

Prejudice Toward Immigrants¹

WALTER G. STEPHAN²

New Mexico State University

OSCAR YBARRA

University of Michigan

GUY BACHMAN

Arizona State University

In the present study, 4 variables (realistic threats, symbolic threats, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes) were used to predict prejudice toward immigrants from Cuba, Mexico, and Asia in samples of students from states in the United States that are affected by immigration from these areas (Florida, New Mexico, and Hawaii, respectively). All 4 variables were significant (or marginally significant) predictors of attitudes toward these immigrant groups. Evidence is presented that the predictor variables are conceptually and empirically distinct. However, these variables do appear to be tied together by an underlying theme: They all concern threats to the in-group or its members. Some of the implications of the results for intergroup relations are discussed.

Although immigration is responsible for the racial and cultural mosaic that is America, Americans have a dismaying history of intolerance toward immigrants (Fuchs, 1995; Takaki, 1989). As has so often been the case in the past, immigration is again a subject of controversy in the United States, as evidenced by a series of recent laws affecting immigration and a growing hostility toward immigrants. A *Newsweek* poll conducted in 1993 reported that 60% of Americans see immigration as bad for the country (Morganthau, 1993).

America is not the only nation that is experiencing a rising tide of anti-immigrant sentiment. Hostility and discrimination against immigrants are also widespread in Europe and Japan (Farrell, 1993; Nelan, 1993; United Nations Population Fund, 1993). The negative consequences of this hostility and discrimination for both the immigrants and the host countries make it important to understand the factors associated with these negative attitudes. Of course, not everyone in these host countries is intolerant of immigrants, and it is these individual differences in attitudes toward immigrants that we seek to study.

¹The authors wish to thank Charles S. Carver for his assistance in data gathering in Florida and Krystina Finlay for her assistance in data analysis.

²Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Walter G. Stephan, Department of Psychology, New Mexico State University, Department 3452, Box 30001, Las Cruces, NM 88003.

In the present study, we examine attitudes toward three different immigrant groups: Cubans, Mexicans, and Asians in parts of the United States that are affected by immigration involving these groups. Our primary interest is in understanding factors that might be associated with prejudice toward immigrants. Drawing on previous research and theory, we focus on four factors that would seem to be potentially related to prejudice toward immigrants: realistic threats, symbolic threats, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotyping.

Realistic Threats

Realistic threats concern threats to the very existence of the in-group (e.g., through warfare), threats to the political and economic power of the in-group, and threats to the physical or material well-being of the in-group or its members (e.g., their health). Realistic group conflict theory (Ashmore & Del Boca, 1976; Bobo, 1983, 1988; Coser, 1956; LeVine & Campbell, 1972; Quillian, 1995; Sherif, 1966) incorporates many of these threats, although it is primarily concerned with competition for scarce resources, such as territory, wealth, or natural resources. The focus here is somewhat broader than realistic conflict theory because it encompasses any threat to the welfare of the group or its members.

Realistic group conflict theories tend to emphasize both objective conflict and subjectively perceived conflict between groups (Bobo, 1988). We, like Sherif (1966), are concerned primarily with subjectively perceived threats posed by the other group. We emphasize perceived threats because the perception of threat can lead to prejudice, regardless of whether or not the threat is "real." The greater the threat that the out-group is perceived to pose to the in-group, the more negative the attitudes toward the out-group will be (cf. LeVine & Campbell, 1972). A study consistent with this view found that perceived realistic threats were highly correlated with evaluative ratings of African Americans (Ashmore & Del Boca, 1976). In another study, it was found that the perceived threat posed to the in-group by the out-group's power was positively related to preferences for political candidates of the racial in-group (Bovasso, 1993).

Symbolic Threats

In the case of symbolic threats, the primary issue concerns group differences in morals, values, norms, standards, beliefs, and attitudes. Symbolic threats are threats to the in-group's worldview. These threats arise because of a belief in the moral rightness of the in-group's system of values. It is such beliefs that make groups ethnocentric, leading group members to believe that their group is superior to others (Sumner, 1906). Groups holding differing values and beliefs threaten the in-group's ethnocentric worldview, which leads to hostility toward these out-groups. These types of threat have been the subject of extensive theorizing and research.

