Perspective Taking and Common Interest Generation to Promote Self-Like Characteristics and Enhance Impressions of Strangers

Julie Severson

Gustavus Adolphus College

In fulfillment of the requirements for PSY-390

Dr. Jennifer Ackil

May 26, 2006

Abstract

The present study was aimed at exploring ways to promote self-other overlap in the cognitive representations of strangers. To accomplish this, participants first identified traits to describe themselves, and then several weeks later under the appearance of a separate experiment, watched a 10-minute video of an interview with a stranger. While watching the video, participants either attempted to take his perspective, mentally generate shared interests, attitude and perspectives, or objectively observe him ($N = 62$). Whereas the proportion of traits shared by the participant and the individual in the tape did not vary across groups, and little overlap was revealed in the traits identified for self and other, female participants' impressions of the stranger were improved in the perspective taking and common interest groups. The results offer evidence that positive feelings towards an other can be promoted without necessarily altering one's overall cognitive representation of him.

Perspective Taking and Common Interest Generation to Promote Self-Like Characteristics and Enhance Impressions of Strangers

We live in an increasingly diverse world where a great variety of people interact with each other on a daily basis. As these interactions increase, so does the opportunity for stereotypical thought. As Stuart states (2004, p. 6), "Stereotypes can be convenient: Like emotions, they store a considerable amount of information in quickly accessible form." Whereas stereotyping can enhance efficient processing, it can also have very negative consequences. Researchers have demonstrated that individuals have the natural tendency to rate members of their out-group more negatively, and in-group members more positively (e.g. Isbell & Tyler, 2003) based perhaps on stereotypes of out-group members. Moreover, stereotyping can lead to discrimination that results in various harmful effects, such as lack of opportunity in employment (Ziegert & Hanges, 2005; Tomkiewicz & Adeyemi-Bello, 1997), racial profiling (Aguirre, 2004), biased courtroom decisions (Bodenhausen & Lichtenstein, 1987) and even improper health care (Reismann, Talavera, Salmon, Nunez & Velásquez, 2004). Finding ways to overcome discrimination against Hispanics is particularly relevant in contemporary society, as the U.S. Census Bureau found that there were over 36 million Hispanics living in the United States (2000). It is also projected that Hispanics will make up almost 25% of the population by the year 2050 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). With this in mind, the current study was aimed at exploring interventions that might reduce stereotyping and enhance impressions of a Hispanic individual.

Self-other overlap

Increasing cognitive overlap in the representation of the self and others is one way to promote positive affect towards individuals from an out-group. Self-other overlap involves an

individual taking part of the cognitive representation they have for themselves and attributing it to another, or attributing part of the cognitive representation they have for another to themselves. We find it easier to identify with those who we view as having characteristics like ourselves (Smith & Henry, 1996). In turn, we are also likely to form positive impressions of them (Davis, Conklin, Smith & Luce, 1996; Smith & Henry, 1996; Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000; Aron & Aron, 2004). When someone becomes a part of the in-group, a greater amount of overlap between traits is assumed. Members of out-groups are typically viewed as so because of the existing differences between an individual and the others (Isbell & Tyler, 2003). A study by Nier and Gaertner found that students rate other individuals more positively when they work together in a situation that produces cognitive representations as in-group members, who are more self-like (2001). These studies have demonstrated the cognitive inclusion of the other as a part of the self and show the importance in promoting self-other characteristics.

How can one increase self-other overlap?

Perspective-taking involves attempting to put oneself in another's shoes and view the world as they do. The importance of this skill has long been recognized, as Piaget once defined it as being an important part of the stages of moral reasoning (as cited in Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000). The ability to do so has also been found to be positively correlated with social competence and self-esteem (Davis, 1983). Perspective taking has been shown to decrease stereotyping and in-group favoritism (Galinsky, Gillian & Wang, 2005; Galinsky & Gillian, 2004). Perspective taking has been found to be an effective method of reducing stereotypic thoughts as a result of an increased amount of cognitive overlap between the self and other. Galinsky and Moskowitz (2000) found that perspective-taking resulted in both increased overlap between the self and other and decreased stereotyping towards the elderly.

In a study by Davis et al. (1996), participants were instructed to either imagine themselves as the target individual, imagine how they would feel if they were the target individual, or objectively observe (control) while watching a videotape of an interview with a stranger. Participants who had been asked to role-play, or take the perspective of the target individual, showed a greater proportion of positive self-relevant traits that were also attributed to the target than those who simply objectively observed (Davis et al., 1996). This study demonstrates that perspective taking is effective in promoting overlap of self and other characteristics, and will serve as a base for the present study. The self-concept is encourage to be activated through the process of taking another's perspective, and can have many positive implications.

In a study by Crisp & Beck (2005), university students were asked to list common traits with individuals who attended rival schools. This manipulation was effective, and the participants who had been asked to list common traits showed an increase their positive feelings towards the rival university members (Crisp & Beck, 2005). Thus, encouraging participants to think of commonalties with another individual appears to encourage more positive ratings of that individual. However, although this manipulation was effective, it is unclear whether this led to an increase in the overlap of self-other characteristics. The present study will attempt to duplicate these findings using an adapted version of the manipulation employed by Crisp & Beck (2005) by encouraging participants to think of common interests, attitudes and perspectives they may have with a stranger.

