this success stems from the activation of negative racial or ethnic bias? This paper proposes a research agenda that we argue will provide a way forward on this tricky and important question, and it presents our first findings and concrete suggestions for feasible empirical strategies.

In short, what we propose is not yet another refined measure of prejudice, racial bias or negative stereotypes. Instead we suggest switching focus and asking, to what extent does a social norm against racism exist in Western European nations? How does it influence the political behaviour of non-immigrant, dominant ethnic group Europeans? And especially, how and to what extent do political parties mobilize or de-mobilize such normative concerns?

In the following we argue, theoretically and empirically, for the need to consider such questions and for a particular approach to analysing anti-racism norms. In the theoretical section, we discuss the ways in which existing literature either indirectly or directly suggest that the anti-racism norm is influential in immigration politics. Then, in the empirical section, we present the results of a pilot study which suggests (1) that there exists a social norm against racism in Western Europe, and (2) that this norm can be meaningfully measured at the individual level. The two measures of the anti-racism norm proposed in this paper are adapted
from previous work by social psychologists on US racial attitudes. We argue, with empirical
support from the pilot study conducted in Norway in 2007, that these measures and concepts
travel surprisingly well to the context of immigration politics in Europe. We conclude that
the suggested research agenda appears both promising and feasible, and we encourage
researchers to incorporate the anti-racism norm in future empirical and theoretical work on
European immigration politics.

Why we need to study the anti-racism norm

We believe that the existence of a widespread norm against racial or ethnic prejudice is
crucial to explaining why radical right-wing parties sometimes—and more often than usually
perceived (Ivarsflaten 2005a)—fail, despite the presence of seemingly fertile ground in terms
of anti-immigrant sentiment. Further, we suggest that at the individual level, strength of
adherence to this norm may strongly predict attitudes towards immigrants and responses to
various political messages, actors, and campaigns. Two distinct branches of literature inspire
our call for including the anti-racism norm in theories and empirical studies of immigration
politics in contemporary Western Europe—(a) existing research on European immigration
politics and (b) work in political science and in psychology on racial attitudes in the U.S. As
will be detailed below, the first branch of literature has discovered empirical patterns that we
argue suggest the existence and influence of an anti-racism norm. The second branch is by
contrast more useful for the theoretical and empirical possibilities that it alerts us to.

Existing research on Western European immigration politics documents that political
parties experience varying degrees of success in their efforts to mobilize voters who hold
restrictionist views. For example, during the past five years, researchers seeking to explain
and chart the variability in the electoral success of radical right parties have introduced the
useful concept of “radical right potential.” This is usually defined as the proportion of the
electorate that holds the types of political preferences that radical right parties tend to mobilize\(^1\) (Brug, Fennema & Tillie 2005; Norris 2005; Ivarsflaten 2007). These studies consistently show that even the most successful radical right parties do not come near to mobilizing their full potential, as measured in this manner. Furthermore, several studies point out that even in the countries where radical right parties have not risen to success, there is a significant radical right potential (Rydgren 2006; 2002; Carter 2005; Givens 2005).

In other words, simply offering restrictionist immigration policies to voters who hold restrictionist preferences is not sufficient to mobilize a large number of these voters. But why not? This remains a puzzle for the literature. Even considering institutional variables (Givens 2005; Norris 2005), the party competitive context (Carter 2005; Meguid 2005), and party organizational features (Mudde 2007), considerable variation in radical right parties’ electoral performance remains unexplained (Coffe 2005; Art 2005). This unexplained variability suggests that some important factor may have been left out of previous accounts. We propose that the missing piece to this puzzle is the anti-racism norm, and a proper understanding of how it varies across countries and individuals and not least how some political parties (de)mobilize it.

Another strand of literature on European immigration politics, developed by Paul Sniderman and colleagues in Italy and the Netherlands (Sniderman & Hagendoorn 2007; Sniderman et al. 2000), points to additional features of public opinion that in our view suggests the existence and influence of the anti-racism norm. Of particular interest to us are the findings of list-experiments which show that more majority-group respondents express negative stereotypes of immigrant or minority groups when they can give their answers in secret than when they have to state them openly to an interviewer (even if the interview in itself is anonymous) (Sniderman and Hagendoorn 2007). Such findings are suggestive of a
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\(^1\) Studies operationalize this concept differently. Some restrict the radical right potential to voters who hold restrictionist views while others use self-placement on the radical right end of the left-right scale. The findings described in this section hold regardless of operationalization.
social norm against racism that, for some respondents at least, has documented consequences even in a survey experiment context, where not much is at stake.

But list experiments only document respondents who are externally, but not internally, motivated by the anti-racism norm. That is, they document those that perceive a certain standard of proper behaviour in society, but who do not let this standard guide their behaviour in private settings. As will be discussed below and shown in the empirical section, other respondents may have gone further, internalizing the anti-racism norm. For these individuals controlling negative racial biases is a personal goal that they do their best to stick to in both private and public settings. An individual-level measure of the anti-racism norm, and preferably one that can distinguish those who are internally motivated to follow it from those who are externally motivated to do so, could in our view bring us closer to explaining the types of public opinion dynamics documented by Sniderman and his colleagues.

While we think empirical patterns found in existing work suggest that a social norm against racism influences attitudes and political behaviour in Western Europe, the existence, scope, geographic spread and the variability of this norm over time and across individuals remain undocumented. This lack of empirical information means that we do not know how this norm influences immigration politics in the European setting. In the U.S. context of race politics, by contrast, the development and influence of the anti-racism norm has been explored a bit more extensively both theoretically and empirically, although even there political attitude surveys have yet to incorporate the sorts of individual level measures we develop in this paper. Still, this branch of literature can provide clues about useful theoretical and empirical strategies that we could try to transfer and adapt to the substantially different European immigration politics setting.

