Stereotyping & Prejudice

Lecture Overview

- Discuss Midterm 2
- Group-Based Bias
  - Intergroup cognition
  - Intergroup affect
  - Intergroup behaviour
- Reducing Prejudice & Discrimination

Midterm 2

- See the announcement posted yesterday (November 12th)
- Midterm 2 is online
- You have until November 19th to argue that any question had more than 1 correct answer

Important Caveats

- You MUST check the “Midterm 2” section on the FAQ to see if someone else has already argued for the same thing:
  - http://www.utsc.utoronto.ca/psyb10/faq.html#exam2
- You MUST be able to cite a specific page number, lecture slide, or WebOption Lecture timestamp
- I will not consider arguments based on “common sense”
Midterm 2

If someone argues an alternative answer successfully:

- I will give 3 points to everyone who chose that alternate answer
- Announcement & Change in Mark on BlackBoard

Group-Based Bias

Psychological Components

- Affect
- Behaviour
- Cognition

Affective Component:

Prejudice

Cognitive Component:

Stereotypes

Beliefs about the typical characteristics (usually traits) of group members

Schemas used to categorize complex social groups

A hostile or negative attitude toward a distinguishable group of people, based only on their membership in that group
**Behavioural Component: Discrimination**

- Unjustified negative or harmful action toward a member of a group, simply because of his or her membership in that group.

**Stereotyping**

- Stereotypes Across Time
- Mechanisms
- Who stereotypes?

---

**“A Short Description of the People Who Live in Europe and their Defining Characteristics”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Customs</th>
<th>Nature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Arrogant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Frivolous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| German | Open-Hearted | }
“Racial Stereotypes of 100 College Students”

Katz & Braly (1933)

GERMANS:
Scientifically minded (78%)
Industrious (65%)
Stolid (44%)

ITALIANS:
Artistic (33%)
Impulsive (44%)
Passionate (37%)

Jews:
Shrewd (79%)
Mercenary (49%)
Industrious (48%)

NEGROES:
Superstitious (84%)
Lazy (75%)
Happy-go-lucky (35%)

In many cases, a high degree of consensus (agreement)

Gave impetus to investigate the nature and content of stereotypes

The Princeton Trilogy

Longitudinal Study of Stereotypes:
Katz & Bradley (1933)
Gilbert (1957)
Karlins et al. (1969)

The Princeton Trilogy

1933 1951 1969

Americans
Industrious
Intelligent
Materialistic
Ambitious
Progressive
Industrious
Intelligent
Materialistic
Ambitious
Progressive
Industrious
Intelligent
Materialistic
Ambitious
Progressive

Japanese
Intelligent
Industrious
Shrewd
Sky
Sky
Extremely Nationalistic
Efficient
Industrious
Intelligent
Ambitious
Progressive

Jews
Shrewd
Mercenary
Industrious
Cynical
Intelligent
Shrewd
Mercenary
Industrious
Cynical
Intelligent
Shrewd

Conclusions:
Stereotypes are generally stable over time
Stereotypes are also contextually bound
Stereotypes: Mechanisms

- Usually broad and generalized:
- “Trait-based” stereotype
- Can also be dependent on context:
  - IF _______ , THEN ___________

Who Stereotypes?

- Most people have knowledge of cultural stereotypes
- Factors affecting stereotype use:
  - Egalitarian ideologies
  - Cognitive load

Egalitarian Ideologies

- Stereotype Activation
  - Automatic
    - Stereotypes are automatically activated
- Non-prejudiced Response
  - Controlled
    - If the person is egalitarian, the controlled process of the stereotype is activated
    - That person will preconsciously reject stereotypical judgments

Cognitive Load

- Greater use of cognitive resources
- Greater load = More reliance on stereotypes
Cognitive Load & Stereotyping

Mendoza-Denton et al. (1999)

Method:
1. Participants all high in egalitarian ideology
2. Experimental Condition: Cognitive Load or not
3. Rate the aggressiveness of “African Americans” and “Caucasian Americans”

Egalitarian

Cognitive Load: Remember 782995026
Low Load: Remember 543

Black People
White People

How Aggressive Are...

Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings of Aggression</th>
<th>White Target</th>
<th>Black Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Load</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Load</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meta-Stereotypes

Stereotypes about how outgroup members stereotype the ingroup

Consequences of Stereotyping

For the Perceiver
For the Target
Outcomes for the Perceiver

**Good:**
- Move quickly through social world
- Conserve cognitive resources

**Bad:**
- Selective encoding
- Make more judgement errors

Selective Encoding by Stereotypes

* Macrae, Milne, & Bodenhausen (1994)

**Method:**
- Participants come to lab for person perception experiment
- Read a list of personality traits of 3 targets
- Stereotype conditions:
  - **Stereotype Present:** Group associated with each target
  - **Stereotype Absent:** No groups associated with the targets
- Ask Participants to recall as many traits as they can remember about each target

**“Stereotype Absent” Condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nigel (Doctor)</th>
<th>Julian</th>
<th>John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>Rebellious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>Temperamental</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>Unconventional</td>
<td>Dishonest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upstanding</td>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>Dangerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>Untrustworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlucky</td>
<td>Fearless</td>
<td>Lucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgetful</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Observant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Cordial</td>
<td>Modest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clumsy</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>Optimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>Generous</td>
<td>Curious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**“Stereotype Present” Condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nigel (skinhead)</th>
<th>Julian (artist)</th>
<th>John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>Rebellious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>Temperamental</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>Unconventional</td>
<td>Dishonest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upstanding</td>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>Dangerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>Untrustworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlucky</td>
<td>Fearless</td>
<td>Lucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgetful</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Observant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Cordial</td>
<td>Modest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clumsy</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>Optimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>Generous</td>
<td>Curious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selective Encoding by Stereotypes

- Macrae, Milne, & Bodenhausen (1994)

Results: Recalled words by stereotypicality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral Traits</th>
<th>Stereotypical Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average # Traits Recalled

Outcomes for the Target

- Individual level
  - Health outcomes
    - Higher mortality rates, heart attacks, diastolic BP
- Social Level
  - Stereotype Threat
  - Law enforcement: Racial Profiling

Stereotype Threat

- The apprehension experienced by members of stereotyped groups that they may behave in a manner that confirms existing stereotypes
- Becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy

Stereotype Threat

- Steele & Aronson (1995)

Method:
1. Black and White participants
2. All participants told they will take a difficult test
3. Stereotype Threat Condition:
   - Threat: Told, “This test is diagnostic of your intellectual ability.”
   - No Threat: “This test is not diagnostic of your ability”
4. Participants take test (subset of GRE Verbal)
**Stereotype Threat**

* Steele & Aronson (1995)

**Results: Performance by threat condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average # Items Solved</th>
<th>Black Participants</th>
<th>White Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specificity of Stereotype Threat**

* Stone, Lynch, Sjomeling, & Darley (1999)

**Method:**
1. African-American and Caucasian-American participants
2. Play a stationary golfing game
3. Stereotype Threat Condition:
   - Threat for Black Ps: “Sports Intelligence”
   - Threat for White Ps: “Natural Ability”
4. Measure actual golf performance

**Results:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean # of Strokes</th>
<th>African-American Ps</th>
<th>Caucasian-American Ps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Complexity of Stereotype Threat**

* Stone, Lynch, Sjomeling, & Darley (1999)

**Question 1:** Is there a stereotype in Canadian culture that Men are better at math than Women?

A. Yes
B. No
C. Not sure
Question 2: Is there a stereotype in Canadian culture that Asians are better at math than non-Asians?

