

Профиль:

«Прикладная социальная психология / Applied social psychology»

КОД-082

Время выполнения задания – 180 мин.

1. Read the article and answer the questions below. Answers should be given in English.

Stereotype Content: Warmth and Competence Endure

Susan T. Fiske

Abstract

Two dimensions persist in social cognition when people are making sense of individuals or groups. The stereotype content model (SCM) terms these two basic dimensions perceived warmth (trustworthiness, friendliness) and competence (capability, assertiveness). Measured reliably and validly, these Big Two dimensions converge across survey, cultural, laboratory, and biobehavioral approaches. Generality across place, levels, and time further support the framework. Similar dimensions have emerged repeatedly over the history of psychology and in current theories. The SCM proposes and tests a comprehensive causal theory: Perceived social structure (cooperation, status) predicts stereotypes (warmth, competence), which in turn predict emotional prejudices (pride, pity, contempt, envy), and finally, the emotions predict discrimination (active and passive help and harm). The SCM uncovers systematic content and dynamics of stereotypes, which has practical implications.

Introduction

Life and theory both demand an explanation of the groups that surround us. In everyday life, immigration, globalization, multiculturalism, and inequality are changing personal experiences with other kinds of people, so as individuals, we need to make sense of them. In scientific theory, researchers investigating social cognition and prejudice spent the last century devising process models of how people relate as individuals and groups. What researchers mostly neglected were content models—taxonomies—of the systematic kinds of impressions that people form.

On closer conceptual and empirical investigation, a simple model explains much. Robust converging methods, cumulative data, generality, history, conceptual parallels, coherent theory, and evolutionary plausibility characterize social cognition's Big Two dimensions— warmth-communion and competence-agency. In emphasizing these points, this review omits other points; I instead refer the reader to other reviews emphasizing issues not detailed here: validities (Fiske, 2015), cultural analyses (Fiske & Durante, 2016), as well as implications for interpersonal status (Swencionis, Dupree, & Fiske, 2017), social class (Durante & Fiske, 2017), and political perception (Fiske & Durante, 2014).

Stereotype Content Model (SCM)

Humans are complicated stimuli, distinguished from most other objects by having intent and autonomy. Presumably, then, people first want to know each other's individual or collective intent toward them and their groups. The SCM (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002) calls this dimension warmth (trustworthiness, sociability). Warmth is fundamental because intent predicts behavior. For survival, sentries call out, "who goes there: friend or foe?" Second, one needs to know whether the other people can enact that intent, namely how competent (capable, agentic) they are. Perceivers often operate on such stereotypes (Bodenhausen, Kang, & Peery, 2012), which are shared beliefs about common groups' warmth and competence. Even impressions of individuals, including the self, use similar dimensions (Abele et al., 2016; Russell & Fiske, 2008; Wojciszke, Abele, & Baryla, 2009).

Warmth × Competence space maps basic, recurring intergroup arrays (see Fig. 1):

- Society's defaults (reference groups), which are allegedly high in both warmth and competence: Such people include the middle class, citizens, and dominant religionists. People report pride and admiration for these groups.
- The lowest of the low, stereotyped as untrustworthy and incompetent: the homeless, refugees, undocumented migrants, drug addicts, and nomads. People report disgust and contempt for them.

These extremes of all-good in-groups and all-bad out-groups could follow from decades of intergroup research (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2010; Yzerbyt & Demoulin, 2010) or even individual halo effects (Nisbett & Wilson, 1977). The SCM adds ambivalence in two additional intergroup stereotypes:

- Groups seen as warm but incompetent, including older people and people with disabilities, as well as young children. People report pity or sympathy, itself an ambivalent emotion (feeling sorry for someone holds only as long as their status remains lower).
- Groups stereotyped as cold but competent, which is the opposite kind of ambivalence, including rich people, businesspeople, and technical experts. People reported that they elicit envy, also an ambivalent emotion; they admire such people but also resent them.

The four combinations of warmth and competence (see Fig. 1) include different ethnic groups, depending on social context, national history, and immigration circumstances (Bergsieker, Leslie, Constantine, & Fiske, 2012, Study 4; Lee & Fiske, 2006). For example, in the United States, Americans and Canadians appear allegedly high in both the warmth and competence dimensions. Mexicans, other Latinos, and Africans appear stereotypically low in both warmth and competence. Irish and Italians appear allegedly warm but less competent, while Asians, Jews, British, and Germans appear supposedly competent but less warm.