Our conception of symbolic threats is closely related to the concept of symbolic racism. Theories of symbolic racism argue that the hostility of White people in America toward African Americans is a response to the manner in which African Americans are perceived to violate traditional values shared by most Whites (Kinder & Sears, 1981; McConahay & Hough, 1976; Sears, 1988). In Kinder and Sears' version of this approach, symbolic racism was conceived of as "a form of resistance to change in the racial status quo based on moral feelings that Blacks violate such traditional American values as self-reliance, the work ethic, obedience, and discipline" (p. 416). Although the theory has not gone uncriticized (Sniderman, Piazza, Tetlock, & Kendrick, 1991; Sniderman & Tetlock, 1986), a large number of studies examining the relationship between symbolic racism and political attitudes and behavior have supported the theory (Sears, 1988). The underlying premise of theories of symbolic racism is that African Americans have different values from Whites, and this leads Whites to hold negative attitudes toward African Americans. A recent study suggests that the basic problem, from the perspective of Whites, is not that African Americans violate values that Whites hold dear, but that African Americans do not support these values (Biernat, Vescio, & Theno, 1996). Recent research indicates that symbolic beliefs similar to those measured by symbolic racism theorists are also related to prejudice toward obese people and women (Crandall, 1994; Tougas, Brown, Beaton, & Joly, 1995).

Esses, Haddock, and Zanna (1993) formulated another approach to symbolic beliefs that is similar to ours. They argue that the more the in-group's values, customs, or traditions are blocked by the out-group, the more negative the in-group's attitudes toward the out-group will be. Esses et al. presented studies of attitudes toward various ethnic groups, as well as homosexuals, showing a relationship between their measure of symbolic beliefs and attitudes toward these groups. They concluded, "when our values seem to be threatened, they are especially likely to be salient and to influence our attitudes toward other groups" (p. 159).

Intergroup Anxiety

In their work on intergroup anxiety, Stephan and Stephan (1985) argued that people often feel personally threatened in intergroup interactions because they are concerned about negative outcomes for the self, such as being embarrassed, rejected, ridiculed, or exploited. In the intergroup anxiety model it is hypothesized that anxiety will be particularly high if the groups have a history of antagonism; have little prior personal contact; are ethnocentric; perceive the out-group to be different from the in-group; know little about the other group; and have to interact with them in relatively unstructured, competitive interactions where their group is in the minority or is of lower status than the out-group (see Gudykunst,

1988, 1995, for a similar set of predictions). Research has generally supported these ideas (Stephan & Stephan, 1985, 1989, 1992). Intergroup anxiety has been shown to be related to prejudice in several studies (Britt, Bonecki, Vescio, Biernat, & Brown, 1996; Islam & Hewstone, 1993).

Negative Stereotypes

Stereotypes serve a variety of functions, including providing expectations for social interaction, providing explanations for behavior, and justifying the subordination of minority groups (Jost & Banaji, 1993; Stephan & Stephan, 1996). Thus, negative stereotypes often lead to avoidance of out-group members, provide negative trait attributions to explain their behavior, and justify discrimination against them. As a consequence, negative stereotypes are likely to lead to prejudice, as indicated by a number of studies (Eagly & Mladinic, 1989; Esses et al., 1993; Stangor, Sullivan, & Ford, 1991; Stephan, Ageyev, Coates-Shrider, Stephan, & Abalakina, 1994; Stephan & Stephan, 1993).

The Present Study

We anticipate that attitudes toward immigrants from Cuba, Mexico, and Asia will be related to all four of the previously mentioned factors. Immigrants pose a number of realistic threats, including the perception that jobs will be lost and that resources will be used for the education, health, and welfare of immigrant groups. Immigrant groups are perceived to pose symbolic threats because their values are thought to differ from those held by mainstream Americans. Intergroup anxiety concerning immigrants may be salient for many Americans because of ignorance of their customs and uncertainty about how to behave toward them. And, stereotypes of immigrants are typically quite negative.

Method

Participants

The participants for the study were recruited at three different universities: the University of Miami ($N = 124$), New Mexico State University ($N = 91$), and the University of Hawaii ($N = 117$). The participants from the University of Miami were 10% Asian American, 10% African American, 22% Hispanic, 41% White, and 17% other. The participants from New Mexico State University were 2% Asian American, 2% African American, 35% Hispanic, 47% White, and 13% other. The participants from the University of Hawaii were: 60% Asian American, 2% African American, 13% White, 5% Hawaiian, and 20% other. All of the participants were given course credit for their participation.

Measures

Attitudes toward out-groups. Our conception of intergroup attitudes is based on the radial network model proposed by Stephan and Stephan (1993), who argue that prejudice reflects negative affect associated with out-groups. In the context of the radial network model, affect includes evaluations as well as emotional reactions and thus emphasizes antipathy toward out-groups, as did Allport (1954). Using this definition of prejudice led us to measure evaluative reactions like disliking and approval and reactions such as hatred and disdain, which, although they are also evaluative, are more emotionally laden.

