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

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

Participants seated in front of machine w/steering wheel attached

Completed survey about self
Rated African Americans on traits by turning wheel
-3 (very uncharacteristic)
+3 (very characteristic)

Manipulation

Bogus pipeline group
Control group
If people lie on self-report measures to appear unbiased then...

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

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

Explicit and Implicit Prejudice

**Explicit Measures**  
**Implicit Measures**

Responses more easily modified

<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

More vulnerable to social desirability

Taxonomy of prejudice measures
Maass, Castelli & Arcuri (2000)

Controlling Responses

Easy  Difficult

Old fashioned racism  Open discrimination
Open discrimination  Modern racism
Modern racism  Subtle prejudice scale
Subtle prejudice scale  Seating distance
Seating distance  Subtle language bias
Subtle language bias  Eye contact
Eye contact  Non-verbal behaviors
Non-verbal behaviors  Famous person task
Famous person task  Implicit association test
Implicit association test  Stroop-like task
Stroop-like task  Who-said-what
Who-said-what  Famous person task
Famous person task  Subtle language bias
Subtle language bias  Seating distance
Seating distance  Modern racism
Modern racism  Open discrimination
Open discrimination  Old fashioned racism

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.

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

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?

Mayor's Race Study
Kinder & Sears (1981)

3. Racial Busing

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

Mayor's Race Study
Kinder & Sears (1981)

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)

Symbolic Racism:
Measured via questionnaire responses spanning two domains of value systems...
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?

Mayor's Race Study
Kinder & Sears (1981)

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)

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.

**Symbolic Racism**
- Feel ambivalence toward the stigmatized
- Not conscious of prejudice
- Endorse conservative values
- Believe racism is wrong

**Aversive Racism**
- Feel ambivalence toward the stigmatized
- Not typically conscious of prejudice
- Endorse liberal values
- Strongly believe racism is wrong

**Causes of Prejudice:**

**Cultural Norms**

- Protected Status
- Comfort expressing prejudice
Denial of Prejudice Study
Crandall (1994)

**Purpose:**
Examined denial of prejudice against African Americans & obese

Denial of prejudice
Willingness to derogate publicly

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

Participants indicated:

- How comfortable they personally feel saying or thinking bad things about 41 different groups

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Comfortable</th>
<th>Least Comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>homosexuals</td>
<td>cancer patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prostitutes</td>
<td>People w/leukemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child abusers</td>
<td>paralyzed people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ambivalence-Amplification Theory

People are ambivalent toward the stigmatized.
- aversion and hostility
- sympathy and compassion
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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

55

Ambivalence-Amplification Theory

Proposes that...

2. People try to reduce threats to self-esteem

They justify or deny the way the feel at the moment, depending on the situation
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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

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.

African American target  | White target
---------------------------------  
| Strong shock | Mild Shock | Strong shock | Mild Shock |
---------------------------------  
Before Shock  | 19.2 | 14.3 | 16.3 | 15.4 |
After Shock   | 7.3  | 21.5 | 16.3 | 14.6 |
Change score  | -11.9 | 7.2  | 00.0 | -0.8 |

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>Hurtful Insult</th>
<th>African American target</th>
<th>White target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.21</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.13</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td></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.

Justify/Deny Prejudice Studies  
Katz & Glass (1979)

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