TPM

THE AKRAMI, EKEHAMMAR, AND ARAYA'S CLASSICAL AND MODERN RACIAL PREJUDICE SCALE IN THE ITALIAN CONTEXT

SILVIA GATTINO
ANNA MIGLIETTA
SILVIA TESTA
UNIVERSITY OF TORINO

The validity of the Classical and Modern Racial Prejudice Scale by Akrami and colleagues, in its full 17-item form and a new reduced 15-item form, was assessed in the Italian context. Study 1 was carried out on 300 participants and Study 2 on 310. Confirmatory factor analyses showed that classical and modern prejudice may be distinguished one from the other. The scale construct validity — convergent and discriminant — and the criterion-based validity were also evaluated. The findings not only confirmed the validity of the scale, but also highlighted the importance of ideological orientation in ethnic prejudice.

Key words: Classical and Modern Racial Prejudice Scale; Conservatism; Validity; Ethnic prejudice.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Silvia Gattino, Dipartimento di Psicologia, Università di Torino, Via Verdi 10, 10124 Torino (TO), Italy. Email: silvia.gattino@unito.it

INTRODUCTION

Prejudice can be defined as a negative evaluation of a social group or individual that is significantly based on group membership. As Crandall and Eshleman (2003) noted, authentic and genuine prejudice is seldom expressed directly, indeed prejudice is almost always expressed through the filters of suppression and justification. Among the reasons for suppressing prejudice one could include a changing normative climate that makes "old fashioned" prejudice socially unacceptable in its raw form. Specifically, the post World War II period, and even more so the post 1970 period, witnessed the spreading of tolerant and equalitarian ideologies that modified its expression in western societies. However, although open rejection of diversity is now somewhat contained, it does not necessarily follow that prejudice has disappeared from the individual's cognitive and affective world. Therefore, the expression "modern racism" has been coined to describe this trend, when referring to ethnic prejudice and has been confirmed by research carried out in various European countries, in the United States, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand (Akrami, Ekehammar, & Araya, 2000; Barker, 1982; Durrheim & Dixon, 2004; Essed, 1991; Manganelli Rattazzi & Volpato, 2001; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995; Reeves, 1983; Sears, 1988; Taguieff, 1990; van Dijk, 1984; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). That of race is a controversial and criticized concept, because recent advances in the sequencing of the human genome found evidence that racial groups are not scientifically meaningful. What is central in the concept of prejudice is the ethnic dimension. Indeed, "ethnicity refers to clusters of people who have com-

mon culture traits that they distinguish from those of other people" (Smedley & Smedley, 2005, p. 17). In this paper, however, the terms "race" and "racism" appear several times because they are part of the labels of the different measures of ethnic prejudice that we considered. From a conceptual point of view, the terms *modern* and *classical* racism refer to the new and the old expressions of ethnic prejudice.

Many theorists of prejudice claim that modern ethnic prejudice is characterized by different components, such as that described by Sears (1988) in the form of a denial of continued discrimination, antagonism toward minority group demands, and resentment as to "special favors" for minority groups. Similarly, Pettigrew and Meertens (1995) argued that subtle (modern) prejudice has three components: the defence of traditional values, an exaggeration of cultural differences, and the denial of positive emotions.

The conceptual distinction between the "old" and "new" forms of prejudice is reflected empirically in the various instruments developed to define the nature of this construct and to assess its strength, for example Kinder and Sears' (1981) Symbolic Racism Scale, Kleinpenning and Hagendoorn's (1993) Aversive Racism Scale, McConahay's (1986) Modern Racism Scale, Pettigrew and Meertens' (1995) Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale. As the last was developed in Europe, its use is widespread in this context (Gawronski, Geschke, & Banse, 2003; Hofmann, Gschwendner, & Schmitt, 2005; van Dick et al., 2004; Vrij, Akehurst, & Smith, 2003; Wagner & Zick, 1995). Pettigrew and Meeertens' scale owes its popularity also to its having been described as a bidimensional structure, allowing the assessment and comparison of the strengths of the old and new forms of prejudice. However, the nature of the two dimensions underlying this scale was questioned by Coenders and colleagues (Coenders, Scheepers, Sniderman, & Verberk, 2001). Moreover, a recent study demonstrated that the Subtle and Blatant Prejudice Scales underlie a single factor rather than a bifactor structure, at least as far as its Italian version is concerned (Gattino, Miglietta, & Testa, 2008).

In 2000, Akrami et al. presented the Classical and Modern Racial Prejudice Scale (CMRP), measuring ethnic prejudice (see also Akrami, Ekehammar, Bergh, Dahlstrand, & Malmsten, 2009). Like Pettigrew and Meertens's scale, the CMRP scale was developed and validated in a European (Scandinavian) context, and distinguishes between classical and modern prejudice. The scale contains 17 items grouped into two subscales. The Classical Racial Prejudice Scale has eight items, whilst the Modern Racial Prejudice Scale has nine. Just like Sears (1988), the authors grouped modern items into three components, labeled *Denial of continuing discrimination*, *Antagonism toward demands*, and *Resentment about special favors* (see the items labels in Table 4). Two analytical studies were carried out on the psychometric properties of the CMRP scale. A confirmatory factor analysis was performed, comparing three models: the *one-factor model*, the *uncorrelated two-factor model*, and the *correlated two-factor model*, that fitted the data relatively well. Alphas were .72 for the Classical and .82 for the Modern Scale. Construct validity was evaluated by correlating the CMRP scale with the *Modern* and *Classical Sexism Scale* (Ekehammar, Akrami, & Araya, 2000) and *Conservatism Scale* (Ekehammar & Sidanius, 1982), in Study 1, and with a Swedish variant of *Social Dominance Scale* (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994), in Study 2. Conservatism, Classical sexism, and Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) showed the same correlation with Classical and Modern Scales, while Modern sexism was more correlated with Modern, rather than Classical ethnic prejudice. The relationship between the two forms of prejudice and gender was not clear. Data in Study 1 showed that males

had higher scores than females on only the Modern Scale, whilst Study 2 reported significant gender differences for both the Modern and Classical Scale. As claimed by Akrami and colleagues (2000) in Study 2, "these analyses give support for the construct validity [...] but do not indicate discriminant validity as in Study 1" (p. 528).

