Stereotyping

next week:
Prejudice: The target’s perspective

Last week: Prejudice
Two weeks ago: Managing ethnic and religious differences
• Up to the human cost of Assimilation
Overview

First: Catchup from two weeks ago
- Multiculturalism & dual identities
- It’s a two-way street: The Berry model of acculturation

In this week’s lecture we’re going to discuss:
- Defining stereotypes
- Why do stereotypes survive?
- Can stereotypes be stopped?

Human costs of Assimilation

Voices from the “stolen generation”

“It's like a hole in your heart that can never heal”
*Victorian man*

“Actually what you see in a lot of us is the shell, and I believe as an Aboriginal person that everything is inside me to heal me if I know how to use it, if I know how to maintain it, if I know how to bring it out and use it. But sometimes the past is just too hard to look at.”
*South Australian woman*
MULTICULTURALISM
(essentially the political analogue of the dual identity model)

Psychological assumptions:

- Ethnic identity is fundamental to self-concept: “Man is a thinking and sensitive being: severing him from his roots could destroy an aspect of his personality and deprive society of some of the values he can bring to it” (Government of Canada, 1969)

- Security of identity is a precondition for tolerance - attempts to eclipse valued identities will result in more aggressive intergroup behaviour

- Difference is not inconsistent with unity (“Unity in diversity”, “Celebration of difference”)
“National unity, if it is to mean anything in the deeply personal sense, must be founded on confidence in one's own individual identity; out of this can grow respect for that of others and a willingness to share ideas, attitudes and assumptions. A vigorous policy of multiculturalism will help create this initial confidence. Canadian identity will not be undermined by multiculturalism. Indeed, we believe that cultural pluralism is the very essence of Canadian identity”
- Government of Canada, 1971

“A cohesive and united society, not a divided multicultural society, is what is needed”
One Nation, 1998
**Separation:** “sticking together” ... ghettoization

“All these people come out here and fester in their little cocoons. They've got no idea about becoming Australians. They just want to grab the golden orange off the tree. We must be the greatest suckers on earth.”

*Bruce Ruxton, RSL President*
**Separation:** “sticking together” … ghettoization

**Integration:** maintaining cultural heritage while still supporting and participating in the culture of the host country

**Assimilation:** completely revoking cultural heritage and adopting the values and cultures of the host country

**Marginalization:** Retreat from all types of cultural identification ... individualization.

---

**People look favourably upon the idea of retaining ethnic identities – but:**

- assimilation to new culture tends to develop over time
- greater pressure to assimilate in public
- greater pressure to assimilate if you are a member of a visible minority
- assimilation may occur more readily on some dimensions than others
- freedom of expressing and maintaining heritage culture is dependent on migrants abiding by mutual civic obligations. All Australians are expected to show loyalty to basic structures such as the constitution, parliamentary democracy, freedom of speech and religion, English as the national language, and the rule of law (Department of Multicultural Affairs, 2003).
Creating Harmony

- Contact
  - Positive, equal status
  - Recognition of the individual
  - But recognition of the group member
- Protected dual (group) identities
  - Both groups willing to accept integration
  - Both groups’ heritage protected
  - Superordinate group values consensually accepted by both (vs one-sided)
  - Cooperation achieving mutual goals

What are stereotypes?

Lippman (1922)
Pictures in our heads.

Brown (2000)
The images that spring to mind once a particular category is evoked.

Hogg & Abrams (1988)
Beliefs that all members of a particular group have the same qualities, which circumscribe the group and differentiate it from other groups.
Definitions of stereotyping

Main features
1. Define people in terms of their social category membership
2. Stereotypes are shared

Australian stereotype as seen by wikipedia ...

A lot of these stereotypes are reflected in Crocodile Dundee and Monty Python's Bruces sketch and the character Sir Les Patterson. Australian stereotypical characters always use expressions like "Crikey!", "G'day, mate" and "Put another shrimp [sic] on the barbie." They are often represented as being unsophisticated and obsessed with beer and surfing, boomerangs and kangaroos. Australian men are often shown as being macho, misogynistic brutes. The 'Ozzie' woman is seen as a beach babe with a sexy accent. However due to people like Germaine Greer and Dame Edna they are also generally seen as independent, well educated and forthright to a fault. They are sexy, overbearing about world injustice and date foreigners.
Why do stereotypes survive?

