



Psicothema

ISSN: 0214-9915

psicothema@cop.es

Universidad de Oviedo

España

Cárdenas Castro, Manuel
Forms of ethnic prejudice: Assessing the dimensionality of a Spanish-language version of the Blatant
and Subtle Prejudice Scale
Psicothema, vol. 22, núm. 1, 2010, pp. 118-124
Universidad de Oviedo
Oviedo, España

Available in: <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=72712699019>

- How to cite
- Complete issue
- More information about this article
- Journal's homepage in redalyc.org

redalyc.org

Scientific Information System

Network of Scientific Journals from Latin America, the Caribbean, Spain and Portugal

Non-profit academic project, developed under the open access initiative

Forms of ethnic prejudice: Assessing the dimensionality of a Spanish-language version of the Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale

Manuel Cárdenas Castro
Universidad Católica del Norte

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the dimensionality of a Spanish-language version of the Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale via exploratory (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). No research has confirmed the hypothesized factor structure in Latin American countries. Using data from a random and probability survey in population of the northern area of Chile (N= 896), four models were specified: single factor model (global prejudice factor), correlated two-factor model (subtle and blatant prejudice), correlated two-factor second-order model, and single-factor second-order model. The findings indicated that the two-factor second-order model had the best fit. The corresponding alpha coefficients were .82 (subtle prejudice) and .76 (blatant prejudice). Lastly, differences were examined between «equalitarians», «subtle», and «bigots» regarding their feelings toward immigrants, their feelings about their beliefs concerning the state aid received by these out-groups, and their feelings about their beliefs regarding future policies for them.

Nuevas formas de prejuicio étnico: evaluación de las dimensiones de la versión en español de la Escala de Prejuicio Sutil y Manifiesto. El principal objetivo de este estudio fue investigar la dimensionalidad de una versión en español de la escala de prejuicio sutil y manifiesto a través de análisis factoriales de tipo exploratorio (AFE) y confirmatorio (AFC). Ninguna investigación ha confirmado la estructura factorial hipotetizada por los autores en los países de América Latina. Utilizando datos de una encuesta probabilística y aleatoria de la población de la zona norte de Chile (N= 896) se especifican cuatro modelos: modelo de factor único (factor de prejuicio global), modelo de dos factores correlacionados (prejuicio sutil y manifiesto), modelo de dos factores de segundo orden correlacionados y modelo de un solo factor de segundo orden. Los resultados indicaron que el modelo de dos factores de segundo orden obtenía el mejor ajuste. Los coeficientes alfa para las subescalas fueron de .82 (prejuicio sutil) y .76 (flagrante prejuicio). Por último, se examinaron las diferencias entre «igualitarios», «sutiles» y «fanáticos» con respecto a sus sentimientos hacia los inmigrantes, en relación a sus creencias sobre las ayudas estatales recibidas por fuera de estos grupos, y en relación a sus creencias sobre las políticas futuras para con ellos.

This article analyzes the factor structure of Pettigrew and Meertens' subtle and blatant scales (1992, 1995). Its objective is to determine if the structure originally proposed by these authors is supported by data collected in the Chilean social environment and if this instrument, that theoretically detects modern prejudice manifestations, is useful to appropriately distinguish between old and new forms of ethnic prejudice.

The premise underlying new forms of prejudice is that far from decreasing or disappearing, they have changed the way they express themselves from brutal and direct to others much better adapted to modern values of tolerance and non-discrimination than promoted by democratic systems. So, the traditional function of prejudice, far from losing importance, has been undergoing a

progressive change from more traditional and open expressions to others less evident and subtler. This idea has gained support by showing that more evident and violent forms of expression, generally accompanied by feelings of anger, rage or hatred, have consistently decreased and have been replaced by feelings of discomfort, insecurity, disgust, and fear (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1986), along with the difficulty to express positive emotions toward exogroups (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). The expression of negative attitudes would simply restraint itself to situations without clear rules defining proper behavior.

Blatant prejudice refers to more traditional and frequently studied forms of expression. As some authors state, it is hot, close, and direct prejudice (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). More precisely, the differential characteristics of blatant prejudice would refer to two basic components: Threat and rejection to the out-group (including the belief in its genetic inferiority that would allow justifying the disadvantages of the out-group in society) and opposition to contact with the out-group (the anti-intimacy component focuses upon an emotional resistance against any intergroup, e.g. sexual contact or intermarriage).

In contrast, subtle prejudice would acquire a cold, distant, and indirect form. The components of subtle prejudice would be three: defense of traditional values and the idea that out-groups would not be respecting them, exaggeration of cultural differences and its use to justify the out-group position, and denial of positive emotions toward the out-group (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995).