Research in the US suggests an anti-racism norm that became quite widespread in the 1960’s, with enormous ramifications for political campaigns and for voters’ choices.
According to Mendelberg’s study of American race politics, “the norm of racial inequality began to erode in the 1930s, [and was] replaced in the 1960s by the norm of racial equality” (2001: 67). Supporting this analysis of political developments, survey research documents a marked, rapid decline in self-reported blatant racism in the 1960’s almost to the point of complete disappearance in the wake of the Civil Rights Movement (Schumann, Steeh, and Bobo 1997). Mendelberg has argued persuasively that the changing normative context has transformed the way US political parties campaign and how voters respond to these campaigns. She shows that the anti-racism norm does not rule out political mobilization of negative racial bias, but that it influences how this can occur. She also shows that certain political appeals to the anti-racism norm can effectively prevent mobilization of negative racial bias.

How can appeals to anti-racist norms and to racist stereotypes both be effective in the same political environment? We suggest that a view of racial attitudes based on a “dissociation model” (Devine 1989) provides a convincing psychological underpinning for the political dynamic described by Mendelberg, and also provides a potentially useful way of modelling European immigration politics. The dissociation model sees an individual’s consciously-held, explicit attitudes toward another racial (or ethnic) group as existing quite separately from that same individual’s latent or implicit set of mental images and associations that arise when prompted to think about that same other group. In other words, sincerely-held beliefs in racial equality co-exist with deeply-rooted, highly negative stereotypes of racial others, often within the same individual.²

Many studies based on this or similar models show experimentally that racial biases can be activated and can influence behavior, even in subjects who presumably endorse the

² Indeed, Devine plausibly suggests that by virtue of growing up in a society in which racial stereotypes are plentiful, all Americans have knowledge of negative stereotypes of African Americans which can be activated by the right stimulus, whether it is a blast of rap music coming from a passing car stereo or a TV news story on crime featuring pictures of an African American suspect (Gilliam and Iyengar 2000).
widespread norm against racism. In particular, racial bias surfaces among white Americans
when they are unaware that they have been “primed” subconsciously to think about African
Americans (e.g. Dovidio et al. 1997, Fazio et al. 1995, Greenwald, McGhee, and Schwartz
1998), or when they have to make an instant decision and thus cannot consider normative
implications (e.g. Correll et al. 2002, see also Dovidio, Gaertner, and Kawakami 2002 on
uncontrollable physiological reaction to interracial settings) or when there is an alternative
justification for their behavior available (e.g. Crosby, Bromley, and Saxe 1980, Gaertner and
Dovidio 1986). On the other hand, when racial norms are clearly and explicitly at stake,
white Americans’ behavior and expressed attitudes are much less likely to show bias against
African Americans (Blinder 2004).

For a time, researchers simply posited without any empirical evidence that social
norms against racism provided individuals with motivation to avoid expressing prejudice,
often presumed to operate through social pressure (Plant and Devine 1998). But more recent
work has shown individual level variation in such motivations, and even distinct sources of
that motivation. Plant and Devine (1998), among others, developed individual-level measures
of the motivation to avoid prejudice. In fact, they show two distinct sources of this
motivation: internal and external. Some white American individuals in their sample seem
driven to avoid expressing prejudice by “external motivation”—fear of disapproval from
others, for example. But others in their sample were more internally motivated, seeking to
preserve not merely their public image as non-racist, but their self-image as well. This
distinction has a number of important implications: those high in external motivation may be
those whose prejudice is most difficult to capture in a political attitude survey, but also those
most likely to change their behavior if the external environment changes—perhaps even
changes brought about by a political party or campaign. On the other hand, those high in
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3 Recently, Akrami and Ekehammar (2005) found evidence consistent with a dissociation model in Sweden, and
further found that motivation to avoid prejudice helped explain the gap between expressed prejudice and
latently-held, implicit prejudice.
internal motivation but low in external motivation seem likely to be particularly immune to
even subtle ways of activating prejudiced mental images (Devine and Plant 2002).

In short, then, the US context shows the existence of a robust anti-racism norm with
strong political and psychological impact, and points to ways of measuring the operation of
the norm at the individual level. Returning to the European context, we suggest that it is at
least highly plausible that similar patterns might shape the politics of immigration. While
European politics have not centred around racial cleavages historically in the way that US
politics have, the extreme racism manifest in colonialism and the Holocaust may have given
rise to a broad norm against racism. Others have argued that this is the case (Mendelberg
2001; Art 2005; Bowser 1995).

Yet, at the same time, American patterns of race and politics, its psychology of anti-
racism, and the models, explanations and measures designed to capture this, emerge from a
quite specific context. The European setting differs not only with regards to the historical
events that may have brought about a social norm against racism, but also with the type of
minority situation the politics concerns. The politics of race in the US is about a large group
of racially distinct citizens who have lived in the U.S. for many generations, while the politics
of immigration in Europe is about minority populations of variable sizes most of whom are
first- or second-generations citizens, or have not yet gained citizenship. Thus, while the U.S.
literature is useful for suggesting lines of enquiry and empirical measures, we cannot assume
without further investigation that these will be useful for explaining European immigration
politics.

