

Right-Wing Authoritarianism, Social Dominance Orientation, and Prejudice

Bernard E. Whitley, Jr.
Ball State University

Right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation have been proposed as 2 major individual-difference variables underlying prejudice. This study examined the relationships of these variables to 3 forms of prejudice— affective responses, stereotyping, and attitudes toward equality enhancement— directed at 2 social groups— African Americans and homosexuals. Canonical correlation analyses showed that social dominance orientation was related to most forms of prejudice directed toward both groups and that right-wing authoritarianism was related to affective responses to and stereotyping of homosexuals. In addition, it was found that, as predicted by the social dominance model, stereotyping mediated the relationships between social dominance orientation and other forms of prejudice and that social dominance orientation mediated gender differences in expressions of prejudice.

The whole world is festering with unhappy souls:
The French hate the Germans, the Germans hate the Poles;
Italians hate Yugoslavs, South Africans hate the Dutch;
And I don't like anybody very much!

—Sheldon Harnick, *The Merry Little Minuet*

Are there people who “don't like anybody very much,” who are, in Altemeyer's (1998) words, “equal opportunity bigots” (p. 52)? Two personality-based perspectives—right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation—suggest that the answer is yes.

Right-Wing Authoritarianism

Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford (1950) proposed the concept of an authoritarian personality as one explanation for the rise of fascism during the 1930s. People high in authoritarianism exhibit high degrees of deference to established authority, aggression toward out-groups when authorities permit that aggression, and support for traditional values when those values are endorsed by authorities. Although the definition and measures of authoritarianism have evolved during the 50 years since the construct was first proposed (e.g., Christie, 1991), the construct, which is now generally referred to as right-wing authoritarianism (RWA; Altemeyer, 1981, 1988, 1996), has consistently been associated with prejudice, discrimination, and hostility against members of out-groups. For example, people high in authoritarianism have been found to be prejudiced against (among others) African Americans (e.g., Altemeyer, 1998; McFarland & Adelson, 1996, 1997; Whitley, 1998), Native Americans (Altemeyer, 1998), women (e.g., Altemeyer, 1998; Duncan, Peterson, & Winter, 1997; McFarland & Adelson, 1996, 1997), lesbians and gay men (e.g., Whitley & Lee, in press), people with visible handicaps (e.g., Noonan, Barry, & Davis, 1970), and people with

AIDS (e.g., Cunningham, Dollinger, Satz, & Rotter, 1991; Peterson, Doty, & Winter, 1993). In addition, McFarland and his colleagues have found that authoritarianism is related to prejudice not only among North Americans but also among citizens of Russia and the former Soviet Union (McFarland, Ageyev, & Abalagina, 1992; McFarland, Ageyev, & Djintcharadze, 1996).

Altemeyer (1981, 1998) proposed that two characteristics of people who are high in authoritarianism cause them to be prejudiced. First, people high in authoritarianism tend to organize their worldviews in terms of in-groups and out-groups and perceive members of out-groups as threatening the traditional values authoritarians hold dear. Authoritarians' derogation of members of out-groups serves to defend their value system by permitting them to dismiss the out-groups as unimportant and therefore as constituting no real threat to those values. In addition, prejudice provides a means of expressing the hostility and aggression aroused by the perceived threat to their value systems in a way that stops short of physical violence (although authoritarian aggression can also be expressed violently).

A second characteristic of people high in authoritarianism that leads to prejudice is self-righteousness. High authoritarians see themselves as more moral than other people and, therefore, they feel justified in looking down on anyone defined by authority figures as less moral than themselves. Furthermore, they feel justified in pointing out the errors of people engaged in what authoritarians see as immoral behavior. People high in authoritarianism will feel especially free to express prejudice against members of out-groups, such as lesbians and gay men, who are condemned by authority figures as immoral threats to traditional values.

Social Dominance Orientation

Social dominance orientation (SDO) is “the extent to which one desires that one's in-group dominate and be superior to out-groups” (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994, p. 742). The desire to maintain the superior position of their in-groups motivates people high in SDO to denigrate members of out-groups, to oppose equality-enhancing social programs such as affirmative action, and, when possible, to discriminate against members of

I thank Betty Gridley and Mary Kite for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this article.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Bernard E. Whitley, Jr., Department of Psychological Science, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana 47306. Electronic mail may be sent to bwhitley@wp.bsu.edu.

out-groups in order to enforce the status quo (Sidanius, 1993; Sidanius & Pratto, 1993). Thus, people high in SDO tend to hold negative attitudes toward a variety of groups that push for social equality, such as ethnic minorities, feminists, and lesbians and gay men (Altemeyer, 1998; McFarland & Adelson, 1996, 1997; Pratto et al., 1994; Sidanius, Pratto, & Bobo, 1994, 1996; Whitley & Lee, in press).

However, the social dominance perspective differs from the authoritarianism perspective in terms of the role played by stereotypes. In the authoritarianism model, stereotyping is one of many forms that prejudice can take. In the social dominance model, stereotypes play the role of *legitimizing myths* that people high in SDO use as means of justifying their negative attitudes (Sidanius, 1993; Sidanius & Pratto, 1993; Sidanius et al., 1994). For example, the belief that members of other racial groups are inherently inferior legitimizes prejudice and discrimination against members of those groups: Why should society expend precious resources to provide people with opportunities they are inherently unfit to take advantage of? Thus, high SDO causes people to endorse stereotypes of out-groups, and this adherence to stereotypes leads to negative attitudes toward members of those groups.