These two scales have been successfully tested in different countries and contexts (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995; Arcuri & Boca, 1996; Pettigrew, 1997; Pettigrew, Jackson, Ben Brika, Lemain, Meertens, Wagner, & Zick, 1998; Vala, Brito, & Lopes, 1999; Ratazzi & Volpato, 2000; Espelt, Javaloy, & Cornejo, 2006; Navas, García, Rojas, Pumares, & Cuadrado, 2006; Frias Navarro, Montverde i Bort, & Peris García, 2009). They have also been translated, adapted, and validated for use in the Spanish language (Rueda & Navas, 1996), although neither the Spanish version nor its Chilean adaptation (Cárdenas, 2006; Cárdenas, Music, Contreras, Yeomans, & Calderón, 2007) included the use of confirmatory factor models.

Confirmatory studies on these scales show important differences, depending on procedures followed. Pettigrew and Meertens (1995) state that the second-order hierarchical model offers the best fit index. The factor analysis was independently made for the subtle and blatant scale, a fact that has raised criticism toward these authors (Coenders, Scheepers, Sidanius, & Verbeek, 2001). Following a different path in the exploratory factor analysis, these critics included the 20 items of both scales and found two main factors: one referring to general prejudice and another relating to cultural differences (16 and 4 items, respectively). As expected, this is the factor model showing the best fit index in the confirmatory factor analysis. Two of the three prejudice dimensions saturate in the same factor as the items of the two dimensions of blatant prejudice (Coenders, Scheepers, Sidanius, & Verbeek, 2001).

On the other hand, these scales have been subjected to criticism due to the high correlation between them since this could be another indicator of similar and little differentiated constructs. This would question the idea of a new form of prejudice (Sniderman & Tetlock, 1986). Original studies report correlation ranging from .48 (Netherlands) to .70 (France) (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995; Meertens & Pettigrew, 1997). Other studies show correlations between .55 and .73 (Rueda & Navas, 1996) in various groups in Spain, and .65 in the case of Portugal (Vala et al., 1999). In addition, these high correlations could indicate high levels of social desirability (Brown, 1995) since subjects seem to be clear as to the «correct» or expected response for each item.

In addition, some studies reveal that a similar set of variables allow predicting the scores of both scales. In this way, subjects who score high in each of the scales (or in both) tend to have poor education, be older, have only ingroup friends, experience Group deprivation relative to the out-group, lack political interest, and boast considerable pride in their nationality (Meertens & Pettigrew, 1997). So, the idea that they have poorly differentiated constructs strengthens.

On the other hand, the items of the subtle prejudice scale have been questioned as real prejudice and not only political conservatism indicators (Sniderman & Tetlock, 1986). In the same fashion, reactants corresponding to the dimension «cultural differences» of the subtle prejudice scale have been referred to as probably not detecting prejudiced subjects, since many people in favor of progressive policies who feel close to racial or ethnic

minorities believe it is important to recognize and value cultural differences. Not doing it is seen as a form of intolerable cultural assimilation. Regarding the first of these critiques, Meertens and Pettigrew (1997) answered by showing data linking conservatism more strongly with blatant prejudice in three different samples.

What does seem to be agreement on is that the typology derived from crosschecking the two scale scores is pertinent to distinguish subjects in a series of variables and so, they can be used for predicting. Likewise, the crosscheck of both scales allows distinguishing among «equalitarians» (showing low scores both in the subtle and blatant scales), «bigots» (those who have high scores in both scales) and «subtles» (who would have low scores in the blatant prejudice scale and high scores in the subtle prejudice scale). Significant differences in variables such as subjects' beliefs regarding help offered to immigrants (out-groups) by the state and future policies connected with the actions that could be taken to stop discrimination have been found among these types of subjects (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995; Rueda & Nava, 1996). In general terms, «equalitarians» want to increase rights and improve immigrants living conditions; «subtles» prefer to keep the state of affairs (showing themselves prejudiced only in ambiguous contexts and giving reasons considered as non-prejudiced); and «bigots» are in favor of restricting immigrant rights.

The objective of this study is to determine the model that best expresses the blatant and subtle prejudice scales and to explore the relations between the different typologies and a series of variables. This analysis will deal with a group of Bolivian immigrants, one of the most representative in the northern zone of Chile. The Second Region is one of the five with the most immigrants each year, given its mining features. Bolivian immigrants correspond to 30% of the total legal immigrants in the zone, according to data from the National Institute of Statistics (INE, for its acronym in Spanish). So, differences could be expected among «bigots», «subtles» and «equalitarians» in: [1] attitude toward future immigrant rights and policies («equalitarians» will fight for increasing immigrant rights and their permanence in the country; «bigots» will be in favor of restricting immigrant rights and their entrance to the country or the expulsion of Bolivian immigrants residing in the country; and «subtles» will hold a more ambiguous position in favor of leaving things in the current state of affairs) and [2] differences in opinions regarding future policies the state should have with respect to Bolivian immigrants («equalitarians» will support the idea that all immigrants can stay in the country; «bigots» will opt for measures involving expulsion or increase in police vigilance; and finally, «subtles» will prefer expulsion of those undocumented or committing crime).