	Low Competence (Capability, Assertiveness)	High Competence (Capability, Assertiveness)
High Warmth (Friendliness, Trustworthiness)	Common: Elderly, Disabled, Children United States: Italians, Irish Emotions Evoked: Pity, Sympathy	Common: Citizens, Middle Class, Defaults United States: Americans, Canadians, Christians Emotions Evoked: Pride, Admiration
Low Warmth (Friendliness, Trustworthiness)	Common: Poor, Homeless, Immigrants United States: Latinos, Africans, Muslims Emotions Evoked: Disgust, Contempt	Common: Rich, Professional, Technical Experts United States: Asians, Jews, British, Germans Emotions Evoked: Envy, Jealousy

Fig. 1. Warmth and competence stereotypes. Common stereotypes, mostly based on socioeconomic status and age, are shared across many countries. Other stereotypes vary by country; persistent stereotypes in the United States appear here (Bergsieker Leslie, Constantine, & Fiske, 2012, Study 4; Cuddy et al., 2009; Durante et al., 2013, see link to individual countries; Lee & Fiske, 2006).

Measurement

With experience, data, and psychometrics, researchers have been able to hone reliable and valid indicators of warmth and competence, as well as other variables, in the SCM (Fiske, 2015; Kervyn, Fiske, & Yzerbyt, 2015). Warmth items include warm, trustworthy, friendly, honest, likable, and sincere (in order of priority). Note the mix of items related to sociability and to morality (cf. Abele et al., 2016). Competence items include competent, intelligent, skilled, and efficient, as well as assertive and confident; note the mix of items related to capability and to agency (Abele et al., 2016, supplementary materials).

Social structure predicts stereotype content (Fiske, 2015). Stereotypic warmth follows from a group’s perceived cooperativeness and competitiveness, best measured as both economic interdependence (zero-sum resources) and symbolic values (shared vs. conflicting). For example, an item measuring economic interdependence is, “If resources go to . . . , to what extent does that take resources away from the rest of society?” and an item measuring symbolic values is, “The values and beliefs of . . . are NOT compatible with the beliefs and values of most Americans” (Kervyn et al., 2015, p. 37). Stereotypic competence follows from perceived status, as measured by the following item: “How prestigious are the jobs generally held by . . . ?” and “How economically successful have . . . been?” (Kervyn et al., 2015, p. 45).

Converging Methods: Survey, Comparative, Laboratory, and Biobehavioral Approaches

Descriptive research has long supported the SCM. Surveys ask for relevant societal groups in a given country, and those groups reported by at least 15% of the sample meet the SCM criterion of consensus. A second sample then rates society’s reported view of each group’s warmth and competence, as well as (sometimes) the emotions they evoke, the behaviors directed toward them, and the social-structural predictors (see Measurement). Because respondents report society’s views, this minimizes social desirability concerns, and it means that samples need not be representative, because everyone knows the society’s stereotypes of common groups

(compare the representative sample in Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2007, with the convenience samples in Fiske et al., 2002). Individual differences and in-group favoritism are rare (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2008).

Generalizing the U.S. results, cultural comparisons reveal consistencies and differences. Most countries sampled to date (nearly 50) show groups in the four quadrants illustrated in Figure 1. But countries differ in their warmth-competence correlations, which index use of the ambivalent quadrants (low competence, high warmth and vice versa; Durante et al., 2013). The United States and other countries with moderate to high income inequality (Latin America, South Africa) show many groups in the ambivalent quadrants, so they have low warmth-competence correlations. In contrast are countries with high income equality, such as Scandinavia, Australia, and much of Europe, where most groups are all-good insiders or all-bad outsiders, so they align along more of a vector: At the top are those highwarmth, high-competence in-groups included in the social-welfare safety net (all citizens); at the bottom are the low-warmth, low-competence, excluded out-groups (refugees, Roma). Countries with more income equality have a larger inclusive “us” population but also a small “them” subpopulation—and few ambivalent groups. Income inequality apparently generates more complicated lay theories (e.g., we have deserving and undeserving poor, deserving and undeserving rich).

Even when the warmth-competence correlation is moderate, respondents still use both dimensions. For example, in countries with greater income equality, the pity cluster moves into the mainstream. But rich people (envied groups) are persistently viewed with ambivalence, respected but mistrusted. Their apparent competitiveness is judged as neither warm nor competent in more income-equal countries.