The primary aim of the present study was to test the dimensionality of CMRP scale in a different cultural context, so as to determine whether it is possible to generalize its capacity to discriminate between Modern and Classical forms of ethnic prejudice. There are various factors characterizing the Italian context, one of which being that immigrant settlement in Italy is quite a recent phenomenon, because since the '90s, Italy has evolved from a country from which people emigrated, to a country of choice for people of many different origins. At the time of writing, Italy has an immigrant population of approximately 4,235,059 people from over 190 different communities, representing 7% of its total population and making it one of the most dynamic countries in Europe, as far as immigration is concerned (Caritas/Migrantes, 2010). However, to date, there are no consistent Italian policies covering the integration of immigrants, and citizenship is still dominated by blood right principles (*ius sanguinis*). There are two main ways for an immigrant to become a citizen: (a) *ius connubi*, through marriage to an Italian citizen; (b) *ius domicilii*, after a set number of years of continuous residence and/or work in the country (10 years for non-EU citizens, five years for EU citizens). In the case of *ius domicilii*, access to citizenship is subject to a discretional decision made by an authoritative committee. Children, born in Italy from non-Italian parents, are not Italian citizens. Therefore, the Italian population does not consider immigrants to be potential co-citizens, thus facilitating the emergence of ethnic prejudice.

Study 1
Testing the Two-Factor Model of Akrami et al.'s Classical and Modern Racial Prejudice Scale

The main aim of Study 1 was to replicate the confirmatory factor analyses carried out in the original studies (Akrami et al., 2000) in the Italian context, so as to test the bidimensionality of the scale. Convergent validity was tested by correlating Classical and Modern prejudice items with Pettigrew and Meertens' prejudice scale (BSPS; 1995). Discriminant validity was evaluated by correlating CMRP items with the SDO scale (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999; see Akrami et al., 2000). Finally, the effects of gender and political orientation were also considered.

Method

Participants

A total of 300 respondents were enrolled into Study 1, 55.7% were female and 44.3% male; age ranged between 18 and 37 years (M = 23.1 years, SD = 3.10). All were students in non-humanistic disciplines at Turin University and Turin Polytechnic Institute. All participants received a small token of appreciation.

Procedure and Questionnaire

Students were contacted in their academic courses and, with professors' permission, completed the questionnaire in class. The questionnaire included the Italian translation,[1] of the *Modern* (α = .76) and *Classical* (α = .78) *Racial Prejudice Scales*, the validated Italian version of Pettigrew and Meerten's *Prejudice Scale* (target group: Immigrants; α = .87; Arcuri & Boca, 1996; Gattino et al., 2008). These contained items such as "Most politicians in Italy care too much about immigrants and not enough about the average Italian" and an Italian modification of the *Social Dominance Scale* (α = .80; Di Stefano & Roccato, 2005) which included items such as "Inferior groups should stay in their place." Participants responded on a 5-point scale, ranging from *strongly disagree* (0) to *strongly agree* (4). One item assessed participants' political orientation measured by self-placement on a 7-point rating scale from *left wing* (1) to *right wing* (7). A brief list of sociodemographic items, including respondents' gender, age, and education, was also included. Items were randomly mixed and appropriate items were reversed.

The experimenter gave students oral instructions as to how to fill in the questionnaire, and asked participants not to write their names or any identifying information so as to ensure anonymity. Once the task was completed, participants were thanked and dismissed.

Data Analysis

We performed a confirmatory factor analysis on the covariance matrix using Lisrel 8.72 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2005) to test the construct validity of the scale. Two alternative models were estimated: the unidimensional model and Akrami et al.'s (2000) model with two correlated factors (the first referring to Classical Prejudice items and the second referring to Modern Prejudice items).

Because data violated the multinormality condition — Mardia's multivariate omnibus test of skewness and kurtosis (2, 266) = 400.177, $p < .01$ — we used the Maximum Likelihood method (ML) to estimate parameters, correcting the chi-square and standard errors (Satorra & Bentler, 1994). The following criteria were used to evaluate the acceptability of the goodness of fit of the model: RMSEA ≤ .08; CFI ≥ .95; SRMR ≤ .08 (Browne & Cudeck, 1993; Hu & Bentler, 1995, 1999). In order to respect the fit criteria, both models were re-specified according to the indications given by the Modification Index (MI), as is sometimes done in such cases. Convergent and discriminant validity of the scale were tested by means of correlations (Pearson's *r*) and means differences (the *t* test).

Results

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Table 1 shows the fit values for the estimated models. As may be observed, all of the fit indexes were unsatisfactory.

TABLE 1
Goodness-of-fit indices for the two confirmatory factor models

Model	SBχ^2	*df*	*p*≅	RMSEA	CFI	SRMR
One factor	570.27	119	.00	.13	.82	.09
Two correlated factors	512.97	118	.00	.11	.84	.09

Note. N = 266. SBχ^2 = Satorra-Bentler scaled-χ^2; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Squared Residuals.

