Italian version of the RIVEC Prejudice Scale

Paola Villano, Stefano Passini

Department of Education Studies, University of Bologna

s.passini@unibo.it

❧ ABSTRACT. Classicamente la psicologia sociale ha analizzato gli effetti che il contatto intergruppi ha sull'intolleranza e la discriminazione. In particolare, vari studi si sono focalizzati su come la coesistenza di culture diverse possa influenzare le dinamiche intergruppi, nello specifico dei processi che portano ad atteggiamenti tolleranti o parziali nei confronti di altri gruppi sociali. Sulla base della classica scala di pregiudizio sottile e manifesto, recentemente è stata proposta la scala RIVEC, che valuta il pregiudizio attraverso cinque componenti: minaccia e rifiuto (Rifiuto), perdita di intimità (Intimità), valori tradizionali (Valori), negazione di emozioni positive (Emozioni) e differenze culturali (Cultura). Nella presente ricerca, 409 partecipanti hanno risposto alla versione italiana di questa scala e ad altre scale relative al pregiudizio: razzismo moderno, orientamento alla dominanza sociale (SDO), etnocentrismo e competizione a somma zero. L'analisi dell'affidabilità interna e l'analisi confermativa hanno confermato la soluzione a cinque fattori.

❧ SUMMARY. The effects of intergroup contact on intolerance and discrimination have been a classical topic in social psychology. Research has indeed focused on how the coexistence of different cultures affects intergroup dynamics, particularly the processes that are related to tolerant versus biased attitudes towards other social groups. Based on the classic blatant-subtle prejudice scale, the RIVEC Prejudice Scale was recently proposed, which assesses prejudice by way of five components: threat and rejection (Rejection), loss of intimacy (Intimacy), traditional values (Values), denial of positive emotions (Emotions), and cultural differences (Culture). In the present research, 409 participants responded to the Italian version of this scale and to other scales related to prejudice: i.e., modern racism, social dominance orientation (SDO), ethnocentrism, and zero-sum competition. RIVEC's internal reliabilities were investigated and a confirmatory factor analysis was performed. Results show adequate fit of both the total score and the single five dimensions.

INTRODUCTION

Prejudice has been traditionally considered the emotional component of attitudes toward social groups and historically defined as reflecting overt intergroup hostility toward groups, especially marginalized groups (Allport, 1954; Brown, 2011; Dovidio & Jones, 2019). The current view defines prejudice as "an individual-level attitude (subjectively positive or negative) toward groups or their members that creates or maintains hierarchical status relations between groups" (Dovidio, Hewstone, Glick, & Esses, 2010, p. 7). Pettigrew and Meertens (1995; Meertens & Pettigrew, 1997) have suggested the existence of two distinct yet related types of prejudice expression in contemporary society: blatant (i.e. open and direct means of expressing prejudice) and subtle (i.e. covert and indirect behaviours that discriminate against a target out-group, particularly pernicious because it complies with social norms and is therefore less detectable). The two authors operationalised these two forms using 20 items as being referred to five facets of prejudice (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995): two related to blatant prejudice (i.e. rejection and intimacy) and three related to subtle prejudice (i.e. values, culture and emotions). As the psychological literature has shown, the blatant and subtle prejudice scale has been used in many cultural and social contexts (for the Italian context see for example Arcuri & Boca, 1996; La Barbera & Cariota Ferrara, 2010; Mancini & Carbone, 2007; Manganelli Rattazzi & Volpato, 2001; Villano, 1999; Villano & Passini, 2018) and has been applied to the study of prejudice against indigenous people (Ungaretti, Etchezahar & Barreiro, 2018), sexual and gender prejudice (Cramwinckel, der Toorn & Scheepers, 2018; Krolikowski, Rinella & Ratcliff, 2016) or ethnic prejudice (Pirchio, Passiatore, Panno, Maricchiolo & Carrus, 2018).