Overview of Present Study

The purpose of the present study is to attempt to promote self-like characteristics and encourage positive thinking towards a stranger by employing two intervention strategies: perspective taking and generating common interests. To this end, participants will first complete adjective generation and checklist tasks to identify self-descriptive traits. In a separate session, participants will be asked to consider their impressions of a Hispanic stranger. The critical manipulation is that participants will be asked to engage in one of three tasks while viewing this stranger. Specifically, participants will either be asked to imagine themselves as the individual in the tape, think of common interests, attitudes, and perspectives they may share with him, or objectively observe him. I hypothesize that participants in the perspective taking and common interests groups manipulation will experience a greater degree of self-other overlap and more positive feelings towards the individual.

Method

Participants

Eighty-eight General Psychology students from Gustavus Adolphus College volunteered to complete two brief questionnaires regarding self-representation. All were given the opportunity to sign up for a second session, which was presented as an unrelated study on first impressions of strangers. Sixty-two students (33 females and 29 males) returned for the second session. Of these 62 participants, 52 students identified themselves as Caucasian, 5 as Asian-American/Hmong, 2 as African-American, and 2 Hispanic/Latino. All participants were awarded extra credit for each phase of the experiment in which they participated.

Materials & Procedure

Session 1. Participants were first run in groups of around fifteen, and told they were participating in a study involving representations of the self. They were first given the Adjective Generation Sheet, on which they were asked to freely generate and list all the adjectives they felt best described themselves. Participants were given 3 minutes to complete this task. Upon completion, participants were asked to complete Goldberg's 100 word Adjective Checklist (Goldberg, 2000), which consisted of 100 adjectives designed to measure the Big 5 factors of personality (see Appendix A). This scale was chosen because it was a reasonable length for the task at hand, and because of its established validity in exploring the Big 5 factors of personality. Participants were instructed to check all the adjectives they found to be self-relevant, and were given no time limit for this task. The adjectives had previously been categorized into positive and negative based on the Big 5 Personality Traits by Goldberg (2000). The categories included Surgency (Extraverted/Introverted), Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Intellect. The positive traits were coded so that they coincided with these factors (Extraverted, Agreeable, Conscientious, Highly Stable, Intellectual) and the negative traits so that they coincided with the opposite of the positive traits. The checklist consisted of 45 positive and 55 negative traits.

At the end of Session 1 participants were asked to indicate whether they would be willing to volunteer for an additional research experience that was presented as an unrelated study about first impressions of strangers. This study was actually the second session of the current study, but participants were kept unaware of this so as to reduce the possibility that their self-descriptors would influence their descriptions of the stranger in the video. Moreover, Session 2 was conducted at least one week after the college's one-week spring break, so that participants would at minimum have a 2-week retention interval between Session 1 and Session 2. This was

done to increase the likelihood of believing that Session 1 and 2 were unrelated, again so that the way they described themselves in Session 1 would not affect their ratings of the individual in Session 2.

Session 2. Session 2 occurred 2-3 weeks after the initial testing. Participants were tested individually, and told they would be watching a 10 minute interview with a stranger, for whom they would afterwards be asked to provide their first impressions. Prior to viewing this video, each participant was randomly assigned to one of the following intervention conditions: A) perspective taking, B) common interests, attitudes and perspectives or B) objective observing (control). Before viewing the video, participants listened to an experimenter read the set of instructions that corresponded to the intervention condition they had been assigned to. The instructions for each of the three conditions were as follows:

A) Perspective Taking:

As you watch the interview, please imagine how you yourself would feel if you were the person in the tape. In your minds eye, trade places with the individual and watch the tape as if the events were actually happening to you. You should concentrate on the way you would feel under those circumstances. Your job as you watch the tape will be to think about what your reaction would be in this situation. Imagine how you would feel if these events were happening to you. Imagine as clearly and vividly as possible everything that you would feel. In short, imagine that you are actually the person in the videotape (Davis et al., 1996).

B) Common Interests, Attitudes and Perspectives:

As you watch the interview, please think of as many things as you can that you may have in common with the individual being interviewed. Mentally take note of perspectives and

attitudes you may share with this person. Also concentrate on similarities in the interests you might share with this individual. Your job as you watch the tape is to think about all the perspectives, common interests and attitudes you share with him. Consider all the resemblance that you and this individual have. Keep these common interests and attitudes in mind, and be prepared to list them when you are asked to do so.

C) Objective Observing:

As you watch the interview, look at and listen to what the individual does and says. Make careful observations of all their behavior. Concentrate your observations on their mannerisms, posture, movements, facial expressions, speech characteristics, tone of voice, etc. Notice exactly what they do, whatever it is. Try to take a neutral perspective, being as objective as possible about the situation. Do not concern yourself with their feelings or views. Do not let yourself get caught up in imagining what the individual has been through and how they feel as a result. Just try to concentrate on the tape objectively (Davis et al., 1996).

