Prejudice Reduction

Reach Cambridge – Psychology Summer Programme
“Social psychology is the scientific attempt to explain how the thoughts, feelings, and behaviours of individuals are influenced by the actual, imagined, or implied presence of other human beings” (Allport, 1954a, p. 5)

Social psychology as “the influences that people have upon the beliefs, feelings, and behaviour of others” (Aronson, 1972, p. 6)
* Power of situational factors → Social Psychology in 60s and 70s
* People will think and behave differently depending on the context, e.g. aggression, obedience
* Other people’s presence affects our behaviour, e.g. bystander effect
* People have a tendency to conform, but also to be unique
WHO behaves in certain way?

* Individual differences → Social Psychology in 30s, 40s and 50s, e.g. we have different political attitudes
* Individuals behave differently in the same situation → something has to make their behaviour different
* Examples: right-wing authoritarianism, neuroticism, need for cognitive closure
* Interactionism → person x situation = behaviour
WHY do we behave in certain way?

* Motivations
* Need to belong
* Need to feel competent
* Need to have control over one’s own and other people’s behaviours → when we lose it we may look for groups that can restore our feeling of control
* Cognitive needs, e.g. need for closure
* Need for positive self-esteem
* Need for social identity
Methodology

* Quantitative methods:
  * Experimental studies, e.g. we present two groups of participants with different types of stimuli (e.g. pictures, videos, texts) and see whether they differ on some outcome variable (e.g. level of prejudice)
  * Correlational studies (we measure a relationship between two variables) → e.g. surveys
    * The more we help others the happier we are
    * OR The happier we are the more we help others
    * The more we play violent video games the more aggressive we are
    * OR The more aggressive we are the more we play violent video games
  → Correlation does not imply causality
There is a correlation between the consumption of cheese in the US and the number of people who die by becoming tangled in their bedsheets.

Methodology
Methodology

* A decrease in number of pirates is related to a climate change
Methodology

* Analyses of the existing data:
  * Memoirs
  * Newspaper articles
  * Testimonies
  * Examples:
    * If we look at some historical documents from the US we can see that the decrease in cotton prices was related with the number of attacks on Black people in America (Olzak, 1992; Beck i Tolnay, 1990) → aggression and prejudice are related with frustration
    * We can also see that there is a correlation between the number of Google searches for the word “Jew” and “economical crisis” → anti-Semitic conspiracy theories
  * Neurophysiological data
    * The amygdala activity (region of brain responsible for fear responses) is often observed when people are presented with photos of members of other racial groups → are prejudice related with fear?
We can talk about a social group when two or more individuals define themselves as members of a social group. This definition underlines the importance of shared identity and it is very subjective. However, there are different social groups and they can be based on different kinds of characteristics, e.g.:

- An intimate relationship (family)
- Shared goals (football team)
- Social categories (women)
- Presence in time (people in the cinema).

Intergroup relations → the way in which people in groups perceive, think about, feel about, and act towards people in other groups.
* Ingroup = every social group you belong to/identify with

* Outgroup = a group you do not identify with (every other social group that is relevant to the context)
Stereotypes, prejudice, discrimination...

* STEOREOTYPES?
  * A simplified but widely shared belief about a characteristic of a group and its members (COGNITION)

* PREJUDICE?
  * A negative, affective prejudgment about a group and its individual members (AFFECT)

* DISCRIMINATION?
  * Negative treatment of a group member simply because of their group membership (BEHAVIOUR)

→ Stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination are the most studied forms of intergroup relations

Sutton and Douglas (2013)
Antecedents of stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination

* Individual Factors (individual differences)
  * Authoritarianism (Adorno et al., 1950)
  * Social Dominance Orientation (Sidanius and Pratto, 1999)
  * Personal Need for Structure (Neuberg & Newsom, 1993)

* Intergroup Factors
  * Realistic Group Conflict Theory (Sherif et al., 1954)
  * Category Differentiation Model (Tajfel et al., 1963, 1971)
  * Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1978)
Authoritarianism