Recently, some authors (Arancibia, Ruiz, Blanco & Cárdenas, 2016; Arancibia, Blanco, Ruiz & Castro, 2016; Cárdenas Castro, 2010; Gattino, Miglietta & Testa, 2008; Leone, Chirumbolo & Aiello, 2006) have focused their attention on the issue that Pettigrew and Meertens based their scale on the two-factor structure of the scale (blatant and subtle), but they did not separately measure the five distinct facets they theoretically proposed. Moreover, methodological problems related to the blatant and subtle prejudice scale have been identified. Firstly, some items contain double statements and are extremely long (Arancibia,

2014). Moreover, Arancibia (2014) pointed out that the items designed to measure the "cultural differences" component, assessed perceived cultural differences between out-group and in-group culture (by asking for the level of diversity of values, religious beliefs, etc..) rather than cultural bias. Therefore, it was incorrectly assumed that accounting for cultural differences would be comparable to cultural bias. Secondly, the subtle prejudice scale lacks construct validity due to the fact that the construct was operationalized via some items that do not show discriminant validity with the blatant prejudice measures (Leone et al., 2006). Thirdly, the high correlations between subtle and blatant prejudice (equal to or above .70) would lead one to consider that it is the same construct (Cárdenas Castro, 2010; Coenders, Scheepers, Sniderman & Verberk, 2001).

Measure of prejudice

Starting from these limitations, Arancibia, Ruiz and colleagues (2016) have recently proposed the RIVEC (Rejection, Intimacy, Values, Emotions, and Culture) scale. Although theoretically based on the theoretical model of Pettigrew and Meertens (1995), Arancibia, Ruiz and colleagues (2016) have completely rewritten all the items and then built a novel scale.

The RIVEC consists of 15 items distributed homogeneously across five dimensions (three items for each of them): threat and rejection (Rejection), loss of intimacy (Intimacy), traditional values (Values), denial of positive emotions (Emotions), and cultural differences (Culture). These five dimensions should be considered both as individual facets or components of prejudice and, on the whole, as a generalised measure of prejudice. As shown by the results obtained by Arancibia, Ruiz and colleagues (2016) in validating the scale, the RIVEC represents an adequate measurement of the expression of prejudice. Moreover, in accordance with Arancibia (2014), the RIVEC addresses some of the weaknesses of the blatant-subtle prejudice by consisting of just one-sentence items, by measuring the Culture dimension as tolerance with respect to perceived cultural differences, and by overcoming the problematic subtle and blatant distinction.

The aim of the present study is to adapt the scale to the Italian context and to analyse its psychometric properties and dimensionality. Moreover, we assess the

relationships of RIVEC with other variables related to the attitudes towards other social groups and intergroup bias. In particular, social dominance orientation (SDO), ethnocentrism, modern racism, and competitiveness were considered. Many scholars have shown a great connection between these variables and prejudice. For instance, some authors (Fontanella, Villano & Di Donato, 2016; Passini, 2017; Passini & Villano, 2018; Ungaretti et al., 2018; Villano & Zani, 2007) have demonstrated that people with higher levels of social dominance orientation will be more prejudiced but only towards the groups perceived as inferior in terms of competence or power.

Moreover, different studies have shown that ethnocentrism and some variables like age and political orientation correlate with prejudice (Aiello & Areni, 1998; Passini & Villano, 2013; Pedersen, Clarke, Dudgeon & Griffiths, 2005). In the present research, we hypothesized that SDO, ethnocentrism, modern racism, and competitiveness would positively correlate with the total prejudice score, obtained by considering the RIVEC as a single score. With respect to the relationship of these concepts with each one of the five dimensions of the RIVEC, the research intent is exploratory and therefore no specific assumptions are made.

METHODS

Participants

The participants were contacted online, using an Internet questionnaire constructed using Limesurvey, a survey-generating tool (http://www.limesurvey.org). Respondents were advised that their participation was voluntary and that their responses would remain anonymous and confidential. The data were collected in 2017.

