

An integrated threat theory composed of four variables was used to predict attitudes toward immigrant groups in Spain and Israel. The four threats are symbolic threats based on value differences between groups; realistic threats to the power, resources, and well-being of the in-group; anxiety concerning social interaction with out-group members; and feelings of threat arising from negative stereotypes of the out-group. All four threats were significant predictors of attitudes toward one or more of the immigrant groups. It was predicted, and found, that intergroup anxiety and negative stereotypes were more powerful and consistent predictors of prejudicial attitudes toward immigrants than were realistic threats or symbolic threats. The implications of the theory for the causes and reduction of prejudice were discussed.

PREJUDICE TOWARD IMMIGRANTS TO SPAIN AND ISRAEL

An Integrated Threat Theory Analysis

WALTER G. STEPHAN
New Mexico State University

OSCAR YBARRA
University of Michigan

CARMEN MARTÍNEZ MARTÍNEZ
Universidad de Murcia

JOSEPH SCHWARZWALD
MICHAL TUR-KASPA
Bar-Ilan University

Immigration has shaped the world in which we live. Throughout history, people have migrated from one part of the world to another, populating the earth and eventually creating the nation states that exist today. In the modern era, immigration among these nation states has occurred in response to many pressures, including the changing distributions of employment opportunities, population imbalances, natural disasters, and the actions of the nation states (Tilly, 1978). During the latter half of the 20th century, immigration has been largely driven by decolonization, political changes in the former Soviet Union

AUTHORS' NOTE: The authors thank Cookie White Stephan for her assistance in analyzing the data. Address correspondence to Walter G. Stephan, Department of Psychology, Box 30001, Dept. 3452, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM 88003, USA.

JOURNAL OF CROSS-CULTURAL PSYCHOLOGY, Vol. 29 No. 4, July 1998 559-576
© 1998 Western Washington University

and Eastern Europe, the labor needs of the industrialized nations, regional wars, and famine in the developing world. Many countries that had traditionally been sources of immigrants, such as Spain, are now receiving immigration.

Immigration is often beneficial to both the individuals who immigrate and the receiving countries, but it also creates many problems and tensions (United Nations Population Fund, 1993). Thus, most modern nation states have felt the need to control immigration, although there has been an ebb and flow to how restrictive immigration policies have been (Rystad, 1992). In many countries, immigrants are despised, hated, or discriminated against, sometimes violently. These tensions and negative attitudes are due to a host of factors, including the fact that most immigration flows from poor to rich countries, immigration threatens the jobs of citizens of the host country, and immigrants typically do not share the culture of the dominant group in the host country. The negative consequences of this hostility and rejection for the immigrants and the host countries make understanding the causes of these negative attitudes an important issue.

In our attempt to understand the causes of these negative attitudes, we employed the integrated threat theory of prejudice (Stephan & Stephan, 1996; Stephan, Ybarra, & Bachman, 1997; Ybarra & Stephan, 1994). Based on an extensive review of the literature, Stephan et al. (1997) argue that there are four basic types of threats that lead groups to be prejudiced toward one another; realistic threats, symbolic threats, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes. The concept of realistic threats has its origins in realistic group conflict theory (LeVine & Campbell, 1972; Sherif, 1966). The realistic threats posed by the out-group concern threats to the very existence of the in-group (e.g., through warfare), threats to the political and economic power of the in-group, and threats to the physical or material well-being of the in-group or its members (cf. Ashmore & Del Boca, 1976; Bobo, 1983, 1988; Coser, 1956; LeVine & Campbell, 1972; Quillian, 1995; Sherif, 1966). Studies illustrating the importance of realistic threats as determinants of prejudice have been conducted by Ashmore and Del Boca (1976), Bovasso (1993), Ybarra and Stephan (1994), Stephan et al. (1997), and Quillian (1995). Realistic threats typically arise as a result of competition for scarce resources such as land, power, or jobs, but they can also arise because of threats to the welfare of the group such as health threats or the threats posed by pollution across international borders.

Symbolic threats concern group differences in morals, values, norms, standards, beliefs, and attitudes. Symbolic threats are threats to the worldview of the in-group. These threats arise because of a belief in the moral rightness of the in-group's system of values (Sumner, 1906). Research on symbolic racism (e.g., McConahay & Hough, 1976; Sears, 1988; Weigel &

Howes, 1985), social dominance theory (Sidanius, 1994; Sidanius, Devereux, & Pratto, 1992), ambivalence-amplification theory (Katz, Wackenhut, & Glass, 1986), social identity theory (Branscombe & Wann, 1994), and symbolic beliefs (Esses, Haddock, & Zanna, 1993) indicates the important role that symbolic threats play in creating prejudice toward out-groups and opposition to social policies benefiting out-groups. Symbolic threats are experienced when members of the in-group perceive that their system of values is being undermined by an out-group.

