

Test 2 Ch. 5-8

March 20, 2015

1. Predictive validity of explicit and implicit measures of prejudice - **p.67**
 - o Ability of explicit and implicit measures of prejudice to predict discriminatory behaviors and judgments
2. Bertrand and Mullainathan (2004) - **p. 68**
 - o Applicants with White names needed to send about 10 resumes to get one callback; applicants with Black names needed to send 15 resumes; difference of 50%
 - o Whites with higher-quality resumes received nearly 30% more callbacks compared to Whites with lower-quality resumes; no difference in callbacks for Blacks with higher-quality resumes compared to Blacks with lower quality resumes
3. Zigert and Hanges (2005) - **p. 68-69**
 - o College students in the climate for racial bias condition ("hire a White candidate") evaluated the Black job candidate significantly lower than did participants in the climate for equality condition
 - o Explicit prejudice did not influence candidate ratings in either of the climate conditions
 - o College students who showed a bias for Whites over Blacks in the IAT rated the Black candidate lower than the White candidate, but only in the climate for racial bias condition
4. Rooth (2010) - **p. 69**
 - o 56% of job recruiters (study sample in Sweden) had at least moderate implicit bias against Muslims
 - o Recruiters with moderate bias against Muslims were 5% less likely to invite a job applicant for an interview compared to Swedish applicants (based on names)
 - o Explicit prejudice did not affect invitations to interview
5. Moss-Racusin et al. (2013) - **p. 69-70**
 - o Men and women evaluators rated the male applicant more competent and hireable than the female applicant; recommended a higher salary; offered more career mentoring
 - o The more bias against women (Modern Sexism Scale), the less competent and hireable the female candidate was perceived to be, and less mentoring offered to her. No effect on evaluations of males

6. Greenwald et al. (2009) - **p. 71-72**
 - o 1,057 registered voters in 2008 presidential election → controlling for liberal-conservative ideology, age, gender, and race
 - White preference (thermometer scale, Symbolic Racism Scale, and IATs) predicted preference for McCain to Obama (accounting for 21.4% of vote preference)
 - Conservatism was the strongest predictor of preference for McCain
7. Knowles et al. (2010) - **p. 72-73**
 - o Implicit prejudice against Blacks predicted a vote against Obama and opposition to the Obama health care proposal
 - o Implicit prejudice predicted negative evaluations of and opposition to the health care plan when attributed to Obama; when attributed to Bill Clinton, implicit prejudice was not related to opposition to the health care policy
 - o Caution in over-interpreting these results: no evidence that all who oppose Obama and his policies are explicitly or implicitly prejudiced against him because of his race
8. Green et al. (2007) - **p. 74**
 - o Doctors reported no explicit preferences for Whites over Blacks or differences in perceived cooperativeness
 - o Doctors showed implicit preferences for Whites over Blacks, and implicit stereotypes of Blacks as less cooperative
 - o As doctors' implicit biases in favor of Whites increased, the likelihood of their treating White patients and not treating Black patients increases
9. McConnell and Leibold (2001) - **p. 75**
 - o College students expressed more positive biases in favor of Whites compared to Blacks
 - o Interactions of biased students were more negative
10. Gawronski et al. (2003) - **p. 76-77**
 - o IAT bias against Turks predicted negative ratings of Turkish man's behaviors compared to ratings of German man's same behavior
11. Levinson and Young (2010) - **p. 79**
 - o Dark skin tone was associated with "guilty" evaluations of evidence and alleged perpetrator
 - o IAT bias for Whites over Blacks predicted guilty evaluations of total evidence when alleged perpetrator had dark skin, but did not predict the evaluations of the guilt of dark or light skinned perpetrators
12. Levinson et al. (2010) - **p. 79**

- o Unconscious biases against Blacks (darker skin tone) lead to more negative evaluations than those that occur for Whites (lighter skin tone) in a criminal case
- 13. Rachinski et al. (2009) - **p. 80**
 - o Judges were not affected by race of the defendant in evaluations of guilt
 - o Judges who expressed a White preferences on the IAT were more likely to impose harsher penalties when primed with Black associated words than when primed with neutral words (defendant's race was not explicitly identified)
 - o Judges can be influenced by unconscious biases when they are not self-motivated to control them
- 14. Levels of analysis of the origins of prejudice - **p. 83-86**
 - o Sociobiological explanation
 - o Cognitive style
 - o Socialization
- 15. Explanations of the origins of prejudice - **p. 83-86**
 - o Sociobiological explanation
 - Humans hard-wired to be prejudiced; evolution; survival of species
 - Studies of monkeys
 - Criticisms of strictly biological explanation influence of environment - culture
 - o Cognitive style
 - Prejudice is based on fear of unknown
 - To conquer this fear, we have to be open to new information
 - Openness facilitated by ability to process complex information
 - Intolerance of ambiguity, cognitive rigidity and preference for simple answers positively related to prejudice
 - o Socialization
 - Influence of parents and the "cultural environment"
 - Sinclair, Dunn & Lowery (2005)
- 16. Hodson and Busseri (2012) - **p. 85**
 - o Lower levels of intelligence is indirectly related to prejudice via social conservatism and authoritarianism
- 17. Integrated theory of prejudice: definitions of components - **p. 88-89**
 - o BASIC PRINICIPLE - fear caused by perceived and real threats leads to prejudice
 - o **In-group Identification (ex: wife, mother, teacher, etc.)**