

SUBJECT NAME	SUBJECT CODE	PREPARED BY
SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY	18BPS52C	Dr. S. Rajakumari M.A, M. Phil, MBA, Ph.D. Dept. Of Psychology, Ph- 9442525919

UNIT III

PREJUDICE, DISCRIMINATION AND STEREOTYPES

PREJUDICE- DISCRIMINATION AND STEREOTYPES

In everyday conversation, the terms stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination are often used interchangeably. However, social psychologists have traditionally drawn a distinction between them by building on the more general attitude concept (see Chapter 5). That is, stereotypes are considered the cognitive component of attitudes toward a social group—specifically, beliefs about what a particular group is like. Prejudice is considered the affective component, or the feelings we have about a particular group. Discrimination concerns the behavioral component, or differential actions taken toward members of specific social groups. According to this attitude approach, some groups are characterized by negative stereotypes and this leads to a general feeling of hostility (although, as we will see, there might actually be other types of emotions underlying prejudice toward different groups), which then results in a conscious intention to discriminate against members of the targeted group.

Social Psychologists tried to define prejudice from different viewpoints. Some psychologists define prejudice as a preconceived irrational judgement, while others define it as an expression of dislike against members of some religion, race or group. However, majority of psychologists agree upon the definition given by Secord and Backman “Prejudice is an attitude that predisposes a person to think, perceive, feel and act in favourable and unfavourable ways towards a group or its individual members.” According to Baron & Byrne “Prejudice is generally a negative attitude towards the members of some social, ethnic or religious.” Prejudice be it negative or positive is decidedly an attitude and has all the three components of attitude i.e. affective, cognitive and behavioural.

CHARACTERISTICS OF PREJUDICE

Psychologists have identified following characteristics of prejudice:

Prejudice is acquired: Like attitude prejudice is acquired through the process of learning and socialisation. When born a child is like a blank slate and is free of any kind of prejudice. It is only when the process of socialisation begins that he starts imitating his parents and their likes and dislikes. Norms, values, customs, and traditions of the society of which he is member make him prejudiced toward members of other group. Acquisition of prejudice is facilitated by classical conditioning, instrumental and observational learning. A child learns to hate Pakistanis only because he sees significant others in the society hating Pakistanis.

Emotional overtones: Prejudice is always colored with emotions. It is either for or against some group, community or religion. If favourable, the person would show too much affection, love, care and sympathy for members of another group. But if unfavourable the person would show hatred, dislike and hostility.

Prejudice is irrational: Prejudice does not lend itself to reason, wisdom, and relevance. The individual does not change his prejudice in the face of information and evidence to the contrary.

Prejudice is functional: Prejudice helps the individual justify his hostilities, repressed desires and strengthen feelings of self-esteem and prestige. It helps individual justify his exploitation, discrimination of members of other group. For example, in Indian society the upper caste Hindus justified their exploitation of lower castes reasoning that they are like that only and deserve to be exploited and discriminated against.

Prejudice has no connection with reality: It is primarily based on hearsay, incomplete and wrong information, customs and traditions of the society. It can't stand test of logic and reasoning.

TYPES OF PREJUDICE

Prejudices are of different types depending upon the social conditions of the individual. Sociologists and Psychologists delineate following main types of prejudices:

Racial prejudice: This is aimed at members of another race. For example, Negroes have been subject of racial prejudice at the hand of whites. Similarly, Jews were a target of prejudice by Nazis in Germany. Hitler went to the extent of exterminating at mass scale.

Sex prejudice: This is for centuries women have been target of prejudice. They have been thought of weak, dependent and intellectually less gifted than men.

Caste prejudice: Indian social structure is the best example of such prejudice. Our society is divided into numerous castes and each caste is believed to have specific characteristics.

Prejudice and Discrimination Language prejudice : This is often evident when we go to different parts of India. Particularly in South India it is very evident. People despise Hindi knowing fully well that it is our national language. They prefer to speak English but not Hindi even if they know Hindi. In fact organisation of states in India has been on linguistic basis.

Religious prejudice: This has been a burning problem in India since independence days. Creation of Pakistan was only because of religious differences. In religious prejudice individual holds positive attitude toward his own religion and unfavourable attitude toward other religion. Consequently, misunderstandings and misconceptions about people of other religions crop up.

Some other prejudices are political prejudice, communal prejudice etc.

DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF PREJUDICE AND DISCRIMINATION

Psychologists have categorised the causal and maintenance factors of prejudice as given below:

Status and Power structures: The structure of relations between two groups in terms of relative status and power sometimes gives rise to prejudice. For

example, where a dominant group holds another group in a condition of slavery, slaves are likely to be considered lazy, irresponsible and lacking in initiative. These beliefs emerge from the fact that slaves act upon orders from their masters and not given an opportunity to demonstrate initiative or responsibility. Thus the beliefs about them are consonant with their behaviour, which is controlled by structure of relations.

Historical facts: Prejudice and discrimination develop out of history of economic conflict as well as from political power distribution among groups of people . Historical incidents led to the development of attitude which slowly takes form of prejudice. In our society prejudice against women is one such example. Women have always been considered weak, dependant and tools such prejudice developed out of atrocities perpetrated over women and they kept tolerating them thinking it to be their duty.

Similarly some professions have historically been thought to be fit for men than women. For example, truck driving has never been considered fit for women, Women in this profession and other such professions are looked down upon.

Another example of historical reason of prejudice comes from prejudice against Jews. An image of Jews as rich, grasping, and shrewd grew out of their occupational roles as money lenders. The church prohibited Christians from lending money at interest, but did permit them to borrow from Jews. Thus the jews became bankers when this occupation was extremely profitable, and the cognitive image commensurate with the role became firmly established. Besides competitive circumstances produced negative effect against Jews.

Situational Factors: The number of situational factors in the immediate environment of the individual also lead to development of prejudice:

Social learning: Every individual during the process of socialisation learns and acquires beliefs, values and attitudes through parents, school, religion and church. These agents of socialisation invariably transmit prejudices held by them to the child. Besides childrearing practices adopted by parents have been shown to help develop prejudice and discrimination.

Job Competition: Scarcity of job avenues and abundance of applicants is one important economic factor for development of prejudice. It led to the emergence of sons of soil theory. For example, the Marathi movement against North Indians in Mumbai and other parts of Maharashtra has one of its reasons based

in economic factors. North Indians coming to Mumbai are ready to work for longer hours and that too at cheaper wages as against Local people. They have gradually outplace local people in petty and traditional jobs thus rendering many of people jobless and fending for struggle to survive. It has led them to believe that north Indians are responsible for their plight and are replacing them in their own home. Such beliefs lead to development prejudice against North Indians.

Conformity to Norms: Once prejudice and discrimination against outgroup are well established, the accompanying cognitions and feelings concerning the outgroup acquire a normative quality. They are shared by members of the ingroup and the members expect each other to hold such attitudes. The factors underlying conformity to the norms of prejudice may be explained in terms of the varying reward-cost outcomes ensuing from conformity or nonconformity. If prejudice and discrimination against other group is the norm, then overt expression of prejudice and discrimination will receive approval from other members of the group.

Interaction Patterns: Prejudice and discrimination create certain interaction patterns that contribute to maintenance of the status quo. Several interaction patterns increase cohesion and thus strengthen the power of the group to enforce conformity to norms of prejudice and discrimination. Any factor that makes members more dependent on the group is likely to increase cohesion. Interaction pattern within the ingroup may also increase the economic dependence of members upon each other. Finally, if interaction within each group predominates over interaction across group lines, the development of patterns of thinking, feeling and behaving unique to each group is fostered. Such interaction patterns increase the cultural gulf that separates the two group.

Frustration and Aggression: Frustration also gives rise to prejudice. The underlying theory in it is displaced aggression. According to this theory when individual finds some obstacle between him and his goal he gets frustrated and becomes aggressive toward the obstacle. Since the interfering agent is stronger and powerful and has the power to punish him this frustration and aggression is displaced toward some weaker object. Thus, the weak person or group becomes scapegoat.

Authoritarian Personality: Among psychological factors of prejudice authoritarian personality has received much attention from psychologists.

People with authoritarian personality exhibit rigid thinking, punitive tendency. These tendencies predispose individual toward prejudice. Besides these people value people on the scale of power, people above them in the power scale are attributed all good characteristics, and people below them on power scale are treated as inferior and deserve to be exploited and hated.

