Prejudice & stereotyping: The target’s perspective

next week:
Crowd behaviour and collective action

Last week: Stereotyping

• What’s it all about, anyways?
• Defining stereotypes
• Why do stereotypes survive?
• Can stereotypes be stopped?
Overview
In this week’s lecture we’re going to discuss:
• Catchup from Prejudice lecture
The Target’s Perspective:
• Self-fulfilling prophecies
• Stereotype threat
• Prejudice and self-esteem
• Perceiving, Reporting & Combating prejudice

Feedback
Pros:
• Exciting, lively, interesting, entertaining, enlightening
• Funny
• Tute allocation
• Great examples
• Caring, committed to teaching, enthusiastic, passionate
• Good pacing, thanks for going slow
• Detailed, knowledgeable
• Clear expectations
• Brilliant, great lecturer
• Easy to understand

Improve:
• More interaction needed
• Construction noises annoying
• Tute allocation
• Meet and greet
• Scheduled time of lecture
• More on how things link week to week
• More on important topics
• Allow questions to break into talk
• It’s all good
• Go slower
• Summary slide needed
• Printing trouble
Prejudice catchup
Legitimizing ideologies

Some theorists argue that people’s ideologies are partly driven by a need to legitimate or rationalize the fact that their group (e.g., Whites) enjoy a dominant position in society.

E.g., belief in a just world, individualism

Reducing prejudice – pointing out privilege

Given that legitimizing one’s power and status is linked with prejudice from dominant groups to minority groups, can prejudice be reduced by simply pointing out privilege?

Branscombe et al. (2007) asked participants to either list reasons why Whites are privileged relative to other groups, to list reasons why Whites are disadvantaged relative to other groups, or to list life events (control condition).

They then measured White participants’ levels of modern racism.
Reducing prejudice – pointing out privilege

Rather than decreasing when participants had to reflect on their privilege, modern racism levels went up.

Reducing prejudice – power of norms

It is widely assumed that the drop off in explicit levels of prejudice in the last 50 years is because of the development of more liberal norms over that time.

Monteith et al. (1996) found experimental support for this notion:

- Experimenters would stop 2 people (one a true participant, one a confederate) and would get them to fill out a questionnaire examining attitudes toward gays.
- In the control conditions the confederate and the true participant would respond privately (no norm).
- In the other conditions the confederate would call out their answers and then the true participant would respond – in some conditions the confederate was relatively prejudiced, in other conditions the confederate was relatively non-prejudiced.
Reducing prejudice – power of norms

Anxiety and intergroup relations

Stephan & Stephan (1985) highlighted the fact that for many people – particularly those who have had little prior contact with other ethnic groups – interacting with somebody of a different race raises anxiety levels.

One response to this is polarized emotional reactions. If the interaction goes well, people are super-positive. If it goes badly, people are super-negative.
Reducing prejudice

- Pointing out Privilege: ✗
- Norm change: ✓
- Anxiety management: ✓

The targets of prejudice

- Under-performing
  - Self-fulfilling prophecy
  - Stereotype Threat
- Lower self-esteem, well-being
- Perceiving, reporting, & challenging prejudice
Stereotypes as expectancies

Snyder & Swann (1978) led interviewers believe that the person who they were interviewing (over telephone) was an extravert or an introvert. They were then required to select from a set list of interview questions. Those who thought the person was an extrovert primarily asked questions that would be likely to reveal these tendencies (e.g., “what would you do if you wanted to liven things up in a party?”). Those who thought the person was an introvert primarily asked questions that would be likely to reveal these tendencies (e.g., “what factors make it hard for you to really open up to people?”)

Self-fulfilling prophecies

In a follow-up experiment, the responses of the target were taped and a fresh set of participants were asked to rate the interviewee. Interviewees who had been placed in the extrovert condition were rated as more extraverted than were those who had been placed in the introvert condition.

In other words the expectancies of the interviewer had created a reality – if you talk to somebody expecting them to be introverted they become introverted.
Observer “believes” actor is an extravert

Actor’s behaviour is interpreted through the lens of this expectation

Actor is treated as an extravert

Actor’s behaviour is constrained so that it becomes difficult to behave in ways other than being extraverted

Actor’s behaviour becomes more extraverted

Actor perceives self as extraverted

Self-fulfilling prophecies

Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) administered an IQ test to school children and told their teachers that a particular group of 20 students had been identified as “bloomers” ... people who were particularly likely to show development in the future.

In fact, the 20 students were chosen randomly.
Self-fulfilling prophecies

Word, Zanna, & Cooper (1974) had White participants act as job interviewers interviewing White and Black applicants.

When interviewing Black applicants, the interviewers made more speech errors, had shorter interviews, and engaged less with the interviewee non-verbally than when the interviewee was White.

