Lecture Outline

Prejudice

Theories of Racism
Prejudice

Definition:

A positive or negative attitude, belief, or feeling about a person generalized from attitudes, beliefs, or feelings about the person’s group.
Components of Prejudice

Stereotypic beliefs  
  typical attributes

Symbolic beliefs  
  values, traditions, customs

Emotions  
  affective reactions (e.g., disgust)
Theories of Racism

Old Fashioned Racism

Modern (Symbolic) Racism
Old Fashioned Racism

Premise:

People are consciously aware they are racist, but may conceal that from others.
Examples of Self-Report Measures of Prejudice

Old Fashioned Racism Scale

Generally speaking, do you feel blacks are smarter, not as smart, or about as smart as whites?

If a black family with about the same income and education as you moved next door, would you mind it a lot, a little or not at all?
Modern (Symbolic) Racism

Premise:

People feel ambivalent toward the stigmatized – torn between the egalitarian values they truly hold and the racism they harbor.
Modern (Symbolic) Racism

Theory proposes that....

People deal with their ambivalence by letting it come out in disguised form – as support for conservative American values.
Examples of Self-Report Measures of Prejudice

Modern Racism Scale

Over the past few years, blacks have gotten more economically than they deserve

Blacks are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights
Self-Reported Prejudice

General pattern:

Prejudice is subsiding
Explanations

People are less prejudiced now

Social Desirability
Social Desirability

People lie about their prejudiced to appear unbiased to others
Bogus Pipeline

An experimental paradigm

Experimenter claims to have access (a pipeline) to participants’ true reactions
Bogus Pipeline Study  
Sigall & Page (1971)

Participants seated in front of machine w/steering wheel attached
Bogus Pipeline Study
Sigall & Page (1971)

Completed survey about self
Rated African Americans on traits by turning wheel

-3 (very uncharacteristic)
+3 (very characteristic)
Bogus Pipeline Study
Sigall & Page (1971)

Manipulation

Bogus pipeline group

Control group
**Bogus Pipeline Study**  
*Sigall & Page (1971)*

If people lie on self-report measures to appear unbiased then....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogus Pipeline</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Control</td>
<td>&gt; Bogus Pipeline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sigall & Page (1971)
### Bogus Pipeline Study
Sigall & Page (1971)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neg. Attributes</th>
<th>Bogus Pipeline</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happy-go-lucky</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreliable</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Bogus Pipeline Study
Sigall & Page (1971)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos. Attributes</th>
<th>Bogus Pipeline</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explicit and Implicit Prejudice

Explicit Measures  Implicit Measures

Responses  more easily modified
Explicit and Implicit Prejudice

Explicit Measures  Implicit Measures

More vulnerable to social desirability
## Taxonomy of prejudice measures

**Maass, Castelli & Arcuri (2000)**

### Controlling Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old fashioned racism</td>
<td>Physiological reactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open discrimination</td>
<td>RT following priming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial slurs</td>
<td>Stroop-like task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern racism</td>
<td>Implicit association test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle prejudice scale</td>
<td>Who-said-what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating distance</td>
<td>Non-verbal behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle language bias</td>
<td>Famous person task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye contact</td>
<td>Who-said-what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal behaviors</td>
<td>Seating distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famous person task</td>
<td>Subtle language bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroop-like task</td>
<td>Seating distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT following priming</td>
<td>Subtle prejudice scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiological reactions</td>
<td>Old fashioned racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT following priming</td>
<td>Open discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroop-like task</td>
<td>Racial slurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit association test</td>
<td>Modern racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who-said-what</td>
<td>Subtle prejudice scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famous person task</td>
<td>Seating distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal behaviors</td>
<td>Subtle language bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who-said-what</td>
<td>Seating distance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IAT: Implicit Association Test

The IAT measures RT:

- how quickly people categorize stimulus words.

Faster RT = stronger association

IAT responses correlate mildly with explicit responses
Realistic Group Conflict Theory

Competition between groups causes prejudice & intergroup conflict
Mayor's Race Study
Kinder & Sears (1981)

Examined whether racial prejudice stems from:

- competition over scarce resources
  (realistic group conflict theory)

- belief that African Americans violate cherished values
  (symbolic/modern racism)
Mayor's Race Study
Kinder & Sears (1981)

Mayoral elections in Los Angeles:

- 1969 and 1973
Mayor's Race Study
Kinder & Sears (1981)

Election Results:

1969: Samuel Yorty won with 53% of vote

1973: Thomas Bradley won with 56% of vote
Mayor's Race Study
Kinder & Sears (1981)

**Scarce Resources Prediction**

If racial prejudice stems from competition over scarce resources, then...