In our measure of attitudes, participants were asked to indicate the degree to which they felt 12 different evaluative and emotional reactions toward immigrants on a 10-point scale ranging from 0 (*no _____ [e.g., hatred] at all*) to 9 (*extreme _____ [e.g., hatred]*). The students in Florida responded by giving their attitudes toward Cuban immigrants; the students in New Mexico gave their attitudes toward Mexican immigrants; and the students in Hawaii gave their attitudes toward Asian immigrants. The evaluations and emotions included hostility, admiration, disliking, acceptance, superiority, affection, disdain, approval, hatred, sympathy, rejection, and warmth. For this measure (and all of the other measures) the same items were used for all three immigrant groups. Items were reverse-scored where necessary to create an index reflecting the negativity of the students' attitudes.

Realistic threats. The measure that was created to assess realistic threat originally consisted of 12 items including such threats as crime, drugs, disease, job loss, and economic costs for health, education, and welfare (Appendix). The response format consisted of a 10-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 10 (*strongly agree*). The items were evaluatively balanced and reverse-scored where necessary.

Symbolic threats. To capture the threats posed by perceived differences in values and beliefs between our participants and the immigrant groups, a measure that originally consisted of 12 items was developed (Appendix). The items were rated on a 10-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 10 (*strongly agree*). The items were evaluatively balanced and reverse-scored where necessary.

Intergroup anxiety. The measure of intergroup anxiety was a modified version of the intergroup anxiety scale developed by Stephan and Stephan (1985). The measure consisted of 12 items that asked participants how they would feel when interacting with members of the respective immigrant groups. The anxiety-related feelings were apprehensive, uncertain, worried, awkward, anxious, threatened, comfortable, trusting, friendly, confident, safe, and at ease. The response format for these items employed a 10-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 10 (*extremely*). Items were reverse-scored where necessary.

Negative stereotype index. To assess stereotypes, a measure developed by Stephan et al. (1993) was employed (cf. Eagly & Mladinic, 1989; Esses et al., 1993). Participants were asked to indicate the percentage of immigrants (Cuban, Mexican, or Asian) that possessed each of 12 traits that pre-testing had shown to be associated with immigrant groups. The response format consisted of a 10-point scale representing 10% increments ranging from 0% to 100%. The traits were dishonest, ignorant, undisciplined, aggressive, hard working, reliable, proud, respectful, unintelligent, clean, clannish, and friendly. In addition to providing the percentage estimates for each trait, participants rated the favorableness of each trait. These judgments employed a 10-point format ranging from 1 (*very unfavorable*) to 10 (*very favorable*). For each trait, the percentage estimate and the favorability rating were multiplied and the resulting figures were added across traits to create a summary stereotype/evaluation index reflecting the negativity of the stereotype.

Factor analyses were used to refine all of the variables included in the analyses. The first of these factor analyses was run to eliminate items that did not load on the appropriate measures. All of the items loaded heavily on only one factor, and each of the factors that emerged in this analysis drew items from only one of the five scales. Those items that did not load strongly on any factor were eliminated from the analyses. This was true for two items in the realistic-threat measure, two items in the symbolic-threat measure, and three items in the negative-stereotype measure. Because this factor analysis indicated that several of the variables were multifactorial, additional factor analyses were run on each variable separately. These oblique factor analyses revealed that the symbolic-threat measure contained two correlated factors: one including all of the items referring to value and belief differences (e.g., "The values and beliefs of Mexican immigrants regarding family issues and socializing children are basically quite similar to those of Americans"), and one including items referring to American culture and the American way of life (e.g., "Immigration from Mexico is undermining American culture"). The stereotype index also contained two correlated factors, one representing positive traits and one representing negative traits. Likewise, the prejudice measure contained two correlated factors, one representing positive evaluations and one representing negative evaluations. All of the items in the realistic-threat measure loaded on only one factor, as did all of the items in the intergroup-anxiety measure.

The four variables that were used to predict prejudice were also tested to establish that students could discriminate them from one another at the conceptual level. A sample of 25 students rated the degree to which every item in the four threat measures referred to the definitional criteria for each of the four predictors. For each item, the students were asked "To what degree does the following item concern," (a) a loss of economic resources, political power, or threats to the physical well-being of the group (realistic threat); (b) issues or problems

created by group differences in values, beliefs, customs, or norms (symbolic threat); (c) feelings of anxiety or discomfort caused by out-group members (intergroup anxiety); and (d) personality traits (stereotypes).

