

Bias and Discrimination

Dr. Melanie A. Morrison
Department of Psychology
University of Saskatchewan
CASHRA CONFERENCE 2015 - TCU PLACE

OBJECTIVES

- Provide Contextual Information About:
 - Types of Prejudice
 - Transformation of Prejudice Over Time
 - Prejudice-Discrimination Linkage
 - Preliminary Evidence of How these Concepts Relate to Evaluations of Aboriginal Persons
 - Closing Remarks

PREJUDICE

- A positive or negative attitude, evaluation, or feeling about a person that is generalized from stereotypical beliefs, symbolic beliefs, emotions, and past experiences with the group to which the person belongs

PREJUDICE

- Two forms of prejudiced attitudes
 - OLD-FASHIONED
 - MODERN

OLD-FASHIONED PREJUDICE

- Belief in the inherent inferiority of the social group in question; this often stems from perceived characterological differences between the groups
 - Race-based: Support for segregation and anti-miscegenation laws
 - Gender-based: Support for traditional roles
 - Sexual-orientation-based: Religious objections and moral condemnation, followed by myths

OLD-FASHIONED SCALE ITEMS

RACISM

“Black people are generally not as smart as whites”

“If a Black family with about the same income and education moved in next door, I would mind it a great deal”

“It is a bad idea for Blacks and Whites to marry one another”

SEXISM

“Women are generally not as smart as men”

“It is more important to encourage boys than to encourage girls to participate in athletics”

“When both parents are employed and their child gets sick at school, the school should call the mother rather than the father”

HOMONEGATIVITY

“Lesbians are immoral”

“Lesbians break down the traditional order in society”

“Gay men should not be allowed to work with children”

“Gay men should be avoided whenever possible”

TRANSFORMATION OF PREJUDICE OVER TIME

- Does not mean that old-fashioned prejudiced is not alive and well, but...
 - Social desirability concerns and need to appear as though one is “non-prejudiced” are pronounced
- RESULT
 - Need for covert or “non-reactive” measures of prejudice

MODERN PREJUDICE

- Theoretical tenets:
 - Discrimination is a thing of the past
 - Illegitimate/unnecessary demands for changes in the status quo
 - Emphasis on point of difference (e.g., sexual orientation) perpetuates marginalization

MODERN PREJUDICE SCALE ITEMS

RACISM

“Blacks are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights”

“Over the past few years, Blacks have gotten more economically than they deserve”

SEXISM

“Discrimination against women is no longer a problem in Canada”

“Society has reached the point where women and men have equal opportunities for achievement”

HOMONEGATIVITY

“Gay men should stop complaining about the way they are treated in society and simply get on with their lives”

“Celebrations such as ‘Gay Pride Day’ are ridiculous because they assume that an individual’s sexual orientation should constitute a source of pride”

MICROAGGRESSIONS

- “Brief, commonplace and daily verbal, behavioural, or environmental slights and indignities directed toward specific groups of people” (Platt & Lenzen, 2013, p. 1012).

A) MICROASSAULTS

- The use of explicit and intended derogations either verbally or nonverbally, as demonstrated through name-calling, avoidant behaviour, or discriminatory actions toward the intended victim (Sue, 2006; 2007)
 - Example: Racial slurs (e.g., “*Jap*”); refusing to serve someone or to work with someone

B) MICROINSULTS

- Verbal or non-verbal communications that convey rudeness and insensitivity and demean a person's heritage or identity (Sue, 2006; 2007)
 - Example: *“How did you get admitted into this program?”* or *“I believe that the most qualified students should be admitted to the university, regardless of their race.”*

C) MICROINVALIDATIONS

- Communications that exclude, negate, or nullify the realities of individuals of oppressed groups (Sue, 2006; 2007)
 - Examples: When non-White children and adults hear from White people the following: “*We are all human beings*” and “*I don’t see colour*”

PREJUDICE-DISCRIMINATION LINKAGE

PREJUDICE TYPE	MICROAGGRESSION TYPE	AWARENESS (level)	DISCRIMINATION
OLD-FASHIONED	MICROASSAULTS	CONSCIOUS (explicit)	-RACIAL EPITHETS
MODERN “A” vs. MODERN “B”	MICROINSULTS	-UNCONSCIOUS (implicit) -UNCONSCIOUS(?) (implicit)	-BIAS IN THE FORM OF OBJECTIONS TO ADVANCEMENTS AND “SPECIAL” FAVOURS
AVERSIVE	MICROINVALIDATIONS	UNCONSCIOUS (implicit)	- SUPPOSED COLOUR “BLINDNESS”

**Individuals higher in modern prejudiced “B” attitudes require a means of justifying their discrimination; and will discriminate when a reason presents itself that will be perceived as non-prejudiced.