Although authoritarianism and social dominance may appear to be competing explanations of prejudice, they are not. The two constructs are only minimally correlated (Altemeyer, 1998; Pratto et al., 1994) and therefore can be independent causes of prejudice. This independence results from differences in the nature of the constructs: Authoritarianism focuses on submission to in-group authority figures independent of whether they advocate intergroup dominance, whereas SDO focuses on dominance over out-groups independent of the views of in-group authority figures. That is, authoritarianism is an *intragroup* phenomenon, whereas SDO is an *intergroup* phenomenon (Altemeyer, 1998; Pratto et al., 1994).

The authoritarianism and social dominance perspectives also differ in the relationships they postulate between their respective constructs and various forms of prejudice. Because the social dominance perspective emphasizes people's desire to maintain the dominance of their in-groups, SDO is rooted in opposition to the redistribution of the benefits that derive from holding a dominant position in society, such as wealth, education, and jobs (Pratto et al., 1994; Sidanius et al., 1996), whereas authoritarianism is rooted in the acceptance of the attitudes and values advocated by authority figures (Altemeyer, 1981, 1988, 1996). Because of its roots in opposition to the redistribution of societal benefits and promotion of social equality, SDO is reflected more in attitudes toward enhancement of intergroup equality than in affective responses to members of minority groups. For example, Sidanius et al. (1996) found a higher correlation between SDO and opposition to affirmative action policies than between SDO and anti-Black affect. Thus, people high in SDO devalue members of out-groups and oppose their efforts to close social and economic gaps between themselves and the dominant social group, but they do not necessarily dislike them. In contrast, authoritarianism may be more closely related to affective responses to members of minority groups because such responses reflect authoritarian aggression and hostility aroused by authority figures' negative statements about members of out-groups.

Authoritarianism and SDO also differ empirically: Authoritarianism is more closely related to attitudes toward homosexuality, whereas SDO is more closely related to prejudice against other

groups (Altemeyer, 1998; McFarland & Adelson, 1996, 1997; Whitley, 1998). However, research on the relationship of authoritarianism to prejudice in general and on the relationship of SDO to attitudes toward homosexuality has not separately assessed the three types of prejudice distinguished by the social dominance perspective: stereotypes, affective responses, and attitudes toward enhancement of intergroup equality. Consequently, authoritarianism's stronger relationship to attitudes toward homosexuality could reflect either a special relationship with homosexuality regardless of the type of attitude assessed or a special relationship to affective responses regardless of the target of prejudice.

Research Objectives

This study had two objectives. The first was to determine whether authoritarianism was specifically related to attitudes toward homosexuality and SDO to prejudice toward other groups, or whether authoritarianism was specifically related to affective responses and SDO to other forms of prejudice. This was accomplished by examining the relationships of authoritarianism and SDO to three forms of prejudice—stereotyping, affective responses, and attitudes toward equality enhancement—directed toward African Americans and homosexuals.¹ Gender of participant was also included in these analyses, because men have generally been found to express more prejudice toward a variety of social groups than have women (e.g., Altemeyer, 1998; McFarland & Adelson, 1996, 1997; Whitley, 1998).

The second objective was to test two hypotheses derived from the social dominance model. The first hypothesis was that because stereotypes constitute one form of legitimizing myth that justifies social dominance, endorsement of group stereotypes mediates the relationship between SDO and other forms of prejudice toward the stereotyped group. This hypothesis was tested by examining the residual relationships of SDO to affective responses and attitudes toward equality enhancement of the groups with stereotyping controlled.

The second hypothesis was that SDO mediates the gender difference that has been found in expressions of prejudice. The social dominance model holds that people who possess social status and power are motivated to preserve the status quo that provides that status and power. Consequently, they are more likely to develop the high SDO that provides them with the justification (by means of legitimizing myths) to oppress others. Because men hold more power in society than do women, they also tend to be higher in SDO (Pratto et al., 1994; Sidanius et al., 1994). Therefore, the social dominance model postulates that gender differences in SDO mediate gender differences in prejudice. For example, Whitley and Lee (in press) found that gender differences in attitudes toward gay men were greatly reduced when gender differences in SDO were controlled.

¹ Although research has shown that many, if not most, people interpret the term *homosexual* to mean a gay man (e.g., Black & Stevenson, 1984; Haddock, Zanna, & Esses, 1993), I used it in this study for two reasons. First, the questionnaire used for data collection was quite long, and I did not want to further lengthen it by having a large number of items refer to both lesbians and gay men. Second, Whitley and Lee (in press) found similar relationships to attitudes toward lesbians and toward gay men for authoritarianism and for social dominance orientation.

Method

Participants

The initial pool of participants consisted of 429 introductory psychology students who participated in partial fulfillment of a course requirement. Because this study was concerned with attitudes toward members of out-groups, the data from 40 participants who reported a racial classification other than White and 17 participants who reported a sexual orientation other than completely heterosexual were not used. In order to make the sample relatively age homogeneous, the data from 9 participants who were older than 25 years were also not used. The remaining participants were randomly divided into two subsamples: an initial analysis sample consisting of 88 men and 93 women and a replication sample consisting of 94 men and 88 women.

Measures

Participants completed a questionnaire consisting of the measures listed in this section. Except for the sexual orientation question, items from the measures were intermixed in random order, and participants responded to them on 9-point agree–disagree scales with anchors at each point ranging from *very strongly disagree* (–4) through *neutral* (0) to *very strongly agree* (+4).