People often feel anxious in intergroup interactions because they are concerned about negative outcomes such as disapproval, rejection, and embarrassment (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). They tend to be particularly anxious when the groups have a history of antagonism, have little prior personal contact, are ethnocentric, perceive one another to be dissimilar, are ignorant of one another, and when the groups interact in relatively unstructured, competitive situations where the in-group is in the minority or is of lower status than the out-group (Gudykunst, 1988; Islam & Hewstone, 1993; Stephan & Stephan, 1985, 1989, 1992). A number of studies have shown that intergroup anxiety is related to prejudice (Britt, Bonecki, Vescio, Biernat, & Brown, 1996; Islam & Hewstone, 1993; Stephan et al., 1997).

Although stereotypes are not usually conceptualized as threats posed by the out-group, negative out-group stereotypes typically do embody threats to the in-group. Stereotypes serve as a basis for expectations concerning the behavior of members of the stereotyped group (Hamilton, Sherman, & Ruvolo, 1990). When the expectations are negative, unpleasant or conflict-laden interactions are likely to be anticipated. Many out-group stereotypes contain traits that refer directly to threats such as being aggressive, pugnacious, and brawling (Martínez, 1995). Several recent studies support the idea that there is a link between negative stereotyping and prejudice (Eagly & Mladinic, 1989; Esses et al., 1993; Stangor, Sullivan, & Ford, 1991; Stephan, Ageyev, Coates-Shrider, Stephan, & Abalakina, 1994; Stephan & Stephan, 1993; Stephan et al. 1997; Ybarra & Stephan, 1994).

The degree to which these threats are related to prejudice is likely to depend on the nature of the relationship between the two groups. If the groups have a history of conflict, realistic threats should be a strong predictor of prejudice. If the groups are extremely dissimilar in terms of values, norms, roles, beliefs, and practices, symbolic threats should predict prejudice. If the groups have had limited contact or have had contact in situations that were threatening (e.g., the contact was involuntary, involved unequal status, was competitive, and/or was not individualized), intergroup anxiety should be closely related to prejudice. And, if the prior relations between the groups have led to the creation of negative stereotypes (particularly those that

portend harm), stereotypes should predict prejudice. It is possible that these aspects of prior intergroup relations act in concert, as well as individually, in creating a sense of threat and that each of these aspects of prior intergroup relations could have more than one effect on the perceived threats. For instance, prior conflict and negative contact could both contribute to intergroup anxiety, and perceived dissimilarity might lead to negative stereotypes in addition to symbolic threats.

In this study, we employ the integrated threat theory to examine the attitudes of Spanish citizens toward Moroccan immigrants and the attitudes of Israelis toward Russian and Ethiopian immigrants. The immigration of Moroccans to Spain and of Russians and Ethiopians to Israel represent two of the basic types of immigration: immigration of people from poorer to richer countries and immigration of refugees due to oppression (Rystad, 1992). The immigration of Moroccans to Spain involves the immigration of people from a developing country to an industrialized country. This immigration occurs primarily to fill the labor market needs of Spain (Pumares-Fernandez, 1993). The workers are considered to be temporary immigrants and are not expected to become permanent residents or assimilate into Spanish society.

Relations between Morocco and Spain have an intriguing history (Spencer, 1980). Although the culture and religions of Morocco and Spain differ, they have often mutually influenced one another over the course of history. Muslims dominated Spain for seven centuries until they were forcibly evicted in the late 15th century. When the Muslims were evicted from Spain, many fled to Morocco. Spain and Morocco fought two wars in the 19th century, and Spain occupied a small part of the Sahara desert (Sidi Ifni) in mid-century and did not relinquish it until 1978. Morocco was a Spanish Protectorate from 1921 to 1956, and even now, two cities in North Africa are Spanish (Ceuta and Melilla). There were numerous skirmishes between Morocco and Spain during the 20th century. In one battle, 9,000 Spaniards were killed (the "disaster of Annual"). Thus, owing to their historical contact, the immigration of Moroccans to Spain represents an interesting variant of immigration from a poorer to a richer country. In the case of Moroccan immigration to Spain, there are deep historical animosities that contribute to the tensions created by cultural differences and competition for jobs and other resources.