Method

Participants

The probabilistic sample consisted of 896 participants (mean age= 38.21 years; SD= 13.46), all Chileans, selected in the cities of Antofagasta, Calama y San Pedro de Atacama (the universe was the population between 18 and 65 years of the second region) with a three-stage sampling model: 1) stratified model; 2) cluster model; and 3) simple random model. The first involves disaggregating the universe into smaller heterogeneous sets (the variable used at this level was «city»). Later, these strata were

divided into smaller universes or clusters (census districts). Finally, blocks in each cluster and houses in each block were randomly selected. The degree of confidence for estimates is 95%, sampling error being 4%. Women in the sample amounted to 58.5% (n= 524; M= 38.81; SD= 13.35) and men totaled 41.5% (n= 372; M= 37.36; SD= 13.6).

Instruments

Social and Demographic Sheet. One page with social and demographic data was developed to elicit personal information regarding participants' sex, age, educational level (measured on seven levels from «Incomplete primary school» to «Graduate»), political self-categorization (seven categories from «Extreme left» to «Extreme right»), socio-economic level (measured with ESOMAR from the World Association of Market Research) and ethnicity (Participants were asked if they considered themselves as belonging to some kind of ethnic minority and, if so, which one).

Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). The version translated and adapted for a national sample was used (Cárdenas et al., 2007). Reliability levels (Cronbach alpha) obtained for the Chilean sample version were .76 for the blatant scale and .65 for the subtle one. Each scale – subtle and blatant - consists of 10 Likert-type items whose options range from 1 («strongly disagree») to 5 («strongly agree»). Four of the 10 items in the subtle prejudice scale correspond to dimension «traditional values»; four items correspond to dimension «cultural differences»; and two items to dimension «denial of positive emotions». In the case of the blatant prejudice scale, six items were included in the dimension «threat and rejection» and four items in the dimension «anti-intimacy». The target group of the scale was the Bolivian immigrants. Differences with other Spanish-language versions of the same scale (Rueda & Navas, 1996) concern the adaptation of language in the style of the country (Chile) and changing the target group under evaluation.

Scale validity indicators. This set consisted of questions on participants' opinion regarding the rights immigrants should have or acquire and future steps the state administration should take in connection with Bolivian immigrants. The question on future policies was: «Regarding future policies the state should implement with respect to Bolivian immigrants, Do you think the most appropriate would be» (5 response options were given: «Allowing everybody to stay in Chile», «There should be more police vigilance to avoid delinquency and drug problems», «Entrance should be allowed only to those having a work contract», «Expulsing those who have committed crime or are undocumented» and «Expulsing everybody from the country»). The question on immigrants' rights was: «Regarding immigrant rights, do you think they should be (4 response options were given): «increased or made equal to Chileans», «Left as they are», «Restricted» and «There shouldn't be any»). These questions were also used by Rueda and Navas (1996).

Procedure

All participants were interviewed after their written consent, keeping anonymity. For this purpose, duly trained interviewers paid visits to their houses and informed them of the study (referring to Chileans' perception of certain social groups living in the zone) and provided them with instructions to complete the

questionnaire (containing a self-application section and another one for the interviewer to ask questions and write down answers). Interviewers were given a map of the sector where they had to administer the questionnaires. The map showed the route they should follow and the blocks and houses selected for administering the questionnaires.

Data analysis

Statistical analysis was carried out on SPSS 14 and AMOS 6. A descriptive analysis of all variable was made. The percentages obtained from participants responses about information needs were compared through contingency-table association measures (χ^2 and Phi coefficient). The Pearson correlation coefficient was used to determine if any relationship existed between both subscales (blatant and subtle). Exploratory Factor Analysis was made (an extraction procedure was used for main components with VARIMAX command). The factor structure of the measure was tested using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) on a total of 20 items that represented each of the five factors reported by Pettigrew and Meertens (1995). The Student's t-tests and one way ANOVA were then applied to data for groups compares. Results were considered significant when $p < 0.05$.

Results

Sample characteristics

The mean and standard deviation scores for the Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scales (BSPS) in each sample group are shown in Table 1.