* Adorno et al. (1950) → trying to explain the Holocaust
  * Evil behaviour stems from one’s personality characteristics → AUTHORITARIAN PERSONALITY
  * People with this kind of personality were demonstrated to be more prejudiced
  * Problems with measurement

  * Authoritarian personality seems to be related more with the right-wing political sympathies
Authoritarianism


* Three components:
  * Conventionalism: the desire to comply with traditional social values and norms
  * Authoritarian aggression: the desire to hurt or punish those who break social norms
  * Authoritarian submission: the tendency to comply with the authority demands

* People who are like this are more likely to be prejudiced towards groups that are traditionally low in status (e.g. Black people) or who do not represent traditional values (e.g. homosexuals)

* Is it a personality dimension or an ideology? Perceiving the world as a dangerous place
A general preference for hierarchical, as opposed to equal, relations between groups

A desire for one’s own group to dominate or be superior to other groups

People who score high on SDO show high level of prejudice towards different social groups and they oppose any organizations or movements that try to improve situations of these groups

They tend to legitimize existing inequalities in a society

Perceiving life as a zero-sum game – the world is a competitive jungle
A person’s preference for structure and clarity in most situations, and level of annoyance experienced by ambiguity

- It upsets me to go into situation without knowing what I can expect from it
- I enjoy having a clear and structured mode of life etc.
- PNS is related to stereotyping
Realistic Group Conflict Theory

* Main idea: Prejudice originates from the competition between groups over the same limited resources
* The Robbers Cave study (Sherif et al., 1954) → Summer camp for 11-year-old boys in Oklahoma
  * Task: Please watch the video and try to remember different stages of the experiment
  * Video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8PRuxMprSDQ
The Robbers Cave study (Sherif et al., 1954)

- Phase 1 – Group Attachment (Bonding)
  - Participating in common activities
  - Choosing names for the groups („Eagles” and „Rattlers”), flags and T-shirts
- Phase 2 – Intergroup Competition
  - Competition activities (baseball, tug-of-war, football)
  - Possibility to win trophies, pocket knives and medals
  - Development of prejudice
  - Acts of intergroup violence
The Robbers Cave study (Sherif et al., 1954)

Phase 3 – Intergroup Reconciliation (Reducing Friction Period)

- Engagement in cooperative activities (putting money together to pay for a movie, repairing the camp’s water supply, pulling together a broken-down truck)

Results

- Prejudice reduction → some boys even became friends with members of the other group
* Tajfel and Wilkes (1963) → placing objects into categories changes the way they are perceived
* People judging the length of lines in an array → when lines were categorized into two separate categories the difference between the shortest and the longest line was perceived to be larger
Tajfel and Wilkes (1963) → similar judgements were found between people
* When we separate people into groups we exaggerate both the similarities within and the differences between these groups
  * „All men/women are the same!”
  * „Women are from Venus, men are from Mars...”
* Why does it happen?
  * We want to perceive our social world as organized and simple
Minimal Group Paradigm (Tajfel et al., 1971)

Can we generate prejudice and problematic intergroup relations by simply placing people into different social categories? → YES

A group of British school boys were asked to evaluate unfamiliar paintings

Klee

Kandinsky
Minimal Group Paradigm (Tajfel et al., 1971)

- A group of British school boys were asked to evaluate unfamiliar paintings
- Following their choices, they were divided into two groups: Klee and Kandinsky (in reality this was random)
- Boys asked to assign points to two other boys – one from their group and one from the other group
* Minimal Group Paradigm (Tajfel et al., 1971)

* On average boys assigned more points to members of their own group
* Maximum differentiation: they maximized the difference in points allocated between the two groups, rather than maximizing the profit gained by their ingroup
* It is enough to divide people into groups (even those which are not meaningful) to provoke ingroup favouritism!
Social Identity Theory

* SIT (Tajfel, 1978) → Personal and social identities are interrelated, and the social groups that we belong to constitute a source of our positive self-concept
* People usually strive to be part of the social group that will increase their self-esteem → groups of high social status that are perceived in a positive way by the society
* We are motivated to increase the perceived value of our group in order to increase our own perceived value
* Striving for positive social identity may explain ingroup favouritism
How can we reduce prejudice?

