

1-1-2001

Prejudice and Racism: Challenges and Progress in Measurement

Alan W. Burkard

Marquette University, alan.burkard@marquette.edu

Barbara R. Medler

Ball State University

Michael Allen Boticki

Marquette University

Published version. "Prejudice and Racism: Challenges and Progress in Measurement," in *Handbook of Multicultural Counseling*. 2nd Edition. Eds. Joseph G. Ponterotto, J. Manuel Casas, Lisa A. Suzuki, and Charlene M. Alexander. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2001: 457-481. DOI. © 2001 Sage Publications. Used with permission.

PREJUDICE AND RACISM

Challenges and Progress in Measurement

ALAN W. BURKARD
BARBARA R. MEDLER
MICHAEL A. BOTICKI

COUNSELORS AND PSYCHOLOGISTS are increasingly designing and implementing prejudice prevention programs in schools, communities, and organizations. Critical to the development of these programs is the evaluation of outcomes and research on treatment-intervention efficacy. Clearly, measures that operationalize prejudice are an important need if counseling practitioners and researchers are to understand the attitudes of clients/research participants and the effects of prejudice reduction programs on changing negative attitudes.

Prejudice toward a variety of groups based on social categories (e.g., gender, ethnicity, race, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic class) has been overtly expressed with little or no societal repercussions throughout most of the 20th century. Allport (1954) wrote about a world that witnessed African Americans being lynched, the rise of the KKK and Nazism, and the political oppression of McCarthyism. White Americans in particular seemed to feel uninhibited in the overt expression of their racist and homophobic attitudes. During this period in psychological research, prejudice was often measured as a unidimensional concept (e.g., Social Distance Scale; Bogardus, 1933), predominately through self-report paper-and-pencil assessments (Biernat & Crandall, 1999).

The Civil Rights Movement, Affirmative Action, the emergence of multiculturalism in our schools, and shifting demographic trends in the United States have all led to significant changes of societal norms involving prejudice toward out-group members. Consequently, the nature and

expression of prejudice and racism also appears to have evolved. Although hate crimes are still a major concern in the United States (Sue & Sue, 1999), "newer" forms of prejudice that are subtle and covert seem to represent the predominate attitude, particularly among White Americans (e.g., Banaji & Greenwald, 1994; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Katz & Taylor, 1988; McConahay, 1986). Although this newer form of racism has been conceptualized in different ways (see Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Jacobson, 1985; McConahay, 1986; Sears, 1988), the term *implicit prejudice* (Banaji & Greenwald, 1994; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995) is used here for several conceptual reasons addressed later in this chapter.

The intent of this chapter is to review three categories of prejudice measures that practitioners and researchers can use in practice or research. Given that a recent comprehensive review of self-report racial prejudice measures was completed by Biernat and Crandall (1999), this chapter focuses on new developments in self-report measures of racial and anti-gay prejudice. Anti-gay prejudice is an important clinical and research area, and to date, only a few critical reviews of instruments measuring negative attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women have appeared in the literature (Herek, 1994; O'Donohue & Caselles, 1993; Schwanberg, 1993). Emerging prejudice measurement issues are the final focus, specifically addressing theoretical developments and the implications for prejudice measurement. Concluding comments address future needs in prejudice measurement and the application to counseling practice and research.

SELF-REPORT MEASURES OF RACIAL PREJUDICE

QUICK DISCRIMINATION INDEX

Description and Development

In a review of the literature, Ponterotto et al. (1995) identified three concerns with current measures of prejudice. First, some measures were composed of a small number of items that represented moderate psychometric properties, whereas other measures that had adequate psychometric properties were unduly lengthy and impaired practical utility. Second, prejudice measures have typically focused on cognitive aspects of people's attitudes rather than seeking to tap into affective aspects of respondents' attitudes. Finally, measures of prejudice were often solely based on White racism toward African Americans. In view of these criticisms, Ponterotto et al. developed the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI) to address both cognitive and affective aspects of prejudice, provide a measure applicable to diverse racial and ethnic populations, and provide an instrument with both practical utility and psychometric soundness.

The QDI is composed of 30 items in a Likert-type format, with responses that range from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Several items are reverse scored to control for a response bias. Based on the Lix Readability Index (Anderson, 1983), the QDI was assessed at the ninth-grade reading level (Utsey & Ponterotto, 1999). Consistent with the original intent of the QDI, this data suggests that the instrument is best used with adolescent and adult populations. Although a full-scale score can be reported, the QDI is best interpreted as a three-factor structure based on 23 of the 30 items (Ponterotto et al., 1995; Utsey & Ponterotto, 1999). The three factors are believed to measure cognitive attitudes toward racial diversity, interpersonal-affective attitudes regarding racial diversity, and general attitudes toward women's equality. Sample items are "It is as easy for women to succeed in business as it is for men," "My friendship network is very racially mixed," and "I feel that I could develop an intimate relationship with someone from a different race."

Psychometric Properties

Ponterotto et al. (1995) conducted three independent studies in the initial development of the QDI. Forty items were written for Study 1, and through a factor analysis and examination of criterion-related validity (based on Walsh and Betz's, 1990, Group-Differences Approach) the QDI was reduced to 25 items. Based on the evidence from Study 1, 2 items were rewritten, and 5 new items were written to further develop the second and third factors. Studies 2 and 3 of Ponterotto et al. and the Utsey and Ponterotto (1999) investigation represent the current data concerning the QDI's psychometric properties.

Reliability. Studies 2 and 3 of Ponterotto et al. (1995) reported the following Cronbach's alpha for the full scale and each of the factors, respectively: (a) .88 and .88 for the full scale, (b) .80 and .85 for Factor 1, (c) .83 and .83 for Factor 2, and (d) .65 and .76 for Factor 3. For three independent samples, Utsey and Ponterotto (1999) reported the following ranges of Cronbach's alpha: (a) .85 to .90 for Factor 1, (b) .70 to .79 for Factor 2, and (c) .70 to .77 for Factor 3. This evidence suggests that the QDI subscales have stable internal consistency coefficients across samples. A test-retest procedure was conducted in Study 2 of Ponterotto et al. (1995). The sample consisted of 37 undergraduates, and the retest procedure was completed at a 15-week interval. The coefficients of stability were .90, .82, and .81, respectively, for the three factors.

Validity. Based on a principal components analysis with a varimax rotation, seven factors were identified with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 in Study 2 of Ponterotto et al. (1995). Upon further analysis, and using a cut-off criterion of .40 for factor loadings, a three-factor oblique extraction

accounting for 41 % of the total scale variance emerged as the best interpretable factor structure for the QDI, a finding consistent with the results of Study 1 in Ponterotto et al. A confirmatory factor analysis conducted in Study 3 supported the three-factor oblique extraction as the best interpretation of the QDI factor structure. Utsey and Ponterotto (1999) conducted a confirmatory factor analysis of the QDI with three independent samples using an aggregate procedure recommended by Bagozzi and Heatherton (1994). The results indicated that the three-factor oblique structure remained fairly stable across these samples.