Each item was tested to determine if it was rated higher on the definitional criteria for that predictor than on the definitional criteria for the other three predictors. For instance, we tested whether or not each item in the realistic-threat measure was rated higher on the criteria for realistic threat than on the criteria for symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and stereotypes. We eliminated all of the items that were not rated as being significantly higher ($p < .05$) on the criteria for that predictor than on the criteria for the other predictors. Three items from the symbolic-threat measure were dropped in this manner, as were two items from the realistic-threat measure.

As a result of these preliminary analyses, the final realistic-threat measure contained 8 items, the final symbolic-threat measure contained 7 items, the final intergroup-anxiety measure contained 12 items, the final negative-stereotype measure contained 9 items, and the final attitude measure contained 12 items. The Cronbach's alphas for these scales are listed in Table 1, along with the means and standard deviations of the measures.

Results

In preparation to run the regression analyses, correlations among the five variables were calculated to examine multicollinearity problems (Table 2). The four predictor variables were all significantly intercorrelated in each sample (Cuban immigrants $M = 0.43$, Mexican immigrants $M = 0.46$, Asian immigrants $M = 0.33$). However, the four predictor variables were even more highly correlated with attitudes toward the respective immigrant groups (Cuban immigrants $M = 0.63$, Mexican immigrants $M = 0.59$, Asian immigrants $M = 0.47$). Thus, the overall pattern of correlations indicated that the predictor variables were more closely related to the dependent variable than they were to one another.

Simultaneous regressions were run on each sample separately. Attitudes toward each of the three immigrant groups were regressed on the four predictor variables (realistic threat, symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes).

For attitudes toward Cuban immigrants, all four predictors were significant ($ps < .05$; Table 3). The four predictors accounted for 64% of the variance in attitudes toward Cuban immigrants. For attitudes toward Mexican immigrants, all four predictors were also significant ($ps < .01$; Table 3). The four predictors accounted for 68% of the variance in attitudes toward Mexican immigrants. For attitudes toward Asian immigrants, two of the four predictors (realistic threat and intergroup anxiety) were significant at conventional levels ($ps < .01$; Table 3), while two predictors (symbolic threat and negative stereotypes) were marginally

Table 1

Basic Statistics for All Measures

	Cuban immigrants	Mexican immigrants	Asian immigrants
Realistic threat			
<i>M</i>	4.54	4.27	3.56
<i>SD</i>	1.73	1.87	1.54
Cronbach's alpha	.81	.82	.80
Symbolic threat			
<i>M</i>	4.97	4.72	4.77
<i>SD</i>	0.57	1.52	1.13
Cronbach's alpha	.71	.68	.46
Intergroup anxiety			
<i>M</i>	3.58	3.17	3.17
<i>SD</i>	1.65	1.52	1.43
Cronbach's alpha	.91	.90	.91
Negative stereotyping			
<i>M</i>	-13.31	-12.97	-15.17
<i>SD</i>	6.70	7.48	6.39
Cronbach's alpha	.70	.76	.70
Attitude			
<i>M</i>	3.85	3.62	3.24
<i>SD</i>	1.87	1.79	1.41
Cronbach's alpha	.93	.92	.91

Note. Higher numbers indicate greater perceived threat or more negative attitudes.

significant ($p < .10$). The four predictors accounted for 47% of the variance in attitudes toward Asian immigrants.

In each of three regressions, the diagnostic indexes used to detect collinearity indicated that collinearity was not a problem. All of the variance inflation factors were lower than 1.87. The finding that all of the predictors were significant or marginally significant predictors of attitudes in these analyses also suggests that collinearity among the predictors was not a problem in this study.