In order to improve the model fit, we considered the Modification Index which suggested to estimate the error covariance involving v2 and v3 in both models. Such covariance is plausible, given the similarity in the contents of the two items, both referring to hygienic conditions: "Immigrants do not keep their homes tidy" (v2) and "Immigrants do not take care of their personal hygiene" (v3). As the introduction of this error covariance parameter did not suffice in meeting the goodness of fit criteria, we decided to remove the item with the lowest loading, that is, item v9: "Discrimination against immigrants is no longer a problem in Italy," for which the loading on the Modern Prejudice factor was zero.[2] Although the resulting 16-item scale did show a better fit, it was still not satisfactory. Therefore, we also eliminated an item from the Classical Scale that is, v7: "I favor full integration of Italians and immigrants." The very high modification index for the error covariance between this item and an item of the Modern Scale (v17; see Table 4 for item's content) suggested the opportunity to estimate such parameter. However, it seemed more appropriate to remove one of them from the scale, in order to make the two subscales more distinguishable from each other. We chose to eliminate v9 to balance the number of items per scale.

Through the introduction of the covariance between errors (v2-v3) and the removal of items v9 and v7, we obtained the results reported in Table 2. As can be seen, the unidimensional re-specified model gave a poorer fit, while the second model was quite satisfactory even if it did not meet the CFI cut-off. The Satorra and Bentler scaled difference χ^2 test (Satorra & Bentler, 2001) yielded a significant result, SB diff (1) = 57.5, $p \cong .00$, confirming that the bidimensional model was a better solution than the unidimensional model.

The first two columns in Table 4 show factor loadings (standardized parameters); all loadings were sufficiently high (except for item v11) and statistically significant ($p < .01$). The disattenuated correlation (ϕ coefficient) between latent variables was .76.

TABLE 2
Goodness-of-fit indices for the two re-specified confirmatory factor models

Model	SBχ^2	*df*	*p*≅	RMSEA	CFI	SRMR
One factor	256.0	89	.00	.08	.91	.07
Two correlated factors	196.3	88	.00	.07	.94	.06

Note. N = 266. SBχ^2 = Satorra-Bentler scaled-χ^2; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Squared Residuals.

Convergent and Discriminant Validity

Classical and Modern Prejudice showed the same high positive correlation with BSPS (total and subscales; Table 3). There was a stronger correlation between Modern prejudice than Classical prejudice with SDO, $t(263) = 2.90$, $p < .005$.

TABLE 3
Pearson's correlation of Classical and Modern Prejudice with SDO and BSPS scales

	Classical	Modern
SDO	.48	.61
BSPS total score	.70	.68
BSPS blatant	.54	.56
BSPS subtle	.59	.56

Note. All correlations are significant at $p < .001$. SDO = Social Dominance Orientation scale; BSPS = Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale.

Political Orientation and Gender Differences

Prejudice scores of both forms were positively and significantly correlated with political orientation ($r = .45$ for Classical prejudice, and $r = .56$ for Modern prejudice, $p < .001$). The correlation was stronger for Modern prejudice, $t(219) = 2.14$, $p < .05$.

Right-wing participants expressed higher prejudice for both Classical ($M = 1.73$ vs. $M = 1.12$) and Modern Prejudice Scales ($M = 2.07$ vs. $M = 1.25$). Differences between right- and left-wing participants[3] were statistically significant: $t(121.4) = 5.64$, $p < .001$, for Classical prejudice,[4] and $t(199) = 8.72$, $p < .001$, for Modern prejudice.

The analysis of gender differences revealed a significant difference for the Modern scale, $t(237) = 2.55$, $p < .05$: men had a higher score ($M = 1.73$) than women ($M = 1.50$). There was no difference for Classical prejudice, $t(221) = 1.44$, *ns*.

STUDY 2
TESTING THE FACTOR STRUCTURE OF THE REDUCED VERSION OF THE CLASSICAL AND MODERN RACIAL PREJUDICE SCALE

The main aims of Study 2 were to test the factor structure of the 15-item version of Akrami et al.'s scale on another sample with social and demographic characteristics similar to those in Study 1, and to provide further empirical evidence for its validity. Discriminant validity was tested by correlating the 15 items in Akrami et al.'s scale with the validated Italian versions of the *Ambivalent Sexism Inventory* (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996; Manganelli Rattazzi, Volpato, & Canova, 2008), the *Host Community Acculturation Scale* (HCAS; Barrette, Bourhis, Capozza, &

Hichy, 2005; Bourhis & Bougie, 1998; Montreuil & Bourhis, 2001), and the *Ideological Orientation Scale* (IOS; Chirumbolo, Sensales, & Kosic, 2003).

The ASI scale — presently the only measure of sexism validated in the Italian context — is a 22-item self-report scale of sexist attitudes comprising two separate 11-item Hostile and Benevolent Sexism Scales (HS; BS). Hostile is a form of antipathy toward women who are perceived as seeking to control men, challenging their power; Benevolent is a form of sexism characterizing women as pure creatures who ought to be protected, thus implying that they are weak and best suited for conventional gender roles. In this sense, benevolent sexism is a form of subjective prejudice that coexists with hostile sexism to inhibit gender equality. According to Glick and Fiske (2001), it is possible to "suggest parallels between the two forms of sexism and prejudice against other groups. HS is similar to other forms of prejudice, directed at groups considered to be threats to in-group status and power. Conversely, BS corresponds to other paternalistic prejudices, directed at groups that are lower in status and viewed as cooperative, or non-threatening" (p.117). In their 1996 study, Glick and Fiske reported a moderate significant correlation between HS and the Modern Racism Scale (McConahay, 1986) both in males ($r = .44$, $p < .01$) and females ($r = .47$, $p < .01$). As BS does not measure hostility, no significant correlation was either found or expected between the Modern Racism Scale and BS, once HS was partialized out in the male sample, even though Modern Racism and BS were weakly but significantly correlated for females ($r = .24$, $p < .01$).