To examine the criterion-related validity of the QDI, Ponterotto et al. (1995) analyzed correlational patterns of QDI scores with various individual demographic variables among a sample of adolescents and adults from the New York metropolitan area. Analyses resulted in significant findings for gender, race, respondent residence (e.g., urban, suburban), and political affiliation, whereas income level and childbearing status were insignificant. All findings were consistent with those expected by the researchers and supported the criterion-related validity of the QDI based on the Group-Differences approach described by Walsh and Betz (1990).

In Study 3, Ponterotto et al. (1995) examined convergent and discriminant validity by correlating QDI factor scores with scores from the New Racism Scale (NRS; Jacobson, 1985), the Multicultural Counseling Awareness Scale (MCAS; Ponterotto et al., 1993), and the Social Desirability Scale (SDS; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). All three factors of the QDI were significantly correlated with the NRS (cognitive factor, $r = .44$; interpersonal-affective factor, $r = .44$; and the women's equality factor, $r = .30$), demonstrating that the QDI factors correlated with another measure of racism-oppression. The cognitive factor of the QDI significantly correlated with both factors of the MCAS. Only the interpersonal-affective factor of the QDI correlated with the knowledge/skills factor of the MCAS ($r = .34$), whereas the women's equity factor correlated with the awareness factor of the MCAS ($r = .39$). These general findings support the convergent validity of the QDI. Finally, the absence of significant correlations with the SDS suggests no contamination from social desirability and establishes some discriminant validity.

Evaluation

Ponterotto et al. (1995) set out to create a prejudice measure that had practical utility across racial groups without sacrificing the psychometric properties of the measure. Additionally, given that most measures of prejudice solely address the cognitive aspects of prejudice (Ponterotto & Pedersen, 1993), Ponterotto et al. attempted to measure affective components of racial prejudice. The QDI does appear to have stable psychometric properties at this time across the samples studied. The initial internal consistency and coefficient of stability suggest that the QDI factors have

moderate to strong reliability. The findings from Ponterotto et al. (1995) and Utsey and Ponterotto (1999) suggest that QDI factor structure is also relatively stable with samples across diverse geographical locations.

In general, additional validity studies should be completed on the QDI. Investigations to date have primarily explored the factor structure of the QDI, significantly contributing to the development of construct validity evidence. Contrary to one of the goals of the original scale, it is questionable if the QDI factor structure is applicable to racially diverse populations. A rough average from Studies 2 and 3 of Ponterotto et al. (1995) and Utsey and Ponterotto (1999) show that 79% of the combined samples from these investigations were composed of White participants, many of whom were college students. It will be important that future research replicate factorial studies with demographically diverse samples (e.g., age, ethnicity, race, gender, and educational level) if the QDI is to be generalized to diverse populations. Also important to the development of the construct validity of the QDI is additional research exploring group differences, correlational investigations with similar constructs, and convergent/discriminant validity analyses with racially and ethnically diverse populations.

Although some initial criterion-related validity evidence is presented by Ponterotto et al. (1995), certainly further research is needed to explore the dimensions and conceptual correlates of the QDI subscales. This becomes a critical issue, given the development of dual-process models of prejudiced attitudes (Devine, 1989; Devine & Monteith, 1999). From a dual-process perspective, the QDI would seem to be appropriately classified as an explicit measure of prejudice. Further research that examines the relationship between behavioral expressions of prejudice and QDI scores will be important to the development of criterion-related validity.

MIVILLE-GUZMAN UNIVERSALITY-DIVERSITY SCALE

Description and Development

Vontress (1988, 1996) asserted the notion that people are simultaneously similar to and different from each other, and that the awareness and acceptance of this notion is critical to relationship development between culturally different individuals. This ability to accept both similarities and differences in others is seen as fundamental to a counselor's work with a culturally different client (Vontress, 1996). Recognizing the implications of Vontress's writings, Miville (1992) worked to conceptually define and operationalize the universal-diverse orientation (UDO) construct. UDO is defined as "an attitude of awareness and acceptance of both the similarities and differences among people" (Miville et al., 1999, p. 292). The emphasis of the UDO construct is on the simultaneous acceptance of cultural (e.g., age,

proportion of variance from the M-GUDS scores can be accounted for by a single general factor. A subsequent examination of subscale correlations showed significant intercorrelations between .65 and .69 (Miville et al., 1999). Based on the pattern of the factor structure and subscale intercorrelations, Miville et al. (1999) suggested that a unidimensional factor is the best interpretation of the M-GUDS.

Although criterion-related validity was not a focus of Miville et al.'s (1999) investigations, some evidence of criterion-related validity is available using Walsh and Betz's (1990) Group-Differences Approach. Among a sample of White university students, it was found that men's M-GUDS scores were significantly lower than women's scores, indicating that men are less appreciating of similarities and differences than women. No gender differences emerged among a sample of African American university students. For both African American and White university students, Miville et al. also examined the racial composition of respondents' childhood neighborhoods and high schools. Racial composition of childhood neighborhoods and high schools were not significantly correlated with M-GUDS scores for African American students. In contrast, higher scores on the M-GUDS were found for those White respondents who reported living in predominantly White neighborhoods and attending high schools that were predominantly White in racial composition.

Across a series of four studies, Miville et al. (1999) examined the concurrent, convergent, and discriminant validity of the M-GUDS. An examination of the correlation patterns between the M-GUDS and several other scales yielded significantly positive correlations with androgyny, empathy toward others, healthy aspects of narcissism, positive attitudes toward feminism, positive aspects of African American and White racial identity. Significantly negative correlations emerged with dogmatism (closed-mindedness), negative attitudes toward gays and lesbians, and the more negative aspects of African American and White racial identity attitudes. Among White respondents, it was also found that M-GUDS scores did not correlate significantly with SAT verbal scores, the Fantasy and Personal Distress subscales of the Empathy Scale (Davis, 1980), or social desirability scores. Each of these sets of correlational findings were in the predicated direction. Five findings emerged from these four studies that were contrary to the original predications. Positive correlations were found between the M-GUDS and White racial identity Contact Subscale scores ($r = .45$) and SAT Quantitative scores ($r = -.21$) for a sample of White undergraduates, and ACT ($r = .25$), grade point average ($r = .24$), and social desirability ratings ($r = .26$) were significantly correlated with a sample of African American undergraduates.

Evaluation. Measurement of racial prejudice has often focused on negative attitudes toward out-groups, leaving little room for understanding aspects and dimensions of nonprejudiced racial attitudes. UDO, as measured by the

M-GUDS, represents an important movement in the direction of understanding dimensions of nonprejudiced racial attitudes. As a new instrument, the M-GUDS lacks extensive psychometric examination; however, the current evidence on construct validity is particularly promising. Certainly, the M-GUDS warrants further research and validation in the field of counseling.

