Running Head: Czech and U.S. Predictors of Anti-Semitism and Racism

Individual Difference and Social Status Predictors of Anti-Semitism and Racism:

U.S. and Czech Findings with the Prejudice/Tolerance and Right Wing Authoritarianism Scales

Edward Dunbar, Ed.D.[1], Lucie Simonova, Mgr., [2.]

1   University of California Los Angeles Los Angeles.
2   Karlova University, Prague, Czech Republic

Word Count: 7,461

Correspondence should be sent to: Edward Dunbar, Department of Psychology, University of California Los Angeles Los Angeles, California, 90024, USA. e-mail edunbar@ucla.

Abstract

Individual Difference and Social Status Predictors of Anti-Semitism and Racism:

U.S. and Czech Findings with the Prejudice/Tolerance and Right Wing Authoritarianism Scales

The relationship of individual difference and social status variables to outgroup bias was studied in the Czech Republic and the U.S. Gough's Prejudice/Tolerance (Pr/To) and Altemeyer's Right Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) scales were employed with social status variables of gender, age, economic level, and ethnicity in predicting anti-Semitism and racial bias. One-hundred-eighty-eight Czech and 281 U.S. participants were included in the study. Results revealed similar cross-cultural relationships for Pr/To and RWA to outgroup bias. However significant U.S. and Czech differences existed for the social status variables in relationship to outgroup bias. For the Czech sample, men scored significantly higher on Pr/To, RWA, and the measures of outgroup bias while for the U.S. sample the outgroup bias measures varied by economic level. Hierarchical multiple regression results, controlling for social status variables, demonstrated a similar predictive relationships of Pr/To and RWA for anti-Semitism with the Czech and U.S. samples and anti-Roma bias (Czech sample) and anti-Black racism (U.S. sample). A two factor model is proposed to examine individual difference predisposition to endorse outgroup bias.

Intergroup hostility is an issue of enduring concern internationally. A wide array of factors have been attributed to the endorsement of biased attitudes against social outgroups. Contemporary research has moved away from single cause explanations for bias against visible ethnic minority groups. Zanna (1994), for example, has observed the relative independence of cognitive, affective, and situational factors in the endorsement of social attitudes. Two dimensions of individual differences that have been found in north America to be related to outgroup bias include Right Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) and Gough's prejudice/tolerance (Pr/To) measure (Dunbar, 1997). In addition, social status and demographic differences have been found to correlate to measures of bias against ethnic minority groups. The goal of this study concerned the cross-cultural comparability of individual difference and social status variables, in the manifestation of anti-Semitism and racial bias. Specifically we sought to provide cross-cultural validation of Pr/To and RWA to predict ethnic/race bias, when controlling for the influence of participant social status.

Social Status Factors and Outgroup Bias

The role of social status differences in the formation of outgroup attitudes, based upon group categories inclusive of gender, race, and ethnicity, has been examined by social psychologists for several decades now (Campbell, 1971; Sniderman, Tetlock, & Carmines, 1993). Prior research has illustrated how social status variables such as economic level (Jones, 1972) and political orientation influence outgroup bias (Weigel & Howes, 1985; Altemayer, 1988). Gender differences have been reported for negative racial attitudes by both Carter (1990) and Pope-Davis and Ottavi (1993); they both found that Euro-white men endorsed more negative attitudes concerning black Americans. In the latter study, younger subjects reported greater anti-Black racism as well. An important question is whether such social status factors are cross-

culturally consistent in their relationship to outgroup bias.

<u>Individual Difference Factors and Outgroup Bias</u>

Researchers concerned with individual difference variables have considered how personality influences a variety of psychological issues (Harkness & Lilienfeld, 1997). One such area concerns the role of individual difference variables in the manifestation of hostile outgroup attitudes and behaviors. Harrison Gough's empirically-based study of personality correlates to prejudice is an exemplar in this regard. In his now nearly one-half-century-old study of anti-Semitism, Gough developed the prejudice (Pr) scale via criterion-reference keying the MMPI item responses of U.S. subjects' in relationship to their scores on the Sanford anti-Semitism scale (Gough, 1951). The factor research of the scale (which when reversed-scored is called the tolerance "To") by Gough and Bradley (1997) has identified the core aspects of the measure as including a worldview of perceived victimization by others, construal of the social environment as malevolent, and the adherence to a cynical and distrustful interpersonal style. In regards to personality theory, Pr/To measures an internally-focused cynicism, and negative affect. The Pr/To scale has more recently been employed in the study of anti-Black attitudes and anti-Semitism in North America (Dunbar, 1995). Pr/To has also been found to be a significant discriminating variable between bias-motivated versus non-bias motivated homicide offenders (Dunbar, Krop, & Sullaway, 2000).

The construct of authoritarianism, another individual difference variable, is well represented by both historical (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950) and contemporary scholarship (Altemeyer, 1988). As the singularly most studied individual difference variable related to outgroup hostility, authoritarianism, as conceptualized by Adorno and his colleagues in the first decade after the Second World War, was derived, in part, from

clinical observation, emphasizing psychodynamic themes of repression, displacement, and projection. Altemeyer's re-working of the measurement of authoritarianism resulted in the development of his Right Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) scale. Altemeyer's measure, which is independent of Adorno et. al.'s psychopathology-laden construct, instead centers upon three primary dimensions of authoritarianism, these are conventionalism, submission, and authoritarian aggression. The RWA measure reflects a personality style that is highly external in orientation, one that is cued to proscribed behaviors of the social environment and the social ingroup. Numerous studies of RWA with samples in North America have demonstrated its relationship to bias against minority groups. Kecmanovic (1996) has proposed that an "Authoritarian Syndrome" underlies the espoused ethnic hatred of many contemporary ethnonationalist movements in central and eastern Europe. RWA then, like Pr/To, is characteristic of a stable individual predisposition correlated with outgroup hostility.