Immigration to Israel falls under the general category of immigration to flee oppression (Goldscheider, 1990). Israel is largely a nation of immigrants. Immigration to present-day Israel began in the 1880s with successive waves of European Zionists arriving during the late Ottoman (1882-1917) and British Mandate (1917-1948) periods. After the state of Israel was officially established (1948), the state itself encouraged immigration, although some

restrictions have been applied. The Law of Return enacted in 1950 granted every Jew in the world the right to immigrate to Israel, but the bulk of the immigration came from Eastern and Central Europe and from Africa and Asia (Goldscheider, 1990). The positive attitude toward immigration to Israel is clear in the terms used to refer to it. Immigration is referred to as *aliya*, meaning ascent, whereas emigration from Israel is referred to as *yerida*, meaning descent.

Ethiopian and Russian immigration represent the two main categories of immigrants to Israel, immigrants from European countries and immigrants from African (or Asian) countries. Ethiopian Jews immigrated to Israel as a result of revolution and famine in the 1970s and, in 1991, as a result of war (Wagaw, 1993). The first wave of immigrants arrived as a result of "operation Moses" (1984-1985), in which nearly 15,000 Ethiopian Jews were flown to Israel from refugee camps in Sudan. Another wave of Ethiopian Jews (14,000) arrived during "operation Solomon" in 1991. The total number of Ethiopian immigrants to Israel is approximately 56,000 (Schindler, 1993; Weil, 1995). Most of these immigrants arrived in Israel without formal education or experience working in industrialized jobs, but as their time in Israel increased, they were increasingly likely to obtain skilled jobs. Successful immigration is much more likely in younger than older immigrants and among women, rather than men (Benita & Noam, 1995). Nearly half of the Ethiopian immigrants remained in temporary housing in the mid 1990s (Holt, 1995).

Immigration from the former Soviet Union represents the largest influx of immigrants from any one country since Israel was established in 1948. Nearly 700,000 Russian immigrants had arrived in Israel by 1993, with the majority arriving after 1990 (Leshem, 1994). A substantial number of the more recent immigrants had wanted to immigrate earlier but had been prevented from doing so by the Soviet government. Most of them immigrated for political, economic, and religious reasons. The average educational level of these immigrants is higher than that of the Israelis as a whole. Although the majority are presently employed, many in jobs for which they are overqualified, they still face housing shortages (Noam, 1994; Zemach, Leshem, & Veisel, 1993).

Stephan and Stephan (1996) have suggested that subordinate groups are likely to pose some of the types of threats outlined in the integrated threat theory to a greater degree than others. The dominant position of high-status groups means that realistic and symbolic threats may not be particularly salient, in that their power protects them from challenges to their dominant position with respect to cultural values and real resources. However, any cultural differences that do exist between the dominant and subordinate group may create intergroup anxiety and be the cause of negative stereotyping.

Thus, Stephan and Stephan (1996) predict that, in general, intergroup anxiety and negative stereotypes should be better predictors of prejudice toward subordinate groups than realistic and symbolic threats.

METHODS

PARTICIPANTS

The participants for the study were recruited at universities in Spain and Israel ($n = 97$ for attitudes toward Moroccans, $n = 121$ for attitudes toward Russians, and $n = 114$ for attitudes toward Ethiopians). All of the participants completed questionnaires in their own language. In Israel, the sample consisted of 99 males and 129 females, whereas in the Spanish sample, there were 38 males and 58 females. In Israel, the ages of the participants ranged from 18 to 45 (85% were between 21 and 30), and in Spain, the ages ranged from 18 to 48 (79% were between 21 and 30).

MEASURES

Prejudicial Attitudes

The conceptualization of attitudes employed in this study is based on the radial network model proposed by Stephan and Stephan (1993), who argued that prejudice reflects negative affect associated with out-groups. In the context of the radial network model, affect includes both emotions and evaluations. Thus, this definition of prejudice includes emotional reactions like hatred and disdain, as well as evaluative reactions such as disliking and approval.