A total of 409 Italian citizens (57.5% women) responded by accessing the website and filling out the questionnaire. Participant ages ranged from 18 to 69 years ($M = 33.21$, $SD = 13.10$). They were mainly born in the north of Italy (78.1%), while the 10.3% and the 11.6% came from the centre and the south, respectively, and 2.6% were born abroad. As regards their level of education, 9.4% declared they had completed middle school, 69.2% declared they had earned a high school diploma, 22% had a university degree and 8.8% a masters or Ph.D. qualification. Job-wise, 37.3%

stated they were clerical workers, 33.8% university students, 9.9% factory workers/artisans, 7.7% self-employed, 4.2% teachers, 2.8% unemployed, 2.1% retired, and, finally, 2.1% chose other.

Measures

All measures employed seven-point response scales (ranging from 1 = *not at all* to 7 = *very much*). Where not specified, the original English versions were translated into Italian and submitted to a back-translation by a native English speaker. The back-translated items were then reviewed by the authors and, where necessary, any unclear statement was reformulated.

– *RIVEC Prejudice Scale.*
  Based on Pettigrew and Meertens' Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale (1995), Arancibia et al. (2016) developed the RIVEC (Rejection, Intimacy, Values, Emotions, and Culture) Prejudice Scale, consisting of fifteen items theoretically structured into five dimensions, each measured with three items. Responses were obtained on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." The complete list of items is shown in Table 1. All the items were coded (and eventually reversed) so that that the higher the score, the higher the prejudice. There were no missing data.

– *Modern racism.*
  To measure modern racism, four items on a 7-point scale (from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*) from the modern sexism scale were adapted to fit racism toward immigrants (see Wohl & Branscombe, 2009). A sample item is "Discrimination against immigrants is no longer a problem in Italy". An overall anti-immigrant racism score was calculated by averaging the four items ($\alpha = .83$, .5% of missing data).

– *Social Dominance Orientation* (*SDO*).
  Social dominance orientation was measured with the Italian 4-item version of the SDO scale (Pratto et al., 2013). The items were rated on a 7-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). A sample item of the scale is "Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups" ($\alpha = .72$, 1.5% of missing data).

– *Ethnocentrism.*
  To assess the level of ethnocentrism, participants responded to a reduced six-item form of the ethnocentrism

Table 1 – Descriptive statistics and factor loadings of the confirmatory factor analysis on the RIVEC Prejudice Scale

	Descriptive statistics				Factor loadings (dimension)	
	M	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	One	Five
Threat and rejection items (Rejection)						
Immigrants live worse than Italians because they belong to a less able race (Gli immigrati vivono peggio degli Italiani perché sono meno capaci)	1.84	1.43	1.87	1.85	.49	.50
Immigrants take jobs, housing and school places that should be filled by Italian citizens (Gli immigrati occupano posti di lavoro, a scuola e abitazioni che dovrebbero essere occupati dai cittadini italiani)	2.71	1.96	.90	−.44	.78	.78
In general, immigrants are people that you cannot trust (In generale, gli immigrati sono persone di cui non ci si può fidare)	2.36	1.65	1.12	.28	.69	.69
Intimacy items (Intimacy)						
I do not think there is a difference between an Italian good friend and an immigrants good friend* (Non credo che ci sia una differenza tra un buon amico italiano e un buon amico immigrato)	5.79	1.85	−1.55	1.20	.41	.42
If I have to travel for work with a co-worker, I would prefer to travel with an Italian than with an immigrant (Se devo viaggiare per lavoro con un collega, preferirei farlo con un italiano piuttosto che con un immigrato)	2.33	1.86	1.24	.32	.77	.81
I would not mind if an immigrant person with a cultural level similar to mine married someone from my family* (Non mi disturberebbe se una persona immigrata con un livello culturale simile alla mia sposasse qualcuno della mia famiglia)	4.99	2.05	−.82	−.65	.42	.43
Traditional values items (Values)						
I perceive that immigrants living in Italy do not understand the friendship values that we have in Italy (Mi rendo conto che gli immigrati che vivono in Italia non capiscono i valori di amicizia che abbiamo in questo paese)	2.36	1.79	1.18	.26	.71	.77
The disadvantage of immigrants using some services (apartment rentals, hospitals, etc.) is that they don't know how to respect the established norms and rules (Il problema degli immigrati che utilizzano alcuni servizi (es. affitti, ospedali, ecc.) è che non sanno rispettare le norme e le regole del nostro paese)	3.56	2.00	.24	−1.21	.67	.70

