

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MINORITY STATUSES AND PREJUDICE

A Dissertation

by

MIA VEVE

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2007

Major Subject: Counseling Psychology

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MINORITY STATUSES AND PREJUDICE

A Dissertation

by

MIA VEVE

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Chair of Committee,
Committee Members,

Head of Department,

Donna Davenport
Michael Duffy
David Lawson
Michael Speed
Michael Benz

August 2007

Major Subject: Counseling Psychology

ABSTRACT

The Relationship between Minority Statuses and Prejudice.

(August 2007)

Mia Veve, B.S., Texas A&M University;

M.Ed., Texas A&M University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Donna S. Davenport

It is important to explore prejudice to understand and learn how to decrease it. There is a central belief that “personal knowledge reduces prejudice.” Does a person who has personal knowledge of prejudice, for example, those of minority status have less prejudice towards others? There has been considerable research on the prejudice that the majority might feel towards minorities but there is limited research on minorities’ prejudice towards others. The current study focuses on the relationship between a person of self-perceived minority statuses and her or his feelings of prejudice towards others (e.g. minorities and mainstream).

Previous research had found a positive correlation between fundamentalism and prejudice. This study investigated that relationship and a positive correlation was found. Another aspect that has been studied in previous research, dealing with prejudice and self reports, is social desirability. This study investigated the relationship between social desirability and multiple minority statuses and no statistical significance was found.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized to investigate the relationship between multiple minority statuses and prejudice. The analysis showed no statistical significance on the relationship between multiple minority statuses and prejudice.

There is still a lot about prejudice that remains unknown. This area of research should be investigated further to better understand minority prejudice, which in turn might lead us to overcome its negative effects.

DEDICATION

To my parents Gino and Mari, for their unwavering love, support and encouragement without which, I would be lost. I would not have achieved all that I have without my father's example to follow and my mother's support.

Gracias a la Vida by Violeta Parra

Gracias a la vida que me ha dado tanto. Me dio dos luceros que, cuando los abro, perfecto distingo lo negro del blanco, y en el alto cielo su fondo estrellado y en las multitudes el hombre que yo amo.

Gracias a la vida que me ha dado tanto. Me ha dado el oído que, en todo su ancho, graba noche y día grillos y canarios; martillos, turbinas, ladridos, chubascos, y la voz tan tierna de mi bien amado.

Gracias a la vida que me ha dado tanto. Me ha dado el sonido y el abecedario, con él las palabras que pienso y declaro: madre, amigo, hermano, y luz alumbrando la ruta del alma del que estoy amando.

Gracias a la vida que me ha dado tanto. Me ha dado la marcha de mis pies cansados; con ellos anduve ciudades y charcos, playas y desiertos, montañas y llanos, y la casa tuya, tu calle y tu patio.

Gracias a la vida que me ha dado tanto. Me dio el corazón que agita su marco cuando miro el fruto del cerebro humano; cuando miro el bueno tan lejos del malo, cuando miro el fondo de tus ojos claros.

Gracias a la vida que me ha dado tanto. Me ha dado la risa y me ha dado el llanto. Así yo distingo dicha de quebranto, los dos materiales que forman mi canto, y el canto de ustedes que es el mismo canto y el canto de todos, que es mi propio canto.

Gracias a la vida que me ha dado tanto.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank several individuals for their love, support, guidance, and encouragement. I would not have achieved all that I have without them.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my family for their unwavering support and the love which has always been felt and cherished. I owe my deepest gratitude to my father for being a role model and a source of strength. To my mother I have nothing but the highest appreciation for her support.

Next, I would like to thank my chair Dr. Donna Davenport for her encouragement, time, guidance, support and words of wisdom. From her I have learned the true definition of being a teacher and an exemplary individual. I would also like to thank Dr. David Lawson for his support, time and guidance and for stepping in and helping even when it was not required.

A special thank you goes to Dr. Christopher Hogan and Dr. Carol O'Saben from Appalachian State University for their support and encouragement throughout the dissertation writing process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
Rationale for Study.....	1
Problem Statement.....	4
Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	5
Purpose of Study.....	6
Terms.....	7
Organization of Study.....	9
II LITERATURE REVIEW.....	10
Prejudice.....	10
Gender.....	14
Sexual Orientation.....	16
Disabilities.....	18
Race and Ethnicity.....	20
Religion.....	24
Socio-Economic Status.....	27
Multiple Minority Status.....	30
Summary.....	32
III METHODOLOGY.....	34
Participants.....	34
Instrumentation.....	36
Procedure.....	38
Data Analyses.....	39

CHAPTER	Page
IV RESULTS.....	40
Preliminary Analyses.....	40
Bivariate Analyses.....	43
Primary Analyses.....	44
Summary of Results.....	48
V CONCLUSION.....	52
Research Questions.....	52
Limitations and Strengths.....	56
Recommendations for Future Research.....	58
REFERENCES.....	60
APPENDIX A.....	75
APPENDIX B.....	77
VITA.....	78

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1	Sample Demographics.....	35
2	Multiple Minority Status Demographics.....	41
3	Correlations Among Variables and Multiple Minority Status ...	45
4	Correlations Among Measures.....	46
5	Analysis of Variance for Multiple Minority Statuses with Prejudice.....	49
6	Means for Multiple Minority Status on Prejudice, Fundamentalism and Social Desirability.....	50
7	Analysis of Variance for Multiple Minority Status with Social Desirability	51

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Rationale for Study

The United States of America: the land of the free, the home of the brave, and a bastion of prejudice. Read a magazine, read a newspaper, watch the news on the television, watch a comedy skit and you will undoubtedly hear prejudicial remarks. Recently, comedian Sarah Silverman in her comedic skit used prejudicial language to make fun of African Americans, Puerto Ricans and Jewish people even though she is a Jewish woman herself (Lynch & Silverman, 2005). Don Imus, a popular radio personality, insulted the Rutgers women's basketball team by making prejudicial comments that were racist, sexist and poking fun at low socio-economic status (Poniewozik, 2007). Don Imus and others defended his actions by saying that other people do it so why can't he (Poniewozik, 2007).

Similarly, a Public Broadcasting System (PBS) documentary on World War II made headlines because they did not include Latinos or Native Americans in the documentary even though these two groups made huge contributions to the war effort (Flakus, 2007). The Native Americans were instrumental in keeping ally intelligence as Navajo code talkers (McCoy, 1981) and 500,000 Latinos fought in the war and earned the most Medals of Honor in proportion to their population (Flakus, 2007).

This dissertation follows the style of the *Journal of Counseling Psychology*.

The population in the United States is increasing, and with this increase the population is getting more and more diverse (Eisen et al., 2006). This richness in diversity has led to people mingling and mixing with others and in turn, prejudice and discrimination arose. Diverse people have different statuses. The term status, as used here, stands for different demographic categories such as: gender, sexual orientation, disabilities, race and ethnicity, religion, and socio-economic status. One person can belong to different categories, and within each category some statuses are more accepted by society than others (Weeks & Lupfer, 2004). For example, under the category of sexual orientation, heterosexuality is considered as mainstream while homosexuality is viewed as a minority status. A minority status is the status least accepted by society unlike the majority status (Weeks & Lupfer, 2004).

There is a central belief that “personal knowledge reduces prejudice” (Haldeman & Buhrke, 2003, p.156). Would, then, a person who has personal knowledge of prejudice- for example, those of minority status be less prejudiced towards others? For instance, would a female Latina pagan be less prejudiced than a female Caucasian Christian? In this example, the former has three minority statuses: gender, racial/ethnicity, and religion. The latter has one minority status, that of gender. So, would the person with three minority statuses be less prejudiced than the one with just one minority status? This current study will investigate this question.

It is important to explore prejudice in order to understand and try to learn how to decrease it (Quiles et al, 2006). There have been narrative accounts of people of multiple minority statuses and their experiences with prejudice but no quantitative studies

(Nabors et al, 2001). Since the population of the United States of America is comprised of many diverse people, the understanding of prejudice and discrimination may truly help lead to the United States becoming the land of the free.

The following sections will give an overview of the findings of recent literature on prejudice, fundamentalism and social desirability.

Prejudice

Prejudice is defined as negative thoughts and negative attitude towards a particular group or person associated with a particular group which may lead to aggression or avoidance of a group or individual belonging to said group (Navas, 1997). Prejudice is comprised of three components: stereotypes, discrimination and affect (Canero & Solanes, 2002).

There has been an abundance of research focused on the prejudice that the majority might feel toward minorities but seldom studies focused on minority prejudice towards others (Loiacano, 1989; Sellers & Shelton, 2003). Minority groups in all categories have to deal with the problem of prejudice from the majority mainstream group and from other minorities (White & Langer, 1999). This study is interested in looking at the relationship between multiple minority status and prejudice.

Religious Fundamentalism

Fundamentalism is characterized by unwillingness to consider alternate beliefs or other points of view (English, 1996). Fundamentalists have been described as individuals who are unwilling to question alternate beliefs and are unable to consider points of views

that differ from their own (English, 1996; Hunsberger, Alisat, Pancer & Pratt, 1996; McFarland & Warren, 1992; Richards, 1994).

A study by McFarland (1989) using a Christian sample found that his measure of fundamentalism was positively correlated with self report measures of prejudice toward Blacks, women, and homosexuals. Another study found that prejudice was positively correlated with fundamentalism in a sample of differing religions: Christians, Protestants and Jewish (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992).

The current study will explore the relationship between prejudice and fundamentalism with a multiple minority status sample in order to find out if the level of fundamentalism affects prejudice.

Social Desirability

The majority of people do not want to appear prejudiced so they answer surveys in a politically correct manner (Canero & Solanes, 2002). This need to appear socially desirable on self report measures is a tendency that has been well documented (Block, 1965; Canero & Solanes, 2002; Edwards, 1970; Maher, 1978). The current study deals with prejudice which is a subject matter that people may not want to admit. As a result they might provide a socially desirable answer instead of their true belief. Accordingly, social desirability will be measured in the current study.

Problem Statement

There has been considerable research on the prejudice that whites might feel towards minorities but there is limited research on minorities' prejudice towards others (Sellers & Shelton, 2003). There is also a lack of research on the effects of multiple

oppressions on an individual (Nabors et al, 2001). Another gap in the literature is how a person's minority status or multiple minority statuses might affect feelings of prejudice. In order to address the aforementioned gaps in the literature, the present study was conducted to explore the relationship between multiple minority statuses and prejudice.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The current study attempts to answer the following questions:

Research Question 1

How does belonging to multiple minority statuses relate to prejudice as measured by the Modified Godfrey-Richman ISM Scale (M-GRISMS) (Godfrey, Richman, & Withers, 2000)?

Research Question 2

To what extent does fundamentalism, as measured by the Religious Fundamentalism Scale, relate to prejudice (Laythe, Finkel, & Kirkpatrick, 2001)?

Research Question 3

What is the relationship between social desirability, as measured by the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M-C SDS) form C, to various minority statuses?

Hypothesis for Research Question 1

The more multiple minority statuses a person has the less prejudice they will display, since they will have more knowledge of prejudice. This hypothesis was based on the central belief that "personal knowledge reduces prejudice" (Haldeman & Buhrke, 2003, p.156).

