

AN OVERVIEW OF PREJUDICES: SOME SPANISH STUDIES

Antonio Rus and Daniel Madrid
(University of Granada)

0. Introduction

Prejudice constitutes a passionate and compromising field of study. It is a concern of social psychologists as well as those involved in education. The intensity of present migration movements urge a serious analysis and the adoption of suitable educational practices.

Research on prejudice is related to research on stereotypes. Lippman (1922) studies the ideas through which people represent reality and how society uses images to represent some national or religious ethnic groups.

Our interest is directed to the origin and development of prejudices. We aim to analyse the changing patterns of prejudices and the role that the school plays or should play. We have followed the research design proposed by Cullingford (1992, 1994).

In this paper we intend to offer a general framework which can be used as a starting point for future research on the topic. After we define the construct "prejudice", we will present a synthesis of the theoretical contributions that research has provided on the topic. Next, we will cite and summarize some studies carried out in the Spanish context: two of them are about stereotypes and one about the role of school in a multicultural society. Our work ends with a proposal for educational intervention in order to improve the present situation. After a description of individuals suffering from prejudices, a programme to prevent prejudices is introduced, which may have an important illustrative value, followed by some useful ideas to modify existing prejudices.

1. DEFINITION OF PREJUDICE

1.1. Prejudices as a negative attitude

Prejudices are defined by most specialists as beliefs, thoughts, conducts or negative affections towards certain groups and their components (Morales and Moya, 1996). Allport (1954) defined prejudices as an antipathy or negative thoughts about others, Buss (1961) as hostilities or aggressions and Simpson and Yinger (1965) as a rigid emotional attitude. The term "attitude" seems to integrate the previous conceptions on prejudices. Some authors, such as Ashmore (1970), Devine (1995) and Oskamp (1991) define a prejudice as a particular "attitude". On the other hand, an "attitude" is defined as an evaluative manifestation towards a socially relevant object (Eagly, 1992). The object of the attitude varies: it can be people, situations, social problems,... or social groups and their members.

The association between the object of an attitude and its evaluation is based on three different factors which may occur simultaneously, but normally they vary in their intensity (Morales et al., 1994). These three factors can be: *cognitive*, *affective* and *conductual*.

The cognitive component: a group may be evaluated negatively by others if they have a deep knowledge about the group's negative characteristics.

The affective component: evaluation can sometimes be based on positive or negative characteristics or experiences. That is the case of the evaluation that would be expressed by someone robbed by one of a particular group's members.

Pág. 118

The conductual component: attitudes about a group may have been formed as result of working together with some members of that group.

As we can see, the three components are of an evaluative nature about the object of the attitude. It must be also added that attitudes are relatively stable structures in a person's memory and these memories play the primary role of orienting people towards the object of their attitudes (Fazio, 1989).

1.2. Prejudices and stereotypes

Stereotypes have got a descriptive component that designates the characteristics associated to a certain groups members. These characteristics may have a negative or a positive connotation, that is, we have another evaluative component. As most studies on stereotypes also focused on negative aspects the connotations associated with them and with prejudices are nearly synonyms. For Katz and Bradley (1933, 1935) prejudices are grouped within the category of stereotypes, which also include beliefs, evaluations and emotional responses. Both concepts - prejudice and stereotypes- are closely linked: the latter provides information that reinforces the prejudicial emotional reaction towards certain groups.

We have pointed out that G. Allport (1954) defines a prejudice as a negative thought about anyone without sufficient motives. He distinguishes two components: a favourable or unfavourable attitude (what has been termed "prejudice") and overgeneralized beliefs (the stereotype). Allport claims that both constituents are always present within one's mind, as it is very difficult to show hostility to anyone or to any group without any underlying beliefs about that person or the group in question.

1.3. Prejudicial personal beliefs

The close connection between stereotypes and prejudice mentioned above has been considered negative for research on stereotypes by some social psychologists. This focus on negative stereotypes has created a tendency to consider the stereotyping process as something negative and faulty by definition given that stereotypes are usually learnt in a unsuitable way. It is considered that they consist of generalisations or simplifications and are rigid and resistant to justification (Ashmore and Del Boca, 1981). The association between stereotypes and prejudices has also been harmful for the conceptualisation and study of prejudices. The emphasis on the prejudice-stereotype connection (cognitive dimension) has neglected the affective and evaluative dimension that a prejudice has. Consequently, it is more advisable to distinguish stereotypes from prejudices. Even though a prejudice generally implies negative

stereotypical thoughts, this relationship is not always so close and clear as has been traditionally assumed .

P. Devine (1989) defines a stereotype as the knowledge of attributes associated with a group or categorizing the people who share the same culture and form the same social group. She defines personal prejudicial beliefs as the maintaining or acceptance of cultural stereotypic contents. Both concepts are independent. In fact, both constructs are activated by different cognitive processes. Stereotypes are activated automatically (unintentionally), whereas personal beliefs, prejudices are activated by controlled processes (intentionally). Personal beliefs (prejudices) are acquired after learning the stereotypes.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1. Historical perspectives

Duckitt (1992) establishes several stages in the literature produced by the social sciences about ethnic prejudices that are summarised below.

a. The psychology of race stage

This stage comprises the period before the 1920's. It is the time when social sciences were deeply influenced by social Darwinism . It was widely accepted that the differences between social groups were due to racial differences and were attributed to an changing hierarchy

Pág. 119

where certain races lived in a more advanced state of evolution. Most studies adopted a comparative approach and focused on the differential abilities between races.

b. The stage of racial prejudice

Included in this stage is the period of time between the 1920's and 1930's. Civil rights movements of the black population in the western industrialised countries, the women liberation movement and the social revolts against the European colonialism unite to question the racial domination thesis. Prejudice began to be considered an irrational and unjustified phenomenon. Racial attitudes were analysed and prejudices were considered a social problem. Descriptive studies on social prejudices were predominant.

