

# RIGHT-WING AUTHORITARIANISM, SOCIAL DOMINANCE ORIENTATION, EMPATHY, AND MATERIALISTIC VALUE ORIENTATION AS PREDICTORS OF INTERGROUP PREJUDICE IN ARGENTINA\*

## EL AUTORITARISMO DE DERECHA, LA ORIENTACIÓN A LA DOMINANCIA SOCIAL, LA EMPATÍA, Y LA ORIENTACIÓN HACIA LOS VALORES MATERIALES COMO PREDICTORES DEL PREJUICIO INTERGRUPAL EN ARGENTINA

DOI: 10.22199/S07187475.2014.0003.00004

Recibido: 20 de Octubre del 2014 | Aceptado: 02 de Diciembre del 2014

CARLOS M. DÍAZ-LÁZARO<sub>1</sub>; CLAUDIA CASTAÑEIRAS<sub>2</sub>; RUBÉN D. LEDESMA<sub>3</sub>;  
SUSANA VERDINELLI<sub>2</sub>; AVONELLE RAND<sub>2</sub>  
(WALDEN UNIVERSITY - MINNEAPOLIS, Minnesota, United States of America)

### ABSTRACT

The study of individual differences in prejudice has received significant attention in the psychological literature. However, very little research has been published on Latin American countries. To address this gap, 300 residents from the general population in Mar del Plata, Argentina, were surveyed. The main objective of the study was to assess the contributions of right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), social dominance orientation (SDO), empathy, and materialistic value orientation (MVO) to the prediction of ethnic prejudice, heterosexism, hostile sexism, and benevolent sexism after controlling for impression management and socio-demographic factors. Multiple regression analyses identified RWA as the most relevant variable predicting intergroup prejudice; as it contributed to the prediction of all dependent variables. The contributions of SDO, empathy, and MVO depended on the specific type of prejudice assessed. SDO and empathy made a significant statistical contribution to the prediction of ethnic prejudice and heterosexism; while a materialistic value orientation contributed only to the prediction of hostile sexism.

**KEY WORDS:** Authoritarianism, empathy, intergroup prejudice, social dominance.

### RESUMEN

**Introducción:** El estudio de las diferencias individuales en el prejuicio ha recibido mucha atención en la literatura psicológica. Sin embargo, han sido muy pocas las publicaciones de investigaciones en Latinoamérica. **Objetivo:** evaluar las contribuciones del autoritarismo de derecha (RWA), la orientación a la dominancia social (SDO), la empatía, y la orientación hacia valores materiales (MVO) a la predicción del prejuicio étnico, el heterosexismo, el sexismo hostil, y el sexismo benevolente luego de controlar para el manejo de impresión y los factores socio-demográficos. **Método:** fueron encuestados 300 participantes en Mar del Plata, Argentina, con edad entre 19 y 71 años, a través de las Escalas de Autoritarismo de Derecha, Escala de Valores Materiales, y Actitudes hacia la Homosexualidad. **Resultados:** Los análisis de regresión múltiple identificaron al RWA como la variable más importante en la predicción de prejuicio intergrupar; ya que aportó a la predicción de todas las variables dependientes. Las contribuciones de SDO, empatía, y MVO dependieron del prejuicio evaluado. La SDO y la empatía aportaron estadísticamente a la predicción del prejuicio étnico y el heterosexismo; mientras que la orientación hacia los valores materiales solamente a la predicción del sexismo hostil.

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** Autoritarismo, dominancia social, empatía, prejuicio intergrupar.

\* La investigación acá presentada fue financiada por el Faculty Research Initiative Grant (FRIG) de Walden University.

Correspondencia electrónica a: Dr. Carlos M. Díaz-Lázaro, carlos\_diaz\_lazaro@yahoo.com

1.,4.,5. Afiliado a la Walden University — Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States of America.

2. Afiliado a la Universidad Nacional de Mar del Plata, Mar del Plata, Argentina.

3. Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas, Universidad Nacional de Mar del Plata, Mar del Plata, Argentina.

There is little question as to the relevance of studying intergroup prejudice. The pervasiveness of intergroup prejudice worldwide has been well documented (Hogg & Abrams, 2001; Moghaddam, 2011). Psychologists have developed a number of theories in its attempt to understand the issue of intergroup prejudice; a few of which have centered on individual difference variables. The authoritarian personality (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, & Sanford, 1950) was probably the first major attempt at explaining prejudice from a perspective of individual differences. The theory gathered a lot of early interest, mainly spearheaded by high correlations between its flagship scale (F-scale) and different types of prejudices. Critiqued by methodological shortcomings in the development of the scale, as well as its inability to explain the pervasiveness of prejudice, the theory lost favor to socio-cultural and cognitive theories of prejudice in the sixties and seventies (Duckitt, 1992).

The concept of individual differences in prejudice has been re-conceptualized in recent years. Notable are the contributions of Altemeyer (1981; 1988; 2006) on right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) as well as Pratto, Sidanius and colleagues (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994; Pratto, Sidanius, & Levin, 2006) on social dominance orientation (SDO). RWA, which is a revision of Adorno and colleague's authoritarian personality (1950), is defined by Altemeyer (2006, p. 9) as comprising three characteristics rooted in an individual's personality style: "a high degree of submission to the established, legitimate authorities in their society; high levels of aggression in the name of their authorities; and a high level of conventionalism". RWA has been associated with prejudice towards gays and lesbians, Blacks (Altemeyer, 1998), women (Rottenbacher, 2010), Arabs (Webster & Coon, 2004), and immigrants (Quinton, Cowan, & Watson, 1996). Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) refers to 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 construct is composed of two concepts: *group-based dominance*, or the belief that one's group needs to be on top of the social ladder and others at the bottom, and *opposition to equality*, or the belief that groups at the bottom of the social ladder should stay there. Members of privileged groups in society tend to score higher on SDO (Pratto, Sidanius, Malle & Stallworth). Also, those high on SDO tend to oppose groups fighting for social change such as ethnic minorities (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Both RWA and SDO have consistently found to make significant contributions to the variance of general prejudice (Altemeyer, 1998; McFarland, 2010).

