There was no difference between men and women when gender was not made relevant before.

The negative effects of stereotype threat can be alleviated:

**Drawing on multiple identities**

- We have multiple identities when deciding the group we belong to and stereotype threat depends on the one which is made salient.
- Shih, Pittinsky and Ambady (1999) - American females from an Asian background were asked to complete a maths test after either their gender or ethnic identity had been made salient.
- When ethnic identity was salient, maths performance improved more because there is a positive stereotype regarding maths ability of East Asians in the USA.
- When gender was made salient, maths performance decreased because women are perceived as less able at maths than men.
- Research also looked at what happens when two identities are made salient.
- Rydell, McConnell and Beilock (2009) gave female college students either a negative stereotype about women’s maths performance or this stereotype along with a positive self-relevant stereotype.
- When gender was made salient women performed worse but when given both stereotypes they did not differ from the control group.
- People who succeed in counter-stereotype domain they have a flexible social category which means they can deflect stereotype threat, for example women engineers.

**Reappraising the threatening situation**

- Stress can either be a threat or a challenge - a challenge makes participants perform better.
- Alter, Aronson et al (2010) - the way stereotype threat is framed can affect the outcome. They had Black American children do a maths test. Half were asked their ethnicity before, the others were asked after. It was also framed as a threat or a challenge - when the ethnicity was made salient; they performed better when it was framed as a challenge.
- Johns, Schmader and Martens (2005) - teaching students about stereotype threat can inoculate them against it, when they were taught about it, women did as well as men on a maths test.

**Dual Process Theories**

- Brewer's (1988) dual process theory and Fiske and Neuberg’s (1990) continuum model both consider impression formation to compromise categorisation and individuation.
- Brewer says either heuristics (categorisation) or systematic (individuation) approach is used for impression formation.
- This maps onto the naïve scientist vs cognitive miser approach.
- Fiske and Neuberg’s continuum model - continuum where one extreme is heuristic processing (category based) and the other is systematic processing (attribute based).
- On the continuum people can be perceived as a representative of a group or as an individual separate from any group membership.