Cultural Contexts of Outgroup Bias

The complex relationship of emic and social psychological factors in the formation of outgroup hostility holds significant implication for multicultural research. There is extensive evidence in the U.S. of anti-Black racism, ranging from bias in the workplace and communities to the perpetration of bias-motivated crimes against persons of color. Likewise, anti-Semitic activity continues to be an issue in contemporary U.S. culture. In 1999, there were 1,547 reported acts of anti-Semitic violence in the US, according to the Anti Defamation League Annual Report. These included the firebombing of three synagogues in Sacramento, California, a shooting spree by a White Supremacist at a Jewish community center in suburban Los Angeles, and the Chicago shooting of Orthodox Jews walking home from Sabbath services.

In Eastern Europe bias against the Roma constitutes a significant problem. Roma persons

constitute the largest racial/ethnic minority group in Europe. The 12 million Roma persons in Eastern Europe are frequent targets of institutional discrimination as well as the victims of bias-motivated violence. Historically, Roma have experienced discrimination, forced migrations orchestrated by the former Czechoslovakian government, systematic extermination by the Nazis, and most recently genocidal "ethnic cleansing" in the former Yugoslav states. Nedomova and Kostelecky (1997) have suggested that the recent separation of the Czech and Slovak regions has resulted in the creation of a highly homogeneous ethnic and cultural climate. In their survey research, they note that the emphasis upon being "truly Czech" has resulted in the defacto exclusion of Jewish and Roma residents, as well as the emerging Asian-Pacific community in the Republic. They noted that the over-riding opinion is that Czech ethnicity is essential to being a citizen of the Czech Republic. As such, citizenship is not *achieved* but rather *legitimized* through ethnic group membership. In a second study, Nedomova (1997) found that Czech human service providers frequently endorsed beliefs of Roma as holding distinctly different cultural values (60%) and customs (52%), as well as being less law-abiding (52%), as being "aversive to work" (38%). The expressed value dissimilarity and endorsement of negative stereotypes of Roma in the Czech Republic implicate an intolerance of Roma culture and suggest an ambivalence of visible ethnic minorities in Central Europe. Likewise, anti-Semitism remains a serious social issue in eastern and central Europe. Similarly, during this century, Jewish persons have experienced stereotyping, discrimination, and extermination [at the hands of the Nazis] in the Czech state. Thus, while there are few Jewish persons currently residing in the Czech Republic, there is ample evidence of anti-Semitism in the recent history of central and eastern Europe.

Research Questions

This study examined the following questions: (1) how are social status variables related

to outgroup bias in two diverse cultures, i.e., the U.S. and the Czech Republic, (2) are the individual difference measures of Pr/To and RWA similarly correlated to outgroup bias – in this instance anti-Semitism and racial bias, and (3) are individual difference variables predictive of outgroup bias when social status factors (i.e. socio-demographic variables) have been accounted for. In addition, this study considered two additional issues. The first of these concerned whether anti-Semitic attitudes were comparable in a culturally diverse context, the U.S., with that of a culturally homogeneous environment, the Czech Republic, that is almost entirely absent of a Jewish population. The other issue this study pursued was related to the cross-cultural validity of the Pr/To scale. While Pr/To has been found to be valid predictor of anti-Semitism and outgroup bias in the U.S., the issue of whether this scale, or any individual difference measure, is related to outgroup hostility cross-culturally, is largely uncertain. As indicated by Hui and Triandis (1985), establishing the cross-cultural utility of an individual difference measure is possible via validation by a nomological network. The construct validity of Pr/To can be determined when the measure reveals a comparable relationship to other factors (such as anti-Semitism). Validation via a nomological network strategy indicates if the construct demonstrates cross-cultural equivalence. Pr/To has recently been studied with Chilean and Asian-American samples in relationship to hostility towards indigenous persons (Mapuche Indians) in Chile and to anti-Semitism in the U.S., respectively (Dunbar, Saiz, Stela, and Saiz, 1999). In this study, Pr/To was found to predict outgroup bias after ingroup-outgroup value dissimilarity had been accounted for. The current study sought to determine whether Pr/To demonstrates a similar relationship to the same criterion (i.e. hostility against the same outgroup with the same measure) in two different cultural contexts.

A final issue raised in the current study concerned the relationship between two

conceptually diverse measures – RWA and Pr/To - that are both predictive of outgroup bias. While the primary aim of the study concerned cross-cultural validation of Pr/To and RWA, analysis of the inter-relationship of the two measures provides an opportunity to consider two inter-related questions. The first of these concerned whether the relative standing on Pr/To and RWA were additive in terms of measured outgroup bias. The second question empirically tested an individual difference-based two-factor model of outgroup bias, consisting of internalizing and malevolent (Pr/To) and externalizing and conforming (RWA) determinants. A similar two factor model of outgroup bias was proposed by Crandall and Cohen (1994).