The HCAS assesses the acculturation orientations of the host community when facing immigrant groups. The acculturation concept expresses the process of adaptation occurring when two (or more) different cultural communities are involved in a long-lasting and direct contact. The *Interactive Acculturation Model* (IAM; Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault, & Senecal, 1997; Montreuil & Bourhis, 2004), which is at the basis of the HCA scale, considers five main acculturation orientations that host communities may adopt toward immigrants: (1) *Exclusionism*, according to which immigrants are allowed neither to retain their original culture, nor to adopt that of the host community. Exclusionists are against immigration and would like some categories of immigrants to return to their country of origin; (2) *Segregationism* maintains that host and immigrant communities must live separately; segregationists accept that immigrants maintain their culture but they do not want immigrants to adopt the dominant culture; (3) *Assimilationism* requires immigrants to give up their culture in order to adopt the host community's culture; (4) *Integrationism*, the host community members accept immigrants retain their cultural heritage, at the same time adopting the salient features of the host community's culture; (5) *Individualism*, in which the host community members define themselves and others on the basis of personal features rather than on group belonging. In the HCA scale, the integration orientation is broken down in two different strategies (Barrette et al., 2005): *Double Integrationism*, that corresponds to Integrationism, and *Integrationism-transformation* in which the host community transforms some features of its own culture in order to adopt those of immigrants. The HCAS is a 6-item scale expressing the six acculturation orientations. The items may refer to specific experiential domains, such as cultural heritage, religion, employment, endogamy/exogamy.

To the best of our knowledge, studies directly investigating the relation between ethnic prejudice and acculturation strategies in majority group members are relatively few (Kosic,

Mannetti, & Lackland Sam, 2005; Navas Luque, García Fernández, Rojas Tejada, Pumares Fernández , & Cuadrado Guiado, 2006; Zick, Wagner, van Dick, & Petzel, 2001). Zick and colleagues reviewed a series of studies conducted in Germany on the relations between acculturation attitudes, ethnic prejudice, and inter- and intra-group behaviors. Results of surveys support a relation between prejudice and ideologies of assimilation and segregation among majority-group members and indicate that these attitudes are related to discriminatory behaviors. The other two studies distinguished between blatant and subtle forms of prejudice, assessed through Pettigrew and Meertens' scale. Kosic and colleagues, in a study in the Italian context, found that participants with higher blatant prejudice toward immigrants evaluated assimilation more positively than those with lower blatant prejudice (the subtle scale was excluded from the analysis because of relatively low reliability). Navas Luque and colleagues conducted a similar study in Spain; their results indicate that the lowest prejudice scores (both blatant and subtle) are related to a preference for the integration strategy, whilst the highest ones are related to exclusion/marginalization.

The IOS scale (Chirumbolo et al., 2003) is a 39-item bidimensional scale. The first factor, labeled *Progressivism,* consists of 20 items, whilst the second consisting of 19 items has been labeled *Conservatism.* Both dimensions are associated with political orientation and voting behavior.

On the basis of the above reviewed literature, we formulated the following expectations: (a) as to the relationships between sexism and ethnic prejudice, we assumed there would be a replication of Glick and Fiske's (1996) findings; (b) with regard to the relationships between HCAS and ethnic prejudice, we expected that modern and classical racists would not differ in their preference for exclusionism because of their general opposition toward immigration; instead, we expected classical racists would prefer assimilation. Assimilation entails accepting the host society's culture and relinquishing one's original culture, and could be perceived as less threatening by the host nationals. Indeed, attitudes held by classical racists are based on the belief that immigrants' values and traditions violate the basic culture of the host society; (c) conversely, we expected modern racists to be not systematically in opposition toward the double integrationism strategy (i.e., we expect a zero correlation), whilst we expected a negative correlation with integrationism-trasformation, because this strategy implies the host community transforms some features of its own culture in order to adapt to that of immigrants; finally (d) relating to the relationships between the Ideological Orientation Scale and prejudice, we might reasonably presume that Classical Prejudice, more than Modern Prejudice, would be correlated with conservative attitudes.

METHOD

Participants

Two hundred and eighty-one participants took part in Study 2: 54.8% women and 45.2% men. Age ranged between 20 and 32 years (M = 23.8 years, SD = 1.90). As in Study 1, all participants received a small token of appreciation.

Procedure and Questionnaire

A procedure similar to that of Study 1 was adopted, both for the recruitment of participants and the completion of the questionnaires. As in Study 1, the questionnaire contained the Italian translation of the *Modern* (α = .80) and *Classical* (α = .80) *Racial Prejudice Scales.* It also included the Italian version of the ASI (α = .90, HS; .81, BS), covering items such as "Women seek to gain power by getting control over men" (HS), and "Women should be cherished and protected by men" (BS); the Italian version of the HCAS,[5] concerning cultural heritage (e.g., "Immigrants should give up their cultural heritage in order to adopt Italian culture") and employment (e.g., "When a job is available, employers should refuse to recruit immigrants") domains. The participants' political orientation was assessed through the left-wing/right-wing dimensions (1 = *left-wing orientation*; 7 = *right-wing orientation*) and 17 items from the IOS (α = .73) (Chirumbolo et al., 2003), which includes items such as "Only a strong leader could resolve the problems our country faces" and "One of the main functions of the Italian State should be to preserve our national identity." A brief list of socio-demographic items, including participants' gender, age, and educational qualifications, was included. Items were randomly mixed and some items were reverse coded. The questionnaire also contained other variables, not taken into consideration for the present study.

Responses to the ASI and the CMRP items were given on a 5-point scale, ranging from *strongly disagree* (0) to *strongly agree* (4). Responses to HCAS and Ideological Orientation Scale items were given on a 7-point scale, ranging from *strongly disagree* (0) to *strongly agree* (6).