In a subsequent experiment the researchers trained interviewers to use either the Black or the White interview style to interview a White applicant.

When interviewed as though they were Black, the White applicant was rated as having performed worse and as having been more nervous than when they were interviewed as though they were White.
Stereotype threat

When stigmatized groups are conscious that other people might treat them stereotypically, they feel anxiety about their performance. This can impede performance.

Steele and Aronson (1995) had Black and White students anticipate taking a “very difficult” test that was defined as being “diagnostic of intellectual ability” or “just a laboratory exercise”.

They then had to complete ambiguous word fragments such as “____CE” or “____ERIOR”.
Stereotype threat

When Black students were anticipating a test of “intellectual ability” (as compared to “a lab exercise”), they
(a) were more likely to reveal race-related anxieties on the word completion task (e.g., “RACE” “INFERIOR”) &
(b) did worse on the task!

Stereotype threat

Spencer et al. (1999) got women and men to do a maths test … consistent with the stereotype, men did better than women on the test.

In a follow-up experiment, participants did two tests: one in which they were told that men and women typically performed differently on the test, and one in which participants were told that the test typically did not reveal sex differences.
**Stereotype threat**

Stone et al. (1999) had white and black participants perform a sports task. In some conditions the test was framed as a test of “natural ability”, in others it was framed as a test of “sports intelligence”
NOTE: high scores mean worse performance

Stone et al. (1999)

Stereotype threat

The presumed reason for these effects is anxiety … but evidence for this is difficult to find.

As it turns out, when self-report measures of anxiety are used there is little evidence it’s playing a role.

But when more subtle measures of anxiety are used (e.g., non-verbal anxiety, blood pressure) the causal role of anxiety is more likely to emerge.
Stereotype threat

Bosson et al. (2004) had gay or straight men playing with children.

In half the conditions the participants’ sexuality was primed (potentially invoking stereotype threat) and in the other half sexuality was not primed.

During the play session, neutral observers rated the participants on signs of nervousness and childcare performance.
Stereotype threat

This is despite the fact gay and straight participants did not differ in the extent to which they *said* they felt anxious in a questionnaire.
Stereotype Threat and Driving Performance
Yeung & von Hippel (2008)

Frequency of Hitting the Pedestrians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>No Threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% hit pedestrian
Simulated journey and events

Event pattern 1

Event pattern 2

- = concurrent task
- = no concurrent task
= a group of pedestrians jumping on the road

Frequency of Hitting the Pedestrians

![Graph showing frequency of hitting pedestrians with divided and full attention with threat and no threat conditions]
Stereotype threat

Others have found that the effects of stereotype threat are partly caused by high blood pressure (Blascovich et al., 2001) and feelings of dejection (Keller & Dauenheimer, 2003).
Prejudice and self-esteem

Intuitively, many people believe that being a member of a stigmatized group will reduce self-esteem. But there is no clear evidence for this notion.

Black and Mexican Americans have self-esteem levels equal to or higher than White Americans.

Also, no convincing evidence that self-esteem is lower among other groups that suffer from stigma (e.g., women, mentally and physically handicapped, the mentally ill, homosexuals).

Why is this?

Prejudice and self-esteem

Crocker & Major (1989) argued that the expected relationship between stigma and global self-esteem might not emerge because stigmatized groups:

(1) Compare their outcomes with those of their ingroup, rather than with the relatively advantaged outgroup

(2) Selectively devalue those dimensions on which their group does poorly and value those dimensions on which the group does well

(3) Attribute negative feedback to prejudice against their group
Attributions to prejudice

Crocker et al. (1991) got women to write an essay, which was then (supposedly) assessed by a male student. From the assessor's responses on a questionnaire, the participants were led to believe he was either liberal or sexist in his attitudes toward women.

Participants then received the feedback from the assessor: it was either positive or negative.


**Attributions to prejudice**

In a subsequent study Crocker et al. (1991) had Black and White participants complete a self-description form (what are your likes / dislikes, strengths / weaknesses etc).

This was then shown to another (fictional) participant who evaluated how much they liked the person … feedback was either very negative or very positive.

Furthermore, participants were led to believe that the assessor could see them (visible condition) or could not see them (anonymous condition).

![Bar chart showing change in self-esteem for Black and White participants under positive and negative feedback conditions with and without visibility.](chart.png)
**Attributional ambiguity**

Crocker et al. argued that members of stigmatized groups have to live with “attributional ambiguity”; in other words, they can never be sure whether people are treating them in a certain way because of their race.

This can have good and bad consequences.

If you fail, it might help protect self-esteem to attribute to prejudice.

If you succeed, you might always wonder if you got preferential treatment because of your minority group status (problem with equal opportunity).

---

**Prejudice and attributions**

Schmitt et al. (2003) have aggressively disputed the notion that attributions to prejudice are good for you.