In the empirical sections that follow we demonstrate one of the ways in which we
think research on the US context can be usefully adapted to the European context. This
analysis is a first and necessary step in developing a research agenda on European
immigration politics that explicitly includes the anti-racism norm and the political
consequences of this norm both at individual and the aggregate levels. The analysis shows that it is indeed empirically feasible to measure the anti-racism norm in a European context. The measures we validate can, and in our view should, be used in future surveys and experimental work. Systematically collecting this evidence and refining hypotheses about how the anti-racism norm affects immigration politics in Europe, we believe, will move researchers toward answering the key questions about contemporary immigration politics: to what extent and how do parties mobilize prejudice and counter-mobilize anti-racist norms? How many voters—and which sorts of voters—are affected by these appeals? And, in perhaps the most politically urgent version, are there countries with significant untapped right wing potential, or does the alarmist account simply overlook the strength of anti-racist norms?

Study Description

Participants

We administered a questionnaire examining subjects’ racial and political attitudes. Two pen and paper survey sessions were held during daytime at the University of Bergen, Norway, in November 2007. Participants were invited from within and around the university campus, and offered movie vouchers as incentive to participate. There were 80 respondents in total, 51 female and 29 male. 67 of the respondents were between 20 and 29 years of age; other ranged between approximately, 18 and 50 years. All respondents had completed high school and 25 respondents had also completed a university degree. 4 respondents who reported an “immigrant background” were excluded from the analysis, resulting in a sample of 76 respondents.

Participants were told that the survey contained questions about political attitudes, but it was not mentioned that the emphasis would be on attitudes towards immigrants and
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4 Exact age was not recorded to avoid indirect identifiability of respondents.
5 The discussion section at the end of this paper analyzes the limits to and opportunities for generalizations based on data from this student sample in Norway.
immigration. It was also emphasized in both oral and written instructions that answers would be anonymous, and that it was important to answer all questions openly and honestly. All participants returned completed questionnaires.

Questionnaire Description

Since our primary aim was to look for the existence of a norm against racism or prejudice that shaped Norwegians attitudes and behavior, the chief component of the questionnaire was a large battery of questions measuring individuals’ “motivation to respond without prejudice”. We drew from three notable studies – Devine and Plant’s (1998) Internal and External Motivation to respond without prejudice Scales (IMS and EMS), Dunton and Fazio’s (1997) Motivation to Control Prejudiced Responding (MCPR), and Crandall, Eshleman, and O’Brien’s Suppression of Prejudice Scale (SPS). From these studies, we gathered a set of 23 questions which we translated into Norwegian, and administered in a randomly-chosen order in the middle of our questionnaire.

We included several more batteries of questions as ways of validating the new measures. To test for predictive validity, we included several scales adapted from other European studies measuring prejudice in the form of subtle or “modern” racism, blatant or “classical” racism (Akrami & Ekehammar), and endorsement of stereotypes (Sniderman & Hagendoorn 2007). We also included scales measuring tendencies to adjust one’s behavior to social norms (Crowne and Marlowe 1960) or context (“self-monitoring”: Snyder and Gangestad 1986) in order to determine if motivation to avoid prejudice is something more than a general desire to conform with social norms or expectations. In addition, we asked our respondents a variety of questions about their political views, including political ideology and
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6 This included all questions from all four scales, but eliminated some due to redundancy. “Questions” were actually statements; respondents were asked to express degrees of approval or disapproval with each statement, on a seven point scale ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.”
feeling thermometers for each of the significant Norwegian political parties, as well as standard demographic questions.

In an embedded question-order experiment, two types of survey questionnaires with different question ordering were randomly distributed. In Questionnaire type 1, administered to 2/3 of respondents, questions about political attitudes not related to immigration were placed before any questions about immigration or prejudice; Questionnaire type 2 reversed this order, placing the general political questions at the end. This allowed us to check for effects of priming the immigration issue on responses to the general questions about politics, and also whether mentioning political parties and ideology had any effects on the anti-racism norm measures.

**Results**

In the following sections, we present results first from our factor analysis of the motivation to avoid prejudice items. This establishes that an anti-racism norm operates among the Norwegians in our sample, as we find that participants report being motivated to avoid prejudice. Also, we find that this motivation stems from both internal and external sources much as in the U.S. We use these results to develop new scales, the Norwegian Internal Motivation and External Motivation Scales (NIMS and NEMS), which we validate by comparison to well-established measures of prejudice and personality traits.

**Coherence of IMS and EMS in Norway**

We begin by showing that our translations of the various motivation to avoid prejudice items worked to capture actual, well-structured variation in opinion in our Norwegian sample. First, we conducted exploratory factor analysis on each of the four motivation batteries (IMS, EMS, MCPR, SPS), the results of which appear in Table 1. Factor analysis reveals one main factor.
for each of the four scales, on which all the items load heavily, suggesting that each of the
American measures is comprehensible in the European context. However, the IMS and EMS
scales, which separate two different motivations for controlling prejudice, perform much
clearly better than the other two scales. The factors based on these scales explain more variance, and
scales constructed from these items have a higher Cronbach’s alpha, indicating that they are
more reliable measures.

[TABLE 1 about here]

This difference between the scales suggests that social norms prohibiting prejudice in
Norway may well operate through two channels as in the US: externally through social
pressure and internally through personal values. The MCPR and SPS scales, which conflate
these two motivations, appear to be missing an important distinction. To explore this
possibility further, we performed an exploratory factor analysis on all of the items from the
four scales together. The analysis was first run with no restrictions on the number of
components. Respondents who answered don’t know or who had given no response were
excluded from this analysis, along with respondents who indicated they were from an
immigrant background. The results showed two clear and distinct factors, with a possible third
factor.