Personality needs: A variety of personality needs may support prejudice and discrimination. One such need is “intolerance for ambiguity”. Persons differ in the extent to which they are disturbed by confusing or ambiguous situations. Some persons like to have everything in black and white i.e. they are unable to tolerate least uncertainty or complexity in situation while some persons are least disturbed by confusing or uncertain situations. In general it has been found that individuals who are more intolerant of ambiguity are also likely to be more prejudiced because prejudice for them serves to clarify ambiguity and uncertainty embedded in the situation. Similarly, a need to achieve superior status may be supported by prejudice, which provides a group of persons lower in status than oneself. The need for security may be satisfied through rejection of outgroup.

MANIFESTATION OF PREJUDICE

As we know that a prejudice is a negative attitude directed toward some member of a particular group. An attitude is a hypothetical construct observable only through the behaviour of a person. A prejudice manifests itself through the following modes of behaviour:

Withdrawal: It means moving from the object of prejudice. For example, a person is prejudiced against jews. He goes to a party and finds that some jews have been invited to that party. Now instead of making jews leave that party he decides to move away from that party.

Avoidance: Keeping away from the social situation where the object of prejudice may be present. For example, the person who is prejudiced against jews and hates them, comes to know before-hand that some of the invitees at the party are jews. In that condition he may decide to not to join that party. Thus he is able to avoid a situation where he might have to interact with object of prejudice.

Discrimination: It involves biased behaviour against the object person of prejudice. For example, a teacher who is prejudiced against a particular community may fail students belonging to that community. He may not select students of particular community for school team, although the students in question deserve and merit selection against all criteria.

Lynching: It involves behaviour aimed at causing physical hurt or injury to the object person of prejudice. For example, the teacher in above example may go to the extent of actually subjecting students of a particular community to physical punishment without any reasonable ground.

Extermination: It is an extreme form of manifestation of prejudice. It is aimed at removing the existence of the object person of prejudice. For example, in the Second World War, Hitler, the then Chancellor of Germany, ordered mass extermination of Jews. Millions of Jews were massacred at the orders of Hitler. Hitler believed himself to be Aryan and he aimed to cleanse Germany of NonAryans.

PREJUDICE : FEELINGS TOWARD SOCIAL GROUPS

Prejudice has been traditionally considered the feeling component of attitudes toward social groups. It reflects a negative response to another person based solely on that person's membership in a particular group—which Gordon Allport, in his 1954 book *The Nature of Prejudice*, referred to as “antipathy” that is generalized to the group as a whole. In that sense, prejudice is not personal—it is an affective reaction toward the category. In other words, a person who is prejudiced toward some social group is predisposed to evaluate its members negatively because they belong to that group. Discrimination has been traditionally defined as less favorable treatment or negative actions directed toward members of disliked groups (Pettigrew, 2007). Whether prejudice will be expressed in overt discrimination or not will depend on the perceived norms or acceptability of doing so (Crandall et al., 2002; Jetten, Spears, & Manstead, 1997). Indeed, as you will see in the final section of this chapter, changing the perceived norms for treatment of a particular group is sufficient to alter prejudice expression. Research has illustrated that individuals who score higher on measures of prejudice toward a particular group do tend to process information about that group differently than individuals who score lower on measures of prejudice. For example, information relating to the targets

of the prejudice is given more attention than information not relating to them (Hugenberg & Bodenhausen, 2003). Indeed, those who are high in prejudice toward a particular social group are very concerned with learning the group membership of a person (when that is ambiguous). This is because they believe the groups have underlying essences—often some biologically based feature that distinguishes that group from other groups, which can serve as justification for their differential treatment (Yzerbyt, Corneille, & Estrada, 2001). As a result of consistently categorizing people in terms of their group membership, one's feelings about that group are legitimized, which results in discrimination (Talaska, Fiske, & Chaiken, 2008). As an attitude, prejudice is the negative feelings experienced when in the presence of, or merely think about, members of the groups that are disliked (Brewer & Brown, 1998). However, some theorists have suggested that all prejudices are not the same—or at least they are not based on the same type of negative feelings. According to this view, we may not be able to speak of “prejudice” as a generic negative emotional response at all. Instead, we may need to distinguish between prejudices that are associated with specific intergroup emotions including fear, anger, envy, guilt, or disgust (Glick, 2002; Mackie & Smith, 2002). As depicted in Figure 6.12, even when the level of prejudice toward different groups (i.e., overall negative feelings toward that group) is similar, distinct emotions can form the primary basis of prejudicial responses. For example, these respondents' primary emotional response toward Native Americans was pity, but their primary emotional response toward gay men was disgust (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005). Depending on what emotion underlies prejudice toward a particular group, the discriminatory actions that might be expected could be rather different. For example, when people's prejudice primarily reflects anger, then they may attempt to directly harm the outgroup (Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000). In contrast, prejudice based on pity or guilt might lead to avoidance of the outgroup because of the distress their plight evokes (Miron, Branscombe, & Schmitt, 2006). According to this perspective, prejudice reduction efforts may need to tackle the specific intergroup emotion that prejudice toward a group is based on. For example, to the extent that fear is reduced when prejudice is based on that emotion, then discrimination may also be reduced (Miller, Smith, & Mackie, 2004). Research also suggests that inducing some negative emotions can directly lead to discrimination (DeSteno, Dasgupta, Bartlett, & Caidric, 2004). In two experiments, these researchers found that after experiencing anger, but not sadness or a neutral state, more negative attitudes toward an