<u>Samples</u>

Czech Republic: 188 Czech undergraduate students (60.5% males) from Karlova (Charles) University in Prague participated in the study. Fifty-three percent of the participants were enrolled in science degree programs such as engineering and mathematics, 11 percent were enrolled in the study of economics, 14 percent in philosophy/liberal arts, 15 percent in education, science, and the remaining 22 percent in other academic fields. All subjects were born in the Czech Republic; 185 of the subjects identified themselves as ethnic Czech nationals with 3 (1.5%) of the subjects being self-identified as Jewish. The mean age was 21.54 years (SD = 1.81) with a range from 18 to 27 years. Self-referenced economic level was coded for 5 categories: upper (1.4%), upper-middle (12.2%), middle (65.5%), middle-lower (19.6%), and lower (1.4%).

United States: The US sample consisted of 281 participants at the University of California at Los Angeles. The race/ethnic composition of the sample included 9 African-Americans, 70 Asian-Pacifics, 160 Euro-Whites, 34 Latinos, and 8 subjects of multi-ethnic or other ethnic heritage. The respondent mean age was 18.49 (median was 17.9, SD = 3.87; range of 17 to 38). The sample included 204 females (73%) and 77 males. Using the same five-point

scale employed with the Czech sample, participants identified their economic level as: upper

(2.8%), upper-to-middle (6.4%), middle (28.1%), middle-to-lower (48.8%), and lower (13.9%).

<u>Measures</u>

      <u>Prejudice/Tolerance (Pr/To) Scale</u> The 32 items of Gough's original Pr/To scale from the

established U.S. and Czech versions of the MMPI was employed. For the Czech sample the scale

mean was 12.14 (SD = 4.39). Based upon the original U.S. norms reported by Gough (1951), the

Czech sample obtained a T-score of 51. The alpha coefficient of reliability was .67. The mean

score for the US sample was 12.89 (SD=4.38) with a coefficient alpha of .68; also yielding a

MMPI T-Score of 51.

      <u>Right Wing Authoritarianism</u> Two different versions of Altemeyer's RWA scale were

administered. Both of these scales examine attitudes favoring submission to authority, need for

conformity, and endorsement of authoritarian aggression. With the Czech sample Altemeyer's

(1996) current 34 item version of the RWA was administered (M= 4.15, SD= .66, alpha

reliability = .90). This version employs a nine-point Likert response format. The U.S. sample

employed the 24 item version of the RWA, using the seven point response format. The mean for

this version of the RWA was 3.40, (SD= .62) with an alpha coefficient of .84. Altemeyer (1996),

in his extensive research with the RWA scales, has commented, "… it does not matter much

which version of the RWA Scale you use, as far as empirical correlations go. You get about the

same results with any of them." (pg. 52) The two versions of the RWA Scale have 8 common

items. These common items were computed as a separate measure for the two samples, as an

estimate of the validity of the two forms of the RWA measure used. This is discussed below.

      <u>Social Status Variables</u>: Social status variables were corded for participant race/ethnicity,

age, gender, and economic level. These social status variables were recorded on the PDD

demographic form (Dunbar, 1996). While the first four variables were coded categorically, self-referenced economic level was coded on the 5 point Likert scale described above.

Selznick and Steinberg Anti-Semitism Scale is an 11 item Likert-scaled measure consisting of statements reflecting negative stereotypes of Jews and Jewish culture (1969). Scale items reflect both negative images ("Jews have a lot of irritating faults") and distrust ("Jews are shrewd and tricky in business") of Jews. This scale has been used in a variety of community-based studies in the U.S. and Canada during the past twenty-five years (Matrie & Clark, 1982; Hoffman, 1993). This scale is modestly correlated with Pr/To for Euro-Whites (Dunbar, 1995). In the current study, with the Czech sample the anti-Semitism scale had a mean of 33.55 (SD = 11.58; alpha coefficient of .90). For the US sample the mean was 30.19 (SD=15.53) with a coefficient of .95.

Roma Bias Scale is an 11-item Likert-type scale, developed by the second author. The items on the scale reflect negative social attitudes consistent with those from Nedemova's survey research of negative Roma stereotypes held by Czech nationals. Items sampled opinions concerning Roma work attitudes ("Roma do not have a positive relationship to work, they are lazy"), criminality/anti-social activity ("Roma commit more criminal acts than other people" and " "Roma drink more alcohol than other people), and problems integrating to mainstream Czech culture ("Roma place greater importance on their own ethnic interests than in the interest of the Czech Republic"). The scale mean was 48.43 (SD = 11.58) and had an internal reliability coefficient of .90.

"New" Racism: This 5 item scale (Jacobsen, 1985) reflects anti-Black attitudes reflective of modern or "symbolic" racism (Kinder and Sears, 1981), in which racial bias is reflected in opposition to social programs such as affirmative action, school

integration, or equal employment opportunity. The scale has been used in studies of

social identity and racial attitudes (Carter, 1990). In the current study the scale mean was

8.20 (SD=1.99) with an alpha reliability coefficient of .62.

Procedure

For administration in the Czech Republic the RWA, Selznick and Steinberg anti-

Semitism scale, and the participant social status variables from the PDD demographic

form were translated from English into Czech by the second author, and then back-

translated by a colleague in the Department of Psychology at Karlova University. The

Pr/To items were taken from a prior translation of the MMPI, which has been widely

used in the Czech Republic. Subjects were solicited through their enrollment at the

university. All questionnaire protocols were administered during regular class sessions.

With the US sample, participants were solicited from introductory psychology courses

and received academic credit for participating in the study.

At both sites the administration of the materials was as follows. The PDD

demographic data form was completed initially; this was followed by the completion of

the Pr/To and RWA scales. This was then followed by distribution and completion of the

Anti-Semitism and anti-Roma (Czech Republic) and New Racism (US) measures. To

reduce response bias (Sundberg & Bachelis, 1956) no reference was made in participant

solicitation that topics of inter-group attitudes would be sampled.

