

MORTALITY SALIENCE AND PREJUDICE AGAINST ARABS:

A TERROR MANAGEMENT PERSPECTIVE

by

Jessica M. Dora

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of Humboldt State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

In Psychology, Counseling

December, 2009

MORTALITY SALIENCE AND PREJUDICE AGAINST ARABS:  
A TERROR MANAGEMENT PERSPECTIVE

By

Jessica M. Dora

Approved by the Master's Thesis Committee:

---

Gregg Gold, Major Professor Date

---

Senqi Hu, Committee Member Date

---

Beth Eckerd, Committee Member Date

---

James Dupree, Graduate Coordinator Date

---

Jena' Burges, Dean for Research and Graduate Studies Date

## Abstract

### MORTALITY SALIENCE AND PREJUDICE AGAINST ARABS: A TERROR MANAGEMENT PERSPECTIVE

This study tested the relationship between mortality salience and prejudice against Arabs, using hypotheses from Terror Management Theory. The study sample consisted of 106 undergraduate college students at Humboldt State University. After random assignment to a mortality salient or control condition, participants were administered the New Anti-Arabs Attitudes Scale (Echebarria-Echabe & Fernandez-Guede, 2007) and the Blatant and Subtle Prejudice scales (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). As was hypothesized, there were statistically significant positive correlations between mean scores on all three of the scales,  $p < .001$ . Also as predicted, participants' mean scores on the Subtle Prejudice scale were significantly higher than mean scores on the Blatant Prejudice and New Anti-Arab Attitudes scales,  $p < .001$ . Findings regarding the measures provide useful evidence for future research on prejudice against Arabs. Regarding the Terror Management Theory hypothesis, no statistically significant difference was found between the control and the mortality salient group on any of the prejudice measures. Characteristics of the sample, the design of the study, and the use of the Mortality Attitudes Personality Survey as a mortality salience manipulation are discussed as possible explanations for the no difference finding between the experimental and control groups. Other potential factors influencing this finding and potential refinements of this study for future research are further discussed.

## **Acknowledgements**

There are so many who deserve recognition in helping to make this possible. First, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Gregg Gold for his patience, sense of humor, availability and continual encouragement over this long journey. I couldn't have completed this without all of your faith in this project and in me. Thanks also to my committee members, Dr. Beth Eckerd and Dr. Senqi Hu for the input and availability, which helped to make this possible. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Bettye Elmore for being there in a pinch and offering her time and support.

My family and friends have also played an instrumental role in the completion of this project. To my grandparents, William and Ramona Dora, who have encouraged my education from day one, thank you immensely for all of the encouragement and the financial support. I couldn't have done this without you! Thanks to my Mom and sister Nyana for always listening and believing in me. And to Cheryl, my other mom, thank you for all of your help with everything, you are a gem! To my daughter, Jaida, who came along and reminded me what I am doing this all for. And to my partner Matt, thank you for supporting me, and us, on all levels through this rocky climb. Last but not least, thanks to my dear therapist friends, Amber, Jessica, Autumn, Kiersten, and Leah, for listening, inspiring me, and never letting me forget! Thanks for all of your help.

## Table of Contents

<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Literature Review</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<i>The aftermath and significance of September 11</i> .....	3
<i>Prejudice</i> .....	5
<i>Terror Management Theory</i> .....	13
<b>Hypotheses</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>Method</b> .....	<b>22</b>
<i>Participants</i> .....	22
<i>Materials/Apparatus</i> .....	22
<i>Procedure</i> .....	26
<b>How the Data Were Prepared for Analysis</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>Results</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<b>Discussion</b> .....	<b>30</b>
<i>Summary and Discussion of the Findings</i> .....	30
<i>General Limitations</i> .....	34
<i>Directions for Future Research</i> .....	35
<i>Conclusions</i> .....	35
<b>References</b> .....	<b>37</b>
<b>Appendix A Skiing Filler Survey</b> .....	<b>43</b>

<b>Appendix B Mortality Attitudes Personality Survey.....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Appendix C Parallel Writing Task.....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Appendix D New Anti-Arabs Attitudes Scale .....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Appendix E Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scales .....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Appendix G Research Protocol/Instructions to participants.....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Appendix H Informed Consent Form .....</b>	<b>64</b>

## **Introduction**

The examination of prejudicial attitudes against Arabs has been increasingly notable in the years following the terrorist acts of September 11, 2001 (9/11). In the immediate aftermath of the attacks and throughout the ongoing “war on terror” there was a dramatic rise in negative press and public scrutiny of Arab peoples and politics. Accordingly, the psychological constructs that contribute to bias against those of Arab descent became of critical significance and interest.

Acts of prejudice and violence against US citizens viewed as “Arab” were reported in record numbers. Blatant prejudice was expressed throughout the media. Stereotypes and negative comments abounded that would have been deemed unacceptable toward many other racial and ethnic groups. However, more recently a mainstream backlash against the conservative politics that led to our military involvement and war in Iraq has occurred. With the election of a new president who campaigned largely on the promotion of peace and withdrawal of troops from the Middle East, the pendulum has swung back toward scrutiny of US government actions. How alive then is explicit prejudice against Arabs at this time in our nation’s history and how does fear motivate our reactions to them?

Many variables have been shown to affect levels of prejudice, including personality traits, social and religious affiliations, and level of education. Terror management theory (TMT) provides another way to conceptualize the internal

psychological structures that contribute to prejudiced responses. In theory, when one's awareness of death is made salient, people cling more tightly to their cultural worldview and self-concept, as an individual in a larger group, thus increasing their rejection of differing, or cultural worldview-threatening others (increased prejudice). This internal response maintains one's self-esteem, which in turn buffers the anxiety of death awareness (Solomon et al., 2004). Some studies also illustrate that increasing a participant's self-esteem after inducing mortality salience decreases the need for the cultural worldview defense reaction and seems to provide a necessary anxiety buffer (Solomon et al., 2004). Since Arabs have been associated with terrorism and acts of violence against US and Western society, TMT seems an appropriate model with which to test the effects of fear on prejudicial attitudes against Arabs, as a potential cultural worldview threatening-other. Supporting this concept with a European sample of participants, Echebarria-Echabe & Francisco (2008) found that when death-related thoughts were induced implicit anti-Arab prejudice increased.

This study will examine the degree to which participants in the United States express explicit anti-Arab attitudes after mortality is made salient. Also of interest are how participants from a politically liberal California state university sample will respond to questions on various prejudice scales measuring anti-Arab prejudice, and how these scales might correlate with one another.

## **Literature Review**

### **The aftermath and significance of September 11**

American opinion in the month after Sept 11, 2001 (9/11) was one of fear, anger, and distrust of Arabs immediately following the terrorist attacks on the United States. The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research found in a survey of U.S. citizens, that a majority of respondents favored requiring Arabs—including US citizens—to undergo extensive security checks before boarding airplanes, close monitoring of the whereabouts of legal immigrants from Arab and Muslim countries, and restricting the number of immigrants from Arab or Muslim countries into the United States. Almost half of respondents supported giving police the power to stop and search anyone who appeared to be Arab or Muslim at random, and 31% favored allowing the detention of Arabs who are US citizens in camps until determined whether they had links to terrorist organizations (Verhovek, 2003). Prejudice against Arabs in the period after 9/11 was not limited to the United States. A review of similar accounts of prejudice in Canada reveals the widespread perception of Arabs as terrorists and a threat to Western societies.

Khalema and Wannas-Jones (2003) describe the significance of 9/11 on anti-Arab and anti-Muslim prejudice in Canada, relating it to World War II and prejudice against the Japanese, as well as discrimination against Arabs and Muslims post Gulf War. Suspicion and open verbal hostility against Middle Easterners was rampant from government agencies to the halls of universities (Khalema & Wannas-Jones, 2003). Arab-Canadian participants—both Christian and Muslim—felt targeted by ethnic tensions

and relayed a sense of being silenced, misrepresented, and misunderstood. It was noted that public opinion is affected largely by foreign policy and overall ignorance regarding Arab culture as a whole. “Arab” and “Muslim” became synonymous with violence and terrorism. These images were relayed and reinforced by the media and educational systems as well (Khalema & Wannas-Jones, 2003). Canadian police also reported an increase in racially motivated hate crimes post 9/11, though it was not evident whether this was due to more reporting of such crimes or an actual increase. Verbal harassment was rampant on the streets toward people who looked to be of Middle Eastern descent (Khalema & Wannas-Jones, 2003).