outgroup was expressed. In these studies, participants were first assigned to minimal groups—they were falsely told that they belong to a social group that was created in the context of the study. Once participants were categorized as belonging to one group rather than another, they were given an emotion-inducing writing task (e.g., to write in detail about when they felt very angry, very sad, or neutral in the past). Finally, participants were asked to evaluate other members of their ingroup (e.g., those wearing the same color wristband) or the outgroup (e.g., those wearing another color wristband). As shown in Figure 6.13, reaction times to associate positive or negative evaluation words with the ingroup and outgroup differed depending on the type of negative emotion participants experienced. When feeling angry, they more rapidly associated the outgroup with negative evaluations and the ingroup with positive evaluations, whereas it took longer to learn to associate the outgroup with positive evaluations and the ingroup with negative evaluations. When either feeling sad or neutral, in contrast, no difference in time to associate each group with positive or negative evaluations was obtained. This suggests that even incidental feelings of anger—those caused by factors other than the outgroup per se (in this case, the writing task)—can generate automatic prejudice toward members of groups to which we do not belong. As you can see, such implicit associations—between group membership and evaluative responses—can be triggered in a seemingly automatic manner as a result of ingroup and outgroup categorization. The important point about such implicit prejudice is this: We may not be aware of it, although our judgments and decisions about other people and how we interact with them can be influenced. Consider the decisions made by white participants in a simple video game about whether to shoot or not shoot either black or white targets who were armed or unarmed (Correll, Urland, & Ito, 2006). Overall, participants were quicker in deciding to shoot armed black targets than armed white targets, and they were faster in deciding not to shoot unarmed whites compared to unarmed blacks. Those who had stronger implicit associations between blacks and violence were especially likely to show these decision biases. In fact, such automatic prejudice effects are particularly difficult to inhibit following alcohol consumption (Bartholow, Dickter, & Sestir, 2006).

METHODS OF REDUCING PREJUDICE AND DISCRIMINATION

Social psychologists have suggested a number of methods for reducing prejudice which as follow:

Intergroup Contact: Allport was the first psychologist to realise the importance of intergroup contact in between prejudiced person and the target person. Such interactional situations provide the two parties an opportunity to know each other from close quarters and understand each other thereby reducing misunderstandings and misconceptions. However, for intergroup contact to be effective certain conditions are to be met.

Intergroup contact is an effective method of reducing prejudice only in those conditions where both the parties have equal status.

For this technique to be effective contact between the prejudiced person and target person ought to be intimate and not superficial. Intimate and honest contact between the concerned parties motivates the person to perceive members of target group more as humans than as stereotypes.

Intergroup contact method is more successful in situations where the success of both parties is dependent on each other i.e. when a common goal is to be achieved. In such situation both parties are forced to understand each other in a better manner.

Education: Social psychologists emphasise that appropriate education has important role to play in reduction of prejudice, particularly racial prejudice. In it both informal and formal education are important. As far as informal education is concerned parents ought to be encouraged not to indulge before children in things which knowingly or unknowingly promote prejudice.

As for formal education, its syllabus and curriculum should be designed to promote harmony between different sections of society. It should aim at developing healthy minds. It has been found that higher and better formal education leads to decreased prejudice and increased liberalism.

Recently, psychologists have devised a new method called cultural assimilator. In this method a group of prejudice persons is explained about traditions, norms, beliefs and value system of people of other communities and races so that they

can appreciate those communities and races in the light of recent information. A number of social psychologists have successfully used this method.

