Old-Fashioned and Contemporary Prejudice
Overview

- The Transformation of Prejudice
- Modern-Symbolic Prejudice
- Aversive Prejudice
- Ambivalent Prejudice
- Benevolent Prejudice
Transformation of Prejudice

- Research studies show people still express strong prejudiced attitudes and behaviors even though they don’t consciously admit to it
  - Bogus Pipeline
  - fMRI studies
  - Politeness Request Studies
  - Diary Studies – sexism and racism
Transformation of Prejudice

- Changes from “Jim Crow Racism” (old-fashioned) – belief that Whites were genetically superior and subordinate segregation was acceptable
  - WWII made us aware of the dangers of segregation and subordination
  - Since Jim Crow laws are gone, some feel prejudice is no longer an issue
Transformation of Prejudice

Perceptions of Discrimination

% saying this … because of their sexual orientation or gender identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Happened in the past year</th>
<th>Happened, not in past year</th>
<th>NET Ever</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Been subject to slurs or jokes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been rejected by a friend or family member</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been threatened or physically attacked</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been made to feel unwelcome at a place of worship</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received poor service in a restaurant, hotel, place of business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been treated unfairly by an employer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Based on all LGBT (N=1,197). "Net" was computed prior to rounding.

Pew Research Center

Most Blacks Continue to Say Their Position Has Not Improved

% agree that in past few years there hasn’t been much real improvement in position of black people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pew Research Center 2012 Values Survey. Q30aa/Q40j. Whites and blacks include only those who are not Hispanic.
Changing Prejudice

- Are we becoming less prejudiced?
  - I’m not racist, but...
  - I’m not sexist, but...
  - Homophobic Language
  - Multicultural Response
Explaining the Contradictions

- **Prejudice and Character** – most incorrectly feel that only “bad” people are prejudice
- **Implicit Biases** – unconscious biases can lead to discrimination
Old Fashioned Prejudice

- Women and minority groups are biologically inferior to white men
  - Supported by scientific evidence, government and social support
Theories of Contemporary Prejudice

- Try to explain how we support racial/sex equality, while still holding negative attitudes towards minority groups
- Contemporary prejudice emerges when it can be justified
  - e.g. “Affirmative Action violates the principle of fairness and equality”
Modern/Symbolic Prejudice – belief that minority groups are *morally* inferior to majority groups and lack traditional values

- Feel that discrimination complaints are unjustified
- Wealth and Education gaps are due to minority values and lack of motivation
- Endorse egalitarian values, but oppose equal outcome programs to maintain status quo
- Feel threatened by programs that support minority groups
Theories of Contemporary Prejudice

- Modern Symbolic Prejudice...
  - People are socialized to feel a degree of negative emotion towards minority groups
  - People with modern prejudice typically have little actual experience with minority groups
  - Discrimination – occurs when it can be justified by non-racial/sex/religious grounds
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample:</th>
<th>Percent callback for White names</th>
<th>Percent callback for African-American names</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Percent difference (p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All sent resumes</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.20 (0.0000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.66 (0.0057)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4.05 (0.0023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>3.26 (0.0003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females in administrative jobs</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3.91 (0.0003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females in sales jobs</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.54 (0.3523)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>3.04 (0.0513)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The table reports, for the entire sample and different subsamples of sent resumes, the callback rates for applicants with a White-sounding name (column 1) and an African-American-sounding name (column 2), as well as the ratio (column 3) and difference (column 4) of these callback rates. In brackets in each cell is the number of resumes sent in that cell. Column 4 also reports the p-value for a test of proportion testing the null hypothesis that the callback rates are equal across racial groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Arab</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $1,000</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000–$1,500</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $1,500</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Arab</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theories of Contemporary Prejudice

- **Aversive Prejudice** – belief in equality, but ignoring and/or avoiding contact with minority groups
  - May support equality programs like affirmative action
  - Strongly motivated to see themselves as unprejudiced
  - Avoid intimate and prolonged contact with minority groups to eliminate negative affect
FIGURE 6.4 Interracial Discomfort in Aversive Prejudice

White research participants who exhibited aversive prejudice (low explicit prejudice but high implicit prejudice) were found to exhibit prejudice but were perceived to be less friendly because they gave off nonverbal cues
Theories of Contemporary Prejudice

- **Aversive Prejudice**
  - May Overcompensate by being overly **positive**
  - Ambiguous situations lead to minority discrimination
  - Discomfort around high status minorities leads to discrimination
Theories of Contemporary Prejudice

- **Ambivalent Prejudice** – simultaneously having positive and negative feelings/beliefs about other groups
  - Individualism values vs. Egalitarian values
    - e.g. “black people are both deviant and disadvantaged” or “women are both controlling/manipulative and disadvantaged”
  - Overemphasize one value set depending on context/primes to reduce conflicted feelings
Theories of Contemporary Prejudice

- Ambivalent Prejudice...
  - **Response Amplification** — extremely positive or negative behavior towards an outgroup member
Theories of Contemporary Prejudice

- **Benevolent Prejudice** - Positive beliefs about minority groups that keep them in low status/power
  - Ambivalent **Sexism** – a mix of hostile **prejudice** and benevolent prejudice (e.g. chivalry)
  - Rewarding women only for adhering to traditional gender roles
Theories of Contemporary Prejudice

- Old fashioned – domination and exclusion
- Modern – opposition to social policies
- Aversive – avoidance
- Ambivalent – response amplification
- Lack of Prejudice – consistently treat minorities as individuals
Fig. 1. Competence, hireability, and mentoring by student gender condition (collapsed across faculty gender). All student gender differences are significant ($p < 0.001$). Scales range from 1 to 7, with higher numbers reflecting a greater extent of each variable. Error bars represent SEs. $n$ (male student condition) = 63, $n$ (female student condition) = 64.