Similarly, Ahmad (2002) discusses racial violence and socio-political reactions to 9/11 in the U.S., describing instances of U.S. government-sanctioned aggression including immigration restrictions and racial profiling and detention of Arab or “Muslim-looking” people. He also critiques the lack of support by liberal citizens and politicians who “abandoned their principled commitments and lined up, flags waving, in full support of the Bush administration’s prosecution of the war” (Ahmad, 2002, p. 101). In the days and weeks following the 9/11 attacks, there were multiple reports of violent physical attacks leading to injuries and deaths among Arab, Muslim, and South Asian community members in the United States. Hate crimes by citizens were reported in escalated numbers with almost 1,000 reports of bias incidents in an 8-week period. These included fire-bombings, attacks with hands and weapons, vandalism and property destruction, as well as frequent verbal harassment and intimidation. Increased patriotism is also discussed as a notable correlate in the weeks following 9/11 (Ahmad, 2002). An increase

in prejudice toward those perceived to be members of the same group as the perpetrators of a traumatic event on such a grand scale in the U.S. was evident by these accounts. An overview of prejudice will now be reviewed to take a step back and conceptualize these events within a broader framework.

## **Prejudice**

Prejudice, or the biased evaluation of another based only upon their membership in a certain group, and the factors that influence levels of prejudice, have been studied extensively. Various correlates have been examined in an effort to better understand the influences on prejudiced attitudes, including personality traits, social attitudes, religious orientation, education, and cultural factors (Jones, 2002). Much of the prejudice literature to date has examined prejudice against African Americans in the United States, thus many of the prejudice scales were created with African American targets, contexts, and stereotypes in mind. Though some measures may be used interchangeably to measure prejudice against other ethnic or minority groups, there are generally some questions that do not seem fit the unique facets of prejudice against different out-groups. With these differences in mind, it is also important to note the copious body of research that supports certain underlying predictor variables that appear to influence prejudice across out-groups across the board. Though many variables have been studied, for the purposes of this research, a selection of some of the major factors that have been shown to influence an individual's tendency toward prejudice will be reviewed.

**Personality traits and social attitudes.** Personality is a predicting factor in how information is received and interpreted by an individual. Personality influences found to have consistent effects in prejudice research are right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) and social dominance orientation (SDO). Right-wing authoritarianism is described as a mix of aggressive, submissive, and conventional traits, which lead to potentially dictatorial attitudes and a high susceptibility to such propaganda (Nelson, 2002). Social dominance orientation is a term used to describe the propensity of some individuals to prefer and enjoy the benefits of a society with inequity among groups. Those scoring high in SDO prefer to maintain a hierarchical society in order that they may enjoy higher status or superiority over other groups. Individuals scoring low SDO instead prefer that social policies and programs be implemented or maintained in order to equalize status amongst groups (Nelson, 2002). “Authoritarianism focuses on seeking security against perceived threats from other groups by conformity to norms and obedience to authority. SDO focuses on quashing competition for resources from other groups and maintaining the in-group’s domination in society” (Whitley & Kite, 2006, p.219). The dual-process motivational approach, proposes that personality influences prejudice indirectly-with effects mediated through right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation-as social attitude rather than personality dimensions (Sibley & Duckitt, 2008). Researchers have also examined other individual factors that may be responsible for levels of prejudice.

**Religious orientation and cultural factors.** To many, religious faith and affiliation offer hope and release from death anxiety through the promise of an afterlife,

or symbolic immortality. Some research demonstrates the protective power of religious faith that buffers some individuals from particular aspects of fear of death (Mikulincer & Florian, 2008). However, religious institutions may also explicitly or implicitly influence individuals' beliefs, judgments, and cultural viewpoints on what and who are acceptable and unacceptable. Duck and Hunsberger (1999) examined the correlations between religious proscription, right-wing authoritarianism, and social desirability. Religious orientation was related to prejudice in proscribed or non-proscribed (explicit or implicit) fashion by religious entities (Duck & Hunsberger, 1999).

The literature reports that cultural background, education level, and contact with people of other cultures have varied effects on predicting prejudicial responses. Researchers continue to be interested in how these factors may reduce or increase prejudice across settings (Mikulincer & Florian, 2008). It is important to note however that the various factors that can result in an individual's expression of prejudice, may result in prejudice being expressed in various ways. A discussion of various forms of prejudice follows.

**Types of prejudice.** Prejudice has been studied extensively over many years and many contexts, thus a variety of definitions and conceptualizations have emerged to examine the different facets of prejudice that exist in our society. The following are brief descriptions to compare, contrast, and better understand the varying characteristics of prejudicial attitudes (Whitley & Kite, 2006).

***Old fashioned.*** Low acceptance of equality and a belief in the innate superiority of the White race with a strong negative emotional response to “others.” Tries to exclude or dominate and control minority groups (Whitley & Kite, 2006).

***Modern-symbolic.*** High acceptance for opportunity for equality, but low for outcome in equality. Denies discriminatory attitudes, believing that minorities demand and receive special favors while Whites are treated unfairly as a result. Mild to moderate negative response to “others.” Opposes social programs benefiting minorities (Whitley & Kite, 2006).

***Subtle.*** Similar to modern-symbolic in acceptance of opportunity for equality, but tends to result in discrimination that works against the implementation of equality. An exaggeration of cultural differences that results in prejudice against out-groups, along with an emphasis on more traditional values. Negative or at best indifferent emotional response to out groups (Whitley & Kite, 2006).

***Aversive.*** High acceptance for equality and a rejection of traditional racist beliefs. Sees self as unprejudiced, may have some discomfort or anxiety in interactions with out-groups and avoid these interactions as a result. Polite in unavoidable situations with a concern for not appearing to be prejudiced. When in ambiguous or anti-minority situation will show pro-white bias if justifiable as unprejudiced (Whitley & Kite, 2006).

***Ambivalent.*** Similar to aversive and subtle in acceptance of equality and rejection of traditional racist beliefs but internal conflicts between traditional and egalitarian beliefs and stereotypes. Both positive and negative emotional responses (e.g. sympathy

and aversion) and discomfort when aware of ambivalent responses (Whitley & Kite, 2006).

***Lack of prejudice.*** Also high on both acceptance of equality and rejection of traditional racist beliefs, with a complex social identity and a focus on similarities across groups. Positive implicit attitudes notes and responds to others as individuals rather than as members of groups, both emotionally and behaviorally (Whitley & Kite, 2006).

As expected, all of the above except “lack of prejudice” will result in some disadvantage to out-group members. As there are many types of prejudice, there is no “one size fits all” means of measuring prejudice.

**Measurement of prejudice.** The measurement of prejudice may be approached from many different perspectives. Most relevant for the research presented here are the perspectives of implicit vs. explicit attitudes and subtle vs. blatant expressions of prejudice. Implicit measurement and subtle prejudice measurement are similar in assessing prejudice that individuals are either less aware or completely unaware of, and more importantly, are most resistant to deliberate self-enhancing responses. Blatant measures are most useful when cultural norms do not prohibit prejudice against a certain target group. Below, both blatant and subtle/implicit measurement will be reviewed as these are most relevant to the current research .

***Implicit and explicit measurement.*** Implicit measurement is generally studied through use of the Implicit Attitudes Test (IAT). The IAT is a computer program which entails participants to use a quick two-key categorization of stimulus words, generating response times to racially stereotyped names and adjectives that have evaluative

connotations. Explicit measurement typically requires a self-report format involving more conscious awareness and potential for delivering socially desirable responses. Studies have established links between implicit attitudes of prejudice and discriminatory behaviors as well as correlation with explicit measures of prejudice (McConnell and Leibold, 2001). Others have found a negative correlation between implicit and explicit measures of prejudice against out-group members. Thus, participants with higher prejudice ratings on implicit tests displayed more favorable ratings of out-group members than their own group on explicit self-report measures. Researchers have mixed opinions on whether implicit or explicit measurement is preeminent in assessing accurate prejudiced responses. Overall, it seems that both explicit and implicit measurement tap prejudiced responses on different levels, and thus results should be analyzed with caution, keeping strengths and weaknesses of each in mind.