Authoritarianism. Authoritarianism was measured with Altemeyer's (1988) Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) Scale. The RWA Scale consists of 30 items and has been found to have high degrees of reliability and construct validity (Altemeyer, 1988, 1996; Christie, 1991). The RWA Scale includes two items that assess attitudes toward homosexuality; those items were not scored for this study. In the current sample, the scale had an internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) of .87 for the 28 items used. Higher scores indicate higher levels of authoritarianism. All reliabilities reported here are for the combined initial analysis and replication samples.

SDO. SDO was measured with Pratto et al.'s (1994) Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) Scale. The SDO Scale consists of 16 items such as "Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups" and "No one group should dominate in society." The scale has been found to have high degrees of reliability and construct validity (Pratto et al., 1994). In the current sample, the scale had an internal consistency coefficient of .88. Higher scores indicate higher levels of SDO.

Stereotyping. Participants' endorsement of stereotypes of African Americans was assessed with Judd, Park, Ryan, Brauer, and Kraus's (1995) list of positive and negative stereotypes of African Americans. The items were worded so that Black and White people were compared on each characteristic. A factor analysis of the participants' responses to these items revealed two factors: a positive stereotype factor consisting of 7 items and a negative stereotype factor consisting of 11 items. The positive stereotype factor included items such as "Black people are more hardworking than White people," "Black people are more religious than White people," and "Black people place more value on family ties than White people" and had an internal consistency coefficient of .81. The negative stereotype factor included items such as "Black people are more violent than White people," "Black people are more hostile than White people," and "Black people are lazier than White people" and had an internal consistency coefficient of .92.

Participants' endorsement of stereotypes of homosexuals was assessed with LaMar and Kite's (1998) Beliefs About Lesbians and Gay Men Scale. The scale consists of 14 items, of which 7 refer to lesbians and 7 refer to gay men. Sample items are "Gay men have identifiable female characteristics," "Lesbians prefer to take roles (passive or aggressive) in their sexual behavior," and "A gay man's mother is probably very domineering." Scores from all 14 items were combined to form one scale that had an internal consistency coefficient of .85. For all three measures, higher scores indicate higher levels of agreement with stereotypical statements.

Affective responses. Affective responses to members of both groups were assessed with seven positive and seven negative items from Crites, Fabrigar, and Petty's (1994) affect scales. The items on the questionnaire took the form "Generally, thinking about [group] makes me feel [affect]." The positive affect scale included items such as "warm and friendly," "happy," and "relaxed" and had internal consistency coefficients of .91 for African Americans and .94 for homosexuals. The negative affect scale included items such as "annoyed," "angry," and "disgusted" and had internal consistency coefficients of .92 for African Americans and .95 for homosexuals. Because scores on the positive and negative affect measures were highly correlated in the combined samples, $r = -.72$ for African Americans and $r = -.83$ for homosexuals, each pair of scales was combined into a single affect scale with the negative items recoded so that higher scores indicated more positive affect.

Attitudes toward equality enhancement. Attitudes toward intergroup equality enhancement were assessed with McConahay's (1986) Modern Racism Scale (MRS) and a scale developed for this study to measure attitudes toward the equality enhancement of lesbians and gay men. Because no such scale currently exists, items were adapted from the MRS and from Swim, Aikin, Hall, and Hunter's (1995) Modern Sexism Scale to measure these attitudes. The scales included items such as "Over the past few years, Blacks have gotten more economically than they deserve" and "Over the past few years, the government and news media have been showing more concern about the treatment of homosexuals than is warranted by their actual experiences." The MRS had an internal consistency coefficient of .81, and the attitudes toward the equality enhancement of homosexuals scale had an internal consistency coefficient of .82. Higher scores on a measure indicate more positive attitudes toward enhancement of the equality of the group.

Sexual orientation. Participants' sexual orientations were assessed by asking them to rate themselves on a 9-point scale (this was the last item on the questionnaire). The odd-numbered scale points were labeled as follows: 1 = *completely heterosexual*, 3 = *primarily heterosexual*, 5 = *bisexual*, 7 = *primarily homosexual*, and 9 = *completely homosexual*. The even-numbered scale points were not labeled. Only participants who gave themselves a rating of 1 were classified as heterosexual for this study.

Procedure

Participants completed the questionnaire in groups of 10 to 20. After distributing questionnaires to participants, a male research assistant explained that the study dealt with college students' attitudes toward a variety of social issues (this information was also printed on the questionnaire). After the participants completed their questionnaires, they were debriefed and thanked.

Results

Table 1 shows the correlations among the variables; correlations for the initial analysis sample are shown above the diagonal and those for the replication sample are shown below the diagonal. Consistent with the results of previous research (Altemeyer, 1998; Whitley & Lee, in press), RWA and SDO scores were essentially uncorrelated, $r = .14$, *ns*, in the initial analysis sample and $r = .20$, $p = .008$, in the replication sample. Gender of participant was essentially uncorrelated with RWA in either sample, $r = -.16$, $p = .04$, in the initial analysis sample and $r = -.13$, *ns*, in the replication sample; gender of participant was moderately correlated with SDO in the initial analysis sample, $r = .43$, $p < .001$, but essentially uncorrelated with SDO in the replication sample, $r = .17$, $p = .02$. Also consistent with the results of previous research (Whitley & Lee, in press), correlations with the prejudice measures were generally higher for SDO than for RWA in both

