

# [Theory of social attitudes and role of schemas](https://assignbuster.com/theory-of-social-attitudes-role-of-schemas/)

[Psychology](https://assignbuster.com/essay-subjects/psychology/)

Attitudes, Biases, and Social Schema Questions Many theories exist that describe influences on attitude, but operant conditioning is one of the few that allows for the examination of emotions, behavior, and cognition as interacting factors in the process. Operant conditioning would be too limiting if held to the strictest of behaviorist principles that originally inspired the theory (Ajzen, 2011), but modern adaptations provide the opportunity to consider each of these variables in multiple roles. Operant contingencies allow for the consideration of context, which may be shaped by emotional state, behavior, and/or cognitions, as well as attitude if it is not already the response variable. All of these factors can be used as conditional variables and response variables in addition to the contextual considerations, and so operant conditioning provides the framework to extensively examine potential relationships and interactions.
2. Social roles have been shown to be internalized by people, even when they do not necessarily display the typical prerequisites that are associated with those roles (Zimbardo, 1974). Internalization will occur even when roles are interpreted as having an inherent bias, thus influencing personal characteristics. Social schemas can also be sources of bias, as they are often quickly and automatically employed without a bias screening process. Accordingly, biases associated with schemas may arise due to unexamined generalizations. This issue is well described by the theory of self-fulfilling prophecy. Schematic biases are also demonstrative of the susceptibility that automatic thinking processes, as controlled methods are more likely to result in realization and correction.
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