After listening to their instructions, participants then watched a video of "Miguel," a 24 year old Hispanic male who spoke English as a second language. He was portrayed as an average recent college graduate who received average grades (Bs and Cs) in college due to his involvement in several activities such as working at the student desk, socializing, and playing in a softball league. His videotaped comments indicated that he enjoyed college but would have preferred attending a smaller school with more of a community feel, had a close-knit group of friends from high school, was close to his family and was currently searching for a full-time job. It was assumed that because the individual was older than the participants, Hispanic (most

participants were non-Hispanic), and a non-native English speaker, he would be perceived as an out-group member.

After viewing the video, participants were given the Adjective Generation Sheet they had previously filled out for themselves, and were asked to complete it with regards to the individual whom they had just viewed in the tape. They were allowed 3 minutes to complete this task. Adjective generation was followed by Goldberg's 100 Word Adjective Checklist, which they were instructed to complete according to their impressions of the individual who they had just viewed in the tape (see Appendix A).

Participants were then administered Cowan's adapted version of the Stereotypes of Illegal Immigrants Scale (Cowan et al., 1992), and asked to rate the individual on 16 trait pairings using a scale of 1 to 7, where 1 represented the more positive trait of the two, and 7 represented the more negative trait (see Appendix B). This scale was adapted for use in the current study because it included adjectives specifically aimed at measuring attitudes towards Hispanics. This measure included 16 trait pairings with both positive and negative salience (e.g. ambitious/lazy, responsible/irresponsible, motivated/unmotivated), and was included to measure participants impressions of Miguel.

Upon completion of the immigrant scale, participants were asked two questions about the likeability/potential friendship of the other: *1) Based on the interview, how likable did you find this individual? 2) Would you enjoy having this individual as a friend?* Participants were asked to respond on a scale from 1 to 7, where 1=very likeable/would enjoy having as a friend and 7=very unlikable/would not enjoy having as a friend. Participants were then asked for their demographic information, including gender, age, race, and year in college. Finally, to assess the extent to which the participants were able to follow the pre-video intervention condition

instructions, participants were asked to respond to one of the following questions: *A) To what extent did you imagine yourself as the individual, B) To what extent did you think of common perspectives, attitudes, and interests you share with the individual?* or *C) To what extent did you objectively observe the individual in the tape?* Participants were asked to respond on a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 represented "not at all" and 7 represented "very much". Upon completion of all questionnaires, participants were thanked for their participation and fully debriefed.

Results

Manipulation check

To determine whether there were differences in the extent to which participants were able to follow instructions, their responses to the corresponding question were analyzed in a 3 (Intervention: perspective taking, common interests, objective observation) x 2 (Gender: male, female) Analysis of Variance. Depending on condition, participants were asked to respond on a scale of 1 to 7 to the following questions: *A) To what extent did you imagine yourself as the individual, B) To what extent did you think of common perspectives, attitudes, and interests you share with the individual?* or *C) To what extent did you objectively observe the individual in the tape?* The results revealed no statistically significant differences as a function of condition [F (2, 55) = 4.36, $p > .05$] or gender [F (1, 55) = .62, $p > .05$]. Similarly, no interaction effect was found [F (2, 55) = .03, $p > .05$]. All participants were able to follow the instructions they were given equally well.

Self-other overlap

Higher amounts of overlap with the self can promote more positive thinking towards individuals typically viewed as less similar to the self. For this reason, the amount of self-other

overlap was analyzed. There are several ways to analyze the amount of self-other overlap. In the current study the methods used by Davis et al (1996) were employed.

Other percentage. The first method – other percentage overlap– provides the proportion of the other's traits that are shared with the self: This measure responds to the question: *What percentage of the total adjectives that the participants generated or selected for the other, had they previously generated for themselves?*

Participants' responses from the Adjective Generation Sheet were first examined. The other percentage based on the Adjective Generation Sheet was first analyzed using a 3 (intervention) x 2 (gender) ANOVA. In order to measure this, the total number of adjectives that overlapped between the participants list for themselves and the list for the other was divided by the total number of adjectives that had been listed for the other (see Table 1). This analysis revealed no differences in the amount of other percentage across gender [F (1, 56) = .17, $p > .05$] or condition [F (2, 56) = .76, $p > .05$], and no interaction [F (2, 56) = .72, $p > .05$]. All participants, regardless of intervention condition, shared relatively the same amount of adjectives with the other that they had previously listed for themselves.

Next, a 3 x 2 ANOVA was used to measure the other percentage from Goldberg's 100-word Adjective Checklist. The total number of adjectives the participant had checked both for themselves and the other was divided by the total number that they had checked for the other (see Table 1). The analysis revealed no statistically significant difference in the other percentage according to gender [F (1, 56) = .33, $p > .05$] or condition [F (2, 56) = .12, $p > .05$], and no interaction [F (2, 56) = .12, $p > .05$]. The intervention condition failed to lead to differences in the amount of overlap between the other and the self.