Table 1
Correlations Among the Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. RWA	—	.14	-.16*	.01	-.47***	.02	.10	.44***	-.08	-.32***
2. SDO	.20**	—	.43***	-.54***	-.39***	.36***	.61***	.37***	-.65***	-.57***
3. Gen	-.13	.17*	—	-.33***	-.32***	.44***	.48***	.24***	-.41***	-.38***
4. AA-Aff	-.09	-.65***	-.19**	—	.26***	-.18**	-.64***	-.12	.74***	.36***
5. Hx-Aff	-.46***	-.44***	-.22**	.35***	—	-.25***	-.36***	-.62***	.29***	.72***
6. AA-PS	.07	.26***	.09	-.18**	-.08	—	.64***	.46***	-.36***	-.36***
7. AA-NS	.26***	.59***	.15*	-.61***	-.30***	.59***	—	.43***	-.74***	-.50***
8. Hx-S	.46***	.37***	.15*	-.17*	-.65***	.41***	.48***	—	-.33***	-.57***
9. AA-Eq	-.32***	-.68***	-.15*	.64***	.43***	-.39***	-.64***	-.41***	—	.51***
10. Hx-Eq	-.43***	-.52***	-.31***	.34***	.79***	-.19**	-.34***	-.64***	.53***	—

Note. Correlations for the initial analysis sample ($n = 181$) are above the diagonal; those for the replication sample ($n = 182$) are below the diagonal. RWA = right-wing authoritarianism; SDO = social dominance orientation; Gen = gender of participant (coded 1 = female, 2 = male); AA = African Americans; Hx = homosexuals; Aff = affect; PS = positive stereotype; NS = negative stereotype; S = stereotype; Eq = attitude toward enhancement of equality of the group.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

samples, except for the correlations for affective attitude toward homosexuality and homosexual stereotypes, and men generally expressed higher degrees of prejudice than did women.

RWA, SDO, and Prejudice

The relationships of RWA and SDO to the various forms of prejudice were assessed with the canonical correlation analysis (CCA). CCA, which is a form of multivariate multiple regression analysis, assesses the relationships between a set of independent variables (in this case, RWA, SDO, and gender of participant) and a set of dependent variables (in this case, the prejudice measures). CCA creates pairs of *canonical variates*; the number of variate pairs is equal to the number of variables in the smaller variable set. In each pair, one canonical variate represents the independent variables, and the other canonical variate represents the dependent variables. For each pair of canonical variates, the canonical correlation indicates the degree to which each variate is related to the other. Canonical correlations can be tested for statistical significance, and only canonical variate pairs with statistically significant canonical correlations were interpreted for this study.

The degree to which the variables load on the canonical variates indicates the degree to which the variables are related to the latent variable represented by the canonical variate, just as factor loadings in factor analysis indicate the degrees to which the measured variables are related to the latent variable represented by each factor. As in exploratory factor analysis, the minimum loading used to assign a variable to a canonical variate is based on a rule of thumb rather than a statistical test. In this study, a minimum loading of .40 was used to assign a variable to a canonical variate. Results from the initial analysis and replication samples are shown in Table 2. A more detailed explanation of CCA can be found in Tabachnick and Fidell (1996).

Initial analysis. In the initial analysis sample, the first canonical correlation was .77, $F(21, 486) = 13.47, p < .001$. The canonical variate for the predictor set primarily represented SDO, which had a loading of .91. The canonical variate for the prejudice set represented all six prejudice measures. High SDO was related to negative affect toward African Americans and homosexuals, stereotyping of African Americans and homosexuals, and negative

attitudes toward the equality enhancement of African Americans and homosexuals.

The second canonical correlation was .52, $F(12, 340) = 6.49, p < .001$. The canonical variate for the predictor set represented RWA, which had a loading of $-.92$. The canonical variate for the prejudice set represented affect toward African Americans and homosexuality, and stereotyping of homosexuals. High RWA was related to positive affect toward African Americans, negative affect toward homosexuality, and stereotyping of homosexuals.

The third canonical correlation was .30, $F(5, 171) = 3.43, p = .006$. The canonical variate for the predictor set represented gender of participant, which had a loading of .72. The canonical variate for the prejudice set represented positive stereotypes of African Americans. Men endorsed these stereotypes to a greater extent than did women.

Replication. In the replication sample, the first canonical correlation was .82, $F(21, 486) = 17.76, p < .001$. The canonical variate for the predictor set primarily represented SDO, which had a loading of $-.91$. The canonical variate for the prejudice set represented all prejudice measures except positive stereotypes of African Americans. High SDO was related to negative affect toward African Americans and homosexuals, negative stereotyping of African Americans, stereotyping of homosexuals, and negative attitudes toward the equality enhancement of African Americans and homosexuals.

The second canonical correlation was .47, $F(12, 340) = 4.61, p < .001$. The canonical variate for the predictor set represented RWA, which had a loading of $-.80$. The canonical variate for the prejudice set represented affect toward African Americans and homosexuality, and stereotyping of homosexuals. High RWA was related to positive affect toward African Americans, negative affect toward homosexuality, and stereotyping of homosexuals.

The third canonical correlation was .23, $F(5, 171) = 1.88, ns$. Because this canonical correlation was not statistically significant, the relationship between the third pair of canonical variates was not interpreted.