For the measure of prejudicial attitudes, participants were asked to indicate the degree to which they felt 12 distinct evaluative or emotional reactions toward immigrants on a 10-point scale running from 0 = *no* _____ (e.g., *hatred*) at all to 9 = *extreme* _____ (e.g., *hatred*) (Stephan et al. 1997). The evaluations and emotions included hostility, admiration, disliking, acceptance, superiority, affection, disdain, approval, hatred, sympathy, rejection, and warmth. For this measure, the same items were used for all three immigrant groups (Moroccans, Russians, Ethiopians). Items were reverse scored where necessary to create an index reflecting the negativity of the subjects' attitudes. The Cronbach alphas for this measure were .90, .93, and .93 for the Moroccan, Russian, and Ethiopian immigrants, respectively.

Realistic Threats

The measures that were created to assess realistic threat differed in Spain and Israel because although the types of threats posed by the immigrant groups overlap, they are not the same in these countries. In Spain, the measure consisted of 11 items including such threats as crime, job loss, and economic costs for social services, as well as items on drugs and religious education. Sample items include "Moroccans should not receive social assistance destined for Spaniards" and "Moroccan immigrants are increasing the amount of crime in Spain." In Israel, the measure consisted of 10 items and also included threats such as crime, job loss, and economic costs for social services, but in addition it included items on public schooling and access to medical care. Sample items include "The immigrants from Russia take away jobs from the Israelis" and "The immigrants from Ethiopia pose a health hazard to Israelis." The response format consisted of a 10-point Likert-type scale that ran from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. The items were evaluatively balanced and reverse scored where necessary. The Cronbach alphas were .77, .88, and .86 for the Moroccan, Russian, and Ethiopian immigrants, respectively.

Symbolic Threat

These scales assessed threats posed by perceived differences in values and beliefs between our participants and the immigrant groups. The items were rated on a 10-point Likert-type scale that ran from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. In Spain, this scale consisted of 9 items. Some examples of these items are "The religion of the Moroccans is not compatible with our religion" and "Our way of life is not being modified by Moroccan immigration" (reverse scored). In Israel, this scale consisted of 13 items. Some sample items are "The Ethiopian aliya damages Israeli culture" and "The values and beliefs of Russian immigrants regarding work are quite similar to those of most Israelis" (reverse scored). The items were evaluatively balanced and reverse scored where necessary. For the symbolic threats by Moroccan, Russian, and Ethiopian immigrants, the Cronbach alphas were .80, .86, and .86, respectively.

Intergroup Anxiety

The measure of intergroup anxiety was a modified version of the intergroup anxiety scale developed by Stephan and Stephan (1985). The measure consisted of 12 items that asked participants how they would feel when interacting with members of the respective immigrant groups. Examples of

the anxiety-related feelings that were used are apprehensive, uncertain, worried, awkward, anxious, and threatened. The response format for these items employed a 10-point scale running from *not at all* to *extremely*. The Cronbach alphas were .93, .89, and .88 for the Moroccan, Russian, and Ethiopian immigrants, respectively.

Stereotype Index

To assess stereotypes, a measure developed by Stephan et al. (1993) was employed (cf. Eagly & Mladinic, 1989; Esses et al., 1993). Participants were asked to indicate the percentage of immigrants (Moroccan, Russian, or Ethiopian) who possessed each of 6 traits (for Moroccans) or 12 traits (for Russians and Ethiopians) that had been shown or were thought to be associated with immigrant groups (Stephan, Ageyev, Stephan, et al., 1994). The response format consisted of a 10-point scale representing 10% increments running from 0% to 100%. Examples of the traits are dishonest, unintelligent, clannish, and undisciplined. In addition to providing the percentage estimates for each trait, participants rated the favorableness of each trait. These judgments employed a 10-point format running from *very unfavorable* (+5) to *very favorable* (-5). For each trait, the percentage estimate and the favorability rating were multiplied and then the resulting figures were added across traits to create a summary multiplicative stereotype/evaluation index reflecting the negativity of the stereotype. The Cronbach alphas were .67, .91, and .90 for the Moroccan, Russian, and Ethiopian immigrants, respectively.

Although the threat variables are united thematically, the study by Stephan et al. (1997) indicates that they are both conceptually and empirically distinct. In this study, it was found that the items in each of the threat variables were rated as conceptually distinct. For instance, the realistic threat items were all rated as being significantly more closely related to realistic threats than to symbolic threats, intergroup anxiety, or negative stereotypes. In addition, a factor analysis found that the items from all four threat variables, plus attitudes toward immigrants, loaded on different factors.

RESULTS

Simultaneous regressions were run on each sample separately. Attitudes toward each of the three immigrant groups were regressed on four threat variables (symbolic, realistic, intergroup anxiety, and stereotypes) in Spain and in Israel.