The internal consistency of the scale is satisfactory and was consistent across samples in the four Miville et al. (1999) investigations. Additional reliability evidence was provided through a test-retest procedure. It should be noted that the sample size was small ($n = 23$) for the test-retest procedure, and these findings need to be replicated with larger samples. As indicated by the scale's authors, the factor structure and subscale correlations suggest that the M-GUDS is best interpreted as a unidimensional scale. The combination of the factor analysis, the correlational evidence with other scales representing similar constructs, and the convergent/discriminant validity provide evidence that the M-GUDS has initially strong construct validity. A few correlations between scores on other scales and M-GUDS scores were contrary to the predicted direction (e.g., White participants' scores on SAT Quantitative subscale, African American students' grade point averages, ACT scores, and social desirability scores). Replication of these findings will be important to determine if this was an artifact of the samples, or a stable pattern needing conceptual clarification. It is important to note that three of four investigations on the M-GUDS focused on samples consisting of White undergraduates, and the fourth sample was composed of African American undergraduate students. Consequently, researchers will need to examine the generalizability of the M-GUDS to populations outside a university setting that represent more diversity. This should include confirmatory factor analysis studies across demographically diverse samples (e.g., racial/ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic status).

MOTIVATION TO CONTROL PREJUDICE REACTIONS

Description and Development

Researchers in cognitive and social psychology are increasingly recognizing the dissociation between automatic and controlled social judgment processes (Devine, 1989; Devine & Monteith, 1999; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995). The independence of these two social judgment processes was demonstrated in a study of an unobtrusive measure of racial prejudice (Fazio, Jackson, Dunton, & Williams, 1995). An important finding of this study was that an unobtrusive measure did not significantly correlate with participants' Modern Racism Scale (MRS; McConahay, 1986) scores, despite

the fact that participants in this investigation were selected based on MRS scores falling within the lowest and highest 10% of a large sample.

Dunton and Fazio (1997) considered these findings from the Motivation and Opportunity as Determinants (MODE) model of attitude-behavior processes perspective (see Fazio, 1990, for a complete review of the MODE model) and concluded that "any controlled component within a mixed sequence of automatic and controlled processes, requires that the individual be both motivated to engage in the necessary cognitive effort and have the opportunity to do so" (p. 317). In essence, any automatic or implicit process that is activated in social judgment situations (e.g., homophobia, racism, and sexism) involving out-group members may be mediated by the motivation to control such processes. The Motivation to Control Prejudice Reactions (MCPR) scale was developed to measure this important individual difference construct specifically with respect to racial prejudice.

The current MCPR (Dunton & Fazio, 1997) consists of 17 items developed to measure two dimensions of the motivation to control prejudiced reactions. Following a factor analysis with a varimax rotation, two factors (i.e., concern with acting prejudiced and restraint to avoid dispute) emerged as the best interpretation of the scale. Respondents are directed to indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree with each item-statement on a Likert-type scale, which ranges from -3 (*strongly disagree*) to +3 (*strongly agree*). The MCPR can be completed in approximately 5 to 10 minutes. Sample items are "In today's society it is important that one not be perceived as prejudice in any manner" and "I think that it is important to speak one's mind rather than to worry about offending someone."

Psychometric Properties

Psychometric data on the MCPR are reported in Dunton and Fazio (1997), Fazio et al. (1995), and Fazio and Dunton (1997). Four independent samples for the initial development of the MCPR (Dunton & Fazio, 1997) consisted of (a) 55 students, (b) 418 undergraduates in a mass survey, (c) 429 undergraduates in a mass survey, and (d) 207 paid participants recruited through advertisements in campus or local town newspapers who agreed to participate in psychological research.

Reliability. Coefficient alphas across the four samples were reported to range from .74 to .81 (Dunton & Fazio, 1997). Individual coefficient alphas were not reported for the two subscales in any investigations.

Validity. Using a principal components analysis with a varimax rotation, five factors were identified that had eigenvalues greater than one (Dunton & Fazio, 1997). The combined total of these factors accounted for 56% of the variance. To test the stability and replicability of the factor structure,

Dunton and Fazio (1997) employed a factor comparability procedure recommended by Everett (1983). An examination of the factor score coefficient matrix that was derived from two independent samples suggested that a two-factor structure was stable and replicable across these samples. The first factor, measuring concern with acting prejudiced, accounted for 23.1% of the variance. The second factor, measuring restraint to avoid dispute, accounted for 11.6% of the variance. A correlation between the two factors has not been reported in the research publications on the MCPR scale.

The criterion-related validity of the MCPR was examined in a series of studies reported in Fazio et al. (1995), Dunton and Fazio (1997), and Fazio and Dunton (1997). Fazio et al. (1995) found that higher scores on the MCPR were statistically related to less prejudiced attitudes as measured by the Modern Racism Scale (MRS). An interaction effect also emerged. As scores on the MCPR decreased, the statistical relationship between scores on the MRS and an indirect measure of racial prejudice involving social judgment reaction time increased. Specifically, high MCPR scores (higher motivation to control prejudice) were correlated with high MRS scores, and the interaction between these two scales was statistically significant and predicted positive attitudes on an unobtrusive measure of racial attitudes.

Dunton and Fazio (1997) replicated the Fazio et al. study in order to examine the influence of the two identified factors of the MCPR (e.g., concern for acting prejudiced, restraint to avoid dispute) in predicting racially prejudiced attitudes, as measured by the MRS and an unobtrusive measure. They found that positive racial attitudes scores on the unobtrusive measure could be predicted from the interaction between high scores on the Concern with Acting Prejudiced (CAP) factor and low scores on the MRS. This indicated that if an individual has low explicit prejudiced attitudes and a high motivation to control prejudiced reactions they are likely to have less implicit racially prejudiced attitudes. Similar to the prior findings on the full scale MCPR, the interaction between low scores on the CAP factor and negative racial attitudes, as measured by the MRS, were predictive of negative racial attitudes, as measured by the unobtrusive priming procedure. In contrast, an interaction between the MRS and the Restraint to Avoid Dispute (RAD) factor did not predict scores on an unobtrusive measure priming procedure. Dunton and Fazio suggested that the prediction of negative racial attitudes by an unobtrusive measure can best be accounted for by the CAP factor of the MCPR scale.

Additional research by Fazio and Dunton (1997) found that individuals with high MCPR scores tended to use race less in a similarity judgment task. As in prior investigations, type and speed of social judgments varied based on an interaction between MCPR scores and a behavioral task involving perception of race. These relationships varied in the predicted direction.

This study provided further evidence of the criterion-related validity of the MCPR.