A. Yes  
B. No  
C. Not sure

Method:
1. All Asian-American or Asian-Canadian Participants
2. Made Group membership salient:
   - Race salient: Describe what being Asian means to you.
   - Gender salient: Describe what being female means to you.
   - "Student" salient: Describe what being a student means to you
3. Take subset of GRE Quantitative

Results among Asian-Americans:  

Results among Asian-Americans and Asian-Canadians:
Outgroup Homogeneity

- Cognitive bias to perceive that outgroup members are more similar to each other (more homogenous) than they really are

Nature of Prejudice

- Allport (1954)
  - Prejudice = motivated cognition
    - Having negative views about other groups is not prejudice, if you change those views when confronted with disconfirming evidence
    - Thought prejudice was primarily due to inexperience/ignorance

Prejudice

- Nature of Prejudice
- Psychodynamic Perspectives on Prejudice
- Social Cognitive Perspective on Prejudice: Attitudes
  - Modern and Aversive Racism
  - Motivation to Control Prejudice

Psychodynamic Perspectives

- You feel better by making less of other peoples’ self-worth
- Rooted in Freudian thinking:
  1. Frustration-aggression hypothesis
  2. Reaction formation defence mechanism
Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis

- Chronic social frustration is displaced onto minorities as scapegoats
- Can lead to aggression or displacement of hostility onto minorities

Frustration-Aggression Example

- Hovland & Sears (1940):
  - Higher Price of cotton (economic index)
  - Higher Number of lynchings of African-Americans

Reaction Formation

- Freudian Defence Mechanism
  - Anxiety-producing impulses are replaced by its opposite in consciousness

Reaction Formation & Homophobia

- Adams, Wright, & Lohr (1996)
- Method:
  1. Heterosexual male P.s who scored either HIGH or LOW on a homophobia scale came to the lab
  2. A girth monitor was affixed around P's penis
  3. P's viewed 3, 6-minute pornographic films:
     1. Consensual heterosexual activity
     2. Consensual lesbian activity
     3. Consensual gay male activity
Heterosexual Video

Adams, Wright, & Lohr (1996)

Results: Heterosexual video

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute of Watching Video</th>
<th>Arousal (Penile Girth)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low Homophobics
High Homophobics

Lesbian Video

Adams, Wright, & Lohr (1996)

Results: Lesbian video

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute of Watching Video</th>
<th>Arousal (Penile Girth)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low Homophobics
High Homophobics

Gay Male Video

Adams, Wright, & Lohr (1996)

Results: Gay Male video

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute of Watching Video</th>
<th>Arousal (Penile Girth)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low Homophobics
High Homophobics

Social Cognitive Approach to Prejudice

Prejudice is an attitude about certain social groups

Explicit prejudice
Implicit prejudice
Explicit Prejudice

- Prejudicial attitudes that are held in declarative memory
- You are always aware of your explicit attitudes

Implicit Prejudice

- Automatic prejudicial attitudes that are the degree to which you associate certain ethnic groups with the concepts of “good” and “bad”

Aversive Racism

- Conflict between explicit and implicit prejudice
- Explicitly feel people should be egalitarian
- Implicitly associate certain groups with the concepts of good and bad
- Leads to avoidance of intergroup contexts

Modern Racism

- Outwardly acting unprejudiced while inwardly maintaining prejudiced attitudes
- Key is on regulating prejudicial behaviour
Motivation to Control Prejudice

- **Internal Motivation to Control Prejudice**
  - Desire to be non-prejudiced that comes from within

- **External Motivation to Control Prejudice**
  - Desire to be seen as non-prejudiced by others

Discrimination

- The actions that derive from stereotyping and prejudice

Henry Louis Gates, Jr.

- Tenured Harvard Professor
- 2009/07/16
- Locked his keys inside his house, entered through a window
- Police arrived and asked for ID
- Prof. Gates presented his Drivers License (that showed his address)
- Prof. Gates was arrested

Discrimination in Marriage

**Mixed-race marriage refusal shocks U.S. couple**

A Louisiana justice of the peace has drawn criticism for his refusal to marry an interracial couple.

Keith Bardwell, a justice of the peace in Tangipahoa Parish, turned down the request to issue a marriage license to a couple on the grounds that most interracial marriages do not last long.