***Blatant and subtle measurement.*** “A more subtle form of out-group prejudice has emerged in recent years” (Meertens & Pettigrew, 1997, p. 54). This shift to a more subtle form of expression of prejudice appears to have occurred due to overt prejudice becoming less socially acceptable, or politically correct, and even punishable by law in some situations. Therefore, the cultural norms which proscribe blatant prejudice expression create a social desirability effect on many individuals in society (Meertens & Pettigrew, 1997). The influence of social desirability has led many to express prejudice and stereotyped views of other groups in a more subtle manner, and/or only when they can justify their views in a “logical” manner.

Thus, subtle prejudice tends to present as indirect in nature, where blatant prejudice appears traditional and straightforward. Predictor variables for both subtle and blatant prejudice include poor education, older age, only in-group friendships, group deprivation, lacking political interest, and boasting pride in one's nationality (Meertens & Pettigrew, 1997). Conservative respondents scored higher in both blatant and subtle measures, with blatant more closely related to conservatism. Subtle scale means were consistently higher than blatant means because the questions appear more socially acceptable. Participants who scored higher on subtle measures rejected crude expressions of prejudice but view minorities as an out-group with whom they feel no sympathy or adoration. Participants who expressed higher subtle prejudice often required a rationale to express their opposition to immigration. Further, the poorly educated evinced considerable prejudice on both scales, while the well educated exposed their prejudice on subtle scale only. A key finding related to this research was that younger, well educated, left-wing participants had relatively low scores on blatant scales, with group means on subtle scales more closely approaching those of older less well educated and conservative respondents (Meertens & Pettigrew, 1997).

**Measurement of prejudice against Arabs.** Tools for assessing specific prejudice against Arabs have been scarce until recently. Much of the prejudice literature conducted in the United States has focused on racism against African American and Latino populations, which does not fit the unique political and social attitudes toward Arabs present since 9/11. The few scales that have been utilized to measure prejudice against Arabs are discussed below.

Self-report measures utilized to measure explicit attitudes toward Arabs and Muslims include The Anti-Arab Racism scale (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994) and the Attitudes Toward Muslims scale (Altareb, 1997). The Anti-Arab Racism (1994) scale consists of 5 items rated on a 7-point Likert scale that ask participants to rate the degree of positive or negative feeling they have toward Arabs. The Attitudes toward Muslims scale (1997) consists of 25 items rated on a 6-point Likert scale concerning attitudes toward Muslims. The Christian-Muslim Implicit Association Test (FIAT 2.3; Farnham, 1998) has also been used to measure implicit attitudes and to examine the relationships with explicit and personality measures. This specific IAT is a Microsoft Windows-based software program in which participants categorize Judeo-Christian and Muslim names with pleasant and unpleasant adjectives. Participants' reaction times in sorting the four concepts into two categories is calculated and examined to produce a composite racism score—lower reaction times are assumed to mean a stronger association between the adjectives and the names.

More recently, Echebarria-Echabe and Fernandez-Guede (2007) produced the New Anti-Arab Attitudes Scale, an explicit measure of prejudice against Arabs. As it should have, the New Anti-Arab Scale produced a strong correlation with the Modern Racism scale, the Right-Wing Authoritarianism scale and conservative ideological orientation scales. Predictive validity of the scale was supported with participants behaviorally reinforcing study results through the signing and sending in of petitions against “Islamization.” The researchers also found strong correlations between anti-Arab prejudice, authoritarianism, anti-Semitism, and conservatism, with no significant

correlations found for social status (Echebarria-Echabe & Fernandez-Guede, 2007). With the understanding of some of the factors, manifestations, and measurement of prejudice at hand, we may look at another potential framework for viewing prejudice against a group such as Arabs, at a time when they are viewed as a culture and world apart, and a physical threat to Americans and Western society.

### **Terror Management Theory**

Terror Management Theory originated mainly from the work of Ernest Becker (1962, 1973, 1975) who attempted to fuse social science research findings into a unified and logical explanation of basic human motives and behavior. He proposed that the awareness of mortality was a unique human feature, which had the propensity to create immense terror within individuals. As intellectual and psychological capabilities increased and evolved so then did the need for coping mechanisms to manage this terror (Rosenblatt, Greenberg, Solomon, Pyszczynski, & Lyon, 1989). Cultural affiliations and worldviews were vital in helping individuals find solace and a buffer to the anxiety that this extreme vulnerability and ‘terror’ could evoke. “These worldviews consist of humanly constructed beliefs about reality shared by individuals in groups that provide a sense that one is a person of value in a world of meaning” (Solomon et al., 2004, p. 17). With this comforting belief system established, the inherent and unconscious drive to defend and protect one’s worldview, and oneself symbolically, becomes of utmost importance. Research into the more intricate structure of TMT examines the variables that increase death anxiety or ‘terror’, those that protect against it, and the effects that

death anxiety, or mortality salience, has on our reactions and behavior toward those of different cultures than our own.

Salzman (2008) outlines two central hypotheses to TMT, noting the breadth of empirical support that has been generated by researchers internationally. The first hypothesis described is the anxiety-buffer hypothesis. This hypothesis suggests that when augmented, psychological structures (i.e. self-esteem) that protect against anxiety should reduce anxiety in response to threats. The second, the mortality salience hypothesis proposes, "...if faith in the cultural worldview and self-esteem function to protect people from anxiety about death, then reminders of this primary fear should increase people's need for these psychological structures" (Salzman, 2008, p. 323). It is the mortality salience hypothesis of TMT that this research will be most concerned with. A more detailed review of the mortality salience hypothesis follows.

**Fear of death.** People differ in intensity of fear and in the meanings they attach to death. Cultural factors, religious beliefs and practice, and the promise of symbolic immortality (living on through one's culture) all effect personal meaning related with death conceptualization. Commitment to religious beliefs and practice often protects individuals from interpersonal fears, but may also magnify worries about the consequences of one's own death for family and friends. Fear of punishment in the hereafter is also related to these concepts (Mikulincer & Florian, 2008). Three psychological components of fear of death include the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and transpersonal consequences, together comprising a multidimensional model of fear of death (Florian & Mikulincer, 1997).

**Mortality salience.** Mortality salience is a hypothesis used to study TMT that predicts that if one primes the awareness of death, there will be an increase in both fear of death anxiety and the defenses that buffer that anxiety. Increased fear of death anxiety thus heightens the support of one's cultural worldview in order to uphold order, continuity, and security. Accordingly, this structure may increase the disdain of "outsiders" and especially those that are believed to pose a threat or challenge one's cultural worldview and society, increasing levels of prejudice when mortality is made salient.

In a test of fear of death and judgment of social transgressions, Florian and Mikulincer (1997) found that death salience led to harsher judgments against transgressors across situations and types of fear. Along similar lines, Arndt, Greenberg, Pyszczynski, and Solomon (1997) tested how unconscious concerns about death—through the use of subliminal death-related stimuli—would impact responses to cultural worldview-threatening others. Participants in the experimental group who were subliminally primed with the word "death" displayed more pro-American bias than participants in the control group who viewed the neutral word "field" (Arndt et al., 1997). This finding imparts support to TMT in that thoughts of death, especially on an unconscious level, lead individuals to bolster and cling more tightly to their own cultural worldviews. "The fact that one must die bears no logical connection to a desire for faith in one's country. Nonetheless, subliminal reminders of death led to clear effects on evaluations of people who praised and criticized the participants' country" (Arndt et al., 1997).

Rosenblatt, Greenberg, Solomon, Pyszczynski, and Lyon (1989) found significant differences in judgments of transgressors, with participants in mortality salient conditions doling out much harsher punishments to transgressors (Rosenblatt et al., 1989).

McGregor, Greenberg, Arndt, Lieberman, Solomon, and Simon (1998) also found that participants in mortality salient conditions allocated harsher punishments to worldview-threatening others than to worldview-consistent others. Additionally, in two consecutive studies, it was found that when mortality salience was induced, "...the opportunity to express a negative attitude toward the critical target first eliminated aggression, and the opportunity to aggress toward the critical target first eliminated derogation" (McGregor et al., 1998).