Even though RWA and SDO have been the most researched individual differences constructs, there are others which have received attention. For example, empathy has been consistently found to be negatively associated with prejudice (Backstrom & Bjorklund, 2006; Shih, Wang, Trahan, & Stotzer, 2009; Vescio, Sechrist, & Paolucci, 2003; Whitley & Kite, 2006). Most definitions of empathy address its dual dimension: cognitive and affective. The cognitive dimension associated with empathy is more commonly known as "perspective-taking" while the affective component of empathy is simply referred to as "affective empathy" or "sympathy" (Stephan & Finlay, 1999). It should be noted that although most of the research associating RWA and SDO with research has focused on the contributions of these constructs to the prediction of prejudice, most of the research on empathy and prejudice has centered on its role in prejudice reduction. Exceptions to this trend are recent studies by McFarland (2010) which showed dispositional empathy to contribute to the prediction of generalized prejudice, and Díaz-Lázaro and Toro-Alfonso (2014) which found it to contribute to the prediction of ethnic prejudice and heterosexism. Another individual differences

variable which has been implicated in prejudice is that of a materialistic value orientation (MVO), which consists of an individual's prioritizing of acquiring and maintaining material goods as a way of enhancing their quality of life. Kasser, Ryan, Couchman, and Sheldon (2004, p.13) further note that a materialistic value orientation is related to "the belief that it is important to pursue the culturally sanctioned goals of attaining financial success, having nice possessions, having the right image (produced, in large part, through consumer goods), and having high status (defined mostly by the size of one's pocketbook and the scope of one's possessions)". Roets, Van Hiel, and Cornelis (2006) found MVO as a predictor of racism. According to the authors MVO constitutes a third dimension uniquely contributing to the variance in racism. In addition, Díaz-Lázaro and Toro-Alfonso (2014) found MVO as statistically contributing to the prediction of benevolent sexism, although not to the prediction of hostile sexism, ethnic prejudice and heterosexism.

#### Theoretical Models of Individual Differences and Intergroup Prejudice

The individual differences' perspective assumes that there are several variables which consistently predict generalized prejudice (Son Hing & Zanna, 2010). This means that variables such as authoritarianism, social dominance, empathy, and materialism should be implicated in the prediction of a variety of different types of prejudice, not just one or two. Thus, these individual difference variables are expected to be general factors predicting prejudice related to a variety of social dimensions such as religious affiliation, ethnicity, sexual orientation, ability, and socio-economic status, among others. Another assumption of this perspective includes that there are specific psychological processes that account for the relationship of these individual difference factors and intergroup prejudice. In Adorno et al's (1950) classic conceptualization

prejudice develops primarily as a defense mechanism (i.e. displacement) rooted from experiencing an extremely rigid parenting style. Instead of openly confronting repressive parental figures which they outwardly love and admire but inwardly reproach, individuals displace this conflict toward a less threatening object: individuals from marginalized groups in society. It is relevant to note that authoritarianism was originally conceptualized as a personality style. Nevertheless more recent conceptualizations have suggested it as a socio-ideological attitude or belief (Son Hing & Zanna, 2010).

With the emergence of social dominance as a relevant individual differences variable, in recent years several theoretical models have been developed in order to explain the psychological processes implicated in the relationship between individual difference constructs and intergroup prejudice. Most of these models attempt to explain the strong contributions of RWA and SDO to prejudice. Probably the first of these attempts was advanced by Altemeyer (1998) who in a paper titled "The 'Other' Authoritarian Personality" made the distinction between a submissive personality style as associated with RWA and a dominant personality style as associated with SDO. Thus, Altemeyer argues that RWA and SDO are two different but related expressions of authoritarianism.

One of the explanations which has received most attention is Duckitt's Dual Process Model (Duckitt, 2001; Duckitt & Sibley, 2009; Duckitt, Wagner, du Plessis, & Birum, 2002). The model focuses on motivational factors associated with RWA and SDO. It conceptualizes both RWA and SDO as social attitudes or ideological beliefs, rather than personality factors. Furthermore, in line with this conceptualization as social attitudes or ideological beliefs, both RWA and SDO should be able to express specific motivational goals which are activated by highly salient social schemas (Duckitt,

Wagner, du Plessis, & Birum). More specifically, these authors contend that RWA is associated to “the motivational goal of social control and security, activated by a view of the world as dangerous and threatening” while SDO is associated to “motivational goals of power, dominance, and superiority over others” activated by viewing the world as a “competitive jungle” (Duckitt, Wagner, du Plessis, & Birum, p. 76-77).

Duckitt's (2001) Dual Process Model focuses on the motivational processes involved in the development of authoritarianism and social dominance as social attitudes and beliefs. Several approaches, however, have focused on group and situational processes (e.g. Duckitt, 1989; Kreindler, 2005). For example, Kreindler's (2005) Dual Group-Process Model conceptualizes individual differences in intergroup prejudice as associated to group dynamics and identification. Her basis premise is that RWA responds to normative-based group processes while SDO to category-based processes. Previous literature had identified that RWA is related to intragroup attitudes while SDO to intergroup attitudes (Pratto et al 1994; Whitley, 1999). That is, those high in RWA are more interested in group conformity (intra-group processes) while those high in SDO more interested in intergroup competition (based on their goal for superiority and dominance). This distinction also fits also with the association of RWA with cultural conservatism and SDO with economic conservatism (Duckitt, 2001; Duriez & Van Hiel, 2002; Duriez, Van Hiel, & Kossowska, 2005). Contrary to Altemeyer's claim of RWA and SDO being anchored in personality styles, Kreindler focuses on two normal group processes: category differentiation and normative differentiation. SDO is associated with category differentiation, which accounts for conflict in intergroup settings and is explained by social identity theory. According to Kreindler (2005, p. 96) “Category differentiation

contributes to a positive social identity by establishing the ingroup's superiority over other groups”. It is argued that SDO can be predicted by identification with group in a particular structural position, and that this group identification is determined by multiple contextual factors. Thus, Kreindler's conceptualization of SDO draws the construct much further away from a personality-based one. RWA, on the other hand, responds to normative differentiation processes as it reflects conflicts in intragroup settings which are explained by Turner's Self-Categorization Theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987) and the Subjective Group Dynamics Model (Abrams, Rutland & Cameron, 2003). Kreindler (2005, p. 96) asserts that “normative differentiation contributes to a positive social identity by promoting the longevity and legitimacy of ingroup norms” and further associates authoritarianism with a “desire to uphold group norms and to ensure that these norms are maintained” (p. 97).