To determine whether overlap varied as a function of adjective valence (positive, negative), the proportion of positively overlapping adjectives between the participant and the other was divided by the total number of positive adjectives checked for the other (see Table 1). This proportion was submitted to a 3 x 2 ANOVA, which revealed no difference between gender [F (1, 56) = 1.87, $p > .05$] or condition [F (2, 56) = .74, $p > .05$], and no interaction [F (2, 56) = .55, $p > .05$]. Thus, participants showed no significant differences in the amount of positive other percentage overlap as a function of gender or intervention condition.

A 3 x 2 ANOVA was also used to analyze the amount of other percentage overlap for negative traits. Proportions were computed by tallying the total number of negative adjectives that overlapped and dividing this number by total number of negative adjectives checked for the other. Results showed no difference across gender [F (1, 56) = .84, $p > .05$] or condition [F (2, 56) = 1.68, $p > .05$], and no interaction [F (2, 56) = 1.05, $p > .05$].

Self percentage. The second method of analyzing self-other overlap– self percentage– responds to the question: *Of the total adjectives the participant generated or selected for themselves, what percentage did they also generate or select for the individual?* Restated, this gives us the proportion of the self traits that were shared with the other.

The self percentage overlap calculated from participants' responses from the Adjective Generation Sheet was examined using a 3 x 2 ANOVA. Specifically, the total number of adjectives shared by the participant and the other was divided by the total number of adjectives generated for the self (see Table 1). The results of this analysis revealed no differences in the amount of self percentage overlap according to gender [F (1, 56) = .10, $p > .05$] or condition [F (2, 56) = .90, $p > .05$], and no interaction [F (2, 56) = .49, $p > .05$]. In other words, all

participants shared relatively the same proportion of adjectives with the other that they had generated for themselves.

The self percentage overlap calculated from Goldberg's 100-word Adjective Checklist was also examined. The total number of shared adjectives was divided by the total number of adjectives checked for the self. A 3 x 2 ANOVA revealed no differences in self percentage overlap across gender [F (1, 56) = 1.67, $p > .05$] or condition [F (2, 56) = .42, $p > .05$], and no interaction [F (2, 56) = .48, $p > .05$]. Thus, intervention condition and gender did not influence the amount of trait overlap with the self.

To examine the positive self percentage overlap the total number of positively overlapping adjectives was divided by the total number of adjectives checked for the self and submitted to a 3 x 2 ANOVA (see Table 1). Results of this analysis showed no differences across gender [F (1, 56) = 2.12, $p > .05$] or condition [F (2, 56) = .08, $p > .05$], and no interaction [F (2, 56) = .75, $p > .05$].

Lastly, a 3 x 2 ANOVA was used to analyze the self percentage overlap for negative traits. For this analysis, the total number of negatively overlapping adjectives was divided by the total number of negative adjectives checked for the self (see Table 1). A significant difference was found for condition [F (1, 56) = .006, $p = .05$], such that those in the objectively observing condition appeared to have higher overlap for negative traits than the perspective taking or common interests conditions. This observation should be verified with planned comparisons. Results showed no main effect for gender [F (1, 56) = .01, $p > .05$] and no interaction effect [F (2, 56) = 1.52, $p > .05$].

Ratings towards individual

The ratings from Cowan's adapted Stereotypes of Illegal Immigrants Scale were analyzed individually, according to each trait using a 3 x 2 ANOVA. An examination of the trait ratings showed no statistically significant differences across gender or condition for any of the traits ($p >$ .06, see Table 2). Given that previous researchers employed experimental designs that restricted observations to same sex others (Davis et. Al, 1996), I decided to explore the data for male and female participants separately. To this end I conducted one-way ANOVAs for each trait. The results revealed some interesting effects. First, data from female participants revealed main effects for wealth [F (2, 30) = 3.26, p = .05], contribution to society [F (2, 30) = 9.68, p = .001], and responsibility [F (2, 30) = 3.08, p = .06]. As is apparent in Table 2, it appears that those in the common interests condition gave the other the highest ratings for wealth, contribution to society, and responsibility, followed in turn by those in the perspective taking condition and objective observing conditions. These differences appear to support the idea that the intervention conditions improved participants' impressions of the video other.

Analysis of ratings reported by males showed a statistically significant difference in only one trait – intelligence. Males in the perspective taking condition found the individual to be the least intelligent, followed by the common interest condition, then the objective observing condition [F (2, 26) = 3.12, p = .06]. This difference is opposite of what was expected if one assumes the interventions will have a positive impact on impressions of others.

Regarding the question, *"How likable did you find the individual?"* a 3 x 2 ANOVA showed no main effect for gender [F (1, 56) = .08, $p >$ .05] or condition [F (2, 56) = 1.32, $p >$ .05], and no interaction**.** However, interesting effects were found when the data from females and males were analyzed separately. There was an effect of condition [F (2, 30) = 4.57, p = .02] such that females in the common interests group appeared to find the other more likable than the

perspective-taking group and the objective observing group. No difference in likeability was found for the males [F (2, 26) = .11, p > .05].