Besides national income equality and inequality, a nation’s degree of peace or conflict moderates the use of SCM-ambivalent clusters (Durante, Fiske, et al., 2017). As noted, countries with greater income equality, such as Scandinavian ones, have a more inclusive in-group and one smaller cluster of out-groups. This pattern characterizes peaceful countries as well. The other pole, extreme conflict (external or internal warfare), also creates a simple us/them dynamic. It is the countries intermediate on peace conflict, such as the United States, that most display the clearest stereotype ambivalence.

As a final example of cultural comparison, Asian samples show out-groups similar to the Western ones: Groups low in both competence and warmth include the homeless and immigrants, envied groups include rich and professionals, and pitied groups include older and disabled people (Cuddy et al., 2009). But the societal in-groups (citizens, members of one’s hometown) appear in the moderate middle, consistent with cultural modesty norms.

Besides surveys and cultural comparisons, SCM evidence draws on laboratory experiments demonstrating causality. As noted, the predictors of stereotypic warmth and competence are perceived social structures (Fiske et al., 2002). Groups viewed as cooperative are awarded warmth. Groups viewed as high status are deemed competent. Experimental vignettes manipulating the cooperativeness and status of hypothetical groups support the hypothesized causal patterns (Caprariello, Cuddy, & Fiske, 2009), as do in-person laboratory encounters with parallel manipulations (Russell & Fiske, 2008). Using photographs instead of labels to elicit groupbased ratings of warmth and competence yields similar responses (see the next paragraph).

Finally, neural signatures distinguish reactions to photographs of groups in each quadrant, consistent with perceivers having absorbed the cultural stereotypes reported in the surveys. For example, apparently homeless people and drug-addicted people (the low competence, low warmth contempt quadrant) fail to activate the brain's medial prefrontal cortex, otherwise reliably implicated in social cognition (Harris & Fiske, 2006). Participants also report difficulty in imagining their experience and other verbal responses consistent with dehumanization (Harris & Fiske, 2009). Both disgust ratings and insula activation also fit this quadrant.

People at the bottom of the competence-status dimension are devalued as expendable, especially if also viewed as having low warmth (Cikara, Farnsworth, Harris, & Fiske, 2010). And those with less status may be viewed as having less autonomy (Cikara, Eberhardt, & Fiske, 2011). In subjecting some groups to suffer varieties of dehumanizing perception, the status-competence dimension elicits a more social form of neural processing than do other forms of ranking (e.g., weight; Mason, Magee, & Fiske, 2014). Social valuation by status activates networks implicated in other social decisions, so the process seems distinctive to human sociality

Various biobehavioral data converge for the envy quadrant (rich people and business people). Perceivers' smile muscles (zygomaticus major) typically respond to other people's good events over bad ones, but this is not so for the envy quadrant: Negative events happening to envied groups elicit smiles of *schadenfreude*, reward-center activation, self-reported glee, and admitted aggression (Cikara, Botvinick, & Fiske, 2011; Cikara & Fiske, 2011).

The social neuroscience, cultural comparisons, interpersonal encounters, and survey research are all ongoing projects, some more established than others. Nevertheless, converging evidence seems to support the SCM.

The SCM's Generality Across Place, Levels, and Time

Evidence converges across place, as noted in the overview of cultural comparisons. As to converging across levels of group perception, besides national groups and individual impressions, just noted, SCM data distinguish stereotypic subgroups of societal groups (see Fiske, 2015): subtypes of men and women, ethnic subgroups, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) subgroups. For example, although the overall category "Native Americans" appears neutral in some samples (Fiske et al., 2002), the subtypes spread out across SCM space (Burkley, Durante, Fiske, Burkley, & Andrade, 2017).

SCM dimensions appear over time. Systematic content analysis of century-old Italian Fascist magazines revealed warmth and competence distinctions (Durante, Volpato, & Fiske, 2010). Italians and Aryans were the idealized in-groups, whereas Black and mixed-race people were contemptibly low on both dimensions. Jewish and British people were threateningly competent dehumanized enemies. And no groups landed in the pity quadrant, consistent with Fascist ruthlessness.

In another look backward in time, samples of Princeton University students rated the same 10 ethnic and national groups on the same 84 adjectives four times over 70 years (Bergsieker et al., 2012, Study 4). Most adjectives were reliably recoded along the warmth and competence dimensions, resulting in a coherent stereotype map at each time point. Consistent with changing norms, students became more reluctant to mention ambivalent stereotypes'

negative dimension, instead omitting it but still endorsing the groups' positive dimension, if any. This negativity omission left the groups in the same relative positions: Americans and English as being high in both competence and warmth; Turks as lower in both competence and warmth; Irish, Italians, and African Americans as warmer but less competent; and Japanese, Chinese, Germans, and Jews as competent but less warm.

