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WHAT IS RACIAL PREJUDICE

Distinct from Discrimination
- Behavioral outcome

Distinct from Racism
- Systemic

Racial Prejudice
- More strong association of negative affect/attitudes with one group over another, based on racial category¹

PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH ON PREJUDICE

Early Research
“Old-fashioned” forms
• No longer common
• Emerging egalitarian norms

Face-valid surveys

Modern Research
More subtle forms

Surveys, reaction time
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPES OF ATTITUDES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explicit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implicit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside conscious awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintentional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSIDERATIONS IN MEASUREMENT

Explicit
- Surveys
- Social desirability
- Confounding political conservativism

Implicit
- Reaction time
- “Real world” applicability
- Confounding cultural/environmental norms
A NEW MODEL OF PREJUDICE¹

¹Son Hing et al. (2008)

- Presents implicit and explicit attitudes as orthogonal dimensions
- Accounts for the confound of conservativism
- Accounts for the existence of prejudice among those with egalitarian beliefs
- Recognizes some individuals as “Truly Low”

Application to the study of prejudice in U.S.
THE “BIG” PICTURE

Psychology in geographic space

Personality traits and trends cluster geographically¹

Does prejudice cluster too?

Rentfrow, R.J. (2010). Statewide Differences in Personality: Toward a Psychological Geography of the United States
CURRENT STUDY

Measures

Explicit Prejudice
- Modern Racism Scale¹

Implicit Prejudice
- Implicit Association Test²

Demographics

Location

So far...

N = 2,488
All 50 states & DC

“PEEKING” AT THE DATA: DIMENSIONS

Explicit prejudice
- Strongly associated with political conservativism ($r = .58^*$)

Implicit prejudice
- Weakly associated with political conservativism ($r = .10^*$)

Weak association between explicit with implicit prejudice ($r = .18^*$)

*p < .0001
Every Individual
- Explicit prejudice score
- Implicit prejudice score

Geographic assignment
- Regions
  - West (n = 554)
  - Midwest (n = 537)
  - South (n = 954)
  - Northeast (n = 443)
- Sub-regions
  - Pacific (n = 369)
  - Mountain (n = 185)
  - East N. Central (n = 387)
  - W. N. Central (n = 150)
  - S. Atlantic (n = 540)
  - E. S. Central (n = 142)
  - W. S. Central (n = 272)
  - New England (n = 101)
  - Mid-Atlantic (n = 342)
“PEEKING” AT THE DATA: SUB REGIONS

- Mountain
- Pacific
- West North Central
- West South Central
- South Atlantic
- East North Central
- East South Central
- Middle Atlantic
- New England

- Modern Racism
- Aversive Racism
- Truly Low Prejudice
- Principled Conservativism
IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Project Goals

- Examine the efficacy of the Son Hing model
  - Including ability to predict unique outcomes
- Examine clustering at the county level

Project Implications

- Association between social justice outcomes and prejudice types
  - Implicit bias linked to lower levels of perceived clinical care¹
  - Perceptions of racism linked to increases in psychological distress²
  - DMA racism linked to increases in mortality
- Matching prejudice interventions with specific types of prejudice

¹Penner et al. (2010). Aversive racism and medical interactions with black patients: A field study.
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FROM EXPLICIT TO **IMPLICIT** PREJUDICE