"I'm not a racist. I just don't believe in mixing the races that way," Bardwell told The Associated Press on Thursday. "I have black and white friends. I have Jewish friends. I marry them, they use my bathroom. I treat them just like everyone else."

Bardwell said he asks everyone who asks about marriage if they are a mixed-race couple, and if they are, he does not marry them. He said. He said he came to the conclusion that neither black nor white society would accept the offspring of such relationships.

"I think mixed-race children are fine and I don't think it's harmful to them. But I have seen what race does."

[Image of Henry Louis Gates, Jr.]

[Image of article about discrimination in marriage]
Reducing Prejudice & Discrimination

- Self-Affirmation
- Mutual Interdependence
- Contact Hypothesis
- Contact Quality and Friendship
- Extended Contact Effect
- Jigsaw Classroom

Self-Affirmation

- If experiencing low self-esteem, you can restore self-regard by:
  - Thinking about an important social identity (Social Identity Theory)
  - Derogate others to achieve high self-esteem (Psychodynamic Approach)

Fein & Spencer (1997)

Method:

- Participants either affirm their self-worth or not:
  - Self-affirmation: List 5 things that make you good
  - Not affirmation: Don’t do affirmation task
- Read about one of two political candidates: one who is Jewish and one who is Italian
- Rate candidate’s personality

Results:

![Graph showing the mean number of strokes for Jewish and Italian candidates between Self-Affirmed and Not Self-Affirmed conditions.]
Mutual Interdependence

* Situation in which two or more groups need each other and must work together to achieve a superordinate goal
* Sherif's Robber's Cave Experiment

Contact Hypothesis

* Gordon Allport (1954)

Optimal Conditions for Contact

* Allport's 4 conditions
  * Equal status
  * Common goals
  * No competition or intergroup cooperation
  * Sanctioned by authority/social norms
* Pettigrew's (1998) addition
  * Contact must involve friendship

Does Contact Work?

* Pettigrew & Tropp (2006)
  * 515 studies, 713 independent samples
  * Choice questions:
    * Is contact associated with less prejudice?
    * What conditions are truly necessary?
    * Generalization beyond known outgroup member?
    * Which groups?
Contact → Less Prejudice?

- Short Answer: Yes
- Longer answer:
  - Moderately
  - Average effect: \( r = -.21 \)
  - But reliably
  - 94\% of samples: contact → less prejudice

Do We Need These Conditions?

- Short Answer: No
- Non-optimal contact: \( r = -.20 \)
- But they help ...
- Only when all together: \( r = -.29 \)
- None are independently predictive

Generalization?

- Short Answer: Yes
- Unknown members of same group:
  - Average effect: \( r = -.21 \)
- Across situations:
  - Average effect: \( r = -.24 \)
- Unknown members of different groups:
  - Average effect: \( r = -.19 \)

Which Groups?

- All of 'em!
- But to varying degrees ...
  - Gay/Lesbian: \( r = -.27 \)
  - Physically Disabled: \( r = -.24 \)
  - Race and Mentally Disabled: \( r = -.21 \)
  - Mentally Ill and Elderly: \( r = -.18 \)
Quality of Contact

- Friendship:
  - Strongest predictor: $r = -0.25$
  - Particularly among high-conflict groups
- Why?
  - Self-expansion theory: We include collective characteristics of close others' in our self-concept

Indirect Contact Effect

- Knowledge of an ingroup member’s cross-group friends is sufficient to improve intergroup attitudes
- Also called “Extended Contact Effect”

Jigsaw Classroom

- Innovative approach to learning where students work together in small, diverse “co-operative learning teams”
- Idea built off both mutual interdependence and contact theory

Outcomes:
- Decreased prejudice and stereotyping
- Improved performance
- Higher self-esteem
- More friends from other groups
“All colours agree in the dark”
- Sir Francis Bacon

- Next Lecture (11/18):
- Aggression

- Related Websites:
  - Project Implicit:
    - http://projectimplicit.org
  - Reducing Stereotype Threat:
    - http://reducingstereotypethreat.org