Hypothesis for Research Question 2

Fundamentalism relates to prejudice, in that the higher the degree of fundamentalism the higher the prejudice. This hypothesis was based on previous research that found a relationship between fundamentalism and prejudice (McFarland, 1989).

Hypothesis for Research Question 3

The more minority statuses a person possesses the less the need to display social desirability. This hypothesis was based on the idea that minorities have been the object of discrimination and might feel less inclined to appearing socially desirable in order to please the majority (Weeks & Lupfer, 2004).

Purpose of Study

The purpose of the study is to address a gap in the literature of minority prejudice. The current study focuses on the relationship between the number of self-perceived minority statuses of a person and her or his feelings of prejudice towards others (e.g. minorities & mainstream). The focus will be on the relationship between individuals' perceived statuses and their feelings of prejudice toward others. More specifically, this study will look at the number of minority statuses a person belongs to and his or her level of prejudice, as measured by the Modified Godfrey-Richman ISM Scale (Godfrey, Richman, & Withers, 2000). The study will also look at the role fundamentalism plays in prejudice, as measured by the Religious Fundamentalism Scale (Laythe, Finkel, & Kirkpatrick, 2001), and how appearing socially desirable may affect

the participant's answers to questions on prejudice, as measured by the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M-C SDS) form C (Reynolds, 1982).

Terms

Majority

This is the status that is most accepted by society (Weeks & Lupfer, 2004). For example, Caucasians are the majority while Latinos are the minority because they are the ones more accepted by society when discussing race.

Minority

This is the status that is least accepted by society (Weeks & Lupfer, 2004). For example, Pagans are considered the minority while Christians are considered the majority when discussing religion.

Multiple Minority Status

The term multiple minority status indicates that a person has more than one minority status. Participants will disclose their demographic information: gender, sexual orientation, disability, race/ethnicity, religion and socio-economic status. They will also indicate whether they are part of the majority or minority by placing an "X" in the Checklist of Statuses. (Please see Appendix A for this instrument.)

Gender

This study will ask participants to state whether they are male or female. The gender minority status is female while males are considered the majority (Jones, 2002). Women have a history of being discriminated against overtly by males and other

females but currently there is a wave of covert discrimination that has been mostly ignored (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Jones, 2002).

Sexual Orientation

Participants will be asked to state their sexual orientation whether it be homosexuality or heterosexuality. Homosexuals are considered to be the minority. Homosexuals have been discriminated against throughout history (Conley, Calhoun, Evett & Devine, 2001).

Disabilities

Participants will be asked whether they are disabled or not. Disabled people are considered to be a minority while non disabled are the majority. People seem to display ambivalent feelings towards those with disabilities. People may feel sympathy and compassion towards people with disabilities, but at the same time feel aversion towards them (Jones, 2002).

Race and Ethnicity

The participants will be asked to state their race/ethnicity and whether it is considered the race/ethnicity of the majority or not. Caucasians are considered the majority. Racial/Ethnic prejudice has apparently not decreased but has changed from being expressed overtly, which is no longer socially acceptable, to being expressed covertly (Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakami & Hodson, 2002).

Religion

This study will ask participants to report their religious affiliation and whether it is considered the religion of the majority or not. Today, members of minority religious

groups deal with discrimination from mainstream religious groups (White & Langer, 1999).

Socio-economic Status

The current study will have participants report their socio-economic status: low or middle. For the purpose of this study and the particular sample of this study, low socio-economic status will be considered the minority while middle class will be considered the majority. People tend to display feelings of prejudice towards people of low socio-economic status (Weeks & Lupfer, 2004).

Organization of Study

This paper is comprised of five chapters which will describe the study. The introduction of the study and the research questions are found in Chapter I. Chapter II will give a review of the literature pertinent to the study. In Chapter III, the methods used to collect and analyze the data are given. Chapter IV details the results of the study and in Chapter V the discussion of the results, the strengths and limitations of the current study and future recommendations for related research are given.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter is organized into eight sections which discuss relevant literature and provide a rationale for the current study. The first seven sections present relevant literature on the constructs researched in the study as they pertain to prejudice, including gender, sexual orientation, disabilities, race and ethnicity, religion, socio-economic status and multiple minority status. The eighth section is a summary and rationale for the study.

Prejudice

The word prejudice can be traced to the Latin words *prae* which means before and the word *judicium* which means judgment, so prejudice “represents a judgment before all the facts are known” (Bucher, 2004, p. 82). According to Allport (1954), prejudice is based on inaccurate information or illogical arguments. Accordingly, prejudice is considered not only a “prejudgment but a misjudgment” (Bucher, 2004, p. 82). There exist several definitions of prejudice from simple to general to more complex (Duckitt, 1992). A simple definition is that prejudice is negative attitudes toward a group (Ashmore, 1970). A generalized definition is that prejudice is the adoption of rigid, generalized and sometimes hostile attitudes toward a group (Ehrlich, 1973). Others define it as negative attitudes or thoughts about others (Canero & Solanes, 2002; Navas, 1997). A complex definition is that prejudice is negative thoughts and negative attitude towards a particular group or person associated with a particular group which may lead

to aggression or avoidance of a group or individual belonging to said group (Navas, 1997).

Prejudice is comprised of three components: stereotypes, discrimination and affect (Canero & Solanes, 2002). The cognitive component of prejudice is stereotypes. Stereotypes are attributes used to characterize members of a group which can be described as an unverified and simplified generalization of a specific group of people (Bucher, 2004). People learn stereotypes at an early age through interactions with family, peers, the media, religion and other influences (Bucher, 2004). An example of stereotypes affecting perceptions towards African Americans was noticed in a research study in which a group of white students were shown a picture for one second of a white person holding a razor blade while arguing with a black person on a New York subway (Helmreich, 1992). The students described what they saw and more than half of the students reported seeing the black man holding the razor against the white person's throat (Helmreich, 1992). The belief that blacks are violent distorted the perceptions of the students (Helmreich, 1992).

Discrimination is the behavioral component of prejudice (Canero & Solanes, 2002). It is negative behavior towards a group or a person belonging to a particular group. Discrimination can come in many forms, from very obvious to hidden. Blatant discriminatory acts happen everyday. For example, throughout the Southwest many people are asked to provide proof of their citizenship only because their skin color is different or they have an unusual name or because of their accent (Bucher, 2004). Research reveals that insults and derogatory remarks towards minorities are common in

the workplace with workers and supervisors ignoring the occurrences because that is the way things are (Larcom & George, 1992). More subtle discrimination also occurs. For example, a Hispanic woman enters a department store and she is either ignored by employees or is followed around to make sure nothing is stolen (Kuntz, 1998). This kind of subtle discrimination is not as overt as other types but still is considered an example of prejudicial discrimination.

The last component of prejudice is affect, which deals with the emotions which are predominantly negative in nature: antipathy and hostility (Canero & Solanes, 2002).

Some people say that prejudice and discrimination are a thing of the past while others say that prejudice and discrimination are ever present in society (Bucher, 2004). Prejudice and discrimination usually go together but not always. There are four combinations that might occur in individuals: the prejudiced discriminator, the prejudiced nondiscriminator, the unprejudiced discriminator, and the unprejudiced nondiscriminator (Bucher, 2004).

A prejudiced discriminator is a person who is prejudiced and because of this discriminates. For example, a manager of a company evaluates younger employees more favorably than older employees even though their performances are equal because the manager is prejudiced against age (Bucher, 2004).

A prejudiced undiscriminator is a person who is prejudiced but does not follow those feelings with discriminatory actions. For example, a male employee feels prejudice based on gender towards his female supervisor but he does not act on it because he is afraid of the consequences (Bucher, 2004).

A nonprejudiced discriminator is a person who is nonprejudiced but unknowingly discriminates by following accepted policies and practices that discriminate. For example, a high school student is open minded about the subject of homosexuality, but in order to fit in with his environment, he joins the crowd and discriminates against people who “act gay” (Bucher, 2004, p. 92).

An unprejudiced nondiscriminator describes a person who is not prejudice and does not discriminate. For example, “An employer conducting a job interview notices that an interviewee with a noticeable accent shies away from direct eye contact. As in every other interview, the employer puts the candidate at ease and focuses solely on the person’s ability to do the job” (Bucher, 2004, p. 92).

There has been considerable research showing that intergroup contact lowers intergroup prejudice (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998; Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005). A recent study investigated the relationship between intergroup contact and prejudice for minority and majority groups. The study found differences between majority and minority in that intergroup contact for the majority leads to less prejudice, while for minorities there is no difference on prejudice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). The authors of the study encouraged further research on minority prejudice in order to better understand the differences between minority and majority prejudice (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005).

There has been an abundance of research focused on the prejudice that the majority might feel toward minorities but few studies which have focused on minority prejudice towards others (Loiacano, 1989; Sellers & Shelton, 2003). Most minority studies have dealt with African Americans (Cummings & Lambert, 1997). Another

aspect that recently has been heavily studied has been the effect that prejudice and discrimination have on minorities (Dion, 2002). White and Langer (1999) wrote that future research should explore “issues of prejudice from the perspective of the minority group member” (p.557) in order to generate new strategies for reducing prejudice.

Gender

Discrimination and Gender

In 1893, Cesare Lombroso, a famous psychiatrist, wrote that women were inferior to men because they were childlike and lacked the intelligence and ability for creative thought. He believed that women could not be trusted with any type of power so they should not be given any (Lombroso, 2004). This view has been debunked and with the women’s movement many changes in people’s perception of women have taken place (Pipes & Davenport, 1999).

However, day to day life tells us that prejudice toward women still exists, but in recent years it has become more covert (Jones, 2002). This covert prejudice may lead some people to think prejudice against women does not exist anymore, thus fueling discrimination in the workplace, in higher education and in the government, while not acknowledging that it does occur (Jones, 2002). Research on gender stereotypes has shown that they have not changed much over the years (Berger & Williams, 1991). Women compared to men are perceived as more “passive, emotional, easily influenced and dependent” (Newman, 2004, p. 427).

A recent article in by Rawe (2007), explored the discrepancy in earnings between men and women who are equally qualified and work in the same jobs. The study

concluded that women who work full time are earning only 80% as much as their male counterparts. This discrepancy in earnings is an example of discrimination still occurring these days.

Glick and Fiske (1996) noticed an emotional ambivalence when discussing sexism and made a distinction between hostile sexism and benevolent sexism. Hostile sexism describes situations where people have negative views of women and overtly discriminate against them. Benevolent sexism at first glance seems positive but with an underlying belief of women in stereotypical roles (Glick & Fiske, 1996). For example, a benevolent sexist may believe that a woman should be cherished and taken care of by her man, not realizing that by doing this they are limiting women's opportunities and social roles (Glick & Fiske, 1996).