As in Study 1, the experimenter gave oral instructions and asked participants not to write their names, or any identifying information, on the questionnaire so to ensure anonymity. On completion of the task, participants were thanked and dismissed.

RESULTS

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The unidimensional and bidimensional models were tested on the 15-item prejudice scale, following the same rules and criteria adopted in Study 1. Both models respected the fit criteria: SB- χ^2 (89) = 205.5, $p \cong .00$; RMSEA = .07; CFI = .96; SRMR = .06, for the unidimensional model, and SB- χ^2 (88) = 180.7, $p \cong .00$; RMSEA = .06; CFI = .97; SRMR = .05, for the two correlated factors model. The result of Satorra and Bentler scaled difference χ^2 test was significant, that is: SB diff (1) = 43.5, $p \cong .00$. Although they were more correlated in this study (r = .70) than in the previous one (r = .56), Modern and Classical Prejudice were distinct constructs in the second study as well.

As in Study 1, loadings were high and significant ($p < .01$). Table 4 compares factor loadings obtained in the two studies, showing very similar results.

TABLE 4
Loadings (standardized parameters) for the 15-item model
of the Classical and Modern Prejudice Scale

	Item	Study 1		Study 2	
		Classical	Modern	Classical	Modern
v3	Immigrants do not take care of their personal hygiene	.76	–	.74	–
v8	Immigrants hold negative attitudes toward women	.69	–	.64	–
v2	Immigrants do not keep their homes tidy	.66	–	.69	–
v4	Immigrants are generally honest people*	.65	–	.57	–
v1	Immigrant camps should be placed far out in the countryside	.48	–	.69	–
v6	Immigrants are generally not very intelligent	.43	–	.66	–
v5	Generally speaking, immigrants have high moral principles*	.35	–	.25	–
v14 A	Immigrants are getting too demanding in the push for equal rights	–	.81	–	.79
v17 R	A multicultural Italy would be good*	–	.72	–	.71
v12 A	It is easy to understand immigrants' demands for equal rights*	–	.69	–	.79
v15 R	It is important to invest money in teaching immigrants their mother tongue*	–	.56	–	.44
v16 R	Special programs are needed to create jobs for immigrants*	–	.49	–	.50
v13 A	Immigrants get too little attention in the media*	–	.41	–	.48
v10 D	There have been enough programs designed to create jobs for immigrants	–	.33	–	.48
v11 D	Racist groups are no longer a threat towards immigrants	–	.20	–	.39

Note. N = 266 in Study 1; N = 281 in Study 2. *item reverse coded. v2-v3: correlation between errors = .28. All loadings are statistically significant at $p < .01$. A = Antagonism toward demands; D = Denial of continuing discrimination; R = Resentment about special favors. Items are reported in their original formulation.

Construct Validity of the CMRP Scale

Table 5 reports the correlations among ambivalent sexism, political, ideological, and acculturation orientations and the two forms of Modern and Classical Prejudice.

TABLE 5
Pearson's correlations between sexism, political orientation, and acculturation orientations, and the two forms of Modern and Classical Prejudice

	Classical	Modern
Hostile Sexism	.23***	.21**
Benevolent Sexism[a]	.25***	.11*
Left-right self-placement[a]	.49***	.59***
Progressivism orientation[a]	–.52***	–.62***
Conservatism orientation	.57***	.62***
Assimilationism	.56***	.56***
Exclusionism	.68***	.65***
Segregationism	.57***	.57***
Double Integrationism	–.52***	–.55***
Integrationism-transformation[a]	–.50***	–.60***
Individualism	–.43***	–.51***

Note. *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001. [a] The difference between the correlation of Classical Prejudice and the correlation of Modern Prejudice was statistically significant (p < .05).

All correlations were significant. Benevolent sexism was more correlated with Classical Prejudice, while left-right self-placement, Progressivism orientation, and Integrationism-transformation were more correlated with Modern Prejudice. Ambivalent sexism and ethnic prejudice were also analyzed separately for males and females, due to the different meaning of the sexism dimensions in the two genders (Table 6).

TABLE 6
Relationship between the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory and the two forms of Modern and Classical Prejudice for males and females

	Males		Females	
	HS	BS	HS	BS
Classical	.354***	.203*	.067	.360***
Modern	.305**	.067	.061	.214**

Note. HS = Hostile Sexism Scale; BS = Benevolent Sexism Scale.
*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

Classical Prejudice was correlated to both forms of sexism among men, but only with Benevolent sexism among women. Modern Prejudice was correlated only with Hostile Sexism among men and only with Benevolent Sexism among women.

Two regression models in which prejudice was the dependent variable and gender, political orientation, sexism, and acculturation orientations were the independent variables,[6] were analyzed to better evaluate the difference between the two constructs of Modern and Classical Prejudice. Because predictors were not of the same nature (from a logical point of view, acculturation strategies are more directly connected to prejudice than political, ideological, or sexist orientation), we grouped them into four sets and entered them step by step into the predictive models. In the first step, we introduced gender (Males vs. Females); in the second, we introduced the variables related to political and ideological orientation: self-placement on the left-right scale, Progressivism, and Conservatism orientation. The third step involved the introduction of sexism orientation: Hostile Sexism, Benevolent Sexism, and Ambivalent Sexism.[7] The fourth step introduced the six acculturation strategies: Assimilationism, Exclusionism, Segregationism, Double Integrationism, Integrationism-transformation, and Individualism.