Evaluation

The MCPR scale is the first instrument of its kind to measure an individual's motivation to control expressions of prejudice. This measure represents an important conceptual development in understanding individual differences in social judgment processes. Given that the scale is composed of 17 items, it is efficient and easy to use in research. The MCPR has been specifically used as a moderating variable between an explicit and implicit measure of racial prejudice, and further study is needed before the MCPR is used outside this specific research context.

Although the MCPR has acceptable levels of internal consistency, further research is needed to examine the internal consistency and temporal stability of the full scale and subscales. Dunton and Fazio (1997) and Fazio and Dunton (1997) presented strong evidence of the MCPR's construct validity through a factor analysis and experimental investigations using the MCPR as a moderator variable. It is important that additional studies explore the construct validity of the MCPR by analyzing discriminant and convergent validity patterns and by further analyzing the underlying factor structure using confirmatory factor analyses with other samples. The studies presented in this review focused on White participants, and it remains unclear conceptually and empirically if these social judgment processes are applicable to individuals outside diverse racial backgrounds. Finally, Schmidt, Hunter, and Urry (1976) found that sample sizes of 200 or more were needed to reflect accurate validity levels in the population 90% of the time. The experimental investigations had small sample sizes; consequently, it is important that sample sizes be increased in future validity studies.

An important issue to resolve is the use of the total MCPR scale score or the subscale scores. In the investigation by Dunton and Fazio (1997), the CAP factor was found to significantly contribute to the prediction of unobtrusive measure scores, whereas the RAD factor did not contribute to the prediction equation. Certainly, further study is needed, but it currently appears that the CAP factor is primarily responsible for the interaction effect between MRS scores and the unobtrusive measure of racial prejudice.

Theoretically, the motivation to control prejudice reactions represents an important conceptual advancement with respect to prejudice reduction. Current and past prejudice reduction efforts have focused on attempts to reduce negative stereotypes or prejudicial attitudes (Ponterotto & Pedersen, 1993). MCPR represents an operational definition of an individual differences construct that is thought to affect both controlled and automatic

social judgment processes, and that may be an appropriate target for future prejudice reduction efforts.

THE MODERN HOMOPHOBIA SCALE

Description and Development

To keep pace with the more subtle forms of prejudice expressed in contemporary society, conceptual and empirical advances have been made with respect to the measurement of racist attitudes. Similar advances have been slower to evolve with respect to the measurement of prejudice toward lesbian women and gay men. Recognizing this need, Raja and Stokes (1998) sought to develop a contemporary measure of prejudiced attitudes toward lesbian women and gay men to address three concerns. First, noting that older measures of racism and sexism have been updated to reflect the relatively more subtle forms of prejudice that appear to be expressed today (Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995), Raja and Stokes (1998) identified a need to "update the content of some of the older homophobia scales" (p. 115) in a similar manner. Second, older measures of antigay prejudice ask about "homosexuals" or "homosexuality" in general, rather than differentiating between attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women (e.g., Kite & Deaux, 1986; Larsen, Reed, & Hoffman, 1980). Finally, Raja and Stokes (1998) sought to operationally differentiate personal discomfort and institutional discrimination toward lesbian women and gay men.

The Modern Homophobia Scale (MHS) consists of two subscales: the attitudes toward lesbians subscale (MHS-L) and the attitudes toward gay men subscale (MHS-G). The MHS consists of 46 total items (24 of which comprise the MHS-L and 22 of which comprise the MHS-G). Items are presented in an agree-disagree format on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*do not agree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Sample items from the MHS-L are "Employers should provide health care benefits to the partners of their lesbian employees," "I wouldn't mind working with a lesbian," and "Female homosexuality is a psychological disease." Sample items from the MHS-G are "I wouldn't mind going to a party that included gay men," "Male homosexuality is a psychological disease," and "I would not vote for a political candidate who was openly gay."

Psychometric Properties

Psychometric data for the MHS are reported in Raja and Stokes (1998), and the sample for the development of the MHS consisted of 322 undergraduate students.

Reliability. Coefficient alphas for the MHS-L and MHS-G were reported to be .95 for each of the two subscales. Coefficient alphas for each of the three MHS-L factors were reported as follows: (a) .89 for Factor 1, institutional homophobia toward lesbians; (b) .92 for Factor 2, personal discomfort when associating with lesbians; and (c) .90 for Factor 3, the belief that female homosexuality is deviant and changeable. The coefficient alphas for each of the three MHS-G factors were reported as follows: (a) .91 for Factor 1, personal discomfort when associating with gay men; (b) .85 for Factor 2, the belief that male homosexuality is deviant and changeable; and (c) .90 for Factor 3, institutional homophobia toward gay men.

Validity. Since Raja and Stokes (1998) intended to measure attitudes toward gay men and attitudes toward lesbian women separately, separate factor analyses were performed for the two subscales. A principal factors extraction and oblique rotation were implemented. After restricting the range of item-to-total correlations, eliminating items not meeting criteria recommended by Schmitt (1993), and including only those factors with coefficient alphas of greater than .80, three factors were identified as best representing the items for each of the two MHS subscales. The three combined factors for the MHS-L accounted for 47.3% of the variance in MHS-L scores, and the three combined factors for the MHS-G accounted for 44.9% of the variance in MHS-G scores. High intercorrelations among the factors were noted. Correlations among the MHS-L factors were reported to range from .60 to .74, and correlations among the MHS-G factors were reported to range from .71 to .82. Correlations between MHS-L and MHS-G factors were reported to range from .57 to .90.

To further explore the construct validity of the MHS, correlational patterns between scores on the MHS and certain respondent variables were examined. In comparing MHS-L and MHS-G scores by gender of respondent, Raja and Stokes (1998) found that a gender difference in responding emerged in the predicted direction. Male respondents endorsed more negative attitudes as compared to female respondents, although they indicated more positive attitudes toward lesbians than toward gay men. Conversely, female respondents endorsed more positive attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbian women.

A consistent finding that has emerged across studies of the correlates of antigay prejudice is that persons who report having had contact with gay male and lesbian individuals tend to endorse more positive attitudes toward these persons as compared to persons who report that they have had no such contact (Herek & Glunt, 1993). As expected, Raja and Stokes (1998) found that female respondents who indicated that they had at least one lesbian friend-acquaintance endorsed statistically significantly lower personal discomfort factor scores as compared to female respondents who indicated that they had no lesbian friends-acquaintances. Similarly, male

respondents who indicated that they had at least one gay male friend-acquaintance had less personal discomfort (as measured by the personal discomfort factor of the MHS-G) as compared to male respondents who indicated that they had no gay male friends-acquaintances.