Antiprejudice propaganda: Through mass media it has also been helpful in reducing prejudice. In one of the studies it was found that films and documentaries aimed at reducing prejudice have been successful in reducing prejudice upto 60 percent. Some other psychologists have reported antiprejudice propaganda to be more effective than formal education.

Incongruent role: It has been found that when a person is made to play a role contrary to his prejudice it leads to reduction in prejudice after some time. It happens because playing such role creates dissonance in the individual. This dissonance gives rise to tension compelling the individual to change his prejudice and restore balance between his behaviour and attitude. The person can't change his behaviour as it is public but his prejudice. For example, if a person prejudiced against a particular community is entrusted the task of welfare of that community, he is left with no alternative but change his prejudice because he is not able to change his role.

Social legislation: This is another method of reducing prejudice. Government in different countries have adopted and enacted several legislations which prohibit expression of prejudice in any form. Any public manifestation of prejudice is unlawful and liable to punishment. Let us take the example of our own country.

Our constitution states that state shall not make any discrimination on the basis of caste, creed, sex, and religion of the individual and no person shall be allowed to do so. Consequently, today we don't mind a harijan sitting beside us and offering prayer in the temple. Government even encourages people for intercaste marriages. Persons belonging to deprived communities or castes have been provided reservation in jobs.

Personality change techniques: This is for prejudice reduction to be effective a person must have balanced personality and open mind. However in cases where prejudice is an integral part of personality it becomes imperative to seek help of therapeutic treatment. A number of psychotherapies have been developed to help such persons. For example, Play therapy is an important tool for detecting prejudice at early stage and to bring reformation in personality of children.

STEREOTYPES

A stereotype is a cluster of beliefs usually lacking a rational basis regarding the members of some group. The word 'stereotype' was first used by Walter Lipman in his book "Public Opinion" (1922).

According to Albrecht, Thomas & Chadwick (1980) "A stereotype is a belief about some particular trait being prevalent among all members of a social group. Whatever be the characteristic it is assumed to vest all people in that category. Therefore, all members of the group are perceived and understood alike." From above definitions it can be concluded that:

- Stereotype is a set of beliefs used to categorise people.
- Such categorisation is exaggerated and lacks in truth.
- This categorisation provides for the basis for gross generalisation about people.
- Some particular physical, social and cultural characteristics are ascertained which serve to identify people of that group.
- There is general consensus as to the prevalence of a particular trait among people of that category.
- It is assumed that a person will exhibit all the traits of that category simply because he is member of that group.

Stereotypes about groups are the beliefs and expectations that we have concerning what members of those groups are like. Stereotypes can include more than just traits; physical appearance, abilities, and behaviors are all common components of stereotypic expectancies (Deaux & LaFrance, 1998; Zhang, Schmader, & Forbes, 2009). The traits thought to distinguish between one group and another can be either positive or negative; they can be accurate or inaccurate, and may be either agreed with or rejected by members of the stereotyped group. Gender stereotypes—beliefs concerning the characteristics of women and men— consist of both positive and negative traits (see Table 6.1). Stereotypes of each gender are typically the converse of one another. For instance, on the positive side of the gender stereotype for women, they are viewed as being kind, nurturant, and considerate. On the negative side, they are viewed as being dependent, weak, and overly emotional. Thus, our collective portrait of women is that they are high on warmth but low on competence

(Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002). Indeed, perceptions of women are similar on these two dimensions to other groups (e.g., the elderly) who are seen as relatively low in status and nonthreatening (Eagly, 1987; Stewart, Vassar, Sanchez, & David, 2000). Men too are assumed to have both positive and negative stereotypic traits (e.g., they are viewed as decisive, assertive, and accomplished, but also as aggressive, insensitive, and arrogant). Such a portrait—being perceived as high on competence but low on communal attributes—reflects men’s relatively high status (e.g., the category “rich people” is perceived similarly on these two dimensions; Cikara & Fiske, 2009). Interestingly, because of the strong emphasis on warmth in the stereotype for women, people tend to feel somewhat more positively about women on the whole compared to men—a finding described by Eagly and Mladinic (1994) as the “women are wonderful” effect. Despite this greater perceived likeability, women face a key problem: The traits they supposedly possess tend to be viewed as less appropriate for high-status positions than the traits presumed to be possessed by men. Women’s traits make them seem appropriate for “support roles” rather than “leadership roles” (Eagly & Sczesny, 2009). Although dramatic change has occurred in the extent to which women participate in the labor force—from 20 percent in 1900 to 59 percent in 2005 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007)—the vast majority of working women in the United States and other nations are in occupations that bring less status and monetary compensation than comparably skilled male-dominated occupations (Tomaskovic-Devey et al., 2006).