TABLE 1
Correlations Among the Variables

	<i>Realistic Threat</i>	<i>Symbolic Threat</i>	<i>Intergroup Anxiety</i>	<i>Stereotyping</i>
Moroccan Immigrants				
Prejudicial attitudes	.52	.34	.66	.60
Realistic threat	—	.53	.53	.30
Symbolic threat	—	—	.38	.29
Intergroup anxiety	—	—	—	.34
Stereotyping	—	—	—	—
Ethiopian Immigrants				
Prejudicial attitudes	.43	.53	.60	.42
Realistic threat	—	.56	.35	.45
Symbolic threat	—	—	.38	.39
Intergroup anxiety	—	—	—	.38
Stereotyping	—	—	—	—
Russian Immigrants				
Prejudicial attitudes	.43	.52	.54	.65
Realistic threats	—	.55	.39	.43
Symbolic threat	—	—	.42	.56
Intergroup anxiety	—	—	—	.52
Stereotyping	—	—	—	—

In preparation to run these regression analyses, correlations among the threat variables and prejudicial attitudes were calculated (Table 1). The threat variables were all significantly intercorrelated in each sample (all $ps < .005$). Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations of all of the variables included in the analyses.

The regression analyses indicated that for attitudes toward Moroccan immigrants to Spain, intergroup anxiety, stereotyping, and realistic threats were significant predictors ($p < .0001$, $p < .0001$, and $p < .03$, respectively, Table 3). The model including the four predictors accounted for 61% of the variance in attitudes toward Moroccan immigrants. The variance inflation indexes suggest that multicollinearity was not a problem in this analysis (VIFs [Variance Inflation Factors] < 1.71).

For Israelis' attitudes toward Russian immigrants, intergroup anxiety and stereotypes were significant predictors ($p < .0002$ and $p < .0001$, respectively, Table 3). The predictors accounted for 53% of the variance in attitudes toward

TABLE 2
Means and Standard Deviations (in parentheses) for all Measures

	<i>Moroccans</i>	<i>Ethiopians</i>	<i>Russians</i>
Realistic threat	2.28 (1.36)	4.84 (1.06)	5.37 (1.05)
Symbolic threat	3.96 (1.10)	2.62 (1.17)	3.83 (1.08)
Intergroup anxiety	2.39 (1.53)	2.29 (1.24)	2.82 (1.31)
Negative stereotypes	15.18 (7.63)	-74.66 (66.09)	-39.51 (60.18)
Prejudicial attitudes	2.57 (1.40)	2.88 (1.46)	4.26 (1.45)

NOTE: Higher numbers indicate greater perceived threat or more negative attitudes.

TABLE 3
Regression for Attitudes Toward Immigrants

	<i>Regression for Attitudes Toward</i>								
	<i>Moroccan Immigrants</i>			<i>Ethiopian Immigrants</i>			<i>Russian Immigrants</i>		
	<i>Standardized Estimate</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Standardized Estimate</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Standardized Estimate</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Realistic threat	.18	2.22	.03	.01	.10	.92	.02	.81	.24
Symbolic threat	-.04	-.53	.60	.30	3.00	.004	.14	1.47	.14
Intergroup anxiety	.43	5.47	.0001	.43	4.52	.0001	.33	3.81	.0002
Stereotyping	.41	5.85	.0001	.09	.98	.33	.40	4.23	.0001

Russian immigrants. The variance inflation indexes suggest that multicollinearity was not a problem in this analysis (VIFs < 1.61).

For Israelis' prejudicial attitudes toward Ethiopian immigrants, intergroup anxiety and symbolic threats were significant predictors ($p < .0001$ and $p < .004$, respectively, Table 3). The predictors accounted for 45% of the variance in attitudes toward Ethiopian immigrants. The variance inflation indexes suggest that multicollinearity was not a problem in this analysis (VIFs < 1.76).