CASE EXAMPLE



Old-Fashioned and Modern Prejudice Toward Aboriginal Persons (Morrison et al., 2008; 2014)

- Effects of colonialism are widespread
- Discrimination has been documented by researchers from a variety of disciplines
 - Yet, limited research by social psychologists on stereotyping and prejudice toward Aboriginal persons (or the “causes” of discrimination)
 - Of the limited research that exists, there are a paucity of geographic areas represented

Old-Fashioned and Modern Prejudice Toward Aboriginal Persons (Morrison et al., 2008; 2014)

- Purpose ($N=289$ university students):
 - To document stereotypes toward Aboriginal men and women
 - To disentangle participants' cultural awareness of stereotypes and personal endorsement of stereotypes
 - To explore the valence associated with commonly endorsed stereotypes
 - To assess the correspondence of stereotypes with prejudice

TARGET = Aboriginal Men; (*n* = 35 Non-Aboriginal Men)

	<u>CULTURAL</u>	<u>PERSONAL</u>	<u>Valence</u>	<u>MI</u>
Welfare dependent	94%	6.94	-2.31	-16.03
Criminal	91%	6.40	-3.16	-20.22
Alcoholic	89%	6.31	-2.75	-17.35
Poor	85%	5.40	-1.13	-6.10
Uneducated	80%	5.00	-2.16	-10.80
Bad Parent	68%	7.92	-3.31	-26.22
Abusive	66%	1.00	-3.81	-3.81
Physically dirty	66%	6.28	-2.97	-18.65
Violent	63%	7.65	-3.53	-27.00
Aggressive*	60%	8.48	-2.06	-16.07
Dangerous*	60%	1.30	-2.66	-3.46
Lazy*	60%	6.11	-2.63	-16.07

Personal = could range from 0-11; Valence = could range from -4 to 4; MI = multiplicative index OR
 "Personal" X "Valence"; MI = could range from -44 (negative, with 0 being neutral, to 44 (positive)

TARGET = ABORIGINAL MEN (*n* = 110 Non-Aboriginal Women)

	<u>CULTURAL</u>	<u>PERSONAL</u>	<u>Valence</u>	<u>MI</u>
Alcoholic	92%	5.47	-2.75	-15.04
Welfare dependent	89%	6.36	-2.31	-14.69
Criminal	87%	5.49	-3.16	-17.34
Uneducated	82%	5.07	-2.16	-10.95
Poor	78%	6.62	-1.13	-7.48
Dangerous	71%	4.93	-2.66	-13.11
Undisciplined	68%	6.35	-2.13	-13.53
Physically dirty	68%	5.00	-2.97	-14.85
Abusive*	66%	4.03	-3.81	-15.35
Aggressive*	66%	6.09	-2.06	-12.55
Lazy*	66%	5.51	-2.63	-14.49

Personal = could range from 0-11; Valence = could range from -4 to 4; MI = multiplicative index OR "Personal" X "Valence"; MI = could range from -44 (negative, with 0 being neutral, to 44 (positive)

TARGET = ABORIGINAL WOMEN; (*n* = 31 non-Aboriginal Men)

	<u>CULTURAL</u>	<u>PERSONAL</u>	<u>Valence</u>	<u>MI</u>
Welfare dependent	74%	5.73	-2.31	-13.23
Poor	68%	6.41	-1.13	-7.24
Bad parent	68%	4.86	-3.31	-16.10
Uneducated	58%	6.65	-2.16	-14.36
Spiritual	52%	8.75	2.06	18.03
Criminal	48%	4.80	-3.16	-15.17
Alcoholic	48%	4.21	-2.75	-11.58
Sexually easy*	45%	6.80	-2.13	-14.48
Physically dirty*	45%	6.23	-2.97	-18.51
Undisciplined*	45%	7.67	-2.13	-16.34