c. The stage of psychodynamic processes

This stage extends through the 1940's. The origin of prejudices were sought in individual and internal psychological conflicts. Prejudices were seen as a mechanism against such conflicts. Most studies had a clinical and correlational orientation.

d. The period of the authoritarian personality

This period takes in many of the studies carried out in the 1950's. Most of the emphasis was put on the subject's personality structure in contrast with the emphasis put on the

psychological processes in the previous decade. It was argued that certain patterns of life led to the development of certain pathological structures of personality that were predisposed to prejudice and made people more susceptible to be convinced by fascist and antidemocratic propaganda.

e. The period of culture and society

This period was developed during the 1960's and 1970's. During this time the analysis was focused on groups and social norms. This period can be divided in two subperiods. The first one is characterised by consensus. Prejudice was considered a social norm (Jones, 1986). There were societies and cultures more prejudiced than others which transmitted these prejudicious norms to their members through a socialisation process. This approach was concerned with the analysis of these prejudicious norms and how they are transmitted to other subjects. The second subperiod concentrates on how groups express their interests (Sheriff, 1966 and Tajfel, 1984).

f. The stage of fundamental psychological processes

This stage developed in the 1980's and is immersed in the cognitive revolution and in the hegemonic character that social cognition had in psychology. Prejudice was considered as a universal and unavoidable phenomenon that originated in the human mind as other phenomena do, for example: the tendency to categorize. Empirical studies focused on the detection of natural mechanisms of human thinking which, even though they are fundamentally adaptative to the environment, they generate certain undesirable factors such as prejudice.

2.2. Theories

Some theories highlight individual factors and follow the idea of a psychosocial orientation taking as a basic category motivation and affects (psychodynamic theories). Others focus their analysis on knowledge (cognitive orientation). Within the theories which focus on the motivational base of prejudice, some concentrate on individual internal conflicts (approaches close to psychoanalysis); others are based on group conflicts (for instance: theory of the objective conflict) and they include motivational and group explanations.

Taking as the starting point the analysis of motivational and cognitive basis as well as group processes and individual dimensions, the studies made by Tajfel and associates present the best combination of all these factors, integrating them in a solid and consistent theory supported by empirical evidence.

Social psychology is concerned with social structure, the normative system, social mobility, socialisation, etc. with an emphasis in the way prejudices are originated and transmitted, and their social and individual influence. We will describe some of these approaches in the following sections following Rodriguez's research work (1996).

2.2.1. Motivational approaches

2.2.1.1. Psychodynamic individual factors

Freud (1974) thinks that the social relations of adults are determined by the development of individual psychism in the family environment. The origin of prejudice is based on the hostility to others, to outgroups and to ingroups. The need for prejudice is as essential as the need to love oneself. During their development, children form ambivalent affective ties with their family members which later are reflected in their relationship with social groups. Their way of identifying with a group leader and, partially, with the other group members, helps to explain the group identity and cohesion. But in this identification, ambivalent love-hate feelings are nested which somehow have to make their way out. As social controls avoid a rebellion against the group leader or aggression on the group members, anger is transferred towards members of other group and that is the origin of prejudices.

2.2.1.2 The authoritarian personality

Adorno et al. (1950) have studied the human predisposition that leads some people to believe antisemitic propaganda. They found that, when antisemitism exists there also exists negative attitudes towards all the other ethnic minorities, ethnocentrism and authoritarianism form a complex syndrome which include, besides the general attitudes mentioned above, some styles of thought (stereotypes, dogmatism, rigidity, irrationality) and other conflictive and pathologic features of a neurotic personality.

It is the result of a repressive education during infancy. The syndrome originates from the individual. But some sociocultural and historical situations may favour an intensive identification with one's group and a deep hostility towards the outgroup, and this activates these potential tendencies of the authoritarian syndrome in a bigger number of individuals.

The studies on authoritarian personality have been highly criticised on theoretical and methodological grounds which have been deeply influenced by the psychoanalytic theory.

2.2.1.3 The frustration-aggression hypothesis

This hypothesis maintains that any aggression is the result of some kind of frustration, because frustration leads to aggression. An individual suffers frustration when one is impeded to obtain a goal or accomplish a wanted expectation. The frustrated individual develop aggressive feelings, but if the frustrating agent is not accessible or is too powerful one will address one's aggression towards other socially weaker individuals or groups, thus creating a "scapegoat".

The phenomenon of creating a "scapegoat" is usually individual but it can also be of a social and collective origin. In fact, Dollard et al. (1939) use the frustration-aggression hypothesis to interpret social and collective behaviour. Thus, the defeat of Germany in the first World War and the humiliating conditions of the Versailles treaty may explain the aggressive behaviour of the Germans against the ethnic minorities under the national-socialist regimen.

2.2.1.2. Non psychodynamic motivational approaches

a. Non-psychodynamic interpretations of frustrations and aggressions

Berkowitz (1969) reformulates the frustration-aggression hypothesis in relation to causal determination and argues that frustration increases the probability of aggression, especially if there are environmental stimuli to suggest or evoke it, but these stimuli do not necessarily provoke it. According to other views, aggression can be the result of a previous experience without being originated by frustration. Instead of a reaction to frustration, aggression is considered instrumental, that is an initiative to achieve a goal.