In an effort to understand the underlying structural relations among the variables, three sets of structural equation models were run. For each of the immigrant groups, we examined four models. The first model, the direct effects model, tests the degree to which all four threats have direct effects on prejudice. The second model tests the idea that the threats are composed of two latent factors, one of which is concerned with threats that are predomi-

TABLE 4
Structural Equation Analyses

<i>Model</i>	<i>Moroccan Immigrants</i>				<i>Ethiopian Immigrants</i>				<i>Russian Immigrants</i>			
	<i>df</i>	<i>Chi-Square</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>GFI</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Chi-Square</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>GFI</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Chi-Square</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>GFI</i>
Null model	10	174.29	.000	.53	10	202.67	.000	.51	10	229.13	.000	.47
Direct effects	6	82.16	.000	.71	6	114.43	.000	.67	6	148.54	.000	.62
Two latent factors	4	37.27	.000	.89	4	40.40	.000	.89	4	62.52	.000	.86
One latent factor	5	26.68	.000	.90	5	16.37	.005	.95	5	6.26	.28	.98

nantly at the group level (realistic and symbolic threats) and the other of which is concerned with threats that are predominantly at the level of interpersonal interaction (intergroup anxiety and negative stereotyping). The third model tests the idea that there is one latent variable underlying all of the threat measures, that is, that they are all tapping aspects of threat. The fourth model is a null model that specifies that the threat variables are uncorrelated and thus provides a baseline against which the other models can be compared. By examining the chi-square statistic for each model, it is possible to determine which model fits the data best (lower chi-squares indicate a better fit). The structural equation analyses provide a statistic that assesses goodness of fit (GFI). It indicates the amount of variance jointly accounted for by each model (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). Table 4 presents the results of these analyses.

Table 4 indicates that in all three samples, the model with one latent factor (threat) fits the data best, as indicated by the chi-square results. This conclusion is supported by the goodness of fit indexes that are always highest for the one latent factor model (all three of the GFI figures were .90 or above indicating that the model was a good fit to the data).

DISCUSSION

The results of this study provide considerable support for the integrated threat theory of prejudice (Stephan & Stephan, 1996; Stephan et al., 1997; Ybarra & Stephan, 1994). The combination of realistic threats, symbolic threats, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes accounted for substantial

amounts of the variance in attitudes toward three distinct immigrant groups: Moroccan immigrants to Spain and Russian and Ethiopian immigrants to Israel. Although each of the threats was a significant predictor toward at least one of the immigrant groups, in none of the three samples were all four types of threat significant predictors. However, the structural equation model analyses suggested that the threat variables were all tapping a single underlying dimension—threat.

With only one exception, intergroup anxiety and negative stereotypes were the strongest and most consistent predictors of prejudice for all three groups. The exception was that negative stereotyping was not a significant predictor of prejudice toward Ethiopians. Overall, this pattern of results supports the integrated threat theory hypothesis that for prejudicial attitudes toward subordinate groups, interpersonal anxiety and negative stereotypes are generally stronger predictors of prejudice than realistic or symbolic threats.

Symbolic threat was a significant predictor of prejudice toward Ethiopians in Israel, but not of prejudice toward Moroccans in Spain or Russians in Israel. There are at least two plausible reasons why perceived symbolic threats did not predict prejudice in the Spanish sample. First, the Moroccans are clearly in a subordinate position in Spain and they are not expected to become permanent residents, so they are unlikely to pose a challenge to Spanish culture. Second, the gulf between the two cultures is so wide that people in Spain may feel that a relatively small number of Moroccan immigrants is not likely to bring about unwanted cultural changes. The lack of relationship between symbolic threats and prejudice is consistent with other research demonstrating that in Spain prejudice toward Moroccans is less closely tied to symbolic issues than is negative contact (Martínez & Vera, 1994).

In the case of Israel, there are some important differences between Ethiopian and Russian immigrants that may account for why symbolic threats were significant predictors of prejudice toward Ethiopians, but not toward Russians. Although both groups are Jewish, their cultural heritage is very different. Russian culture is similar to the cultures of the Eastern and Central European countries from which many Israeli Jews derive their heritage. Ethiopian Jews do not share a common cultural background with Israelis, and even their religion is not the same as the Judaism practiced by most Israelis. Thus, the cultural differences between Israelis and the Ethiopian immigrants are probably more salient than those between Israelis and the Russian immigrants, and these differences probably explain why symbolic threats were a significant predictor of prejudice only for the Ethiopian immigrants.

Realistic threat was a significant predictor of prejudice in the Spanish sample, but not for either of the immigrant groups in Israel. The reason that

realistic threats did not predict prejudice toward immigrants to Israel may be that in Israel immigrants are expected to assimilate into Israeli society and contribute to the future welfare of Israel. Israel is a nation of immigrants and immigrants are treated as a resource, rather than an economic or political threat. In addition, there is no prior history of conflict between Israelis and these two groups, unlike the situation for Moroccan immigrants to Spain where there is a long history of intergroup conflict (and where realistic threats were a significant predictor of prejudice).