*Anxiety-buffers.* According to TMT, the evolutionary drive to maintain the continuity of personal existence and the intellect that makes humans aware of their own mortality creates a need for buffers such as self-esteem to reduce anxiety. Boosting an individual's self-esteem after making mortality salient reduced participants' need to engage the anxiety buffer (Solomon et al., 2004). Other studies have found that the self-serving attribution bias and belief in the validity of positive information about the self were increased with the introduction of mortality salience (Mikulincer and Florian, 2002, Dechesne et al. 2003, Solomon et al., 2004).

The cultural anxiety buffer has two aspects. The first is a worldview in which one has absolute faith. The second aspect of the buffer is the set of standards for being and acting in the world. This cultural anxiety-buffer, if achieved, provides

the individual with a place of belonging, self-esteem, and even immortality if one lives up to the cultural standards (Salzman, 2001).

Self-esteem as an anxiety buffer for mortality salience has gained empirical support in studies where enhancing a participant's self-esteem, even momentarily, provided a buffer for anxiety in anticipation of disturbing events and threats to the self (Greenberg et al., 1992, Solomon et al., 2004). As self-esteem is determined within a cultural context, meeting cultural standards and feeling that one plays a meaningful part in one's own world determines whether individuals experience meaning and acceptance in their personal lives. This concept motivates individuals to establish and maintain faith in the world that they live and hold value within.

As with prejudice research, individual factors have also been studied to examine various predictors and correlates of TMT, including religious orientation, personality, and political orientation.

***Other Individual Factors.*** Greenberg, Solomon, Veeder, Pyszczynski, Rosenblatt, and Kirkland (1990) used religious orientation to test terror management hypotheses. They found that mortality salience increased the negative feedback given to those of different faiths. An increased effect was noted when participants were asked to rate members of their in-group first, perhaps reminding them of the potential out-group threat. Another possible explanation was that rating in-group members first creates "an anchor against which ratings of the out-group member could be contrasted" (Greenberg et al., 1990). Level of identification with one's in-group was also noted as a factor that would determine the strength of these effects.

In a second study, Greenberg et al. (1990) further examined whether mortality salience would intensify attraction and liking of similar others and less liking of dissimilar others. They also examined the effect of individual traits such as authoritarianism in response to mortality salience. The mortality salience effect was notable with high authoritarians expressing increased negativity toward dissimilar others. High and low authoritarians presented differing reactions only when mortality was made salient. Low authoritarians did not present derogation toward others in the mortality salience condition (Greenberg et al., 1990).

Greenberg, Simon, Solomon, Pyszcznski, and Chatel (1992) reported that when tolerance was primed or when participants were liberal in political orientation the mortality salience effect was rendered null and participants did not respond with increased negativity toward different others. Therefore, political orientation can be viewed as a cultural context (Greenberg et al., 1992).

**The impact of terrorist attacks.** In the 19 months following the 9/11 attacks, Cory, Beale, and Myers (2004) collected data regarding anxiety, patriotism, and prejudice against Arabic people. Four different periods were designated for data collection that aligned with changes in threat level posted in the media by the US Department of Homeland Security. Their hypotheses were confirmed that anxiety producing events, or increased threat levels, would correlate positively with patriotic attachment toward the US and prejudiced attitudes toward Arabic people (Cory et al., 2004).

Thomas (2003) examined stress and terror management theory concepts following the 9/11 attacks, specifically collecting the narrative interview responses of American

midlife women, ages 35-60. This sample was chosen to also examine how a group that has been found to have higher levels of stress overall would cope with a threatening event such as 9/11. She found that high-stress women differed in several ways from lower-stress women in their responses to interview questions. High-stress women had a closer relationship with someone either present at an attack site or in one of the countries targeted as perpetrators, more criticism of the American government, 9/11 remained in the forefront of their minds, and in extreme cases had significant health problems necessitating hospitalization. Previously traumatized women felt that their backgrounds served as buffers that improved their coping with this traumatic event. The mortality salience hypothesis of TMT was strongly supported through responses to interview questions, especially among the most stressed participants. Overall, TMT was supported with an increase in patriotism and bigotry noted (Thomas, 2003).

Similarly, the psychological responses of participants in the aftermath of terrorist attacks in Madrid, were examined in a study by Echebarria-Echabe and Guede (2006). Following the attacks, the researchers found a provocation of explicit prejudice against Arabs and Jews, and a displacement toward more conservative values and political ideals (Echebarria-Echabe & Guede, 2006). In another study, Echebarria-Echabe and Francisco (2008) hypothesized three potential factors—death-related thoughts induced by the images broadcast by the media, feelings of fear, and perception of threat from the out group—all of which are factors related to terror management theory. It was found that inducing death-related thoughts only increased implicit expression of anti-Arab prejudice (Echebarria-Echabe & Francisco, 2008). They further hypothesized that personal or

group threats could explain explicit attitude changes while death related thoughts could explain implicit changes, noting the need for further research to examine the processes involved.

In sum there is now a substantial empirical literature that unequivocally supports the central tenets of TMT: (1) self-esteem reduces anxiety in response to threatening circumstances; (2) reminders of death engender exaggerated need for the anxiety-buffering properties of cultural worldviews, which is in turn reflected by increased regard for worldview bolstering people and behaviors, as well as increased disdain for worldview threatening people and behaviors; (3) momentarily elevated or disproportionately high self-esteem reduces or eliminates worldview defenses following MS; (4) MS instigates efforts to bolster self-esteem; and (5) MS effects are instigated by heightened accessibility of implicit death thoughts and the function of terror management processes is to reduce the accessibility of such thoughts” (Solomon et al., 2004, p.20).

One goal of this study is to add to the currently small, but growing body of research on measurement of prejudice against Arabs. We are comparing participant responses to blatant and subtle prejudice measurement, and assessing the efficacy of our three chosen scales. Further, we are testing the mortality salience hypothesis of TMT, which asserts that inducing thoughts of death tends to lead to increased prejudice toward potentially threatening out-groups. Thus, we are examining the perception of Arabs and the cultural worldview of our participants, in testing whether a mortality salience manipulation will lead to higher levels of prejudiced responses toward Arabs.

## **Hypotheses**

1. Prejudice scores on the New Anti-Arabs Attitudes and the Blatant and Subtle Prejudice scales were expected to demonstrate a positive correlation with each other.
2. Subtle prejudice scores were expected to be higher for the sample than blatant prejudice scores, as the literature has demonstrated that younger, more educated and liberal individuals tend to display prejudice in a more subtle manner.
3. Prejudice scores were expected to be higher for the mortality salience condition than the control condition, as TMT would predict.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

Participants consisted of 110 college students recruited from undergraduate psychology classes at Humboldt State University. Of the 110 participants, 108 completed demographic information. The other 2 were removed from the study due to incomplete surveys. Of the 108 participants, 82 were female and 26 were male. The sample consisted of 62 White, 21 Hispanic/Latin American, 13 other, 6 African American, and 6 Asian American participants. Year in school was fairly evenly distributed between freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors ( $n = 21, 24, 36, \text{ and } 27$ , respectively). The total range in age was 18 to 46 years old ( $M = 21.31, Mdn = 20$ ).

### **Materials/Apparatus**

Questionnaire packets included: A brief filler survey regarding reactions to a scenario about an injured skier's experience (See appendix A), The Mortality Attitudes Personality Survey (or parallel writing task) (Rosenblatt et al., 1989), the New Anti-Arabs Attitudes scale—that we adapted for use in this study with a U.S. audience—(Echebarria-Echabe & Fernandez-Guede, 2007), the Blatant and Subtle Prejudice scales (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995), and a brief demographic questionnaire.

The Mortality Attitudes Personality Survey was utilized as a mortality salience manipulation for half of the participants prior to administration of the prejudice measures. The other half of participants completed a parallel writing task where they described

feelings evoked by taking an exam, an aversive event that does not evoke mortality salience. The New Anti-Arabs Attitudes Scale and the Blatant and Subtle Prejudice scales were used to measure levels of prejudice.