According to Bandura's theory of social learning, aggression can be learnt by observation, but such aggression will only be produced if the individual perceives that aggression is licit and fair; and the perception of the licitness and unlicitness of aggression depends on the group's culture and norms. In this sense, prejudice has a social basis in two ways: it is acquired through the learning of observed behaviour and, besides that, its transformation in discriminatory conducts depends on social approval.

b. Relative privation

Berkowitz's reformulation of the frustration-aggression hypothesis (1969) contributed to the conceptualization of frustration as a social comparison. In this context, individuals perceive that they lack something that others possess and that they deserve to have it. Their predisposition to aggression can be addressed to those that they think they have dispossessed (taken away) them of something that they are entitled to have. When the "dispossessor" is stronger than the "dispossessed" aggression is transferred to a "scapegoat". The hypothesis of relative privation was used, in the 1970's, to explain most social violent episodes.

c. Objective conflict of interests

Sherif's studies on conflicts and cooperation among groups (1966) led him to conclude that it is not interpersonal attitudes and conflicts what cause problems between groups, as the individualist approaches had postulated, but just the opposite: the individual's attitudes are influenced by conflictive relations between their group and groups. Prejudice is, in this case, the result of a conflict, but of a social conflict; one that has arisen from the relations between groups: racial, ethnic, religious, national groups, etc.

When groups perceive one another as competitors towards an incompatible goal (where only one group can achieve that goal) negative stereotypes or prejudice can be formed which may lead to conflicts and violence. Once negative attitudes have been established, they are maintained even after the competition for the original goal is finished. Only when groups feel they must cooperate with one another in order to solve a problem or overcome difficulties that they are unable to solve by themselves, do conflicts begin to deactivate and prejudices disappear. However, the conflict and prejudices do not disappear completely. Some members of the rival groups may retain negative attitudes.

2.2.2. Articulating the motivational and cognitive factors with the individual and group ones

Tajfel's empirical studies (1978, 1984) on ingroup favouritism argue that the mere presence of another group makes both groups behave, before any interaction, as if they were in conflict. This reaction to the presence of other groups has its origin in cognitive and motivational processes which form the basis of conflict and prejudice. Before any arousal of

personal interests, there exists a perceptive bias which turns into "ingroup selfishness", a defence of the group interests and it is also motivational.

Pág. 121

2.2.2.1. Categorisation

Categorising means grouping, classifying objects or people according to a common feature. Because one's cognitive capacity is too small to deal with the enormous amount of information that one receives from one's environment, categorization is natural and necessary. Stereotyping, the selection of characteristics that define and differentiate a group of individuals from others is the result of categorisation. Tajfel (1954) has reformulated Allport's categorisation process and has based his theory of identity in it; this is an important contribution to the explanation of prejudices.

Allport established a difference between temporal judgement and prejudice: the former changes easily according to the information received, the latter is very reluctant to any change even though the information received recommends or induces to such a change. This difference helps to explain how some people are considered prejudiced and others are not even though categorisation is considered an essential human activity.

That is why Tajfel states that all categorisations do not originate prejudices. There are some soft forms of categorisation that do not produce prejudices, these types of categorization are not associated with hostility because the individual considers them emotionally irrelevant. When prejudicial judgements exist one judges others dogmatically. This prejudicial form is also accompanied by hostile emotions. These prejudicial forms establish rigid differences between groups and are associated with an extraordinary sensitivity to the differences established. The individual is interested in maintaining a convenient clear-cut division between their group and others.

Prejudices are not always the result of individual processes. Sometimes they have social character instead. Tajfel argues that in order to explain intergroup relations, especially the prejudicial ones, it is necessary to bear in mind:

- the influence cognitive processes and intergroup relations have on each other,
- the psychosocial effects of intergroup conflicts,
- the relationship between intergroup conflict and social identity.

2.2.2.2. Cognitive processes and intergroup relations (the categorisation version)

Tajfel states that the phenomena that the theorists of the "new look" have found related to physic objects perception -e.g. assimilation and contrast- also operate in the categorisation and perception of people. For instance, when categorising any characteristic (focal and relevant for the receiver), for example pertaining to a group (a peripheric characteristic in this case), it is "contrasted"; that is, it will be highlighted and exaggerated. For this reason, when categorising, the differences between groups are exaggerated in relation to the characteristics used. At the same time some assimilation effects occur. The similarities between group members are exaggerated; and when a characteristic is analysed it is homogenized in relation to all members of said group. This tendency to perceive -or to react in the case of a prejudice- members of another group in a certain way without taking into consideration their individual differences is an essential characteristic of stereotyping.

2.2.2.3. Psychosocial effects of pertaining to a group

Conflicts among groups cause the individuals of different groups to assume the stereotypes of the other group to be true. Sherif argues that intergroup conflicts are not the result (effect) of personal prejudices of problematic individuals but their causal origin.

Tajfel states that it is not necessary that a conflict be objective to create a prejudice. He says that one can imagine a theoretical continuum in which the groups situated at one extreme are in competition for objective reasons... At the other extreme are the situations where the only result of the competition implies changing the relative position of the groups (Tajfel, 19789: 437)

Tajfel maintains that prejudice and discrimination between groups arise even if there is no dispute for objective possessions, an explicit competition or any previous hostility towards another group. Tajfel proves that even in the special condition of a "minimal group" (situations in which a particular group does not work as a group) there exists ingroup favouritism and intergroup discrimination.

2.2.2.4. Relationship between social identity and intergroup conflict (theory of social identity)

Tajfel argues that the establishment of positive-valued differences between an individual's group and an alien one are of capital importance for the individual. That which one perceives requires a positive self-image; ingroup favouritism is used for that goal. It is also used to obtain (or maintain) a positive self-image and a social identity that includes these facets derived from pertaining to the group and being part of it.

Our self-image, in this sense, is of social nature. A group (and the fact of being part of it) will be judged positively or negatively only in comparison with other groups. Group evaluation is only meaningful in a intergroup context. Consequently social identity is a relative concept: one is what one is only in comparison with others.

This process of intergroup differentiation, is subject to the positive differentiation of the ingroup, and has some characteristics which are important in understanding prejudice: they are produced according to a vicious-circle pattern. The strength of group differences has three dimensions: cognitive, evaluative and conductual.