CHARACTERISTICS OF STEREOTYPES

Stereotype is a mental picture or image about people of a community or category on the basis of which we ascribe traits or characteristics to people. Stereotype is a widely agreed belief about people of some category or community. For example, it is widely agreed that politicians are opportunist. Stereotype involves gross and exaggerated generalisations. An important characteristic of stereotype is that they develop out of experiences with individuals of other community and are then extended to apply to all members of that community. For example, it is generally believed that Bengalees are timid by nature. This may be true for some people of Bengali community but certainly not for all Bengalees.

Stereotypes usually are not amenable to change despite information and evidence to the contrary. For example, when we encounter a brave, fearless and

bold Bengali we do not change our stereotype about them instead we say that this person is exception among Bengalees.

Positive or negative stereotype: A stereotype can have either direction i.e. it can be positive or negative. For example, Japanese are generally believed to be industrious and diligent and Bengalees are usually thought to be timid and shy.

DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF STEREOTYPES

Stereotypes are acquired. Psychologists have delineated following factors that go into development and maintenance of stereotypes.

A major cause of development of stereotypes is inadequate and improper experience and information about people of other group. Experiences with handful of people of other community lead to formation of wrong notions about them and it is then generalised to all members of that community.

Socialisation: Process of socialisation plays an important role in the formation of stereotypes. Most important agent of socialisation are parents. Many parents encourage their children to develop stereotypes thinking it will better prepare them to deal with people of other community.

Imitation: In order to become an acceptable member of the community or society we live in, we simply imitate beliefs, opinions and attitudes held by them without even thinking their desirability and logical validity. Result is that knowingly or unknowingly we develop stereotypes. Perhaps this is the reason a person born in Hindu community easily adopts stereotypes held by other people of Hindu community but he will not with that ease adopt stereotypes held by Muslim community.

Traditions and folkways: Traditions and folkways prevalent in a culture also help foster stereotypes. Everybody tries to behave according to the traditions, customs and folkways prevalent in the society because doing so brings prestige and social reputation.

Social and cultural distance: Social and cultural distance is another important factor in the development and maintenance of stereotypes. Social distance prevents us from gaining right knowledge and information about people of other community and society. Similarly, due to cultural distance we lack knowledge about living style, habits, customs, beliefs, opinions and attitudes of people of other culture. This lack of correct knowledge and information about other

people provides breeding ground for development and maintenance of stereotypes.

STEREOTYPES AND SOCIAL LIFE

Stereotypes have profound importance in social life as they directly affect social interactions. For example, teachers are usually thought to be idealistic and accordingly we expect conversation with teachers to take idealistic tone. Thus our behaviour naturally orients toward idealistic patterns.

Stereotypes serve a number of social functions as given below:

- 1) Stereotypes help understand social behaviour. Stereotype that politicians are opportunist helps us understand their behaviour and we are not easily taken in by their statements and claims.
- 2) Stereotypes help control social behaviour. In fact stereotypes equip us with a power that automatically directs our behaviour in a specific direction. For example, Americans are known to be friendly. Therefore when dealing with an American we are in relaxed mood and try to be frank and friendly with them.
- 3) Stereotypes help in prediction. Whether right or wrong stereotypes control our social interaction. We even predict behaviour on the basis of stereotypes. For example, Nepali servants are believed to be brave, honest, and reliable. Thus we can predict that our house and property will remain safe in the hands of a Nepali servant, when we are out on vacations.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STEREOTYPE AND PREJUDICE

The two concepts are very similar with very fine difference between them. Following are the differences between the two:

In stereotype all members of a community are treated alike as they are believed to have same characteristics while prejudice can take any direction it can be positive or negative both.

A prejudice is a type of attitude and has all the three components i.e. affective, cognitive and behavioural. However, stereotype is cognitions and expectations from person simply because the person is a member of a particular group or community.

Stereotypes are comparatively more stable than prejudices.