Probably one of the more ambitious attempts at explaining the psychosocial mechanisms associated with individual differences variables has been Jost, Glasser, Kruglanski, and Sulloways' (2003) Motivated Social Cognition model. The Motivated Social Cognition model aims at accounting for factors associated with the holding of a political conservative ideology and thus does not deal neither exclusively nor primarily with RWA and SDO. However, it integrates these two key individual differences variables in a comprehensive approach to make sense of a number of constructs associated with political conservative ideology. The model is conceptually anchored by three theories: lay epistemics (Kruglanski, 1989), regulatory focus (Higgins, 1997), and terror management (Greenberg, Pyszczynski, & Solomon, 1986). Based on these theories, the motivated social cognitive approach argues that holding political conservative beliefs is associated with specific

psychological needs which could stem either from individual differences and/or social-situational factors. Jost and colleagues argue that a personality-based conceptualization of political conservatism, although a good starting point, is incomplete. So, although acknowledging the relevance of early theories such as Adorno's authoritarian personality, it also identifies the relevance of situational and contextual factors. Of particular relevance is their identification of system instability and related threatening factors as influencing conservatism in specific populations. Described as a hot-cognitive (as opposed to cold-cognitive) approach, the Motivated Social Cognition perspective identifies the need to reduce fear, anxiety, and uncertainty, as key to the development and maintenance of a political conservative belief system. This need to reduce fear, anxiety, and uncertainty is hypothesized to account for the core aspects of political conservatism: resistance to change and endorsement of social inequality. Following this line of thinking, RWA has been associated with resistance to change, as apparent from its focus on the preservation of traditional values and ways of life; and SDO associated with the rejection of social equality, apparent in its focus on group competition and ingroup superiority. The model posits "that a kind of matching process takes place whereby people adopt ideological belief systems (such as conservatism, RWA, and SDO) that are most likely to satisfy their psychological needs and motives (such as needs for order, structure, and closure and the avoidance of uncertainty or threat)" (Jost et al, 2003, p. 341).

We have presented a few key theoretical models accounting for some of the psychosocial processes associated with individual difference variables and intergroup prejudice. Several general themes can be identified from these theories and/or conceptual approaches. First, it is quite apparent that these theories focus

almost exclusively on RWA and SDO. Although both RWA and SDO have been found to be consistently associated with intergroup prejudice, there are other individual difference variables which have also been found relevant (McFarland, 2010). Second, there has been an increasing attempt to integrate both dispositional and social-situational variables. Although initially conceptualized almost exclusively as personality-based, explanations on the influence of individual difference on intergroup prejudice have evolved to include much more flexible conceptualizations. Notwithstanding ongoing debate as to the weight of dispositional, group-based processes, and situational factors, current perspectives do acknowledge the relevance of all of these factors. Furthermore, recent conceptualizations have attempted to include motivational, social, and cognitive factors. In order to further identify the impact of dispositional, group-based processes, and situational, and motivational factors in the development and maintenance of intergroup prejudice, the relevance of research done in countries other than the traditional US, Canada, and Europe becomes key, as we can expect the meaning and relationships of these constructs to differ based on cultural factors.

#### Rationale and Research Question of Current Study

Research on prejudice is relatively widespread in the U.S., Canada, and Europe, and significant contributions have been made in other regions as well. However, there has been a lack of research in Latin American countries (Smith-Castro, 2006). In the specific area of individual differences and intergroup prejudice, although there are published studies which include either measures of authoritarianism, social dominance or other individual difference variables (e.g. Cárdenas & Parra, 2010; Cárdenas, Meza, Lagunes, & Yañez, 2010; Hays, Carvacho, Gonzales, Manzi & Segovia, 2009; Rottenbacher, 2009; Zubieta, Delfino, & Fernández, 2009), or

measures of prejudice (e.g. Toro Alfonso & Varas Díaz, 2004; Vaamonde, 2010), only Rottenbacher (2010) and Díaz-Lázaro and Toro-Alfonso (2014) has directly assessed the association between the two.

Although there have been significant contributions to the literature on individual differences and prejudice in other regions, the results of these studies cannot be assumed to generalize to Latin American countries, particularly when we take into consideration social, cultural, economic, and political differences between regions. For example, many Latin American countries (included Argentina) have experienced significant political and economic crises which are likely to affect the meaning of socio-political ideologies for individuals in these countries. Therefore our study aims at making a contribution to fill this gap by assessing the impact of several individual difference factors to the prediction of intergroup prejudice in a sample of Argentinians. The potential effects of both social desirability in self report research (Paulhus, 1984) as well as socio-demographic on prejudice (McFarland, 2010), few published articles control for these factors. Therefore in our study we control the effects of impression management as well as several socio-demographic variables. Our main research question is: After controlling for impression management and sociodemographic factors, do RWA, SDO, empathy, and MVO significantly contribute to the prediction of ethnic prejudice, heterosexism, benevolent sexism, and hostile sexism? Related to this core question, we were interested in finding whether results in other countries compare to those in Argentina (a Latin American country with a relatively recent history of political and social repressive government and with a significant share of economic crises). Furthermore we are interested to know whether these individual difference variables account for generalized prejudice. Consistent with this we would expect for these variables to predict multiple forms of

prejudice. Our study will extend on previous research by assessing whether the construct of materialism in the study of prejudice has relevance in the Argentinean context. More specifically we hypothesize that RWA, SDO, empathy, and MVO will make a statistically significant contribution to the prediction of ethnic prejudice, heterosexism, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism after controlling for impression management and socio-demographic factors. To test this hypothesis, three hierarchical multiple regression analyses were ran. For this purpose a cross-sectional, correlational research design was proposed.

## METHOD

### Participants

All data was collected in the city of Mar del Plata, Argentina. Of a total sample of 300 participants, 109 (36%) were identified as male and 191 (64%) as female. In relation to nationality, 290 (97%) identified themselves as Argentinean while 10 (3%) as from other nationalities. A very high number of participants, 277 (92%) self-identified racially as white, while 23 (8%) as "mestizo" (mixed race). Age ranged from 19 to 71. With regards to sexual orientation, 294 (98%) participants identified themselves as heterosexual while 6 (2%) as gay, lesbian or bisexual.