A 3 x 2 ANOVA of participants' responses to the question, *"Would you enjoy having this individual as a friend?"* revealed no main effect for gender [F (1, 56) = .01, p > .05] or condition [F (2, 56) = 2.28, p > .05], and no interaction [F (2, 56) = .99, p > .05]. However, interesting effects were once again found upon separate analysis of responses from the males and females. For the female participants, there was an effect of intervention condition [F (2, 30) = 3.5, p = .04]. As is apparent in Table 3, those in the common interest group were the most likely to enjoy having the individual as a friend. There was no difference in condition for the male "friend" responses [F (2, 26) = .16, p > .05].

Discussion

Whereas the study was initially designed primarily to examine self-other trait overlap following interventions aimed to reduce stereotypes, very little emerged in these data. Rather, the most interesting effects emerged in the ratings participants provided based on their impressions of the other. For example, analyses of the trait ratings from Cowan's adapted Stereotypes of Illegal Immigrants scale (1992) and the likeability/friend rating based on condition or gender revealed no significant differences for any of the adjectives. However, when female and male data were analyzed separately of each other, a variety of interesting differences were revealed. Females in the common interests group found the individual to be more wealthy, more responsible, to contribute to society more, more likable, and were the most likely to enjoy having him as a friend, findings which are consistent with Crisp & Beck's (2005). Those in the objective observing group found him to be the least wealthy, most irresponsible, more of a burden to society, less likable, and would enjoy the least having him as a friend. These

differences did not occur for male participants, who rather formed a difference in their impressions of the other's intelligence as a function of intervention condition. Surprisingly, this difference was opposite of what one would expect in that those who objectively observed the individual (i.e. had no intervention) found him to be significantly more intelligent than the common interests group and perspective taking group, who found him to be the least intelligent.

Overall, these data demonstrate that the intervention conditions had an effect on the female participants that they did not have on the males. This is particularly interesting, and adds to the findings in the existing literature (Davis et al., 1996; Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000) which restricted their observations to same sex participants. That females' impressions were more likely to be influenced by the intervention is somewhat surprising, as one might intuitively believe that it would be harder for females to identify with a male due to the obvious gender difference, and easier for males.

It is also interesting to note that there are 12 trait pairings from Cowan's scale on which no difference was found for either of the sexes. There may be something about these specific pairings (wealthy/broke, responsible/irresponsible, contributes to society/burden to society, intelligent/unintelligent) that encouraged differences. Perhaps the intervention conditions will only be effective in changing the impressions regarding certain types of traits. If so, these characteristics of these traits seem to be different for males and females.

The participants' overall cognitive representation of themselves and the other appears not to have been significantly changed as a result of the intervention conditions, although examination of Table 1 shows an overall pattern supporting the possible effectiveness of the common interests manipulation. Although not statistically significant, participants in this condition have slightly overall higher percentage of both positive other and self overlap, along

with a lower percentage of negative other overlap (see Table 1). The objectively observing group typically had the lowest amount of other and self percentages, and highest percentage of negative overlap. The one significant difference found that those in the common interests manipulation showed a lower amount of negative self percentage overlap, followed by the perspective taking and objective observing (see Table 1). Thus, the participants attributed to the other a lower percentage of the negative traits they had already listed for themselves. These findings are not as robust as those by Davis et al. (1996), who found differences in the self-other representation regarding, positive, and negative adjectives. Therefore, the intervention conditions employed revealed a lower amount of overlap than previous research (Davis et al., 1996).

Although increasing the amount of self-other overlap has been found by many to be useful (Davis et al., 1996; Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000), it appears not to be necessary in order to influence ratings towards strangers. Participants' cognitive representations of the other did not appear to be altered to a great extent, yet there were still differences across conditions related to ratings they gave to the individual. If this interpretation is correct, perhaps it is not as crucial as it may seem to attempt to make others appear more self-like in order to promote positive feelings towards others.

Whereas the interventions employed in the present study seemed not to greatly influence cognitive representations, further research might examine the unexpected gender differences in greater detail. The present study was limited to having the participants watch a video with a male interviewee. Whether the interventions would similarly influence participants if the other was a female remains to be seen. It is possible that some sort of interaction between the gender of the participant and that of the individual in the tape would emerge in this circumstance.

Future research might also examine the extent to which race or ethnicity was a factor in how well the participants were able to engage in their assigned intervention condition. The individual in the current study was Hispanic, however, it would be interesting to see how participants reacted to someone who was of different descent. At the particular moment this study was happening, there was much debate in the news about the immigration issue regarding Hispanic immigration. This may have somehow unconsciously influenced some sort of attitudes towards the individual. Presenting the individual as either non-American or an American citizen would also be an interesting variation to examine. As one participant stated when asked how easy they found it to engage in the intervention, "he's foreign; he's obviously not like me." This response points to the fact that having the individual in the tape have obvious racial differences may affect participants' willingness or ease to fully engage in the activity. Previous research has not fully examined the role that race or ethnicity may play in taking the perspective of another individual (Davis et al., 1996; Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000). The difference of the other in race or ethnicity could also be an explanation as to why the present study did not find the same amount of overlap.