continued

	Descriptive statistics				Factor loadings (dimension)	
	M	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	One	Five
Immigrants don't have the ingrained value that we give to the family in Italy (Gli immigrati non hanno il valore fondamentale della famiglia che hanno gli Italiani)	2.28	1.76	1.32	.65	.62	.67
Positive emotions items (Emotions)						
I admire immigrants who come to Italy looking for better job opportunities* (Ammiro gli immigrati che vengono in Italia alla ricerca di migliori opportunità di lavoro)	5.09	1.75	−.70	−.47	.43	.52
In general, I feel sympathy for immigrants who come to live in our country* (In generale, mi sento solidale con gli immigrati che vengono a vivere nel nostro Paese)	4.93	1.70	−.49	−.69	.63	.87
In general, I consider that immigrants resident in Italy are friendly and educated* (In generale, ritengo che le persone immigrate residenti in Italia siano cordiali ed educate)	4.31	1.47	−.09	−.59	.43	.61
Cultural differences items (Culture)						
If my son had an immigrant classmate he will be enriched by recognizing different traditions and customs* (Se mio figlio avesse un compagno di classe immigrato, ne sarebbe arricchito perché apprezzerebbe tradizioni e costumi differenti)	5.73	1.54	−1.25	.93	.58	.56
The immigrant children who go to school in Italy should assimilate more to the culture of our country than their culture (I bambini immigrati che vanno a scuola in Italia dovrebbero assimilarsi di più alla cultura del nostro paese invece di mantenere la loro)	3.78	1.98	.17	−1.16	.55	.49
If an immigrant child goes to school in Italy he or she should be required to respect our cultural values and traditions (Se un bambino immigrato va a scuola in Italia, dovrebbe essere tenuto a rispettare i valori e le tradizioni culturali italiane)	4.60	2.01	−.36	−1.14	.46	.42

Note. * = Reversed items.

scale (Aiello & Areni, 1998), an Italian measure. Items were measured on a 7-point scale, anchored at *strongly agree* and *strongly disagree*. The scale had a good reliability (α = .92, .7% of missing data). An example of an item is: "It's no accident that our country's prisons are mostly filled with immigrants".

– *Zero-sum competition.*

The zero-sum competition scale (see Ho et al., 2012), made up of four items on a 7-point scale (ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*), was used. A sample item is "More good jobs for immigrants means fewer good jobs for members of other groups". Cronbach's α was .92. This scale was collected in a subsample with n = 268 (no missing data).

– *Right-wing orientation.*

Participants indicated their ideological affiliation (from 1 = *extreme left* to 10 = *extreme right*, 19.3% of missing data).

Data analysis

First of all, confirmatory factor analysis with maximum likelihood estimation with robust standard errors (MLR) was performed in order to confirm the scale's structure. The analysis was performed using the lavaan R Package (Rosseel, 2012). We relied on the following indexes for the evaluation of the model fit: the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), the Standardized Root-Mean Square Residual (SRMR), and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA). In line with the recommendation of Hu and Bentler (1999), goodness-of-fit criteria were used in order to quantify acceptable (CFI>.90, TLI>.90, SRMR<.10, RMSEA<.08) and excellent fit (CFI>.95, TLI>.95, SRMR<.08, RMSEA<.06). In particular, we examined two different structures: the one- and the five-dimensional (i.e. rejection, intimacy, values, emotions, and culture) solutions. To test significant improvement in model fit, the chi-square difference test to compare nested models was used. Second, the normality and the internal reliability [both with alpha and McDonald's (1999) omega coefficients] were examined. In particular, as concerns the scale's normality, values of skewness and kurtosis were considered. Normality of the data is considered acceptable when skewness and kurtosis are between ±2 (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2014). Finally, by computing zero-order and partial correlations we explored the association of RIVEC with other relevant dimensions related to discrimination.