To determine if the relationship of the predictor variables to attitudes toward immigrant groups was additive, we ran three additional regressions in which the six interaction terms among the four predictor variables were included. Adding

Table 2

Correlations Among the Variables

	Real threat	Symbolic threat	Intergroup anxiety	Stereotyping	Attitudes
Cuban immigrants					
Real threat	—	.56	.52	.38	.64
Symbolic threat		—	.48	.30	.62
Intergroup anxiety			—	.33	.69
Stereotyping				—	.42
Attitudes					—
Mexican immigrants					
Real threat	—	.51	.51	.32	.69
Symbolic threat		—	.58	.36	.68
Intergroup anxiety			—	.50	.66
Stereotyping				—	.49
Attitudes					—
Asian immigrants					
Real threat	—	.32	.40	.29	.52
Symbolic threat		—	.25	.28	.35
Intergroup anxiety			—	.43	.58
Stereotyping				—	.41
Attitudes					—

Note. All correlations are significant, $p < .01$.

these six interaction terms increased the amount of variance accounted for by only a small amount in each sample. The R^2 for the Cuban immigrants changed by less than one percentage point, the R^2 for the Mexican immigrants increased from .68 to .76, and the R^2 for the Asian immigrants increased from .47 to .52. Thus, it appears that the contributions of the four predictors used in this study were largely additive.

To determine whether or not the ethnic background of the respondents affected attitudes toward immigrants, we entered a variable into the regression equation consisting of a comparison between students who were culturally similar to the immigrant groups (e.g., Asian American students' attitudes toward Asian immigrants) and students who were culturally distinct (e.g., Anglo and other non-Hispanic students' attitudes toward Mexican immigrants). This ethnicity variable

Table 3

Multiple Regressions for Attitudes Toward Immigrants

	Standardized estimate	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Cuban immigrants			
Realistic threat	.25	3.50	.0006
Symbolic threat	.25	3.73	.0003
Intergroup anxiety	.40	5.97	.0001
Stereotyping	.12	1.94	.05
Mexican immigrants			
Realistic threat	.37	5.06	.0001
Symbolic threat	.31	4.06	.0001
Intergroup anxiety	.21	2.55	.01
Stereotyping	.16	2.26	.02
Asian immigrants			
Realistic threat	.12	1.63	.10
Symbolic threat	.30	3.85	.0002
Intergroup anxiety	.37	4.60	.0001
Stereotyping	.13	1.68	.09

was nonsignificant in two of the three samples: New Mexico, $t(90) = 0.82$, *ns*; Hawaiian, $t(116) = 0.58$, *ns*. However, in the Florida sample, this ethnicity variable was significant when included as a predictor along with the four threat variables, $t(123) = 1.99$, $p < .05$. Hispanics in Florida had more favorable attitudes toward Cuban immigrants than did members of other ethnic groups. This mixed pattern of results suggests that whether or not the immigrant group is culturally similar to the respondents' in-group is not a consistent predictor of attitudes toward immigrants.

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that a combination of realistic threats, symbolic threats, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes accounts for substantial amounts of the variance in attitudes toward three distinct immigrant groups: Cubans, Mexicans, and Asians. The results are consistent with the many previous theories positing that threats are related to prejudice. The views of theorists contending that realistic threats lie at the heart of prejudice (Bobo, 1988; Coser,

1956; LeVine & Campbell, 1972) are amply supported by the results of this study. Similarly, theories emphasizing the role that value differences play in prejudice (Greenberg et al., 1990; McConahay & Hough, 1976; Rokeach, 1960; Sears, 1988) are supported by the finding that perceived symbolic threats consistently predicted prejudice. The consistent relationship between symbolic threats and attitudes toward immigrants also conceptually replicates the results of previous studies showing that symbolic threats are highly correlated with direct measures of racial attitudes (Esses et al., 1993; McConahay, 1986; Weigel & Howes, 1985; Ybarra & Stephan, 1994). The argument in social dominance theory that symbolic attitudes are important in understanding the behavior and attitudes of members of the dominant group (Sidanius, 1993; Sidanius, Devereux, & Pratto, 1991; Sidanius & Pratto, 1993) is also consistent with our findings since Americans can be considered to be the dominant group with respect to immigrants.

Theories positing a central role for anxiety in intergroup relations (Britt et al., 1996; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Gudykunst, 1988, 1995; Islam & Hewstone, 1993; Stephan & Stephan, 1985) were supported by the results indicating that intergroup anxiety consistently predicted prejudice in this study. Similarly, this study supported the long-held notion that stereotypes are related to prejudice (Brigham, 1971; Eagly & Mladinic, 1989; Esses et al., 1993; Stephan & Stephan, 1993) by showing that a negative stereotype index predicted prejudice.