Big Two Parallels

The twin dimensions of stereotype content have numerous precedents, the most prominent earlier inventions being communion and agency, in the context of psychology and religion (Bakan, 1966), as well as social good-bad and intellectual good-bad, in the context of impression formation (Rosenberg, Nelson, & Vivekananthan, 1968). Various other researchers have proposed similar dimensions (see Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick, 2007, for a review).

The most active current parallel revolves around communion and agency, in the context of self-concept (Abele et al., 2016) and interpersonal attitudes (Wojciszke et al., 2009). These two research programs, separately and together, show the primacy of communion (morality) in impressions of others but the importance of agency to self-concept. The total explanatory value of the two dimensions accounts for more than 80% of the variance in individual impressions (see Abele & Wojciszke, 2014, for references). The dimensions each break down into facets: Communion includes both warmth and morality, and agency includes both competence and assertiveness, according to selfconcept data in five cultures (Abele et al., 2016).

Building on both the warmth-competence and communion-agency frameworks, the two dimensions show some consistent dynamics. A compensation effect emerges in social comparisons: If one individual or group is high in one dimension, then a second individual or group in comparison is presumed to be high in the other dimension (Judd, James-Hawkins, Yzerbyt, & Kashima, 2005; Kervyn, Yzerbyt, & Judd, 2010). This produces the SCM signature: predominantly ambivalent stereotypes. If rich people seem cold but competent, then working-class people seem warm but incompetent. This trade-off holds only for these two dimensions, not just any two social comparisons. Perceivers differentiate two social targets in a comparative context on the two fundamental dimensions of social judgment by contrasting them inversely. Comparing two groups or individuals, the one judged more positively on one dimension is also judged less positively on the other dimension and vice versa, according to both experimental and correlational data.

Compensation has implications for sampling within the comparative context. When participants generate groups spontaneously, they generate only a manageable few, along dimensions that include warmth, competence, and political beliefs. But when forced to generate more (e.g., 40), they become more deliberate, using systematic strategies and mentioning competence- and belief-based groups more than warmth ones (Yzerbyt, Terache, Carrier, Fiske, & Nicolas, 2017). In a deliberate mind-set, competence seems more objective, has higher consensus, and depends more on the target group. In contrast, warmth seems more subjective and idiosyncratic, depending more on the perceiver. The distinction between societal structure and personal experience explains the difference. Status readily translates into competence, as the

SCM predicts. However, a group's beliefs do not translate directly into warmth but instead appear subjectively better or worse via the lens of perceivers' own beliefs.

The two dimensions operate most clearly in individual, interpersonal contexts, as illustrated by the communion-agency work on self-concept and interpersonal attitudes, as well as the compensation effect for specific warmth-competence comparisons of individuals and groups. Further, in the SCM warmth-competence survey questions, respondents describe how people in society relate to social groups, so the two dimensions are arguably relevant to the directly experienced pragmatics of interaction. Judging groups in the neighborhood generates SCM space. But sometimes judging groups at a more distant level generates other dimensions, such as ideology (Nicolas & Fiske, 2017).

For example, one more abstract, deliberate context starts with larger numbers of groups (e.g., 40 or 80), then requires numerous paired similarity judgments and derives dimensions from multidimensional scaling (Koch, Imhoff, Dotsch, Unkelbach, & Alves, 2016). Aggregated data do replicate the competence-status dimension, but instead of the warmth-communion dimension, they identify progressive-conservative beliefs as a basic dimension. This aggregate result contradicts other models.

Nevertheless, individual-level analyses do reveal warmth-communion as a function of ideological ingroups: Progressives rate progressives as warm, and conservatives rate conservatives as warm. In the aggregate, these ratings cancel out, leaving warmth only in the moderate middle, where progressives and conservatives can agree. Modeled and measured agreement on warmth-communion is lower than agreement on competence-agency and ideological belief; this warmth idiosyncrasy produces the misfit between aggregate and individual analyses of similarity ratings. In any case, individual-level stereotypes show all three dimensions can indeed be spontaneous (Koch, 2017).