**Mortality Attitudes Personality Survey.** The Mortality Attitudes Personality survey (Rosenblatt et al., 1989), a mortality-salience manipulation (See appendix B), was used to evoke mortality salience in half of the participants in order to test TMT hypotheses with respect to prejudice against Arabs. The survey consists of two open-ended questions regarding personal death. The first question asked participants to write about what will happen to them as they physically die, and the second question asks about the emotions that the thought of their own death arouses in them. A control condition, consisting of a parallel writing task (See appendix C), was employed to compare and examine the mortality salience effect. The parallel writing task used in this study asked participants to write about what will happen to them as they physically take their next exam, and the emotions that the thought of taking their next exam evokes in them. This control condition has been used in past TMT research (McGregor et al., 1998).

**New Anti-Arab Attitudes scale.** In order to measure specific prejudice against Arabs, the New Anti-Arabs attitudes scale (see appendix D) was administered. Echebarria-Echabe and Fernandez-Guede (2007) created and tested the reliability and validity of the New Anti-Arab Attitudes scale, an explicit measure of prejudice against Arabs. As the New Anti-Arab Attitudes scale (Echebarria-Echabe & Fernandez-Guede, 2007) was produced and administered within a European context, certain terms were

modified and some questions were eliminated to retain the relevance of the survey for a US audience.

The measure consists of 42 items on a 7-point likert scale of self-report on statements regarding feelings about Arabs. Examples of questions used in this survey include, “Most Arab countries are fanatic, nationalist, and in conflict with human rights” and “Arabs are all the same. They are resentful of the West.” Overall, most items in this survey seem to be asked in a blatant manner. The researchers collected data from a varied sample of men and women, across socioeconomic status and professions. The Chronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient was high ( $\alpha=.96$ ). They also tested the measure’s validity against McConahay’s Modern Racism Scale and the Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale. The New Anti-Arab Attitudes scale evidenced a strong correlation with the Modern Racism scale, sharing 76 % of the variance. Strong correlations with the Right-Wing Authoritarian Scale and conservative ideological orientation scales were noted as well.

Echebarria-Echabe and Fernandez-Guede (2007) conducted an additional study to test for predictive validity of the scale. After participants completed identical measures, they included an additional pamphlet and signature form to support a fictitious association in defense of Western values against the risk of “Islamization”. The results supported the validity of the scale as reported above, with predictive validity established between respondent’s self report scores on the New Anti-Arab Attitudes scale and actual behavior. Strong correlations were also noted between anti-Arab prejudice, authoritarianism, anti-Semitism, and conservatism.

**The Blatant and Subtle Prejudice scales.** In order to measure and compare ratings of prejudice we also used the Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995) (See appendix E). For this scale, initial data in scale construction were collected from a large (3806 respondents) sample of respondents from Western European regions. Ten out of fifty items were chosen to measure each type of prejudice, thus the final scale has twenty items altogether based on a factor analysis of the two forms. The factors of threat and rejection and anti-intimacy were found to underlie blatant prejudice (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). The defense of traditional values, the exaggeration of cultural differences, and the denial of positive emotions were three components found underlying subtle prejudice. The measure is scored on a 10-item, 5-point Likert scale, measuring blatant and subtle prejudice as separate subscales. A few examples of questions on the Blatant Prejudice subscale (with Arab as the target group) include “Arabs have jobs that Americans should have,” and “Arabs come from less able races and this explains why they are not as well off as most American people.” Examples from the Subtle subscale include, “many other groups have come to the United States and overcome prejudice and worked their way up. Arabs should do the same without special favor”, and “how different do you think Arabs living here are to other American people like yourself in the values they teach their children?” Five items are reversed and standard Likert scoring was used.

**Demographic information.** A brief demographic questionnaire was included at the end of the survey to track the participants’ age, gender, ethnicity, and class standing (See appendix F).

**Procedure**

Upon approval by the Internal Review Board, surveys were administered to participants. Study participants were recruited from undergraduate psychology courses at Humboldt State University. Study participation was offered as an extra credit opportunity by their professors. The researcher visited the classes of professors who agreed to offer class time and an extra credit opportunity to their students for study participation.

The researcher gave verbal instructions to all interested students, informing them of the nature of the research, reviewing informed consent, and announcing that those who wished not to participate could leave the class at that time (See appendix G). Those who chose to stay and participate were provided with informed consent forms which they signed and dated before surveys were administered (See appendix H). The informed consent forms were collected by the researcher and participants were offered a copy of the consent forms which provided contact information for the researchers and local counseling agencies in case any issues arose following study participation. Both verbal and written instructions included directions to refrain from writing names anywhere on survey packets and to stop at any time if participants no longer wished to take part in the study. The researcher handed out surveys in the last half hour of class time and participants completed the survey packets at their desks. Following survey completion, as instructed, participants placed their own survey packets in a large manila envelope to maintain anonymity, and were then offered candy before exiting (as a mood enhancer per IRB protocol). The study took approximately 30 minutes to complete.

## **How the Data Were Prepared for Analysis**

Following data entry, four participants were eliminated due to incomplete surveys, where either a majority of questions or the mortality salience manipulation, was left unanswered. Thus there were a total of 106 participants available for the study (control with  $n = 50$  and mortality salience with  $n = 56$ ).

Question 6 on the Blatant Prejudice Scale was eliminated due to a problem with the wording, which led many participants to leave the question blank. Questions 3, 6, 17, 18, 20, 30, and 31 on the Anti-Arab Attitudes scale and questions 7, 8, 9, 10, and 15 through 20 on the Subtle and Blatant prejudice scales were then reversed so that larger numbers meant more prejudice. After eliminating the four participants and the faulty question, 17 questions remained that were missing only one or two data points. A minority of participants had such missing data. Five participants left at least one item blank on the New Anti-Arab Attitudes scale, and 3 participants left at least one item blank on the Subtle and Blatant Prejudice scales. Missing values were replaced using the series mean for each scale. Following this, means were computed for each participant for all three of the prejudice scales. For hypothesis #2, mean scores on the New Anti-Arab Attitudes scale (7-point Likert scale) were negatively weighted to achieve the same metric as the Blatant and Subtle Prejudice scale means (5-point Likert scale).

## Results

Reliability of the prejudice scales was examined. The New Anti-Arab Attitudes scale, had a Chronbach's  $\alpha = .93$ ; the Blatant Prejudice scale had a Chronbach's  $\alpha = .68$ ; and the Subtle Prejudice scale had a Chronbach's  $\alpha = .64$ . No particular item on the Blatant or Subtle subscales was responsible for the lower levels of reliability and thus the entire scale was retained for analysis. These were considered acceptable levels of reliability for the purposes of our study analysis.

A correlation analysis was conducted to test hypothesis #1 which predicted that scores on all three of the prejudice scales would demonstrate a positive correlation with one another. The New Anti-Arab Attitudes scale was significantly correlated with both the Blatant Prejudice Scale  $r(106) = .60, p < .001$ , and the Subtle Prejudice scale,  $r(106) = .57, p < .001$ . The Blatant Prejudice scale was also significantly correlated with the Subtle Prejudice scale,  $r(106) = .34, p < .001$ . As predicted, all of the scales were positively correlated with each other.

Paired samples *t*-test analyses were conducted to test hypothesis #2 which predicted that the subtle prejudice scores would be higher overall than the blatant and Anti-Arab prejudice scores. The means for the Subtle Scale were  $M = 4.35, SD = .57$ , the Blatant scale,  $M = 2.63, SD = .53$ , and for the New Anti-Arab Attitudes Scale,  $M = 2.07, SD = .60$ . Subtle scale scores were significantly higher than Blatant scores with  $t(105) = 28.03, p < .001, \eta^2 = .882$ . Subtle scale scores were also higher than New Anti-Arab Attitudes scores with  $t(105) = 43.19, p < .001, \eta^2 = .947$ . As predicted by hypothesis 2,

Subtle score means were significantly higher than both Blatant and the New Anti-Arab Attitudes means.

The third and final hypothesis tests TMT, with the mortality salience manipulation expected to result in higher prejudice scores amongst experimental group participants versus control group participants. An independent  $t$ -test was conducted to compare the control ( $M = 2.95, SD = .84$ ) and mortality salient group ( $M = 2.86, SD = .85$ ) on New Anti-Arab Attitudes. There was no significant difference between the groups with independent  $t(104) = .56, p = .57, \eta^2 = .003$ .