Given the Czech sample was administered the most recent form of Altemeyer's

RWA measure, whereas the US sample was given his prior version of the scale, the 8

common items from the two versions of RWA were separately coded. Item values were

converted to "agree" and "disagree" to correct for differences in scaling values between

the two forms of the scale. These common items were then aggregated into a single value

with higher values reflecting greater authoritarian beliefs. This measure will be referred

to as the "core RWA measure" hereafter in this paper.

Results

Participant scores for Pr/To and the anti-Semitism measure were compared for the Czech

and U.S. samples. Between-group scale score differences were not significant. In the Czech

sample the mean for Pr/To was comparable to the original findings obtained by Gough (1951)

and more recent studies of Dunbar (1995) with North American samples as well as by Dunbar,

Saiz, Stela, and Saiz (1998) with their Chilean sample. Because of the item content and response

scaling differences of the two versions of RWA employed, significance testing for between-

group differences for the entire scales was not possible. Instead, significance tests were

computed between the Czech and US samples for the composite core RWA item values. Results

revealed that for the Czech sample, the 8 core items were correlated (r = .54, p < .001) with the

16 unique items of the 24 item measure. For the US sample, the 8 core items were correlated (r =

.69, p < .001) with the 27 unique items of the 35 item measure.

The relationship of participant social status for gender, age, and economic level

with Pr/To, RWA, and the outgroup bias measures were examined for the Czech and U.S.

samples. For Czech participants, Pr/To, RWA, anti-Semitism and anti-Roma bias were

unrelated to economic level, as computed on a series of oneway 1X5 ANOVAs. With the

Czech sample, a significant gender difference was observed on Pr/To, with males (M=

13.23) scoring higher than females (M= 10.45, t = 4.39, p < .001). Men also had higher

scores on the RWA scale (M=4.24) than did women (M=4.01; t=2.22, p<.03) and were

significantly higher for anti-Semitic attitudes (M=36.52) than women (M=29.01; t= 4.66,

p<.001). Czech men also endorsed greater anti-Roma attitudes (M=50.21) than Czech women (M=45.68; t=2.44, p<.02). Participant age did not reveal a significant relationship for the Czech sample, as determined via zero-order correlations, with anti-Semitism, Roma bias, Pr/To, and RWA.

Social status variables played a notably different role in the manifestation of outgroup bias for the U.S. participants. A significant difference for participant's reported economic status was found for Pr/To, anti-Semitism, and the New Racism scores. On a 1X5 (Pr/To by economic level) oneway ANOVA, a significant (F = 9.23, p<.001) relationship was found for economic status and Pr/To; Scheffe contrasts of economic level and Pr/To indicated that middle income status (M=9.0) self-ratings had lower Pr/To values than both lower economic (M=16.14) and upper economic (M=14.50) levels. Economic status differences (F = 7.24, p<.001) for anti-Semitism were also observed; Scheffe contrasts indiciated that middle (M=36.32) and upper-middle (M=34.5) economic status was related to significantly greater anti-Semitic attitudes than upper (M=15.00) economic status self-ratings. New Racism scores also varied by economic status (F = 7.24, p<.001); however, Scheffe contrasts did not reveal significant between-group differences. Only RWA did not vary by economic level. With the US sample gender differences were not significant for Pr/To, RWA, New Racism, or anti-Semitism. Computed zero-order correlations for participant age were not significant for any of the study variables. Given the ethnic diversity of the U.S. sample, between-group differences for African-Americans, Asian-Pacifics, Euro-Whites, and Latinos were examined. There were no ethnic group differences for Pr/To, as determined via a 1X4 (Pr/To by race/ethnic categories of African-Americans, Asian-Pacifics, Euro-Whites, and Latinos)

oneway ANOVA. For RWA, results of a 1X4 oneway ANOVA revealed a significant

between-race/ethnic group difference (F= 2.57, p<.05); however, Scheffe contrasts did

not reveal between-group differences. For anti-Semitism, results of a 1X4 ANOVA

revealed a significant between-race/ethnic group difference (F= 28.59, p<.001); Scheffe

contrasts revealed that African-Americans (M=58.22) and Asain-Pacifics (M=39.81)

reported significantly greater anti-Semitic attitudes than did Euro-Whites (M=26.66) or

Latinos (M=29.50). For anti-Black racism a 1X3 (New Racism by Asian-Pacific, Euro-

White, and Latino) ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for race/ethnicity by New

Racism scores (F= 11.82, p<.001); between-group differences based upon Scheffe

contrasts indicated that Asian-Pacifics (M=8.49) endorsed greater anti-Black racism than

did Latinos (M=6.50). The descriptive statistics for the study variables and significance

tests gender differences with the Czech and U.S. samples are reported in Table one.

Table One About Here

The relationship of the individual difference variables and the measures of outgroup bias

were computed by first removing participants who were members of the identified outgroup,

namely persons of Jewish, African-American, or Roma descent. In the Czech sample 3 subjects

(1.6%) and in the U.S. sample 54 subjects (19.5%) who identified their ethnicity or religion as

Jewish were removed from subsequent analyses concerning anti-Semitism. There were no Roma

participants in the Czech sample while in the U.S. sample 1 percent of the participants who

identified themselves as African-American were removed before computing the correlations of

Pr/To and RWA with the New Racism scale score. In the Czech sample, as determined via zero-

order correlation, Pr/To (r = .28, p < .001) and RWA (r = .42, p < .001) were both related to anti-Semitism. This relationship for Pr/To to anti-Semitism is similar to US findings reported by Gough (1951) and Dunbar (1995). Roma Bias was also correlated with both Pr/To (r = .45, p < .001) and RWA (r = .38, p < .001). With the Czech sample, Pr/To was modestly correlated with RWA (r = .17, p < .02). The anti-Semitism and Roma bias scales were correlated as well (r = .51, p < .001).

