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Stereotypes

Working definition:

Generalized beliefs about a social group attributes behaviors social roles

(nurturing) (homemakers)

(take care of children)
Types of Stereotypes

Cultural stereotypes

Beliefs about a group that are endorsed by society at large
Types of Stereotypes

Personal (individual) stereotypes

One person’s beliefs about a group
Cultural & Personal Stereotypes

Sometimes they overlap:
Society portrays New Yorkers as loud, and Mary thinks they are loud too

Sometimes they don’t overlap:
Society portrays Librarians as spinsters, but Mary doesn’t think they are
Consensual Stereotypes

**Definition:**

Beliefs about a social group that many people endorse

High consensus = high agreement
Consensual Stereotypes

Personal stereotypes
Sometimes consensual:
(many people may believe that New Yorkers are loud)

Sometimes not consensual:
(Mary believes lawyers are short, but nobody else does)
Definitions of Stereotypes

For most of the 20th Century researchers did not have a good, clear definition of the term "stereotype"
Definitions of Stereotypes

Sampled the literature to identify how stereotypes were defined.

This is what they found.........
Definitions of Stereotypes

Stereotypes had been defined in six different ways!!
1. Generalized Beliefs

Stereotyping may be defined as the tendency to attribute generalized and simplified characteristics to groups of people in the form of verbal labels, and to act towards the members of those groups in terms of those labels (Vinacke, 1949, p. 265).
2. Categories or Concepts

A stereotype is commonly thought of as involving a categorical response--i.e., membership is sufficient to evoke the judgment that the stimulus person possesses all of the attributes belonging to that category (Secord, 1959, p. 309).
3. Incorrectly Learned

Unlike other generalizations stereotypes are based not on an inductive collection of data, but on hearsay, rumor, and anecdotes--in short, on evidence which is insufficient to justify the generalization (Klineberg, 1951 p. 505).
4. Exaggerations

A stereotype is an exaggerated belief associated with a category (Allport, 1958, p. 187).
5. Inaccurate

A stereotype is a fixed impression, which conforms very little to the fact it pretends to represent, and results from our defining first and observing second (Katz and Braly, 1935, p. 181).
6. Rigid and Resistant to Change

Stereotypy...the disposition to think in rigid categories (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 228).
YIKES!

What sense can one make of all that?

Field lacking formal, consistent and clear definition of the term “stereotype”
Ashmore & Del Boca (1981)

Offered A Formal Definition

“A set of beliefs about the personal attributes of a group of people”
Measurement of Stereotypes

Four common procedures:

1. Adjective checklist
2. Rating scale
3. Free responses
4. Diagnostic ratio
Stereotype Measurement

1. Adjective checklists:

- Pre-determined attributes
- Endorse attributes
- “yes - no” responses

Mark the attributes typical of medical doctors.

- Talkative
- Intelligent
- Sensitive
Adjective Checklists
1st way that stereotypes were measured

Princeton Trilogy (Study 1)
Katz and Braly (1933)

Sampled 100 Princeton University students

Used adjective checklist procedure to identify stereotypes of 10 ethnic and national groups
Princeton Trilogy (Study 1)
Katz and Braly (1933)

The 10 groups

Germans
Jews
Italians
Americans
African Americans
Chinese
Irish
Japanese
English
Turks
Princeton Trilogy (Study 1)
Katz and Braly (1933)

Procedure:
1. Participants given list of 84 traits

2. Participants selected the 5 that were most typical of each group (5 traits per group)
Princeton Trilogy (Study 1)
Katz and Braly (1933)

How content was assessed:

The 10 traits that were selected most often
How consensus was assessed:

Distinctiveness scores:
Number of traits needed to account for 50% of responses

lower scores = more consensus
## Results: Consensus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Distinctiveness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>(most consensual) 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks</td>
<td>(least consensual) 15.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adjective Checklists

Benefits:
- Can include a lot of attributes
- Easy to complete

Drawback:
- May omit central traits from list
- List may become outdated
Stereotype Measurement

2. Rating Scales:
   - Pre-determined attributes
   - Rate attributes
   - Rating scale responses

How sensitive are medical doctors?
1  2  3  4  5
not at all  very

4
Gay Male Stereotype
Madon (1997)

Assessed the content of the gay male stereotype

Participants rated gay men on 75 attributes

Example
How characteristic is it of gay men to be...