The thread that holds all of these predictors together is that each embodies some aspect of feelings of threat. This is clearly true for realistic and symbolic threats, but a case can be made that intergroup anxiety and negative stereotypes also contain elements of threat. Intergroup anxiety is based on the idea that in-group members anticipate negative consequences during interaction with out-group members, such as being taken advantage of or rejected, or experiencing open hostility. The anticipation of negative outcomes is conceptually related to the cognitive appraisals that are thought to lead to feelings of threat. In a similar fashion, negative stereotypes may be related to prejudice toward immigrants because they concern expectations of negative consequences during social interaction. For instance, if immigrants are expected to be aggressive, dishonest, ignorant, or undisciplined, it will probably be anticipated that interactions with them will be unpleasant or worse. Thus, negative stereotypes, too, may be associated with the anticipation of negative outcomes for the individual or the in-group and may therefore be viewed as a type of threat. Supporting the idea that the four predictors reflect a single underlying theme, another study of attitudes toward immigrants to Spain and Israel using structural equation analyses revealed evidence of a common latent factor underlying the four predictors included in this study (Stephan, Ybarra, Martinez, Schwarzwald, & Tur-Kaspa, 1998). Thus, although none of the predictor variables employed in this study was originally conceptualized in terms of threat, it appears that all of them can be thought of in these terms,

and doing so helps to make sense of the data obtained in these studies of immigrants.

It is important to note that the relationships between the four predictors and prejudice that were obtained in this study are all correlational. We are inclined to believe that these predictors are more important causes of prejudice than vice versa, but in some cases it is reasonable to argue that causality may also run in both directions. For instance, in the case of stereotypes, it is possible that people who dislike another group will impute negative traits to the other group to justify their attitudes. It should be possible to disentangle these causal threads with longitudinal data on intergroup relations or, in some cases, by conducting laboratory studies. For instance, Maio, Esses, and Bell (1994) manipulated the valence and relevance of values and stereotypes imputed to a fictitious immigrant out-group by the participants' in-group. This information, along with knowledge of the emotional reactions of in-group members toward the fictitious out-group, affected the participants' attitudes toward the immigrant group. In a subsequent study, Esses, Jackson, and Nolan (1996) manipulated threat by presenting students with newspaper "editorials" that varied in the degree to which immigrants were said to pose economic threats. They found that greater perceived threats led to more negative attitudes toward immigrants. Further, Branscombe and Wann (1994) demonstrated that for people who are highly identified with a social group, threats to their group identity lead to derogation of the threatening out-group.

We chose to study attitudes toward immigrants because immigration is relevant to the participants' lives, and it seemed that all four of the predictors would be salient for immigrant groups. However, we do not necessarily expect that these four variables will always predict prejudice toward all types of groups. The degree to which these threats are salient and therefore likely to be related to prejudice probably depends on such variables as the prior history of relations between the groups, the relative status of the groups, the strength of identification with the in-group, knowledge of the out-group, and the amount and type of current contact between the groups. When prior relations between groups have been amicable, the groups are relatively equal in status, the in-group members do not strongly identify with their group, the in-group members are knowledgeable about the out-group, and contact has been extensive, voluntary, positive, individualized, and cooperative, threats are unlikely to be strong predictors of prejudice. It also seems unlikely that threats would predict prejudice for groups that are not relevant to the in-group members' lives.

The findings of this study have some potential practical implications for relations between Americans and immigrants. Policy makers, intergroup-relations trainers, teachers, and others who are interested in decreasing prejudice toward immigrants may do well to address the variables associated with prejudice toward these groups. When symbolic or realistic threats are misperceived, it may be possible to diffuse them and thereby reduce prejudice. For example, for

symbolic threats, information stressing value similarities between immigrant groups and the dominant culture might allay some of the fears of the Americans whose attitudes are most negative. Similarly, for realistic threats, it would be helpful if Americans could be led to understand that some of these perceived threats are unrealistic or overblown. In work and educational settings, it should be possible to change the cognitions leading to intergroup anxiety by training in-group members in the subjective culture of the out-group so that they can interact with out-group members more effectively (Cushner & Landis, 1996; Triandis, 1972). Research on negative stereotypes suggests that they can be modified through equal-status contact with a variety of out-group members who behave in counter-stereotypic ways in many different contexts (Rothbart & John, 1985; Stephan & Stephan, 1996). Thus, using a combination of threats to understand the causes of prejudice can potentially provide useful information on which to base the selection of techniques to overcome prejudice.