RWA and affective responses to African Americans. The association of affective attitudes toward African Americans with RWA in both analyses was unexpected given the very low zero-

Table 2
Canonical Correlations and Canonical Variate Loadings for the Two Samples

	Initial analysis sample canonical variate			Replication sample canonical variate		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
Canonical correlation	.77***	.52***	.30**	.82***	.47***	.23
Predictor variables						
Social dominance orientation	.91	.27	-.32	-.91	.39	.12
Right-wing authoritarianism	-.31	-.92	-.23	-.51	-.80	.33
Gender of participant	.66	-.21	.72	-.32	-.02	-.95
Prejudice variables						
African Americans						
Affect	-.66	-.43	.27	.74	-.58	-.04
Positive stereotypes	.55	.22	.63	-.30	.13	-.05
Negative stereotypes	.84	.26	.12	-.73	.17	.20
Equality enhancement attitude	-.82	-.34	.25	.85	-.17	-.33
Homosexuals						
Affect	-.68	.63	-.20	.70	.48	.13
Stereotypes	.63	-.53	-.10	-.61	-.55	.04
Equality enhancement attitude	-.82	.20	.05	.80	.36	.45

Note. Loadings with absolute values equal to or greater than .40 are shown in boldface.
 ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

order correlations of these variables (see Table 1). One possible explanation for these results is that they represent a case of suppression (e.g., Pedhazur, 1982): Controlling for the other prejudice variables removed enough variance from the relationships between RWA and affective responses and equality enhancement attitudes that the residual relationship became statistically significant. This possibility was tested by examining the partial correlations of RWA with affective responses and equality enhancement attitudes while controlling for the other prejudice variables. For affective responses, the partial correlations were statistically significant in both the initial analysis sample, $pr = .15$, $p = .04$, and the replication sample, $pr = .23$, $p = .002$. However, because all four forms of anti-Black prejudice covary, the finding that RWA has a positive relationship to one with the others controlled probably has little substantive significance.

Summary. The results of these analyses indicate that SDO is a basic factor underlying multiple forms of prejudice toward a variety of groups, RWA is an additional factor underlying attitudes toward homosexuality, and gender differences are negligible with RWA and SDO controlled.

Stereotype Endorsement as a Mediator of the SDO-Prejudice Relationship

The social dominance model holds that for people high in SDO, stereotypes serve as one form of myth that legitimizes other forms of prejudice. This mediating role of stereotype endorsement was tested by conducting hierarchical multiple regression analyses in which the criterion variables were affective responses to and attitudes toward equality enhancement of African Americans and homosexuals. Stereotype endorsement was entered in the first step of the analyses, and SDO was entered in the second step. Mediation would be indicated if the percentage of variance accounted for

by SDO with stereotype endorsement controlled were substantially lower than the zero-order percentage of variance accounted for (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

Table 3 shows the percentage of variance accounted for by SDO alone, by stereotype endorsement, and by SDO with stereotype endorsement controlled. In all cases, the percentage of variance accounted for by SDO was substantially reduced (by an average of 78% in the initial analysis sample and by an average of 71% in the replication sample) when stereotype endorsement was controlled. These results confirm the mediating role of stereotype endorsement in the SDO-prejudice relationship.

SDO as a Mediator of Gender Differences in Prejudice

Social dominance theory holds that men express more prejudice than do women because men are higher in SDO. This mediating role of SDO was tested by conducting hierarchical multiple regression analyses in which the criterion variables were the prejudice measures. SDO was entered in the first step of the analyses and gender of participant was entered in the second step.

Table 4 shows the percentage of variance accounted for by gender of participant alone, by SDO, and by gender of participant with SDO controlled. In all cases, the percentage of variance accounted for by gender was substantially reduced (by an average of 77% in both samples) when SDO was controlled. These results confirm the mediating role of SDO in gender differences in prejudice.

Discussion

This study had two broad goals. The first was to examine the degrees to which SDO and RWA are related to various forms of prejudice. The second goal was to test the hypothesis that endorse-

Table 3
Percentage of Variance in Prejudice Measures Accounted for by SDO, Stereotyping, and SDO With Stereotyping Controlled

Variable	Initial analysis sample			Replication sample		
	SDO	Stereotyping	SDO, Stereotyping	SDO	Stereotyping	SDO, Stereotyping
African Americans						
Affect	29.2***	50.5***	3.0***	42.3***	42.4***	11.0***
Equality enhancement attitudes	42.9***	56.3***	6.5***	46.0***	41.2***	14.3***
Homosexuals						
Affect	15.0***	38.6***	2.8**	19.0***	42.1***	4.6***
Equality enhancement attitudes	32.8***	32.1***	15.2***	27.0***	41.2***	9.4***

Note. SDO = social dominance orientation; SDO.Stereotyping = social dominance orientation with stereotyping controlled.
 p* < .01. *p* < .001.

ment of stereotypes about out-group members mediates the relationship between SDO and other aspects of prejudice, and that SDO mediates gender differences in expressions of prejudice.

SDO, RWA, and Prejudice

A number of researchers have proposed that RWA and SDO operate jointly to bring about prejudiced attitudes: Both constructs have been shown to be related to multiple forms of prejudice but relatively independent of each other (Altemeyer, 1998; McFarland & Adelson, 1996, 1997; Whitley, 1998). However, the results of the present research indicated that SDO was the primary factor underlying a variety of forms of prejudice, whereas RWA was primarily related to the endorsement of stereotypes of, and affective attitudes toward, homosexuals.

Why should SDO dominate prejudice? As its name indicates, SDO represents a worldview in which one's own identity groups should be dominant over other groups. This view of "us" being better than "them" leads the person high in SDO to denigrate members of other "lesser" groups and to endorse stereotypes of those groups as a means of justifying social dominance (Sidanius,

1993; Sidanius & Pratto, 1993). By its nature, then, SDO predisposes people to be prejudiced against all out-groups. Like the character speaking in the epigraph to this article, they "don't like anybody very much," at least anybody they see as being substantially different from themselves.