• artsy-looking
• feminine

1 = not at all characteristic; 5 very characteristic
Gay Male Stereotype
Madon (1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Percent endorsed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artsy-looking</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act Macho</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rating Scales

Benefits:
- Can include a lot of attributes
- Easy to complete

Drawback:
- May omit central traits from list
- List may become outdated
Rating Scales

One distinct advantage over Adjective Checklists:

More specific measurement of the stereotype --

Responses are not "all or none"
Rating Scales

Measurement specificity important because....... 

Researchers can assess “stereotype strength”
Rating Scales

Definition: Stereotype Strength

Extent to which the attributes in a stereotype are thought to characterize the group

Example.........
Example: Stereotype Strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smithtown residents</th>
<th>Jonestown residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very upper class</td>
<td>slightly upper class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very snobbish</td>
<td>slightly snobbish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very reclusive</td>
<td>slightly reclusive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stereotype Strength

The content of the stereotypes are the same..............BUT

Smithtown stereotype is stronger

VERY characteristic of Smithtown
SLIGHTLY characteristic of Jonestown
Content vs. Strength

**Stereotype content**: attributes contained in a stereotype

**Stereotype strength**: extent to which these attributes are thought to characterize a group
Stereotype Strength

Adjective Checklists cannot measure a stereotype's strength

Rating scales can measure a stereotype's strength
Stereotype Measurement

3. Free Responses:

- No pre-determined attributes
- Generate attributes

List 10 attributes typical of medical doctors.

- smart
- kind
Free Responses

Benefits:
- Measures central traits
- Don’t ever become outdated

Drawbacks:
- Incomplete responding
- May not measure weakly endorsed attributes
Distinguishing Features

Adjective checklists, rating scales, and free responses may indirectly assess the attributes that distinguish between groups.

Only one measure does so directly.
Diagnostic Ratio

Participants given a list of attributes and asked to make two percentage estimates

1. % of group that has each attribute
2. % of reference group that has each attribute
Diagnostic Ratio

\[ DR = \frac{\% \text{ of group (with attribute)}}{\% \text{ of reference (with attribute)}} \]
Diagnostic Ratio

When DR = 1 (or close to 1), attribute does not distinguish between groups

Example
Jon believes that......
99% of women have arms
99% of Americans have arms
DR = 99.9/99.9 = 1
Diagnostic Ratio

When DR substantially greater than 1, attribute:
▲ distinguishes between groups
▲ is stereotypic

Example: Jon believes that......
35% of women are nurturing
20% of Americans are nurturing
DR = 35/20 = 1.75
Diagnostic Ratio

When DR substantially less than 1, attribute:

▲ distinguishes between groups
▲ is counterstereotypic

Example: Jon believes that.......  
10% of women are aggressive  
25% of Americans are aggressive  
DR = 10/25 = .40
So, according to the DR measure, a stereotype is defined....

As set of beliefs about a group that distinguish that group from other groups in either a stereotypic way (DR > 1) or a counter-stereotypic way (DR < 1).
Assumptions of Stereotypes

Stereotypes have been characterized in three ways

1. Inaccurate
2. Exaggerations
3. Resistant to change
Stereotype Inaccuracy

Stereotypes are inaccurate when they are at odds with empirical evidence

Armenian Study: La Pierre (1936)

**Purpose**: Examine whether ethnic stereotypes of Armenians are inaccurate
Stereotype Inaccuracy

Stereotypes are inaccurate when they are at odds with empirical evidence

Armenian Study: La Pierre (1936)

Purpose: Examine whether ethnic stereotypes of Armenians are inaccurate
Armenian Study
La Pierre (1936)

Armenian stereotype:
- dishonest
- lying
- deceitful

Procedure:
- Sampled credit ratings
- Compared Armenian & non-Armenians
Armenian Study
La Pierre (1936)

Prediction: If Armenians really are dishonest, lying, and deceitful, then they should have worse credit ratings than non-Armenians
Armenian Study
La Pierre (1936)

Percent of good, fair and bad credit risk

[Graph showing the percentage of good, fair, and bad credit risk for Armenians and Non-Armenians]
Armenian Study
La Pierre (1936)

Armenian stereotype did NOT correspond to empirical evidence

The stereotype was inaccurate
Stereotype (In)accuracy

Very little work on the accuracy of stereotypes

Just because one stereotype is inaccurate doesn’t mean they all are

Research shows that some stereotypes are at least partially accurate
Gender Study
(Swim, 1994)

**Purpose**: Examine whether gender stereotypes are (in)accurate.

**General Procedure**: Compared perceived differences to differences reported by all meta-analyses.
Gender Study
(Swim, 1994)

Step 1: Identified stereotypic attributes:
For example.....