Some studies have looked at the similarities in the values that contribute to racism and sexism (Butler & Gels, 1990; Frable, 1989). Using McConahay's model for modern racism (1986) as a template, Swim and her colleagues termed this new covert sexism as modern sexism (Swim, Aikin, Hall & Hunter, 1995). Modern sexism encompasses three underlying beliefs. The first is that many people believe that discrimination against women doesn't exist. The second is that women are given preferential treatment in admissions to universities and job opportunities. The third is a feeling of antagonism toward women who are still demanding equality (Swim, Aikin, Hall & Hunter, 1995). This similarity between modern racism and modern sexism was studied by replicating a study of modern racism and changing it to study modern sexism. The modern racism study looked at voter preferences for a White or Black candidate and

found that those who voted for the Black candidate displayed low modern racism (Sears, 1988). This study used an election to explore sexism. They found that modern sexism predicted whether people voted for the male or female candidate. The people who voted for the female candidate displayed lower modern sexism scores on the sexism scale (Swim, Aikin, Hall & Hunter, 1995).

Gender and Prejudice

In qualitative studies, horizontal hostility has been found to be very common among women (White & Langer, 1999). Horizontal Hostility is the infighting or factionalism within a group rather than banding together (Penelope, 1992). As of 1999, this horizontal hostility phenomenon had not been quantitatively studied (White & Langer, 1999).

In a study looking at females in science, a male dominated field, the findings showed that women were not encouraged to enter the scientific field by males or other females, unlike males who were encouraged to enter the field of science by females and other males (Stake, 2003). Another study showed that this gender difference, where males are encouraged by other males and females while females are not encouraged by their own gender or by males, was observed in different ethnic groups such as: Caucasians, African Americans, Hispanics and Asians (Greenfield, 1996).

Sexual Orientation

Discrimination and Sexual Orientation

Homosexuality has been tied to different emotions and opinions throughout history (Conley, Calhoun, Evett & Devine, 2001). As one writer said, “Lesbians, gay

men, and bisexuals represent a minority, and like other minorities; they are often treated by the majority with much disdain and discrimination” (Diplacido, 1998, p. 138).

Aguero, Bloch and Byrne (1984) wrote that, “homosexuals were rated as the third most dangerous people in the United States behind communists and atheists in a public opinion survey conducted during the 1960’s” (p.95). Similarly, Meyer (2003), stated that, “Antigay prejudice has been perpetrated throughout history: Institutionalized forms of prejudice, discrimination, and violence have ranged from Nazi extermination of homosexuals to enforcement of sodomy laws punishable by imprisonment, castration, torture and death”(p.680; Adam, 1987; Guindon, Green & Hanna, 2003).

Until fairly recently, homosexuality was viewed as a mental illness produced by problems during that person’s psychosexual development (Haldeman & Buhrke, 2003). When the diagnosis of homosexuality was shown to be a sign of society’s prejudice and not psychopathology, it was no longer considered a mental illness (Haldeman & Buhrke, 2003) and was removed from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders in 1973 (Meyer, 2003; Walters & Simoni, 1993). With passing years, there have been many signs of positive social change, such as gay liberation displayed through pride parades, television shows and gay friendly laws. However, especially as a result of widespread political support for “anti-gay” constitutional amendments and laws, there is an uneasiness both in and out of the homosexual community, and homophobia and prejudice may very well be escalating (Borowitz, 2004; Corcoran & Schneider, 2005; McGill, 2005). In 1998 Matthew Shepard, a gay college student, died after receiving a

beating because of his sexual orientation. Protestors showed up at his funeral with signs saying, “God hates fags” and “I hope it happens more often” (Newman, 2004, p. 247).

The research on attitudes of heterosexuals towards lesbians and gay men have found heterosexual attitudes to be predominantly negative (Herek, 1994; Hudson & Ricketts, 1980; White & Franzini, 1999). A nationwide study found that people in the United States seem to hold negative views toward homosexuality (Wolfe, 1998).

Sexual Orientation and Prejudice

There have been many studies on the prejudice that heterosexuals feel towards homosexuals but few studies on feelings of prejudice of homosexuals towards heterosexuals (Herek, 1994; Hudson & Ricketts, 1980; White & Franzini, 1999).

According to Lewin (1980), the marginal status of minorities would tend to cause them to develop a rational rather than a traditional view of life thus resulting in lower feelings of prejudice. White and Franzini (1999) studied this belief by exploring prejudice and sexual orientation. Their hypothesis stated that homosexuals would be less prejudiced than heterosexuals and their results supported the hypothesis (White & Franzini, 1999).

Disabilities

Discrimination and Disabilities

There seems to be a lack of research regarding people with disabilities as belonging to a minority status (Kleftaras, 2003). Mpofu and Harley (2006) wrote that research has been delayed because society has lagged in recognizing disability as a minority status. The current study seeks to remedy this oversight.

Disability theory is divided into two factions-- those that believe that disability is defined by social prejudice and those that believe that it is a fact that affects people's quality of life (Alrecht & Devlieger, 1998; Koch, 2001; Young & McNicoll, 1988). Koch (2001) wrote that social prejudice theory describes disability in terms of "a social discrimination that limits the opportunities of persons of difference" (p. 370). The other view, or the medical model perspective, defines disability as a "negative variation from the norm" (Koch, 2001, p. 370).

People seem to display ambivalent feelings towards those with disabilities. People may feel sympathy and compassion towards people with disabilities, but at the same time feel aversion towards them (Jones, 2002). A study that represents this ambivalence is one where a person has an encounter with a disabled or non-disabled person. The participants evaluated the disabled person in a more favorable light than the non-disabled person. During the interaction participants appeared more uncomfortable with the disabled person than with the non-disabled person, and their encounter with the disabled person was shorter than their encounter with the non-disabled person (Kleck, Ono, & Hastorf, 1966).

Given the apparent ambivalence toward disabled persons found in this study, the current project will look at social desirability in conjunction with a self report of prejudice by using the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960).

Disabilities and Prejudice

People with disabilities are more aware of disability related discrimination and prejudice than non disabled people (Mpofu & Harley, 2006). Individuals who are hyper-aware of their disabilities may be less eager to engage in participation with individuals different than them (Hahn, 1997). There is no research that focuses on the prejudice that people with disabilities might feel towards others.

Race and Ethnicity

Discrimination and Race/Ethnicity

Newman in his book wrote that, “a quick glance at the history of the United States reveals a record of not just freedom, justice, and equality but also conquest, discrimination, and exclusion” (2004, p. 387). Every ethnoracial minority has a history of persecution. For example, when white European immigrants- Irish, Italians, Greeks- first arrived to the United States they were discriminated against but some time later, because they were the same color as the majority, they were incorporated into the mainstream. On the other hand for people of color-- Native Americans, Latinos, African Americans-- racial equality has been almost impossible to attain (Newman, 2004).

The history of Native Americans “has been one of racially inspired massacres, takeover of their ancestral lands, confinement on reservations, and unending governmental manipulation. Successive waves of westward expansion in the 18th and 19th centuries pushed them off any land that white settlers considered desirable” (Newman, 2004, p. 387). The Europeans used their belief that Native Americans were savages as justification for conquering them in order for civilized people to have room to

grow (Newman, 2004). Native Americans were not considered citizens of the United States until 1940 (Haney Lopez, 1996). In the last few decades, organizations have been set up to advance Native American's finances in industries such as gas, oil, and coal which are found on their land (Snipp, 1986). Now a new struggle has arisen over the reserves between them and large multinational corporations (Newman, 2004).

The history of Latinos in the United States has been diverse. For some it has been positive but for others it has been a struggle. For example, when Fidel Castro came into power in the 1950's, Cuban exiles came to the United States without difficulties due to the fact that this people were highly educated and were running away from the dictatorship in Cuba. Interestingly, many of the early Cuban immigrants were wealthy business owners, so their transition to the new country came without difficulty since they had business relations with the United States prior to Castro (Suarez, 1998).

Unlike Cubans, immigrants from Mexico and other Central and South American countries have experienced hostility and oppression in the United States (Santiago-Rivera et al, 2002). The history of Puerto Ricans in the United States differs even more from the ones already mentioned. Puerto Rico became part of the United States in 1898 when Americans took possession of the island from Spain. Puerto Ricans did not become citizens of the United States until 1917. This has allowed them to travel to the mainland from the island with no problems. During World War II, the migration from the island to the mainland increased and many Puerto Ricans settled mostly in the northeastern states (Santiago-Rivera et al, 2002). Since then, Puerto Ricans have

struggled to be accepted and treated like other citizens of the United States (Santiago-Rivera et al, 2002).

Today, the status of Latinos is mixed. Culturally, Latinos seem to be making an impact with their own television stations, radio stations, actors, singers and foods becoming part of the mainstream. Economically and educationally, the situation seems very negative since Latinos seem to earn less than other groups, appear to have a higher drop out rate, and are less likely to go to college than any other group (Newman, 2004).

The history of African Americans in the United States is very different from other groups because of slavery. Even after slavery was abolished the conditions for African Americans did not improve (Newman, 2004). Nowadays, the quality of life of most African Americans is still below the quality of life of Whites (Cose, 1999). The average annual income for black household is less than for whites and black unemployment is twice as high as that of whites (Newman, 2004).

Research has shown that Blacks and Whites view prejudice differently (Blauner, 1989). Whites view racism as a sporadic concern that is usually triggered by some event covered by the media. For example, a 49 year old black man was beaten and then chained to a truck and dragged for three miles until he died in Jasper, Texas. When white residents were interviewed they said that race relation problems were in the minds of the black community and that the people who committed the murder were drunk troublemakers (Temple-Raston, 2002). When the black residents were interviewed they said that the crime was the culmination of everyday discrimination (Temple-Raston,

2002). Blacks view racism as “central to society” and “ever-present” (Bucher, 2004, p. 90).

Racial/Ethnic prejudice has not decreased but has changed significantly through the years (Jones, 2002). Prejudice has changed from being expressed overtly, which is no longer socially acceptable, to being expressed covertly (Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakami & Hodson, 2002).

Recent studies on discrimination are trying to change the view on prejudice from binary black and white to one that encompasses other aspects of a person. For example, Aranda and Rebollo-Gil (2004) found that accents are often the basis of prejudice, especially if it is a Spanish accent, even if a person looks white.

Race/Ethnicity and Prejudice

There has been an abundance of research focused on the racial prejudice that white men may feel toward different minorities (Loiacano, 1989; Sellers & Shelton, 2003). However, there has not been extensive research exploring the racial prejudice that minorities might feel toward Whites or other minorities (Conley, Devine, Rabow & Evett, 2002; Sullivan & Jackson, 1999; White & Franzini, 1999). Interestingly, there seems to be an underlying assumption that minorities are more advanced when it comes to accepting diversity (Rooney, Flores & Mercier, 1998).

However, a study by White and Langer (1999) has shown otherwise. They found that minority-toward-minority prejudice exists, which they termed “horizontal hostility” (p. 537). An example of this phenomenon was when a light skinned Black woman

professor's appointment to a university was opposed by the Black Student Association because they felt she was not black enough (Sege, 1995).

Cummings and Lambert (1997) explored the prejudicial feelings of African Americans towards Hispanic Americans and Asian Americans. They found that African Americans display prejudice equal to that displayed by Anglo Americans towards Hispanic and Asian Americans. These results were consistent with previous studies (Dyer, Vedlitz & Worchel, 1989).