RESULTS

CFA was used to verify the fit of the one- and five-dimensional solutions. We started with the five-dimensional structure. The model did not fit the data in an acceptable way: $\chi^2(80)$ = 269.69, CFI = .89, TLI = .85, RMSEA = .07, SRMR = .07. Modification indexes suggested correlating four error terms. These correlations were all plausible given that three of them were between reversed and anti-prejudice items: "I do not think there is a difference between an Italian good friend and an immigrants good friend" (intimacy) with "If my son had an immigrant classmate he will be enriched by recognizing different traditions and customs" (culture), with "I would not mind if an immigrant person with a cultural level similar to mine married someone from my family" (intimacy) and with "I admire immigrants who come to Italy looking for better job opportunities" (emotions). The last one is between two items of the same dimension (culture): "The immigrant children who go to school in Italy should assimilate more to the culture of our country than their culture" with "If an immigrant child goes to school in Italy he or she should be required to respect our cultural values and traditions". The final five-dimensions model fit the data: $\chi^2(76)$ = 187.70, CFI = .94, TLI = .91, RMSEA = .06, SRMR = .05. The one-dimension model with the same four correlations between error terms did not fit the data in an acceptable way: $\chi^2(86)$ = 308.40, CFI = .87, TLI = .84, RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .07. Factor loadings for both the uni- and the five-dimensions are shown in Table 1 and were all significant with p<.001.

As concerns psychometric properties, items had statistically acceptable values on normality (skewness and kurtosis <±2, see Table 2). Internal reliabilities of the five dimensions and the total score showed acceptable values for three dimensions and all the 15 items (α = .89; ω = .89): rejection (α = .72; ω= .73), values (α = .75; ω= .75), and emotions (α = .70; ω = .72). Intimacy and culture had reliabilities both of .62 (α = .61; ω = .65, respectively). However, considering the fact that they are composed by just three items, they were considered adequate, even if lower that the other ones.

Bivariate correlations showed statistically significant high values between all the five dimensions: rs were between .42 and .58, except for the value between rejection and values with r = .73. Both the complete RIVEC Prejudice Scale and its five dimensions were highly positively correlated with all the other variables investigated (see Table 2, above). Partial correlations (see Table 2, below) showed that, when each RIVEC dimension

Table 2 – Zero-order and partial correlation between RIVEC dimensions and the other variables

Correlations	SDO	Ethnoc.	Modern racism	Zero-sum Com.	Right-wing orientation
Zero-order					
RIVEC	.63***	.81***	.78***	.78***	.55***
Rejection	.55***	.71***	.68***	.72***	.43***
Intimacy	.49***	.51***	.54***	.54***	.34***
Values	.51***	.69***	.64***	.67***	.46***
Emotions	.47***	.53***	.54***	.49***	.44***
Culture	.47***	.71***	.67***	.64***	.54***
Partial					
Rejection	.19***	.32***	.27***	.36***	.04
Intimacy	.21***	.00	.10*	.11	−.02
Values	.10*	.22***	.14**	.19**	.12*
Emotions	.21***	.22***	.24***	.13*	.21***
Culture	.10*	.43***	.38***	.30***	.31***

Legenda. SDO = social dominance orientation; Ethnoc. = Ethnocentrism; Com. = Competition.

Note. RIVEC = All the 15 items of the RIVEC scale. ***$p<.001$, **$p<.01$, *$p<.05$

was controlled for the other four RIVEC dimensions, values and culture were modestly related to SDO, intimacy was only related to SDO, emotions were slightly related to zero-sum competition, and finally intimacy and values were not or just slightly related to right-wing orientation.