Theory: Structure Predicts Stereotypes, Which Predict Prejudice, Which Predicts Discrimination

Our social thinking is for social doing. The SCM dimensions derive from the idea that social cognition focuses on the target's apparent intent, which determines social interaction. Other people's predispositions matter to us when we need them, that is, when we as individuals or as a group are interdependent with them. Interdependence can be positive (cooperative) or negative (competitive). As noted, perceived social structural interdependence (cooperation-competition) implies other people's apparent intent for good or ill, that is, their warmth. Their believed ability to enact those intents, their competence, depends on their status (prestige and power). Interdependence-warmth correlations are reliable and medium-sized; status-competence correlations are reliably higher (Durante et al., 2013; Kervyn et al., 2015).

Specific stereotype content in turn predicts specific emotional prejudices on the basis of social comparison and attributions for outcomes (Fiske et al., 2002). A cooperative in-group's or ally's positive outcome evokes pride, while a competitive out-group's positive outcome provokes envy. An ally's negative outcome evokes pity, whereas a competitor's negative outcome provokes contempt. These emotions predict behavior even better than stereotypes do (Cuddy et al., 2007).

Conclusion: Evolutionary Plausibility

Another person's intent can determine our surviving or at least thriving in their presence. Their competence and agency determines how much attention we must pay. Stereotype content is systematic, general, and pragmatic.

Questions to discuss:

1. What is meant by warmth and competence in the stereotype content model (SCM)? Why do these particular dimensions constitute the model? Base your answer on the information provided in the article and on your knowledge of social psychology.
2. Explain how stereotypes and behavior may influence each other. Base your answer on the information provided in the article and on your knowledge of social psychology.
3. What other groups (which are not mentioned in the article) can be placed in the quadrant of envy and which in the quadrant of pity? Provide examples of such groups and a rationale for your answer using the information provided in the article and your knowledge in the area of social psychology.
4. In your opinion, in which quadrant do Westerners place Gypsies? Provide an explanation of your point of view.
5. Choose the area which is the most interesting for you (social psychology, cross-cultural psychology, economic psychology, organizational psychology) and think of a possible research using the framework of the SCM. Applying this model in your preferred area, try to come up with a research question that could be examined empirically. Formulate a hypothesis and describe a study design to check your hypothesis.

2. As a psychologist, please, comment on this case.

- **Analyze the situation that occurred during the party night and after that.**
- **Imagine what do the party participants need to change in their behavior in order to improve the party situation.**
- **Suggest a resolution (a set of recommendations) of the problem that occurred after the party.**

Please, use social psychological theories in your response. Try to be concise and avoid journalism and stereotypes in your analysis. Note that your response should be given in English.

A week ago the Chinese International textile company "Can Nai Nai" celebrated its 20th anniversary of entering the foreign markets.

A lavish party took place in the company's head office and all the expatriates (foreign workers based in China) participated in it. At the official welcoming, all the external partners and the Chinese owners demonstrated mutual respect to each other. A bright show, connecting the

mythology of China with the business history of the company and its foreign partners, was performed.

During the evening, all the staff of the head office in Beijing went for dinner to a restaurant serving tasty, mainly local, food. The majority of Chinese employees sat at the tables and engaged in communication within small groups, almost fully representing the structures of their working groups in their departments. Top managers and heads of the departments were situated in a specific area of the restaurant and rarely visited the other staff. The Chinese marketing department leader was the only one who spent the evening with his team which included several foreigners: 3 members from the Netherlands and 4 from Mexico. However, this leader didn't participate in all the entertaining activities. Many Chinese team members followed his example. For instance, the music in the restaurant was rather loud but almost nobody danced. On the other hand, when the music selection changed from Chinese to popular European, expatriates from Mexico and the Netherlands went to the restaurant's dance zone and started to dance. Some Chinese colleagues joined them at first, but a few minutes later went back to their tables and sat near their team leader. Mexican expatriates were not tired of dancing but felt uncomfortable being on the dance floor without the majority of their Chinese colleagues. They stopped dancing and returned to their places. Dutch expatriates, on the contrary, danced during the biggest part of the evening and had a lot of fun. They didn't pay much attention to the fact that almost nobody except them was dancing.

After the party and during their breaks at work, all the Chinese staff discussed "the strange Dutch people who do not respect the authority and probably had too much drinks", while almost nobody spoke about their Mexican colleagues. The Dutch noticed that their Chinese colleagues started avoiding them and the general effectiveness of the marketing department decreased.