In the U.S. sample, Pr/To (r = .25, p < .002) and RWA (r = .30, p < .001) were similarly correlated to anti-Semitic attitudes. Pr/To (r = .45, p < .001) and RWA (r = .30, p < .001) were also correlated with the New Racism scale. The anti-Black racism and anti-Semitism scores were likewise inter-correlated (r = .22, p < .001). Pr/To and RWA were modestly correlated in the US sample, (r = .20, < .01) as was found with the Czech sample. The computed correlations of the core and unique RWA items with the other study measures are reported in an appendix to this manuscript.

The predictive relationship of the social status variables, Pr/To, and RWA to outgroup bias was determined via hierarchical regression analysis. The social status variables of age, economic level, and gender, were entered on step one in the regression model in the prediction of anti-Semitism for both the Czech and US samples. Similar hierarchical regression models were computed for Roma bias (the Czech sample only) and anti-Black racism (the US sample only). On step two of the model the individual difference predictors (Pr/To and RWA) were entered in the equation. Separate regression models were computed for Pr/To and RWA, so as to compare the predictive power of each measure after the social status variables had been accounted for. In predicting anti-Semitism with the Czech sample, the social status variables (entered on step one) accounted for 8% of the variance in anti-Semitic attitudes (R^2 = .10, adj. R^2 = .08, F = 6.81, p <

.01); a significant gender difference was observed (Beta = -.20, t=2.97, p<.01). When Pt/To was entered (step two) a significant improvement in predicting anti-Semitic attitudes resulted (R^2 = .37, adj. R^2 = .14, F = 7.15, p < .02, Beta = .21, t = 2.73, p<.01,). In a separate regression model, employing the same social status variables on step one, RWA (on step two) accounted for a further 14% of the variance in anti-Semitism (R^2 = .24, adj. R^2 = .22, F = 32.60, p < .001, Beta = .36, t = 5.50, p<.001). Using the same two-step regression model, the social status variables revealed a significant relationship to Roma bias (R^2 = .13, adj. R^2 = .05, F = 3.53, p < .02); when Pr/To was entered on step two an additional 16% of the variance was accounted for (R^2 = .46, adj. R^2 = .21, F = 34.75, p < .05, Beta = .42); RWA likewise (R^2 = .41, adj. R^2 = .17, F = 30.5, p < .001, Beta = .34, t = 4.93, p<.001) increased prediction of anti-Roma attitudes in a separate regression model, again after the social status variable had been accounted for in the model.

For the US sample the social status variables accounted for 9% of the variance in predicting anti-Semitic attitudes (R^2 = .32, adj. R^2 = .09). On step two Pr/To demonstrated a modest improvement of the model (F= 6.49, p < .01), accounting for an additional 4% of the total variance (R^2 = .21, adj. R^2 = .13, t = 2.55, p <.01). When RWA was employed as the predictor variable (i.e. replacing Pr/To) for anti-Semitism, a stronger relationship was found (R^2 = .46, adj. R^2 = .20, F = 29.65, P<.001, Beta = .24, t = 5.45, p<.001). Social status variables accounted for only 1% of the variance in the anti-Black racism scores (R^2= .10, adj. R^2 = .01). On step two Pr/To improved prediction of New Racism in the model (R^2= .31, adj. R^2 = .10, F = 10.35, p < .001, Beta = .29, t = 3.22, p<.001). In a separate regression model, RWA likewise improved prediction of New Racism after the social status variables had been accounted for (R^2= .35, adj. R^2 = .12, F = 13.37, p < .001, Beta = .33, t = 3.66, p<.001).

As we have noted above, Pr/To and RWA evidenced a modest correlation for both

samples. This reflects the markedly different dimensions of the individual that the two measures reflect. Conceptually, RWA and Pr/To represent two distinct dimensions of individuals who adhere to hostile outgroup attitudes. High RWA-scoring participants would be thought to view outgroup persons as being unacceptable in terms of their behaviors and values and will tolerate if not endorse punishment of persons construed as deviant. By comparison high-scoring participants on Pr/To evidence a sense of victimization and construe their social environment as being fundamentally hostile. Given this, we sought to view subjects in terms of their relative standing on Pr/To and RWA simultaneously, in regards to outgroup bias and the social status variables employed in each study. This classification approach is similar to that proposed by Crandall and Cohen (1994), who proposed that prejudice incorporated a dimension representing a worldview marked by cynicism and alienation and a second dimension characterized by authoritarianism and a belief in a just world. With the current sample, using a median split classification strategy, subjects for both samples were grouped into high and low scoring categories for Pr/To and RWA. As is found in Table Two, differences were observed for anti-Semitism for both the Czech (F = 9.47, p<.001) and U.S. (F = 3.72, p<.01) samples, as computed via 1X4 (anti-Semitism by Pr/To-RWA classification) ANOVAs; Scheffe contrasts revealed that the two high-scoring categories for RWA in the Czech sample were both significantly different from the low-Pr/To-low-RWA category. That is, higher scores for RWA yielded significantly stronger anti-Semitic attitudes, irrespective of classification on Pr/To. For the Czech sample, gender differences (X^2 = 17.74, p<.0005) and for the US sample, economic level (F =2.08, p<.03) and age (F = 6.39, p<.0004) varied significantly between the bias classification categories. The New Racism scale scores varied as well (F = 7.39, p<.001).