Criterion-related validity was examined by correlating scores on the MHS-L and MHS-G with scores on an existing measure of homophobia, the Index of Homophobia (IHP; Hudson & Ricketts, 1980) and with a measure of traditional beliefs about women's roles, the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (ATWS; Helmreich & Spence, 1978). As expected, higher scores on the MHS-L and MHS-G, indicating greater endorsement of antigay beliefs, were found to be significantly related to higher scores on the IHP, also indicating greater endorsement of antigay beliefs. Higher scores on the MHS-L and MHS-G were also found to be statistically significantly associated with higher scores on the ATWS, indicating more traditional beliefs about women's roles. Further evidence of criterion-related validity was established by examining correlations between negative affective reactions to vignettes containing a gay male, lesbian, or heterosexual target and scores on the MHS-L and MHS-G. A statistically significant relationship was found between negative affective reactions and higher MHS scores for participants whose target character was a gay or lesbian person, indicating that the MHS-L and MHS-G may accurately predict negative affective reactions to lesbian women and gay men.

Raja and Stokes (1998) expected that lower levels of homophobia, as measured by both the MHS and IHP, would be associated with higher levels of socially desirable responding, as measured by the Impression Management scale of the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR-IMP; Paulhus & Reid, 1991). Contrary to prediction, higher BIDR-IMP scores were found to be related to greater levels of homophobia, as measured by both the IHP and MHS.

Evaluation

The MHS represents a more contemporary approach to defining and measuring heterosexual persons' negative attitudes toward lesbian women and gay men. A strength of the measure is that, in keeping with contemporary measures and theoretical formulations of other forms of prejudice, it attempts to "tap into" the more subtle prejudicial beliefs that may be represented among the general population today. Another strength of the measure is that it represents an attempt at conceptually and operationally differentiating heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbian women and their attitudes toward gay men. Moreover, it represents an initial attempt to make a distinction between a personal discomfort dimension of negative attitudes toward lesbian women and gay men and a cultural-institutional

dimension having to do with one's beliefs about these individuals' fundamental rights in society.

Since the MHS is a relatively new measure, psychometric data reported here are limited to those reported by the instrument developers based on the sample on which the measure was constructed. The scale developers report satisfactory estimates of internal consistency for the instrument; however, additional research is needed to examine the internal consistency and temporal stability of the instrument. Solid evidence of the construct validity of the MHS was provided by the test developers through separate factor analyses of subscales, and an examination of correlational patterns with other conceptually related measures (e.g., ATWS and IHP). Moreover, during initial validation of the MHS, the frequent finding that male respondents tend to endorse stronger antigay attitudes as compared to female respondents was replicated, as was the expectation of an interaction between sex of respondent and sex of target, with women endorsing more negative attitudes toward lesbians than toward gay men and men endorsing more negative attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbian women.

Since the validation studies reported here are limited to the sample upon which the measure was constructed, it will be important that additional validation studies of the MHS are undertaken across demographically diverse samples. The high intercorrelations among the MHS-L and MHS-G factors suggest significant construct overlap and redundancy. This finding may suggest that a general homophobia factor may account for the intercorrelations between the MHS factors. Future investigations should include confirmatory factor analyses to test the generalizability of the MHS factor structure across samples as well as higher-order factor analyses to test for a general factor of homophobia and the underlying factor structure. It will be important to subject the relationship between the MHS-L and MHS-G to further statistical examination, as the correlations between the two subscales were not reported by Raja and Stokes (1998). Further examination of the finding of a positive relationship between greater endorsement of antigay prejudice and more socially desirable responding is certainly in order, since this finding may have important implications to the study and prevention of negative attitudes toward lesbian women and gay men.

EMERGING ISSUES IN PREJUDICE MEASUREMENT

LIMITS OF SELF-REPORT MEASURES

One predominant concern in the measurement of prejudice has been the reactivity of self-report measures (Crosby, Bromley, & Saxe, 1980). In

essence, respondents can vary their scores on measures of prejudice by discerning the content of the items of the scale and making a decision whether to provide a response that is more reflective of their attitudes or one that represents a deliberately managed response to present themselves in a favorable light. From the empirical evidence on the MCPR scale presented earlier in this chapter, we see that some individuals are motivated to control their prejudiced responses (Dunton & Fazio, 1997). This suggests that self-report measures of prejudice are inherently limited and that construct validity may be compromised (Sniderman & Tetlock, 1986).

The reactivity of self-report measures has led some researchers to question the validity of measuring prejudice with this methodology (Crosby et al., 1980; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). This would seem to be an extreme position, and evidence presented by Fazio et al. (1995) and Dunton and Fazio (1997) would seem to suggest that self-report measures do have a place in the assessment of explicit prejudice. In a comprehensive review of self-report prejudice measures, Biernat and Crandall (1999) expressed a strongly favorable view of self-report as a measurement tool, asserting their "faith that the heart of modern-day racial attitudes can be successfully measured through self-report" (p. 298). Yet multiculturalism has taught our field to question its "faith" in traditional assumptions. Although measurement of prejudice through self-report measures may be an important assessment tool, it may also represent a conceptually and empirically limited perspective.

More recent prejudice attitude research has resulted in the development of conceptual models and measures that recognize both automatic and controlled processes (Devine & Monteith, 1999), or what is also referred to as implicit and explicit prejudice processes (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995). Thus, if counselor educators and researchers are to move forward in understanding and measuring prejudice and in developing appropriate interventions, prejudice must be seen as a multidimensional construct and measured as such. One specific implication for counseling researchers that follows from this more contemporary view of prejudice is that alternative methodologies to self-report measures may be important to prejudice assessment. We strongly disagree with Biernat and Crandall's (1999) "faith" perspective and feel that alternative and novel measurement approaches must be encouraged and explored to help facilitate better understanding of the nature of prejudice and to assist practitioners in the design of appropriate prejudice reduction programs.

IMPLICIT PREJUDICE

The assumption underlying self-report measures of prejudice is that the processes involved in prejudice are explicit by nature. Even more recent

conceptual or operational definitions of prejudice, such as modern racism (McConahay, 1986), symbolic racism (Sears, 1988), and modern homophobia (Raja & Stokes, 1998) assume that attitudes are accessible consciously and that individuals are able to consciously manage their prejudice in response to members of target groups.

Contrary to the assumption of explicit prejudice processes underlying traditional self-report measures of prejudice, recent research efforts in the area of social cognition suggest that the expression of prejudice involves simultaneous implicit and explicit processes (Devine, 1989; Devine & Monteith, 1999; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995). Although a full theoretical treatment of explicit and implicit prejudice is not appropriate here (see Devine & Monteith, 1999; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995), a conceptual definition for implicit prejudice will be facilitative in understanding relevant measurement issues. Greenwald and Banaji (1995) suggest the following definition: "Implicit attitudes are introspectively unidentified (or inaccurately identified) traces of past experience that mediate favorable or unfavorable feeling, thought, or action toward social objects" (p. 8). In essence, past experiences that are not remembered through explicit memory, and which are inaccessible through introspection or self-reflection, affect some behavior.