Further, a study found that African Americans that had been discriminated against or are aware that discrimination exists, express less prejudice towards others than those that have not known discrimination or are not aware that discrimination exists (Livingston, 2002). This research represents one of the few published studies that examines non-dominant group prejudice.

Religion

Discrimination and Religion

Throughout history there have been many instances where one religion has tried to subjugate another. For example, the crusades were military expeditions that Christians took in order to get control of the Holy Land during the 11th, 12th and 13th centuries (Andrea, 2003).

Even today members of minority religious groups deal with discrimination from mainstream religious groups. In a study by White and Langer (1999), participants from three Orthodox Jewish congregations showed prejudice towards members of a more secular congregation.

Further, Sheridan (2006) noticed that religious discrimination has been ignored by many researchers. Most of the studies on religion have been limited to Christianity and the role fundamentalism plays on prejudice (English, 1996; Hunsberger, Alisat, Pancer & Pratt, 1996; McFarland & Warren, 1992; Richards, 1994).

Fundamentalism is characterized by unwillingness to consider alternate beliefs or other points of view (English, 1996). It also describes organizations that follow their religious traditions and texts in a literal way (Rock, 2004). Sometimes this leads to fear of differences and prejudice against people whose views differ from their own.

Few studies have been written about religions other than Christianity. In one study, Omeish (1999) found that Muslim students perceived prejudice and discrimination as commonplace in their higher education establishments. Since September 11th there has been an increase in discrimination and prejudice towards Muslims (Allen & Nielson, 2002). For example, “Recently, concerns about terrorism and security have made religious profiling more common and visible. Passengers who appear Muslim have complained that airport security authorities single them out for scrutiny and possible abuse. An American-Islamic civil rights organization has received complaints from a number of Muslim women who have been forced to remove their head scarves in front of others at airports. Since removing head scarves in public violates Muslim teachings about modesty, the organization says it should be done in a private area and in front of a female security screener” (Bucher, 2004, p. 86).

Religion and Prejudice

Few studies have examined religion and prejudice. A study by Batson, Schoenrade and Ventis (1993) explored the relationship between prejudice and amount of religiosity which was measured in the behavior of individuals and not their thoughts. They looked at church attendance and participation in church activities. They found a positive correlation between religiosity and prejudice.

Two studies researching whether religious influence at home correlated with prejudice found that Roman Catholic students were more prejudiced towards black people than they were towards people with no religious affiliations. They concluded that strong religious influence in the home was positively correlated with racial prejudice (Allport & Kramer, 1946; Rosenblith, 1949).

Many religions express the principles of tolerance and love towards others but the empirical evidence is that there is very little following of these teachings (Cañero & Solanes, 2002). In one study, Wulff (1991) examined the relationship between religious affiliation and prejudice and found that a positive correlation existed between fundamentalism and prejudice toward black and Jewish people.

There have been many studies on the relationship between religion and prejudice (Laythe, Finkel, & Kirkpatrick, 2001). There are opposing views on the relationship between fundamentalism and prejudice. Some studies have found a positive correlation between fundamentalism and prejudice (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Hunsberger, 1995, 1996; Wylie & Forest, 1992). Other studies have found a negative correlation

between fundamentalism and prejudice (Kirkpatrick, 1993; Laythe, Finkel & Kirkpatrick, 2001).

In a study by Laythe, Finkel and Kirkpatrick, the roles of religious fundamentalism and right wing authoritarianism were investigated as they relate to prejudice (2001). They administered several questionnaires to their participants in order to measure their constructs of interest. They found that religious fundamentalism was a predictor of homosexual prejudice but not racial prejudice (Laythe, Finkel, & Kirkpatrick, 2001). It is not known if being a member of a minority group other than religious lessens prejudice. Accordingly, this study will examine the relationship between fundamentalism and prejudice.

Socio-Economic Status

Discrimination and Socio-economic Status

Socio-economic status refers to the prestige and power associated with different class positions in society (Weber, 1970). It is influenced by an individual's wealth, education, prestige of occupation, race, ethnicity, gender and family (Newman, 2004). Socio-economic status is made up of three class standings: upper class, middle class and lower class. The upper class is comprised of 5% of the United States population and is defined by sociologists as the part of the population which earns the highest amount of money (Newman, 2004). The middle class is comprised of 80% of the U.S. population and the lower class is comprised of 15% of the population (Navarro, 1992; Walton, 1990). An individual's class standing can determine a variety of things, such as access to education and high paying jobs. For example, some wealthy individuals hire personal

physicians for a yearly fee and they are guaranteed 24 hour telephone access and physician visits to a person's home (Belluck, 2002).

On the other hand, the poor face several challenges and barriers in their lives. Studies of the poor have shown that they are more likely to be arrested and receive the death penalty than upper class people (Reiman, 2001). Research also shows that lower classes are more likely to die from homicides and inadequate healthcare than the upper classes (Kearl, 1989). The death rate for the lower classes is three times higher than that of upper classes (Pear, 1993). An example on the discrepancy between the opportunities afforded the upper class compared to the lower classes occurred on the Titanic. The upper classes had easy access to lifeboats from the upper decks where they resided while the lower classes were locked up in the lower levels (Sidel, 1986). Due to this segregation of classes, more than 60% of the wealthy people from the upper deck were saved and only 24% of the people from the low poor deck were saved.

Interestingly, news stories of poor people are very rare in the media (Newman, 2004; Parenti, 1996). A study by Mantsios (1995) found that only 1 in 500 articles in the New York Times addressed poverty issues. Most of the stories dealing with the poor revolve around drug addicts, people cheating welfare, and criminals (Newman, 2004). According to Mantsios (1995), these types of stories reinforce the view that poor people are the cause of society's problems which in turn leads other people to look down on the poor. In contrast, the media tends to shine a positive light on the upper classes by focusing on stories about high fashion, dinner parties, expensive vacations, formal parties and the ins and outs of the elite (Mantsios, 1995; Newman, 2004). In movies, the

poor are portrayed as narrow-minded, dumb or irresponsible while the upper classes are portrayed as educated, intelligent and deserving of positive things (Ehrenreich, 1995). These discrepancies in portrayals are example of stereotyping and are forms of prejudicial thinking.

There have been few studies on socio-economic status and prejudice (Weeks & Lupfer, 2004). One such study suggested that racial issues and tensions should be attributed to class effects, so that a person's race is of less importance than a person's social standing (Heaven & Furnham, 2001). Another study suggested that tensions between groups are a combination of racial tensions and differences in socio-economic status (Jones, 2002).

Another study found that job applicants who were part of the middle class were viewed as more favorable than people from a lower social class (Jussim, Coleman, & Lerch, 1987). People tend to display feelings of prejudice towards people of low socio-economic status (Weeks & Lupfer, 2004). A study by Kirby (1999) investigated the effects of income and race on ratings of potential neighbors. The study found that class prejudice based on income is openly expressed when compared to racial prejudice.

Socio-Economic Status and Prejudice

The studies on socio-economic status and prejudice tend to focus on prejudice against low socio-economic status (Jussim, Coleman, & Lerch, 1987; Kirby, 1999; Weeks & Lupfer, 2004). No studies were found on socio-economic status and prejudice, but there are studies combining racial prejudice and economic beliefs (Heaven &

Furnham, 2001). These studies look at black and white participants from middle and low socio-economic status (Weeks & Lupfer, 2004).

Multiple Minority Status

Discrimination and Multiple Minority Status

People with multiple minority status tend to “face multiple stigmas” (Haldeman & Buhrke, 2003, p.152). For example, persons of color who are also a homosexual may be alienated from their race and ethnic cultural group for being gay and alienated from the gay community for their race (Haldeman & Buhrke, 2003). Furthermore, they may face oppression from the mainstream, heterosexual, Caucasian community for their race/ethnicity and sexual orientation (Taywaditep, 2001; Akerlund & Cheung, 2000).

Many of the contemporary theories on racial prejudice are also being used to explain prejudice based on gender, sexual orientation, religion and disabilities (Jones, 2002). For example, the compunction theory suggests that everybody reacts with prejudicial thoughts but the less prejudiced people will consciously counteract their initial impulse by activating non-prejudiced beliefs (Devine, 1989).

A popular theory in sociology, the social identity theory assumes that a group maintains “positive self-conceptions via negative comparisons with other groups” (Smith et al, 2003, p. 284). A problem with this theory is that it does not take into account people with different statuses which belong to many groups (Smith et al, 2003).

There have been studies looking at the similarities of experiences between minority statuses. For example, there are many similarities between prejudice due to race and prejudice due to gender (Swim, Aikin, Hall & Hunter, 1995). For example women,

like people of color, have been the subject of strongly held stereotypes and have faced overt and covert discrimination (Heilman, Block & Lucas, 1992).

There have been qualitative accounts of people of multiple minority statuses and their experiences with prejudice. Nabors and colleagues (2001), recounted personal accounts of several people of multiple minority statuses discussing prejudice. One of the accounts was from a disabled gay African American male and he discussed feeling discriminated against because of his “triple-minority group membership” (Nabors et al, 2001, p. 103). The authors of this article encouraged research on multiple minority groups because there is a lack of literature on this topic and more and more people are identifying as having multiple minority statuses (Nabors et al, 2001).

Multiple Minority Status and Prejudice

There is a central belief that “personal knowledge reduces prejudice” (Haldeman & Buhrke, 2003, p.156). Would, then, a person who has personal knowledge of prejudice-- for example, those of minority status-- be less prejudiced towards others? The focus of prejudice has been viewed and studied largely from the context of prejudice toward minority groups, such as Hispanics, African Americans, and homosexuals (Sellers & Shelton, 2003). To date, little attention has been given to the degree to which individuals who have been the object of prejudice (e.g., homosexuals and minority races) may express prejudice towards other groups (Conley, Devine, Rabow & Evett, 2002).

Recently a dissertation written by Noble (2006), explored the difference in levels of prejudice from multiracials and Caucasians based on the belief that personal

knowledge reduces prejudice. She failed to find any significant difference between multiracials and Caucasians on their level of prejudice (Noble, 2006).

In qualitative studies horizontal hostility has been found to be very common among minorities (White & Langer, 1999). Horizontal hostility is the infighting or factionalism within a group rather than banding together (Penelope, 1992; White et al, 2006). This horizontal hostility phenomenon has not been empirically studied (White & Langer, 1999). This study will explore the relationship between multiple minority status and prejudice, thus empirically studying horizontal hostility.

The current study was designed to explore prejudice through the eyes of individuals with multiple minority statuses. For example, the feeling of prejudice of a person who is female, lesbian, disabled, African American Buddhist and is part of low socio- economic status was measured and compared to other people's feelings of prejudice in order to study if the number of minority statuses has any relationship with how prejudiced a person may be.

Summary

As stated previously, gender, sexual orientation, disabilities, race and ethnicity, religion and socio-economic status minorities have had some experience of discrimination because of their minority status (Haldeman & Buhrke, 2003). If the central belief that "personal knowledge reduces prejudice" is accepted then this would mean that all minorities would be considerably less prejudiced than non-minorities (Haldeman & Buhrke, 2003, p.156).