In addition to all this, it should be pointed out that a facet of the prejudice is that, once the prejudice has been established, it feeds on itself. This is why it is so difficult to make the prejudice disappear, even when there is evidence that the prejudice is unsustainable. In this sense prejudice implies an obstinate attitude.

2.2.3. Cognitive approaches

They assume that information process mechanisms are structured in such a way that they themselves can give rise to a stereotyped perception of another group. Cognitive psychology analysed prejudices with the intention of giving a full explanation of these phenomena. By starting from the analysis of cognition the dynamic of prejudices is explained : formation, sustenance and repercussion in behaviour.

2.2.3.1. Attribution processes

Attribution theory has played an important role in the analysis of the prejudice cognitive basis. Pettigrew (1979) expanded Allport's categorisation theory by adding parts of the attribution theory. In essence, it is a matter of transferring the auto-attribution and hetero-attribution effects of individual subjects to ingroup and outgroup situations.

In general, people tend to attribute ingroup positive behaviour to positive internal factors, whereas when these positive behaviours are associated with an outgroup they are attributed to environmental factors (showing that these positive features are unworthy because they were produced at random). In the same way, people tend to forgive negative-valued ingroup behaviour because these behaviours are attributed to situational factors also. In the case of an outgroup the positive behaviours are attributed to dispositional internal factors (what is used to base the attribution of negative features).

Weber (1994) has analysed the attributional differences of in- and outgroups and has classified them according to the attributional ethnocentric biases. When the level of conflict with the outgroup is high, subjects tend to adopt an attributive style motivated for the need to increase the ingroup affection; in case of a low conflict with an outgroup, an attributive style, motivated by the need to defend the group esteem prevails; to facilitate this both the ingroup's negative actions and the outgroup's negative ones are attributed to incidental factors.

Implicit attributions are manifested in the different terms used to describe in- and outgroup behaviour. Through a linguistic discursive analysis it is possible to diagnose any hidden or subconscious prejudice that may exist between opposing group members and the intensity of such prejudice if any. (Wetherell and Potter, 1992; Billing, 1987).

2.2.3.2. Bias of social information processing

Hamilton (1981) assumes that human cognitive mechanisms themselves can give rise to stereotypes of social groups. Stereotypes are not only a natural product, but they are also necessary. These stereotypes are not only necessary for one's need to simplify the enormous amount of information one receives continuously, but also for the human cognitive mechanisms work in a biased way. Once an observer has formed a stereotype about an outgroup, that stereotype can bias the information processing that observer makes about the stereotyped group. In addition to that, the stereotypes that one has formed about an outgroup exert an important influence on the behaviour towards the outgroup.

Hamilton bases his cognitive model on two aspects of information processing: the categorisation of objects in groups and the sensitiveness to distinctive stimuli. It is the categorisation function what helps one to anticipate the behaviour of others, and helps one to accommodate one's conduct to the anticipated behaviour. Hamilton's innovation lies in the sensitivity to distinctive stimuli. All innovative stimuli are attractive, they call attention to themselves. As the featured characteristics of minorities are infrequent stimuli, they attract people's attention more intensely than the featured characteristics of majorities, which are frequent and more familiar to people and show less novelty than minorities which in contrast are less frequent and unfamiliar. In general, any feature that contrasts to an homogeneous

background of similar stimuli attracts one's attention. For instance, a woman in a group of men, an old man in a group of young people, a blackbird on the snow! Stimuli which are unfamiliar to people and are contrasts in their perceptive environment are specially attractive. But they would still be more attractive if any new ingredient is added: so long as it is relevant and has importance to the perceptor or receiver.

Pág. 123

2.2.3.3. Illusory correlation

The relevance and prominence stimuli are essential features that determine the formation process of stereotypes and prejudices towards minorities. Both constitute the base of the phenomenon known as "illusory correlation", which is used by Hamilton to explain how stereotypes are formed. Illusory correlation takes place when a subject overestimates the frequency of which two events occur simultaneously. Such overestimation of concurrence lies in the infrequent events during the codification process and attract one's attention more than the familiar events. As one pays more attention to these events one stores them with a more pronounced mnemonic track and they become more available to be retrieved; that is they can be recovered more quickly and with great detail. The vivacity of the retrieved information make one think that one has perceived it with a higher degree of frequency, but that is not the case. One's sensitivity to appealing stimuli predispose one to an exaggeration of the perceived correlation.

The effect of illusory correlation is produced in a similar way when a journalist reports on a robbery and adds "two gypsy individuals..." The appealing effect of these two facts (a robbery and gypsy people) reinforce themselves and become closely associated when perceived and stored. To this effect of illusory correlation, the influence exerted by the reader, disturbed by this type of journalism, must be added. That is what is called "the newsreader's torture". People with stereotyped thinking, have a tendency to an inversion of logical terms: these people end up thinking not only that "gypsies are robbers" but also that "robbers are gypsies", which is the most serious symptom of a prejudicial mind.

The expectancy of the prejudicial association "gypsy-robbery", tends to bias the interpretation of sensory data. The people who have formed the prejudice that minorities are aggressive will perceive some conducts of a minority threatening that would normally be perceived as friendly if such conducts they were associated with other people. As previously stated above, once a stereotype has been formed the behaviour that confirm it tend to be attributed to internal dispositions of the stereotyped individual, but the conducts that contradict the stereotypes are interpreted as external factors to the stereotyped individual or as the exception to the rule.

2.2.4. Emphasis on emotions

Part of the criticism received by cognitive psychology states that there is no "cold" knowledge; Cognition is always associated to affection, to emotions that have been ignored by cognitive psychology. At present, research on the influence of emotions in the formation, maintenance and reproduction of stereotypes seems to be trendy. Hamilton himself has shown the influence of emotions, state of mind or affects on perception, memory and behaviour towards outgroups. From this derives a more balanced conception where the unilateral view that highlights either cognition or motivation disappears.