Evidence of implicit prejudice has been presented primarily in experimental studies (e.g., Devine, 1989; Fazio et al., 1995; Gilbert & Hixon, 1991). Such evidence suggests that the expressions of implicit and explicit prejudice are concurrent but independent social cognitive processes. Thus, it may be that explicit measures of prejudice measure conscious content of prejudicial attitudes, and implicit measures of prejudice measure people's social judgment processes with respect to those attitudes (von Hippel, Sekaquaptewa, & Vargas, 1997). Although the initial evidence suggests that implicit and explicit prejudice are independent processes, Bargh (1989, 1994) has argued that operational definitions of implicit prejudice have not been held to stringent criteria in delineating these underlying processes. This lack of definitional clarity has served as a measurement confound and has, on occasion, led to empirically and conceptually unclear results.

One of the difficulties in the measurement of implicit prejudice is one of practical utility. Judgment latencies have often been used as an individual differences measure of implicit social cognition (e.g., Devine, 1989; Dunton & Fazio, 1997; Fazio et al., 1995). These measurement techniques are computer and technology dependent. Within the context of counseling, educational workshops, or supervision, counselors would rarely find judgment latencies a practical tool in the measurement of implicit racism. Essentially, measures of implicit prejudice that are conceptually and empirically valid and have practical utility are needed.

BRIDGING THE GAP: LINGUISTIC INTERGROUP BIAS

Maas, Salvi, Arcuri, and Semin (1989) developed a model of in-group/out-group prejudice behavior called Linguistic Intergroup Bias (LIB), which is based on Semin and Fiedler's (1988) psycholinguistic model. Semin and Fiedler's model identified four distinct linguistic categories that could be used to describe people. These linguistic categories varied in descriptive complexity from concrete, behaviorally focused descriptions of people, to abstract, trait-focused descriptions (e.g., descriptive action verb, interpretative action verb, state verb, and adjectives). Maas et al. (1989) applied this model to stereotyping in-group and out-group members. They found that concrete, behavioral descriptions (descriptive action verbs) were used by participants when identifying stereotype-incongruent behaviors; whereas, participants used more abstract, trait-focused descriptions (adjectives) when identifying stereotype-congruent behaviors.

Recently, von Hippel et al. (1997) suggested that LIB could be used as a conceptual basis for measuring implicit racial prejudice. Adapting the LIB stimulus materials from Maas et al. (1989), von Hippel et al. developed a booklet containing a series of various ersatz newspaper articles (e.g., basketball slam-dunk contest winner, employee embezzling money from a computer firm, spelling-bee winner planning to attend MIT, jewelry thief that lived in subsidized housing). Stereotype congruency-incongruency was controlled through these newspaper articles by pairing either an African American or White photograph with the various articles. Consistent with Maas et al.'s application of Semin and Fiedler's (1988) model, below each article-photograph pairing were four descriptive statements, varying in complexity from abstract to concrete, describing the person portrayed in the article. Participants rated the accuracy of the description based on a 10-point scale anchored from 1 (*describes very poorly*) to 10 (*describes very well*).

In two specific studies involving White undergraduate students, von Hippel et al. (1997) found support for the LIB measurement technique. In both experimental studies, it was found that implicit prejudice toward African Americans, as measured by LIB, predicted differential responses of perceived threat by African American and Caucasian targets. More specifically, White respondents' scores on an explicit measure of prejudice (MRS) predicted higher perceived threat in Caucasian targets rather than African American targets, whereas the findings from the LIB measure resulted in higher ratings of perceived threat from African American targets as opposed to Caucasian targets. The scores on the explicit measure would seem to reflect more socially desirable responses and support the notion that LIB is measuring an independent social judgment process. This

evidence would seem to suggest that LIB may be a valuable measure of implicit prejudice.

There are some important implications with respect to implicit prejudice measurement that can be drawn from von Hippel et al.'s (1997) research on LIB. One of the difficulties of measures of implicit prejudice is that they have often been reliant on fairly sophisticated computer equipment that has little practical utility for multicultural counselors and educators. LIB, as operationally defined by von Hippel et al., represents an important paper-and-pencil measure of implicit racism that is relatively simple to administer and score. In this sense, von Hippel et al.'s technique has great practical utility without sacrificing conceptual integrity. It appears to be a promising measure of individual differences with respect to implicit prejudice. At this stage of development, however, LIB is experimental and needs further research and development. All aspects of the psychometric properties of the instrument need to be subjected to empirical examination.

CLARIFYING CONCEPTUALIZATIONS AND OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

Although some initial investigations are indicating that explicit and implicit prejudicial attitudes and processes are independent (e.g., Devine, 1989; Fazio et al., 1995; von Hippel et al., 1997), not all studies support this finding (Wittenbrink, Judd, & Park, 1997). One of the major difficulties in comparing results of implicit prejudice is a lack of consistency across studies in the criteria used to operationalize the concept. Bargh (1989, 1994) identified a variety of methods through which implicit prejudice has been operationalized in research. A definitional confound may account for the empirical differences across investigations. It is important that future research conduct criterion-related validity studies to explore how or if implicit prejudice measures are conceptually related and empirically correlated.

A second related issue is the contrast between content and process issues in the measurement of prejudice. In examining the focus of past prejudice attitude scales, von Hippel et al. (1997) have suggested that these scales have tended to focus on the content of prejudice rather than the underlying processes. This would suggest that responses to self-report instruments are an outcome of a social judgment process, and this may in part account for the differences found between explicit and implicit measures of prejudice. Several recent models of attitude measurement (see Fazio et al., 1995) have focused on prejudice judgment processes. Counseling researchers should familiarize themselves with these models and explore how these

contemporary conceptual models may be used to better understand the role of prejudiced attitudes and behavioral expression.

There are important conceptual and definitional issues that are specific to the measurement of antigay prejudice. In contrast to other forms of prejudice, such as racism, prejudice toward gay men and lesbians potentially involves the evaluation of a target person with respect to two social dimensions: gender and sexual orientation. Others have argued that the literature on negative attitudes toward gay men and lesbians has not typically taken into account the complexity of those attitudes; thus sex differences that emerge in studies of anti-gay prejudice are still not well understood (Kite & Whitley, 1996). Specifically, it is not clear for what reasons heterosexual men tend to endorse greater degrees of anti-gay prejudice as compared to heterosexual women, although support for traditional gender roles for women was identified as an important mediating variable in a meta-analysis of sex differences in antigay prejudice (Kite & Whitley, 1996). Another issue related to gender of respondents in anti-gay prejudice research is that in some studies an interaction between sex of respondent and sex of target has emerged (Herek, 1994; Kite & Whitley, 1996). Specifically, in some studies heterosexual men endorse more negative attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbians, whereas heterosexual women endorse more negative attitudes toward lesbians than toward gay men. However, this has not been a consistent finding across studies (Herek, 1994).