The control ( $M = 2.68, SD = .56$ ), and mortality salient group ( $M = 2.58, SD = .50$ ) were tested on Blatant Prejudice. There was no significant difference between the groups with independent  $t(104) = .96, p = .34, \eta^2 = .009$ .

Lastly, the control ( $M = 4.37, SD = .54$ ) and mortality salient group ( $M = 4.33, SD = .61$ ) was tested on Subtle Prejudice. There was no significant difference between the groups with independent  $t(104) = .35, p = .73, \eta^2 = .001$ . Thus, hypothesis 3 was not supported, as there were no significant differences between the groups on any of the prejudice measures.

## **Discussion**

### **Summary and Discussion of the Findings**

The purpose of this study was to examine the expression of prejudice against Arabs, as well as measurement and scale efficacy, while concurrently testing the effect of mortality salience on levels of explicit prejudice toward Arabs. It was hypothesized that there would be a significant positive relationship between all three prejudice measures administered, and that participants would demonstrate higher levels of subtle prejudice than blatant prejudice. It was also predicted that participants in the mortality salient condition would indicate higher levels of prejudice toward Arabs than those in the control condition. The goal of the research was to contribute to the present literature on prejudice against Arabs as a target minority group, and examine how fear of death contributes to individuals' levels of prejudice against this group.

Hypothesis one predicted that all three prejudice scales would demonstrate significant positive correlations with each other. Our results supported this hypothesis, with strong relationships between all three scales. These results impart the first evidence of the convergent validity of the Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scales with the New Anti-Arab Attitudes scales. Previously, the New Anti-Arab Attitudes Scale showed strong correlations with the Modern Racism Scale (McConahay, 1986). They also add additional validity evidence to, and were consistent with the findings of Meertens and Pettigrew (1997), who reported moderately high relationships between the Blatant and Subtle Prejudice scales. Overall, the results suggest that all of the prejudice scales were

measuring the same underlying construct, thus supporting the validity of our measures and design in order to further examine our next hypotheses.

Hypothesis two predicted that subtle prejudice scale scores would be higher overall than scores on the blatant prejudice scales (the Blatant Prejudice and New Anti-Arab Attitudes scale). Results from our study supported hypothesis two, with participants expressing significantly higher levels of prejudice on the subtle scale versus the blatant scales. The analyses indicated that subtle scale means were slightly above the middle of the Likert scale leaning toward higher prejudice, and means for both of the blatant scales fell below the middle of the Likert scale toward low prejudice. This finding provides further evidence, as postulated by Meertens and Pettigrew (1997), that the Subtle Prejudice scale provides a very useful means for identifying covert forms of prejudice. They further note that “the blatant-subtle distinction should prove especially useful for those groups and societies where such an antiblatant norm has taken root—among the well educated, the young, and the politically liberal” (Meertens & Pettigrew, 1997, p.55). As this largely describes the demographics of our sample and the dominant political orientation in our geographical region, our findings are consistent with this postulation.

Hypothesis three predicted that participants in a mortality salient condition would report higher levels of prejudice than those in the control condition. The present data did not offer any evidence that fear of death through the induction of mortality salience contributes to higher levels of prejudice against Arabs. We expected that evoking

mortality salience would produce a significant effect upon prejudice against Arabs due to findings of previous Terror Management Theory research with other potentially worldview threatening out-groups. Contrary to this hypothesis, there were no differences between control and mortality salient groups on any of the prejudice measures utilized for this study. Possible explanations for the failure of the mortality salience manipulation to affect higher prejudice ratings amongst our sample follow.

Some research has found that participants who associated with a worldview where tolerance was of importance (often those with liberal political orientation) actually exhibited even greater tolerance toward worldview threatening others than less tolerant (conservative) subjects after mortality was made salient (Salzman, 2008). For instance, Greenberg et al. (1992) found significant differences between the responses of liberal and conservative participants in a mortality salient condition versus a control condition. In their study, preference for a similar over a dissimilar other increased for conservative participants, whereas preference decreased for liberal participants. These findings may have similarly impacted our data and results, as because previously mentioned, this study was conducted in a geographical area known for its predominantly liberal political orientation, population, and values. Also, an undergraduate college sample was utilized, and younger age and higher education tend to be factors that correlate with liberal orientation. Since we did not include a measure to assess political orientation, however we can not be sure that this was the case.

Also of interest were the responses to the mortality salience questions and the potential implications this could have had on our results. Several participants described

either a positive or neutral account of the thoughts and emotions that considering their own death evoked within them. It is possible that some individuals have more positive views on death and/or lower fear of death, thus decreasing the need for the cultural anxiety-buffer and nullifying the mortality salience effect. However, since these are conscious responses and the mortality salience effect is theorized as a subconscious or unconscious process it is unclear as to whether this had any bearing on the lack of difference between the groups.

Another possibility is that the mortality salience manipulation was simply ineffective due to the classroom environment where it was administered. This seems a likely explanation due to the very brief answers that many participants gave to questions on the Mortality Attitudes Personality Survey. The apparently brief amount of time that participants spent thinking about their own deaths (judging from the minimal responses) may not have been enough to induce the desired effect. Perhaps in a limited-time classroom setting, a different mortality salience manipulation would be preferable, such as Boyar's Fear of Death scale (1964), a multi-item Likert-type scale which requires participants to think about each question before answering. In past studies, Boyar's (1964) measure was as effective as the mortality salience manipulation used in this study (Rosenblatt et al., 1989), and with hindsight, a multi-item self-report measure such as this one may have been a preferable experimental manipulation.

## **General Limitations**

The characteristics of our sample are a limiting factor in our study. The sample consisted of mostly young, undergraduate college students at one university who were predominantly female, making results difficult to generalize to the overall population. The young age of most participants is significant, as the 9/11 terrorist attacks occurred 8 years ago. That would place a majority of participants in middle school at the time of the attacks which may have impacted their perception of Arabs, versus how a person of older age may have internalized the event. Also, given that the location of the university where this study was conducted is rural, has no history of terrorist attacks, and has a very low Arab population, the proximity to Arabs and terrorism is low. Thus, Arabs may not be considered a worldview threatening other to our sample, which would render the mortality salience effect null.

In addition, as noted above, the participants completed their surveys in a classroom environment, which could have played a part in both increasing a social desirability effect, and in rushing the time they took to complete the surveys. All participants had also completed close to one semester or more in one or more psychology classes, which may have made them aware of social desirability considerations when giving their responses.

Other factors also may have affected the results of the study. For one, the filler survey was administered prior to the mortality salience and control questionnaire as was done in a study conducted by Rosenblatt et al. (1989). But had the filler survey followed the mortality salience prime (instead of preceding it), there may have been more of a

latency effect in processing the mortality salience manipulation. This response latency effect may have increased the effectiveness of the manipulation.

### **Directions for Future Research**

Future researchers could alter the design of this study in various ways including, broadening the sample characteristics, conducting the study in a lab versus a classroom setting, and using other mortality salience manipulations, as well as personality and other prejudice correlate measures (such as RWA, SDO, and political and religious orientation). It may also be interesting to include prejudice measures using different out-group targets for comparison to anti-Arab measures in a similar study. Another possible study variation would be first administering prejudice scales and then separating out participants who scored higher on anti-Arab prejudice. Then those participants could be randomly assigned to a mortality salient and control condition strengthening the design of the study. Another possibility for future studies would be to have participants first rate their in-group, and then rate Arabs, as some research has found that this design prompts a contrast response, which may then lead to higher mortality salience effects (Greenberg et al., 1990, Rowatt et al., 2005).

### **Conclusions**

This study showed that even at a liberal university prejudice exists against Arabs. However, just like other studies have shown for Blacks, this prejudice was only apparent with the use of a subtle measurement. This is relevant for other researchers who are

testing prejudice against Arabs in the U.S., particularly when these studies are conducted with a younger, more educated, and/or liberal sample. Another useful finding pertained to measurement of prejudice against Arabs. There currently aren't very many measures regarding prejudice specific to Arabs. Here the New Anti-Arab Attitudes scale was modified for use with a U.S. audience, and it was found that it significantly correlated with other prejudice measures and had high within scale reliability ratings. Thus for use as a measure of blatant and or consciously expressed prejudice against Arabs, this scale could be utilized in future studies.