They got women to participate in a mock job interview, after which they all received negative feedback.

Participants were then led to believe that the negative feedback was due to non-sexist reasons, to a rare example of sexism, or to pervasive culture of sexism.

Participants then rated their positive affect and their self-esteem.
Schmitt et al. (2003)

Rejection-identification model

Schmitt and colleagues argued that experiencing pervasive discrimination does, in fact, hurt self-esteem. However they argue that the negative consequences of discrimination are buffered – either partially or completely – by a sense of identification and solidarity with other members of your disadvantaged group.
Rejection-identification model

Evidence for the rejection-identification model have been found among:

(1) Women (but not men) Schmitt et al., 2002
(2) International students Schmitt et al., 2003
(3) Body piercers Jetten et al., 2001

Concealable v/ non-concealable stigma

Supportive evidence for the role of ingroup solidarity to buffer the negative effects of stigma is also found by Frable et al. (1998) who compared self-esteem and affect among people with concealable stigma (gays, bulimics, the poor) and people with non-concealable stigma (Blacks, the obese, stutterers).

Somewhat surprisingly, levels of self-esteem were generally higher among people with non-concealable stigmas … these effects were caused by the fact that people with non-concealable stigma were better able to find each other and support each other.
In the spirit of these findings, Postmes and Branscombe (2003) wondered whether one downside of desegregation (i.e., ethnic mixing) for minority groups is that they lose support from their ingroup.

They found that African Americans who lived in predominantly White neighbourhoods perceived more rejection from their ingroup, leading to lower self-esteem.
Reporting prejudice

In contrast to the notion that people are motivated to attribute failure to prejudice (in order to help buffer self-esteem) there is a convergence of evidence that people are remarkably loath to attribute events to prejudice.

For example Taylor et al. (1990) asked Indian and Haitian migrants to Canada (a) if they personally experienced discrimination, and (b) if their group as a whole experiences discrimination.
Reporting prejudice

Minority groups in general tend to not claim they have been victims of discrimination unless the evidence is completely clear.

Ruggiero & Taylor (1995) got women to perform a test, and led them to believe that either 100%, 75%, 50%, 25%, or 0% of the judges were sexist.

After failing the test, they were asked to what extent they believe their failure was a result of discrimination.
Only when women had very strong proof that the discrimination was real did they attribute failure to discrimination.

Negative consequences of making attributions to discrimination

Perhaps one reason for this is that they sense complaining about discrimination will win them no friends.

Kaiser & Miller (2001) gave White participants a description of events that had supposedly occurred in a previous experiment. They were led to believe that another research participant (a Black male) had taken a test assessing their future career success. After completing the test, an apologetic experimenter had explained there was some chance that a prejudiced judge would evaluate the test ... that all of the 8 judges were White, and that either none, four, or all of them had a history of prejudice. The Black participant had then received a fail on the test. In a follow-up questionnaire, the Black man either attributed their fail grade to discrimination or to poor performance. Participants then rated how much they liked the Black man.
Kaiser & Miller (2001)

Those who attributed to discrimination were rated as less likable than those who attributed it to poor performance … regardless of the objective likelihood that the failure was a result of discrimination!

Negative consequences of making attributions to discrimination

People seem to understand the negative consequences of claiming discrimination – for example women are more likely to cry “discrimination” when on their own or with other women than when they’re with men. (Stangor et al., 2001)
Reporting prejudice

BUT ... when women are asked what they would do if they came across an example of sexism, they massively overestimate their willingness to confront the sexism head-on.

Swim & Hyers (1999) gave women a scenario in which they faced obvious sexism from a member of a group in a decision-making task. They were asked to anticipate what they would do in that situation.

In a separate experiment, a different group of women were actually placed in that scenario (in other words they directly experienced the sexism).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>% who said they’d do it</th>
<th>% who did it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ignore the comment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait to see what others would do</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question the response</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment on inappropriateness</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarcasm or humour</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express surprise</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit or punch</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stages in responding to discrimination (Stangor et al., 2003)

(1) Ask … what was that? Was that discrimination?
(2) Answer … make a decision as to whether that was discrimination
(3) Announce … overt reporting and confronting

This process can take time!

Changing Society
Motivations for collective action

DISADVANTAGED
- Identification / solidarity
- Group norms
- Cost-benefit analyses for self and group
- Relative deprivation
- Emotions such as moral outrage, anger

ADVANTAGED
- Group norms
- Moral values / injunctive norms
- “Relative deprivation on behalf of others” – perspective-taking, empathy
- Emotions such as moral outrage, sympathy, pity, collective guilt
- Positioning with respect to intra-group dynamics or other intergroup conflicts

• Next week:
  Crowd behaviour and collective action

• Recommended Readings:
  - Brown 2000 (pp.10-21);

• In the Tutes this week:
  - Consult for Assignment 1