

May 10th, 9:00 AM - 11:00 AM

Expanding Stereotype Content Beyond Warmth and Competence

Lauren S. Park
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/studentsymposium>



Part of the [Applied Behavior Analysis Commons](#), [Experimental Analysis of Behavior Commons](#), and the [Multicultural Psychology Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Park, Lauren S., "Expanding Stereotype Content Beyond Warmth and Competence" (2017). *Student Research Symposium*. 3.

<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/studentsymposium/2017/Presentations/3>

This Oral Presentation is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Research Symposium by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Expanding Stereotype Content Beyond Warmth And Competence

Lauren S. Park

Portland State University

Larry Martinez
Portland State University

Nicholas A. Smith
Portland State University

Sabrina Volpone
University of New Mexico

Alex P. Lindsey
*Indiana University – Purdue University
Indianapolis*

Afra Ahmad
Zayed University



Origins of stereotyping

Nature	Nurture
<p data-bbox="318 586 784 758">Dual process theory</p> <p data-bbox="324 872 778 1043">Evolutionary perspectives</p>	<p data-bbox="1180 586 1541 743">Intergroup relations</p> <p data-bbox="1136 868 1586 939">Socialization</p>

Stereotype Content Model (Fiske et al., 2002)

		Competence	
		Low	High
Warmth	High	Pity Low status, not competitive (e.g., housewives, elderly people, people with disabilities)	Pride/Admiration High status, not competitive (e.g., ingroup, close allies)
	Low	Disgust Low status, competitive (e.g., welfare recipients, poor people)	Envy High status, competitive (e.g., Asians, Jews, rich people, feminists)

Adapted from Fiske et al. (2002)

TO ALL OF OUR ATHEIST FRIENDS:
THANK GOD YOU'RE WRONG.

1:1 AnswersInGenesis.org

Does Fiske et al.'s (2002) stereotype content model explain the stereotype content of all groups?

Can adding perceived morality better explain stereotype content than simply the two-dimensional model alone?

STUDY 1

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Study 1: Method

- 288 participants from Amazon's Mechanical Turk
- 9 items by Fiske et al. (2002)
 - *As viewed by society, how [competent, warm] are members of this group?*
- 4 morality items
 - *As viewed by society, how **moral** are members of this group?*
 - *As viewed by society, how **ethical** are members of this group?*
 - *As viewed by society, how **honest** are members of this group?*
 - *As viewed by society, do members of this group **have integrity**?*
- Examined 8 target groups

Study 1: Target Groups

Fiske et al. (2002)

- Asian people
- Elderly people
- White people
- Poor people

New groups

- Atheists
- Ex-convicts
- Cancer survivors
- People with disabilities

Study 1: Results

		Competence	
		Low	High
Warmth	High	<i>Cancer survivors</i> <i>People with disabilities</i> <i>Elderly people</i>	White people
	Low	Atheists Ex-convicts Poor people	<i>Asian people</i>

3-Factor Model

Cancer survivors
People with disabilities
Elderly people
Asian people

STUDY 2

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Study 2: Methods

- 403 participants from Amazon's Mechanical Turk
- 9 items by Fiske et al. (2002)
 - *As viewed by society, how [competent, warm] are members of this group?*
- 4 morality items
 - *As viewed by society, how [moral, ethical] are members of this group?*
- Target groups

Study 2: Results

Cancer Survivors

Model	χ^2	<i>df</i>	$\Delta\chi^2$	CFI	SRMR	RMSEA
Three-factor (Competence, Warmth, Morality)	116.91	51		.96	.04	.08
Two-factor (Competence, Warmth + Morality)	140.00	53	23.09**	.94	.05	.09
Two-factor (Competence + Warmth, Morality)	150.33	53	33.42**	.94	.05	.10
Two-factor (Competence + Morality, Warmth)	140.74	53	23.83**	.94	.05	.09
One-factor (Competence + Warmth + Morality)	166.17	54	49.26**	.93	.05	.11

Note: All models compared against the hypothesized 3-factor model (as shown in bold-faced text) for each group.

*† = $p < .10$, * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$*

Study 2: Results

Atheists

Model	χ^2	<i>df</i>	$\Delta\chi^2$	CFI	SRMR	RMSEA
Three-factor (Competence, Warmth, Morality)	116.95	51		.96	.05	.08
Two-factor (Competence, Warmth + Morality)	121.87	53	4.92†	.96	.05	.08
Two-factor (Competence + Warmth, Morality)	160.01	53	43.06**	.93	.06	.11
Two-factor (Competence + Morality, Warmth)	154.81	53	37.87**	.94	.06	.10
One-factor (Competence + Warmth + Morality)	160.78	54	43.83**	.93	.06	.10

Note: All models compared against the hypothesized 3-factor model (as shown in bold-faced text) for each group.