Reliability

The reliability levels obtained for the subtle prejudice scale were $\alpha = .82$ and the scale measuring blatant prejudice was $\alpha = .76$. The item-total correlation of all the items was higher than .25. So, indexes can be considered remarkable and reveal high internal test consistency. The correlation between both scales was $r = .53$ ($p < .001$). The Cronbach alpha coefficients of the blatant prejudice

Table 1
Sociodemographic variables

Variable	N	%	Blatant	Subtle
Sex				
Male	372	41.5	2.80	3.38
Female	524	58.5	2.90	3.37
Age				
18-29	294	32.8	2.75	3.33
30-49	385	43.1	2.88	3.39
49-65	215	24.0	2.96	3.42
Political self-categorization				
Left	259	30.5	2.73	3.29
Central	431	50.7	2.91	3.37
Right	160	18.8	2.84	3.46
Socio-economical level				
High	219	25.2	2.62	3.21
Medium	542	62.4	2.83	3.35
Low	108	12.4	2.99	3.47

scale were .75 (rejection) and .63 (anti-intimacy). Coefficients for the subtle subscales were .51 (traditional values), .75 (D) and .47 (EP). In all cases, item-total correlations were greater than .25.

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

Factor structure analysis of the BSPS and subscales was attempted and is shown in Table 2. For the BSPS scale, an extraction procedure was used for main components with VARIMAX command; however, the best explanation for the existence of predicted factors occurred with a rotate model. Sample adequacy measures indicated good data agreement for the factor analysis of the full scale (KMO= .88 and Bartlett sphericity test, $\chi^2_{(190)}= 3753.37$; $p= .000$).

To make an exploratory factor analysis, Coenders et al. (2001) recommendations were followed to include the 20 items of the subtle and blatant scales in only one analysis, thus avoiding separate analysis, the procedure used in the original studies. This procedure was followed because if statements about the BSPS factor structure are correct, they should be clearly shown in the factor analysis, dimensions corresponding to each scale being differentiated.

The BSPS scale factor structure illustrated the presence of five main factors explaining 52.28% of the total variance, all of them with own values greater than one. Table 2 shows the factor charges of each item and their corresponding dimension.

In factor I, explaining 15.23% of the variance, items 2, 5, 8, 9, 10, 15 and 17 of the questionnaire saturate strongly, corresponding to the factor « threat and rejection» stated by Pettigrew and Meertens (1995). Factor II, to which items 6, 11, 12 and 16 of the scale correspond, explains 12.48% of the variance and is identical

to the factor named «exaggeration cultural differences». Items 4, 7, 13 and 20 strongly saturate in factor III. This is the factor «anti-intimacy» and explains 10.46% of the total variance. Factor IV includes items 1, 3 and 14. This is the factor «defense of traditional values» which explains 7.47% of the variance. Finally, factor V corresponds to dimension «denial of positive emotions» including items 18 and 19. This dimension explains 6.63% of the total variance.

All items (except item 5 that should be in dimension IV which, though corresponding to traditional values in the subtle scale, is linked to the dimension «rejection» in the blatant scale) saturate in the dimension theoretically predicted. In other words, the factor structure of the data collected with BSPS has a very good fit with the theoretical structure predicted by the authors, that is, in including the 20 items of the scale in the factor analysis (some authors criticized scale creators for not including them) a reproduction almost identical to the data matrix theoretically formulated is observed: five factors, each of them with their corresponding items (except item 5 which should appear in dimension IV and not in dimension I as it does together with the items of the blatant scale).

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

In order to study the latent structure of the BSPS Spanish-language version, a series of CFA models were specified and estimated using AMOS 16 (Analysis of Moment Structure) software. In this study, the following fit measures are assessed: CFI (Comparative Fit Index) index, NFI (Normal Fit Index), RFI (Relative Fit Index) and RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation). Four models were specified: I) single factor model (global factor of prejudice); II) correlated two-factor model («subtle» and «blatant» prejudice); III) correlated two-factor second-order model (defined by two correlated factors named «Blatant» and «Subtle». The «blatant» factor consists of «threat and rejection» and «anti-intimacy», while the «subtle» factor consists of «defense of traditional values», «exaggeration of cultural differences» and «denial of positive emotions»); and IV) single-factor second-order model (defined by one general factor named «prejudice» consisting of five second-order factors: «threat and rejection», «anti-intimacy», «defense of traditional values», «exaggeration of cultural differences» and «denial of positive emotions». Table 2 shows the fit indexes for each of the models proposed by BSPS.