## References

- Ahmad, M. (2002). Homeland Insecurities: Racial violence the day after September 11. *Social Text*, 72, 20(3), 101-115. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.humboldt.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=afh&AN=8553849&site=ehost-live>
- Altareb, B.Y. (1997). Attitudes toward Muslims: Initial scale development. (Doctoral dissertation, Ball State University, Muncie, IN). Retrieved from <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=736577541&sid=1&Fmt=2&clientId=17853&RQT=309&VName=PQD>
- Arndt, J., Greenberg J., Pyszczynski, T., & Solomon S. (1997). Subliminal exposure to death-related stimuli increases defense of the cultural worldview. *Psychological Science*, 8, 379-385. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.1997.tb00429.x
- Bassett, J.F. (2007). Psychological defenses against death anxiety: Integrating terror management theory and Firestone's separation theory. *Death Studies*, 31, 727-750. doi:10.1080/07481180701490628
- Boyar, J.I. (1964). The construction and partial validation of a scale for the measurement of the fear of death. *Dissertation Abstracts*, 25(3), 2041.
- Dambrun, M., & Guimond, S. (2004). Implicit and explicit measures of prejudice and stereotyping: Do they assess the same underlying knowledge structure? *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 34, 663-676. doi:10.1002/ejsp.223

- Dechesne, M., Janssen, J., & Knippenberg, A. (2000). Derogation and distancing as terror management strategies: The moderating role of need for closure and permeability of group boundaries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(6), 923-932. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.79.6.923
- Duck, R.J., & Hunsberger, B. (1999). Religious orientation and prejudice: The role of religious proscription, right-wing authoritarianism, and social desirability. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 9*(3), 157-180. doi:10.1207/s15327582ijpr0903\_1
- Echebarria-Echabe, A., & Fernandez-Guede, E. (2006). Effects of terrorism on attitudes and ideological orientation. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 36*, 259-265. doi:10.1002/ejsp.294
- Echebarria-Echabe, A., & Francisco, V.G. (2008). Analysing the effects of mortality salience on prejudice and decision-taking. In Olsson, F.M. (Ed.), *New Developments in the Psychology of Motivation* (pp. 53-65). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Farnham, S.D. (1998). FIAT 2.3 for windows [Computer software]. Seattle, WA.
- Florian, V., & Mikulincer, M. (1997). Fear of death and the judgment of social transgressions: A multidimensional test of terror management theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*(2), 369-380. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.73.2.369

- Friedman, M., & Rholes, S.W. (2008). Religious fundamentalism and terror management. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 18(1)*, 36-52.  
doi:10.1080/10508610802115800
- Greenberg, J., Simon, L., Solomon, S., Pyszczynski, T., & Chatel, D. (1992). Terror management and tolerance: Does mortality salience always intensify negative reactions to others who threaten one's worldview? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63(2)*, 212-220. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.63.2.212
- Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., Veeder, M., Pyszczynski, T., Rosenblatt, A., Kirkland, S. (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(2)*, 308-318. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.58.2.308
- Greenberg, J., Martens, A., Jonas, E., Eisenstadt, D., Pyszczynski, T., & Solomon, S. (2003). Psychological defense in anticipation of anxiety: Eliminating the potential for anxiety eliminates the effect of mortality salience on worldview. *Psychological Science, 14(5)*, 516-519. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.03454
- Harmon-Jones, E., Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., & Simon, L. (1996). The effects of mortality salience on intergroup bias between minimal groups. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 26*, 677-681. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199607)26:4<677::AID-EJSP777>3.0.CO;2-2
- Jones, M. (2002). Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination. In *Social Psychology of Prejudice*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Khalema, N. E., & Wannas-Jones, J. (2003). Under the prism of suspicion: Minority voices in Canada post-September 11. *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, 23 (1), 25-37. doi:10.1080/1360200032000073049
- McConnell, A.R., & Leibold, J. M. (2001). Relations among the implicit association test, discriminatory behavior, and explicit measures of racial attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 37, 435-442. doi:10.1006/jesp.2000.1470
- McGregor, H. A., Greenberg, J., Arndt, J., Lieberman, J. D., Solomon, S. & Simon, L. (1998). Terror management and aggression: Evidence that mortality salience motivates aggression against worldview-threatening others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(3), 590-605. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.3.590
- Meertens, R.W., & Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Is subtle prejudice really prejudice? *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 61, 54-71. doi:10.1086/297786
- Mikulincer, M., & Florian, V. (2008). The complex and multifaceted nature of the fear of personal death: The multidimensional model of Victor Florian. In A. Tomer, G. Eliason, & P. Wong (Eds.), *Existential and Spiritual Issues in Death Attitudes*, (pp. 39-64). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pratto F, Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L.M. & Malle B.F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 67(4), 741-763. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741

- Rosenblatt, A., Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., Pyszczynski, T., & Lyon, D. (1989). Evidence for terror management theory I: The effects of mortality salience on reactions to those who violate or uphold cultural values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *57*(4), 681-690. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.57.4.681
- Salzman, M. B. (2001). Globalization, culture, and anxiety: Perspectives and predictions from terror management theory. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, *10*(4), 337-352. doi: 10.1023/A:1011676025600
- Salzman, M. B. (2008). Globalization, religious fundamentalism and the need for meaning. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *32*, 318-327. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2008.04.006
- Sibley, C. G., & Duckitt, J. (2008). Personality and Prejudice: A Meta-Analysis and Theoretical Review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *12*, 248-279. doi:10.1177/1088868308319226
- Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., & Pyszczynski, T. (2004). The cultural animal; Twenty years of terror management theory and research. In J. Greenberg, S. Koole, & T. Pyszczynski (Eds.), *Handbook of Existential Psychology* (pp.13-34). New York: Guilford Press.
- Thomas, S. P. (2003). "None of us will ever be the same again": Reactions of American midlife women to 9/11. *Health Care for Women International*, *24*, 853-867. doi:10.1080/07399330390244266

Verhovek, S.H. (2003). Understanding Prejudice and Discrimination. In S. Plous (Ed.),

*Understanding Prejudice and Discrimination* (pp.174-177). Boston: McGraw

Hill.

Whitley, B. E., & Kite, M. E. (2006). Individual Differences and Prejudice. In *The*

*Psychology of Prejudice and Discrimination* (pp.197-225). Australia: Thomson

Wadsworth.

**Appendix A**  
**Skiing Filler Survey**



## **Appendix B**

### **Mortality Attitudes Personality Survey**



## **Appendix C**

### **Parallel Writing Task**

Please give your first, natural response when answering the following questions...

1. Jot down as specifically as you can, what you think will happen to you as you physically take your next exam, and once you are physically taking your next exam.

2. Please briefly describe the emotions that the thought of your next important exam arouses in you.

Thank you for your responses, please continue to the next page for further questions.

## **Appendix D**

### **New Anti-Arabs Attitudes Scale**



7. The U.S. should reinforce the control of Arab immigrants.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7  
 Disagree                      Somewhat                      Strongly  
    Agree     Agree

8. Jihad and hatred against the West are in the heart of the majority of Arabs.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7  
 Disagree                      Somewhat                      Strongly  
    Agree     Agree

9. Most Arab countries are fanatic, nationalist, and in conflict with human rights.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7  
 Disagree                      Somewhat                      Strongly  
    Agree     Agree

10. Islam is radical and intolerant.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7  
 Disagree                      Somewhat                      Strongly  
    Agree     Agree

11. Given Muslim immigration and their high birth rates, the U.S. is at risk of Islamization.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7  
 Disagree                      Somewhat                      Strongly  
    Agree     Agree

12. Arab immigrants are very often involved in crimes.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7  
 Disagree                      Somewhat                      Strongly  
    Agree     Agree

13. Arabic immigrants are exploiting the use of our social services.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7  
 Disagree                      Somewhat                      Strongly  
    Agree     Agree



20. Attempts to integrate Arab immigrants into U.S. culture are a waste of time.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7  
 Disagree                      Somewhat                      Strongly  
    Agree     Agree

21. To be accepted, Arabic immigrants must promise to adapt to our customs and culture.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7  
 Disagree                      Somewhat                      Strongly  
    Agree     Agree

22. It is unacceptable that women wear the Islamic veil in the U.S.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7  
 Disagree                      Somewhat                      Strongly  
    Agree     Agree

23. Most Arabs are glad about terrorism against Western interests.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7  
 Disagree                      Somewhat                      Strongly  
    Agree     Agree

24. Given their religious fundamentalism, Arabs should be under strict control measures.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7  
 Disagree                      Somewhat                      Strongly  
    Agree     Agree

25. Islam is not strictly a religion, but a terrorist movement.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7  
 Disagree                      Somewhat                      Strongly  
    Agree     Agree

26. Second generation Arab immigrants continue to maintain the traditions of their parents.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7  
 Disagree                      Somewhat                      Strongly  
    Agree     Agree

27. Arabs are a future threat for the U.S.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7  
Disagree                      Somewhat                      Strongly  
   Agree     Agree

28. Arabs do not respect our culture.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7  
Disagree                      Somewhat                      Strongly  
   Agree     Agree

29. Arabs love peace and coexistence.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7  
Disagree                      Somewhat                      Strongly  
   Agree     Agree

30. Islam is a great religion and culture and deserves our respect.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7  
Disagree                      Somewhat                      Strongly  
   Agree     Agree

## **Appendix E**

### **Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scales**

Please circle the response that most closely fits your beliefs to the following questions.