### Materials

Nine self-report surveys were administered in a single packet. Demographic questionnaire and impression management surveys were used as control measures. Four surveys measured our independent variables while three measured our dependent variables. All of the surveys (with the exception of the demographic questionnaire) used 5-point response format Likert-scales. Three of the instruments (Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale, Material Values Scale and Homosexual Attitudes Survey) were adapted and translated using back-translation and other cross-cultural

adaptation strategies as suggested by Brislin (1986). The instruments were pilot tested and found to have adequate internal reliability (Author, 2010). Minor item modifications were made after pilot testing. Descriptive statistics for these measures are reported in Table 1.

TABLE 1.  
Descriptive Statistics for Selected Key Variables.

|                      | Descriptive Statistics |     |       |       |
|----------------------|------------------------|-----|-------|-------|
|                      | Min                    | Max | Mean  | SD    |
| RWAS                 | 20                     | 90  | 49.96 | 14.01 |
| SDO                  | 16                     | 75  | 33.40 | 11.35 |
| IRI                  | 26                     | 70  | 55.09 | 8.53  |
| MVS                  | 17                     | 67  | 36.95 | 9.72  |
| EPA                  | 20                     | 84  | 44.17 | 13.15 |
| HAS                  | 21                     | 105 | 42.90 | 18.35 |
| Hostile<br>Sexism    | 11                     | 55  | 33.20 | 9.69  |
| Benevolent<br>Sexism | 11                     | 53  | 33.26 | 9.33  |

Note: n = 300 for all scales.

A 9-item demographic survey was completed by all participants. This survey asked respondents basic demographic information such as gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, education level, and income.

The Right-Wing Authoritarian Scale (RWAS: Altemeyer, 2006) consists of 20-items capturing three broad attitudes: authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, and conventionalism. Low scores indicate low authoritarianism while high scores a high degree of authoritarianism. Cronbach's alpha coefficient for our Spanish-version of the RWAS was .87.

The Social Dominance Orientation (Version 6) Scale (SDO-6: Pratto, Sidanius, & Levin 2006) was used to measure SDO. The SDOS consists of 16-items asking

about how positively or negatively respondents feel about the statements. Higher scores in the scale are associated with higher levels of SDO, while lower scores a lower level of SDO. For our study we made minor wording changes to the Spanish-language translation of Silván-Ferrero and Bustillos (2007). Cronbach's alpha coefficient for our study was .85.

The 15-item Material Values Scale (MVS) (Richins and Dawson, 1992; Richins, Mick, & Monroe, 2004) was used for the purposes of measuring a materialistic value orientation in our study. In our sample, a .82 Cronbach's alpha was obtained.

The Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI: Davis, 1983) is a multidimensional scale measuring empathy. For our study we used a two-factor version consisting of the empathic concern and perspective taking subscales as these two factors better reflect the dual (affective and cognitive) dimension model. We made modifications to the Pérez-Albeniz, de Paul, Exteberria, Montes, and Torres (2003) translation. These modifications included minor wording changes to increase comprehension for our study's population as well as taking out adverbs of frequency, as suggested by Brislin's (1986) item modification guidelines. Our two-factor IRI consisted of 14-items. Scale reliability analysis for our study's two-factor IRI resulted in a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .83.

The Argentinean Ethnic Prejudice Scale (Escala de Prejuicio Etnico Argentino: EPEA) was developed for this study as a culturally relevant prejudice scale for the Argentinean population. Most of the 20 items came from the Manitoba Prejudice Scale (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992), but carefully adapted to reflect the major ethnic minority and immigrant groups in Argentina. In our sample, a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .90 was obtained as internal consistency measure of the scale.

The Homosexuality Attitude Scale (HAS: Kite & Deaux, 1986) was included in our study to assess heterosexism (i.e. negative attitudes towards gays and lesbians). The HAS is a 21-item scale using a Likert scale response format. An internal reliability of the (Cronbach's alpha coefficient) of .94 was obtained in our sample.

The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI: Glick & Fiske, 1996) was included as a measure of sexism. For our study we made minor modifications to the Expósito, Moya, and Glick's (1998) Spanish-language version. In our study, internal consistency coefficients were computed at .85 for benevolent sexism and .88 for hostile sexism.

The Impression Management scale (IM) of the Balance Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR: Paulhus, 1984) was used to assess participants' tendency to present themselves in a positive manner. The scale consists of 20-items which can be scored continuously or dichotomously. For our study we used a continuous scoring method based on Stöber, Dette, and Musch's (2002) suggestions. Minor wording changes were made to Gallardo's (1999) Spanish translation of the scale. Internal

reliability coefficient for the IM yielded .75 in our sample.

Procedures

Participants were selected from the general population in the city of Mar del Plata, Argentina. Data was collected by a senior researcher and three graduate students. Potential participants were approached individually and asked if they were interested in completing a survey on social issues. Prospective participants received information in writing (informed consent as approved by the Institutional Human Research Review Board) regarding the study. Participants were compensated for their time and involvement with 30 Argentine Pesos (about 8 dollars based on the currency exchange at that time). Surveys were filled-out anonymously and took an average of 35 to 40 minutes to complete. Surveyors reviewed completed packets for missing information and redirected participants to complete any missing items if necessary. All stimuli were presented in Spanish-language.

RESULTS

Overall, results supported our major hypotheses. Table 2 shows the correlation matrix for the key variables of interest.

TABLE 2.  
Correlations Among Variables of Interest.

