Lecture Outline

Prejudice

Theories of Racism

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

Premise:
People are consciously aware they are racist, but may conceal that from others.

Modern (Symbolic) Racism

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.

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

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

---

**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)

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>Happy-go-lucky</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreliable</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Bogus Pipeline Study**

Sigall & Page (1971)

Manipulation

Bogus pipeline group  
Control group
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

More vulnerable to social desirability

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

Controlling Responses
Easy
Difficult

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)

Mayoral elections in Los Angeles:
- 1969 and 1973

Election Results:
1969: Samuel Yorty won with 53% of vote
1973: Thomas Bradley won with 56% of vote

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.

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?

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?

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

4. Perception of violence committed by African Americans
   Example Question
   How likely is it that African Americans will bring violence to this neighborhood?

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)

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)

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 vs. Aversive Racism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbolic Racism</th>
<th>Aversive Racism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feel ambivalence toward the stigmatized</td>
<td>Feel ambivalence toward the stigmatized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not conscious of prejudice</td>
<td>Not typically conscious of prejudice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorse conservative values</td>
<td>Endorse liberal values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe racism is wrong</td>
<td>Strongly believe 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

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>

---

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

2. People try to reduce threats to self-esteem

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

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

**Procedure:**

1. Male participants rated confederate on 20 item impression questionnaire
   - liking
   - warmth
   - conceit
   - intelligence
   - adjustment
**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</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Shock</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Shock</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>15.5</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.

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...
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

The letter:

Deny Prejudice Study
Katz & Glass (Study 2, 1979)

Manipulations:
1. Confederate race:
   - African American
   - White
2. Insult level:
   - Very hurtful
   - Not very hurtful

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>Hurtful Insult</th>
<th>Not hurtful insult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American target</td>
<td>44.21</td>
<td>22.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White target</td>
<td>21.20</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