In short, it appears that perspective taking and emphasizing common interests and attitudes may improve some impressions of an out group member without necessarily changing one's cognitive representation. Whether these interventions might have important practical implications for reducing stereotyping and discrimination remains an open question.

References

Aguirre, A.J. (2004). Profiling Mexican Identity. *American Behavioral Scientist*. *7,* 928-942.

Aron, A. Aron, E.N., Tudor, M. & Nelson, G. (1991). Close Relationships as Including Other in the Self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. *60,* 241-253.

Bodenhausen, G.V. & Lichtenstein, M. (1987). Social stereotypes and information-processing strategies: The impact of complexity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. *52, 871-880.*

Cowan, G., Martinez, L., and & Mendiola, S. (1997). Predictors of Attitudes Toward Illegal Latino Immigrants. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. *19,* 403-415.

Crisp, R.J. & Beck, S.R. (2005). Reducing Intergroup Bias: The Moderating Role of Ingroup Identification. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*. *8,* 173-185.

Davis, M.H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multi dimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44,* 113-126.

Davis, M.H., Conklin, L., Smith, A. & Luce, C. (1996). Effect of Perspective Taking on the Cognitive Representation of Persons: A Merging of Self and Other. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70,* 713-726.

Galinsky, A.D. & Moskowitz, G.B. (2000). Perspective-Taking: Decreasing Stereotype Expression, Stereotype Accessibility, and In-Group Favoritism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. *78,* 708-724.

Galinksy, A.D., Gillian, K. & Wang, C.S. (2005). Perspective-Taking and Self-Other Overlap: Fostering Social Bonds an Facilitating Social Coordination. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 8,* 109-124.

Galinksy, A.D. & Gillian, K. (2004). The Effects of Perspective-Taking on Prejudice: The

Moderating Role of Self-Evaluation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30,* 594-604.

Goldberg, L.R. (1992). The Development of Markers for the Big-Five Factor Structure. *Psychological Assessment. 4,* 26-42.

Isbell, L.M. & Tyler, J.M. (2003). Teaching Students About In-Group Favoritism and the Minimal Groups Paradigm. *Teaching of Psychology.* 30, 127-130.

Piaget, J. (1932). *The moral judgment of the child.* London: Kegan, Paul, Trench & Trubner. Found in Galinsky, A.D. & Moskowitz, G.B. (2000). Perspective-Taking: Decreasing Stereotype Expression, Stereotype Accessibility, and In-Group Favoritism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 78,* 708-724.

Reimman, J., Talavera, G.A., Salmon, M., Nunez, J., & Velasquez, R.J. (2004). Cultural competence among physicians treating Mexican Americans who have diabetes: a structural model. *Social Science and Medicine. 59, 2195-2205.*

Smith, E.R., & Henry, S. (1996). An In-group Becomes Part of the Self: Response Time Evidence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin. 22,* 635-642.

Stuart, R.B. (2004). Twelve Practical Suggestions for Achieving Multicultural Competence. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice. 35,* 3-9.

Tomkiewicz, J. & Adeyemi-Bello T. Perceptual Differences in Racial Descriptions of Euro American and Hispanic Persons. (1997). *Psychological Reports. 80,* 1339-1343.

United States Census (2000). www.usgov.org. Date accessed: 5/22/06.

Ziegert, J.C. & Hanges, J.C. (2005). Employment Discrimination: The Role of Implicit Attitudes, Motivation, and a Climate for Racial Bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology. 90,* 553-562.

Notes

1. It is important to note that there were no differences between conditions regarding the number of traits generated for the other on the Adjective Generation sheet [F (2, 56) = 1.43, $p > .05$], nor between gender [F (1, 56) = .02, $p > .05$], nor was there an interaction [F (2, 56) = .55, $p > .05$].

2. There were also no differences between conditions regarding the number of traits checked for the other on Goldberg's Adjective Checklist [F (2, 56) = .1.56, $p > .05$] nor between gender [F (1, 56) = .59, $p > .05$], nor was there an interaction.

3. No main effect was found for condition regarding the number of traits generated for the self on the Adjective Generation sheet [F (2, 56) = 1.56, $p > .05$], gender [F (1, 56) = .97, $p > .05$], and no interaction was found [F(2, 56) = .12, $p > .05$].

4. There were also no differences in condition [F (2, 56) = .09, $p > .05$] or gender [F (1, 56) = .18, $p > .05$] and no interaction [F (2, 56) = .19, $p > .05$] regarding the number of traits checked for the self on Goldberg's Adjective Checklist.

Appendix A

Goldberg's 100 Word-Adjective Checklist

(Self) This sheet contains a list of adjectives. Please read them quickly and put an X beside each one you would consider to be self-descriptive. Do not worry about duplications, contradictions, and so forth. Check each adjective you would use to describe yourself. Work quickly and do not spend too much time on any one adjective. Try to be upfront, and check those adjectives which describe you as you really are, not as you would like to be.