The correlated two-factor second-order model shows better fit for all indexes. Models III and IV get the best fit, being those that best represent the original theory. CFI (Comparative Fit Index), NFI (Normal Fit Index) and RFI (Relative Fit Index) show values close to .90 for models III and IV. These fit indicators are

Table 2
Factor charges for Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale items

Item	Factors				
	I	II	III	IV	V
ITEM 1 (Subtle / Values)				.74	
ITEM 2 (Blatant / Rejection)	.50				
ITEM 3 (Subtle / Values)				.43	
ITEM 4 (Blatant / Intimacy)			.60		
ITEM 5 (Subtle / Values)	.53				
ITEM 6 (Subtle / Differences)		.63			
ITEM 7 (Blatant / Intimacy)			.69		
ITEM 8 (Blatant / Rejection)	.57				
ITEM 9 (Blatant / Rejection)	.70				
ITEM 10 (Blatant / Rejection)	.67				
ITEM 11 (Subtle / Differences)		.70			
ITEM 12 (Subtle / Differences)		.70			
ITEM 13 (Blatant / Intimacy)			.81		
ITEM 14 (Subtle / Values)				.57	
ITEM 15 (Blatant / Rejection)	.61				
ITEM 16 (Subtle / Differences)		.74			
ITEM 17 (Blatant / Rejection)	.53				
ITEM 18 (Subtle / Emotions)				.69	
ITEM 19 (Subtle / Emotions)				.83	
ITEM 20 (Blatant / Intimacy)			-.53		

Table 3
Fit indexes for factor models

Model	χ^2	Df	p	CFI	NFI	RFI	RMSEA
Model I	1486.93	171	.000	.65	.63	.54	.093
Model II	1016.50	169	.000	.77	.75	.68	.075
Model III	585.72	164	.000	.89	.85	.81	.054
Model IV	593.78	165	.000	.89	.85	.81	.054

considered very good when they go over this figure (Bentler & Dudgeon, 1996). The RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation) index is significant because it gets values lower than .08 (Browne & Kudeck, 1993) which are reached by almost every model (except model I). Again, models III and IV get the lowest figures for this indicator. So, to choose between these two models, the value of χ^2 , which is lower for model III (correlated two-factor, second-order model) was used.

Validity indicators

To get scale validity indicators, a mean contrast was made (Student t-test for related samples) with the results of subjects in the blatant and subtle scales. Scale mean differences are significant [$T_{(894)} = -24.55$; $p < 0.001$], indicating that participants respond consistently and therefore scores in the subtle scale are higher ($M = 3.38$; $SD = .66$) than in the blatant scale ($M = 2.86$; $SD = .64$). In addition, women score significantly higher than men in the blatant prejudice scale [$T_{(892)} = -2.23$; $p < 0.05$]. Subjects defining themselves as leftists score significantly lower than those at the center or right, both in the blatant [$F_{(2, 846)} = 6.16$; $p < 0.005$] and subtle [$F_{(2, 846)} = 3.35$; $p < 0.05$] scales. Younger subjects show significantly lower prejudice levels than older ones, both in the blatant [$F_{(2, 846)} = 6.15$; $p < 0.005$] and subtle [$F_{(2, 846)} = 3.35$; $p < 0.05$] scales. Also, subjects with high socioeconomic level are significantly less prejudiced, both in the subtle [$F_{(2, 865)} = 6.08$; $p < 0.005$] and blatant [$F_{(2, 865)} = 12.19$; $p < 0.001$] scales than those at middle or low socioeconomic level, the latter group showing the highest prejudice levels. The socioeconomic level is calculated on the basis of participants' school level and current work, without considering income.

The next step was to divide the sample using the typology presented by Pettigrew and Meerten (1995) with participant scores. To do this, they were divided into «high» and «low» (prejudiced and unprejudiced) in the blatant and subtle scales. This division was made by using the middle or central point of the scales. In other words, since the scale ranges from 1 to 5 and there are 10 items in each scale (according to this, the scale can vary from 10 to 50 points), the middle point would be 30. In this way, scores over 30 in each scale are considered «high» and those lower than 30 are regarded as «low». Table 4 shows the frequency distribution for the different types described: «equalitarians», «subtles», «bigots», and error (corresponding to subjects scoring high in the blatant prejudice scale and low in the subtle prejudice scale which, in practice, can be considered as a form of inconsistent and infrequent response).

An interesting issue in the table above is the big number of «bigots» in this sample as compared with other studies (in the study by Rueda and Navas, «bigots» amounted to only 5% of the

total sample), although these results are coherent with previous measures on the same group in Chile (Cárdenas, 2006; Cárdenas et al., 2007) and can be attributed to the historical rivalry for geographic sovereignty among some countries, along with the great number of Bolivian immigrants (this region belonged to Bolivia until the XIX century and was gained by Chile after the Pacific War). The general tendency is equal distribution for the three types described.

This typology is used to separate the sample and compare the means of the additional questions included in the questionnaire. These questions referred to variables recurrent in the literature on prejudice and that have been used in a series of studies D'Ancona, 2006), as follows: beliefs people have on the rights that the administration or state should give these groups and the future policy more adequate to be followed. Table 5 shows the rights sampled immigrants should have or acquire.