3. SPANISH STUDIES

In this section we present some contributions of interest which have taken place in Spain: they include the early pioneering studies made by Pinillos (1960), Rodríguez Sanabra (1963) and Benito (1963), their contribution thanks to Sangrador (1981), García Fernando (1982) and Mesa (1988), and recent research work by Ovejero (1991) and Javaloy (1990). All of these works deal with stereotypes. We aim to introduce a sufficient research sample of empirical studies carried out in the Spanish context. We also have focused our attention on Sánchez and Mesa's studies (1991), which analyse the Spanish school context and some conflicts arising in pupils who receive the same education. In this way, we will bring our study close to the context that will follow in the future. This new landscape will put our analysis in a better perspective to appreciate educational and social intervention to their full terms.

3.1. Stereotypes of the Spanish autonomous communities and regions

Sangrador (1981) has carried out pioneering studies in relation to the images that the Spanish have about people belonging to the different Spanish Autonomous Communities (nationalities) and regions. His aim has been to find out the stereotypic ideas that the people of the different Spanish nationalities and regions have formed towards the other citizens living in the same Community, other regions and about the Spanish in general. He also analyses the differences and similarities between the stereotypes as well as the different dimensions of the stereotypes associated with the different "nationalities" and regions. Sangrador has also made a factorial analyses of the favourable aspects of the stereotypes found and a quantification of the preferences shown by the individuals. Sangrador has also studied the source of the stereotypes (the stereotypers), that is he analyses the self-image and self-esteem of the stereotypers to check if such variables exert some influence in stereotypes. And finally, he studies the relationship between some dimensions of stereotypes and some attitudes such as authoritarianism, dogmatism, ambiguity and intolerance, among others. After a detailed theoretical and methodological presentation he found out the following (Sangrador 1981:247-254):

a. The contents of a stereotype

b.

- In relation to the contents of stereotypes, the Catalanian, Basque and Castillian people have a less positive image about the other Communities, and the Gallician and Andalusian are perceived in a more favourable way. The group named as "the Spanish" (which include all the Autonomous Communities) is perceived as if it were an additional "region" or Autonomous Community.

- Auto-stereotypes tend to be positive and hetero-stereotypes tend to be negative. The biggest differences appeared in the stereotypes of the Castillian, Basque and Catalanian, with a very favourable auto-stereotype and a more negative hetero-perception.
- Each group uses favourable adjectives in its self-perception, though these adjectives are fairly different under a qualitative point of view. They describe themselves with different qualities to the ones they use to describe the other nationalities.

b. The stereotypes dimensions

- *Uniformity.* There is a higher uniformity in the perception of the Catalanian and Andalusian and there is a higher dispersion of the perception of stereotypes associated with the "Spanish" and Castillian groups.
- *Favourability.* The Gallician and Basque receive the highest and best perception. Women show a higher and more positive perception of the Gallician and a worse perception of the Catalanian and Basque than men (p. 248).
- *Similarity.* The people from Galicia's self-perception is similar to the perception other groups have of them. But the Andalusian and Catalanian perceive one another with a very low similarity, that is their respective self-image is very different from how they perceive each other to be.

c. Similarity between stereotypes

- Globally, the "Spanish" are grouped and associated with the Castillian and the Andalusian.
- The Andalusian, Castillian and Gallician perceive the Catalanian and Basque as a "cluster group" , but the Catalanian and Basque do not perceive themselves with such similarity. They perceive themselves as very different entities.
- The Catalanian, in particular, perceive a greater distance between them and the other autonomous communities

d. Regional preferences and stereotypes

As regard to the relationship between attitudes and stereotypes, the social distance scale did not discriminate the subjects' preferences. It is, in Sangrador's view, an extreme measurement of prejudice (the social distance scale) and as such does not discriminate among positive attitudes between social groups. Nevertheless it can be useful in research studies on racial prejudices.

e. "Ego" variables and attitude variables in relation to stereotyping

Self-image and self-esteem

It seems evident that there is a higher self-concept in the Catalanian in their self-image and self-esteem.

Attitude variables

Authoritarian subjects seem to place themselves in extremes when formulating positive or negative stereotypes; they do not seem to accept ambiguity. In contrast, non-authoritarian subjects seem to be more neutral. The same happens to the individuals who are intolerant ambiguity and dogmatic. The average outgroup favourability is similar in authoritarian and non-authoritarian subjects.

3.2. Spain seen from Catalonia

Javaloy's study (1990) analyses the stereotypes, images, and attitudes towards six ethnic groups, which are Autonomous Communities within the Spanish State. The research study

was carried out in Catalonia, in the metropolitan area, where half the population is Catalanian and the other half belong to six Spanish Autonomous Communities; hence the title chosen for this study: Spain seen from Catalonia.

This study aims to achieve two objectives: a) To know the stereotypes, images, preferences and attitudes towards the six Communities or "ethnic groups" and b) to look into the underlying structure of these stereotypes finding out the social conditions of stereotypes, images and attitudes

Javaloy has found out that stereotypes remain stable through the passage of time, unless new features of a wide consensus emerge. All stereotypes tend to fade away, that is they get blurred. The Basque stereotype is the one which has undergone the most changes. The stability found in stereotypes seems to confirm that they come from a common culture and they share the stability that characterises cultural patterns. The autonomous process in Spain seems to have had an important influence in the expression "fond of their native land".

We believe that these three studies are coherent in relation to the stereotypes that they have discovered. In the same way, their results coincide with the ones presented by Benito (1963) and García Fernando (1982) in connection to ingroup favouritism: each community shows preferences for itself in the first place. Self-stereotypes are always more favourable than hetero-stereotypes.