Our next step lent support to the extraction of two main factors. Restricting the
number of factors to three, we reran the factor analysis with all 23 items. The results
(available from the authors) showed two main factors corresponding closely to the “internal”
and “external” motivations proposed by Plant and Devine. With one exception, items from
the IMS scale all load heavily on the first, “internal” factor, along with the items from the
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7 This is not a result of question ordering effects, as the items in each battery were mixed in the questionnaire.
8 Eigenvalues were 4.8, 4.0, and 2.2, respectively. A scree plot similarly showed two clear factors and a third
possible factor.
9 The exceptional item from the IMS scale is “Being nonpredjudiced towards immigrants is important to my self-
concept.” Its weaker loading may just indicate a loss in translation: the Norwegian word used for “self-concept”
in the survey is actually much closer to the word “self-image” (selvbilde), and suggests concerns about external
as well as internal appearances.

URL: http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/fbep
other two scales which emphasise internal motivations. The two Dunton and Fazio MCPR items that most clearly emphasize internal motivations also load on this factor, as does the lone item from the SPS scale which focuses on an internal motive.

Most of the Plant and Devine EMS scale items load heavily on the second “external” factor, along with three of the MCPR items which emphasize social pressures. None of Crandall and colleagues’ items load strongly on this dimension, since none of these items focus particularly on social pressures. Two of the EMS items load not strongly, but still positively, on the “external” factor.

Analysis of the combined items thus suggests that the studied segment of Norwegians, like their American counterparts, exhibit separate and distinct internal and external motivations for controlling prejudice, with most of the items in the more general MCPR scale actually falling into one of these two categories. The SPS scale is also reasonably coherent in the Norwegian context, but we decided not to investigate it further as the IMS and EMS scales perform more strongly in statistical tests and have been more extensively validated and applied in further psychological studies in the US (Devine and Plant 2002).

Construction of Norwegian scales

The next step was to cull the best performing items from the list, and produce new scales for use in future studies (subject to further validation, as presented later in this paper). Removing items that loaded primarily on the suppression factor, and those with loadings of less than 0.5 on the internal and external factors in the exploratory factor analysis, we created two new scales, the Norwegian Internal and External Motivation scales (NIMS and NEMS), from the

---

10 “I get angry with myself when I have a thought or feeling that might be considered prejudiced” and “I feel guilty when I have a negative thought or feeling about an immigrant”.  
11 “I don’t want to appear racist or sexist, even to myself.”  
12 “In today’s society it is important that one not be perceived as prejudiced in any manner”; “It is important to me that other people not think I’m prejudiced”; “When speaking to an immigrant, it’s important to me that he/she not think I’m prejudiced”
remaining items that loaded on our internal and external factors, respectively. We subjected these new scales to confirmatory factor analysis (see Table 2). The analysis reveals distinct internal and external factors which between them explain 50% of the total variance in all the items.\footnote{Chi Squared, Aikake Information Criterion and Bayesian Information Criterion tests were performed to evaluate whether the two factor solution provided a better fit to the data. In all cases, using two factors produces a highly significant improvement in model fit compared to the one factor solution.} This confirms that coherent and distinct internal and external motivations to control prejudice operate in our Norwegian sample. Reliability tests on these scales show that both are sufficiently reliable, with Cronbach’s alpha statistics of 0.76, a figure which cannot be improved by the removal of any item.\footnote{Nonresponse and missing data were not a serious problem for the NIMS items: three of these items were answered by all respondents, while the remainder had only one missing case. There were more missing responses on the other scale. Between one and six respondents responded “don’t know” (DK) to the items on the NEMS scale, with none answered by all respondents. While some level of nonresponse is not surprising given the sensitive nature of many of the items on these scales and the fact that DK answers were allowed in the survey, the response rates for all items were above 90%, and only three items were refused by five or more respondents. These three items are: “I try to hide any negative thoughts about immigrants in order to avoid negative reactions from others.” (5 missing); “If I acted prejudiced towards immigrants, I would be concerned that others would be angry with me.” (6 missing); and “When I meet a person of another race or ethnicity, I try to avoid thinking about their race.” (5 missing). Where data are missing on one or more items in the scale, a respondent’s score was calculated using the items remaining, so that each respondent has a nonmissing score on each scale. As a check, the following analysis was also conducted using scales constructed using conventional listwise deletion methods, with little impact on the pattern of the results.}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Properties of NIMS and NEMS}
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline
Property & NIMS & NEMS \\
\hline
Mean & 2.20 & 2.19 \\
Standard Deviation & 0.77 & 0.80 \\
Reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) & 0.76 & 0.75 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

With the above results in hand, we calculated individual level scores on both NIMS and NEMS for each respondent, aggregating standardised responses to each scale’s items into a single score for use in the remainder of this study. We then proceeded to examine individual level variation in NIMS and NEMS to see how they related to each other, to existing measures of prejudice, and to measures of general norm-following attitudes and behavior. As we will show below, we find that NIMS and NEMS are distinct from one another and from general norm-following, and are related in expected ways to measures of prejudice, thus further validating the scales for use in future studies.
First, as in Devine & Plant’s US findings, the NIMS and NEMS are quite distinct. In fact, as the scatterplot in Figure 1 confirms, there is no relationship at all between the two motivations to control prejudice at the individual level. Those who feel personally motivated to control negative racial bias are no more or less likely to respond to social pressures to act unprejudiced than those who feel no such internal demands. As table 3 shows, our sample contains respondents who are moved both by internally and externally driven desires to control their prejudice, respondents who are moved by one but not the other, and respondents who report neither motivation.