|                   | 1      | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5    | 6      | 7      | 8      | 9     | 10    | 11    | 12    | 13 |
|-------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----|
| 1 Imp. Mgmt.      | --     |        |        |        |      |        |        |        |       |       |       |       |    |
| 2 Age             | .32**  | --     |        |        |      |        |        |        |       |       |       |       |    |
| 3 Gender          | .24**  | .02    | --     |        |      |        |        |        |       |       |       |       |    |
| 4 Education       | -.14** | -.34** | .10*   | --     |      |        |        |        |       |       |       |       |    |
| 5 Income          | -.13*  | .01    | -.16** | .22**  | --   |        |        |        |       |       |       |       |    |
| 6 RWA             | .12*   | .19**  | -.02   | -.22** | -.04 | --     |        |        |       |       |       |       |    |
| 7 SDO             | -.26** | -.02   | -.13*  | -.10*  | -.08 | .49**  | --     |        |       |       |       |       |    |
| 8 Empathy         | .29**  | .06    | .35**  | .11*   | .06  | -.39** | -.59** | --     |       |       |       |       |    |
| 9 Materialism     | -.32** | -.03   | -.20** | -.04   | -.04 | .30**  | .46**  | -.39** | --    |       |       |       |    |
| 10 Ethnic Prej.   | -.11*  | .15**  | -.12*  | -.25** | -.09 | .64**  | .66**  | -.60** | .37** | --    |       |       |    |
| 11 Heterosexism   | .00    | .19**  | -.21** | -.21** | .05  | .71**  | .50**  | -.47** | .33** | .61** | --    |       |    |
| 12 Hostile Sexism | -.09   | .09    | -.17** | -.29** | -.00 | .52**  | .42**  | -.39** | .34** | .52** | .46** | --    |    |
| 13 Ben. Sexism    | .05    | .16**  | -.10*  | -.18** | -.06 | .52**  | .23**  | -.17** | .20** | .32** | .33** | .46** | -- |

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).  
\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).  
n = 300 for all scales. Gender was coded 1 for males and 2 for females

## Multiple Regression Analyses

Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were used to test major hypotheses (See Table 3). Our independent variables were RWA, SDO, empathy, and MVO. Our dependent variables were ethnic prejudice, heterosexism, hostile sexism, and benevolent sexism. In the four multiple

regression analyses the effects of impression management were controlled by entering this variable in the first step. The effects of the socio-demographic variables (i.e. age, gender, income, and educational level) were also controlled by entering these in the second step.

TABLE 3.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Ethnic Prejudice, Heterosexism, Hostile Sexism, and Benevolent Sexism.

| Predictor          | Type of Prejudice |         |              |        |                |         |                   |         |
|--------------------|-------------------|---------|--------------|--------|----------------|---------|-------------------|---------|
|                    | Ethnic            |         | Heterosexism |        | Hostile Sexism |         | Benevolent Sexism |         |
|                    | $\Delta R^2$      | $\beta$ | $\Delta R^2$ | B      | $\Delta R^2$   | $\beta$ | $\Delta R^2$      | $\beta$ |
| Step 1             | .01               |         | .00          |        | .01            |         | .00               |         |
| IM                 |                   | -.11    |              | .00    |                | -.09    |                   |         |
| Step 2             | .09**             |         | .10**        |        | .10**          |         | .05**             |         |
| Age                |                   | .14*    |              | .14*   |                | .03     |                   | .12     |
| Gender             |                   | -.07    |              | -.19** |                | -.11    |                   | -.11    |
| Education          |                   | -.20**  |              | -.15*  |                | -.28**  |                   | -.12    |
| Income             |                   | -.08    |              | .05    |                | .03     |                   | -.05    |
| Step 3             | .53**             |         | .49**        |        | .26**          |         | .25**             |         |
| RWA                |                   | .35**   |              | .56**  |                | .37**   |                   | .55**   |
| SDO                |                   | .31**   |              | .13*   |                | .10     |                   | -.04    |
| Empathy            |                   | -.28**  |              | -.13*  |                | -.09    |                   | .10     |
| MVS                |                   | .01     |              | .05    |                | .12*    |                   | .05     |
| Total $\Delta R^2$ | .63**             |         | .59**        |        | .38**          |         | .30**             |         |

\* $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .  
n = 300 for all scales.

**Ethnic prejudice.** Impression management (Step 1) explained 1% of the variance in ethnic prejudice,  $F(1, 298) = 3.33$ ,  $p = .067$ . Socio-demographic variables (Step 2) explained 9.2%,  $R$  squared change .092,  $F$  change (4, 294) = 9.42 of the variance. The total variance explained by second model as a whole was that of 10.3 %,  $R$  squared = .103,  $F(5, 294) = 6.75$ ,  $p < .001$ . In Step 3, the independent variables (RWA, SDO, empathy, and MVO) accounted for an

additional 53.1% of the variance in ethnic prejudice,  $R$  squared change = .531,  $F$  change (4, 290), = 105.04,  $p < .001$ . The total variance explained by the whole model was 63.4%,  $F(9, 290) = 55.74$ ,  $p < .001$ . In the final model, five variables reached statistical significance: RWA ( $beta = .35$ ,  $p < .001$ ), SDO ( $beta = .31$ ,  $p < .001$ ), empathy ( $beta = -.28$ ,  $p < .001$ ), educational level ( $beta = -.09$ ,  $p = .034$ ), and age ( $beta = .09$ ,  $p = .033$ ).

**Heterosexism.** Impression management (Step 1) explained less than 1% of the variance in heterosexism,  $F(1, 298) = .005$ ,  $p = .96$ . Socio-demographic variables (Step 2) explained 10%,  $R$  squared change = 0.10,  $F$  change (4, 294) = 8.11,  $p < .001$ , of the variance in ethnic prejudice. The total variance contribution for this second model as a whole was 10%,  $R$  square = .10,  $F(5, 294) = 6.49$ ,  $p < .001$ . In Step 3, the independent variables (i.e. RWA, SDO, empathy, and materialism) accounted for an additional 48.2% of the variance in heterosexism,  $R$  squared change = .49,  $F$  change (4, 290) = 84.86,  $p < .001$ . The total variance explained by the whole model was 59%,  $R$  square = .590,  $F(9, 290) = 45.43$ ,  $p < .001$ . In the final model, four variables were statistically significant: RWA ( $beta = .56$ ,  $p < .001$ ), empathy ( $beta = -.13$ ,  $p = .012$ ), SDO ( $beta = .13$ ,  $p = .018$ ), and gender ( $beta = -.13$ ,  $p = .003$ ).

**Hostile sexism.** Impression management (Step 1) explained 1% of the variance in ambivalent sexism,  $F(1, 298) = 2.65$ ,  $p = .11$ . Socio-demographic variables (Step 2) explained 10%,  $R$  squared change = 0.10,  $F$  change (4, 294) = 8.50,  $p < .001$ , of the variance in hostile sexism. The total variance contribution for this second model as a whole was 11%,  $R$  square = .11,  $F(5, 294) = 7.39$ ,  $p < .001$ . In Step 3, RWA, SDO, empathy, and materialism accounted for an additional 26% of the variance in hostile sexism,  $R$  squared change = .26,  $F$  change (4, 291) = 30.55,  $p < .001$ . The total variance explained by the whole model was 38%,  $R$  square = .38,  $F(9, 290) = 19.33$ ,  $p < .001$ . In the final model, three variables were statistically significant: RWA ( $beta = .37$ ,  $p < .001$ ), educational level ( $beta = -.20$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and materialism ( $beta = .12$ ,  $p = .03$ ).