The development of the MHS represents an important conceptual step forward in beginning to think about attitudes toward lesbian women and attitudes toward gay men as separate constructs entirely. It has long been argued that attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women should be examined separately, and others have developed psychometrically sound measures that allow for this differential examination (Herek, 1994). However, the items comprising such scales are based on similar conceptualizations of the two constructs (Herek, 1994). It is possible that the specific belief structure and social judgment processes underlying negative attitudes toward lesbian women is different from the belief structure and underlying social judgment processes underlying negative attitudes toward gay men. Advances that have been made with respect to implicit prejudice could be helpful in further delineating such distinctions.

An interesting finding from the initial validation studies of the MHS was that socially desirable responding was associated with higher rather than lower homophobia scores. This finding could suggest that, in contrast to other forms of prejudice, anti-gay prejudice may be considered to be the most desirable form of responding with respect to gay and lesbian individuals. This is a possibility, given the fact that many states have yet to pass legislation protecting gay men and lesbians from discrimination in such areas as housing and employment (Herek, 1993, 1994). Further investigation of this finding is recommended, as it has potentially important implications

for educators and researchers in the area of anti-gay prejudice prevention and reduction.

CONCLUSION

This chapter critically reviewed several contemporary developments in the measurement of prejudice. As a group, the instruments reviewed represent important definitional developments in understanding the nature and measurement of prejudice. Clearly, one of the important conceptual trends is the recognition of implicit and explicit prejudice as concurrent but separate social judgment processes. This advancement in prejudice theory has led to the development of both innovative self-report and novel measurement instruments, which have implications for practice and research. In bringing this chapter to a close, we offer some final summary comments about the direction of future research and implications for educational and clinical practice.

The first general area of discussion concerns several issues important to continuing the development of theory and measurement of prejudice. The following areas represent important research directions. First, the LIB procedure and self-report measures reviewed for this chapter must continue to be the focus of validity and reliability studies. Although evidence for each measure had some initial supporting evidence, these findings need to be replicated with other samples, especially with samples outside the context of a university environment. Second, Ponterotto et al. (1995) and Miville et al. (1999) have recognized the need to explore conceptual and empirical meanings of prejudice in diverse groups; however, few investigators have actually explored prejudicial processes beyond African American and White relations. Clearly, White prejudice toward African Americans constitutes a major societal problem in the United States (Sue & Sue, 1999) as well as globally (Ponterotto & Pedersen, 1993). To develop a more complete understanding of prejudicial processes and attitudes, however, research must expand beyond the confines of African American and White relations. For example, heterosexual and gay/lesbian relations have been underresearched, as have race relations between other racial/ethnic populations (e.g., Asian Americans, Hispanic/Latino Americans, and Native American Indians). A related concern involves prejudice toward bisexual individuals. There is a great need for the development of theoretical conceptualizations and operational definitions of prejudice toward members of this neglected group in prejudice research. Finally, prejudice is rapidly being recognized as a multidimensional construct both in terms of process (e.g., explicit and implicit) and content (e.g., homophobia, racial discrimination, and universal-diverse orientation). New dimensions of prejudice and corresponding measures continue to be developed and published. For

example, Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, and Browne (2000) recently operationalized color-blindness attitude to racism and racial issues through the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale. Research efforts should incorporate these new developments, and seek to clarify conceptually and empirically the various dimensions of prejudice.

The second direction in prejudice research concerns the methodological processes used for measurement. In particular, implicit prejudice may challenge counseling researchers to examine and use alternative or novel measurement methodologies. Counseling researchers may want to familiarize themselves with technology-based measures, such as reaction latencies and priming procedures (see Dovidio & Fazio, 1992), as well as psychophysiological measures of prejudice (see Guglielmi, 1999). Although these measurement strategies may be outside the domain of common practice in counseling research, stretching ourselves into these alternative measurement methodologies may prove to be productive in facilitating our understanding of prejudice and its various behavioral expressions. Another consideration is the development of additional alternative measures. For example, Greenwald and Banaji (1995) indicated that projective techniques have proved useful in the measurement of achievement motivation (Spangler, 1992), and that projectives may be useful in the assessment of implicit prejudice. It appears that we are only limited by our creativity.

In the introduction to this chapter, we recognized the commitment of, and challenges for, counseling educators and practitioners in reducing various forms of prejudice. In that endeavor, measurement of prejudice marks our progress in changing prejudicial attitudes and facilitates understanding and clarification of prejudicial processes. For those of us who are practitioners, some of these ideas may appear abstract and obtuse. However, the initial evidence based on measures of implicit prejudice reviewed in this chapter suggests that prejudice reduction efforts targeted solely toward explicit prejudice attitudes may not address implicit dimensions of prejudice. In this sense, measurement can help inform practice. The recent advances in conceptualization and measurement of prejudice discussed in this chapter clearly represent creative efforts and a beginning toward understanding the multidimensional nature of prejudice and the implications that this understanding may have for changing these attitudes.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Anderson, J. (1983). Lix and Rix: Variations on a little-known readability index. *Journal of Reading*, 26, 490-496.
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Heatherton, T. G. (1994). A general approach to representing multifaceted personality constructs: Application to state self-esteem. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 1, 35-67.

