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Abstract

In two studies we develop and validate a Classical—overt or direct—and a Modern—covert or subtle—Racial Prejudice Scale, concerning attitudes toward immigrants, for a Swedish (Scandinavian) context. Further, we examine whether these two forms of prejudice are distinguishable. Confirmatory factor analyses showed that, although highly correlated, classical and modern racial prejudice are distinguishable. This conclusion was also supported by various construct validations. The findings are discussed in relation to other studies that compare the content and structure of modern and classical racism. Copyright © 2000 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

INTRODUCTION

Prejudice against immigrants is probably not a recent problem in Europe, a continent with an immigrant population of many different ethnic groups. However, most European countries have experienced an increasing influx of war immigrants from the former Yugoslavia, Middle East, and Africa in recent years. Further, Europe’s current economical situation and the high rate of unemployment since the beginning of the 1990s seem to have challenged the European’s tolerance toward immigrants. Although a few extremist individuals have been responsible for the increasing racially motivated violence against immigrants in different parts of Europe, most researchers agree that
direct and open expression of racial prejudice has declined (McConahay, Hardee, & Batts, 1981; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995).

Nevertheless, the covert manifestation of racial prejudice has, most probably, not declined. For example, Lange (1996) asked four major groups of immigrants (Africans, Arabs, Asians, and Yugoslavs) in Sweden if they believed Sweden to be a racist country. Seventy per cent of the Africans, 47 per cent of the Arabs, 71 per cent of the Asians, and 62 per cent of the Yugoslavs answered yes to the question. These proportions tell us that discrimination or racial prejudice as experienced by immigrants is a serious problem for various groups of immigrants. Consequently, immigrant groups have increased their demands for equality and legal provisions against discriminatory acts.

In the past thirty years, particularly in the 1990s, much has been written about stereotyping and prejudice (for reviews, see Fiske, 1998; Hamilton & Sherman, 1994; Hilton & von Hippel, 1996). Many researchers dealing with racial prejudice agree that its expression has become more subtle in modern society (Dovidio, Mann, & Gaertner, 1989; Eberhardt & Fiske, 1994; Katz & Hass, 1988; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995; Sears, 1988). For example, Dovidio and Gaertner (1998) have argued that ‘discrimination occurs when an aversive racist can justify or rationalize a negative response on the basis of some factor other than race’ (p. 7). Sears (1988) characterized modern racism by three components: denial of continued discrimination, antagonism toward minority group demands, and resentment about special favors for minority groups. Similarly, Pettigrew and Meertens (1995) have argued that blatant prejudice is the manifestation of three components: defense of traditional values, exaggeration of cultural differences, and denial of positive emotions. We believe that these classifications are current and identifiable in today’s societies.

In contrast to modern racism, blatant or old-fashioned racism is expressed more directly and openly. However, changes in sociopolitical climate in general since the Second World War (Katz & Hass, 1988) and in particular the tendency of people to present themselves as non-prejudiced and socially or politically ‘correct’ (Crossby, Bromly, & Saxe, 1980), may prevent the expression of blatant racial prejudice (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). Moreover, in many countries, direct expression of racial prejudice may lead to legal punishment, and therefore some people can be reluctant to express their prejudice openly (Franco & Maass, 1999).

Although most researchers agree on the subtlety of modern racial prejudice, they differ in their labels for the new form of racism, which has been denoted, for example, symbolic racism (Sears, 1988), aversive racism (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998), modern racism (McConahay, 1983), and subtle prejudice (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). These types are assumed to be the covert expressions of old-fashioned racism (McConahay, 1986). In the present article, we use the terms modern and classical racism to refer to the new and the old expressions of racial prejudice.

To date, much of the research done on racial prejudice has focused on the attitudes that white Americans hold toward African Americans (Fiske, 1998; van Ommeren & Ishiyama, 1998), but little is known about attitudes toward ethnic minorities in Europe (but see Franco & Maass, 1999; Lepore & Brown, 1997; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995).

The above discussion highlights the importance of developing measures that tap the covert forms of prejudice. Therefore, the primary aim of the present study was to develop and validate racial prejudice scales for a Swedish (Scandinavian) context, and examine whether classical and modern racism can be distinguished in this cultural context.
STUDY 1: CONSTRUCTING CLASSICAL AND MODERN RACIAL PREJUDICE SCALES

We devised a pool of items chosen to reflect Swedish beliefs and ideas underlying classical and modern racism. Following McConahay (1986), we compare modern and classical racial prejudice, and we expect responses to the two sets of items to be correlated. In addition, we anticipate that the responses will be characterized by a two-factor structure, representing modern and classical racial prejudice, respectively.