**Benevolent sexism.** Impression management (Step 1) explained less than 1% of the variance in ambivalent sexism,  $F(1, 298) = .85$ ,  $p = .36$ . Socio-demographic variables (Step 2) explained 5%,  $R$  squared change = 0.05,  $F$  change (4, 294) = 4.05,  $p$

= .003, of the variance in benevolent sexism. The total variance contribution for this second model as a whole was 5.5%,  $R$  square = .055,  $F(5, 294) = 3.42$ ,  $p = .005$ . In Step 3, RWA, SDO, empathy, and materialism accounted for an additional 25% of the variance in benevolent sexism,  $R$  squared change = .25,  $F$  change (4, 291) = 25.42,  $p < .001$ . The total variance explained by the whole model was 30%,  $R$  square = .30,  $F(9, 290) = 13.83$ ,  $p < .001$ . In the final model, two variables were statistically significant: RWA ( $beta = .55$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and gender ( $beta = -.12$ ,  $p < .028$ ).

## DISCUSSION

It has been argued that individual difference factors predict generalized prejudice (Duckitt & Sibley, 2007). It is assumed, then, that individuals who are prejudice toward a particular outgroup are likely to also have negative evaluations of other outgroups as well (Son Hing & Zanna, 2010). We were interested in determining if RWA, SDO, empathy, and MVO would predict generalized prejudice. Based on the factors entering our regression models for the different types of prejudices, we have to respond to this question with “yes”, but it depends on the variable. There was a factor which in our sample significantly contributed to levels of prejudice towards ethnic groups, gays and lesbians, and women. This factor is RWA. RWA was the highest contributor to the prediction of the dependent variables in all of the regression models. SDO and empathy made statistically significant contributions to the variance in levels of prejudice towards ethnic groups and sexual minorities, but not women. MVO only contributed to the prediction of hostile sexism. How do we account for this?

In assessing the contribution of independent factors in the prediction of variance of a dependent variable it is relevant to evaluate the independence among these factors, since such orthogonality would point out to the potential

effect of each factor on the dependent variable. Previous research had originally found RWA and SDO to have low to non-statistically significant bivariate correlations. First we must note the correlation found in our study between RWA and SDO ( $r = .49, p < .001$ ) which is higher than the ones in McFarland and Adelson's (1996) .21 and .07, and Pratto and Sidanius' (1994) .14 (ns). It must be noted, however, that recently Cárdenas, Meza, League, and Yañez (2010) reported a .34 association between RWA and SDO in a Chilean sample and Rottenbacher (2010) reported a .42 association in a Peruvian sample. Although our level of association between RWA and SDO still confirms discriminant validity of these constructs for our sample, it does raise questions as to potential cross-cultural factors related to political and social ideologies influencing their measurement. In Canadian and American samples SDO is clearly and consistently found to have higher associations with prejudice as compared with RWA (See Altemeyer, 1998, for a review). However, in our study, the associations of RWA and SDO with ethnic prejudice were comparable (.64 and .66 respectively), but marked differences were seen in associations with heterosexism (.70 and .50), hostile sexism (.52 and .42) and particularly benevolent sexism (.52 and .23). Even in the case of ethnic prejudice where there was a slightly higher association with SDO, it did not result in a higher contribution in the regression model, as RWA still had the highest single contribution. This may also indicate that at least in our sample, RWA's contribution was less mediated by demographic factors. Another possible explanation for discrepancies in our study's results as compared to samples from other countries is based on the right-left political continuum. It has been argued that in countries with a broad left to right wing ideology spectrum, RWA and SDO could influence one another as both refer to the right (Duckitt, 2001; Duriez, Van Hiel, and Kossowska, 2005). On the other hand, in countries without relevant left-wing parties

such as in the U.S. and Canada, there should be a lower association between RWA and SDO. Argentina could be argued represents the former political context in which there are important political parties along the left-right-wing spectrum. Related to this, Van Hiel, Duriez, and Kossowska (2010) have argued that RWA and SDO account for two different types of conservatism. RWA has been associated with cultural conservatism and SDO with economic conservatism. It could be that in the case of Argentina, cultural conservatism as exemplified by RWA is the significant ideological factor related to generalized prejudice, while other factors play a secondary role.

In further analyzing the overwhelmingly significant impact of RWA in accounting for levels of prejudice across the board, it must be noted that Argentina has had a recent history of right-wing military government (1976 to 1983) in which the country suffered through tremendous political and social repression (Jones, 2010). It has been argued that living in repressive governments and under conditions of significant fear and conflict has a marked impact on the construction of individual and collective meaning (Barrero Cuellar, 2008). It could be that after having experienced the repression of an authoritarian government, participants in our study were particularly sensitive to the RWAS. In fact, after pilot-testing our Spanish-language version of the RWAS our team decided to lessen the intensity of some of the scale items as participants disclosed having strong emotional reactions to its content (Author, 2010). Further research could explore the ways in which history of recent military dictatorship or repressive governments moderates the relationship between RWA, SDO, and prejudice. Furthermore the role of system instability, as identified by Jost et al's (2003) conceptualization of political conservatism is also worth considering. It can be argued that Argentina's history of political and economic instability makes it particularly sensitive to

the threat of change. That is, in a country with significant political, social, and economic instability, change is highly overrated for some. Many individuals would rather take their chance with a strong and traditional leader even at the expense of potentially jeopardizing the rights of marginalized social groups. On the other hand, being very aware of the damaging effects of an authoritarian government, others may be highly motivated to stir away from leadership associated with the singling out of any social, political, or cultural group. So, it is possible that this ambivalence (i.e. wanting a strong leader but without infringing on group rights) is what makes RWA construct particularly relevant in predicting intergroup prejudice in Argentina.