(1) Kernel of truth
(2) Legitimizing function
(3) Socialization
(4) Media
(5) Sub-typing
(6) Attributions
(7) Cognitive factors: Assimilation and accentuation
(8) Cognitive factors: Stereotypes as expectancies

Kernel of truth

Are stereotypes based on some element of truth?

Question difficult to resolve … impossible to gain “objective” information about the real characteristics of a group.

Some research suggests that stereotypes are exaggerated and simplified reflections of real group traits.
Kernel of truth

It is feasible that certain group traits will emerge as a function of some aspect of social reality; for example …

• Biological differences
• Status differences
• History
• Desire for intergroup distinctiveness
• Socialization / social roles

Limitations of kernel of truth argument

BUT … are we really that clever? For example we hold the stereotype that women are more easily influenced than men, but the actual size of that effect is small ($d = 0.3$; for differences in height, $d = 2.6$). Differences this small must be difficult to detect.

There are other differences between the sexes that are much larger than this; for example the difference between men and women on body restlessness is relatively large ($d = 0.7$) but this is not part of the stereotype.

Furthermore, we have strong stereotypes on a number of dimensions (e.g., kindness, patience, ability to make decisions, ability to think clearly, willingness to talk about sex, driving ability) that research suggests is not based in fact.
Limitations of kernel of truth argument

Terraciano et al. (2005) collected two pieces of data from 49 different cultures:
(1) people’s perceptions of the personality traits of the “typical person” in their culture, and
(2) The actual personality traits of people in their culture, using self-report and observer ratings on the NEO-PI (a personality scale).

The median correlation between stereotype and reality was .04.
Legitimating myths

A striking consistency exists in many stereotypes of groups that are marked by status or power: groups with high status/power hold stereotypes that serve to rationalize and reinforce the outgroup's lower status/power.

Men, for example, might be motivated to think of women as less agentic because this helps justify existing role divisions between men and women.

Allport (1958): “the rationalizing and justifying function of a stereotype exceeds its function as a reflector of group attributes”
Legitimizing myths

“Having found that it is useful, if not essential, for women and men to assume different sex roles, a society finds it adaptive to believe that each sex has … the characteristics necessary for the successful performance of the assigned functions. If females are to have principal responsibility for the care of the young, it is reassuring to believe that they are – or can become – affectionate, gentle, patient, sympathetic, and so on. If males are to serve as hunters and warriors, it is comforting to believe that they are – or can become – adventurous, aggressive, courageous, energetic, independent, self-confident, and the like … It may be in this context, the ‘justification of necessity’ with regard to different social roles, that many of the sex-trait stereotypes originated.” (Williams & Best, 1982)

Legitimizing myths

Hoffman & Hurst (1990) gave participants descriptions of two hypothetical alien groups: Orinthians and Ackmians.

In all conditions, one of the groups was described as primarily made up of child raisers, and the other group was described as made up of city workers.

Half the participants were asked to write an explanation for why the groups would differ, and the other half were not.

All participants then rated the Orinthians and the Ackmians in terms of the extent to which they were characterized by agentic or communal traits (+ve scores = agentic, -ve scores = communal)
When group was described as mostly city workers they were seen to be more agentic, and this tendency was more pronounced when participants had to explain the difference.

Legitimating myths

Members of groups with low status / power might also manufacture stereotypes that help rationalize their position and to protect self-esteem.

Brewer & Campbell (1976) studied 30 ethnic groups in East Africa. One of the richer tribes – the Kikuya in Kenya – was repeatedly described by the other tribes as intelligent and progressive, but also pushy and proud.

This is a consistent finding among low status groups – they're successful but arrogant and cold. We're not so successful but we're nicer and more communal.
Socialization

Once the content of a stereotype has been established (for whatever reason), the stereotype might survive through socialization and learning.