The inconsistent results concerning realistic and symbolic threats in this study contrast with the findings of Stephan et al. (1997) who found that both of these intergroup threats were significant predictors of prejudice toward Asian, Cuban, and Mexican immigrants to the United States. The most probable reason for the different pattern of results in the two studies involves the policies of the U.S. government toward immigration and the intense controversy surrounding immigration in the United States (Morganthau, 1993). Although, like Israel, the United States is largely a nation of immigrants, unlike Israel it does not encourage immigration. In fact, the United States has a long history of attempting to exclude immigrants. The salience and intensity of the controversy surrounding immigration to the United States mean that many Americans believe that immigrants do pose threats to their way of life and valued resources (jobs, health, safety, and money). When there is ongoing, open conflict between groups, all four threat factors are likely to predict prejudice between groups. Thus, the high levels of controversy over immigration in the United States may explain why realistic and symbolic threats were consistently significant predictors in the U.S. study but not in this study.

It is important to note that the relationships between threats and prejudice that were obtained in this study are all correlational. Although it seems likely that threats are a greater cause of prejudice than prejudice is of feelings of threat, in some cases it is reasonable to argue that causality may be reciprocal. For instance, negative stereotypes probably do lead to prejudice, but prejudice toward a group could also lead to negative stereotyping. It is possible to address these issues of causality in laboratory studies. For instance, Maio, Esses, and Bell (1994) manipulated the valence and relevance of values and stereotypes imputed to a fictitious immigrant out-group. This information, along with information on the emotional reactions of in-group members toward the fictitious out-group, affected the subjects' attitudes toward the immigrant group. In a subsequent study, Esses, Jackson, and Nolan (1997) manipulated the realistic threats that immigrants were said to pose to Canadians. Higher realistic threats led to more negative attitudes toward immigrants. In another study demonstrating the causal role of threats, Branscombe

and Wann (1994) found that when people are strongly identified with their in-group, threats to their group identity lead to derogation of the threatening out-group. Although all of these studies indicate that different types of threat can cause prejudice, much remains to be learned about the causal network relating threats and prejudice.

The findings of this study may also have practical implications for immigration policy makers and members of immigrant groups. People who are interested in decreasing prejudice toward immigrants might consider addressing the particular threats these groups are perceived to pose. For example, in this study, intergroup anxiety was a powerful and consistent predictor of prejudice. One possible way to reduce prejudice based on intergroup anxiety would be for policy makers to emphasize the existence of positively evaluated similarities between immigrant groups and the dominant group. This type of information might allay some of the fears of members of the dominant group concerning interaction with immigrants. In accord with this suggestion, Roccas and Schwartz (1993) have recently demonstrated that perceived similarity to an out-group increases readiness for contact with that group. In specific contexts, such as work or educational settings, where immigrants often interact with members of the host culture in terms of their respective group memberships (i.e., at the intergroup level; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987), it may be beneficial to institute programs that teach members of the host culture about the subjective culture of the immigrant groups (Cushner & Landis, 1996; Triandis, 1972). It has been suggested that this type of knowledge may reduce intergroup anxiety (Randolph, Landis, & Tzeng, 1977; Stephan & Stephan, 1984). For members of immigrant groups, it may be useful for them to know that a primary source of prejudice toward them consists of anxieties concerning social interaction. Any efforts immigrants can make to reduce the discomfort of members of the dominant group when they are interacting with them may pay off with reduced hostility being directed at them and other immigrants.

The integrated threat theory of prejudice is not a comprehensive theory of the causes of prejudice. It simply attempts to bring together many of the theories of prejudice that emphasize the role threat can play in causing prejudice. One advantage the integrated threat theory has over previous theories stressing just one type of threat is that it makes it possible to compare the relative strength of various different types of threats in a given context. The inclusion of multiple threats also makes it possible to account for more of the variance in prejudice than is done in most studies. In addition, the integrated threat theory of prejudice is also a potentially practical theory because, having identified the relative importance of different causes of

prejudice, the results can be used to offer suggestions regarding avenues for reducing prejudice toward particular groups.