(Other) This sheet contains a list of adjectives. Please read them quickly and put an X beside each one you would consider to be descriptive of the individual in the videotape. Do not worry about duplications, contradictions, and so forth. Check each adjective you would use to describe him. Work quickly and do not spend too much time on any one adjective. Try to be upfront, and check those adjectives which describe him as he really is, not as you would like him to be.

__ Active
__ Agreeable
__ Anxious
__ Artistic
__ Assertive
__ Bashful
__ Bold
__ Bright
__ Careful
__ Careless
__ Cold
__ Complex
__ Conscientious
__ Considerate
__ Cooperative
__ Creative
__ Daring
__ Deep
__ Demanding
__ Disorganized
__ Distrustful
__ Efficient
__ Emotional
__ Energetic
__ Envious
__ Extraverted
__ Fearful
__ Fretful
__ Generous
__ Haphazard
__ Harsh
__ Helpful
__ High-strung
__ Imaginative
__ Imperceptive
__ Imperturbable
__Impractical
__ Inconsistent
__ Inefficient
__ Inhibited
__ Innovative
__ Insecure
__ Intellectual
__ Introspective
__ Introverted
__ Irritable
__ Jealous
__ Kind
__ Moody
__ Neat
__ Negligent
__ Nervous
__ Organized
__ Philosophical
__ Pleasant
__ Practical
__ Prompt
__ Quiet
__ Relaxed
__ Reserved
__ Rude
__ Self-pitying
__ Selfish
__ Shallow
__ Shy
__ Simple
__ Sloppy
__ Steady
__ Sympathetic
__ Systematic
__ Talkative
__ Temperamental
__ Thorough
__ Timid
__ Touchy
__ Trustful
__ Unadventorous
__ Uncharitable
__ Uncooperative
__ Uncreative
__ Undemanding
__ Undependable
__ Unemotional
__ Unenvious
__ Unexcitable
__ Unimaginative
__ Uninquisitive
__ Unintellectual
__ Unintelligent
__ Unkind
__ Unreflective
__ Unrestrained
__ Unsophisticated
__ Unsympathetic
__ Unsystematic
__ Untalkative
__ Verbal
__ Vigorous
__ Warm
__ Withdrawn

Appendix B

Cowan's adapted Stereotypes of Illegal Immigrants Scale (1992)

Based on the interview you just saw, please make the following judgments about the individual you viewed in the videotape. Please circle your response according to the continuum below.

1 = trait listed on the left hand side
2/3 = moderate amounts of trait on the left hand side
4 = "equal amounts of each"
5/6 = moderate amounts of trait on the right hand side
7 = trait listed on the right hand side

Ambitious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Lazy
Honest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Dishonest
Cares for Others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Selfish
Wealthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Broke
Hard working	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unmotivated
Contributes to society	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Burden to society
Courageous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Fearful
Likable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Dislikable
Makes healthy choices	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Engages in risky health behavior
Competent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Incompetent
Responsible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Irresponsible
Intelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unintelligent
Emotional	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unemotional
Law abiding	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Criminal
Sets high goals for self	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Has few goals for self
Aggressive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Passive

Table 1

Number of Adjectives Ascribed to Other, and Degree of Self-Other Overlap, as a Function of Intervention Condition

	Intervention Condition		
Measure	Perspective Taking	Common Interest	Objectively Observe
# Adjectives Listed for Other			
- Adjective generation	11.09 (2.36)	10.29 (2.81)	9.50 (3.59)
- Adjective checklist	21.14 (6.89)	19.43 (5.11)	22.85 (5.60)
-Positive adjectives	8.05 (6.42)	9.24 (4.24)	8.40 (4.13)
-Negative adjectives	13.09 (6.17)	10.19 (3.36)	13.75 (3.51)
Degree of self-other overlap			
~Other Percentage~			
-Adjective generation	0.14 (.13)	0.20 (.14)	0.17 (.14)
-Adjective checklist	0.46 (.22)	0.49 (.20)	0.48 (.21)
-Positive adjectives	0.29 (.23)	0.34 (.16)	0.27 (.15)
-Negative adjectives	0.17 (.09)	0.15 (.12)	0.22 (.15)
~Self Percentage~			
-Adjective generation	0.10 (.11)	0.14 (.09)	0.11 (.10)
-Adjective checklist	0.29 (.16)	0.28 (.10)	0.31 (.14)
-Positive adjectives	0.19 (.16)	0.20 (.10)	0.18 (.11)
-Negative adjectives	*0.10 (.06)	*0.08 (.06)	*0.13 (.09)

Note. Standard deviations are included in parenthesis. *$p \leq 05$.