Table Two About Here

<u>Discussion</u>

This study illustrates how social status and individual difference variables contribute to the expression of outgroup bias in two diverse cultural contexts. While the findings point to the cross-cultural validity of Pr/To and RWA, the similarities and differences that emerged in the multiple relationships concerning outgroup hostility are also noteworthy. The influence of what we have referred to as social status (i.e., social category) variables in the expression of outgroup bias proved revealing when considered cross-culturally. For the Czech sample, the role of gender, and for the U.S. sample, economic and ethnic differences played distinctly different roles in the expression of outgroup bias. For the Czech sample, bias against ethnic minority groups is mediated by the individual's gender. Not only do men in the Czech Republic report greater bias against Jewish and Roma persons, but they also evidence personality characteristics related to a pre-disposition towards outgroup hostility. It appears that men in the Czech Republic (and perhaps elsewhere in eastern Europe) more readily embrace outgroup bias as a normative social attitude and ascribe to cynicism and authoritarianism as a solution to intergroup relations. Given the rise of hate-based gangs in the former eastern bloc states, our findings suggest that young men more so than women evidence social attitudes likely to make such groups tolerable in society. This may not be a recent phenomenon. Payne (1995), for example, has identified the social ideal of male dominance in the formation of authoritarian political organizations in Europe during the twentieth century, while Marlin (1990) has argued that a totalitarian worldview is a consequence of the rise to power of such organizations. By comparison, with the U.S. sample, economic status and not gender was related to differences in outgroup bias. This may be

explained by the importance of economic status in shaping ingroup and outgroup perceptions in the U.S., whereas in the Czech Republic the role of a market-based social system is a still decidedly new phenomena. However, the difference by economic status for U.S. subjects in terms Pr/To less clear-cut. It may be that the subjective ratings of economic level employed here reflect the presence of social desirability in participant self-ratings and that economic self-reference may be mediated by differences in Pr/To. The issue of participant age did not emerge in either sample, as a factor related to outgroup bias for university educated young adults and is in contrast to other recent research. As such we did not replicate the Pope-Davis and Ottavi (1993) finding for a similarly aged sample, in the prediction of racist attitudes.

Our findings suggest that Pr/To and RWA constitute two distinct individual difference factors that are both related to outgroup bias. Conceptually, RWA constitutes a social attitude and belief system that is signified in part by a politically repressive ideology. Gough's Pr/To construct represents a belief system that is indicative of subjective distress and cynicism. The results of this study provide evidence of the cross-cultural validity of both Pr/To and RWA as predictors of outgroup bias. Consistent with the recent work of Dunbar, Saiz, Stela, and Saez, (1999), Pr/To is a cross-culturally valid predictor of bias, even when social status factors are accounted for.

Our study provides one of the few cross-cultural examinations of the predictors of anti-Semitism. Not only were the relationship of Pr/To and RWA to anti-Semitism cross-culturally similar, but that the measured degree of expression of anti-Semitism was also comparable, even though the two cultural contexts are distinctly different in terms of both history and intergroup contact. Specifically, the absence of a significant Jewish population in the Czech Republic (which is currently reported as 2,000 persons of Jewish heritage in a country of 10,250,000

citizens) is due in substantial part to the German occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Nazis. At the beginning of World War Two there were 120,000 Jews living in what is now the Czech Republic. The Holocaust resulted in the deaths of thousands of Czechoslovakian-born Jews. In contrast, while anti-Semitism has long been a problem in the US, there has been no event of similar magnitude in North America as that of the Holocaust. As such, the history of anti-Semitism is significantly different between the Czech Republic and the US. Additionally, the Czech and US samples vary in terms of probability of intergroup contact experiences with Jewish cohorts. This is demonstrated most clearly by the presence of nearly 20% Jewish participants in the US sample (who were removed in the analyses) as compared to the presence of only 1 percent of Jewish participants in the Czech sample. In general then, it can be seen that daily contact between Jews and non-Jews would be quite different for the two samples. In spite of this, our findings indicate that anti-Semitic attitudes are quite similar. As such, while political history and daily contact experiences varied widely in the two samples, measured hostile attitudes did not. Our findings would support the observation of human rights experts that "one can have anti-Semitism without the presence of Jews"(Marta Alpert, personal communication, January 17, 2000). Given the substantial body of research concerning the contact hypothesis, it is therefore particularly important for future research to consider what components of contact – such as affective characteristics or support by authorities - may influence anti-Semitic attitudes in communities with low frequency of routine intergroup interaction.

Our findings also explore the cross-cultural pathways of bias against persons of color. As with the prediction of anti-Semitism, the combination of social status variables Pr/To, and RWA both played a role in racial bias. For the Czech sample, anti-Semitism and Roma bias revealed a similar role for gender, the Pr/To, and RWA. However, for the U.S. sample, anti-Black racism

was unrelated to the social status variables of participant gender, economic level, or age. Rather, ethnic ingroup membership, and the Pr/To and RWA factors played a role in the endorsement of anti-Black stereotypes. While it appears that social status variables influence outgroup hostility cross-culturally, the specific relationships may be distinctly different in the US and Czech Republics. This finding should serve as a note of caution for researchers and practitioners involved in intergroup issues, in that targeted populations may indeed vary, based upon the cultural context and worldviews in which the group is situated. Indeed, our findings would caution against presuming that similar social needs (e.g. gender or economic status) or values contribute to outgroup bias for US and Czech individuals. Given that the cultural context may uniquely shape outgroup attitudes, educational efforts and social policies may prove ineffective if borrowed whole cloth from one setting (e.g. the US) to another (in this case, the Czech Republic).