In contrast, rather than being based on intergroup dominance, RWA is based on submission to the beliefs promulgated by in-group authority figures and results in hostility and negative attitudes toward groups condemned by those authority figures (Altemeyer, 1981, 1988, 1996). Because religious authorities may be especially powerful influences on these kinds of attitudes (Altemeyer, 1996, 1998; McFarland & Adelson, 1997), authoritarianism would be expected to be strongly related to attitudes toward groups, such as lesbians and gay men, who are portrayed by many religious authorities as violating traditional religious teachings. In contrast, acceptance of religious authority appears to be unrelated to SDO (Altemeyer, 1996; McFarland & Adelson, 1997). Thus, previous research has found that authoritarianism is more closely related to attitudes toward homosexuality than is SDO (Whitley & Lee, in press), and the present research found that authoritarianism

Table 4
Percentage of Variance in Prejudice Measures Accounted for by Gender of Participant, SDO, and Gender of Participant With SDO Controlled

Variable	Initial analysis sample			Replication sample		
	Gender	SDO	Gender.SDO	Gender	SDO	Gender.SDO
African Americans						
Affect	10.9***	30.4***	1.0	3.6**	44.1***	0.6
Positive stereotypes	19.4***	12.9***	10.2***	0.8	6.1***	0.2
Negative stereotypes	23.0***	37.8***	5.9***	2.2*	34.2***	0.2
Equality enhancement attitudes	16.8***	42.0***	1.9*	2.2*	45.7***	0.1
Homosexuals						
Affect	10.2***	13.6***	3.1**	4.8**	18.9***	2.3*
Stereotypes	5.8***	14.0***	0.7	2.2*	12.5***	0.1
Equality enhancement attitudes	14.4***	30.5***	2.7**	9.6***	26.8***	5.1***

Note. SDO = social dominance orientation; Gender.SDO = gender with SDO controlled.
 p* < .05. *p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

was related to attitudes toward homosexuals but not to attitudes toward the other groups.

Consequently, SDO appears to be a general substratum of prejudice, with RWA layering on additional prejudice in the cases of groups condemned by authority figures, perhaps especially by religious authority figures. Therefore, this "add-on" effect of authoritarianism is probably not limited to antigay prejudice but might also be part of negative attitudes toward other groups condemned by traditionalist religious authorities.

SDO and affective responses. One somewhat surprising finding of the study was the strong correlations between SDO and affective responses to African Americans and homosexuals. It had been hypothesized that SDO would have little correlation with affective responses to members of out-groups because, in two studies, Sidanius et al. (1994, 1996) found very low correlations between SDO and affective responses to African Americans, $r = -.11$ and $r = -.09$, respectively. However, in the present study, SDO was relatively strongly correlated with affective responses to African Americans in the initial analysis sample, $r = -.54$, and in the replication sample, $r = -.65$.

There are three differences between Sidanius et al.'s (1994, 1996) studies and the present study that could explain these inconsistent results. One difference is in the demographic characteristics of the samples. Sidanius et al.'s (1994, 1996) studies used survey data and therefore included a very heterogeneous set of participants. Because the present study used college student participants, the correlations found may be limited to that population. There appear to be no published data that compare the affective responses of college student samples and more diverse samples to members of out-groups. Pratto et al. (1994) used college student samples in their research, but they did not assess affective responses. However, Pratto et al. (1994) and Sidanius et al. (1996) found similar correlations between SDO and general anti-Black racism for college students and survey respondents, $r = .55$ and $r = .47$, respectively. These findings argue against the existence of large differences between college student and survey populations in the relationship between SDO and attitudes toward African Americans.

A second difference is the region of the United States in which the studies were conducted. Sidanius et al. (1994, 1996) conducted their studies on the West Coast and the present study was conducted in the Midwest, so the higher correlations found in the present study could be due to regional differences in the relationship between SDO and affective responses to African Americans. However, examination of the correlations for variables used in the Pratto et al. (1994) study and those used in the present study that are conceptually similar shows little difference. Pratto et al. (1994) found a correlation between SDO and anti-Black racism, $r = .55$, and between SDO and attitudes toward racial policies such as affirmative action, $r = -.44$. The present study found a correlation between SDO and negative stereotyping of African Americans, $r = .61$, and between SDO and attitudes toward equality enhancement of African Americans, $r = -.65$. These findings argue against the existence of large regional differences among college students in the relationship between SDO and attitudes toward African Americans.

The third difference between the studies is the way in which affective responses were assessed. Sidanius et al. (1994, 1996) used a single-item feeling thermometer anchored at *very warm and*

favorable and very cold and unfavorable. In contrast, the present study used a 14-item scale that assessed a variety of both positive and negative affects. Given the general psychometric superiority of multi-item scales over single-item scales (e.g., Judd, Smith, & Kidder, 1991), the differences in the findings of the studies may be due to differences in the ways affect was measured. Therefore, contrary to the findings of previous research, affective responses to members of out-groups may be an important correlate of SDO. However, replication of these findings is required before firm conclusions can be drawn.

RWA and affective responses to African Americans. The finding that RWA was essentially uncorrelated with affective responses to African Americans in either sample was also somewhat surprising because hostility toward members of out-groups is a major component of RWA (Altemeyer, 1981, 1988, 1996). However, RWA is also positively correlated with concern over making a favorable impression on others (McFarland & Adelson, 1996, 1997). Consequently, people high in authoritarianism may inhibit the expression of negative attitudes toward African Americans because such expressions are unacceptable in most public circumstances (e.g., Jones, 1997). In contrast, because expressions of antigay prejudice receive less disapproval (e.g., Kite & Whitley, 1996) and are modeled by some authority figures, people high in authoritarianism probably feel free to express their prejudice, as was found in the present study.