People pick up many attitudes about other groups from their parents (Horowitz & Horowitz, 1938).

From birth, people are treated differently depending on whether they are guys or girls.

For example when people are told they are interacting with a male infant, they play with the child in a more physical fashion than when they are told they are interacting with a female infant.

Media

Often, the media reinforces certain stereotypes.

Women, for example, are often portrayed as either kind homemakers or untrustworthy, sexually aggressive vamps or as “eye candy”.

In early- to mid-20th Century, Chinese portrayed as conniving and evil, and Blacks in the US portrayed as barely human.

In the last 25 years there has been a conscious effort to reverse the stereotyped images of minority groups in TV and film.
Media

Why do stereotypes persist in media?
• Conspiracy on behalf of white men?
• Laziness?
• Commercial considerations?
Is it possible that people have an affection for stereotypes? (simple, familiar, sometimes funny, provides certainty, better than being ignored)
Media

Also, media stereotypes can be perpetuated in unconscious ways.
Archer et al. (1983) analysed 1750 pictures & found that pictures of men are typically shoulder-up, whereas pictures of women are typically full-body. Facial prominence in photos is associated with ambition and intelligence – so face-ism conveys the view that, relative to men, women are more important for their physical beauty than their intellectual capacity.

Media

Mullen (2004) noted that members of ethnic minority groups (particularly those that face high levels of hostility) are often depicted in children’s books with smaller heads.
Relevant because head size is associated with
• Perceptions of ambition and dominance
• Perceptions of cuteness
• Perceptions of intellectual ability
**Stereotype inconsistent information**

What happens when people are presented with stereotype inconsistent behaviour?

One possibility is that, over time, the stereotype will change to adjust to reality (*book-keeping*).

If counter-stereotypical information is dramatic enough, it might even cause a sudden change in attitudes (*conversion*).

There are some cognitive strategies, however, that sometimes mean stereotypes survive despite stereotype-inconsistent information: sub-typing and attributions.

---

**Sub-typing**

Sometimes, stereotype-inconsistent information produces a sub-type, so that the outgroup stereotype becomes more complex but the stereotype of the superordinate group remains unchanged (e.g., sensitive new age guy; career woman).
Attributions

Deaux and Emswiller (1974) had students watch fellow students perform well on tasks that were male-stereotypical (e.g., identifying a tyre jack). Female success tended to be attributed more to luck whereas male success was attributed more to ability.

Cognitive factors: Assimilation and Accentuation

Are stereotypes a by-product of the normal cognitive process of categorization?

Two basic processes of categorization:

- Accentuation (in which intergroup differences are exaggerated)
- Assimilation (in which intragroup differences are minimized)
Outgroup homogeneity effect

BUT … Assimilation effect is not equal for ingroup members and outgroup members. In general, outgroup members are viewed to be more homogenous and less differentiated than ingroup members (“outgroup homogeneity effect”). “They’re all the same, but we’re different”

Explanations for the outgroup homogeneity effect

(1) Familiarity
Because we interact more with ingroup than with outgroup members, we have more time to get to know ingroup members as individuals.

Linville et al. (1989) showed that over a semester classmates rated each other to be increasingly more variable, and in a computer simulation showed that greater perceived variability was associated with greater familiarity.
Explanations for the outgroup homogeneity effect

Familiarity explanation has some basis in fact when it comes to perception.

Bringham & Berkowitz (1978) had Black and White participants attempt to identify individuals in photographs of both Black and White people.
Explanations for the outgroup homogeneity effect

BUT ... other studies showed no link between familiarity and variability, and some even found a negative link.

For example, Brown & Wootton-Millward (1993) observed nurses over time, and found that perceptions of ingroup variability decreased over time, to the point that the ingroup was seen to be more homogeneous than the outgroup (cohesiveness?)

Finally, the outgroup homogeneity effect occurs in minimal group situations, when there is zero contact between individuals and members of either group.

Explanations for the outgroup homogeneity effect

(2) Abstractness

An alternative account is that people don’t represent categories in terms of individual exemplars of the group, but rather in terms of more abstract representations. This might consist of a prototype (a fuzzy set of defining characteristics) and some estimate of variability.

