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Stereotyping

Applying one's stereotype to an individual

Ambiguous Behavior (e.g., poking)

| African American | White | More mean & threatening |

Function of Stereotypes

Cognitive Miser Perspective:

Stereotyping easier than judging targets according to personal attributes
Time Pressure Study
Kruglanski & Freund (1983)

Essay

Ashkenazi Jew
Sephardic Jew

Manipulation
Time Pressure
No Time Pressure

Self-Fulfilling Prophecies
A false belief that leads to its own fulfillment:

1. Perceiver develops false belief about a target
2. Perceiver treats target in a manner consistent with false belief
3. Target responds to the treatment in such a way as to confirm the originally false belief
Two Types of SFPs

Positive SFPs:
1. Perceiver overestimates target's ability
2. Perceiver treats target consistent with that overly positive belief
3. Target responds by confirming the overly positive belief

Two Types of SFPs

Negative SFPs:
1. Perceiver underestimates target's ability
2. Perceiver treats target consistent with that overly negative belief
3. Target responds by confirming the overly negative belief

Dumb Rat - Smart Rat Study

Positive Belief  Negative Belief

Smart Rat  Dumb Rat

Learned the maze better
Self-Fulfilling Prophecies and Stereotypes

Self-fulfilling prophecies can contribute to social problems

Interview Study

Study 1
Do W treat AA and W different?

Participants interviewed confederate for a job

Confederate: African American or White

Interview Study

Results: Study 1

Interview length: AA < W
Distance: AA > W
Eye contact: AA < W
Speech dysfluencies: AA > W
Interview Study

Study 2
Does differential treatment influence behavior?
Confederates interviewed participant for job
Treated participant like AA or W were treated in Study 1

Interview Study

Results: Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treated like African Americans</th>
<th>Treated like Whites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worse Performance</td>
<td>Better Performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prejudice

Positive or negative feeling about person based on attitude about person's group
**Causes of Prejudice**

1. Competition between groups
2. Simple distinction between groups

**Realistic Group Conflict Theory**

Prejudice stems from competition between groups

**Summer Camp Studies**

Purpose: 

[Diagram: Competition → Prejudice]
Robber’s Cave Study

Phase 1: In-group Identity

Build cohesion among in-group

Robber’s Cave Study

Phase 2: Intergroup Conflict

Create competitive environment

Robber’s Cave Study

Each boy rated own group and other group

- brave
- tough
- friendly
- sneaky
- smart aleck
- stinker
Robber’s Cave Study

Bean Toss:
- Collected as many beans as possible
- Estimate # beans in a sack

- Overestimated beans collected by in-group
- Underestimated beans collected by out-group

Phase 3: Restoring Harmony

Create harmonious environment with superordinate goals
(goals that can only be achieved if both groups work together cooperatively)

Competition led to prejudice.
When competition removed, prejudice stopped
Minimal Group Paradigm

Simple distinction between groups causes bias

Payoff Matrix

Boys most often selected 12:11 strategy
Fairness combined with ingroup profit