«Equalitarians» show a clear tendency to increase immigrant rights (50%). «Subtles» show a clear tendency to move around the different options since, except for the elimination of rights, all the other options show similar response percentages (in this sense, «subtles» seem to lie between «equalitarians» and «bigots»). In general, «bigots» tend to be in agreement with restraining Bolivian immigrant rights (53.4 %). In analyzing a possible association between the typology and the options subjects adopt on Bolivian immigrant rights, a significant association is found between these two variables ($\chi^2_{(9)} = 140.13$; $p < 0.001$; $\Phi = .40$). So, the hypothesis of independence between these variables can be rejected.

Regarding future actions for Bolivian immigrants, subjects were offered response options to allow them choosing among openly prejudiced expressions and others in which actions could be justified from «unprejudiced arguments». Table 6 shows the data collected.

Both «equalitarians» and «subtles» tend to choose the expulsion of all immigrants involved in delinquency or undocumented. In the case of «subtles» results confirm the prediction that they would try to justify their prejudice, not from an ethnic component but from «non-racial» argumentations. In other words, prejudice effects remain, but from the viewpoint of immigrant, it links to illegal activities. In the same fashion and in

Table 4
Frequencies for different types of prejudice

Typology	N	%
<i>Equalitarians</i>	224	25.0
<i>Subtles</i>	337	37.7
<i>Bigots</i>	300	33.5
<i>Error</i>	34	3.8

Table 5
Opinion on Bolivian immigrant rights (percentages)

	Equalitarians	Subtles	Bigots
<i>Expand</i>	50.0	27.1	10.4
<i>Restrict</i>	19.1	39.0	53.4
<i>Leave them as they are</i>	29.1	30.7	24.8
<i>There shouldn't be any</i>	1.8	3.3	11.4

Table 6
Opinion on future actions for immigrants (percentages)

	Let all remain	Expulsing all	Expulsing criminals and undocumented	Expulsing those who have no work	More police surveillance
<i>Equalitarians</i>	31.9	01.4	39.6	13.1	14.9
<i>Bigots</i>	03.7	10.7	41.8	21.7	22.1
<i>Subtles</i>	09.0	2.4	49.3	21.8	17.6

accordance with the study hypothesis, some «equalitarians» (31.9%) opt for immigrants to stay in Chile. This option is clearly lower for «bigots» and, in accordance with predictions, most of them opt for actions involving expulsion or increased police control. In making an analysis to compare the hypothesis of independence of the two categorization variables (typology and opinion on future actions for immigrants), a clear relation between these variables is shown ($\chi^2_{(12)} = 129.3$; $p = 0.001$; $\Phi = .38$).

Discussion and conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine BSPS psychometric properties and factors underlying its structure using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). Results obtained suggest that the model with the best fit indexes among the four models proposed is the correlated two-factor second-order model (blatant and subtle prejudice). This results support the model proposed by Pettigrew and Meertens (1995) and reject critiques regarding the adoption of a different methodological strategy (Coenders et al., 2001). These authors were in favor of a model with two factors which, in fact, reduce to only one since they stated that cultural differences related to migratory phenomena were evident and not exaggerated by the population. Indeed, they state that the perception of cultural differences can be a *conditio sine qua non* of prejudice, but they accept that the perception *per se* of cultural differences cannot necessarily be an expression of prejudice. Supporting Pettigrew and Meertens (2001), emphasis can be put on both differences and similarities. This is evident in this study since Bolivian immigrants speak the same language as Chileans; they live in similar geographic areas (in fact, the northern zone used to be Bolivian territory); they share religious beliefs; and they are physically similar, differences prevailing over common traits.

On the other hand, the study shows that blatant prejudice levels are lower than subtle prejudice levels, a fact that could reveal changes in their forms of expression. But the high levels of blatant prejudice pose a question on the real magnitude of such a change in the Chilean social context, although they could indicate that the scale successfully leaves social desirability out. What is actually evident is that there are two forms of prejudice, the moderate correlation between both scales showing that, in fact, both refer to prejudice measurement, though they might refer to different expressions of prejudice since they measure different but related dimensions of such a construct. On the one hand, a traditional measure of threat and rejection against immigrants and anti-intimacy with them are faced, this being the form ethnic prejudice has always taken. On the other hand, it is evident that rejection occurs through socially acceptable paths and reasons that do not appear to be directly prejudiced due to both, the pressure of democratic and equalitarian values and also subjects' desire to keep their positive identity. The confirmatory factor analysis supports this distinction.