Fazio, Jackson, Dunton, and Williams (1995, Study 3), for example, argue that conservatism was a significant predictor of racism. Further, drawing on the arguments of Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, and Malle (1994), we consider conservatism as a legitimizing myth that separates people into different groups and accords a positive social value for the preferred but a negative value for the non-preferred group. Immigrants are one example of such a non-preferred group. Moreover, women are historically considered as a low-power social group and are often victims of discrimination, a position, we suggest, they share to a certain extent with immigrants (e.g., Glick & Fiske, 1996). In addition, extant research indicates that racism and sexism are connected (e.g., Dovidio et al., 1989) and that men and women differ in their racism scores, in Sweden at least (e.g., Ekehammar & Sidanius, 1982).

Because of the prevailing norms against overtly expressing prejudicial beliefs in today’s society, as the reviewed research above indicates, we expect (a) Swedish participants to score higher than immigrants on modern but not classical racism, and (b) men to score higher than women on modern but not classical racism. Further, we expect our racial prejudice scales to correlate positively with conservatism, modern sexism, and classical sexism. Confirmatory evidence in favor of our hypotheses would simultaneously lend support to the construct validity of our scales.

Method

Participants

There were 230 respondents, 138 women and 92 men, students from various academic disciplines at Uppsala University and at the local authority-administered adult education, in the age range of 18 to 59 years (M = 23.1 years). Thirty of the participants had an immigrant background (i.e., first- or second-generation immigrants). The respondents received cinema vouchers for their participation.

Procedure and Questionnaire

When they arrived, participants were given envelopes containing a questionnaire of several parts. The part relevant to the present study consisted of a preliminary set of items for the Modern and Classical Racial Prejudice Scales. Further, Modern and Classical Sexism Scales (see Ekehammar, Akrami, & Araya, in press), and a Conservatism Scale, constructed using Ekehammar and Sidanius (1982) as a guide, were used for validation. Sample items included such as ‘Discrimination of women is no
longer a problem in Sweden’, for Modern sexism, ‘Women are generally not very talented’, for Classical sexism, and ‘Harder measures against criminals’ for Conservatism. The internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) reliabilities were 0.74 for the Conservatism scale, and 0.73 and 0.80 for the Classical and the Modern Sexism Scale, respectively. The questionnaire items were embedded in items concerning general subjects (e.g. ‘Nuclear power is good’), in order not to arouse participants’ suspicion about the main purpose of the study. Responses to all items were made on 5-point scales ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Items were randomly mixed and appropriate items were reversed.

The experimenter gave oral instructions and told the participants not to write names or make personal marks on the questionnaires in order to ensure anonymity. When they finished this task, participants were told to put the envelope in a box placed in the room and then received their cinema vouchers. Participants were then thanked and dismissed.

Scale Construction

We used McConahay’s (1986) items and Sears’ (1988) classification system as guides in constructing potential items ($n = 26$) for the Modern and Classical Racial Prejudice Scales. We conducted a preliminary exploratory principal components factor analysis. A two-factor solution resulted from these analyses using a scree test for determining the number of factors. All modern items loaded on the first factor, and most classical items on the second factor. Some items loaded equally on both factors and these were eliminated from subsequent analyses. The final items, 9 modern and 8 classical, are presented in the Appendix.

LISREL Analyses

Confirmatory factor analyses were conducted on the obtained covariance matrix using LISREL 8.14 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993). Three separate models were tested: (1) the one-factor model, which tests if the covariance matrix of the modern and classical items, is best represented as simply measuring one latent factor; (2) the uncorrelated two-factor model, which tests if the data can be represented as two (modern and classical) separate, uncorrelated latent factors; (3) the correlated two-factor model, which tests if the item covariance matrix is described best by two separate and correlated factors.

The best factor solution was determined by using $\chi^2$ tests. However, because $\chi^2$ values are influenced by sample size, five additional indices were used to compare the goodness of fit of the models. The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) measures the discrepancy per degree of freedom. Values close to or lower than 0.05 indicate a satisfactory fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1993). The Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI) measures the relative amount of variance and covariance jointly accounted for by the model. The more variance accounted for by the model, the better the fit. The GFI can range from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating better fit (Bollen, 1989; Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993). The three fit indices, NFI, NNFI, and CFI measure...
how much better a model fits as compared to other models (Bollen, 1989). These fit indices can range from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating better fit.