Noticing a gap in the literature, White & Langer (1999) called for future research on prejudice “from the perspective of the minority group member” (p.557). However, there are only a handful of studies that look at minorities and their feelings of prejudice towards others. Those studies look at only one status at a time, so the relationship between minority statuses and prejudice has been overlooked. The only studies looking at the relationships of multi minority status and prejudice are from other countries and in other languages and are only looking at one or two statuses (Kleftaras, 2003; Gattino & Miglietta, 2004).

Research has started to explore horizontal hostility through qualitative studies (White & Langer, 1999). There are accounts of people with multiple minority status and their struggles with discrimination and the prejudices they feel towards others.

This study attempted to explore the relationships between multiple minority status and prejudice, taking into account previous findings by looking at fundamentalism and its relationship to prejudice. Since social desirability could affect the people’s frankness in answering, this study explored this component as well.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter is comprised of four sections which detail how the study was conducted. The first section contains information on the participants. The second section contains information on the instruments used in the study. The third section describes the procedure used to obtain participants and collect data and in the final section, the information on the analyses used in the study is given.

Participants

The participants for the study were 105 males and females who volunteered to anonymously take part in the study. The participants were recruited from a Southwestern University and its surrounding town. The participants voluntarily responded to the survey packet. The essential requirement for participation was that the participant be a minority or have multiple minority statuses. Five of the participants who completed the surveys did not meet the minority requirement leaving 100 participants for the purpose of analysis.

Table 1 includes demographic information regarding the participants. Of the sample group, 77 were female and 23 were male. The sample consisted of 31 homosexuals and 69 heterosexuals. In the category of racial/ethnic status, the sample had 36 minority individuals and 64 majority individuals. For religion, the sample was 76 Christians and 24 non Christians. For disability the sample was 15 disabled and 85 non disabled. The socio-economic status sample consisted of 11 individuals belonging to the majority and 89 belonging to the minority.

Table 1

Sample Demographics

Demographic Variable	Total sample (N = 100)
Gender	
Female (minority)	77
Male (majority)	23
Sexual Orientation	
Homosexual (minority)	31
Heterosexual (majority)	69
Disabilities	
Disabled (minority)	15
Non-Disabled (majority)	85
Race/Ethnicity	
Minority	36
Majority	64
Religion	
Non-Christian (minority)	24
Christian (majority)	76
Socio Economic Status	
Majority	11
Minority	89

Instrumentation

Participants completed a survey packet that included a demographic questionnaire (the Checklist of Statuses), and instruments measuring prejudice, social desirability, and religious fundamentalism.

The Checklist of Statuses

The Checklist of Statuses consisted of a list of race/ethnicities, sexual orientations, religions, gender and disabilities. The participants put a check on all the statuses with which they identified. This instrument was used to ascertain the number of minority statuses for each participant. (Please see Appendix A for this instrument.)

Measure of Prejudice

The Modified Godfrey-Richman ISM Scale (M-GRISMS) is a 26-item self administered scale which measures prejudice towards various groups. It measures prejudice based on ethnicity, religion, and sexist and heterosexist attitudes. This scale attempts to assess prejudice toward various subgroups within the four categories. The racial/ethnic subscale measures attitudes toward African Americans, Latino/Hispanics, Asian Americans, Native Americans and European Americans. The religion subscale looks at attitudes toward Christian, Jewish, Muslim and Agnostic/Atheist people. The sexism subscale measures attitudes toward males and females. The heterosexism subscale measures attitudes toward homosexuals. The Modified Godfrey-Richman ISM Scale (M-GRISMS) demonstrates acceptable levels of reliability from .77-.84 (Godfrey, Richman, & Withers, 2000).

Measure of Social Desirability

The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M-C SDS) form C consists of 13 items (Reynolds, 1982). The scale examines social desirability as a response tendency to self-report measures. Social desirability is defined as “the need to obtain approval by responding in a culturally appropriate and acceptable manner” (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960, p.353). Most individuals are able to complete the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M-C SDS) form C in 5 minutes or less. The participants indicate whether the given statements are true or false. The more socially desirable statements the participant endorses, the higher his or her preoccupation with coming across as socially desirable and needing approval. Item examples include: It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged; On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability; There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone; and I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M-C SDS) form C was standardized on a sample of 608 ethnically diverse individuals. The instrument demonstrates an acceptable level of reliability, with alpha reliability coefficients ranging from .76 to .88 (Reynolds, 1982).

Measure of Religious Fundamentalism

The Religious Fundamentalism Scale consists of twenty items designed to measure levels of militant, conservative beliefs (Laythe, Finkel, & Kirkpatrick, 2001). Most individuals are able to complete the Religious Fundamentalism Scale in

approximately ten minutes. Participants indicate their level of agreement in a 9-point Likert-type scale (-1 slightly disagree, -4 very strongly disagree; 1 slightly agree, 4 very strongly agree) and 0 for neutral answers. High scores indicate high levels of fundamentalism. Item examples include: All of the religions in the world have flaws and wrong teachings; God will punish most severely those who abandon his true religion; and It is more important to be a good person than to believe in God and the right religion. The Religious Fundamentalism Scale was standardized on a sample of 463 individuals. The internal consistency reliability ranged from .93 to .95 across various religious samples.

Procedure

After consulting with the dissertation committee and prior to data collection, the study was reviewed and approved by the Texas A&M University Institutional Review Board (IRB). The forms required by the Institutional Review Board found in the “IRB Application Protocol for Human Subjects in Research” including the participant recruitment letter was submitted and approved.

Participants were recruited through different organizations at a large state university in the Southwest, as well as the local community. Heads of the different organizations were contacted and meetings were attended in order to obtain participants. Those participants were encouraged to contact their friends and family members and ask them to participate as well.

All participants were given a numbered packet containing a checklist, a social desirability scale, a fundamentalism scale and a prejudice scale. The checklist can be

seen in Appendix A. Each packet contained a study information form with a brief description of the study and directions on how to get compensation for participating which can be seen in Appendix B. Each participant was asked to anonymously fill out the contents of the packet as truthfully as possible.

Upon receipt of the completed packet, the participant provided his or her e-mail address on a separate paper, which in turn was entered in a raffle where he or she had the possibility of winning one of three twenty five dollar gift certificates to a fine dining restaurant. The winners were contacted through e-mail and they picked up their prize at a specified location.

Data Analyses

The data was entered and analyzed using SPSS for Windows which is a statistical analysis software package. The minority statuses for each individual were computed and their level of prejudice, fundamentalism and social desirability noted. The data was then analyzed using an analysis of variance (ANOVA) to find out if the number of minority statuses a person represents affects the level of prejudice he or she displays, and to what extent fundamentalism and social desirability affect participants' scores. The results are reported in detail in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter provides the results of the data analyses and is divided into three sections. The first section discusses preliminary analyses, including descriptive statistics and scale reliability. The second section discusses the primary analyses, including the hypotheses and results for each hypothesis. The third section discusses the summary of the results.

Preliminary Analyses

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were calculated to examine the sample demographics and survey measures. The sample was examined for outliers on all measured variables using Moore and McCabe's (1989) criteria for an outlier as an observed value that lies ± 3 standard deviations away from the mean.

Table 1 presented the details of the descriptive statistics that are discussed below. The results indicated that the sample was unbalanced. The gender of the sample was comprised of 77 females and 23 males. When discussing sexuality, 69 identified as heterosexuals and 31 as homosexuals. On disabilities, 85 individuals identified as non disabled and 15 as disabled. The sample consisted of 76 individuals affiliated with the majority religion and 24 with a minority religion. The sample consisted of 64 majority racial/ethnic status and 36 minority racial/ethnic status. As for socio-economic status, 11 identified as majority and 89 as minority. Table 2 presents the details on multiple minority status. The sample consisted of uneven numbers of participants in each status.

Table 2

Multiple Minority Status Demographics

Demographic Variable	Total sample (N = 100)
One Minority Status	10
Two Minority Statuses	38
Three Minority Statuses	31
Four Minority Statuses	21

The group of 2 minority statuses is the one with the most participants at 38 and the 1 minority status group has the least participants at 10.

Instrumentation Descriptive Statistics

The Modified Godfrey-Richman ISM Scale (M-GRISMS) is a 26-item self administered scale which measures prejudice towards various groups. This measure had a possible range of 25-47 with higher scales indicative of higher feelings of prejudice.

The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M-C SDS) form C consists of 13 items (Reynolds, 1982). The scale examines social desirability as a response tendency to self-report measures. The more socially desirable statements the participants endorse, the higher their preoccupation with coming across as socially desirable and needing approval. This measure had a possible range of 0-13 with higher scales indicative of higher social desirability.

The Religious Fundamentalism Scale consists of twenty items designed to measure levels of militant, conservative beliefs (Laythe, Finkel, & Kirkpatrick, 2001). This measure had a possible range of 20-180 with higher scales indicative of high fundamentalist views.

Scale Reliability

Reliability analyses were conducted to evaluate internal consistency scale reliability. Although previous studies reported moderate to high scale reliabilities, internal consistency reliability analyses were also conducted in the present study as well in order to evaluate the scale reliability for this particular sample.

The Modified Godfrey-Richman ISM Scale (M-GRISMS) demonstrates acceptable levels of reliability of .77-.84 (Godfrey, Richman, & Withers, 2000). The current sample's Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was .84, so it was deemed adequate and consistent with previous studies reported alpha.

The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M-C SDS) demonstrates an acceptable level of reliability, with alpha reliability coefficients ranging from .76 to .88 (Reynolds, 1982). The current sample's Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was .77, so it was seen as consistent with previous studies' reported alpha.

The Religious Fundamentalism Scale's internal consistency reliability ranged from .93 to .95 across various religious samples (Laythe, Finkel, & Kirkpatrick, 2001). The current sample's Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was .93, so it was consistent with previous studies' reported alpha.

Bivariate Analyses

Pearson and Spearman correlational analyses were conducted to assess the association between demographic characteristics and measures. The correlation coefficient between each pair of variables allows for evaluation of the degree of association between each variable pair. Table 3 presents significant relationships between variables. Only general significant relationships will be discussed here. Multiple minority status was positively correlated with gender ($r = .44$, $p < .01$), which indicated that the females in this sample had more minority statuses than the males. Multiple minority status was positively correlated with sexual orientation ($r = .62$, $p < .01$), which is indicative that homosexuals had more minority statuses than

heterosexuals. Multiple minority status was positively correlated with religion ($r = .65$, $p < .01$), which suggests that those with minority religious affiliation had more minority statuses than those with majority religious associations.

Table 4 presents significant relationships between variables and measures. Only general significant relationships will be discussed here. Social desirability was positively correlated with fundamentalism ($r = .26$, $p < .01$), which indicates that those who scored high on social desirability also tended to score high on fundamentalism. Fundamentalism was positively correlated with prejudice ($r = .61$, $p < .01$), which indicates that participants who displayed high fundamentalist views also scored high on feelings of prejudice.