DISCUSSION

The aim of the present research was to analyse the psychometric properties and the dimensionality of the RIVEC scale and to adapt it to the Italian context. As

concerns the structure, the results of the analyses confirm the existence of the five distinct dimensions measuring generalized prejudice. Specifically, the CFA proposes that the five-dimensional structure should be considered as statistically more robust that the one-dimensional structure (even if the bifactor solution had a satisfactory fit). Moreover, the item analysis shows adequate fit with univariate normality and the reliability coefficient of both the total score and the single dimensions are acceptable (also considering the small number of items for each dimension). It is worth noting that partial correlations show some discriminant association of the five dimensions with the other variables considered. In

particular, rejection and culture are more related to other forms of discrimination as ethnocentrism, modern racism, and zero-sum competition. Instead, rejection, intimacy, and values are not or else they are slightly related to right-wing orientation. Future studies should deepen the discriminant validity of these dimensions on other variables, confirming the utility of considering them separately, together with a single general measure of prejudice. For instance, it might be interesting to analyse whether they are differently related to basic values, as measured by Schwartz (1992).

This study had some limitations which have to be taken into account. First of all, the results are based on one single sample. Future studies should replicate these results. Secondly, intimacy and culture are the two weaker dimensions in a statistical sense. Future studies should investigate whether this weakness depends from the current sample or whether it may be better to improve the items of these two dimensions. Thirdly, in order to better compare RIVEC with the blatant-subtle scale, a study should be carried out in the future in which both scales are collected. Finally, the RIVEC scale may suffer from the same limitations as Pettigrew and Meertens' scale, that is social desirability (Olson, 2009). This limitation could be overcome by combining it with implicit measures.

Despite these limitations, the results presented in this article are promising. In particular, the RIVEC scale should be applied cross-culturally with other samples. Arancibia (2014) argues for the importance of studying expressions of prejudice in different social and cultural contexts and with different reference groups. Hence, the RIVEC scale should be considered as a useful tool for studying intolerant attitudes towards the out-groups. In Italy, as in many other countries, there is a need to focus studies and analysis on prejudice and its consequences. As shown by numerous news stories and official statistics[1], the increase in phenomena of overt discrimination and racism against immigrants is leading Italy towards a sort of "racist" emergency. For example,

explicit anti-migrant prejudice has recently been shown to predict deliberate actions against migrants among British and Italian participants (Sheperd, Fasoli, Pereir, & Brainscombe, 2018). It might therefore be useful to work on the use of a scale, such as the RIVEC, which captures five dimensions of prejudice, in order to fully understand the various aspects of the phenomenon and consequently try to curb and reduce it. These five dimensions should be conceived as distinct facets, without, however, exasperating the subdivision in blatant and subtle forms as had been done in the past. In a review on quantitative and qualitative studies from social psychology, sociology, and political science, Leach (2005) has indeed remarked the non-existence of a clear temporal distinction between old and new expressions of prejudice and racism. "Formal expression of 'old-fashioned' racism was not as open, overt, blatant and direct as is commonly presumed. Indeed, formal expressions of racial ideology were 'subtl,', 'symboli,', indirect and covert" (p. 434). To corroborate this continuity in formal expression, Leach demonstrates that the formal expression of presumably "old-fashioned" prejudice continues today at levels not so different from the first half of the 20th century, for example by essentializing ethnic groups in terms of culture, religion, origin, or more general practice. Today prejudice in Italy is more overt and direct than ever, and this should lead social psychologists to raise this issue by working on adequate scales, such as RIVEC.

The study of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination remains an active research field (Dovidio & Jones, 2019; Krueger, Hall, Villano & Jones,,2008), and social psychologists should have the responsibility to study these kinds of phenomena that have important theoretical and practical implications. New scales like RIVEC could contribute to examining in depth not only personal responses to prejudice, but also how the expressions of prejudice differ in accordance with the social and cultural context (Crandall & Stangor, 2005).

---

1 See the report of hate crime data on the site of OSCE: http://hatecrime.osce.org/italy.

References

AIELLO, A. & ARENI, A. (1998). Un aggiornamento della Scala di De Grada ed altri (1975) per la misura dell'etnocentrismo. *Rassegna di Psicologia*, *15* (2), 145-160.

ALLPORT, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley.