SDO, Stereotyping, and Other Forms of Prejudice

The social dominance model holds that people high in SDO defend their privileged positions in society by opposing policies that would enhance the equality of less privileged groups. SDO thus represents a generalized belief in in-group dominance that can be expressed as opposition to policies, such as affirmative action, that further the enhancement of equality of specific groups (e.g., Sidanius, 1993; Sidanius & Pratto, 1993). The finding that SDO had strong relationships with opposition to the equality enhancement of both African Americans and homosexuals was consistent with this formulation of SDO.

The social dominance model further holds that people high in SDO justify their belief in their group's superiority by endorsing myths that legitimize that belief. Stereotypes portraying members of out-groups as morally and intellectually inferior and thus incapable of achieving anything worthwhile constitute one type of legitimizing myth that mediates the relationship between SDO and other forms of prejudice (Sidanius, 1993; Sidanius & Pratto, 1993). The results of the present research supported stereotypes' role as mediators of the relationship between SDO and prejudice by finding that the relationship was reduced when stereotype endorsement was controlled.

Although the mediation was only partial in most cases, that outcome was not surprising because the social dominance model proposes that stereotypes are only one of a number of legitimizing myths. Other such myths include the belief that hard work is sufficient for success, which is related to anti-Black prejudice (e.g., Biernat, Vescio, Theno, & Crandall, 1996), and adherence to traditional gender-role beliefs, which is related to antigay prejudice (e.g., Kite & Whitley, 1996). Because few studies have tested the mediational role of legitimizing myths hypothesized by social dominance theory (see Sidanius & Pratto, 1993), further research

that uses other forms of prejudice and other legitimizing myths is required.

Gender Differences in Prejudice

The zero-order correlations found in the present research replicated the well-established finding that men are more likely than women to express prejudiced attitudes about a variety of groups (e.g., Altemeyer, 1998; McFarland & Adelson, 1996, 1997; Whitley, 1998). The research also found that a large proportion of these gender differences in prejudice result from gender differences in SDO. However, the research also found that some gender differences in prejudice remained despite controlling for SDO, which suggests that other mediational variables may exist. One candidate for an additional mediator is empathy: Women generally score higher on self-report measures of empathy (e.g., Basow, 1992), and self-reported empathy is negatively correlated with expressions of prejudice (Johnson, Brems, & Alford-Keating, 1997; McFarland & Adelson, 1997). The identification of additional mediators of gender difference in expressions of prejudice is a clear direction for future research to take.

Limitations

It is important to bear in mind that the theoretical model tested in this research is a White, middle-class model in two respects. First, social dominance theory holds that members of dominant groups in a society—White people in North American society—will be higher in SDO than members of nondominant groups (Sidanius, 1993; Sidanius & Pratto, 1993). Consequently, SDO may play a different role, or no role, in the attitudes held by members of one racial or ethnic minority group toward the White majority or members of other racial or ethnic groups. Second, the data for this research were provided by a sample of predominantly White, middle-class university students, which potentially limits the generalizability of the results to other socioeconomic and racial-ethnic groups.

In addition, although an effort was made to restrict the data analysis to responses of heterosexual participants, some lesbian, gay, or bisexual individuals may have been reluctant to report their sexual orientations as anything other than heterosexual even under conditions of anonymity. Inclusion of these individuals' responses would, of course, add some degree of unwanted variance to the results. However, given the relatively low base rates of bisexuality and homosexuality in the population (e.g., Diamond, 1993), such effects would be minimal.

This study also included only a few groups as targets of prejudice and a few indicators of prejudice toward each group. For example, groups such as Asian Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans were not used as targets of prejudice in this research because it was thought that those groups would not be as salient to the research participants as would African Americans. Although the results of the research were clear for the groups and types of prejudice that were used, replication research should be conducted with other groups and other indicators of prejudice. For example, the following question arises: Does Asian Americans' status as a hardworking "model minority" (e.g., Fiske, 1998) affect the relationship of SDO to responses to that group given that the Protes-

tant work ethic is one of the myths used to justify prejudice by people high in SDO?

Finally, because the sample used in the research was split to form initial analysis and replication groups, any sampling errors that existed in the initial analysis group would also be found in the replication group (Murphy, 1983). Therefore, replication of these results should use an independent sample in order to supplement the within-sample replication that was conducted.

Conclusions

The results of this research indicate that SDO is a primary factor underlying various forms of prejudice: Almost all measures of prejudice loaded with SDO in two analyses, and SDO mediated gender differences in a variety of forms of prejudice. In addition, this research found that RWA is an additional primary factor underlying antigay prejudice. However, because RWA loaded with SDO on the first canonical variate in the cross-validation study, it may also play a secondary role in other forms of prejudice. For example, both SDO and RWA predict various forms of prejudice when included in regression analyses with single indicators of prejudice as the criterion variables (McFarland & Adelson, 1996, 1997). One direction for future research, then, is clarifying the specific roles played by SDO and RWA in prejudice.

