

Supplemental Material accompanying the manuscript

Rimicci, A., Kuppens, T., Easterbrook, M.J.E., & Spears, R. (2024). Perceptions of misalignment and the academic achievement of underrepresented groups in higher education, *Topics in Cognitive Psychology* [*L'Année Psychologique*]

Stereotype threat and student identification

Stereotype Threat

A 3-item scale was used to measure stereotype threat. Factor analysis indicated that one item (“My university treats everyone the same, regardless of their background”) did not load with the other two items and was thus removed. Upon removal, the two items indicated a strong correlation ($r = .57$, $p < 0.001$). The two remaining items were “People expect me to behave in a certain way at university because of the amount of money my family has” and “People make assumptions about me at university based on my family’s social background” (Easterbrook, et al., 2015). Participants indicated how much they agreed with each statement on a scale of -3 (disagree strongly) to 3 (agree strongly).

Identification with the student group

A 4-item scale was used to measure identification with university students ($\alpha = .80$). The items were “I identify with university students” (Postmes et al., 2013), “I have strong ties with other university students”, “I think that university students have a lot to be proud of”, and “I have a lot in common with other university students” (Leach et al., 2008). Participants indicated the degree to which they agreed with each statement on a scale of -3 (strongly disagree) to 3 (strongly agree).

Table S1: Descriptive Statistics Stereotype Threat and Identification

	N	Mean	SD	Min, Max	Median
Stereotype Threat	508	-1.37	1.42	-3, 3	-1.50
Student Identification	515	1.21	1.00	-2.75, 3	1.25

Table S2: Correlations (Pearson's *r*) between study variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Grades	—						
2. Total ECTS	.81***	—					
3. Interdependent Motives	-.09*	-.06	—				
4. Independent Motives	.03	.05	.29***	—			
5. Identity Incompatibility	-.16***	-.15***	-.00	-.06	—		
6. Student Identification	.12**	.16***	.08	.20***	-.28***	—	
7. Stereotype Threat	-.00	.04	.09*	-.02	-.13**	-.00	—
8. Social Identity Threat	-.09*	-.11*	.12**	-.11*	.20***	-.55***	.15***

Note: N = 437 - 637. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Results

Higher subjective income was associated with stronger identification with the student group ($\beta = 0.128$, $p = .02$, 95% CI [0.020, 0.236]). Similarly, first-generation students reported lower identification with students ($\beta = -0.094$, $p = .037$, 95% CI [-0.182, -0.006]), compared to continuing-generation students.

Stereotype threat was not related to lower grades, or to the number of credits.

Identification with students was related to higher grades, $\beta=0.113$, $p=.006$, 95% CI [0.025, 0.201], and more credits, $\beta=0.156$ $p=0.001$, 95% CI [0.068, 0.244].

Table S3: Indirect effects of underrepresented group membership, through student identification, on academic performance

	Academic performance indicator	
	Average grade	Number of ECTS
<i>Ethnic minority status</i>		
Student identification	-0.023 [-0.076, 0.013]	-0.032 [-0.099, 0.02]
<i>First generation status</i>		
Student identification	0.026 [-0.001, 0.069]	0.035 [0.001, 0.087]
<i>Subjective income</i>		
Student identification	0.013 [-0.003, 0.036]	0.019 [0.001, 0.046]

Results when all alignment indicators are present in the same model, predicting academic achievement.

Table S4: Regression with all predictor variables on Average grades

Variable	B	95% CI	β	t	p
(Constant)	6.649	[5.817, 7.48]	0.000	15.710	<.001
Interdependent Motives	-0.076	[-0.149, -0.003]	-0.100	-2.041	.042
Independent Motives	0.043	[-0.071, 0.157]	0.036	0.738	.461
Stereotype Threat	-0.017	[-0.088, 0.054]	-0.022	-0.475	.635
Social Identity Threat	0.019	[-0.092, 0.132]	0.020	0.349	.727
Student Identification	0.103	[-0.018, 0.224]	0.093	1.665	.097
Compatibility	0.131	[0.039, 0.224]	0.136	2.793	.005
Gender	0.037	[-0.196, 0.27]	0.014	0.312	.755
Survey Language	0.008	[-0.203, 0.219]	0.004	0.075	.940
Ethnicity	-0.178	[-0.495, 0.139]	-0.053	-1.104	.270
University Generational Status	-0.061	[-0.307, 0.185]	-0.023	-0.485	.628

Note. N = 491. $R^2 = .045$. Adjusted $R^2 = .025$.

Table S5: Regression of all predictor variables on total ECTS

Variable	B	95% CI	β	t	p
(Constant)	48.189	[34.791, 61.587]	0.000	7.067	<.001
Interdependent Motives	-1.083	[-2.263, 0.095]	0.056	-1.806	.072
Independent Motives	1.068	[-0.762, 2.898]	-0.088	1.147	.252
Stereotype Threat	0.369	[-0.781, 1.5189]	0.029	0.631	.528
Social Identity Threat	-0.083	[-1.881, 1.716]	-0.005	-0.090	.928
Student Identification	2.147	[0.196, 4.097]	0.120	2.162	.031
Compatibility	2.034	[0.544, 3.524]	0.130	2.682	.008
Gender	-1.148	[-4.886, 2.591]	-0.027	-0.603	.547
Survey Language	0.391	[-3.011, 3.794]	0.011	0.226	.821
Ethnicity	0.031	[-5.076, 5.138]	0.001	0.012	.991
University Generational Status	-2.379	[-6.345, 1.587]	-0.055	1.179	.239

Note. N = 493. $R^2 = .051$. Adjusted $R^2 = .032$.

References

- Leach, C. W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, M. L. W., Pennekamp, S. F., Doosje, B.,
Ouwerkerk, J. W., & Spears, R. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment:
A hierarchical (multicomponent) model of in-group identification. *Journal of Personality
and Social Psychology*, 95(1), 144–165.
- Postmes, T., Haslam, S. A., & Jans, L. (2013). A single-item measure of social identification:
Reliability, validity, and utility. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 52, 597–617.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12006>