* Contact Hypothesis
  * Direct contact
  * Extended contact
  * Imagined contact

* Categorization-based approaches
  * Decategorisation
  * Crossed categorisation
  * Recategorisation

* Novel interventions
Contact Hypothesis

* Gordon Allport – The Nature of Prejudice (1954)
  * Under optimal conditions of equal interaction between two groups contact should lead to reduced prejudice
* What did Allport mean by optimal conditions?
  * Not every case of contact will result in low level of prejudice: the case of Jews in Europe, the case of former Yugoslavia
  * Casual contact is not enough – it may even intensify prejudice
    * We may perceive a person we see through a lens of already-existing stereotype – we are more sensitive to information that aligns with our beliefs
What did Allport mean by optimal conditions?

- Residential contact – *integrated* versus segregated housing
  - Segregation as creating further social and economical boundaries
  - Outbursts of hostility at the boarders of segregated neighbourhoods
  - Among those White Americans who lived in integrated housing only 25% expressed prejudice towards Black Americans; in segregated housing this number equalled 75%
  - Those who lived in segregated housing perceived Black Americans as dangerous and aggressive
  - Integrated housing creates conditions in which friendly contact can occur and more knowledge can be acquired
What did Allport mean by optimal conditions?

- Occupation contact – contact at one’s workplace
  - Typical minority/immigrant jobs – low social status → negative consequences
  - **Equal status** facilitates positive effects of contact
- Those White American soldiers who knew Black American soldiers working at the same skill level had more favourable attitudes
- Initial resistance changes very quickly into more open and understanding relations
* What did Allport mean by optimal conditions?
  * **Acquaintance** – more favourable conditions for prejudice reduction
    * Researchers in the 40s-50s observed that those White students who knew more ethnic minority students demonstrated lower levels of prejudice
    * „Social travel” interventions – graduate students visiting Harlem
    * Strength of the relationship – American soldiers meeting German civilians
What did Allport mean by optimal conditions?

* **Common goals, cooperation**
  * Even if people have positive contact they may fail to generalize their positive experiences
  * Contact that encourages people to do things together is the most effective, e.g. sports teams, clubs at schools
  * White and Black soldiers who were fighting together during a war (were dependent on one another) had lower levels of interracial prejudice

* **Support of community or political leaders** → governmental policies, school rules, law
  * Cognitive dissonance → when behaviour is not in line with attitudes it causes an unpleasant internal state
Contact hypothesis is one of the most popular theories in the field of intergroup relations. Until 2006, more than 500 studies tested the effectiveness of the hypothesis in many different contexts → greater intergroup contact is generally associated with lower levels of prejudice (mean $r = .215$). Moreover, contact effects typically generalize to the entire outgroup, and they emerge across a broad range of outgroup targets (not only ethnic and racial).
How does it work?

- Reducing negative feelings
  - Intergroup anxiety
    - The anxiety that an individual may feel when anticipating or experiencing contact with someone from another group
    - Minorities may be anxious about negative evaluation
    - Majorities may be anxious about being perceived as prejudiced
  - Negative intergroup emotions
How does it work?

- Reducing negative feelings
- Promoting positive feelings
  - Encouraging empathy/perspective-taking
    - Empathy = the capacity to know person’s state of mind and adapt to it
    - Perspective-taking = ability to understand internal state of another
  - Promoting mutual sharing of personal information
    - Frequent contact should lead to a more personalised (or individuated) perception of the outgroup as a whole
  - Positive intergroup emotions
Sometimes direct intergroup contact cannot occur:

* People may leave in distant neighbourhoods or even in different countries
* Even if they do not, it may be difficult or expensive to arrange contact situations
* Prejudice may be too strong

Can people benefit from the idea of contact, even when they are unable to experience it?