Primary Analyses

The primary analyses investigated the three research questions proposed in Chapter I. The following discussion will restate the research questions and state the results found for each question by using the results of the Pearson and Spearman Correlations as well as an analysis of variance. All the data was entered and analyzed using SPSS. The Pearson and Spearman correlations were used to answer question two and a statistical analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure was used to analyze the data in order to test research questions one and three. Separate ANOVAs were conducted for each of the dependent variables i.e. social desirability, fundamentalism and prejudice with the independent variable being multiple minority statuses which consisted of four groups.

Research Question 1

How does belonging to multiple minority statuses relate to prejudice as measured

Table 3

Correlations Among Variables and Multiple Minority Status

	Multiple Minority Status
Sexual Orientation	.62**
Religion	.65**
Gender	.44**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

Table 4

Correlations Among Measures

	Prejudice	Fundamentalism
Prejudice	-	
Fundamentalism	.61**	-
Social Desirability	-.04	.26**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

by the Modified Godfrey-Richman ISM Scale (M-GRISMS)?

It was hypothesized that the more multiple minority statuses individuals had, the less prejudice they would indicate, since they would have more knowledge of prejudice. This question was addressed using an analysis of variance to evaluate the relationship between multiple minority statuses and prejudice.

Table 5 presents the results of the analysis of variance for multiple minority statuses and prejudice, $F(3, 96) = .130, p > .05$, so the hypothesis was not supported. Only 1% of the variability in prejudice can be explained by multiple minority statuses ($R^2 = .01$).

Table 6 lists the means for each multiple minority status and prejudice. The means for the different number of statuses on prejudice are very similar, so the hypothesis is not supported.

Research Question 2

To what extent does fundamentalism, as measured by the Religious Fundamentalism Scale, relate to prejudice? It was hypothesized that fundamentalism relates to prejudice, in that the higher the fundamentalism the higher the prejudice. The Pearson correlation showed a positive correlation between fundamentalism and prejudice ($r = .61, p < .01$), which indicates that participants who displayed highly fundamentalist views also tended to score highly on feelings of prejudice. Table 6 lists the means for fundamentalism and prejudice for the minority statuses as reported in the ANOVA. It appears that the participants with more minority statuses displayed slightly more fundamentalism, but the scores on prejudice were similar for all statuses.

Research Question 3

What is the relationship between social desirability, as measured by the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M-C SDS) form C, to various minority statuses? It was hypothesized that the more minority statuses a person has the less social desirability he or she would display. This question was addressed using an analysis of variance to evaluate the relationship between multiple minority statuses and social desirability.

The Pearson correlation showed no significant correlations between social desirability and any of the minority statuses. Table 7 presents the results of the analysis of variance for multiple minority statuses and social desirability, $F(3, 96) = .668, p > .05$, so the hypothesis was not supported. Only 4% of the variability in social desirability can be explained or accounted for by multiple minority statuses ($R^2 = .04$). Table 6 lists the means for each multiple minority status and social desirability.

Summary of Results

The preliminary analyses indicated that all of the measures used in the study were highly reliable. The primary analyses indicated that hypotheses one was not supported, with there being no statistical significance on the relationship between multiple minority statuses and prejudice. The second hypothesis stated that fundamentalism relates to prejudice, in that the higher the fundamentalism the higher the prejudice, and his hypothesis was supported. The third hypothesis that the more minority statuses a person has the less for social desirability the person would display, was not supported.

Table 5

Analysis of Variance for Multiple Minority Statuses with Prejudice

Prejudice	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	9.838	3	3.279	.130	.942
Within Groups	2419.072	96	25.199		
Total	2428.910	99			

Table 6

Means for Multiple Minority Status on Prejudice, Fundamentalism and Social Desirability

Multiple Minority Status	Prejudice	Fundamentalism	Social Desirability
One Minority	32.90	86.80	1.600
Two Minorities	32.55	99.08	1.578
Three Minorities	32.03	100.03	1.484
Four Minorities	32.76	104.10	1.714

Table 7

Analysis of Variance for Multiple Minority Status with Social Desirability

Social Desirability	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	21.422	3	7.141	.668	.573
Within Groups	1025.578	96	10.683		
Total	1047.000	99			

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the study was to address a gap in the literature of minority prejudice. More specifically, this study investigates the relationships between multiple minority status, prejudice, social desirability and fundamentalism. The focus was on the relationship between individuals' perceived statuses and their feelings of prejudice toward others.

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section reviews the research questions and hypotheses presented in Chapter I and discusses the results related to the research questions. The second section discusses the limitations and strengths of the present study. The third section discusses recommendations for future studies.

Research Questions

Research Question 1

How does belonging to multiple minority statuses relate to prejudice as measured by the Modified Godfrey-Richman ISM Scale (M-GRISMS) (Godfrey, Richman, & Withers, 2000)?

Research Hypothesis Question 1

It was hypothesized that the more multiple minority statuses a person had the less prejudice they would display, since they would have more knowledge of prejudice. This hypothesis was based on the central belief that “personal knowledge reduces prejudice” (Haldeman & Buhrke, 2003, p.156).

Research Question 1 Results

This study did not find a connection between the number of multiple minority statuses and prejudice. This indicates that these results did not confirm the central belief that “personal knowledge reduces prejudice” (Haldeman & Buhrke, 2003, p.156). The lack of understanding of minority prejudice could play a part in the results. Most of the studies on prejudice have looked at prejudice from majority towards minorities and not minority to minority prejudice. It is not known whether minorities express prejudice in a similar or different manner than the majority. If there is a difference, then the instruments used to measure majority-minority prejudice might be inappropriate or lack adequate sensitivity to measure minority-minority prejudice.

Also, the study may have been affected by the lack of knowledge about relationships between minority statuses and the influence it might have if a person views one status as more important to them than any other. Hypothetically, for example, individuals might not truly identify with one of their statuses but indicate on surveys that they do belong to that status. Would that affect their perception and feelings of prejudice towards others with that status? For example, if a Latina lesbian female did not identify with her racial/ethnic status but had been discriminated against because of it. Would she react differently than those who identify with all their statuses? If this in fact occurred, then it would be a limitation of the study and another component should be added in future research to tease out this issue of identification level with status.

Research Question 2

To what extent does fundamentalism, as measured by the Religious Fundamentalism Scale, relate to prejudice (Laythe, Finkel, & Kirkpatrick, 2001)?

Research Hypothesis Question 2

It was hypothesized that fundamentalism relates to prejudice, in that the higher the fundamentalism the higher the prejudice. This hypothesis was based on previous research that found a relationship between fundamentalism and prejudice (McFarland, 1989).

Research Question 2 Results

This study found that fundamentalism was correlated with prejudice. This is consistent with previous research which had found that fundamentalism contributes to prejudice. Altemeyer and Hunsberger (1992) found that prejudice was positively correlated with fundamentalism in a sample of differing religions: Christians, Protestants and Jewish.

Research Question 3

What is the relationship between social desirability, as measured by the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M-C SDS) form C, to various minority statuses?

Research Hypothesis Question 3

It was hypothesized that the more minority statuses a person had the less social desirability he or she would display. This hypothesis was based on the idea that

minorities have been the object of discrimination and might feel less inclined to appear socially desirable in order to please the majority (Weeks & Lupfer, 2004).

Research Question 3 Results

Previous studies found that the majority of people do not want to appear prejudiced so they answer surveys in a politically correct manner. In other words, they need to appear socially desirable through their answers (Block, 1965; Canero & Solanes, 2002; Edwards, 1970; Maher, 1978).

The current study did not display a link between social desirability and different minority statuses. This may be due to the type of sample in the study. For example, all the minority statuses seemed to display similar scores on social desirability. This could be explained by the theory that everybody reacts with prejudicial thoughts but the less prejudiced people will consciously counteract their initial impulse by activating non-prejudiced beliefs (Devine, 1989). These none prejudiced beliefs could be interpreted as socially desirable answers so this could be affecting the results.

Results could also be due to the fact that the survey was anonymous so their answers could not be traced back to the participants. Anonymous surveys could be a benefit because people might feel comfortable answering truthfully since the answer cannot be traced back to them or the person may not answer truthfully because there is no accountability. Either of those two instances could have affected the results.

Limitations and Strengths

Limitations

There are several limitations and strengths to the current study that must be considered when interpreting the results. First, with respect to generalizability, the sample is comprised of people with minority statuses, so the results can only be generalized to similar samples.

Previous research has explored discrimination based on an individual's age and has found that it is prevalent (Martens et al, 2004; Nelson, 2005). This study excluded age as a minority status because the participants were all around the same age.

Another limitation is selection bias in that those who chose to participate could have been significantly different than those who chose not to participate. However, due to the anonymous data collection procedures it was not possible to determine if there were significant differences from the respondents and non-respondents.

Thirdly, the study utilized only self report measures, which are subject to participants' self awareness and to responding in a socially desirable manner. Although this study was anonymous and social desirability was accounted for, some participants may have still responded in a socially desirable manner or since there is no accountability they could have answered untruthfully.

Also, the format of the surveys was forced choice and did not allow the participants to express their thoughts and feelings about what was being asked. Many participants wrote their thoughts in the margin and it would have improved the study if it had allowed for a qualitative component. Examples of such comments include:

- “I don’t know any Native Americans personally but I have heard that they drink a lot.”
- “I think that because of 9-11 the Muslims have shown that they are a dangerous group of people.”
- “I have an acquaintance who is Jewish and I don’t like her so that is why I am answering this question like this.”

Lastly, as I collected data, I found that it would have enhanced my study if I had a specific qualitative component where participants could discuss the reasoning behind their answers to the prejudice survey in particular. This would have given the study a glimpse into how a person really feels about others and how he or she comes to the decision to discriminate against others based on the theory that everybody reacts with prejudicial thoughts but the less prejudiced people will consciously counteract their initial impulse by activating non-prejudiced beliefs (Devine, 1989).

Strengths

The present study has several strengths that allow it to make a unique contribution to the literature exploring multiple minority statuses.

First, the purpose of the present study was to contribute to the multiple minority status literature by looking at relationships between statuses, prejudice, social desirability and fundamentalism. The research questions in the present study are unique and no studies to date have empirically investigated these variables. Thus, the present study makes an original contribution to the literature.

Also, the sample utilized had increased diversity demographics compared with previous studies, which had investigated prejudice primarily in the Caucasian population and overlooked the population with multiple minority statuses.

Recommendations for Future Research

This area of research should be investigated further in order to better understand prejudice. Future research should focus on the experience of prejudice and how this may affect one's views on prejudice. Another area for future research is how prejudice may be affected when a person identifies with a particular minority status over other statuses that the person may have. So, if a person doesn't truly identify with one of his or her statuses, but she or he belongs to that status and has been discriminated because of it, would that affect his or her perception and feelings of prejudice towards others with that status?

Another aspect that was not touched on in this study was the concept of power and how it may affect majority and minority statuses and prejudice. Future studies could investigate the role of power in minority to minority prejudice.

An interesting finding was that social desirability was correlated with fundamentalism, which in turn, was correlated with prejudice. Does this imply that their religion sanctions prejudice—thus making it socially desirable? This relationship should be investigated further. Future research could investigate the relationship between social desirability and religion or even go one step further and investigate how individuals interpret religious teachings.

