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Stereotyping
Applying one's stereotype to an individual
Ambiguous Behavior (e.g., poking)

Function of Stereotypes

Cognitive Miser Perspective:
Stereotyping easier than judging targets according to personal attributes

Time Pressure Study
Kruglanski & Freund (1983)

Stereotyping
Applying one's stereotype to an individual
Ambiguous Behavior (e.g., poking)

More mean & threatening

Time Pressure Study
Kruglanski & Freund (1983)

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
Smart Rat
Learned the maze better
Negative Belief
Dumb Rat

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
Treated like African Americans
Worse Performance

Treated like Whites
Better Performance

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:

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

Robber’s Cave Study
Phase 3: Restoring Harmony
Create harmonious environment with superordinate goals
(goals that can only be achieved if both groups work together cooperatively)

Robber’s Cave Study
Competition led to prejudice.
When competition removed, prejudice stopped
Minimal Group Paradigm

Simple distinction between groups causes bias

Payoff Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>boys, one of the overestimators (in-group)</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>girls, one of the overestimators (in-group)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

1. Alone & anonymous
2. Estimated dots
3. Labeled: Over- or Underestimators
4. Completed pay off matrices