Taken together, the results of this study strongly suggest that feelings of threat and prejudice are closely intertwined. We, along with many other theorists, contend that it is predominantly feelings of threat that cause prejudice, rather than the other way around, but our correlational data are mute on this point. If this causal supposition is verified through longitudinal as well as experimental research, using an array of threats to understand prejudice may prove to be a more useful approach than focusing on only one source of threat, as most previous theories have done.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Ashmore, R. D., & Del Boca, F. K. (1976). Psychological approaches to understanding intergroup conflict. In P. A. Katz (Ed.), *Towards the elimination of racism* (pp. 73-124). New York NY: Pergamon.
- Biernat, M., Vescio, T. K., & Theno, S. (1996). Violating American values: A "value congruence" approach to understanding intergroup attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, **32**, 387-410.
- Bobo, L. (1983). Whites' opposition to busing: Symbolic racism or realistic group conflict? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **45**, 1196-1210.
- Bobo, L. (1988). Group conflict, prejudice, and the paradox of contemporary racial attitudes. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 85-116). New York NY: Plenum.
- Bovasso, G. (1993). Self, group, and public interests motivating racial politics. *Political Psychology*, **14**, 3-20.
- Branscombe, N. R., & Wann, D. L. (1994). Collective self-esteem consequences of outgroup derogation when a valued social identity is on trial. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, **24**, 641-657.

- Brigham, J. C. (1971). Ethnic stereotypes. *Psychological Bulletin*, **76**, 15-38.
- Britt, T. W., Bonecki, K. A., Vescio, T. K., Biernat, M. R., & Brown, L. M. (1996). Intergroup anxiety: A Person \times Situation approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **22**, 1177-1188.
- Coser, L. (1956). *The functions of social conflict*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Crandall, C. S. (1994). Prejudice against fat people: Ideology and self-interest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **66**, 882-894.
- Cushner, K., & Landis, D. (1996). The cultural sensitizer. In D. Landis & R. Bhagat (Eds.), *The handbook of intercultural training* (2nd ed., pp. 185-202). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Eagly, A. H., & Mladinic, A. (1989). Gender stereotypes and attitudes toward men and women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **15**, 543-558.
- Essex, V. M., Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. P. (1993). Values, stereotypes, and emotions as determinants of intergroup attitudes. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception* (pp. 137-166). Orlando, FL: Academic.
- Essex, V. M., Jackson, L. M., & Nolan, J. M. (1996, October). *Perceived economic threat influences attitudes toward immigrants and immigration*. Paper presented at the National Symposium on Immigration and Integration, Winnipeg, Canada.
- Farrell, C. (1993, July 5). Shut out immigrants and trade may suffer. *Business Week*, 82-84.
- Fuchs, L. H. (1995). The American civic culture and an inclusivist immigration policy. In J. A. Banks & C. A. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 293-309). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 61-90). Orlando, FL: Academic.
- Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., Rosenblatt, A., Veeder, M., Kirkland, S., & Lyon, D. (1990). Evidence for terror management theory. II: The effects of mortality salience on reactions to those who threaten or bolster the cultural worldview. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **58**, 308-318.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1988). Uncertainty and anxiety. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication* (pp. 123-156). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1995). Anxiety/uncertainty management (AUM) theory: Development and current status. In R. L. Wiseman (Ed.), *Intercultural communication theory* (pp. 8-58). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Islam, R. M., & Hewstone, M. (1993). Dimensions of contact as predictors of intergroup anxiety, perceived outgroup variability, and out-group attitude: An integrative model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **19**, 700-710.

- Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1993). The role of stereotyping in system justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social psychology*, **33**, 1-27.
- Kinder, D. R., & Sears, D. O. (1981). Prejudice and politics: Symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **40**, 414-431.
- LeVine, R. A., & Campbell, D. T. (1972). *Ethnocentrism*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Maio, G. R., Esses, V. M., & Bell, D. W. (1994). The formation of attitudes toward new immigrant groups. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **24**, 1762-1776.
- McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91-125). Orlando, FL: Academic.
- McConahay, J. B., & Hough, J. C., Jr. (1976). Symbolic racism. *Journal of Social Issues*, **32**, 23-45.
- Morganthau, T. (1993, August 9). America: Still a melting pot? *Newsweek*, 16-23.
- Nelan, B. W. (1993, July 19). Europe slams the door. *Time*, 38-40.
- Quillian, L. (1995). Prejudice as a response to perceived group threat: Population composition and anti-immigrant and racial prejudice in Europe. *American Sociological Review*, **60**, 586-611.
- Rokeach, M. (1960). *The open and closed mind*. New York, NY: Basic books.
- Rothbart, M., & John, O. P. (1985). Social categorization and behavioral episodes: A cognitive analysis and the effects of intergroup contact. *Journal of Social Issues*, **41**(3), 81-104.
- Sears, D. O. (1988). Symbolic racism. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 53-84). New York, NY: Plenum.
- Sherif, M. (1966). *Group conflict and cooperation*. London, UK: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Sidanius, J. (1993). The psychology of group conflict and the dynamics of oppression. In W. McGuire, & S. Iyengar (Eds.), *Current approaches to political psychology* (pp. 183-219). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Sidanius, J., Devereux, E., & Pratto, F. (1992). A comparison of symbolic racism theory and social dominance theory as explanations for racial policy attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology*, **132**, 377-395.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1993). The inevitability of oppression and the dynamics of social dominance. In P. M. Sniderman, P. E. Tetlock, & E. G. Carmines (Eds.), *Prejudice, politics, and the American dilemma* (pp. 173-212). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Sniderman, P. M., Piazza, T., Tetlock, P. E., & Kendrick, A. (1991). The new racism. *American Journal of Political Science*, **35**, 423-447.