Pág. 125

3.3. Schools in a multicultural society: the situation in Melilla

Sánchez y Mesa (1991) report about a case study in Melilla, a Spanish town in the north of Africa with an mixed Muslim-Moroccan population. They studied the prejudices and stereotypes belonging to different ethnic and cultural groups among the Melilla school population . They describe the role and functions that the school must play in a multicultural society. And they offer interesting alternatives to encourage an intercultural education for children receiving the contributions of different ethnic and cultural minorities living together in a multicultural community.

Mesa (1988) did a previous study on the stereotypes of the Melilla school children towards the different sociocultural groups living in the town. She also found out that these subjects had a more positive stereotype of their own ingroup, as mentioned above and in accordance with Tajfel and Turner's theory of social identity (1979). These children had a more negative stereotype of their outgroup, as their ingroup favouritism operates again. Mesa also proved that stereotypes are stable as other authors had concluded (e.g. Katz and Braly 1933, Pinillos 1960, Ovejero 1991).

This research work was carried out in Melilla, a city with 55.000 inhabitants, where one fourth has an Arab background and practise the Muslim religion, half the population is Christian and identify with the European way of life. The other fourth of the population is divided between some Hebrew and Hindi groups, who have some influence in the town's commercial activities, and a small minority of gypsies.

Sánchez and Mesa's study shows the disorders produced by the differences between the communities language environment and the language used at school for instruction. They

also study the conflicts arising from the co-existence of different cultures being educated together in the same school.

Intergroup relations and the microsocial environment in the classroom are key issues in education. Social relations among students and their grouping play an important role in the formation and changing of attitudes, interpersonal relations, social perception and student's expectations, identity and self-esteem. Many theories and studies on the improvement of intergroup relations are based on the social contact hypothesis, which states that an individual's behaviour and attitudes towards members of an outcast social group will become more positive after a direct reciprocal action with that outcast group. A more intensive contact in the classroom implies a great chance of a better mutual understanding and this, in turn, could diminish prejudices and discrimination. Nevertheless, contact in itself does not reduce conflicts nor does it improve intergroup relations.

It has also been proved that contact itself does not improve social relations. This was confirmed in school situations where the students after sharing the same classroom for 8 to ten years have not improved their social perception of the other groups, even though some perceptions of specific individuals may change due to contact during that time, but these changes cannot be taken for granted in the relation of individuals towards the other groups as such.

Sánchez, Mesa and Serrano (1991) have studied the implications of this for teacher education. The teacher who work in low social class schools and with children belonging to the ethnic minorities described above experience more educational problems in their teaching. Integration and discipline problems are very common. Consequently, it is necessary to study in detail these schools contexts and design suitable educational programmes which help students and teachers to overcome all this difficulties. The research work extracted below has been oriented in this direction.

Pág. 126

4. Educational intervention: some proposals

This section has been organised in three parts: first we report on the discriminated individual and/or the victim of prejudice. Secondly we introduce Garaigordóbil' excellent study (1995), whose suggestions and findings are considered a powerful tool to improve social relations among individuals, cultures and ethnic groups. And thirdly we recapitulate some theoretical contributions and research work on this topic.

4.1. The victims of prejudice and the consequences

The main psychological effects which have been studied in connection to prejudices are: self-perception effects, group withdrawal, cognitive strategies and social competition. The first two effects assume that discriminated group members accept their discriminatory and inferior situation, whereas the last two effects assume that those individuals who are victims of prejudice try to overcome the situation.

Concerning the effects on self-perception, empirical studies support that our self-evaluations and self-perceptions are related to the way we think other people perceive or judge us (Morales and Moya, 1996). Crocker and Mayor (1989) have proved that black people, women, mentally-retarded people, homosexuals, blind people, obese people and physical handicapped people are aware of the negative opinion that society frequently has about them.

As regard to group withdrawal of individuals suffering from prejudices and discrimination, it has been stated that such withdrawal can be real or symbolic. The processes included here imply breaking the social ties with one's group and denying the groups previous identity. A similar process to group withdrawal is an identification with a dominant group or "self-hate" (Allport, 1954). This identification with the "oppressors" is a kind of adjustment which takes place when other defence mechanisms fail.

In relation to cognitive strategies, it is assumed that groups that are discriminated against defend themselves by attributing prejudicious attitudes to the people who have "discriminated" against them (Crocker and Major, 1989). These attributive processes can also explain why stigmatised group members depict higher self-esteem levels than other members of groups. In this way, Kelly's increasing principle, (which states that when inhibiting motives or causes exist, the importance given to facilitating motives increases) is applied. According to this principle, these people would base their results on their high capacity: it is more meritorious to obtain a high result when circumstances are adverse (and prejudices are adverse) than when they are favourable.

Another cognitive strategy is applied when individuals compare themselves to groups of a similar or inferior status (Tajfel and Turner 1986). There is empirical evidence about one's tendency to compare with ingroup members but not outgroup members (Hyman 1942, Oakley 1970). An additional cognitive strategy consists of choosing specific comparative dimensions or reducing the importance given to the dimensions in which they rank lower (Crocker and Mayor 1982). Groups do not always obtain low results in all the dimensions they use for comparison (Tajfel and Turner, 1986)

Finally, in connection with social competition, this psychosocial effect frequently implies a competitive strategy with a higher status group, in order to match or overcome the effect in relation to the relevant dimensions chosen for the intergroup comparison. Improving the situation implies that the subjects affected perceive the situation as unstable or illegitimate.