Gender effect was not statistically significant for either Classical or Modern Prejudice, as reported in Table 7. Conservatism was related to both forms of Prejudice, while Progressivism and left-right self-placement were predictors of Modern prejudice only. Ideological and political orientations were important predictors of ethnic prejudice, because they accounted for 44% and 58% of variance in the dependent variables, respectively. It has to be noted that especially Modern Prejudice value (58%) was high. Hostile and Benevolent Sexism orientations were related only to Classical Prejudice and their contribution to the explained variance was very low (Ad-

TABLE 7
Hierarchical regression findings for Classical and Modern Prejudice

		Classical Prejudice					Modern Prejudice			
Step		b	β	Adjusted R^2	ΔR^2		b	β	Adjusted R^2	ΔR^2
	Constant	1.13				Constant	2.07			
1	Males	–.02	–.01	.00	.00	Males	–.07	–.04	.00	.00
2	Right	.01	.03			Right	.05*	.10*		
	Progr	–.04	–.05			Progr	–.16***	–.19***		
	Cons	.10*	.15*	.44	.45***	Cons	.14***	.22***	.58	.59***
3	Benev	.28**	.15**			Benev	–.02	–.01		
	Hostile	.22*	.12*			Hostile	.04	.02		
	Ambiv	.14	.07	.46	.03**	Ambiv	–.08	–.04	.58	.00
4	Ass	.08**	.15**			Ass	.04	.09		
	Excl	.15***	.29***			Excl	.08**	.16**		
	Segr	.06	.11			Segr	.04	.08		
	Int_d	–.06	–.10			Int_d	–.05	–.09		
	Int_t	–.04	–.09			Int_t	–.08***	–.16***		
	Indiv	–.02	–.04	.59	.14***	Indiv	–.03	–.05	.65	.08***

Note. Males = Males (1) vs. Females (0); Right = left (1)- right (7) self-placement; Progr = Progressivism orientation; Cons = Conservatism orientation; Benev = Benevolent Sexism; Hostile = Hostile Sexism; Ambiv = Ambivalent Sexism; Ass = Assimilationism; Excl = Exclusionism; Segr = Segregationism; Int_d = Double Integrationism; Int_t = Integrationism-transformation; Indiv = Individualism.
*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

justed R^2 increased from 44% to 46%). The explained variance improved greatly once the acculturation strategies were added. This was particularly true for Classical Prejudice. In this final step, the explained variance for Classical Prejudice was 59% (with a 13% increase over the previous step) and of 65% for Modern prejudice (with a 7% increase). Exclusionism strategy was related to both forms of prejudice, while Assimilationism and Integrationism-transformation were related to the Classical and Modern forms, respectively.

Discussion and Conclusion

As noted by Akrami and colleagues (2000), "If one wanted to measure, for example, prejudice in the 1930s, an item such as *I hate blacks* would be a useful item" (p. 528). However, as the literature previously reviewed shows, nowadays, blatant expressions of prejudice are socially sanctioned and avoided. Moreover, while such blatant expressions of prejudice have not disappeared from the minds of some individuals, more subtle forms of discrimination have emerged. In this case, the refusal of the others is centred on cultural, rather than ethnic, dimensions, and such changes can be observed in many countries. Therefore, on the basis of these phenomena, there is clear evidence for the need of a tool detecting the distinction between Classical and Modern forms of ethnic prejudice.

The results of our two studies confirm the validity of the CMRP scale also in a cultural context that differs from the Scandinavian one, even in its reduced 15-item form. Indeed, the CMRP scale turned out to be a bidimensional instrument. As in the original studies, the two dimensions were highly correlated, and the internal consistency was both satisfactory and similar to that obtained by Akrami et al. (2000).

As expected, the CMRP scales had a stronger correlation with instruments measuring the same constructs, such as the Pettigrew and Meertens' Subtle and Blatant Prejudice Scale, than with scales referring to different constructs. We found approximately the same correlation between the modern and classical prejudice scales and both the subtle and blatant scales; in spite of the appearance, this result does not undermine the construct validity of the CMRP scales, because the Pettigrew and Meertens' prejudice scale may measure a single general prejudice factor instead of two distinct forms (Castelli, Arcuri, & Zogmaister, 2003; Gattino et al., 2008; Hofmann et al., 2005; Neuman & Seibt, 2001). High correlations were observed between the CMRP scales and the SDO scale in Study 1, confirming the construct validity of the scale. Construct validity was also confirmed by the correlations between the CMRP dimensions and HCAS, ASI, and IOS in Study 2. The importance of the ideological dimension was confirmed by the great amount of variance explained by these variables in the hierarchical regression. These results, which are in line with those available in the literature, suggest that people who hold conservative values are more likely to display prejudice and negative attitudes toward minority groups than those who do not (Lambert & Chasteen, 1997). Further evidence as to the validity of this interpretation can be inferred from the difference between Classical and Modern Prejudice, that emerges from the correlations of the two dimensions with sexism and acculturation strategies, when ideological and political orientations are controlled. Classical Prejudice was related to both forms of sexism, while no relation emerged between Modern Prejudice and sexism.

Modern and Classical racists differ also on preferred acculturation orientations. Indeed, our results show that Exclusionism is the preferred acculturation strategy; however, the refusal of contact is expressed in a different way by Modern and Classical racists. The former show a higher negative correlation with the Integrationism-transformation strategy, because they are not at all interested in adapting their culture so as to facilitate immigrant integration. In contrast, classical racists show higher positive correlations with Assimilation, given that, in their view, immigrants have to become similar to the host community if they wish to be accepted. In other words, classical racists express a greater hostility toward cultural diversity; in fact, modern racists state their not being available toward any form of cultural shift of the dominant culture, but at the same time are not prescriptive about how immigrants should behave.