ARANCIBIA, H. (2014). *Diseño Psicométrico y Validación de la Escala de Prejuicio RIVEC basada en los presupuestos de Pettigrew & Meertens* (Doctoral thesis, Departamento de Psicología Social y Metodología, Facultad de Psicología Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain).

ARANCIBIA, H., BLANCO, A., RUIZ, M.Á. & CASTRO, M.C. (2016). Rivec (rejection, intimacy, values, emotions, and culture) prejudice scale: An adaptation to the chilean context of the blatant and subtle prejudice scale. *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology*, *10*, 1-12.

ARANCIBIA, H., RUIZ, M.Á., BLANCO, A. & CÁRDENAS, M. (2016). New evidence of construct validity problems for Pettigrew and Meertens' (1995) Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale. *Psychological Reports*, *118* (2), 544-564.

ARCURI, L. & BOCA, S. (1996). Pregiudizio e affiliazione politica: destra e sinistra di fronte all'immigrazione dal terzo mondo. In P. Legrenzi & V. Girotto, *Psicologia e Politica*. Milano: Raffaello Cortina.

BROWN, R. (2011). *Prejudice: Its social psychology*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

CÁRDENAS CASTRO, M. (2010). Forms of ethnic prejudice: assessing the dimensionality of a Spanish-language version of the Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale. *Psicothema*, *22* (1), 118-124.

COENDERS, M., SCHEEPERS, P., SNIDERMAN, P.M. & VERBERK, G. (2001). Blatant and subtle prejudice: dimensions, determinants, and consequences; some comments on Pettigrew and Meertens. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 31* (3), 281-297.

CRAMWINCKEL, F.M., der TOORN, J. & SCHEEPERS, D.T. (2018). Interventions to reduce blatant and subtle Sexual Orientation- and Gender Identity Prejudice (SOGIP): Current knowledge and future directions. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, *12* (1), 183-217.

CRANDALL, C.S. & STANGOR, C. (2005). Conformity and prejudice. In J.F. Dovidio, P. Glick & L.A. Rudman (Eds.), *On the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport*. Malden MA.: Blackwell.

DOVIDIO, J.F., HEWSTONE, M., GLICK, P. & ESSES, V.M. (2010). Prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination: Theoretical and empirical overview. In D.C. Mutz & S.K.Goldman (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination*. London, UK: Sage.

DOVIDIO, J.F. & JONES, J.M. (2019). Prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination. In E.J. Finkel & R.F. Baumeister (Eds.), *Advanced social psychology: The state of the science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

FONTANELLA, L., VILLANO, P. & DI DONATO, M. (2016). Attitudes towards Roma people and migrants: A comparison through a Bayesian multidimensional IRT model. *Quality & Quantity*, *50* (2), 471-490.

GATTINO, S., MIGLIETTA, A. & TESTA, S. (2008). Dimensionality in Pettigrew and Meertens' Blatant Subtle Prejudice Scale. *TPM-Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, *15* (3), 135-151.

GRAVETTER, F. & WALLNAU, L. (2014). *Essentials of statistics for the behavioral sciences (8th ed.)*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

HO, A.K., SIDANIUS, J., PRATTO, F., LEVIN, S., THOMSEN, L., KTEILY, N. & SHEEHY-SKEFFINGTON, J. (2012). Social dominance orientation: Revisiting the structure and function of a variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *38* (5), 583-606.

HU, L. & BENTLER, P.M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *6* (1), 1-55.

KROLIKOWSKI, A.M., RINELLA, M. & RATCLIFF, J.J. (2016). The influence of the expression of subtle and blatant sexual prejudice on personal prejudice and identification with the expresser. *Journal of homosexuality*, *63* (2), 228-249.

KRUEGER, J.I., HALL, J.H., VILLANO, P. & JONES, M.C. (2008). Attribution and categorization effects in the representation of gender stereotypes. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *11* (3), 401-414.

LA BARBERA, F. & CARIOTA FERRARA, P. (2010). Subtle and blatant prejudice toward Chinese, Moroccan, and Polish immigrants in an Italian province. *TPM-Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, *17*, 217-227.