- Restless
- Emerge as leader
- Math SAT scores
- Verbal SAT scores
- Helpfulness
- Aggressiveness
- Influenced by persuasive messages
- Decode non-verbal cues
- Involved in conversations
- Happy
Gender Study
(Swim, 1994)

Step 2: Obtained actual female-male differences on stereotypic attributes from meta-analyses.

Step 3: Assessed perceived female-male differences on stereotypic attributes from participants.

Step 4: Compared the actual female-male differences to the perceived female-male differences.
Gender Study
(Swim, 1994)

1. Gender stereotypes were accurate 20% of the time. For example:
   ▲ Happy
   ▲ Involved in conversations
   ▲ Decode verbal cues

2. Gender stereotypes were inaccurate on 80% of the time. For example:
   ▲ Restless
   ▲ Emerge as leaders
   ▲ Math SAT
   ▲ Helpfulness
   ▲ Aggressive
   ▲ Verbal SAT
   ▲ Influenced by persuasive messages
   ▲ Influenced by group pressure
   ▲ Gazing during conversations
Stereotypes are exaggerated when differences between groups are thought to be larger than they really are.
Stereotypes are Exaggerated

Perceived Heights of Men and Women
Men = 5'11' Women = 5'5' (Diff = 6 in.)

Actual Heights of Men and Women
Men = 5'10' Women = 5'6' (Diff = 4 in.)

Perceived differences are exaggerated
Gender Study (Continued)  
(Swim, 1994)

Most of the inaccuracies reflected underestimates not overestimates

75% of inaccuracies were underestimates!!!

For example:

▲ Emerge as leaders - Women emerge less, but difference underestimated.

▲ Math SAT - Women score lower, but difference underestimated.

▲ Helpfulness - Women help less, but difference underestimated.

▲ Influenced by persuasive messages - Women less influenced, but difference underestimated.

▲ Influenced by group pressure - Women less influenced, but difference underestimated.
Stereotypes Resist Change

Stereotypes remain stable over time and across generations
Princeton Trilogy

Study 1 (Katz & Braly, 1933)
Study 2 (Gilbert, 1951)
Study 3 (Karlins et al., 1969)

Recent Replication/Extension

Madon et al. (2001)
Princeton Trilogy

Limitation of the Princeton trilogy:

- Never updated the attribute list

Problem because......

Outdated attribute list may omit current beliefs and underestimate change by leading people to endorse old, and therefore, similar stereotypes
Recent Replication:

Study 1: replicated Princeton trilogy
Study 2: updated the attribute list
Study 3: assessed changes in favorableness
Princeton Trilogy Replication: Study 1
Madon et al. (2001)

Procedure:

1. Given original attribute list

2. For each group, selected the five most typical
Princeton Trilogy Replication: Study 1
Madon et al. (2001)

Results:

Content: Only 1 of the 10 stereotypes changed significantly

This is consistent with idea that stereotypes are resistant to change
Princeton Trilogy Replication: Study 1
Madon et al. (2001)

Results:

**Consensus:** Only 1 of the 10 stereotypes changed significantly

This too is consistent with idea that stereotypes are resistant to change
Outdated Attribute List

Study 1 showed little change

Could this be due to an outdated attribute list?

Study 2 tested this by updating the attribute list
Princeton Trilogy
Replication: Study 2
Madon et al. (2001)

Procedure:

1. Updated original attribute list w/322 new attributes (total = 406)

2. Rated extent to which each attribute described the groups
Princeton Trilogy
Replication: Study 2
Madon et al. (2001)

Results

Content: 9 of the 10 stereotypes changed significantly. Irish didn’t change.

Consensus: 7 of the 10 stereotypes changed significantly. Irish, Jewish, Italian did not change.
Princeton Trilogy
Replication: Study 2
Madon et al. (2001)

These results are NOT consistent with idea that stereotypes are resistant to change
Purpose:

Examine whether the stereotypes have changed in favorableness
Procedure:

Participants rated the favorableness of the 1933, 1951, 1969 and 1990s stereotypes
Princeton Trilogy
Replication: Study 3
Madon et al. (2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>More Favorable</th>
<th>Less Favorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes in favorableness do NOT support idea that stereotypes are resistant to change
Are stereotypes inherently inaccurate, always exaggerated, and highly resistant to change?

No.

Stereotypes have been stereotyped!!