Another aspect for further research would be to take groups individually and explore their views on others and the reasons behind it. For example, if there is a study on Latino's prejudice towards other minorities then we can investigate how Latinos view prejudice. Are they overt or covert in expressing prejudice? How did those prejudiced feelings begin? What do they gain from prejudice...does it make them feel powerful? A study looking into this might give a clearer picture of how prejudices are made and what leads to discrimination.

Lastly, another area of research might be different ways to measure prejudice other than surveys. For African American and White American prejudice, some researchers are using the Race Implicit Association Test (Race IAT). This is a response latency test that assesses implicit racial attitudes (Greenwald, McGhee & Schwartz, 1998). Finding other methods of exploring prejudice instead of surveys would help diminish the social desirability component of surveys and might help investigate different aspects of minority-minority prejudice.

REFERENCES

- Adam, B.D. (1987). *The rise of a gay and lesbian movement*. Boston: Twayne.
- Aguero, J.E., Bloch, L. & Byrne, D. (1984). The relationships among sexual beliefs, attitudes, experience, and homophobia. *Journal of Homosexuality, 10*, 95-107.
- Akerlund, M. & Cheung, M. (2000). Teaching beyond the deficit model: Gay and lesbian issues among African Americans, Latinos, and Asian Americans. *Journal of Social Work Education, 36*(2), 279-292.
- Allen, C. & Nielsen, J.S. (2002). *Summary report on Islamophobia in the EU after 11 September 2001*. Vienna, Austria: European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia.
- Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Allport, G.W. & Kramer, B.M. (1946). Some roots of prejudice. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied, 22*, 9-39.
- Alrecht, G. L. & Devlieger, P. J. (1998). The disability paradox: High quality of life against all odds. *Social Science and Medicine, 48*, 977-988.
- Altemeyer, B. & Hunsberger, B. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest and prejudice. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 2*, 113-133.
- Andrea, Alfred J. (2003). *Encyclopedia of the crusades*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Aranda, E.M. & Rebollo-Gil, G. (2004). Ethnoracism and the "sandwiched" minorities. *American Behavioral Scientist, 47*(7), 910-927

- Ashmore, R.D. (1970). Intergroup contact as a prejudice-reduction technique: An experimental examination of the shared-coping approach and four alternative explanations. (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1970). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 31(5-B), 2949-2950.
- Batson, C.D., Schoenrade, P. & Ventis, W.L. (1993). *Religion and the individual: A social-psychological perspective*. New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.
- Belluck, P. (2002, January 15). Doctors' new practices offer deluxe service for deluxe fee. *New York Times*. Retrieved April 24, 2007, from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Berger, D.L. & Williams, J.E. (1991). Sex stereotypes in the United States revisited: 1972-1988. *Sex Roles*, 24, 413-423.
- Blauner, B. (1989). *Black lives, white lives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Block, J. (1965). *The challenge of response sets*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Borowitz, A. (2004). The Borowitz report: Operation pink storm George W. Bush launches a new front in the terror war. *The Borowitz Report*. Retrieved May 3, 2005, from <http://www.borowitzreport.com>
- Bucher, R.D. (2004). *Diversity consciousness: Opening our minds to people, cultures and opportunities*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Butler, D. & Gels, F.L. (1990) Nonverbal affect responses to male and female leaders. Implications for leadership evaluations. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 58, 48-59.
- Cañero, J.C. y Solanes, A. (2002) Religión y prejuicio ¿Una relación paradójica?

Psicología, Educação Cultura, 6(2), 243-277.

- Conley, T.D., Calhoun, C., Evett, S.R., & Devine, P.G. (2001). Mistakes that heterosexual people make when trying to appear non prejudiced: The view from lgb people. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 42(2), 21-43.
- Conley, T.D., Devine, P.G., Rabow, J., & Evett, S.R. (2002). Gay men and lesbians' experiences in and expectations for interactions with heterosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 44(1), 83-109.
- Corcoran, K. & Schneider, M.B. (2005). *Court upholds state's gay marriage ban*. The Indianapolis Star.
- Cose, E. (1999, June 7). The good news about black America. *Newsweek*. Retrieved April 24, 2007, from <http://www.msnbc.msn.com>
- Crowne, D.P. & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 24(4), 349-354.
- Cummings, S. & Lambert, T. (1997). Anti-Hispanic and anti-Asian sentiments among African Americans. *Social Science Quarterly*, 78(2), 338-353.
- Devine, P.G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(1), 5-18.
- DiPlacido, J. (1998). Minority stress among lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals a consequence of heterosexism, homophobia, and stigmatization. In G.M. Herek (Ed.), *Stigma and sexual orientation understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals* (pp.138-159). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dion, K.L. (2002). The social psychology of perceived prejudice and discrimination.

- Canadian Psychology*, 43(1), 1-10.
- Dovidio, J.F., Gaertner, S.E., Kawakami, K. & Hodson, G. (2002). Why can't we just get along? Interpersonal biases & interracial distrust. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 8(2), 88-102.
- Duckitt, J.H. (1992). Psychology and prejudice: A historical analysis and integrative framework. *American Psychologist*, 47(10), 1182-1193.
- Dyer, J., Vedlitz, A., & Worchel, S. (1989). Social distance among racial and ethnic groups in Texas: Some demographic correlates. *Social Science Quarterly*, 70, 607-616.
- Edwards, A.L. (1970). *The measurement of personality traits by scales and inventories*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Ehrenreich, B. (1995). The silenced majority: Why the average working person has disappeared from American media and culture. In G. Dines & J.M. Humez (Eds.), *Gender, race, and class in media*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ehrlich, H.J. (1973). *The social psychology of prejudice*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Eisen, S.V., Gerena, M., Ranganathan, G., Esch, D. & Idiculla, T. (2006). Reliability and validity of the BASIS-24© Mental Health Survey for Whites, African-Americans, and Latinos. *Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research*, 33(3), 304-323.
- English, F. (1996). The lure of fundamentalism. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 26, 23-30.

- Flakus, G. (2007, April 12). US Hispanics win battle over World War II documentary. *Voice of America*. Retrieved April 15, 2007, from <http://www.voanews.com>
- Frable, D.E.S. (1989). Sex typing and gender ideology: Two facets of the individual's gender psychology that go together. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *56*, 95-108.
- Gattino, S. & Miglietta, A. (2004). Entre la marginación y la integración: Un estudio sobre el prejuicio étnico, orientación política y empleo del lenguaje. *Boletín de Psicología*, *80*, 37-57.
- Glick, P. & Fiske, S.T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*(3), 491-512.
- Godfrey, S., Richman, C.L. & Withers, T.N. (2000). Reliability and validity of a new scale to measure prejudice: The GRISMS. *Current Psychology*, *19*(1), 3-18.
- Greenfield, T.A. (1996). Gender, ethnicity, science achievement, and attitudes. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *33*, 901-933.
- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998). Measuring differences in implicit cognition: The implicit association test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 1464-1480.
- Guindon, M.H., Green, A.G. & Hanna, F.J. (2003). Intolerance and psychopathology: Toward a general diagnosis for racism, sexism, and homophobia. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *73*(2), 167-176.
- Hahn, H. (1997). An agenda for citizens with disabilities: Pursuing identity and

- empowerment. *Vocational Rehabilitation*, 9, 31-37.
- Haldeman, D.C & Buhrke, R.A. (2003). Under a rainbow flag: The diversity of sexual orientation. In J.D., Robinson & L.C., James (Eds.), *Diversity in human interactions: The tapestry of America* (pp.145-156). Oxford University Press.
- Hall, W. (1986). Social class and survival on the S.S. Titanic. *Social Science and Medicine*, 22, 687-690.
- Haney-Lopez, I.F. (1996). *White by law : The legal construction of race*. New York : New York University Press.
- Heaven, P.C. & Furnham, A. (2001). Race prejudice and economic beliefs. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 127(5), 483-489.
- Heilman, M.E., Block, C.J. & Lucas, J.A. (1992). Presumed incompetent? Stigmatization and affirmative action efforts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(4), 536-544.
- Helmreich, W.B. (1992). The things they say behind your back : Stereotypes and the myths behind them. In H.F. Lena, W.B. Helmreich, & W. McCord (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in sociology*. New York : McGraw-Hill.
- Herek, G.M. (1994). Assessing heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. In B. Greene and G.M. Herek (Eds.), *Lesbian and gay psychology : Theory research, and clinical applications* (pp. 206-228). Newbury Park, CA : Sage.
- Hudson, W.W. & Ricketts, W.A. (1980). A strategy for the measurement of homophobia. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 5, 357-372.
- Hunsberger, B. (1995). Religion and prejudice : The role of religious fundamentalism,

- quest and right wing authoritarianism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51(2), 113-129.
- Hunsberger, B. (1996). Religious fundamentalism, right wing authoritarianism, and hostility in non-Christian religious groups. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 6, 39-49.
- Hunsberger, B., Alisat, S., Pancer, S. & Pratt, M. (1996). Religious fundamentalism and religious doubts : Content, connections, and complexity of thinking. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 6, 201-220.
- Jones, M. (2002). *Social Psychology of Prejudice*. NJ : Prentice Hall.
- Jussim, L., Coleman, L.M., & Lerch, L. (1987). The nature of stereotypes : A comparison and integration of three theories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 536-546.
- Kearl, M.C. (1989). *Endings: A sociology of death and dying*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kirby, B.J. (1999). Income source and race effects on new-neighbor evaluations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29(7), 1497-1511.
- Kirkpatrick, L. (1993). Fundamentalism, Christian orthodoxy, and intrinsic religious orientation as predictors of discriminatory attitudes. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 32, 256-268.
- Kleftaras, G. (2003). The importance of cultural factors in counseling people with physical or intellectual disabilities. *Journal of the Hellenic Psychological Society*, 10(2), 362-377.
- Kleck, R., Ono, H. & Hastorf, A.H. (1966). The effect of physical deviance upon face to

- face interaction. *Human Relations*, 19, 425-436.
- Koch, T. (2001). Disability and difference: Balancing social and physical constructions. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 27(6), 370-376.
- Kuntz, G. (1998, May 4). My spanish standoff. *Newsweek*.
- Larcom, B. & George, A. (1992, March). *First glimpse of new workplace research*.
National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence.
- Laythe, B., Finkel, D. & Kirkpatrick, L.A. (2001). Predicting prejudice from religious fundamentalism and right wing authoritarianism : A multiple-regression approach. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 40(1), 1-10.
- Lewin, K. (1980). Field theory and experiment in social psychology. In R.E. Muuss (Ed.), *Adolescent behavior and society : A book of readings* (3rd ed., pp. 4-13).
New York : Random House.
- Livingston, R.W. (2002). The role of perceived negativity in the moderation of African Americans' implicit and explicit racial attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 38(4), 405-413.
- Loiacano, D.K. (1989). Gay identity issues among black Americans: Racism, homophobia, and the need for validation. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 68, 21-25.
- Lombroso, C. (2004). *Criminal woman, the prostitute, and the normal woman*.
Durham: Duke University Press.
- Lynch, L. (Director) & Silverman, S. (Writer). (2005). *Sarah Silverman: Jesus is magic*.
[Motion Picture]. United States: Black Gold Films.