If attention is put on predictions that can be made through the typology derived from both scales, the distinction between blatant and subtle prejudice can be supported. Thus, predictions for the sample are accomplished. In other words, «bigots» opt for restricting immigrant rights and favor their expulsion or vigilance. The opposite occurs with «equalitarians» since half of them report their desire to increase immigrant rights and claim that all immigrants should stay in Chile, expelling those who committed crime. Also, a meaningful number of subjects opt for police

vigilance or expulsion of the unemployed, but in terms of tendency, the relation between the typologies and the choice of a certain strategy is significant. Finally, «subtles» lie between the two previous categories. They prefer to expulse those who have committed crime or are undocumented and leave immigrant rights in the current state of affairs or restrict them. In this sense, it would be necessary to do studies on a measure to detect the relative power Chileans give Bolivian immigrants since this measure could be an indicator of the degree of threat and rejection perceived regarding this out-group. In addition, measures on relative intergroup privation should be added to explain the reasons for the levels of rejection toward a group that does not represent a high percent of the population, in a country that cannot be considered as an immigrant receiver. According to data from the last population census (INE, 2002), the total number of foreigners residing in Chile is slightly higher than 1% of the total population, clearly representing a small proportion. On the other hand, the number of Chileans residing abroad is greater than the number of immigrants living in Chile (Martínez, 2005).

An alarming element is the high degree of blatant prejudice expressed by participants. At first, it could indicate «art-factual» effects of the five-point scale measure, but results from previous studies made with a six-point scale (leaving out the middle point) on the same group (Bolivian immigrants) and geographic zone (IInd Region, Chile) do not differ substantially (Cárdenas, 2006). Previous studies done on other target groups reveal that prejudice expressions are sometimes open and little elaborated in the Chilean context. Data from a questionnaire administered by Fundación IDEAS in 1997 showed that there is a value charge of intolerance and discrimination considered risky on different issues, particularly homosexuality, which were considered “very serious”, with a figure of 60.2% (100% being the maximum, showing very strong prejudice). The second report of this foundation showed that 45.2% of the subjects think that homosexuality should be forbidden since it is against human nature (Fundación IDEAS, 2001). Most recent results reported by IDEAS indicate that 50% or more of the population could be regarded as homophobic. Results also revealed that people believed homosexuality should be an important issue in medical research in order to avoid homosexual births in the future. Moreover, in the last report (Fundación IDEAS, 2003), 43% of the sample thought that homosexuals should not become school teachers. Similar patterns are found in analyzing prejudice against women (Mladinic et al., 1998). These authors show that 78.4% of men report a high level of hostile sexism. Something similar occurs with prejudice against indigenous people. Admitting prejudice against «mapuche» seems to be independent from social desirability (Sáiz et al., 1988) and recognizing prejudice openly does not seem to be a censurable fact. In this way, though the blatant prejudice levels reported by participants are worrying, these seem to properly reflect the true prejudice against Bolivian immigrants in Chile.

Additionally, if subtle prejudice originates in the existence of social norms banning the open expression of prejudice and discrimination (Molero, Cuadrado, & Navas, 2003; Meertens & Pettigrew, 1997), then the non-existence of laws prohibiting and punishing discrimination in Chile is another element that allows understanding the results of this study and the huge percent of people grouped under «bigots». Molero, Cuadrado and Navas (2003) also found a very high number of «bigots» (about 40%)

attributed by the authors to the effects of the context (where contact with the exogroup is real, producing problems and tension in personal relationships).

BSPS reliability coefficients show that the scales seem to be consistent to measure both traditional and subtle traditional forms of prejudice. Both scales reveal high reliability levels (measured with Cronbach alpha coefficient) and each of the items show high correlations with the total scale. In addition, the exploratory factor analysis indicates that data structure is congruent with the theoretical dimensions of the scale, that is, the dimension would have a two-factor structure in which blatant prejudice is represented by two underlying dimensions referring to threat and rejection and anti-intimacy. Also, subtle prejudice would be formed by dimensions «defense of traditional values»,

«exaggeration of cultural differences», and «denial of positive emotions». This structure seems credible and provides indicators that may support the distinction between two forms of prejudice distinguishable to each other.

In conclusion, the scale seems to work well since it can quite clearly differentiate the various subject typologies since it has psychometric properties (reliability and validity) that make it a good instrument to measure new forms of prejudice in Chile.

Acknowledgements

The present study was funded by the “Fondo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología” (FONDECYT n° 11070096).