Whites who are in greater competition for resources with African Americans should be more prejudiced than those who are in less competition.
Mayor's Race Study
Kinder & Sears (1981)

Symbolic Racism Prediction

If racial prejudice stems from symbolic racism, then.....

The more strongly Whites believe that African Americans violate traditional values, the more prejudice they will show.
Mayor's Race Study
Kinder & Sears (1981)

Participants:

White residents of Los Angeles, CA
1969 (n = 198); 1973 (n = 239)
Most lived in suburbs
Homeowners
33% attended college
Most were Protestant, others Catholic
Nearly all were married
Most had children

Prejudice = Voting behavior
Mayor's Race Study
Kinder & Sears (1981)

Competition over scarce resources:

Measured via questionnaire responses spanning four domains of racial threat.....
Domains of Racial Threat

1. Interracial social contact

Example Question
How strongly would you object if a member of your family wanted to bring an African American friend home to dinner
Domains of Racial Threat

2. Economic competition

Example Question
Have the economic gains of African Americans been about the same, much greater than, greater than, or less than yours over the past 5 years?
Domains of Racial Threat

3. Racial Busing

Example Question
How likely is it that African American children will be bused into the elementary schools of this neighborhood?
Domains of Racial Threat

4. Perception of violence committed by African Americans

Example Question
How likely is it that African Americans will bring violence to this neighborhood?

Mayor's Race Study
Kinder & Sears (1981)
Mayor's Race Study
Kinder & Sears (1981)

Symbolic Racism:

Measured via questionnaire responses spanning two domains of value systems...
Mayor's Race Study
Kinder & Sears (1981)

Domains of Value Systems

1. Expressive Racism

Example Question
Do you think that most African Americans who receive money from welfare programs could get along without it if they tried or do they really need the help?
Domains of Value Systems

2. Opposition to racial busing

Example Question
Busing elementary school children to schools in other parts of the city only harms their education
Mayor’s Race Study
Kinder & Sears (1981)

Only symbolic racism significantly explained voting behavior
Mayor's Race Study
Kinder & Sears (1981)

Symbolic (modern) racism disguised as endorsement of conservative values

Enables symbolic racists to believe they are non-prejudiced, while still supporting political positions that favor Whites over African Americans
Aversive Racism

People feel ambivalence toward the stigmatized

Similar to symbolic/modern racism in this respect
Aversive Racism

Aversive racism differs from symbolic/modern racism in three ways:

1. They believe racism is more wrong.

2. Their prejudice comes out in subtle ways - not as support for conservative values.

3. More aware of their racism.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbolic Racism</th>
<th>Aversive Racism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Feel ambivalence</td>
<td>- Feel ambivalence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\ toward the</td>
<td>\ toward the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\ stigmatized</td>
<td>\ stigmatized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not conscious of</td>
<td>- Not typically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\ prejudice</td>
<td>\ conscious of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\ prejudice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Endorse</td>
<td>- Endorse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\ conservative</td>
<td>\ liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\ values</td>
<td>\ values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Believe racism is</td>
<td>-  \textbf{Strongly}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\ wrong</td>
<td>\ believe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\ racism is wrong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Causes of Prejudice: Cultural Norms

Cultural Norms

Protected Status

Comfort expressing prejudice
Protected Status

Protected

Unprotected
Measures of Protected Status

Denial of prejudice

Willingness to derogate publicly
Denial of Prejudice Study
Crandall (1994)

Purpose:

Examined denial of prejudice against African Americans & obese
Denial of Prejudice Study
Crandall (1994)

2,406 participants

Modern Racism Scale
- Measures prejudice against African Americans

Dislike Scale
- Measures prejudice against the obese
Denial of Prejudice Study
Crandall (1994)

Percent Disavowing Prejudice Against:

African Americans 10%

Obese 3%
Derogation Study
Smith (2001)

Purpose:
Examine willingness to derogate various stigmatized groups
Derogation Study
Smith (2001)