There are a variety of limitations of this study that need to be considered. Methodologically, the equivalence of the two forms of Altemeyer's RWA scales needs to be questioned. The less than robust correlations between the core and unique items in the two forms of the RWA raises questions about the psychometric comparability of the scales, even if the relationships to other variables is largely similar. Additionally, the samples in both countries consist of university students. The presumption to generalize these findings to the entire populations from which they are drawn may not be appropriate.

More importantly than these two issues, however, in terms of the study of predisposition to outgroup bias, is the issue of how comprehensive this two factor model is. The dimension represented by Pr/To and RWA appear to reflect important information about the predisposition to the formation of adverse outgroup attitudes. It is not presumed that these measures in and of

themselves say much about biased behaviors towards ethnic minority persons. We would expect that other critical factors that would influence a bias-prone individual to act upon these beliefs would include social learning supportive of instrumental aggression as a means to respond to cultural conflict, an individual predisposition of impulse disturbance, and the force of a social context that reinforces marked outgroup hostility.

While our study provides evidence of the construct validity of both social status and individual trait variables in the expression of outgroup bias, it does not consider the role of emic variables which may underlie the differences in gender and economic level which we observed, for example. As we have speculated, it may well be that culture-specific constructs could serve to activate – i.e., moderate – biased attitudes. That is, culturally-salient indications of ingroup status and worldview orientation may influence behavioral intent to engage in biased behavior, on the one hand, as well as serve to condone or normalize discrimination and persecution of ethnic minority groups on the other. It is hoped that the findings of this study may serve to stimulate future work that will link social and personality factors with culture-specific constructs in the study of outgroup hostility.

References

Adorno, T., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J., & Sanford, R.N. (1950). The authoritarian personality. New York, Wiley Science.

Anti Defamation League (1999). Annual Report of anti-Semitic Incidents.

Altemeyer, B. (1988). Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism. San Francisco; Jossey-Bass.

Altemeyer, B. (1996). The authoritarian specter. Cambridge; Mass. Harvard University Press.

Berry, J. W. (1969). On cross-cultural comparability. International Journal of Psychology, 4, 119-128.

Campbell, A. (1971). White attitudes towards Black people. Ann Arbor: Institute of social research, University of Michigan.

Carter, R.T. (1990). The relationship between racism and racial identity among White Americans: An exploratory investigation. Journal of Counseling and Development 69, 46-50.

Crandall C. S. & Cohen, C. (1994). The personality of the stigmatizer: Cultural world view, conventionalism, and self-esteem. Journal of Research in Personality, 28, 4, 461-480.

Dunbar, E. (1995). The assessment of the prejudiced personality: The Pr scale forty years later, Journal of personality assessment, 65, (2), 270-277.

Dunbar, E. (1996). Assessing multi-group identity: The personal dimensions of difference scale, International journal of intercultural relations, 21, 1, 1-28., 1996

Dunbar, E. (1997). The relationship of DSM personality disorder criteria and Gough's prejudice scale: Exploring the clinical manifestations of the prejudiced personality. Cultural Diversity and mental health, 3, 4, 247-258.

Dunbar, E., Krop, H., & Sullaway, M.E., (2000). From Hatred to Homicide: Psychometric, Ideological, and Diagnostic Dimensions of Bias-Motivated Murderers. Manuscript under review.

Dunbar, E., Saiz, J.L., Stela, K. & Saez, R. (1999). Personality and Social Group Value Determinants of Outgroup Bias: A Cross-National Comparison of Gough's Pr/To Scale. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 31, 2, 267-275.

Gough, H.G. (1951). Studies of social intolerance II: A personality scale of anti-Semitism. Journal of social psychology, 33, 247-255.

Gough H.G. & Bradley, P. (1993). Personal attributes of people described by others as intolerant. In Sniderman, P.M., Tetlock, P.E., & Carmines, E.G. (Eds.) Prejudice, politics, and the American dilemma. Stanford University Press, Stanford, Ca.

Gough, H.G. & Bradley, P. (1997). Manual for the California psychological inventory. Consulting Psychologists Press. Palo Alto.

Haddock, G., Zanna, M. P., & Esses, V. M. (1993). Assessing the structure of prejudicial attitudes: The case of attitudes toward homosexuals. Journal of personality and social psychology, 65 (6), 1105-1118.

Harkness, A. R.; Lilienfeld, S. O. (1997). Individual differences science for treatment planning: Personality traits. Psychological assessment, 9, 4, 349-360.

Hui, C. H., & Triandis, H. C. (1985). Measurement in cross-cultural psychology: A review and comparison of strategies. Journal of cross-cultural psychology, 16 (2), 131-152.

Jacobsen, C.K. (1985). Resistance to affirmative action: Self-interest or racism? Journal of Conflict Resolution, 29 (2), 306-329.

Malpass, R. S. (1977). On the theoretical basis of methodology: A return to basics. In Y.

H. Poortinga (Ed.), Basic problems in cross-cultural psychology. Amsterdam: Swets &

Zeitlinger.

Marlin, O. (1990). Group psychology in the totalitarian system: A psychoanalytic view.

Group, 14, 1, 44-58

Matrie, G. & Clark, R. (1982). Anti-Semitism in the United States: A study of prejudice

in the 1980's. New York: Prager.