*† = $p < .10$, * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$*

People with Disabilities

Model	χ^2	<i>df</i>	$\Delta\chi^2$	CFI	SRMR	RMSEA
Three-factor (Competence, Warmth, Morality)	83.88	51		.98	.05	.06
Two-factor (Competence, Warmth + Morality)	92.23	53	8.35**	.97	.06	.06
Two-factor (Competence + Warmth, Morality)	296.36	53	212.48**	.92	.11	.16
Two-factor (Competence + Morality, Warmth)	286.81	53	202.93**	.83	.10	.16
One-factor (Competence + Warmth + Morality)	296.97	54	213.09**	.82	.11	.16

Ex-Convicts

Model	χ^2	<i>df</i>	$\Delta\chi^2$	CFI	SRMR	RMSEA
Three-factor (Competence, Warmth, Morality)	106.72	51		.95	.06	.08
Two-factor (Competence, Warmth + Morality)	134.00	53	27.28**	.93	.07	.09
Two-factor (Competence + Warmth, Morality)	162.07	53	55.35**	.90	.08	.11
Two-factor (Competence + Morality, Warmth)	187.88	53	81.16**	.88	.09	.12
One-factor (Competence + Warmth + Morality)	203.55	54	96.83**	.87	.09	.13

Note: All models compared against the hypothesized 3-factor model (as shown in bold-faced text) for each group.

*† = $p < .10$, * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$*

White People

Model	χ^2	<i>df</i>	$\Delta\chi^2$	CFI	SRMR	RMSEA
Three-factor (Competence, Warmth, Morality)	59.93	51		.99	.03	.03
Two-factor (Competence, Warmth + Morality)	68.01	53	8.08*	.99	.03	.04
Two-factor (Competence + Warmth, Morality)	174.27	53	114.34**	.92	.07	.11
Two-factor (Competence + Morality, Warmth)	187.11	53	127.18**	.91	.07	.12
One-factor (Competence + Warmth + Morality)	191.30	54	131.37	.91	.07	.12

Asian People

Model	χ^2	<i>df</i>	$\Delta\chi^2$	CFI	SRMR	RMSEA
Three-factor (Competence, Warmth, Morality)	132.68	51		.92	.07	.09
Two-factor (Competence, Warmth + Morality)	176.63	53	43.95**	.88	.08	.11
Two-factor (Competence + Warmth, Morality)	207.31	53	74.63**	.85	.09	.13
Two-factor (Competence + Morality, Warmth)	176.48	53	43.80**	.88	.08	.11
One-factor (Competence + Warmth + Morality)	226.74	54	94.06**	.83	.09	.13

Note: All models compared against the hypothesized 3-factor model (as shown in bold-faced text) for each group.

*† = $p < .10$, * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$*

Poor People

Model	χ^2	<i>df</i>	$\Delta\chi^2$	CFI	SRMR	RMSEA
Three-factor (Competence, Warmth, Morality)	61.41	51		.99	.03	.03
Two-factor (Competence, Warmth + Morality)	82.06	53	20.65**	.98	.03	.06
Two-factor (Competence + Warmth, Morality)	146.19	53	84.78**	.94	.05	.10
Two-factor (Competence + Morality, Warmth)	120.60	53	59.19**	.96	.04	.09
One-factor (Competence + Warmth + Morality)	146.20	54	84.79**	.94	.05	.10

Elderly People

Model	χ^2	<i>df</i>	$\Delta\chi^2$	CFI	SRMR	RMSEA
Three-factor (Competence, Warmth, Morality)	171.90	51		.89	.08	.12
Two-factor (Competence, Warmth + Morality)	192.00	53	20.10**	.87	.09	.12
Two-factor (Competence + Warmth, Morality)	252.12	53	80.22**	.81	.10	.14
Two-factor (Competence + Morality, Warmth)	280.71	53	108.81**	.78	.11	.15
One-factor (Competence + Warmth + Morality)	291.38	54	119.48**	.77	.11	.16

Note: All models compared against the hypothesized 3-factor model (as shown in bold-faced text) for each group.

f = $p < .10$, * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$

DISCUSSION

Does Fiske et al.'s (2002) stereotype content model explain the stereotype content of all groups?

No!

Can adding perceived morality better explain stereotype content than simply the two-dimensional model alone?

Yes!

Implications & Future Research

- Understanding of stereotypes
- Strategies for counteracting bias
- Future research:
 - Different target groups
 - Implicit measures
 - Behavioral outcomes

Questions?

Sample Characteristics

Study 1

- 288 US participants
- Gender
 - 53% female
 - 47% male
 - One “Other”
- 32.62 years old ($SD = 10.97$)
- Race
 - 73% White
 - 6% Black
 - 7% Hispanic
 - 9% Asian
 - 1% Middle Eastern
 - 1% Indian/South Asian
 - 1% Native American
 - 2% Other
- Employment
 - 64% currently working
 - 7% working in the last 6 months
 - 26% not currently or recently employed
 - 3% retired

Study 2

- 401 US participants
- Gender
 - 55% female
 - 45% male
 - One “Other”
- 34.63 years old ($SD = 12.28$)
- Race
 - 73% White
 - 10% Black
 - 7% Hispanic
 - 7% Asian
 - 1% Middle Eastern
 - 2% Other
- Employment
 - 67% currently working
 - 7% working in the last 6 months
 - 22% not currently or recently employed
 - 4% retired