Participants indicated:

◆ How comfortable they personally feel saying or thinking bad things about 41 different groups
Derogation Study
Smith (2001)

Some of the groups rated:

- people with acne
- white supremacists
- people with AIDS
- schizophrenics
- amputees
- homosexuals
- the blind
- child abusers
- people with ADHD
- pedophiles
- alcoholics
- gamblers
- murderers
- adulterers
Derogation Study
Smith (2001)

Willingness to derogate varied across the stigmas

**Most Comfortable**
- homosexuals
- prostitutes
- child abusers

**Least Comfortable**
- cancer patients
- People w/leukemia
- paralyzed people
Ambivalence-Amplification Theory

People are ambivalent toward the stigmatized.

- aversion and hostility
- sympathy and compassion
Ambivalence-Amplification Theory

Proposes that...

1. Ambivalence causes threat to self-esteem

No matter how one feels, that feeling is in conflict with the other way one feels
Ambivalence-Amplification Theory

Proposes that...

2. People try to reduce threats to self-esteem

They justify or deny the way they feel at the moment, depending on the situation
Ambivalence-Amplification Theory

Proposes that...

3. Behavior toward the stigmatized is very unstable

4. People are aware of their ambivalence
Justify/Deny Prejudice Studies
Katz & Glass (1979)

Examined how the situation sometimes leads people to justify and other times to deny their prejudice
Justify Prejudice Study
Katz & Glass (Study 1, 1979)

Prediction:

People will justify prejudice against a stigmatized other if the situation encourages that response
Justify Prejudice Study
Katz & Glass (Study 1, 1979)

Procedure:

1. Male participants rated confederate on 20 item impression questionnaire
   ➢ liking
   ➢ warmth
   ➢ conceit
   ➢ intelligence
   ➢ adjustment
Justify Prejudice Study  
Katz & Glass (Study 1, 1979)

Procedure:

2. Participant administered shock to confederate as feedback

3. Participant evaluated confederate 2nd time on impression questionnaire
Justify Prejudice Study
Katz & Glass (Study 1, 1979)

Manipulations:

1. Confederate’s race:
   - African American
   - White

2. Shock level: (no shock actually given)
   - strong and painful
   - weak and not painful
Prediction Restated:

People justify prejudice by denigrating stigmatized others who they have harmed. This makes those people seem unworthy and deserving of the harm.

This means: Participants who gave “strong shocks” to the African American target should rate him most negatively after the shock relative to their initial ratings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African American target</th>
<th>White target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong shock</td>
<td>Mild shock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before Shock</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Shock</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change score</td>
<td>-11.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative change = more negative impression after shock  
Positive change = more positive impression after shock

As predicted, impression of African American confederate became most negative after strong shock
Deny Prejudice Study
Katz & Glass (Study 2, 1979)

Prediction:

People will deny prejudice against a stigmatized other if the situation encourages that response
Deny Prejudice Study
Katz & Glass (Study 2, 1979)

1. Participant introduced to confederate
2. Participant required to insult confederate
3. Told confederate left before criticism was explained as part of the experiment
4. Participant believed experiment was over
5. Sent to office for $, where got letter from confederate.....
Deny Prejudice Study
Katz & Glass (Study 2, 1979)

The letter:

Doing an independent study project
Needed one more participant to finish up
Study was on repetition
Experimental materials attached
Materials asked participant to repetitively write the same sentence over and over
Deny Prejudice Study
Katz & Glass (Study 2, 1979)

Manipulations:

1. Confederate race:
   • African American
   • White

2. Insult level:
   • Very hurtful
   • Not very hurtful
Deny Prejudice Study
Katz & Glass (Study 2, 1979)

Prediction Restated:
People will deny prejudice by going out of their way to help a stigmatized other whom they have harmed.

This means: Participants who gave “hurtful insult” to the African American target should work the hardest in the repetitive experiment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African American target</th>
<th>White target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hurtful Insult</td>
<td>44.21</td>
<td>21.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not hurtful insult</td>
<td>22.13</td>
<td>23.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are the average number of times repetitive sentence was written in booklet.

As predicted, participants wrote the sentence more often after having harmed the African American target.
Conclusion:

People feel ambivalence toward stigmatized others

People respond in extreme ways toward those whom they have harmed

Sometimes behave negatively, sometimes positively depending on the situation