YES → Extended Contact Effect
Extended Contact Effect

* Extended Contact = when you know that one of your ingroup friends has a good friendship with outgroup members
  * Wright et al. (1997) – 125 American students
    * Attitudes towards Asian Americans, African Americans, Latinos/Latinas, European Americans
    * Those students who knew an ingroup member with an outgroup friend had less negative attitudes towards that outgroup
Extended Contact = when you know that one of your ingroup friends has a good friendship with outgroup members

* Paolini et al. (2004) – 341 Irish students
  * Irish context – strong religious polarization of the society: Catholics versus Protestants
    * 300 year of conflict
    * 1969-1944 – „The Troubles” → death of 3600 people
  * Respondents indicated the number of friends belonging to their own community who had close friends from the other community
  * Indirect cross-group friendship significantly predicted weaker prejudice towards the rival community and greater perceived outgroup variability
  * Indirect friendship reduces anxiety
Extended Contact Effect

* Problems:
  * Extended contact may lead to lower prejudice
  * But lower prejudice may also be connected with extended contact: people who are not prejudice are likely to have less prejudice friends
  * However, there is some experimental evidence:
    * Children reading stories about other children’s friendship with refugees (Cameron et al., 2006)
Please prepare a pen – you are about to take part in a short experiment!
Imagined contact effect

* Imagined Contact Effect = prejudice can may be reduced, at least temporarily, by imagining a positive episode of contact with an outgroup member
* Our experiment: imagining a positive encounter with an elderly person → a study conducted by Turner, Crisp and Lambert (2007)
  * Undergraduate students divided into imagined contact condition (talking to an elderly person/talking to a homosexual men) or control condition
  * Undergraduates in the imagined contact condition showed more positive attitudes towards the outgroup
* Imagined Contact have other positive effects:
  * Abrams, Eller and Bryant (2006)
    * Older adults prone to stereotype threat
      * “It is widely assumed that intellectual performance declines with age, so the purpose of this study is to see whether old people do perform more poorly on intellectual tasks than young people. Both older and younger people will be taking part in this research.”
    * Imagining positive contact with younger people → Better performance
* DECATEGORIZATION = PERSONALIZATION

* In order to decrease prejudice we should focus on one’s individual identity and not group identity → Shift from „WE” – „THEY” to „ME” – „YOU”

* Interventions based on personalized contact between individuals

* Once we see that beliefs we hold about members of the other group are false our prejudice will decrease
DECATEGORIZATION

* DECATEGORIZATION = PERSONALIZATION
  * This approach has proved to be effective in laboratory → but what about real life situations?
  * Let’s remember that social categories are useful → they make our social world more understandable
  * What about generalization?
  * People seek group membership → it’s a source of positive identity
  * What can we do to acknowledge cultural diversity and still reduce prejudice?
In order to reduce prejudice between members of two different groups we can look for and then accentuate a group membership that they both share, e.g.

* Daniel is British
* François is French
* But they’re also both men/Jewish/left-wing voters
Therefore, Daniel and François may focus on their common gender/religious/political identity and not on their distinctive national identities.

People may be prejudice towards the other group, but they usually have very favourable opinions about the members of their own group.

In other words: ingroup favouritism and outgroup bias cancel out.

Also, people start seeing their own group as more differentiated → e.g. „We British people are not all alike”
Vanbeselaere (1987)
* Groups of 4 people
  * Simple categorization:
    * Red versus Blue team
    * „Seashore” versus „Forest team”
  * Crossed categorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Seashore</th>
<th>Forst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red Seashore</td>
<td>Red Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue Seashore</td>
<td>Blue Forest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CROSSED CATEGORIZATION**

* But:
  * It is difficult to say whether two categories will have the same psychological significance – It may be important for me that I am a woman but not that I am student
  * This approach reduces prejudice but does not eliminate them completely
  * Also, it may actually increase prejudice towards members of the „double outgroup”, e.g. Daniel’s case:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>British Man</td>
<td>British Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>French Man</td>
<td>French Woman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yesterday we talked about...

- Correlations and experiments
- Prejudice, stereotypes and discrimination
- Causes of stereotypes and prejudice
- Contact Hypothesis
  - Extended Contact Effect
  - Imagined Contact Effect
- Decategorization = Personalization
- Crossed Categorization
Approach proposing that prejudice can be reduced by encouraging people to form one common ingroup category
  - We should shift from „Us” and „Them” to more inclusive „We”

Approach related to contact hypothesis showing that cooperation and shared goals are useful in promoting positive intergroup relations

Examples of more inclusive identities?
  - Students
  - Americans
  - Europeans
Stone and Crisp (2007) – 85 British students asked about opinions on different nationalities working together

* British identification
  * I identify strongly with other British people
  * Being a British person is an important part of who I am

* European identification
  * I identify strongly with other Europeans
  * Being an European is an important part of who I am

* British identification was related with higher evaluation of one’s group
  * I’d feel good about working within a mainly British team

* European identification was related with higher evaluation of French group
  * I’d feel good about working within a mainly French team
Gaertner et al. (1994) – 1357 American students attending a multicultural school

Students were asked to circle which of several racial, ethnic and national labels applied to them, e.g.

American  Black  Chinese  Hispanic  Jewish  White

Those students who identified themselves as American (the most inclusive group), in addition to using another, minority subgroup identity, reported lower levels of racial and ethnic prejudice than those students who identified themselves only with a minority group label.
How can we evoke common ingroup identity?

Gaertner et al. (1989) – 20 six-person groups

- People divided into smaller groups
- They were supposed to solve the winter survival problem:
  - Imagine that your plane has crash-landed in the woods of northern Minnesota in mid-January. You have to rank-order 10 items salvaged from the plane (a gun, newspaper, can of shortening, etc.) in terms of their importance for survival.
- First, each person was given 2 minutes to solve the problem individually
- Each three-person group then created a name for itself and then discussed the problem (for a maximum of 5 min) and recorded a single consensus ranking of items
- Afterwards the participants were informed that they would soon discuss the problem again and would get a financial reward for their solution
* Gaertner et al. (1989)
  * One-group condition
    * Coming up with a new common solution (new nickname)
  * Two-group condition
    * Discussing rationale for each group’s solution
  * Separate-individuals condition
    * Coming up with a new individual solution (new nicknames)
* Gaertner et al. (1989)
  * Which participant should become a leader if the survival problem was real?
  * During the interaction did your team feel like one group, two groups, or separate individuals?
  * How would you rate other participants’ honesty, cooperativeness, and value to the discussion? How did you like other participants?
  * Was the interaction in the group: cooperative, friendly, quarrelsome, close, pleasant, trusting, frustrating, successful, honest, useless?
COMMON INGROUP IDENTITY MODEL

Gaertner et al. (1989)
So, this approach seems to be effective in reducing intergroup prejudice

But:

- A common ingroup identity may be short lived – groups may submerge intro their identity in the face of external threat!
- We cannot include two categories in a common group identity when intense distrust has already developed!
- Minorities can be afraid of being dominated by a majority outgroup
- Some groups may feel that they are a better representative of a common ingroup
- No matter how far we can go with creating new inclusive identities – there will always be someone who will remain outside these categories
The interventions we discussed usually aim at reducing one type of prejudice. However, people tend to be prejudiced towards more than one group! How can we promote tolerance towards multiple outgroups?

Vasiljevic and Crisp (2013) – 83 British undergraduates

- Participants were asked to write down five counter-stereotypic, or five stereotypic social category combinations

Examples?