<Figure 1 & Table 3 about here>

We should also note here that our respondents’ answers to the batteries of motivation questions were not contaminated by priming them to think about political ideology and political parties first. As described above, we performed a question-ordering manipulation in which one-third of the respondents completed the prejudice items before the political items, while two-thirds had the reverse. These two groups’ responses to the motivation to avoid prejudice measures were statistically indistinguishable. Thus, individual NIMS and NEMS scores do not seem to be affected by prior discussion of political ideology and parties.

Discriminant Validity: Relationship of NIMS and NEMS to personality measures

Having identified two coherent motivations to control prejudice in the Norwegian context, our next task is to check if these motivations pick out something distinctive about prejudice, or alternatively if they are mere instances of more general motivations to conform with social norms in everyday life. As Plant and Devine (1998) note, the external motivation to control prejudice is especially vulnerable to this concern, since it explicitly measures how respondents feel about being evaluated by others. In order to test whether or not our scales discriminate between anti-racism norms in particular and conformity to social norms in
general, we asked respondents to answer two lengthy, widely-used batteries of questions that assess two different versions of such social conformity. These are the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (SDS) and the Self-Monitoring Scale (SMS) developed by Snyder and Gangestad (1986), each of which has been translated into a number of other languages previously, including Norwegian for the SDS (Rudmin 1999). The SDS (Crowne and Marlowe, 1960) measures respondents’ tendency to speak and act in ways that meet with broad social approval.15 Self-monitoring, meanwhile, measures the extent to which individuals regulate their self-presentation in public situations or interpersonal interactions. High-scorers on the SMS modify their behaviour more to give “situationally appropriate performances” based on social expectations and “interpersonal cues” (Snyder and Gangestad 1986), while low self-monitors are less likely to change to fit the situation or to respond to social cues.

Our substantive concern here was to show that the motivation to respond without prejudice did not simply reflect a broader desire to respond in socially desirable ways as reflected in the SDS scale, nor a heightened tendency to respond to situational cues for appropriate behaviour as captured by the SMS. To test for these possibilities, we aggregated respondents’ answers to each of these scales into a single standardized score.16 We then examined the correlation of each of these scales with our two measures of motivation to control prejudice. As seen below (Table 4), people who are high in NIMS or NEMS are no more likely to be high in self-monitoring or socially desirable behavior in general. Correlations among these scales are substantively small and indistinguishable from zero even by generous standards of statistical significance. (p>.10 in all four cases). We can be
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15 The Marlowe-Crowne scale seems to measure a real tendency to behave in a socially desirable manner in everyday life, as opposed to merely a tendency to answer survey question in such a manner (Johnson and Fendrich 2002).

16 Where data were missing a standardised score was calculated based on the available items. On the SDS, complete information was available for 69 of 76 respondents, 5 were missing on one item, and 1 respondent each were missing two and three items, respectively. For the SMS scale, complete information was available for 73 respondents, one item was missing for 1 respondent, and two items missing for 2 respondents.
confident, then, that the internal and external motivations to avoid prejudice we have found among Norwegian respondents are specific to the domain of prejudice, rather than expressions of general norms against socially undesirable responses and behaviours.

Convergent validity: Relationship of NIMS and NEMS to measures of prejudice

Thus far, we have found evidence that our Norwegian respondents show varying degrees of both internal and external motivation to adhere to anti-racist norms. As an additional validity check, we now examine the relationship of NIMS and NEMS with our versions of three established scales measuring racial prejudice: classical racism (CR), stereotypes (ST), and modern racism (MR).

As a measure of a respondent’s internal motivation to avoid prejudiced responses, the NIMS should be associated with lower scores on prejudice scales – indeed, if respondents who measure as highly motivated to avoid prejudice on the NIMS do not in fact respond with low levels of prejudice, then clearly NIMS does not measure the construct it is designed to capture. We expect weaker correlations between NEMS and prejudice scales. Responding to a survey item is a relatively private act, particularly in the anonymous, written form that we used in this study. Thus, external motivations to avoid prejudice may not influence these responses. Indeed, if the Norwegian context is similar to the US context in this respect, we should expect either no discernible correlations, or even positive relationships between NEMS and prejudice scale scores, as Plant and Devine found. Those high in NEMS (particularly if they are also low in NIMS –see Devine et al. 2002) may report prejudice in an anonymous survey that they would not express in public or in a social interaction.

17 Face-to-face survey or even telephone interviews have more of the characteristics of a social interaction. See Sanders 1995; Berinsky 1999.
Our results are very much as predicted. First, the NIMS performs as expected. As Table 5 shows, it is strongly and negatively correlated with all three prejudice scales. This correlation holds equally strongly for the allegedly more subtle modern racism scale as for the two more blatant scales. Second, also as expected, NEMS is not strongly correlated with any of the prejudice scales. To the extent that there is an association it appears to be a positive one, such that those with more external motivation to respond without prejudice might be slightly more likely to respond with prejudice on the three scales, although only one of the three correlation coefficients was even marginally statistically significant.

Thus, all three prejudice scales were strongly and negatively related to NIMS while weakly and positively, if at all, associated with NEMS. This is precisely the pattern Devine and Plant find in their original validation of IMS and EMS in the US context, suggesting that the two motivations work in similar ways in Norway and in the US, at least given the limited student samples used in both studies. This is not to say that anti-racism norms are substantively identical or equally strong in the two countries, but our results suggest that Norwegians, like Americans, feel both internal and external pressure to live up to norms against prejudice, and that these motivations are related in the same way to racism in various forms. Notably, as in Plant and Devine’s US findings, the group of participants that endorses stereotypes the most freely (in the private, anonymous survey setting) is the low NIMS and high NEMS group. Again, we do not wish to draw strong conclusions from this part of the analysis, as the small sample sizes in each category make the differences statistically insignificant.