Results

Exploratory Factor Analysis

An exploratory Principal Components factor analysis of the final set of the modern and classical racial prejudice items was conducted. This revealed a two-factor structure, where the classical items were loaded on Factor 1 and the modern on Factor 2 (see Table 1). The scores on the Classical and Modern scales were computed by taking the average of the items with highest loading on each factor. The internal consistency reliabilities (Cronbach’s alpha) were satisfactory, 0.72 for the Classical and 0.82 for the Modern Racial Prejudice Scale. The average inter-item correlation was 0.25 for

Table 1. Means, standard deviations, adjusted item-total correlations (r), and factor loadings for two-factor exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis of the Modern and Classical Racial Prejudice Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classical racial prejudice</th>
<th>Exploratory</th>
<th>Confirmatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out in the countryside</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not tidy</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not hygienic</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not honest</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less moral</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not intelligent</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against integration</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexist</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern racial prejudice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination no problem</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough job programs</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racists no longer a threat</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to understand demands</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too little media attention</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too demanding for equal rights</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support teaching mother tongue</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job programs for immigrants</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural society is good</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scales range from 0 to 4, with lower scores indicating or recoded to indicate less racist responses. All correlations are significant at p < 0.001. Highest factor loading for each item is italicized.

a Denial of continuing discrimination.
b Antagonism toward demands.
c Resentment about special favors.
Classical and 0.36 for Modern. Item means, item standard deviations, and corrected item–total correlations are presented in Table 1.

**Confirmatory Factor Analyses**

In the confirmatory factor analyses, the $\chi^2$ tests indicated that the correlated two-factor model gave a significantly better fit than the uncorrelated two-factor model, $\Delta \chi^2(1, N = 230) = 124, p < 0.000$. The correlated two-factor model also yielded a better fit than the one-factor model, $\Delta \chi^2(1, N = 230) = 28, p < 0.000$ (see Table 2). Furthermore, all the fit indices show that the correlated two-factor model fits the data relatively well (see bold-type values in Table 2). The factor loadings for the correlated two-factor model are presented in Table 1.

As hypothesized, the results support that classical and modern prejudice, although highly correlated ($r = 0.62, p < 0.00$), are distinguishable. The confirmatory factor analyses indicated that the two-factor solution of modern and classic racism fit the data significantly better than the one-factor and non-correlated two-factor solution. Further, for the correlated two-factor solution, the factor loadings were significantly greater than 0.

**Construct Validity**

We compared scores of the Swedish ($n = 200$) and immigrant ($n = 30$) participants to assess the discriminant validity the Modern and Classical Racial Prejudice Scales. A one-tailed $t$-test showed that the Modern Scale differentiated between the groups, $t(228) = 1.67, p < 0.05$, indicating that participants of Swedish origin ($M = 1.95, SD = 0.67$) scored higher than those of immigrant origin ($M = 1.74, SD = 0.48$). However, the Classical Scale failed to discriminate between the groups, $t(228) = 0.28, p = 0.39$ ($M = 1.87, SD = 0.54$, and $M = 1.84, SD = 0.49$ for Swedes and immigrants, respectively). These results show that the Modern Racial Prejudice Scale discriminates better than the Classical, indicating the blatant nature of the classical items.

An analysis of gender differences on the mean total scores yielded a significant table.

### Table 1. Goodness of fit indices for three confirmatory factor models in Study 1 and Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>RMESA</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>$\chi^2/df$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-factor</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncorrelated two-factor</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlated two-factor</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>118</td>
<td><strong>1.86</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.906</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.056</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.805</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-factor</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncorrelated two-factor</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlated two-factor</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>118</td>
<td><strong>3.07</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.810</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.107</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.663</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: GFI = Goodness of Fit Index. RMESA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation. NFI = Bentler’s Normed Fit Index. NNFI = Bentler’s Non Normed Fit Index. CFI = Bentler’s Comparative Fit Index. Values in bold indicate the best fit within the group.*
difference for the Modern Scale, \( t(228) = 2.22, p < 0.02 \) (\( M = 2.04, SD = 0.67 \) for men, and \( M = 1.84, SD = 0.62 \) for women). There was no statistically significant gender difference on the Classical Scale, \( t(228) = 0.24, p = 0.40 \) (\( M = 1.88, SD = 0.55 \) for men, and \( M = 1.86, SD = 0.53 \) for women). Thus, these analyses give further support for the discriminant validity of the scales.

Product–moment correlation analyses showed that the Modern and Classical Racial Prejudice scores were correlated with Conservatism (0.39 and 0.42, respectively), Modern Sexism (0.54 and 0.30, respectively), and Classical Sexism (0.38 and 0.39, respectively). All correlations were statistically significant at \( p < 0.000 \). Taken together, these correlations lend support to the construct validity of our scales.