References

- Arcuri, L., & Boca, S. (1996). Pregiudizid e affiliazione politica: Destrae sinistra di forte all' ommigrazione dal terzo mondo (Prejudice and political affiliation: Left and right confronting immigration from the Third World). In *Psicologia e politica* (pp. 241-274), P. Lergenzi e V. Giroto (Eds). Raffaello Cortina Editore: Milano.
- Bentler, M.P., & Dudgeon, P. (1996). Covariance structure analysis: Statistical practice, theory and directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47, 563-592.
- Browne, M.W., & Kudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K.A. Bollen & J.S. Long (Eds.): *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 136-162). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Brown, R. (1995). *Prejudice. Its Social Psychology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cárdenas, M. (2006). «Y verás como quieren en Chile...». Un estudio sobre el prejuicio hacia los inmigrantes bolivianos por parte de jóvenes chilenos («And you will see how good they are in Chile...»). A study over the prejudice toward bolivian immigrants from Chilean young people. *Última Década*, 24, 103-129.
- Cárdenas, M., Music, A., Contreras, P., Yeomans, H., & Calderón, C. (2007). Las nuevas formas de prejuicio y sus instrumentos de medida (New forms of prejudice and their measurement). *Revista de Psicología*, XVI (1), 69-96.
- Cea D'Ancona, M.A. (2006). La medición de las actitudes ante la inmigración: evaluación de los indicadores tradicionales de «racismo» (The measurement of attitudes towards immigration: Evaluation of traditional indicators of racism). *REIS*, 99(02), 87-111.
- Coenders, M., Scheepers, P., Sniderman, P., & Verbeke, G. (2001). Blatant and subtle prejudice: Dimensions, determinants and consequences: Some comments on Pettigrew and Meertens. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 31, 281-297.
- Dovidio, J.F., & Gaertner, S.L. (1986). *Prejudice, discrimination and racism*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Espelt, E., Javaloy, F., & Cornejo, J.M. (2006). Las escalas de prejuicio manifiesto y sutil ¿una o dos dimensiones? *Anales de Psicología*, 22, 81-88.
- Frias-Navarro, D., Montero i Bort, H., & Peris García, F. (2009). La medida del prejuicio manifiesto y sutil. 10º Congreso Virtual de Psiquiatría, *Interpsiquis*, 1.
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística (2003). *Censo 2002*, resultados, Vol. I, Población, País/Región. INE: Santiago de Chile.
- Martínez, J. (2005). Magnitud y dinámica de la inmigración en Chile según el censo 2002 (Magnitude and dynamics of Chilean immigration, according to the census 2002). *Papeles de Población*, 44, 109-147.
- Meertens, R., & Pettigrew, T. (1997). Is subtle prejudice really prejudice? *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 61, 54-71.
- Mladinic, A., Sáiz, J., Díaz, L., Ortega, A., & Oyarce, P. (1998). Sexismo ambivalente en estudiantes universitarios chilenos. *Revista de Psicología Social y Personalidad*, 14, 1-14.
- Molero, F., Cuadrado, I., & Navas, M. (2003). Las nuevas expresiones del prejuicio racial: aspectos teóricos y metodológicos. En J.F. Morales y C. Huiaci (Eds.): *Estudios de Psicología Social*, 83-117. Madrid: UNED.
- Navas, M., García, M.C., Rojas, A.J., Pumares, P., & Cuadrado, I. (2006). Actitudes de aculturación y prejuicio: la perspectiva de autóctonos e inmigrantes. *Psicothema*, 18, 187-193.
- Pettigrew, T.F., & Merteens, R.W. (1992). Le racisme voilé: Dimensions et mesures (Racism veil: dimensions and measures). En M. Wiewiorka (Ed.): *Racisme et modernité*. Paris: La Decouverte.
- Pettigrew, T.F., & Merteens, R.W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 57-75.
- Pettigrew, T. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 173-185.
- Pettigrew, T., Jackson, J., Ben Brika, J., Lemain, G., Meertens, R., Wagner, U., & Zick, A. (1998). Outgroup prejudice in Western Europe. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 8, 241-273.
- Ratazzi, A., & Volpato, C. (2000). Forme Sottili e manifeste di pregiudizio verso gli immigranti (Subtle and blatant forms of prejudice against immigrants). *Giacuale Italiano di Psicologia*, 26(2), 351-375.
- Rueda, J.F., & Navas, M. (1996). Hacia una evaluación de las nuevas formas de prejuicio racial: las actitudes sutiles del racismo (Towards an evaluation of new forms of racial prejudice: The subtle attitudes of racism). *Revista de Psicología Social*, 11(2), 131-149.
- Sáiz, J.L., Jeréz, A., Lucero, C., & Rojas, P. (1988). Medición del prejuicio negativo hacia el Mapuche. Un estudio metodológico. *Estudios Sociales*, 57(3), 112-126.
- Sniderman, P., & Tetlock, P. (1986). Symbolic racism: Problems of motive attribution in political debate. *Journal of Social Issues*, 42, 129-150.
- Vala, J., Brito, R., & Lopes, D. (1999). O racismo flagrante e o racismo subtil em Portugal (On blatant and subtle racism in Portugal). In J. Vala (Ed.): *Novos Racismos: Perspectivas Comparativas*. Celta Editora: Oeiras.