LEACH, C.W. (2005). Against the notion of a 'new racism'. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *15* (6), 432-445.

LEONE, L., CHIRUMBOLO, A. & AIELLO, A. (2006). Pregiudizio sottile e pregiudizio manifesto: Alcuni rilievi critici sullo strumento di Pettigrew e Meertens (1995). *Giornale Italiano di Psicologia*, *33* (1), 175-198.

MANCINI, T. & CARBONE, E. (2007). Identità territoriale, nazionale, europea, culturale e cosmopolita e pregiudizio latente e manifesto. Una ricerca su un gruppo di studenti universitari.

Giornale Italiano di Psicologia, *34* (1), 117-146.

MANGANELLI RATTAZZI, A.M. & VOLPATO, C. (2001). Forme sottili e manifeste di pregiudizio verso gli immigrati. *Giornale Italiano di Psicologia*, *28* (2), 351-378.

McDONALD, R.P. (1999). *Test theory: A unified treatment*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

MEERTENS, R.W. & PETTIGREW, T.F. (1997). Is subtle prejudice really prejudice? *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, *61* (1), 54-71.

OLSON, M.A. (2009). Measures of prejudice. In T. Nelson (Ed.), *Handbook of Prejudice*. New York: Psychology Press.

PASSINI, S. (2017). Different ways of being authoritarian: The distinct effects of authoritarian dimensions on values and prejudice. *Political Psychology*, *38* (1), 73-86.

PASSINI, S. & VILLANO, P. (2013). Judging moral issues in a multicultural society. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, *72*, 235-239.

PASSINI, S. & VILLANO, P. (2018). Left-right orientation and electoral choices: Divergences in the relationships with authority and out-groups. *Psychological Reports*, *121* (6), 1131-1146.

PEDERSEN, A., CLARKE, S., DUDGEON, P. & GRIFFITHS, B. (2005). Attitudes toward Indigenous Australians and asylum seekers: The role of false beliefs and other social-psychological variables. *Australian Psychologist*, *40* (3), 170-178.

PETTIGREW, T.F. & MEERTENS, R.W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in Western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *25*, 57-75.

PIRCHIO, S., PASSIATORE, Y., PANNO, A., MARICCHIOLO, F. & CARRUS, G. (2018). A chip off the old block: Parents' subtle ethnic prejudice predicts children's implicit prejudice. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*, 1-9.

PRATTO, F., ÇIDAM, A., STEWART, A.L., ZEINEDDINE, F.B., ARANDA, M., AIELLO, A., … HENKEL, K.E. (2013). Social dominance in context and in individual contextual moderation of robust effects of social dominance orientation in 15 languages and 20 countries. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 4* (5), 587599.

ROSSEEL, Y. (2012). Lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling and more. Version 0.5-12 (BETA). *Journal of Statistical Software*, *48* (2), 1-36.

SCHWARTZ, S.H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M.P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

SHEPHERD, L., FASOLI, F., PEREIRA, A. & BRANSCOMBE, N.R. (2018). The role of threat, emotions, and prejudice in promoting collective action against immigrant groups. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *48* (4), 447-459.

UNGARETTI, J., ETCHEZAHAR, E. & BARREIRO, A. (2018). Validation of the subtle and blatant prejudice scale towards indigenous people in Argentina. *Current Psychology*, *1*, 1-7.

VILLANO, P. (1999). Anti-Semitic prejudice in adolescence: An Italian study on shared beliefs. *Psychological Reports*, *84*, 1372-1378.

VILLANO, P. & PASSINI, S. (2018). Competent in the North, passionate in the South. Stereotypes and prejudices between northern and southern Italy. *Psicologia Sociale*, *13* (2), 91-106.

VILLANO, P. & ZANI, B. (2007). Social dominance orientation and prejudice in an Italian sample. *Psychological Reports*, *101* (2), 614-616.

WOHL, M.J. & BRANSCOMBE, N.R. (2009). Group threat, collective angst, and ingroup forgiveness for the war in Iraq. *Political Psychology*, *30* (2), 193-217.