**STUDY 2: CONFIRMING THE TWO-FACTOR MODEL OF CLASSICAL AND MODERN RACIAL PREJUDICE**

The main purpose of Study 2 was to replicate the confirmatory factor analyses conducted in Study 1, employing the same 17 items but another sample. Further, in addition to the examination of gender differences, we included a Swedish variant of the Social Dominance Scale (Pratto et al., 1994) for a new construct validation of the Modern and Classical Racial Prejudice Scales. Social dominance orientation is an individual differences variable measuring ‘one’s degree of preference for inequality among social groups’ (Pratto et al., 1994, p. 741). Measures of social dominance orientation have been found to be highly correlated with racial prejudice (Pratto et al., 1994), sexism (e.g. Ekehammar et al., in press; Sidanius, 1993), and negative attitudes toward homosexuals (e.g. Whitley, 1999).

**Method**

**Participants**

There were 186 participants, 95 women and 91 men, aged 18 to 51 years (\( M = 23.9 \) years), students from various disciplines at Uppsala University and the local authority-administered adult education. The former group participated for course credit whereas the latter group received cinema vouchers.

**Procedure and Questionnaire**

When they arrived, participants were given envelopes containing a questionnaire consisting of the Modern (\( \alpha = 0.83 \) in the present study) and Classical (\( \alpha = 0.71 \) in the present study) Racial Prejudice Scales, and a Swedish modification of the Social Dominance Scale (\( \alpha = 0.89 \)), which included items such as ‘Increased social equality’ and ‘Inferior groups should stay in their place’.

As in Study 1, the scale items were embedded in items concerning general subjects (e.g. ‘Nuclear power is good’), in order not to arouse suspicion about the main aim of the study. Items were randomly mixed and nearly half of the items were reversed.
Responses to all items were given on 5-point scales ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5).

The experimenter (a Swedish woman) gave oral instructions and told participants that in order to ensure anonymity they should not write names or make personal marks on the questionnaire. After completion of this task, participants were told to put the envelope in a box placed in the room and then received their cinema vouchers or course credits. Participants were then thanked and dismissed.

**Results**

**Confirmatory Factor Analyses**

As in Study 1, we tested three different models using confirmatory factor analyses (LISREL). The $\chi^2$ tests indicated that the correlated two-factor model fits the data significantly better than the uncorrelated two-factor model, $\Delta\chi^2(1, N = 186) = 70, p < 0.000$. The correlated two-factor model yielded also a better fit than the one-factor model, $\Delta\chi^2(1, N = 186) = 37, p < 0.000$ (see Table 2). Furthermore, the fit indices indicated that the correlated two-factor model fits the data better than the one-factor solution. Moreover, for the correlated two-factor solution, all factor loadings were significantly greater than 0. Thus, the pattern was similar to that reported in Study 1. Although highly correlated ($r = 0.62, p < 0.000$), Classical and Modern racism can be distinguished.

**Construct Validity**

For validation purposes, we computed product-moment correlation coefficients for scores on the Modern and Classical Racial Prejudice Scales with scores on the Social Dominance Scale. The results showed that the Social Dominance Scale was significantly ($p < 0.001$) correlated with Modern (0.58) and Classical (0.56) Racial Prejudice. Thus, the analyses lend support to the construct validity of our racial prejudice scales.

An analysis of gender differences on the mean total scores revealed a significant difference for the Modern Scale, $t(184) = 2.10, p < 0.02 (M = 2.12, SD = 0.76$ for men, and $M = 1.90, SD = 0.68$ for women). There was also a statistically significant gender difference on the Classical Scale, $t(184) = 1.84, p < 0.04 (M = 2.09, SD = 0.54$ for men, and $M = 1.93, SD = 0.63$ for women). Thus, these analyses give support for the construct validity of our two scales but do not indicate discriminant validity as in Study 1.

**DISCUSSION**

If one wanted to measure, for example, prejudice in the 1930s, an item such as ‘I hate blacks’ would be a useful item. Nowadays, the item is too blatant or direct to be used as an item for measuring racial prejudice. Thus, people’s ideas and beliefs about racism have undergone dramatic changes (for a review see Duckitt, 1992). Interestingly, these changes are also observable in Sweden and in Scandinavia in general. However, in Scandinavia no attempt has been made by researchers to construct a Modern Racial
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Prejudice Scale to tap these important changes. Responding to this situation, in the present paper we addressed the issue by developing and testing a Modern and a Classical Racial Prejudice Scale for a Swedish (Scandinavian) context.