Finally, it does appear that although our results support the relevance of individual difference constructs, these do not fit the prevailing two-prong explanatory model as suggested by Duckitt's Dual Processes Model (2001), Kreindler's Group-Process Model (2003) or Jost et al's Motivated Social Cognition Model (2003). Although these perspectives do an adequate job at explaining processes related to RWA and SDO and intergroup prejudice, they do not appropriately address the role of other factors, particularly that of empathy. Our results support a three-prong model, as the contributions of empathy to intergroup prejudice should not be minimized. It had been suggested that the contributions of empathy on intergroup prejudice were mostly moderated by social dominance orientation. However, our study's results (see also McFarland, 2010) clearly presents empathy as contributing uniquely above SDO and RWA. Although SDO and RWA's recent conceptualization as socio-ideological attitudes or beliefs has tremendously added to the field, it is less clear as how to conceptualize empathy. Recently, Son Hing and Zanna (2010) have advanced the concept of egalitarian-humanism as relevant to intergroup prejudice (see also Son Hing, Chung-Yan, Hamilton & Zanna, 2008).

According to these authors a key factor related to intergroup prejudice is the combination of an egalitarian value orientation with the identification, relatedness and similarity with outgroup members. Although contrasted with the construct of empathy, which was defined as the ability to understand others emotions, their correlation was noted. It is possible that empathy's association with intergroup prejudice may have to do with focusing on the individual as a human being (superordinate category) as opposed to a group-based categorization. That is, in connecting to the other person's experience (whether an emotional or cognitive connection) we focus not on that person's group memberships but their humanity. It appears that empathy's negative association with intergroup prejudice is related to the ability to connect with others above and beyond their group memberships. A more coherent integration of RWA, SDO, and empathy is needed in order to truly develop an explanatory model of the relation between individual difference variables and intergroup prejudice.

## CONCLUSION

Our results have special significance as it is the first study that we have knowledge of which directly addresses the contributions of individual difference variables in prejudice in a sample of Argentinians. In fact, research directly testing the association between individual differences and intergroup prejudice in Latin America is virtually non-existent. This is particularly surprising when you consider the wealth of research done in this area in other regions of the world. Our results do suggest that RWA, SDO, empathy and MVO do contribute to predicting changes in prejudice. RWA turned out to be the only factor to contribute to the prediction of all of the types of prejudices assessed as well as being by far the most significant contributor to generalized prejudice. The contribution of the other individual difference factors depended on the type of prejudice assessed. Notwithstanding the literature's

focus on mostly RWA and SDO as the key individual difference variables contributing to prejudice, our findings suggest that both empathy and MVO are variables worthy of more attention. Finally, we would like to echo McFarland's conclusion regarding the possibility of some roots of generalized prejudice to be culture or context specific (2010). Although there are several individual differences variables which appear to be relevant cross-culturally, there is considerable variation on the impact of each of these in specific regions. Further research is needed in Latin America, Asia, and Africa in order to more thoroughly assess the cross-cultural validity of individual difference models developed within a limited geographical and cultural perspective.

## REFERENCIAS

- Author. (2010, Agosto). *Autoritarismo, Dominancia Social, Empatía, y Materialismo como Predictores de la Varianza del Prejuicio en Mar del Plata Argentina: Resultados Preliminares*. Cartel Interactivo (Póster) presentado en el III Congreso Regional de la Sociedad Interamericana de Psicología. Asunción, Paraguay.
- Abrams, D., Rutland, A., & Cameron, L. (2003). The development of subjective group dynamics: Children's judgments of normative and deviant in-group and out-group individuals. *Child Development, 74*(6), 1840–1856.
- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. Oxford, England: Harpers.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-Wing Authoritarianism*. Winnipeg, Canada: University of Manitoba Press.
- Altemeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of Freedom: Understanding Right-Wing Authoritarianism*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. E. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest, and prejudice. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 2*(2), 113-133.
- Altemeyer, B. (1998). The other "authoritarian" personality. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 30*, 47-91.
- Altemeyer, B. (2006). The authoritarians. <http://home.cc.umanitoba.ca/~altemey>
- Bäckström, M., & Björklund, F. (2007). Structural modeling of generalized prejudice: The role of social dominance, authoritarianism, and empathy. *Journal of Individual Differences, 28*(1), 10–17.
- Barrero Cuellar, E. (2008). Psicología social del autoritarismo: Apuntes para una psico-historia del conflicto armado colombiano. *Tesis Psicológica, 3*, 86-97.

- Brislin, R. W. (1986). The wording and translation of research instruments. In W. J. Lonner & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Field methods in cross-cultural research*, Cross-cultural research and methodology series; Vol. 8 (pp. 137-164). Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage Publications.
- Cárdenas, M., Meza, P., Lagues, K., & Yañez, S. (2010). Adaptación y validación de la escala de orientación a la dominancia social (SDO) en una muestra Chilena. *Universitas Psychologica*, 9(1), 161-168.
- Cárdenas, M., & Parra, L. (2010). Adaptación y validación de la escala abreviada de autoritarismos de derecha (RWA) en una muestra chilena. *Revista de Psicología*, 19(1),
- Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(1), 113-126.
- Díaz-Lázaro, C. M., & Toro-Alfonso, J. (2014). La contribución estadística del autoritarismo, la dominancia social, la empatía y el materialismo a la varianza del prejuicio intergrupal en Puerto Rico. *Revista Puertorriqueña de Psicología*, 25(1), 118-137.61-79.
- Duckitt, J. (1989). Authoritarianism and group identification: A new view of an old construct. *Political Psychology*, 10(1), 63-84.
- Duckitt, J. H. (1992). Psychology and prejudice: A historical analysis and integrative framework. *American Psychologist*, 47(10), 1182-1193.
- Duckitt, J. (2001). A dual-process cognitive-motivational theory of ideology and prejudice. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Vol. 33. (pp. 41-113). San Diego, CA US: Academic Press.
- Duckitt, J., & Sibley, C. G. (2007). Right wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation and the dimensions of generalized prejudice. *European Journal of Personality*, 21(2), 113-130.
- Duckitt, J., & Sibley, C. G. (2009). A dual-process motivational model of ideology, politics, and prejudice. *Psychological Inquiry*, 20(2-3), 98-109.
- Duckitt, J., Wagner, C., du Plessis, I., & Birum, I. (2002). The psychological bases of ideology and prejudice: Testing a dual process model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(1), 75-93. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.83.1.75
- Duriez, B., & Van Hiel, A. (2002). The march of modern fascism: A comparison of social dominance orientation and authoritarianism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32, 1199-1213.
- Duriez, B., Van Hiel, A., & Kossowska, M. (2005). Authoritarianism and Social Dominance in Western and Eastern Europe: The Importance of the Sociopolitical Context and of Political Interest and Involvement. *Political Psychology*, 26(2), 299-320.
- Expósito, F., Moya, M. C., & Glick, P. (1998). Sexismo ambivalente: medición y correlatos. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 13(2), 159-169.
- Gallardo, R.Y. (1999). Chilean translation of the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR-6). Unpublished scale. University of Concepción, Chile.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 491-512.
- Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., & Solomon, S. (1986). The causes and consequences of the need for self-esteem: A terror management theory. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *Public self and private self* (pp. 189-207). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52, 1280-1300.

- Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (2001). *Intergroup relations: Essential readings*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Jones, A. (2011). *Genocide: A comprehensive introduction*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. J. (2003). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 339–375.
- Jugert, P., & Duckitt, J. (2009). A motivational model of authoritarianism: Integrating personal and situational determinants. *Political Psychology*, 30(5), 693–719.
- Jugert, P., Cohrs, J. C., & Duckitt, J. (2009). Inter- and intrapersonal processes underlying authoritarianism: The role of social conformity and personal need for structure. *European Journal of Personality*, 23(7), 607–621.
- Kasser, T., Ryan, R. M., Couchman, C. E., & Sheldon, K. M. (2004). Materialistic values: Their causes and consequences. *Psychology and consumer culture: The struggle for a good life in a materialistic world.*, 11-28. Washington DC: American Psychological Association
- Kite, M. E., & Deaux, K. (1986). Attitudes toward homosexuality: Assessment and behavioral consequences. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 7(2), 137-162.
- Kreindler, S. A. (2005). A Dual Group Processes Model of Individual Differences in Prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9(2), 90–107.
- Kruglanski, A. W. (1989). *Lay epistemics and human knowledge: Cognitive and motivational basis*. New York: Plenum.
- McFarland, S. (2010). Authoritarianism, social dominance, and other roots of generalized prejudice. *Political Psychology*, 31(3), 453-477.
- McFarland, S. G., & Adelson, S. (1996). *An omnibus test study of personality, values, and prejudice*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Society for Political Psychology. Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Moghaddam, F. M. (2011). *Multiculturalism and intergroup relations: Psychological implications for democracy in global context*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 598–609.
- Pérez-Albéniz, A., de Paúl, J., Etxebarria, J., Montes, M. P., & Torres, E. (2003). Adaptación de Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI) al español. *Psicothema*, 15(2), 267-272.
- 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
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., & Levin, S. (2006). Social dominance theory and the dynamics of intergroup relations: Taking stock and looking forward. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 17, 271-320.
- Quinton, W. J., Cowan, G., & Watson, B. D. (1996). Personality and attitudinal predictors of support of proposition 187 – California anti-illegal-immigrant initiative. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 26, 2204-2223.
- Richins, M. L., & Dawson, S. (1992). A consumer values orientation for materialism and its measurement: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19(3), 303-316.
- Richins, M. L., Mick, D. G., & Monroe, K. B. (2004). The material values scale: Measurement properties and development of a short form. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(1), 209-219.
- Roets, A., Van Hiel, A., & Cornelis, I. (2006). Does materialism predict racism?

- Materialism as a distinctive social attitude and a predictor of prejudice. *European Journal of Personality*, 20(2), 155-168. doi:10.1002/per.573
- Rottenbacher de Rojas, J. M. (2010). Sexismo ambivalente, paternalismo masculino e ideología política en adultos jóvenes de la ciudad de Lima. *Pensamiento Psicológico*, 7 (14), 9-18.
- Rottenbacher de Rojas, J. M., Amaya López, L., Genna Miyahira, Pulache Páez, M. (2009). Percepción de inseguridad ciudadana y su relación con la ideología política en una muestra de habitantes de la ciudad de Lima. *Revista Española de Investigación Criminológica*, 7, 1-22.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Silván-Ferrero, M. P., & Bustillos, A. (2007). Adaptación de la escala de orientación a la dominancia social al castellano: Validación de la dominancia grupal y la oposición a la igualdad como factores subyacentes. *Revista de Psicología Social* 22(1), 3-15.
- Smith-Castro, V. (2006). La psicología social de los procesos intergrupales: Modelos e hipótesis. *Actualidades en Psicología*, 20, 45-71.
- Son Hing, L. S., Chung-Yan, G. A., Hamilton, L. K., & Zanna, M. P. (2008). A two-dimensional model that employs explicit and implicit attitudes to characterize prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(6), 971-987.
- Son Hing, L. S., & Zanna, M. P. (2010). Individual differences. In J. F. Dovidio, M. Hewstone, P. Glick, & V. M. Esses (Eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotype, and Discrimination*, (pp.163-178). London, U.K: Sage
- Stephan, W. G., & Finlay, K. (1999). The role of empathy in improving intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(4), 729-743.
- Stöber, J., Dette, D. E., & Musch, J. (2002). Comparing continuous and dichotomous scoring of the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 78(2), 370-389.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-categorization Theory*. New York: Blackwell.
- Van Hiel, A., Duriez, B., & Kossowska, M. (2006). The Presence of Left-Wing Authoritarianism in Western Europe and Its Relationship with Conservative Ideology. *Political Psychology*, 27(5), 769-793.
- Vescio, T. K., Sechrist, G. B., & Paolucci, M. P. (2003). Perspective taking and prejudice reduction: The mediational role of empathy arousal and situational attributions. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33(4), 455-472. doi:10.1002/ejsp.163
- Webster, R. J. & Coon, H. (2004, January). *Social dominance orientation, right-wing authoritarianism, and gender as predictors of heterosexuals' attitudes toward homosexuality, Blacks, and Arabs*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Austin, TX.
- Whitley, B. E. Jr. (1999). Right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(1), 126-134.
- Whitley, B. E., & Kite, M. (2006). *The Psychology of Prejudice and Discrimination*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Zubieta, E., Delfino, G., & Fernández, O. (2007). Dominancia social, valores, y posicionamiento ideológico en jóvenes universitarios. *Psicodebate* 8: *Psicología, Cultura y Sociedad*, 151-169.