Pentony, J.F., Petersen, K.S., Philips, O., Leong, C., Harper, C., Bakowski, S.S.,

Gonzales, R. (2001). A comparison of authoritarianism in the United States, England, and

Hungary with selected nonrandom samples. European psychologist, 5, 4, 259-268.

Payne S.G., (1995). A history of fascism, 1914-1945. The university of Wisconsin press.

Pope-Davis, D.B. & Ottavi, T.M. (1994). The relationship between racism and racial

identity among White Americans: A replication and extension. Journal of counseling and

development, 72, 293-297.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical

advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M.P. Zanna (Ed.), Advances in experimental

social psychology, 25, 1-65. San Diego, CA: Academic press.

Schwartz, S. H., & Struch, N.(1989). Values, stereotypes, and intergroup antagonism. In

D. Bar-Tal, C. F. Graumann, A. W. Kruglansky, & W. Stroebe (Eds.), Stereotyping and

prejudice: Changing conceptions, 151-167. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Selznick, G. & Steinberg, S. (1969). The tenacity of prejudice: Anti-Semitism in

contemporary America. New York: Harper and Row.

Struch, N., & Schwartz, S. H. (1989). Intergroup aggression: Its predictors and

distinctness from in-group bias. Journal of personality and social psychology, 56, 364-373.

Sundberg, N.D. & Bachelis, W.D. (1956). The fakability of two measures of prejudice:

The California F scale and Gough's Pr scale. <u>Journal of abnormal psychology</u>, 2, 140-142.

Zanna, M. P. (1994). On the nature of prejudice. <u>Canadian Psychology, 35, 1,</u> 11-23

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics and Significance Tests for PR/To, RWA, and Anti-Semitism for Czech Republic and US Participants by Gender

| | Czech Subjects | | | US Subjects | | |
| | Men (n = 112) | Women (n= 73) | | Men (n = 77) | Women (n = 204) | |
	Mean (s.d.)	Mean (s.d.)	t	Mean (s.d.)	Mean (s.d.)	t
Prejudice/ Tolerance	13.23 (4.13)	10.45 (4.23)	4.39***	12.73 (4.06)	12.00 (4.54)	.26
Right Wing Authoritarianism	4.24 (.60)	4.01 (.58)	2.22*	3.26 (.86)	3.39 (.49)	.12
Anti-Semitism[a]	36.52 (11.67)	29.01 (9.89)	4.66***	36.23 (18.42)	32.58 (13.67)	1.41
Anti-Roma Bias	50.21 (12.51)	45.68 (12.17)	2.44**	N/A		
New Racism[b]	N/A			7.65 (2.13)	7.73 (1.79)	.19

[a] for both groups, Jewish respondents were removed in the computation of the anti-Semitism scale scores

[b] for the US group, African-Americans respondents were removed in the computation of the New Racism score

* p<.05   ** p<.01   *** p<.001

Table 2: Categorical Groupings of RWA and Pr/To with Social Status and Outgroup
Bias for Czech Republic and U.S. Participants

Right Wing Authoritarianism
Low   High

	Low	High

High (Gough Prejudice Scale)	Worldview: low conformance and high malevolence
	
	CZR
	  anti-Semitism = 35.25
	  Roma Bias = 49.92
	  economic level = 2.92
	  men: 13% women: 2%
	  age 21.53
	US
	  anti-Semitism = 29.64
	  anti-Black racism = 7.06
	  economic level = 3.79
	  men: 28% women: 25%
	  age: 20.95
		Worldview: high conformance and high malevolence
		
		CZR
		  anti-Semitism = 37.78
		  Roma Bias = 55.32
		  economic level = 3.12
		  men: 40% women: 30%
		  age 21.44
		US
		  anti-Semitism = 36.64
		  anti-Black racism = 8.62
		  economic level = 3.84
		  men: 33% women: 23%
		  age: 17.34

Low	Worldview: low conformance and high benevolence
	
	CZR
	  anti-Semitism = 26.63
	  Roma Bias = 40.07
	  economic level = 3.05
	  men: 17% women: 46%
	  age 21.14
	US
	  anti-Semitism = 25.61
	  anti-Black racism = 6.12
	  economic level = 3.48
	  men: 24% women: 22%
	  age: 18.56
		Worldview: high conformance and high benevolence
		
		CZR
		  anti-Semitism = 36.64
		  Roma Bias = 48.25
		  economic level = 3.03
		  men: 30% women: 22%
		  age 21.0
		US
		  anti-Semitism = 32.24
		  anti-Black racism =8.20
		  economic level = 3.36
		  men: 16% women: 30%
		  age: 17.78

CZR = Czech Republic participants, median-split bias classification groups by:
Anti-Semitism: F=9.47, p<.0001   Roma Bias: F=15.36, p<.0001
Gender: X^2 = 17.74, p<.0005   Economic Level: F=.69, n.s.   Age: F = 2.01, n.s.

US = United States participants, median-split bias classification groups by:
Anti-Semitism: F= 3.72, p<.01   New (Black) Racism: F=7.39, p<.0001
Gender: X^2 = 4.22, n.s.   Economic Level: F= 2.08, p<.03   Age: F = 6.39, p<.0004

Appendix:

Czech Subjects

	Pr/To	Anti-Semitism	Anti-Roma Bias
Core RWA Items	r=.23	r=.39	r=.42
Unique RWA Items	r=.11	r=.34	r=.27

US Subjects

	Pr/To	Anti-Semitism	Anti-Black Racism
Core RWA Items	r=.18	r=.35	r=.50
Unique RWA Items	r=.10	r=.13	r=.32