- Maher, B.A. (1978). A reader's, writer's, and reviewer's guide to assessing research reports in clinical psychology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 46, 835-838.
- Mantsios, G. (1995). Media magic: Making class invisible. In P.S. Rothenberg (Ed.), *Race, class and gender in the United States* (3rd ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Martens, A., Greenberg, J., Schimel, J. & Landau, M.J. (2004). Ageism and death: Effects of mortality salience and perceived similarity to elders on reactions to elderly people. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(12), 1524-1536.
- 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- 126). New York: Academic.
- McCoy, R. (1981). Navajo code talkers of World War II. *American West*, 18(6), 67-75.
- McFarland, S. (1989). Religious orientations and the targets of discrimination. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 28, 324-336.
- McFarland, S. & Warren, J. (1992). Religious orientations and selective exposure among fundamentalist Christians. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 31, 163-174.
- McGill, K. (2005). *Court reinstates Louisiana's anti-gay marriage amendment*. The Times-Picayune.
- Meyer, I.H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and

- bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(5), 674-697.
- Moore, D.S., & McCabe, G.P. (1989). *Introduction to the practice of statistics*. New York, NY: Henry Holt.
- Mpofu, E. & Harley, D.A. (2006). Racial and disability identity: Implications for the career counseling of African American with disabilities. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 50(1), 14-13.
- Nabors, N.A., Hall, R.L., Miville, M.L., Nettles, R., Pauling, M.L. & Ragsdale, B.L. (2001). Multiple minority group oppression: Divided we stand? *Journal of the Gay and Lesbian Medical Association*, 5(3), 101-105.
- Navarro, V. (1992, March 23). The middle class-A useful myth. *The Nation*.
- Navas, M.S. (1997). El prejuicio presenta un nuevo rostro: Puntos de vista teoricos y lineas de investigacion recientes sobre un problema familiar. *Revista de Psicologia Social*, 12(2), 201-237.
- Nelson, T.D. (2005). Ageism: Prejudice against our feared future self. *Journal of Social Issues*, 61(2), 207-221.
- Newman, D.M. (2004). *Sociology exploring the architecture of everyday life*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Noble, J.A. (2006). Cultural exposure and attitudes toward racial diversity in Caucasians, monoracials and multiracials. (Doctoral dissertation, California School of Psychology, Los Angeles, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66(7-B), 4000.

- Omeish, M.S. (1999). Muslim students' perceptions of prejudice and discrimination in American academia: Challenges, issues, and obstacles and the implications for educators, administrators, and university officials. (Doctoral dissertation, The George Washington University, Washington D.C., 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(2-A), 0360.
- Parenti, M. (1996). The make-believe media. In M.J. Carter (Ed.), *Society and the media*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Pear, R. (1993, July 8). Wide health gap, linked to income, is reported in the U.S. *New York Times*.
- Penelope, J. (1992). *Call me lesbian: Lesbian lives, lesbian theory*. Freedom, CA: Crossing Press.
- Pettigrew, T.F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 65-85.
- Pettigrew, T.F. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(5), 751-783.
- Pipes, R. & Davenport, D. (1999). *Introductions to psychotherapy: Common clinical wisdom*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn/Bacon.
- Poniewozik, J. (2007, April 12). Who can say what? *Time*. Retrieved April 17, 2007, from <http://time.com>
- Quiles, M.N., Rodriguez, A., Navas, M., Rodriguez, R., Betancor, V. & Coello, E. (2006). Variables moderadas y mediadoras de la relacion percepcion de diferencias-ansiedad intergrupala. *Psicothema*, 18(1), 105-111.

- Rawe, J. (2007, April 23). Women's pay: Lagging from the start. *Time*. Retrieved April 24, 2007, from <http://www.time.com>
- Reiman, J. (2001). *The rich get richer and the poor get prison*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Reynolds, W.M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 38(1)*, 119-125.
- Richards, P. (1994). Religious devoutness, impression management and personality functioning in college students. *Journal of Research in Personality, 28*, 14-26.
- Rock, S. (2004). Introductions: Religion, prejudice and conflict in the modern world. *Patterns of Prejudice, 28(2)*, 101-108.
- Rooney, S.C., Flores, L.Y. & Mercier, C.A. (1998). Making multicultural education effective for everyone. *Counseling Psychologist, 26(1)*, 22-32.
- Rosenblith, J.F. (1949). A replication of "some roots of prejudice." *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 44(4)*, 470-489.
- Santiago-Rivera, A.L., Arredondo, P. & Gallardo-Cooper, M. (2002). *Counseling Latinos and la familia*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sears, D.O. (1988). Symbolic racism. In P.A. Katz & D.A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: profiles in controversy. Perspectives in Social Psychology* (pp. 53-84). New York: Plenum Press.
- Sege, I. (1995, February 9). Not Black enough? Law professor heads to BU after furor at Northwestern over her racial identity. *The Boston Globe*, 63-68.
- Sellers, R.M. & Shelton, J.N. (2003). The role of racial identity in perceived racial discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84(5)*, 1079-1092.

- Sheridan, L.P. (2006). Islamophobia pre-and-post September 11th, 2001. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21(3)*, 317-336.
- Sidel, R. (1986). *Women and children last*. New York: Penguin.
- Smith, T.B., Stratton, J., Stones, C.R. & Naidoo, A. (2003). Ethnic identity and racial attitudes in a minority group of mixed racial origin. *Psychological Reports, 92*, 284-290.
- Snipp, C.M. (1986). American Indians and natural resource development. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 45*, 457-474.
- Stake, J.E. (2003). Understanding male bias against girls and women in science. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 33(4)*, 667-682.
- Suarez, Z. (1998). The Cuban-American family. In C.H. Mindel, R.W. Habenstein, & R. Wright (Eds.), *Ethnic families in America: Patterns and variations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Sullivan, G. & Jackson, P.A. (1999). Introductions: ethnic minorities and the lesbian and gay community. *Journal of Homosexuality, 36*, 1-28.
- 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(2)*, 199-214.
- Taywaditep, K.J. (2001). Marginalization among the marginalized: Gay men's anti-effeminacy attitudes. *Journal of Homosexuality, 42(1)*, 1-28.
- Temple-Raston, D. (2002). *A death in Texas*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Tropp, L.R. & Pettigrew, T.F. (2005). Relationship between intergroup contact and

- prejudice among minority and majority status groups. *Psychological Science*, *16*(12), 951-957.
- Walters, K.L. & Simoni, J.M. (1993). Lesbian and gay male group identity attitudes and self-esteem: Implications for counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *40*(1), 94-99.
- Walton, J. (1990). *Sociology and critical inquiry*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Weber, M. (1970). *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weeks, M. & Lupfer, M.B. (2004). Complicating race: The relationship between prejudice, race and social class categorizations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *30*(8), 972-984.
- White, S.M. & Franzini, L.R. (1999). Heteronegativism? The attitudes of gay men and lesbians toward heterosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *37*(1), 65-79.
- White, J.B. & Langer, E.J. (1999). Horizontal hostility: Relations between similar minority groups. *Journal of Social Issues*, *55*(3), 537-559.
- White, J.B., Schmitt, M.T. & Langer, E.J. (2006). Horizontal hostility: Multiple minority groups and differentiation from the mainstream. *Group Process & Intergroup Relations*, *9*(3), 339-358.
- Wolfe, A. (1998). *One nation, after all*. New York: Viking.
- Wulff, D. (1991). *Psychology of religion: Classic and contemporary*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York.
- Wylie, L. & Forest, J. (1992). Religious fundamentalism, right wing authoritarianism

and prejudice. *Psychological Reports*, 71, 1291-1298.

Young, J. M. & McNicoll, P. (1988). Against all odds: Positive life experiences of people with advanced amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *Health and Social Work*, 23, 35-43.

APPENDIX A
STATUS CHECKLIST

Gender

_____ Female

_____ Male

To what degree have you experienced prejudice as a result of your status?

Never	No	Don't Know	Sometimes	Always
1	2	3	4	5

Sexual Orientation

_____ Homosexual

_____ Heterosexual

To what degree have you experienced prejudice as a result of your status?

Never	No	Don't Know	Sometimes	Always
1	2	3	4	5

Disabilities

_____ Disabled

_____ Non-Disabled

To what degree have you experienced prejudice as a result of your status?

Never	No	Don't Know	Sometimes	Always
1	2	3	4	5

Religious

_____ Christian

_____ Non-Christian

Specify Religious Denomination: _____

To what degree have you experienced prejudice as a result of your status?

Never	No	Don't Know	Sometimes	Always
1	2	3	4	5

Socio-Economic Status

_____ \$101,000 or above

_____ \$51,000-\$100,000

_____ \$25,000-\$5,000

_____ \$25,000 or below

How many years of education do you have?

How many years of education do your parents have?

To what degree have you experienced prejudice as a result of your status?

Never	No	Don't Know	Sometimes	Always
1	2	3	4	5

Racial/Ethnic Status

_____ Majority/Dominant

_____ Minority

Specify Minority: _____

To what degree have you experienced prejudice as a result of your status?

Never	No	Don't Know	Sometimes	Always
1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B

STUDY INFORMATION SHEET

The Relationship between Minority Statuses and Prejudice

You have been asked to participate in a research study on prejudice and minority statuses. You were selected to be a possible participant based on your minority status. A total of 100 people have been asked to participate in this study. The purpose of this study is to find out if the number of minority statuses to which individuals belong relate to their feelings about others.

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to complete four questionnaires. This study will only take approximately 20-30 minutes. You have been informed that there are no specific benefits or risks associated with this study. Upon completing the questionnaire packet, you will provide your e-mail address to the investigator who will enter you in a raffle where you have the possibility of winning one of three twenty five dollar gift certificates to a fine dining restaurant in town.

This study is anonymous because your name will not be connected to the information on the questionnaire packet. As a result, no identifiers linking you to the study will be included in any sort of report that might be published. The records of this study will be kept private. Research records will be stored securely and only Mia Veve and Dr. Donna Davenport will have access to the records.

Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Texas A&M University. If you decide to participate you are free to refuse to answer any of the questions that may make you uncomfortable. You may withdraw at anytime without your relations with the University, job, benefits, etc, being affected. You can contact Mia Veve at miaveve@yahoo.com and Dr. Donna Davenport at ddavenport@coe.tamu.edu.

This research study has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board-Human Subjects in Research, Texas A&M University. For research-related problems or questions regarding subjects' rights, I can contact the Institutional Review Board through Dr. Michael W. Buckley, Director of Research Compliance, Office of Vice President for Research at (979)845-8585 (mwbuckley@tamu.edu).

You have read the above information and asked questions and have received answers to your satisfaction. You have been given a copy of this information sheet for your records.

VITA

Mia Veve

4225 TAMU
College Station, TX 77843

Education:

Appalachian State University	Predoctoral Internship		August 2005- August 2006
Texas A&M University	Ph.D.	Counseling Psychology	August 2007
Texas A&M University	M.Ed.	Counseling Psychology	August 2003
Texas A&M University	B.A.	Psychology	August 2001