4.2. Developing preventive attitudes to discrimination and xenophobia

Garaigordóbil (1995) suggests a psycho-educational intervention model directed to the encouragement of pro-social behaviour. And reducing aggressive conduct and discriminatory attitudes towards other people. For this purpose, she introduces two programmes of co-operative games; one for 6-8 year-old pupils and one for 8-10 year-old pupils. This study gives evidence on the efficiency of these types of educational experiences to improve interpersonal relations. This study includes a theoretical view on the important role that co-operative games play in the development of pro-social conduct, describes various procedures to carry them out and presents the results obtained with the programme. These are some of the conclusions:

Taking part in co-operative games is beneficial for the children development (Garaigordóbil, 1992, 1993, 1994) and they generate a high degree of satisfaction. 61.9% of the sample used for the study experienced internal attributions on their helping and co-operating conducts (they did it because they liked co-operating) and considered them as generators of pleasure or feelings of comfort. This attribution is the most changing, as the programme aims the interiorization of this conduct.

Most of the boys and girls felt that they had changed a lot in relation to variables such as respect to the games rules and norms of sociability in co-operative behaviour, the image they have about the other students, self-concept, trustfulness with others, expression of feelings within the group context, number of friends and level of communication with them.

Most children admit that, after the game sessions, they felt free to express what they thought and felt while playing. This reflection and verbalisation about the game processes constitutes a cognitive factor of great importance in the explanation of the kind gestures associated with the game. In this way the children learn more on their behaviour and about other pupils' feelings. 83% of the sample expressed their preference for co-operative games compared to competitive ones. In co-operative games children have more fun, aggression is reduced, feelings of frustration sadness or sense of shame diminish when they lose, and they experience higher welfare feelings: which in turn gives the children better possibilities of making friends, of learning more, of constant participation and of being in an equal position as regard to the other classmates. Consequently, games are a useful tool for communication and cooperation in a group context. They develop positive socio-moral habits, increase communication between groups and co-operative and helping attitudes as well as reflection on the impact of behaviour on other people's feelings. In this way, games have a positive effect on preventing discriminatory and xenophobic attitudes towards different people.

4.3. Modification of prejudices

Sánchez and Mesa's study (1991) gives important clues to understanding how one changes one's opinion about other individuals belonging to different groups. Living together, information, culture and research itself are powerful weapons to overcome the problems we have described on previous pages (see also the recent paper by Martinez (1996).

In association with the contact hypothesis, Cook (1978) offers 5 conditions that guarantee the positive effects in a situation of contact:

- The members of both groups must have equal status.
- The attributes that make up the group stereotype must be unconfirmed

Pág. 128

- The situation will favour an interdependent co-operative relation sharing the achievement of a common goal.
- The individualisation of group members must be favoured
- Social norms must support the contact situation

Besides that, some changes in the Spain's legislation, the introduction of suitable educational programmes, and a positive cooperation of mass media are necessary. With the cooperation of all these platforms one can move forwards so that conscience, morality, one's international projection, and one's orientation towards love and tolerance have priority over repression, conventionalism, power and rigidity.

Epilogue

Prejudice, discrimination, xenophobia, marginalization and segregation are different forms of excluding people who are different from the dominant group. Perhaps the ultimate root of racism lies in the human incapacity to accept differences, in the incompetence to accept that people are part of a great variety of human groups, that one's own culture is not the most natural in the world, that our religion or God is not the only truthful one. Sexism, racism or classism are derived from the conviction that one establishes the norm about what other people are or must be.

As a conclusion, we wish to join Lewin (1948) when he considers intergroup relations as a bi-directional issue. That means that both directions or parts have to be studied in order to improve them. People and groups have been educated through systems of beliefs and customs. That is, people are raised in different cultures which represent objective difficulties for the understanding and comprehension of other groups.

The previous arguments can be taken as an arrival and a starting point at the same time. After the theoretical reflections and the research findings presented in the previous pages we hope that the horizon of future research on the topic we have dealt with is a bit more outlined.

REFERENCES

- ADORNO, W. T et al. (1950) **La personalidad autoritaria**. Buenos Aires: Proyección 1965.
- ALLPORT, G. W. (1954) **La naturaleza del prejuicio**. Buenos Aires: EUDEBA, 1977.
- ASHMORE, R. D. (1970) "Prejudice: causes and cures". En B. E. Collins (ed.), **Social psychology**. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, Reading.
- ASHMORE, R. y DELBOCA, F. (1981) "Conceptual approaches to stereotypes". En D. Hamilton (ed.), **Cognition processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior**. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- BENITO, J. (1963) "Preferencias regionales de varios grupos de estudiantes extremeños de Enseñanza Media", en **Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada**, **68**, 747-751.
- BERKOWITZ, L. (1969) "Revisión de la hipótesis de la frustración-agresión". En J. R. Torregrosa (ed.) (1974). **Teoría e investigación en la psicología social actual**. Madrid: IOP, 239-259.
- BILLIG, M. (1987) **Arguing and thinking. A rhetorical approach to social psychology**. Cambridge: University Press.
- BUSS, A. H. (1961) **The psychology of aggression**. Nueva York: Wiley.
- COOK, S. W. (1978) "Interpersonal and attitudinal outcomes in cooperating interracial groups", en **Journal of Research Development Education**, **12**, 97-113.
- COOK, S. W. (1984) "Cooperative interaction in multiethnic contexts". En N. Miller y M. Brewer (eds.), **Groups in contact**. San Diego: Academic Press.