The results from our studies confirm that modern and classical racial prejudice are distinguishable. The correlated two-factor model is supported by the fit indices, which are higher than for the one- and uncorrelated two-factor models in both Study 1 and Study 2. Despite cultural differences, the results in Study 1 and Study 2 are consistent with previous findings by other researchers (e.g. McConahay, 1983; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995; Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995). Taken together, these findings support our contention that modern and classical racism, although highly correlated, are distinguishable.

Moreover, our analyses showed that, as anticipated, the Modern Racial Prejudice Scale discriminated better between Swedish and immigrant participants than the Classical Scale. Further, the Modern Racial Prejudice Scale discriminated better between men and women than the Classical Scale, indicating that men were more prone to express racial prejudice than women. These results support our contention that the classical, unlike the modern racism items, are blatant in nature. This, we argue, lends support to the discriminant validity of our scales. The results are also consistent with previous related research examining gender differences in racial attitudes in Sweden (Sidanius & Ekehammar, 1979; Ekehammar & Sidanius, 1982; Ekehammar, 1985; Nilsson & Ekehammar, 1990).

Because of the high correlation between the Racial Prejudice Scales, and the small differences in fit indices, some researchers have argued that modern and classical racial prejudice are practically indistinguishable (e.g. Dovidio, Kawakami, Johnson, Johnson, & Howard, 1997; Fazio et al., 1995; Lambert, Cronen, Chasteen, & Lickel, 1996; Sniderman & Tetlock, 1986). However, following Sears (1988) and Swim et al. (1995), we argue that high correlations between the factors do not lessen the importance of the distinction. Moreover, Mulaik, James, Van Alstine, Bennet, Lind, and Stilwell (1989) argue that ‘... if two models applied to the same data both obtain normed-fit indices in the 90s, the differences in fit between them may indeed be small, involving only differences in a few parameters, and yet the differences may have considerable theoretical importance at a given historical moment’ (p. 434). Accordingly, we suggest that the high correlations between modern and classical racism and the small differences in fit for the one- and two-factor models do not diminish the theoretical importance of the distinction.

In Study 1, the correlation analyses revealed that the construct validity of the scales was satisfactory. The Racial Prejudice Scales were highly correlated with modern and classical sexism and conservatism. In Study 2, we found high correlations between the Racial Prejudice Scales and the Social Dominance Scale, which confirm the construct validity of the scales. Further, the Modern and Classical Prejudice Scales were highly intercorrelated in both Study 1 and Study 2. Taken together, these analyses show that our scales share common variance with conservatism, social dominance, modern sexism and classical sexism. This is consistent with results reported by other researchers (Ekehammar & Sidanius, 1982; Sidanius & Ekehammar, 1979; Sidanius, Pratto, & Bobo, 1996; Swim et al., 1995).

Our studies extend the previous findings in the racial prejudice literature in two ways. First, from a practical point of view, our new modern and classical racial prejudice scales for a Scandinavian context may save others from the work of develop-
ing these measures. Because the Scandinavian countries share the same cultural and historical background and a common history of immigration, it is reasonable to assume that our scales could be profitably used in racial prejudice research in the other Scandinavian countries as well. Second, the theoretical importance of our study lies in showing the similarity of the factor structure with other studies conducted in quite different cultural contexts and employing different target groups (i.e. in the present study, immigrants). This is surprising, because immigration is a recent event in the Scandinavian countries, and thus they have a different history of race and ethnic relations than, for example, the USA (e.g. McConahay, 1986; Swim et al., 1995), Great Britain (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995), and Australia (Pedersen & Walker, 1997).
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APPENDIX: ITEM CONTENTS OF THE CLASSICAL AND MODERN RACIAL PREJUDICE SCALE

Classical racial prejudice
1. Immigrant camps should be placed far out in the countryside.
2. Immigrants do not keep their homes tidy.
3. Immigrants do not take care of their personal hygiene.
4. Immigrants are generally honest people.*
5. Generally speaking, immigrants have high moral principles.*
6. Immigrants are generally not very intelligent.
7. I favor full integration of Swedes and immigrants.*
8. Immigrants hold negative attitudes toward women.

Modern racial prejudice

Denial of continuing discrimination
1. Discrimination against immigrants is no longer a problem in Sweden.
2. There have been enough programs designed to create jobs for immigrants.
3. Racist groups are no longer a threat toward immigrants.

Antagonism toward demands
4. It is easy to understand immigrants’ demands for equal rights.*
5. Immigrants get too little attention in the media.*
6. Immigrants are getting too demanding in the push for equal rights.

Resentment about special favors
7. It is important to invest money in teaching immigrants their mother tongue.*
8. Special programs are needed to create jobs for immigrants.*
9. A multicultural Sweden would be good.*

Note. Items with an asterisk have reversed coding.