Personal = could range from 0-11; Valence = could range from -4 to 4; MI = multiplicative index OR
 "Personal" X "Valence"; MI = could range from -44 (negative, with 0 being neutral, to 44 (positive))

TARGET = Aboriginal Women (*n* = 112 Non-Aboriginal Women)

	<u>CULTURAL</u>	<u>PERSONAL</u>	<u>Valence</u>	<u>MI</u>
Welfare dependent	90%	6.65	-2.31	-15.36
Uneducated	86%	5.23	-2.16	-11.30
Poor	82%	5.88	-1.13	-6.64
Alcoholic	76%	5.14	-2.75	-14.14
Bad parent	73%	4.52	-3.31	-14.97
Spiritual	69%	8.47	2.06	17.45
Lazy	63%	4.71	-2.63	-12.40
Criminal	48%	4.80	-3.16	-15.17
Undisciplined	45%	7.67	-2.13	-16.34
Unreliable	56%	5.48	-3.06	-16.77

Personal = could range from 0-11; Valence = could range from -4 to 4; MI = multiplicative index OR
 “Personal” X “Valence”; MI = could range from -44 (negative, with 0 being neutral, to 44 (positive)

SCALE DEVELOPMENT

- PROCESS involved input from Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal adults

OLD-FASHIONED PREJUDICE

(Morrison et al., 2008)

- Old-fashioned Prejudiced Attitudes Scale Items
 - *“Poverty on reserves is a direct result of Aboriginal people abusing drugs”*
 - *“Diseases that affect Aboriginal people are simply due to the lifestyle they lead”*
 - *“Aboriginal people have no sense of time”*

Please note: The Old-fashioned Prejudiced Attitudes toward Aboriginal Scale (O-PATAS; Morrison, Morrison, Harriman, & Jewell, 2008) is the only multi-item measure of this type of prejudice in Canada

MODERN PREJUDICE

Four Theoretical Tenets

- A. Aboriginal men and women place too much emphasis on their cultural backgrounds (e.g., Aboriginal cultural considerations must be in many domains such as work and school);
- B. Aboriginal men and women use their cultural differences to push for changes in the status quo, many of which are viewed as unnecessary (e.g., wanting the right to practice traditional ceremonies);

MODERN PREJUDICE

Four Theoretical Tenets (cont'd)

- C. Aboriginal men and women exploit their “status” as Aboriginals to receive a host of special favours and handouts from various institutions; and
- D. Because Aboriginal persons are the recipients of “special” opportunities and protections, discrimination toward Aboriginal persons is no longer a pressing social issue in Canada.

MODERN PREJUDICE SCALE ITEMS

(Morrison et al., 2008)

- “Canada needs to stop apologizing for events that happened to Aboriginal people many years ago”
- “Aboriginal people should simply get over past generations’ experiences at residential schools”
- “Special places in academics programmes should NOT be set aside for Aboriginal students”
- “Aboriginal people should be satisfied with what the government has given them”
- “It is now unnecessary to honour treaties established with Aboriginal people”
- “Aboriginal people should not have reserved placements in universities unless they are qualified”
- “Aboriginal people should pay taxes just like everyone else”

Please note: The Modern Prejudiced Attitudes toward Aboriginal Scale (M-PATAS; Morrison, Morrison, Harriman, & Jewell, 2008) is the only multi-item measure of this type of prejudice in Canada

PREJUDICE - DISCRIMINATION

- Based on scores on these scales, we may see the harbouring of negative affect toward Aboriginal men and women which may result in explicit and implicit discriminatory behaviour
- Necessity to educate non-Aboriginal persons so as to dispel common myths and stereotypes about Aboriginal men and women
- Prejudice reduction strategies should involve positive contact experience, perspective-taking, and follow-up opportunities to practice positive behaviours and reflect on lessons learned

Concluding Remarks

- Pollock (2007) refers to the enactment of “Everyday Justice”
 - Focuses on opportunity
 - Need for educators, employers, and policy makers to put on a personal “RACE LENS” so that they may avoid and remedy racially-patterned opportunity denials

THANK YOU

Please note: For a full list of Old-fashioned Prejudiced Scale items and Modern Prejudice Scale items, please contact Melanie Morrison at: melanie.morrison@usask.ca.