Finally, our data on gender lend an ambiguous support to the validity of the CMRP scales. Many studies have found gender differences in prejudice using self-report instruments (Akrami et al., 2000; Case, Fishbein, & Ritchey, 2006; Ekehammar & Sidanius, 1982; Whitley, 1999). According to Akrami et al. (2000), we expected to obtain higher prejudice scores for males, especially for the modern expression of prejudice. Our results were consistent with this expectation only in Study 1. Conversely, no gender differences emerged between either prejudice scale in Study 2. Future research should investigate whether this last result is related to the kind of department participants were attending (see Sidanius, Pratto, & Bobo, 1996).

Briefly, as we expected, our results showed that there is a more articulated pattern of relationships between the CMRP scale, ideology, and the HCA scale. This finding might well be considered a relevant theoretical aspect of our study. Our analyses underlined the importance of the ideological dimension, which was mainly linked to the Modern Prejudice. Moreover, the relationships between the CMRP scale and the HCA scale show that Modern and Classical racists express their generalized refusal of immigrants in different ways.

From a practical point of view, the reduction in number of items allowed the construction of a trimmer research instrument for the assessment of intergroup relationships. Although most of our expectations were met, this was not the case for the relationship between CMPR and ASI scales. These unexpected results are likely to be related to the very characteristics of the ASI scale items, that tap the more intimate dimension of the male-female relationship, rather than the general stereotypic beliefs as does the CMPR scale. Further studies are required to clarify this matter; they should include an Italian version of another sexism scale, not yet available.

However, a major drawback of our paper, though shared with Akrami et al.'s (2000) study, is that participants were university students, thus not representative of the Italian population. Therefore, studies involving different samples would improve the generalizability of our findings and would help to overcome these limitations.

NOTES

1. The scale was translated from English into Italian by professional native speakers and a back-translation was also carried out.
2. A graphical analysis (not reported here) of the relationship between item score and summed score on Modern items revealed that the shape was parabolic and not monothonic, or linear as it should be in a factor model.
3. For this analysis we formed two groups, the left-wing group (scale value ranging from 1 to 3 on the political orientation scale) and the right-wing group (scale value ranging from 5 to 7 on the political orientation); respondents who chose 4 had been left out.

4. Due to the statistically significant *F* test for equality of variances we performed the *t* test with the degrees of freedom correction for unequal variances.
5. We considered only one item per acculturation strategy (assimilation, individualism, exclusion, segregation, double integrationism, and integrationism-transformation) and only two domains (cultural heritage and employment). As each strategy is assessed through only two items, one for each domain, the internal consistency of the HCAS scales cannot be calculated.
6. The independent variables, although correlated, were not multicollinear: all the variance inflation factor (VIF) indexes were less than 2.5.
7. As suggested by Glick and Fiske (1996), we used the ASI typology made up of four types: Nonsexist (below the median value for both HS and BS), Benevolent (below the median for HS and above the median for BS), Hostile (above the median for HS and below for BS), and Ambivalent (above the median for both HS and BS), considering Nonsexist as the reference category.

REFERENCES

Akrami, N., Ekehammar, B., & Araya, T. (2000). Classical and modern racial prejudice: A study of attitudes toward immigrants in Sweden. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *30*, 521-532.

Akrami, N., Ekehammar, B., Bergh, R., Dahlstrand, E., & Malmsten, S. (2009). Prejudice: The person in the situation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *43*, 890-897.

Arcuri, L., & Boca, S. (1996). Pregiudizio e affiliazione politica: destra e sinistra di fronte all'immigrazione del Terzo Mondo [Prejudice and political affiliation: Right and left wings confronting Third World immigration]. In P. Legrenzi & V. Girotto (Eds.), *Psicologia e politica* (pp. 241-274). Milano: Raffaello Cortina.

Barker, M. (1982). *The "New Racism": Conservatives and the ideology of the tribe.* Frederick, MD: University Publications of America.

Barrette, G., Bourhis, R. Y., Capozza, D., & Hichy, Z. (2005). La scala di acculturazione HCAS per la comunità che ospita. Verifica della validità nel contesto italiano [HCAS: The Host Community Acculturation Scale. Testing the validity in the Italian context]. *TPM*, *12*, 221-240.

Bourhis, R. Y., & Bougie, E. (1998). Le modèle d'acculturation interactif: Une étude exploratoire [The Interactive acculturation model: An exploratory study]. *Revue Quebecoise de Psychologie*, *19*, 75-114.

Bourhis, R. Y, Moïse, L. C., Perreault, S., & Senecal, S. (1997). Toward an interactive acculturation model: A social psychological approach. *International Journal of Psychology*, *32*, 369-386.

Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A. Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing Structural Equation Models* (pp. 132-162). London: Sage.

Caritas/Migrantes (2010). *Immigrazione. Dossier statistico XX rapporto* [Immigration. Statistical survey XX report]. Roma: Centro Studi e Ricerche IDOS.

Case, K. A., Fishbein, H. D., & Ritchey, P. N. (2006). Personality's influence on higher order factors of prejudice and discrimination. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, *11*, 187-201.

Castelli, L., Arcuri, L., & Zogmaister, C. (2003). Perceiving ingroup members who use stereotypes: Implicit conformity and similarity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *33*, 163-175.

Chirumbolo, A., Sensales, G., & Kosic, A. (2003). Ideologia, personalità e bisogno di chiusura cognitiva. [Ideology, personality, and need for cognitive closure]. *Giornale Italiano di Psicologia*, *30*, 69-93.

Coenders, M., Scheepers, P., Sniderman P. M., & Verberk, G. (2001). Blatant and subtle prejudice: Dimensions, determinants and consequences; some comments on Pettigrew and Meertens. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *31*, 281-297.

Crandall, C. D., & Eshleman, A. (2003). A justification- suppression model of the expression and experience of prejudice. *Psychological Bulletin*, *3*, 414-446.