- Banaji, M. R., & Greenwald, A. G. (1994). Implicit stereotyping and unconscious prejudice. In M. P. Zanna & J. M. Olson (Eds.), *The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario Symposium* (Vol. 7, pp. 55-76). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bargh, J. A. (1989). Conditional automaticity: Varieties of automatic influence in social perception and cognition. In J. S. Uleman & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *Unintended thought* (pp. 3-51). New York: Guilford.
- Bargh, J. A. (1994). The four horseman of automaticity: Awareness, intention, efficiency, and control in social cognition. In R. S. Wyer, Jr., & T. K. Srull (Eds.), *Handbook of social cognition* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 1-40). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Biernat, M., & Crandall, C. S. (1999). Racial attitudes. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of social psychology attitudes: Volume 2. Measures of political attitudes* (pp. 297-411). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Bogardus, E. S. (1933). A social distance scale. *Sociology and Social Research*, 17, 265-271.
- Crosby, F., Bromley, S., & Saxe, L. (1980). Recent unobtrusive studies of Black-and-White discrimination and prejudice: A literature review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 87, 546-563.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24, 349-354.
- Davis, M. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 10, 85.
- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 5-18.
- Devine, P. G., & Monteith, M. J. (1999). Automaticity and control in stereotyping. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-process theories in social psychology* (pp. 339-360). New York: Guilford.
- Dovidio, J. F., & Fazio, R. H. (1992). New technologies for the direct and indirect assessment of attitudes. In J. M. Tanur (Ed.), *Questions about questions: Inquiries into the cognitive bases of surveys* (pp. 204-236). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Dunton, B. C., & Fazio, R. H. (1997). An individual difference measure of motivation to control prejudiced reactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 316-326.
- Everett, J. E. (1983). Factor comparability as a means of determining the number of factors and their rotation. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 18, 197-218.
- Fazio, R. H. (1990). Multiple processes by which attitudes guide behavior: The MODE model as an integrative framework. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 23, pp. 75-109). New York: Academic Press.
- Fazio, R. H., & Dunton, B. C. (1997). Categorization by race: The impact of automatic and controlled components of racial prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 33, 451-470.
- Fazio, R. H., Jackson, J. R., Dunton, B. C., & Williams, C. J. (1995). Variability in automatic activation as an unobtrusive measure of racial attitudes: A bona fide pipeline? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 1013-1027.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In S. L. Gaertner & J. F. Dovidio (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 61-89). New York: Academic Press.
- Gilbert, D. T., & Hixon, J. G. (1991). The trouble with thinking: Activation and application of stereotypic beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 509-517.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, 102, 4-27.
- Guglielmi, R. S. (1999). Psychophysiological assessment of prejudice: Past research, current status, and future directions. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3, 123-157.
- Helmreich, R. L., & Spence, J. T. (1978). Work and family orientation questionnaire: An objective instrument to assess components of achievement motivation and attitudes toward family and career. *Catalogue of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 8, 35.
- Herek, G. M. (1993). The context of antigay violence: Notes on cultural and psychological heterosexism. In L. Garnets & D. C. Kimmel (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on lesbian and gay male experiences* (pp. 89-107). New York: Columbia University Press.

- Herek, G. M. (1994). Assessing heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. In B. Greene & G. M. Herek (Eds.), *Lesbian and gay psychology: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 206-228). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Herek, G. M., & Glunt, E. K. (1993). Interpersonal contact and heterosexuals' attitudes toward gay men: Results from a national survey. *Journal of Sex Research, 30*, 239-244.
- Hudson, W. W., & Ricketts, W. A. (1980). A strategy for the measurement of homophobia. *Journal of Homosexuality, 5*, 357-372.
- Jacobson, C. R. (1985). Resistance to affirmative action: Self-interest or racism. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 29*, 306-329.
- Katz, P., & Taylor, D. (Eds.). (1998). *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy*. New York: Plenum.
- Kite, M. E. (1984). Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexuals: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Homosexuality, 10*, 69-81.
- Kite, M. E., & Deaux, K. (1986). Attitudes toward homosexuality: Assessment and behavioral consequences. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology, 7*, 137-162.
- Kite, M. E., & Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1996). Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexual persons, behaviors, and civil rights: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 336-353.
- Larsen, K. S., Reed, M., & Hoffman, S. (1980). Attitudes of heterosexuals toward homosexuality: A Likert-type scale and construct validity. *Journal of Sex Research, 16*, 245-257.
- Maas, A., Salvi, D., Arcuri, L., & Semin, G. (1989). Language use in intergroup contexts: The Linguistic Intergroup Bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 981-993.
- McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the modern racism scale. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91-125). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Miville, M. L. (1992). *Measuring and defining universal orientation*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland at College Park.
- Miville, M. L., Gelso, C. J., Pannu, R., Liu, W., Touradji, P., Holloway, P., & Fuertes, J. (1999). Appreciating similarities and valuing differences: The Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46*, 291-307.
- Miville, M. L., Romans, J. S. C., Johnson, D., & Lone, R. (1998, August). *Exploring correlates of well-functioning using the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale*. Poster session presented at the 106th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco.
- Neville, H. A., Lilly, R. L., Duran, G., Lee, R. M., & Browne, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*, 59-70.
- O'Donohue, W., & Caselles, C. E. (1993). Homophobia: Conceptual, definitional, and value issues. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 15*, 177-195.
- Paulhus, D. L., & Reid, D. B. (1991). Enhancement and denial in socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 307-317.
- Ponterotto, J. G., Burkard, A. W., Rieger, B. P., Grieger, I., D'Onofrio, A., Dubuisson, A., Heenehan, M., Millstein, B., Parisi, M., Rath, J. F., & Sax, G. (1995). Development and initial validation of the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI). *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 55*, 1016-1031.
- Ponterotto, J. G., & Pedersen, P. B. (1993). *Preventing prejudice: A guide for counselors and educators*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ponterotto, J. G., Rieger, B. P., Barrett, A., Harris, G., Sparks, R., Sanchez, C. M., & Magids, D. (1993, September). *Development and initial validation of the Multicultural Awareness Scale (MCAS)*. Paper presented at the Ninth Buros-Nebraska Symposium on Measurement and Testing: Multicultural Assessment, Lincoln.
- Raja, S., & Stokes, J. P. (1998). Assessing attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: The Modern Homophobia Scale. *Journal of Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Identity, 3*, 113-134.
- Schmidt, F. L., Hunter, J. E., & Urry, V. W. (1976). Statistical power in criterion-related validity studies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 61*, 473-485.

- Schmitt, N. (1993). *Test construction*. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University.
- Schwanberg, S. L. (1993). Attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women: Instrumentation issues. *Journal of Homosexuality, 26*, 99-136.
- Sears, D. O. (1988). Symbolic racism. In P. Katz & D. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 53-84). New York: Plenum.
- Semin, G. K., & Fiedler, K. (1988). The cognitive functions of linguistic categories in describing persons: Social cognition and language. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 558-568.
- Sniderman, P., & Tetlock, P. (1986). Symbolic racism: Problems of motive attribution in political analysis. *Journal of Social Issues, 42*, 423-447.
- Spangler, W. D. (1992). Validity of questionnaire and TAT measures of need for achievement: Two meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*, 140-154.
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (1999). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley.
- Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 199-214.
- Utsey, S. O., & Ponterotto, J. G. (1999). Further factorial validity assessment of scores on the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI). *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 59*, 325-335.
- von Hippel, W., Sekaquaptewa, D., & Vargas, P. (1997). The linguistic intergroup bias as an implicit indicator of prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 33*, 490-509.
- Vontress, C. E. (1988). An existential approach to cross-cultural counseling. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 16*, 78-83.
- Vontress, C. E. (1996). A personal retrospective on cross-cultural counseling. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 24*, 156-166.
- Walsh, W. B., & Betz, N. E. (1990). *Tests and assessment* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Wittenbrink, B., Judd, C. M., & Park, B. (1997). Evidence for racial prejudice at the implicit level and its relationship with questionnaire measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 262-274.

Correspondence regarding this chapter may be addressed to Alan W. Burkard, School of Education, Schroeder Health Complex 138, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI 53201 (e-mail address: alan.burkard@marquette.edu).