Our results differ in one minor way from Plant and Devine’s: while in private reporting conditions they find the least stereotyping among those high in both internal and external motivations, we find high NEMS consistently associated with more stereotyping at a given level of NIMS, so that the least stereotyping occurs among those high in internal but low in external motivation.
With NIMS so strongly and negatively associated with the three prejudice scales, it is reasonable to ask whether it simply measures the inverse of prejudice. Social psychological models of prejudice and its expression would argue against this interpretation, however. There is broad consensus that the expression of prejudice has at least two essential components: underlying “automatic” attitudes which may contain greater or lesser degrees of racial bias, and “controlled” attitudes which may (or may not) act as a brake on the expression of automatic attitudes. This brake is easier to apply in some contexts than in others (see Blinder 2004); individuals also vary in their ability and motivation to apply it. NIMS and NEMS capture the latter factor: individual variation in motivation to apply a controlled “brake” to any expression of prejudice. NIMS does not address the automatic components of prejudice, which are better measured by tools that bypass individuals’ efforts at applying the brakes to prejudice, such as the Implicit Attitudes Test (Greenwald et al.1998).

The anti-prejudice norm and politics: a first look

With added confidence that we can measure individuals’ motivation to adhere to social norms against racism, we now turn our attention back toward the political questions we raised at the outset. While we are still far from answering our overarching questions about the politics of immigration in Europe, we can begin to ask what sort of political impact these social norms have. We have two primary expectations. Firstly, those scoring high on the NIMS, who have internalised social norms sanctioning prejudice, should be less supportive of parties perceived to be racist, even in the context of an anonymous survey. But which parties are perceived to be racist? Perhaps those parties best liked by the most prejudiced individuals.

Thus, as a first step, we looked at the correlation between individuals’ scores on the three racism scales and their scores on ”feeling thermometers” for each significant Norwegian
political party. The relationships should be mirror images: those parties who enjoy higher support from the racially prejudiced will be avoided by high NIMS respondents, and vice versa. Secondly, there should be no such relationship among those who score high on the EMS scale, as the external social sanction should not operate much if at all in a private and anonymous survey setting. Table 6 shows that both of these expectations are fulfilled. High NIMS respondents have lower views of the radically restrictionist Fremskrittspartiet (FRP) and the mainstream conservative Høyre (H), both parties which enjoy higher ratings from more racially prejudiced respondents. At the other end of the political spectrum, high NIMS respondents give significantly more positive ratings to the parties of the left and far left (the DNA, SV and RV) which are rated significantly lower by more prejudiced respondents.

No such relationship holds, however, between NEMS and party ratings. This suggests, for example, that the radical right party enjoys considerable support from Norwegian respondents who do not want to be perceived as prejudiced by their external environment. We would expect that in a more public setting, or in a context where this party is clearly framed as racist in the eyes of peers, these high NEMS respondents would be less likely to express support for the radical right party. This possibility should be tested in a future study as it has crucial implications for how we understand immigration politics. In particular, such respondents’ affinity for anti-immigrant parties should depend at least in part on whether or not those parties are perceived as beyond the pale of anti-racist norms. If so, then the issues we raised at the outset about political communications return to the fore. Right-wing mobilization may depend on means of avoiding the perception that they violate anti-racist norms, while combating right-wing mobilization may benefit from creating or enhancing that

---

19 Feeling thermometers simply ask respondents to rate how warmly or coldly they feel toward someone or something.

20 According to Ivarsflaten’s previous work, Norway’s radical right party has a strong “reputational shield” against accusations of racism due to long-standing associations with issues other than immigration restrictions (Ivarsflaten 2005a). Thus, a public setting might be less relevant with regards to this radical right party, because support for it does not unambiguously suggest prejudice.
perception of norm violation. It is documented in existing research that political parties engage in such political back and forth (Ivarsflaten 2007). The measures we have developed here can be used to empirically test the extent to which voters are influenced by it.

Discussion

In brief, then, the empirical analysis has confirmed that a coherent social norm sanctioning prejudice operates in a segment of the Norwegian population, and influences their expression of prejudice. Previously, such a norm has only been documented in this manner in the US, a country with a long and tortuous history of racial conflict and division, so it is noteworthy to find a similar norm operating in the much more homogenous Norwegian context, where immigration and ethnic diversity are recent experiences. As in the US, two distinct motivations to follow this norm operate among Norwegians. Some alter their behaviour mainly in response to social expectations of tolerance towards minorities. Others go further, internalising the norm sanctioning prejudice as a personal value, and striving to keep their behaviour in line with their understandings of the norm in all situations.

Of course, our study has important limitations at this stage. Since our intention is that this study should be a useful step towards developing a research agenda on the anti-racism norm and immigration politics in Europe generally, two methodological choices that affect the results of this study need to be discussed in a bit more detail before we conclude. We need to examine, first, the consequences of relying on a student sample for this type of research, and, second, the implications of running the study in Norway as opposed to elsewhere in Western Europe.