Di Stefano, G., & Roccato, M. (2005). Una banca di item per misurare l'orientamento alla dominanza sociale in Italia [An item bank to measure social dominance orientation in Italy]. *TPM*, *12*, 5-20.

Durrheim, K., & Dixon, J. (2004). Attitudes in the fiber of everyday life: The discourse of racial evaluation and the lived experience of desegregation. *American Psychologist*, *59*, 626-636.

Ekehammar, B., Akrami, N., & Araya, T. (2000). Development and validation of Swedish classical and modern sexism scales. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *41*, 307-314.

Ekehammar, B., & Sidanius, J. (1982). Sex differences in sociopolitical attitudes: A replication and extension. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *21*, 249-257.

Essed, P. (1991). *Understanding everyday racism: An interdisciplinary theory*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gattino, S., Miglietta, A., & Testa, S. (2008). Dimensionality in Pettigrew and Meertens' blatant subtle prejudice scale. *TPM*, *15*, 135-151.

Gawronski, B., Geschke, D., & Banse, R. (2003). Implicit bias in impression formation: Associations influence the construal of individuating information. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *33*, 573-589.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 491-512.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance. Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist*, *56*, 109-118.

Hofmann, W., Gschwendner, T., & Schmitt, M. (2005). On implicit-explicit consistency: The moderating role of individual differences in awareness and adjustment. *European Journal of Personality*, *19*, 25-49.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1995). Evaluating model fit. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural equation modelling: Concepts, issues, and applications* (pp. 76-99). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *6*, 1-55.

Jöreskog, K. C., & Sörbom, D. (2005). *LISREL 8.72 for Windows* [*Computer Software*]. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International, Inc.

Kinder, D., & Sears, D. (1981). Prejudice and politics: Symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *40*, 414-431.

Kleinpenning, G., & Hagendoorn, L. (1993). Forms of racism and the cumulative dimension of ethnic attitudes. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *56*, 21-36.

Kosic, A., Mannetti, L., & Lackland Sam, D. (2005). The role of majority attitudes towards out-group in the perception of the acculturation strategies of immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *29*, 273-288.

Lambert, A. J., & Chasteen, A. L. (1997). Perceptions of disadvantage versus conventionality: Political values and attitudes toward the elderly versus blacks. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*, 469-481.

Manganelli Rattazzi, A. M., & Volpato, C. (2001). Forme sottili e manifeste di pregiudizio verso gli immigrati. [Subtle and blatant forms of prejudice against immigrants]. *Giornale Italiano di Psicologia*, *27*, 351-375.

Manganelli Rattazzi, A. M., Volpato, C., & Canova, L. (2008). L'atteggiamento ambivalente verso donne e uomini. Un contributo alla validazione delle scale ASI e AMI. [Ambivalent atttitudes toward women and men. A Contribution to the validation of ASI and AMI scales]. *Giornale Italiano di Psicologia*, *35*, 217-243.

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. 91-127). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Montreuil, A., & Bourhis, R. Y. (2001). Majority acculturation orientations toward "valued" and "devalued" immigrants. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *32*, 698-719.

Montreuil, A., & Bourhis, R. Y. (2004). Acculturation orientations of competing host communities toward "valued" and "devalued" immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *28*, 507-532.

Navas Luque, M., García Fernández, M. C., Rojas Tejada, A. J., Pumares Fernández, P., & Cuadrado Guirado, I. (2006). Actitudes de aculturación y prejuicio: la perspective de autóctonos e inmigrantes [Acculturation attitudes and prejudice: The perspective of indigenous and immigrants]. *Psicothema*, *18*, 187-193.

Neuman, R., & Seibt, B. (2001). The structure of prejudice: Associative strength as a determinant of stereotype endorsement. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *31*, 609-620.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in Western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *25*, 57-75.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M, & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*, 741-763.

Reeves, F. (1983). *British racial discourse: A study of British political discourse about race and race-related matters*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Satorra, A., & Bentler, P. M. (1994). Corrections to test statistics and standard errors in covariance structure analysis. In A. Von Eye & C. C. Clogg (Eds.), *Latent variable analysis: Applications for developmental research* (pp. 399-419). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Satorra, A., & Bentler, P. M. (2001). A scaled difference chi-square test statistic for moment structure analysis. *Psychometrika, 66*, 507-514.

Sears, D. (1988). Symbolic racism. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 53-84). New York: Plenum.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social Dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression.* New York; Cambridge, MASS: Cambridge University Press.

Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., & Bobo, L. (1996). Racism, conservatism, affirmative action, and intellectual sophistication: A matter of principled conservatism or group dominance? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 476-490.

Smedley, A., & Smedley, B. D. (2005). Race as biology is fiction, racism as a social problem is real. Anthropological and historical perspectives on the social construction of race. *American Psychologist*, *60*, 16-26.

Taguieff, P. A. (1990). The new cultural racism in France. *Telos*, *83*, 109-122.

van Dick, R., Wagner, U., Pettigrew, T. F., Christ, O., Wolf, C., Petzel, T., et al. (2004). Role of perceived importance in intergroup contact. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *87*, 211-227.

van Dijk, T. (1984). *Prejudice in discourse: An analysis of ethnic prejudice in cognition and conversation*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.

Vrij, A., Akehurst, L., & Smith, B. (2003). Reducing ethnic prejudice: An evaluation of seven recommended principles for incorporation in public campaigns. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, *13*, 284-299.

Wagner, U., & Zick, A. (1995). The relation of formal education to ethnic prejudice. Its reliability, validity and explanation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *25*, 41-56.

Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Whitley, B. E. (1999). Right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*, 126-134.

Zick, A., Wagner, U., Van Dijck, R., & Petzel, T. (2001). Acculturation and prejudice in Germany: Majority and minority perspectives. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*, 541-557.