- CROCKER, J. y MAYOR, B. (1994) "Reactions to stigma: the moderating role of justifications". En M. P. Zanna y J. M. Olson (eds.), **The psychology of prejudice**. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- CULLINGFORD, C. (1992) **Children and society**. Londres: Cassell.
- CULLINGFORD, C. (1994) "The attitudes of children to their environment", en *Cambridge Journal of Education*, Vol. 24, 1, 7-19.
- DEVINE, P.G. (1989) "Stereotypes and prejudice: their automatic and controlled components", en **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**, **56**, 5-18.
- DEVINE, P.G. (1995) "Prejudice and outgroup perception". En A. Tesser (ed.), **Advanced Social Psychology**. Nueva York: McGraw-Hill.
- DOLLARD, J. et al. (1939) **Frustration and aggression**. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- DUCKITT, J. (1992) "Psychology and prejudice. A historical analysis and integrative framework", en **American Psychologist**, **47** (10), 1182-1193.
- EAGLY, A. H. (1992) "Uneven progress: social psychology and the study of attitudes", en **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**, **63**, 5, 693-710.
- ECHEBARRÍA, A. et al. (1995) **Psicología social del prejuicio y el racismo**. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Ramón Areces.
- FAZIO, R. H. (1989) "On the power and functionality of attitudes: the role of stereotypes and personal beliefs". En A. R. Pratkanis; S. J. Breckler y A. G. Greenwald (eds.), **Attitude structure and function**. Hillsdale: L. Erlbaum.
- FREUD, S. (1974) **Escritos sobre judaísmo y antisemitismo**. Madrid: Alianza.
- GARAIGORDÓBIL, M. (1992) **Juego cooperativo y socialización en el aula**. Madrid: Seco-Olea.
- GARAIGORDÓBIL, M. (1993) "Un estudio correlacional de las vinculaciones entre la conducta social con otras variables socio-cognitivas y afectivas del desarrollo infantil", en **Revista de Psicología de la Educación**, **4** (11), 49-71.
- GARAIGORDÓBIL, M. (1994) "Programas de acción para el desarrollo de la conducta altruista". En M. Garaigordóbil y C. Manganto (eds.), **Socialización y conducta prosocial en la infancia y en la adolescencia**. San Sebastián: Servicio de la Universidad del País Vasco
- GARCÍA FERRANDO, M. (1982) **Regionalismo y autonomía en España, 1976-1979**. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.
- HAMILTON, D. L. (1981) **Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior**. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- HYMAN, H. H. (1942) "The psychology of status", en **Archives of Psychology**, **269**.
- JAVALOY, F. y otros (1990) **España vista desde Cataluña**. Barcelona: Promociones y Publicaciones Universitarias.
- JONES, J. M. (1986) "Racism, a cultural analysis of the problem". En J. F. Dovidio y S. L. Gaertner (eds.), **Prejudice, discrimination and racism**. San Diego: Academic Press.
- KATZ, D. y BRALY, K. (1933) "Racial stereotypes of one hundred students", en **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology**, **28**, 280-290.
- KATZ, D. y BRALY, K. (1935) "Racial stereotypes of one hundred students", en **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology**, **30**, 175-193.
- KELLEY, H. H. (1972) **Causal schemata and the attribution process**. Morrestown, NJ, General Learning Press.
- LEWIN, K. (1948) **Resolving social conflicts**. New York: Harper and Row.
- LIPPMANN, W. (1922) **Public opinion**. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- MARTÍNEZ, M. del C. (1996) **Análisis psicosocial del prejuicio**. Madrid: Síntesis.
- MESA, M. C. (1988) "Estereotipos culturales", en **Publicaciones**, **13-14**, 53-78.
- MORALES, F. y otros (1994) **Psicología social**. Madrid: McGraw-Hill.
- MORALES, F. y MOYA, M. C. (1996) **Tratado de psicología social. Volumen I: Procesos básicos**. Madrid: Síntesis.
- OAKLEY, A. (1970) "Occupation housewife", en **New Society**, **13**, 282-284.
- OSKAMP, S. (1991) **Attitudes and opinions**. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall, 2ª ed.
- OVEJERO, A. (1991) "Estereotipos raciales/nacionales de los universitarios: 30 años después", en **Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada**, vol. **44**, **4**, 485-492.
- PETTIGREW, T. S. (1979) "The ultimate attribution error: extending Allport's cognitive analysis on prejudice", en **Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin**, **5**, 461-476.
- PINILLOS, J. L. (1960) "Estereotipos raciales de los universitarios españoles, ingleses y norteamericanos", en **Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada**, **56**, 777-797.
- RODRÍGUEZ, A. (1996) "Psicología social de los prejuicios". En Varios (eds.), **Psicología social aplicada**. Madrid: McGraw-Hill.

- RODRÍGUEZ SANABRA, F. (1963) "Estereotipos regionales españoles", en **Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada**, **68-69**, 763-711.
- SÁNCHEZ, S. y MESA, M. C. (1991) "La escuela en una sociedad multicultural. Estudio de la situación en Melilla". En Varios (eds.), **Educación multicultural e intercultural**. Granada: Impredisur.
- SÁNCHEZ, S., MESA, M. C. y SERRANO, L. (1991) **Demandas formativas del profesorado desde su práctica profesional. Propuestas para su formación**. Granada: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Granada.
- SANGRADOR, J. L. (1981) **Estereotipos de las nacionalidades y regiones de España**. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.
- SHERIF, M. (1966) **Group conflict and cooperation**. Londres: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- SIMPSON, G. E. y YINGER, J. M. (1986) Racial and cultural minorities. An analysis of prejudices and discrimination. New York: Plenum Press.
- TAJFEL, H. (1978) "Intergroup behavior". En H. Tajfel y C. Fraser (eds.), **Introducing social psychology**. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- TAJFEL, H. (1984) **Grupos humanos y categorías sociales**. Barcelona: Herder.
- TAJFEL, H. y TURNER, J. C. (1979) "An integrative theory of intergroup conflict". En W. G. Austin y S. Worchel (eds.), **The social psychology of intergroup relations**. California: Brooks Cole.
- WEBER, J. G. (1994) "The nature of ethnocentric attribution bias: ingroup protection or enhancement?", en **Journal of Experimental Social Psychology**, **30**, 482-504.
- WETHERELL, M. y POTTER, J. (1992) **Mapping the language on racism**. Londres: Harvester.