1. Arabs have jobs that Americans should have.

1	2	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

2. Arabs living here who receive support from welfare could get along without if they tried.

1	2	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

3. Arabs and Americans can never really be comfortable with each other, even if they are close friends.

1	2	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

4. Most politicians care too much about Arabs and not enough about the average American person.

1	2	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

5. Arabs come from less able races and this explains why they are not as well off as most American people.

1	2	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

6. How different or similar do you think Arabs living here are to other American people like yourself --in how honest they are?

1	2	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

7. Suppose that a child of yours had children with a person of very different color and physical characteristics than your own. Do you think you would be very bothered, bothered a little or not bothered at all, if your grandchildren did not physically resemble the people on your side of the family?

1	2	4	5
Very Bothered	Bothered	Bothered a little	Not bothered at all

8. I would be willing to have sexual relations with an Arab.

1	2	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

9. I would not mind if a suitably qualified Arab person was appointed as my boss.

1	2	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

10. I would not mind if an Arab person who had similar economic background as mine joined my close family by marriage.

1	2	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

11. Arabs living here should not push themselves where they are not wanted.

1	2	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

12. Many other groups have come to the United States and overcome prejudice and worked their way up. Arabs should do the same without special favor.

1	2	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

13. It is just a matter of some people not trying hard enough. If Arabs would only try harder they could be as well off as American people.

1	2	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

14. Arabs living here teach their children values and skills different from those required to be successful in the United States.

1	2	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

How different do you think Arabs living here are to other American people like yourself...

15. In the values they teach their children?

1	2	4	5
Very Different	Somewhat Different	Somewhat Similar	Very Similar

16. In their religious beliefs and practices?

1	2	4	5
Very Different	Somewhat Different	Somewhat Similar	Very Similar

17. In their sexual values or sexual practices?

1	2	4	5
Very Different	Somewhat Different	Somewhat Similar	Very Similar

18. In the language that they speak?

1	2	4	5
Very Different	Somewhat Different	Somewhat Similar	Very Similar

Have you ever felt the following ways about Arabs and their families living here...

19. How often have you felt sympathy for Arabs living here?

1	2	4	5	
Never	Not too Often	Fairly Often		Very Often

20. How often have you felt admiration for Arabs living here?

1	2	4	5	
Never	Not too Often	Fairly Often		Very Often

**Appendix F**  
**Demographic Information**

## Demographic Information

INSTRUCTIONS: Please complete the following demographic questions:

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

Gender:  Male  
 Female

Ethnicity:  White/European American  
 African American  
 Hispanic/Latin American  
 Asian American  
 Arab American  
 Other

Class Standing:  Freshman  
 Sophomore  
 Junior  
 Senior  
 Graduate student

## **Appendix G**

### **Research Protocol/Instructions to participants**

## Instructions to participants

Hello. My name is Jessica Dora and I am a graduate student in the Master's Program in Counseling Psychology at Humboldt State University. I am conducting a study to learn more about how various thought processes influence how we think of others. This research is being supervised by Dr. Gregg Gold, Associate Professor of Psychology at Humboldt State University.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you must be at least 18 years old to participate. If you decide you would like to participate, you will be asked to complete a survey packet containing several questionnaires. The questionnaires should take you between 20-40 minutes to complete. It is expected that approximately 100 individuals will eventually participate in this study. Survey questions will ask about your thoughts and feelings, as well as some basic information about yourself (such as age, education, etc.). You may decline to answer any question that makes you feel uncomfortable. If at any time you are not comfortable and decide not to participate you may withdraw from the study without any penalty.

There is a chance that you may feel some negative emotion as you answer some study questions, but we believe that the chances of you experiencing long-lasting negative feelings, due to completing this study, are minimal. If you choose to participate, you will be provided with a copy of the informed consent form which will provide contact and referral information for myself, Dr. Gold, and local crisis and counseling agencies. Please do not hesitate to contact any of us if you have questions regarding the study or if answering the questions brings up any feelings you need to further discuss. You may also choose to contact myself or Dr. Gold at a later date to discuss the findings of this research.

All of the information that is collected will be stored in a secure and locked facility at Humboldt State University. The questionnaires will not have any names or identifying information on them. And all questionnaires will be destroyed after they are no longer required to be stored by professional ethics codes.

Thank you for your time and considering to participate in this study. It is our hope that study results will help further our understanding of how thoughts influence social attitudes.

**Appendix H**  
**Informed Consent Form**

**HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**Study of Thought Processes and Attitudes**

**CONSENT TO ACT AS A RESEARCH SUBJECT**

I hereby agree to participate in the research study described below, to be conducted by Jessica Dora, graduate student in the Master's Program in Counseling Psychology at Humboldt State University. The study is being supervised by Dr. Gregg Gold, Associate Professor of Psychology at Humboldt State University. I understand that the main purpose of this study is to learn more about how various thought processes influence how we think of others.

**INFORMATION**

You will be asked to complete several questionnaires. These include questions about your thoughts and feelings, as well as some basic information about yourself (such as age, education, etc.). You may decline to answer any question that makes you feel uncomfortable.

The questionnaires should take you between 20-40 minutes to complete. It is expected that approximately 100 individuals will participate in this study. You must be over 18 years of age to participate in this study.

**RISKS**

There is a chance that you may feel some negative emotion as you answer some study questions, but we believe that the chances of you experiencing long-lasting negative feelings, due to completing this study, are minimal. If you do feel in need of immediate assistance, please contact the Humboldt County Mental Health crisis hotline at 707-445-7715 or 888-849-5728. For a non-emergency situation, you may contact Counseling and Psychological Services, located in the Humboldt State University Health Center, at 707-826-3236.

**BENEFITS**

Your participation will help advance our knowledge about how thoughts influence attitudes toward others. You may contact the researchers to find out about the findings of the study at a later date.

**CONFIDENTIALITY**

All the information that we collect (questionnaires) will be stored in a locked facility at Humboldt State University. They will be stored securely, and only, Jessica Dora, Dr. Gold, and his trained research assistants will have access to your information. The questionnaires will not have names or identifying information on them. All questionnaires will be destroyed after they are no longer required to be stored by professional ethics codes.

This information was explained to me by Jessica Dora. I understand that she will answer any questions I may have concerning this research study or the procedures at any time. I also understand that my participation is entirely voluntary and that I may decline to enter this study or may withdraw from it at any time without jeopardy. I understand that the investigator may terminate my participation in the study at any time.

### **CONTACT**

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Jessica Dora or her supervisor, Dr. Gregg Gold, at Humboldt State University, Department of Psychology, 1 Harpst Street, Arcata CA 95521, 707-826-3740, and [gregg.gold@humboldt.edu](mailto:gregg.gold@humboldt.edu). You may also contact the Dean for Research and Graduate Studies, Dr. John Lyon, at Humboldt State University, Siemens Hall, Arcata CA 95521, 707-826-3949, or [john.lyon@humboldt.edu](mailto:john.lyon@humboldt.edu).

### **CONSENT**

I have read this form and received a copy of it. I certify that I am over 18 years of age. I have had all my questions answered to my satisfaction. I agree to take part in this study.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Consent form date: