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Only 2 Kinds of People

- Friend or foe?
  - With us or against?
  - Part of the problem or the solution
  - Warm, friendly, trustworthy, sincere
OK, Maybe 4 Kinds of People

- Friend or foe?
  - Warm, friendly, trustworthy, sincere
- Able or unable?
  - Competent, able, skillful, capable
- Warmth x competence → 4 clusters
Welcome to my seminar on dealing with difficult coworkers.

Difficult coworkers generally fall into one of these groups:

- Lazy
- Mean
- Smart
- Crazy

The only way to deal with them is to quit your job and become psychological researchers.

Thanks for coming.
Case Study: Prejudices

- Come in distinct types
- From society & stereotypes in mind
- Universal across culture
- Happen for individuals
- In distinct regions of brain
- Predict distinct patterns of discrimination
Distinct Types

- Friend or foe? = Warmth
- Able or unable? = Competence
- Stereotype Content Model (SCM)
  - Warmth x competence
## Stereotype Content Model


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hi Warmth</th>
<th>Lo Competence</th>
<th>Hi Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pure favoritism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lo Warmth</th>
<th>Pure antipathy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Stereotype Content Model


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lo Competence</th>
<th>Hi Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi Warmth</td>
<td>Ambivalence</td>
<td>Pure favoritism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo Warmth</td>
<td>Pure antipathy</td>
<td>Ambivalence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Stereotype Content Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lo Competence</th>
<th>Hi Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ingroup, allies, reference groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi Warmth</td>
<td>Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo Warmth</td>
<td>poor, welfare, homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disgust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>poor, welfare, homeless</td>
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## Stereotype Content Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hi Warmth</th>
<th>Lo Competence</th>
<th>Hi Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi Warmth</td>
<td>older, disabled, retarded</td>
<td>ingroup, allies, reference groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo Warmth</td>
<td>poor, welfare, homeless</td>
<td>Jews, Asians, rich, professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pity</td>
<td>Envy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disgust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prejudices

- Come in distinct types
- From society & stereotypes in mind
- Universal across culture
- Happen for individuals
- In distinct regions of brain
- Predict distinct patterns of discrimination
SCM Studies

- [American] society’s opinions of groups
- Common groups nominated
- Rate on
  - Warmth (warm, friendly, sincere)
  - Competence (competent, skillful, capable)
  - Social structure
  - Emotions
  - Behavior
Survey Method: Demographics
(Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, *JPSP*, 2007)

- N = 571
- Sex: 62% female, 38% male
- Age: 18-85, mean 45
- Region: 20% NE, 24% MidW, 35% S, 21% W
- Edu: 7% HS-, 24% HS, 30% BA-, 39% BA+
- Race: 77% White, 6% Black, 9% Hispanic
Scales & Reliabilities

- Competent, capable = .81
- Warm, friendly = .83
- Disgust, contempt = .60
- Admiration, pride = .80
- Pity, sympathy = .71
- Envious, jealous = .82
- Cooperate, associate = .61
- Fight, attack = .59
- Help, protect = .60
- Exclude, demean = .68
SCM: US Representative Sample
(Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, *JPSP*, 2007)
U.S. Immigrants
(Lee & Fiske, IJIR, 2006)

Diagram showing the distribution of warmth and competence among different immigrant groups, including housewives, elderly, Italian, African American, South American, documented, 3rd generation, African, Mexican, Latino, 1st generation, poor, farm worker, 1st generation, undocumented, homeless, Canadian, Euro, American, students, East European, Russian, Vietnamese, Middle Eastern, Chinese, Japanese, professionals, tech industry, rich, Middle Eastern, rich.
Prejudices

- Come in distinct types
- From society & stereotypes in mind
- Universal across culture
- Happen for individuals
- In distinct regions of brain
- Predict distinct patterns of discrimination
Prejudices

- Come in distinct *types*
- From ideas of society & stereotypes in *mind*
  - Status $\rightarrow$ competence
  - Competition $\rightarrow$ (low) warmth
- Universal across *culture*
- Happen for *individuals*
- In distinct regions of *brain*
- Predict distinct patterns of *discrimination*
Social Context → Group Stereotype

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Warmth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>.77 (.55 to .87)</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Context → Group Stereotype

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Warmth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>0.77 (0.55 to 0.87)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.25 (0.08 to -0.48)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From US, EU, Latino, & Asian samples
Social Context → Group Stereotype
(Caprariello, Cuddy, & Fiske, *GPIR*, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Warmth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td><em>High</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Low</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td><em>High</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Low</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Context → Group Stereotype
(Caprariello, Cuddy, & Fiske, *GPIR*, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Warmth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prejudices

- Come in distinct types
- From ideas of society & stereotypes in *mind*
  - Status $\rightarrow$ competence
  - Competition $\rightarrow$ (low) warmth
- Universal across *culture*
- Happen for *individuals*
- In distinct regions of *brain*
- Predict distinct patterns of *discrimination*
Prejudices

- Come in distinct types
- From ideas of society & stereotypes in mind
- Universal across culture
- Happen for individuals
- In distinct regions of brain
- Predict distinct patterns of discrimination
German Data (Eckes, 2002)
American Students: 1932-2007
(Bergsiecker, Leslie, Constantine, & Fiske, under review)
## Italian Fascists
(Durante, Volpato, & Fiske, *EJSP*, in press)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hi Warmth</th>
<th>Lo Competence</th>
<th>Hi Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lo Warmth</td>
<td>Italians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>Aryans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Half castes</td>
<td>Jews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCM: Universal or Culture-Bound? (Cuddy, Fiske, Kwan, Glick, et al., BJSP, 2009)

- Warmth x competence map
  - Collective warmth (harmony) > (individual) competence?
- Many groups mixed
  - Result of multi-cultural, egalitarian values?
  - Unnecessary in homogeneous, hierarchical cultures?
- Ingroup favoritism → outgroup derogation
  - No ingroup love prejudice?
SCM: Japanese data
(Cuddy et al., BJSP, 2009)
SCM: Hong Kong data
(Cuddy et al., 2009)
SCM: South Korean data (Cuddy et al., 2009)
### Ingroup Favoritism
*(Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, *Adv in Exptl Soc Psy*, 2008)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Positivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western (2 U.S., Belgium)</td>
<td>.29 - .49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (Japan, Hong Kong, S. Korea)</td>
<td>.02 - .18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positivity averages across warmth & competence, which show same patterns.
Prejudices

- Come in distinct types
- From ideas of society & stereotypes in mind
- Universal across culture
  - But outgroup prejudices without ingroup favoritism
- Happen for individuals
- In distinct regions of brain
- Predict distinct patterns of discrimination
Prejudices

- Come in distinct types
- From society & stereotypes in mind
- Universal across culture
- Happen for individuals
- In distinct regions of brain
- Predict distinct patterns of discrimination
Intergroup Perception $\rightarrow$ Person Perception
(Russell & Fiske, *EJSP*, 2008)

- Individual competition & status $\rightarrow$
  individual warmth & competence
Methods

- **Participants**: Princeton Undergrads (n=46)
- **Cover**: National Impression Formation Study on how synthesize info from different sources
  - Interact & form impression of another student
  - Background (status)
  - “Subliminal” info
  - Game (competition)
  - Rate warmth & competence
- 2 (status) x 2 (competition)
Competition ➔ Perceived Warmth
(Russell & Fiske, *EJSP*, 2008)
Status → Perceived Competence

(Russell & Fiske, *EJSP*, 2008)

![Bar graph showing perceived competence ratings for high and low status targets. The graph indicates higher perceived competence for high status targets compared to low status targets.](image)
Status → Competence on Intelligence Index (SAT, GPA)
Prejudices

- Come in distinct types
- From society & stereotypes in mind
- Universal across culture
- Happen for individuals
- In distinct regions of brain
- Predict distinct patterns of discrimination
Prejudices

- Come in distinct types
- From ideas of society & stereotypes in mind
- Universal across culture
- Happen for individuals
- In distinct regions of brain
- Predict distinct patterns of discrimination
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pride</th>
<th>Envy</th>
<th>Pity</th>
<th>Disgust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emotion Ratings in Scanner
(Harris & Fiske, Psych Science, 2006)

![Bar chart showing emotion ratings](image)
SCAN 101

- Medial Prefrontal Cortex
  - Social cognition, theory of mind, social affect
- Dispositional attributions about people
  (Harris, Todorov, & Fiske, *NeuroImage*, 2006)
  - Not ambiguous attributions
  - Not objects doing same actions
  (Harris & Fiske, *Social Cognition*, 2008)
- “Social valuation”
MPFC: Social Cognition

Pride
Y: 55

Envy
Y: 14

Pity
Y: -19
Disgust: No MPFC, not Social
What I said:
- Differentiated prejudices → distinct activations

What I did NOT say:
- Prejudice is inevitable, wired in

Brief empirical digression:
- Neural activation depends on social context
Goal Study Hypotheses

- Nonsocial goal $\rightarrow$ no MPFC
- Individuating goal $\rightarrow$ MPFC
- Categorization goal $\rightarrow$ amygdala, MPFC
Instructions
(Harris & Fiske, SCAN, 2007)

Shown for 2 sec. at the beginning of each block of 12 faces.

dot?
over 21?
vegetable?
Stimuli & Design
(Harris & Fiske, SCAN, 2007)
Dot: No MPFC, not Social
MPFC Activation: Social Cognition

Vegetable task
x: 8, y: 38, z: 32

Age task
x: 5, y: 42, z: 30
“Rehumanization” (Harris & Fiske, SCAN, 2007)

Dehuman. Targets

Human. Targets
Dehumanization: Denying a Mind to Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prejudices</th>
<th>MPFC activation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envy</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pity</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disgust</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dehumanization: Denying a Mind to Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prejudices</th>
<th>MPFC activation</th>
<th>Attributed mind</th>
<th>Likely interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envy</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pity</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disgust</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disgusting groups also less articulate, intelligent, less typically human

(Harris & Fiske, 2006 & under review)
Other Kinds of Dehumanization?

Dehumanization Theory (Haslam):

- Dehumanization as disgusting animals (e.g., vermin such as rodents, insects)
- Dehumanization as objects (e.g., tools, machines, robots)
## Stereotype Content Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Competence</th>
<th>High Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Warmth</strong></td>
<td><strong>High Warmth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>older, disabled, retarded</td>
<td>ingroup, allies, reference groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pity</td>
<td>Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Warmth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Low Warmth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor, welfare, homeless</td>
<td>Jews, Asians, rich, feminists, vamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disgust <em>(Vermin)</em></td>
<td>Envy <em>(Objects)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Competence: Low, High
- Warmth: High, Low
- Low Competence:
  - Older, disabled, retarded
  - Pity
  - Poor, welfare, homeless
  - Disgust *(Vermin)*
- High Competence:
  - Ingroup, allies, reference groups
  - Pride
  - Jews, Asians, rich, feminists, vamps
  - Envy *(Objects)*
Female Subtypes (Eckes, 2002)
Hypotheses
(Cikara, Eberhardt, & Fiske, under review)

For heterosexual men, sexualized women have instrumental value, so they will:

- Recognize bodies of sexualized women
  - Not faces
- Deactivate social cognition network
  - Correlated with hostile sexism
Participants & Design (Cikara et al.)

- 21 heterosexual male students

Independent variables:
- 2 (bikini/clothed) X 2 (female/male target)

Dependent variables:
- BOLD response
- Surprise face & body recognition
- Hostile Sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996)
Sample Stimuli

20 each, 10 foils
Body Recognition

\[ F_{\text{gender}}(1, 20) = 17.78, \ p < .001, \ \eta_p^2 = .47; \ F_{\text{clothing}}(1, 20) = 11.33, \ p < .005, \ \eta_p^2 = .36 \]
Hostile Sexism & Whole Brain:
Deactivation of Social Cognition Network

William’s test $t(19) = 2.9$, $p < .005$, one-tailed

Mitchell, 2008
HS Correlation within mPFC

mPFC
BA 10
33 voxels

Parameter Estimate

HS & = .38

HS & = -.59

r(19) = -.59, p = .01
First v. Third Person Verb IAT

First Person Verbs
- use
- push
- pull
- squeeze
- turn
- fold
- grasp

Third Person Verbs
- uses
- pushes
- pulls
- squeezes
- turns
- folds
- grasps
IAT Results

Male Participants

1st-Sexual 3rd-Clothed
3rd-Sexual 1st-Clothed

Female Participants

3rd-Sexual 1st-Clothed 1st-Sexual 3rd-Clothed

RT (ms)

(9) = 1.39, p = ns

(15) = -2.22, p < .05

η² = .25
Sexualized Female Bodies
(Cikara et al., under review)

- Remembered best
- Associated with first-person actions
- Sexism *de*-activates mPFC
  - Social cognition network
- Possible neural signatures for unique prejudices
Prejudices

- Come in distinct types
- From ideas of society & stereotypes in mind
- Universal across culture
- Happen for individuals
- In distinct regions of brain
  - But depends on social goals
- Predict distinct patterns of discrimination
Prejudices

- Come in distinct types
- From ideas of society & stereotypes in mind
- Universal across culture
- Happen for individuals
- In distinct regions of brain
- Predict distinct patterns of discrimination
SCM: US Representative Sample
(Cuddy et al., JPSP, 2007)

- **PITY** (help, protect)
- **DISGUST** (attack, fight)
- **ENVY** (cooperate, associate)

Groupings:
- Elderly
- Retarded
- Disabled
- Poor blacks
- Turks
- Feminists
- Arabs
- Rich
- Jews
- British
- Asians
- Americans
- Middle-class
- Irish
- Black professionals
- Housewives
- Christians
- Rich
- Poor blacks
- Homeless
- Welfare
- Turks
- Arabs
- Rich
- Jews
- British
- Asians
- Americans
- Middle-class
- Irish
- Black professionals
- Housewives
- Christians
- Help
- Protect
- Exclude
- Demean
- Disgust
- Envy
- Competence
- Warmth
Predicting Discrimination: US Survey (Cuddy et al., *JPSP*, 2007)

![Graph showing the relationship between behavior orientation and change in Adj R Square. The graph includes bars for Active Facilitation, Active Harm, Passive Facilitation, and Passive Harm. The bars show the change in Adj R Square for stereotypes boost and emotions boost.]
Overall Causal Model

Social Structure (Competition, Status) → Stereotypes (Warmth, Competence) → Emotions (Disgust, Pity, Envy, Pride) → Behavior (Active, Passive, Help & Harm)
Prejudices

- Come in distinct types
- From ideas of society & stereotypes in mind
- Universal across culture
- Happen for individuals
- In distinct regions of brain
- Predict distinct patterns of discrimination
Implications

- Not all biases are equivalent
  - Most stereotypes are ambivalent
  - Most prejudices create mixed emotions
  - Most discrimination includes both help & harm

- People don’t know this
  - Automatic = unconscious
  - Ambiguous = hard to detect
  - Ambivalent = mixed

- Monitor overall patterns
U.S. Collaborators

- Tiane Lee, Ann Marie Russell, Mina Cikara, Princeton
- Lasana Harris, New York University
- Amy Cuddy, Harvard Business School
- Cara Talaska, Eastern Michigan University
- Peter Caprariello, University of Rochester
- Virginia Kwan, Alex Todorov, Princeton University
- Peter Glick, Lawrence University
- Jennifer Eberhardt, Stanford University
- Shelly Chaiken, Berkeley CA
International Collaborators

- Britain: J. Oldmeadow
- Belgium: S. Demoulin, J-Ph. Leyens, V. Yzerbyt
- Bulgaria: K. Petkova & V. Todorov
- China: V. Kwan & M. Bond
- Costa Rica: V. Smith-Castro & R. Perez
- France: J-C. Croizet
- Germany: R. Ziegler
- Israel: N. Rouhana
- Italy: F. Durante, D. Capozza, C. Volpato
- Japan: M. Yamamoto & T. T. Htun
- Korea: H-J. Kim
- Netherlands: E. Sleebos & N. Ellemers
- Norway: J. Perry
- Portugal: J. Vala
- South Africa: A. Akande
- Spain: R. Rodriguez Bailon, E. Morales, & M. Moya
- Wales: G. Maio
Thank you
RSF Project: *Envye Up & Scorn Down*

- Envy & scorn divide us
- What?
- Who?
- Where?
- Why?
  - (comparison informs, identifies, & protects)
- When?
- How to harness for good