- overweight model, rich student, female firefighter, or male midwife

Participants rated their attitudes towards different social outgroups: elderly, disabled, HIV patients, asylum seekers, and gay men.
* Vasiljevic and Crisp (2013)
* After generating counter-stereotypic category combinations participants had more favourable attitudes towards all the outgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outgroup</th>
<th>Category Combination</th>
<th>Stereotypic</th>
<th>Counter-Stereotypic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Combinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>Stereotypic</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>Stereotypic</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV patients</td>
<td>Stereotypic</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum seekers</td>
<td>Stereotypic</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay men</td>
<td>Stereotypic</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vasiljevic and Crisp (2013)
* The same effects were observed in a more difficult interethnic context – 83 Macedonians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outgroup</th>
<th>Stereotypic</th>
<th>Counter-stereotypic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsies</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanians</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbs</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sometimes the level of prejudice between groups is really high, e.g. after instances of mass violence

Victims and perpetrators of intergroup conflicts:

* Usually do not experience any intergroup contact and if they do it is negative
* It is impossible to encourage them to create one superordinate category to which both could belong
* They consider themselves very different and very often dehumanize the adversary
* They see the conflict in totally different ways – they produce mutually exclusive versions of the events
Who are moral exemplars?

* Members of the perpetrator group who acted morally in opposition to the passive or active aggression of the majority
* Also known as „heroic helpers”
* People who risked their lives in order to save others
* Example: Oskar Schindler, Jan Żabiński, Mustafa Lütfi Efendi
Novel interventions – Moral Exemplars Approach

* Centre for Research on Prejudice (2015) - 142 Polish high-school students
  * Polish-Russian relations in the context of the Katyn Massacre from 1940
  * Questions about forgiveness and intergroup attitudes
Russians and Polish deportees/Many Russians were helping Polish deportees
In the night from September 16th to September 17th, the Soviet Red Army invaded the eastern part of the Second Polish Republic. After the annexation of Eastern Borderlands, the NKVD started mass deportations of Poles to remote parts of the Soviet Union. Officers of the Polish Army, policemen, politicians, academics and other representatives of the Polish intelligentsia were arrested. They were directed to prisons, labour camps and other places of compulsory resettlement. Poles were sent mainly to Kazakhstan and Siberia where they were exploited in the mines and lumber mills. About fifteen thousands of Polish officers and soldiers were directed to prison camps in Starobelsk, Ostashkov, Katyn, Kozels and Kharkiv, where in the spring of 1940 they were murdered and buried in secret, in mass graves.
Despite the enormous scale of Stalinist crimes on the Polish nation, a lot of Russians helped Poles survive the exile, and sometimes even saved their lives. This happened to the Lapinski family, who were given shelter by Katrina Jarcova. She took them to her house, saving them this way from freezing to death in a kolkhoz. In spite of the famine, she shared all the food she had with them. On the other hand, thanks to the protection of Maksim Rozanov, the Byhowski family evaded the deportation to Siberia and the father (former soldier of Pilsudski) evaded being imprisoned and executed.

The stories presented above are only some of the numerous examples of help offered to Poles by Russians. Thanks to them, families like Lapinski and Bychowski managed to survive the Soviet occupation. It is worth acknowledging that both civilians and Russian officials could suffer serious consequences for helping Poles: from loosing their job to being sent to labour camps.
* Young Poles who read the stories about Russian moral exemplars:
  * Were more open towards contact with Russians
  * Were more willing to forgive Russians
  * Had more positive feelings towards Russians
  * Perceived Russians as more moral

* Similar effects observed in the Polish-German context and in the context of the Balkan War
Please design an experiment in which you would test an intervention directed at reducing prejudice:

* Choose a context and groups that you are familiar with – it can be the context of your school, hometown, your parents’ workplace, your country etc.

* Try to think why this context is important and what are the examples of prejudice that can be observed there; why do these prejudice occur?

* You can think of the interventions that we discussed here today but you can also think of something new

* Think about where you would conduct your experiment – in the laboratory or maybe in real life? What kind of materials you would use?

* You have 20 minutes to discuss it in your group.