Ingroup is seen to be more variable because the conception of the category is more important (because we’re in it), more concrete (we know at least one member very well!) and more provisional (we’re motivated to have accurate appraisals of those close to us).
Exceptions to the outgroup homogeneity effect

There is some evidence that the outgroup homogeneity effect might be specific to certain situations.

Using a minimal group paradigm, Simon & Brown (1987) varied the relative size of the ingroup and the outgroup.

They found that the traditional outgroup homogeneity effect was reversed when the ingroup was a numerical minority.

Simon & Brown (1987)
Cognitive processes: Stereotypes as expectancies

Another reason that stereotypes might be resistant to change is that people begin to view behaviour through the lens of the stereotype.

Neutral or even disconfirming information is then perceived as confirming information.
Stereotypes as expectancies

Nelson et al. (1990) had people rate the heights of men and women in photographs.

The photographs were selected such that, on average, the men and women did not differ in height at all.

Nelson et al. (1990)

This (imagined) difference persisted even when the researcher pointed out that there were no overall differences between men and women in the pictures, and even when a cash prize was offered for accuracy.
Stereotypes as expectancies

Jussim (1983) brought a 9-month-old baby to a social psychology class. Half were led to believe the baby's name was Karen and half were led to believe the baby's name was Keith.

“Keith” was rated as more athletic, noisy, active, and rough than was “Karen”.

Stereotypes as expectancies

Stereotypical expectancies can not only taint how people perceive events in front of them, it can taint how people remember events from the past.

Hamilton & Rose (1980) showed a series of slides depicting a person from a particular occupational group, and attached to them adjectives describing the person in the slide.

Each trait was associated with each occupation an equal number of times.

Participants then had to recall the pairings of traits and occupations.
Higher scores indicate traits matched to occupation more often.

Stereotypes as expectancies

These biased perceptions on reality can have dramatic consequences for groups that suffer from negative stereotypes.

For example Duncan (1976) had White students observe on TV what they thought was a live conversation between a Black man and a White man. The conversation degenerated into an argument in which one person lightly shoved the other.
Stereotypes as expectancies

Correll et al. (2002) constructed a computer game in which people had to decide whether to shoot or not shoot people.

The targets were either armed or not armed, and were either Black or White.
The police officer’s dilemma

Correll et al. (2002)

This shooter’s bias occurs for both White and Black participants.
Stereotypes as expectancies

Darley & Gross (1983) conducted a study in which half the participants were told that a girl taking an academic test was from a deprived working-class background, and half were told she was from a wealthy background.

Half the participants were asked to rate the girl’s ability immediately after receiving the information about her background.

The other half were told then watched a video of the girl performing a test and then indicated her ability.

Darley & Gross (1983)
Darley & Gross (1983)

Stereotypes as expectancies

Participants in both conditions cited evidence from the ability test to support their conclusions.

These findings suggest that some stereotypes don’t create certainty but rather hypotheses about the stereotyped individual. The bias occurs because these hypotheses are often tested in a biased fashion that leads to their false confirmation.
Can stereotypes be stopped?

Macrae et al. (1994) showed participants a photo of a skin-head, and asked them to write a little essay describing a typical day in this person’s life.

Half the participants were explicitly encouraged to avoid stereotyping when writing the essay, and half were given no instructions.

In the second part of the experiment, all participants were given another photo of a skin-head and were asked to write another essay describing a day in their life.

This second essay was then coded for the number of stereotypical attitudes and thoughts expressed.
Macrae et al. (1994)

Rather than reducing prejudice, stereotype suppression resulted in a rebound effect once people were “allowed” to stereotype again.

Can stereotypes be stopped?

Better way to control stereotypes is through education, socialization, intergroup contact, and perspective-taking (see Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000, for review of perspective-taking as a way of reducing stereotyping).
• Next week:
  Prejudice: The target’s perspective

• Recommended Readings:
  ▪ Brown 2000 (pp.285-308);

• In the Tutes this week:
  ▪ Consultation re Assignment 1