Table 2

Individualized Means from adapted version of Stereotypes of Illegal Immigrants Scale (Cowan, et al., 1992)

	Intervention Condition								
Measure	Perspective Taking			Common Interest			Objectively Observe		
	F	M	Total	F	M	total	F	M	Total
Ambitious/Lazy	4.23 (1.75)	4.40 (1.58)	4.31 (1.63)	3.73 (1.00)	3.50 (1.27)	3.93 (1.12)	4.73 (1.49)	3.89 (1.17)	4.35 (1.42)
Honest/Dishonest	2.95 (1.10)	2.70 (1.70)	2.83 (1.39)	2.36 (1.21)	2.60 (1.07)	2.48 (1.12)	2.91 (1.14)	2.78 (1.39)	2.85 (1.24)
Cares for Others/Selfish	3.09 (1.04)	3.10 (1.10)	3.01 (1.04)	2.73 (1.42)	2.60 (1.17)	2.67 (1.28)	3.09 (1.22)	3.22 (1.20)	3.15 (1.18)
Wealthy/Broke	4.36** (.81)	4.90 (.99)	4.62 (.92)	4.27** (.79)	4.30 (.48)	4.28 (.64)	5.27** (1.35)	5.11 (.93)	5.20 (1.15)
Hardworking/Unmotivated	4.00 (1.34)	4.60 (1.58)	4.28 (1.45)	3.36 (.67)	3.80 (1.48)	3.57 (1.12)	4.45 (1.63)	4.00 (1.19)	4.25 (1.41)
Contributes to Society/ Burden to society	3.91*** (.94)	3.90 (1.66)	3.90 (1.30)	3.09*** (.54)	3.60 (1.65)	3.33 (1.20)	4.82*** (1.17)	3.33 (1.22)	4.15 (1.39)
Courageous/Fearful	4.54 (1.30)	4.50 (1.18)	4.52 (1.21)	5.00 (.77)	4.90 (.88)	4.95 (.80)	4.91 (1.22)	4.56 (.88)	4.75 (1.10)
Likable/Dislikable	3.36	3.10	3.24	2.73	3.00	2.86	3.73	2.78	3.30

	(.92)	(1.45)	(1.18)	(.79)	(1.50)	(1.15)	(1.74)	(1.09)	(1.53)
	3.64	3.90	3.76	3.09	3.20	3.14	3.82	3.00	3.45
Makes healthy choices/ Engages in risky health behavior	(1.12)	(1.73)	(1.41)	(.94)	(1.32)	(1.11)	(1.25)	(.71)	(1.10)
	3.18	4.50	3.81	3.36	3.50	3.43	4.00	3.67	3.85
Competent/Incompetent	(.98)	(1.72)	(1.50)	(1.03)	(1.43)	(1.21)	(1.42)	(1.00)	(1.23)
	3.45*	4.10	3.76	3.18*	3.40	3.28	4.27*	3.10	3.75
Responsible/Irresponsible	(1.04)	(1.80)	(1.45)	(.98)	(1.26)	(1.11)	(1.19)	(.33)	(1.07)
	3.73	4.70*	4.19	3.36	3.50*	3.43	4.18	3.22*	3.75
Intelligent/Unintelligent	(1.20)	(1.77)	(1.54)	(.92)	(1.35)	(1.12)	(.98)	(.83)	(1.02)
	4.10	4.70	4.38	4.18	4.70	4.43	4.91	4.56	4.75
Emotional/Unemotional	(1.64)	(1.16)	(1.43)	(1.25)	(1.25)	(1.25)	(1.51)	(1.67)	(1.55)
	3.36	2.70	3.05	2.64	2.90	2.76	2.54	3.00	2.75
Law abiding/Criminal	(1.03)	(1.49)	(1.28)	(1.03)	(1.10)	(1.04)	(.82)	(1.00)	(.91)
	4.45	5.20	4.81	4.00	4.40	4.19	4.82	4.56	4.70
Sets high goals for self/ Has few goals for self	(1.75)	(1.48)	(1.63)	(1.26)	(1.58)	(1.40)	(1.83)	(1.24)	(1.56)
	5.27	5.80	5.52	5.82	6.10	5.95	5.82	5.33	5.60
Aggressive/Passive	(1.27)	(1.03)	(1.17)	(.87)	(.99)	(.92)	(.98)	(1.32)	(1.14)

Note. Scale: 1 = trait listed on left-hand side, 2/3 = moderate amounts of trait on left-hand side, 4 = equal amounts of each, 5/6 = moderate amounts of trait on right-hand side, 7 = trait on right-hand side. $*p \leq .06$, $**p \leq .05$, $***p \leq .001$.

Table 3

Likeability/Friend Rating

	Intervention Condition					
Measure	Perspective Taking		Common Interest		Objectively Observe	
	F	M	F	M	F	M
How likable did you find the individual?	3.27* (1.56)	3.20 (1.48)	2.55* (.69)	3.40 (1.58)	4.18* (1.40)	3.11 (1.05)
Would you enjoy having the individual as a friend?	4.00* (1.73)	3.90 (1.97)	2.73* (.79)	3.50 (1.27)	4.36* (1.80)	3.78 (1.56)

Note. *$p < .05$.