2236 STEPHAN ET AL.

- Sniderman, P. M., & Tetlock, P. E. (1986). Reflections on American racism. *Journal of Social Issues*, **42**, 173-188.
- Stangor, C., Sullivan, L. A., & Ford, T. E. (1991). Affective and cognitive determinants of prejudice. *Social Cognition*, **9**, 359-380.
- Stephan, W. G., Ageyev, V. S., Coates-Shrider, L., Stephan, C. W., & Abalakina, M. (1994). On the relationship between stereotypes and prejudice: An international study. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **20**, 277-284.
- Stephan, W. G., Ageyev, V. S., Stephan, C. W., Abalakina, M., Stefanenko, T., & Coates-Shrider, L. (1993). Soviet and American stereotypes: A comparison of methods. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, **56**, 54-64.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues*, **41**(3), 157-176.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1989). Antecedents of intergroup anxiety in Asian-Americans and Hispanic-Americans. *International Journal of Intercultural Communication*, **13**, 203-219.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1992). Reducing intercultural anxiety through intercultural contact. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, **16**, 96-106.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1993). Cognition and affect in stereotyping: Parallel interactive networks. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception* (pp. 111-136). Orlando, FL: Academic.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1996). *Intergroup relations*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., Martinez, C., Schwarzwald, J., & Tur-Kaspa, M. (1998). Prejudice toward immigrants to Spain and Israel: An integrated threat theory analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, **29**, 559-576.
- Sumner, W. G. (1906). *Folkways*. Boston, MA: Ginn.
- Takaki, R. (1989). *Strangers from a different shore*. Boston, MA: Little Brown.
- Tougas, F., Brown, R., Beaton, A. M., & Joly, S. (1995). Neosexism: *Plus ça change, plus c'est pareil*. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **21**, 842-849.
- Triandis, H. C. (1972). *The analysis of subjective culture*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- United Nations Population Fund. (1993). *The state of the world population, 1993*. New York, NY: Author.
- Weigel, R. H., & Howes, P. W. (1985). Conceptions of racial prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues*, **41**, 117-138.
- Ybarra, O. J., & Stephan, W. G. (1994). Perceived threat as a predictor of stereotypes and prejudice: Americans' reactions to Mexican immigrants. *Boletín de Psicología*, **42**, 39-54.

Appendix

Realistic Threats

1. Asian immigrants should learn to conform to the rules and norms of American society as soon as possible after they arrive.
2. Immigration from Asia is undermining American culture.
3. The values and beliefs of Asian immigrants regarding work are basically quite similar to those of most Americans.
4. The values and beliefs of Asian immigrants regarding moral and religious issues are *not* compatible with the beliefs and values of most Americans.
5. The values and beliefs of Asian immigrants regarding family issues and socializing children are basically quite similar to those of most Americans.
6. The values and beliefs of Asian immigrants regarding social relations are *not* compatible with the beliefs and values of most Americans.
7. Asian immigrants should *not* have to accept American ways.

Symbolic Threats

8. Asian immigrants get more from this country than they contribute.
9. The children of Asian immigrants should have the same right to attend public schools in the United States as Americans do.
10. Asian immigration has increased the tax burden on Americans.
11. Asian immigrants are *not* displacing American workers from their jobs.
12. Asian immigrants should be eligible for the same health-care benefits received by Americans.
13. Social services have become less available to Americans because of Asian immigration.
14. The quality of social services available to Americans has remained the same, despite Asian immigration.
15. Asian immigrants are as entitled to subsidized housing or subsidized utilities (water, sewage, electricity) as poor Americans are.