Research on SDO has focused on what might be characterized as the opposition of political conservatives to politically liberal social policies (e.g., Pratto et al., 1994; Sidanius et al., 1994, 1996). Future research might profitably focus on the other side of the political coin: opposition by political liberals toward politically conservative groups and social policies. In principle, social dominance theory is politically neutral, holding that a belief in the superiority of one's social groups leads to prejudice and discrimination against other groups; this principle could apply equally to political liberals and conservatives. Because SDO and political conservatism have a minimal modal correlation, $r = .30$ (Pratto et al., 1994; Sidanius et al., 1996; Whitley & Lee, in press), it is quite possible that some political liberals are high in SDO and that their SDO is related to negative attitudes toward conservative political groups and social policies. As Altemeyer (1996) has noted, because there is no necessary relationship between submission to authority and political ideology, psychologists have searched to find a left-wing authoritarianism that parallels RWA. So far, that search has been fruitless. Perhaps the answer lies in SDO rather than authoritarianism.

Finally, the results of the present research supported two propositions of the social dominance model of prejudice: that stereotype endorsement mediates the relationship between SDO and other forms of prejudice and that SDO mediates gender differences in expressions of prejudiced attitudes. These findings add to a growing body of literature that shows SDO is an important variable affecting how individuals approach intergroup relations.

References

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg, Ontario, Canada: University of Manitoba Press.
- Altemeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The authoritarian specter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Altemeyer, B. (1998). The other "authoritarian personality." *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 30, 47–92.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173–1182.
- Basow, S. A. (1992). *Gender: Stereotypes and roles* (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Biernat, M., Vescio, T. K., Theno, S. A., & Crandall, C. S. (1996). Values and prejudice: Toward understanding the impact of American values on outgroup attitudes. In C. Seligman, J. M. Olson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *The psychology of values* (pp. 153–189). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Black, K. N., & Stevenson, M. R. (1984). The relationship of self-reported sex-role characteristics and attitudes toward homosexuality. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 10(1–2), 83–93.
- Christie, R. (1991). Authoritarianism and related constructs. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 501–572). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Crites, S. L., Jr., Fabrigar, L. R., & Petty, R. E. (1994). Measuring the affective and cognitive properties of attitudes: Conceptual and methodological issues. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 619–634.
- Cunningham, J., Dollinger, S. J., Satz, M., & Rotter, N. (1991). Personality correlates of prejudice against AIDS victims. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 29, 165–167.
- Diamond, M. (1993). Homosexuality and bisexuality in different populations. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 22, 291–310.
- Duncan, L. E., Peterson, B. E., & Winter, D. G. (1997). Authoritarianism and gender roles: Toward a psychological analysis of hegemonic relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 41–49.
- Fiske, S. T. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 357–411). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Haddock, G., Zanna, M. P., & Esses, V. M. (1993). Assessing the structure of prejudicial attitudes: The case of attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 1105–1118.
- Johnson, M. E., Brems, C., & Alford-Keating, P. (1997). Personality correlates of homophobia. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 34(1), 57–69.
- Jones, J. M. (1997). *Prejudice and racism* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Judd, C. M., Park, B., Ryan, C. S., Brauer, M., & Kraus, S. (1995). Stereotypes and ethnocentrism: Diverging interethnic perceptions of African American and White American youth. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 468–481.
- Judd, C. M., Smith, E. R., & Kidder, L. H. (1991). *Research methods in social relations* (6th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Kite, M. E., & Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1996). Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexual persons, behaviors, and civil rights: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 336–353.
- LaMar, L., & Kite, M. (1998). Sex differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians: A multidimensional perspective. *Journal of Sex Research*, 35, 189–196.
- McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91–125). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- McFarland, S. G., & Adelson, S. (1996, July). *An omnibus study of individual differences and prejudice*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Society for Political Psychology, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
- McFarland, S. G., & Adelson, S. (1997, July). *Toward a typology of prejudiced persons*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Society for Political Psychology, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- McFarland, S. G., Ageyev, V. S., & Abalakina, M. A. (1992). Authoritarianism in the former Soviet Union. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 1004–1010.
- McFarland, S. G., Ageyev, V. S., & Djintcharadze, N. (1996). Russian authoritarianism two years after communism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 210–217.
- Murphy, K. R. (1983). Fooling yourself with cross-validation: Single sample designs. *Personnel Psychology*, 36, 111–118.
- Noonan, J. R., Barry, J. R., & Davis, H. C. (1970). Personality determinants in attitudes toward visible disability. *Journal of Personality*, 38, 1–15.
- Pedhazur, E. J. (1982). *Multiple regression in behavioral research* (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Peterson, B. E., Doty, R. M., & Winter, D. G. (1993). Authoritarianism and attitudes toward contemporary social issues. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19, 174–184.
- 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, 741–763.
- Sidanius, J. (1993). The psychology of group conflict and the dynamics of oppression: A social dominance perspective. In S. Iyengar & W. J. McGuire (Eds.), *Explorations in political psychology* (pp. 183–219). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1993). The inevitability of oppression and the dynamics of social dominance. In P. M. Sniderman, P. E. Tetlock, & E. G. Carmines (Eds.), *Prejudice, politics, and the American dilemma* (pp. 171–211). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., & Bobo, L. (1994). Social dominance orientation and the political psychology of gender: A case of invariance? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 998–1011.
- Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., & Bobo, L. (1996). Racism, conservatism, affirmative action, and intellectual sophistication: A matter of principled conservatism or group dominance? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 476–490.
- Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 199–214.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper Collins.
- Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1998, August). *Authoritarianism and social dominance orientation as independent dimensions of prejudice*. Paper presented at the 106th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco.
- Whitley, B. E., Jr., & Lee, S. E. (in press). The relationship of authoritarianism and related constructs to attitudes toward homosexuality. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*.

Received September 16, 1998

Revision received January 19, 1999

Accepted January 25, 1999 ■