The student sample

21 A study by Akrami and Ekehammar use Dunton and Fazio’s MCPR scale in the Swedish context, but this study is the first validation of motivation to respond without prejudice scales that we are aware of in the European context.
We chose to conduct this study on a small and inexpensive scale—using a student sample—because it could not be taken for granted that questions measuring the anti-racism norm that had been developed for and used to study the US context of race politics would be meaningful when transferred to a setting that differs substantially. The study design is useful, we argue, for examining if existing measures travel well enough to produce meaningful, well-structured responses in a new setting. Furthermore, since the time constraints on a survey using this type of sample are much less severe than for larger studies, we were able to include an excess number of items measuring each concept which facilitates careful validation and discussion of which items future, larger studies should adopt as an individual-level measure of the anti-racism norm.  

In his well-known critique of studies using a student sample, Sears (1986) does not recommend abandoning this sampling strategy all together, but rather to study and be explicit about the biases such a sample brings about. The socio-demographic characteristics of our sample are typical of student samples: women, young people, and the highly educated are overrepresented relative to national averages. As a result, left-leaning political views are overrepresented as well. Mean party thermometer scores in our study are consistently higher for left-wing parties and lower for right-wing parties than those recorded in the representative national Norwegian Election Study (2005); ideological self-placement on the left-right scale shows a similar story (see Figure 3). That noted, our sample includes respondents from across the full ideological spectrum.

<FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE>

Unfortunately, there is no representative study of anti-racism norms to which we can compare the results of this study, so we cannot know if our sample overrepresents those who

22 It is also worth noting that even in the US context, the studies of motivation to respond without prejudice have mainly been conducted by social psychologists who habitually use student samples, so the sample we have used in this study is more comparable to those of existing research than a randomly selected representative sample would be.
subscribe to such norms. We might speculate, however, that we are particularly likely to find such norms in a student sample that display the characteristics outlined above. In particular, we would suppose that citizens with high levels of formal education are more likely to have been exposed to the anti-racism norm than those with less education (although see Sidanius et al. 2000 and Jackman 1994 for an alternate perspective on education and racial attitudes in the US), and further that this holds even more strongly for younger generations, as has been found in Britain (Ford 2008). Thus, we would guess that our sample is biased in the direction of a more strongly articulated anti-racism norm than we would find in the rest of Norway. On the other hand, our sample was by no means uniform in rejecting various forms of prejudice or in reporting high levels of motivation to avoid expressing prejudice. Thus, even in what is most likely a particularly anti-racist, politically liberal environment, the prejudice scales and anti-racism measures registered sufficient levels of variation to be studied systematically.

The Norwegian context

The specific country context could also hinder the generalizability of our key findings if Norway deviates significantly from the rest of Western Europe on dimensions that can reasonably be thought to affect the presence of an anti-racism norm. As discussed in the following paragraphs some potentially relevant differences between groups of Western European countries do exist. These differences might lead to considerable variation regarding the scope and nature of the anti-racism norm, and the possibility of such variability is one of the reasons why we believe the research agenda sketched in this paper should be pursued further in a cross-national comparative setting.

One possibly relevant difference among Western European nations is that some countries have a colonial history, while others such as Norway do not. Mendelberg (2001) argues that the anti-racism norm in the U.S. developed and spread as a result of specific social
and political developments there, particularly the civil rights struggle (see also Lee 2002).
Likewise, country-specific events related to the end and aftermath of colonialism might have
created different conditions for the development of the anti-racism norm across Western
Europe.\textsuperscript{23} If lessons drawn from a country’s colonial history affects the development of anti-
racism norms, it is likely that this norm is less pronounced in the Norwegian context than
elsewhere in Europe.

A second difference among Western European countries of potential relevance is their
different legacies from WWII, and resulting differences in the sense of collective
responsibility for the Holocaust. David Art (2005) argues that the anti-racism norm is
stronger and more encompassing in Germany than in Austria, because in Germany citizens
were forced to come to terms with their country’s responsibility for the Holocaust, while in
Austria they were not, at least until the mid-1980s Kurt Waldheim affair. It is possible
therefore that Germany is in a special position when compared to other Western European
countries. The effect of the WWII legacy in Norway, which was occupied by Germany
during WWII, is likely to be similar to that of most other Allied countries. The norm would
in other words not be particularly pronounced in the Norwegian context.

Last, variability in the salience of the immigration issue in contemporary politics could
also lead to different degrees of articulation of the anti-racism norm across Western European
countries. It seems reasonable to hypothesize that the anti-racism norm will be more clearly
articulated in contexts where this area of politics is or recently has been highly salient.
Norway, like half of the other Western European countries, has had a highly successful
populist radical right party, The Progress Party (\textit{Fremskrittspartiet}), which rose to political
influence in part because of its restrictive immigration policies (Carter 2005, Kitschelt

\textsuperscript{23} For example, Ford (2008b) argues that in European societies with a longer experience of immigration,
government efforts to criminalise and marginalise racial discrimination, and promote diversity may encourage
development of such a norm.
In terms of immigration and asylum trends, Norway has experienced increases like the rest of Western Europe since the mid 1980s, but levels of new immigrant minorities remain at the modest end of the Western European spectrum (Messina 2007). Comparative cross-sectional examinations of immigration policy preferences showed a sizeable part of respondents on the restrictive side in Norway as in the rest of Western Europe around 2003, but the score of Norwegian respondents was still slightly below the Western European average (Ivarsflaten 2005, Norris 2005). Contemporary trends in politics, migration, and immigration policy preferences thus give a mixed picture of the Norwegian case. The politicization of the immigration issue may mean that the anti-racism norm has become more pronounced in the Norwegian context than in the Western European countries without prominent populist radical right parties.

**Conclusion: Toward a new research agenda**

At the outset, we argued that the anti-racism norm might be a crucial missing piece of the puzzle in explaining Europe’s politics of immigration and variations in the successes and failures of its radical right-wing, anti-immigration parties. We suggested that there is reason to think that norms against racism exist broadly in Europe, especially Western Europe, and that they can be mobilized to counteract radical right efforts to tap into fairly common negative racial bias. Further, we pointed to US research establishing that while social norms are clearly an aggregate, societal phenomenon, anti-racist norms can be measured as an individual level variable, in the form of motivation to avoid prejudiced responses and behavior.

The pilot study reported in this paper has reinforced these views. We found that measures of internal and external motivation to avoid prejudice developed for the US context

24 Although, see Mudde (2007) for an argument that FrP’s ideological platform makes the party a borderline populist right party. According to Mudde, it is less nativist than the parties he categorizes as populist radical right parties.
travelled nicely. We validated new scales (closely related to their American predecessors) designed to measure these dual motivations toward anti-racism. Moreover, we found that these scales vary at the individual level, and that this variation follows predictable patterns and co-varies in predictable ways with related concepts measuring prejudice.

Given our findings along with our theoretical arguments for the importance of anti-racist norms in the politics of immigration, we suggest that it is worthwhile to expand efforts to document the existence of anti-racist norms elsewhere in Europe. In the Norwegian context in particular, with NIMS and NEMS now validated in a student sample, further studies might incorporate them into nationally representative surveys, or continue to employ them in laboratory or survey-based experiments. In other countries, validation studies modelled on this one would ideally be conducted before including the items in a representative survey. That said, in our view, the biggest hurdle was to show that measures developed for the context of race politics in the U.S. could travel to the context of immigration politics in Europe. This study has documented that this is the case. In our judgment, therefore, it is likely that including some of the best-performing items from this study directly in cross-national or national surveys without further piloting will be fruitful.

Alongside encouraging efforts to document forms of variation in anti-racism norms, we also call for explicitly including anti-racism norms in theoretical models explaining immigration politics in Western Europe. We have discussed how this could lead to better explanations of the context-sensitivity of immigration policy preferences and of the failure of many anti-immigrant parties to mobilize their full potential. On top of this, taking the anti-racism norm into account will likely make researchers rethink some commonly held assumptions about contemporary immigration politics. Some such revisionist accounts we can already foresee; others remain to be discovered.
We would like to end by sketching one example of how including the anti-racism norm in our explanations could lead to revision of current accounts of immigration politics. Using our existing theoretical lenses, it appears that many mainstream political parties in Western Europe have chosen vote-losing strategies on the immigration issue by opposing anti-immigrant parties and their policies in various ways. However, if we allow for the possibility that appeals to the anti-racism norm can be effective, at least in certain circumstances and among parts of the electorate, then these mainstream parties could be mobilizing voters in ways that we have so far failed to notice. Since currently we only have evidence about immigration policy preferences and prejudice and not about normative concerns and motivations to avoid prejudice we cannot yet empirically probe this type of revisionist hypothesis. We believe, however, that the study of immigration politics would be strengthened and stimulated if we could do so.
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### Table 1. Factor analysis of four different American measures of the anti-prejudice norm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Motivation to Control Prejudice</th>
<th>Internal Motivation</th>
<th>External Motivation</th>
<th>Suppression of Prejudice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eigenvalue</strong></td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance explained</strong></td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cronbach’s Alpha</strong></td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Confirmatory Factor Analysis: NIMS and NEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Norwegian Internal Motivation Scale (NIMS)</th>
<th>Norwegian External Motivation Scale (NEMS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personally important to act nonprejudiced</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to my personal values, stereotypes OK*</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprejudiced due to my own convictions</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal values, stereotypes not OK</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry with myself when have prej thought</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel guilt when I have negative thought about immigrants</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t want to appear racist, not even to myself</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hide prej thoughts to avoid negative reactions</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If acted prej, concerned other people angry</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appear nonprej to avoid disapproval from others</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important not to be perceived as prej in today’s society</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to me other people think I am unprej</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking to immigrant, important he thinks I’m not prej</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eigenvalue</strong></td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tests: 2 factors vs 1 factor**

- Change in Chi-squared: 122.6***
- Change in AIC: 109.3***
- Change in BIC: 83.1***

Factor loadings are rotated using the varimax rotation method.

### Table 3: Distribution of high and low NIMS and NEMS respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Internal motivation low</th>
<th>Internal motivation high</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External motivation low</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External motivation high</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4. Relationships between NIMS/NEMS and personality measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NIMS</th>
<th>NEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Monitoring</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table notes: Entries are pairwise correlation coefficients. No correlation was significant at p<.05

Table 5: Pairwise correlations between NIMS and NEMS and three racism measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Internal Motivation</th>
<th>External Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMS</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>-.55*</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>-.45*</td>
<td>.19+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>-.53*</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table notes: Entries are pairwise correlation coefficients. Bold indicates p<.05; italics indicate p<.10.

Table 6: Pairwise correlations: Party support with NIMS, NEMS, Stereotype Endorsement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Internal Motivation</th>
<th>External Motivation</th>
<th>Stereotypes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRP</td>
<td>-0.37*</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>-0.21+</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRF</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.27*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.36*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 1. Scatterplot of Internal Motivation against External Motivation

Figure 2: Endorsement of stereotypes by NIMS and NEMS

Mean scores on stereotype scale
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Figure 3. Ideological left-right self-placement, our sample vs. 2005 Norwegian Election Study.