REFERENCES

- Ashmore, R. D., & Del Boca, F. K. (1976). Psychological approaches to understanding intergroup conflict. In P. A. Katz (Ed.), *Towards the elimination of racism* (pp. 73-124). New York: Pergamon.
- Benita, E., & Noam, G. (1995). The absorption of Ethiopian immigrants: Selected findings from local surveys. *Israel Social Science Research, 10*, 81-96.
- Bobo, L. (1983). Whites' opposition to busing: Symbolic racism or realistic group conflict? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*, 1196-1210.
- Bobo, L. (1988). Group conflict, prejudice, and the paradox of contemporary racial attitudes. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 85-116). New York: Plenum.
- Bovasso, G. (1993). Self, group, and public interests motivating racial politics. *Political Psychology, 14*, 3-20.
- Branscombe, N. R., & Wann, D. L. (1994). Collective self-esteem consequences of out-group derogation when a valued social identity is on trial. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 24*, 641-657.
- Britt, T. W., Bonecki, K. A., Vescio, T. K., Biernat, M. R., & Brown, L. M. (1996). Intergroup anxiety as a form of social anxiety. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 1177-1188.
- Coser, L. (1956). *The functions of social conflict*. New York: Free Press.
- Cushner, K., & Landis, D. (1996). The intercultural sensitizer. In D. Landis & R. S. Bhagat (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (2nd ed., pp. 185-202). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Eagly, A. H., & Mladinic, A. (1989). Gender stereotypes and attitudes toward men and women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15*, 543-558.
- Esses, V. M., Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. P. (1993). Values, stereotypes, and emotions as determinants of intergroup attitudes. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition and stereotyping* (pp. 137-166). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Esses, V. M., Jackson, L. M., & Nolan, J. M. (1997, October 25-27). *Perceived economic threat influences attitudes toward immigrants and immigration*. Paper presented at the National Symposium on Immigration and Integration: New challenges. Winnipeg, Canada.
- Goldscheider, C. (1990). In W. J. Serow, C. B. Nam, D. F. Sly, & R. H. Weller (Eds.), *Handbook on international migration* (pp. 131-142). New York: Greenwood.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1988). Uncertainty and anxiety. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hamilton, D. L., Sherman, S. J., & Ruvolo, C. M. (1990). Stereotype-based expectancies: Effects on information processing and social behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 35-60.
- Holt, D. (1995). The culture cluster: A comparative perspective on Ethiopian Jewish problems in Israel. *Israel Social Science Research, 10*, 97-116.
- Islam, R. M., & Hewstone, M. (1993). Dimensions of contact as predictors of intergroup anxiety, perceived out-group variability, and out-group attitude: An integrative model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19*, 700-710.

- Katz, I., Wackenhut, J., & Glass, D. G. (1986). An ambivalence-amplification theory of behavior toward the stigmatized. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 103-117). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Leshem, E. (1994). Immigration and absorption of former Soviet party Jewry: Introduction. In E. Leshem & D. Sor (Eds.), *Immigration and absorption of former Soviet Jewry* (pp. v-xiv). Jerusalem: Henrietta Szold Institute.
- LeVine, R. A., & Campbell, D. T. (1972). *Ethnocentrism*. New York: John Wiley.
- Maio, G. R., Esses, V. M., & Bell, D. W. (1994). The formation of attitudes toward new immigrant groups. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24*, 1762-1776.
- Martínez, C. (1995). *Stereotype and content: Semantic components of Gypsy's representations*. Paper presented at the XXV Inter-American Congress of Psychology, San Juan, Puerto Rico.
- Martínez, C., & Vera, J. (1994). La estructura del prejuicio: Realidad y simbolismo [The structure of prejudice: Reality and symbolism]. *Boletín de Psicología, 42*, 21-38.
- McConahay, J. B., & Hough, J. C., Jr. (1976). Symbolic racism. *Journal of Social Issues, 32*, 23-45.
- Morganthau, T. (1993, August 9). America: Still a melting pot? *Newsweek*, pp. 16-23.
- Noam, G. (1994). *Immigrant absorption in Israel*. Jerusalem: JDC-Brookdale Institute of Gerontology and Human Development.
- Pumares-Fernandez, P. (1993). Problemática de la inmigración Marroquí en España [The problematic of the Moroccan immigration in Spain]. *Política y Sociedad, 12*, 139-147.
- Quillian, L. (1995). Prejudice as a response to perceived group threat: Population composition and anti-immigrant and racial prejudice in Europe. *American Sociological Review, 60*, 586-611.
- Randolph, G., Landis, D., & Tzeng, O. C. S. (1977). The effects of time and practice upon culture assimilator training. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1*, 105-119.
- Roccas, S., & Schwartz, S. (1993). Effects of intergroup similarity on intergroup relations. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 23*, 581-595.
- Rystad, G. (1992). Immigration history and the future of international migration. *International Migration Review, 26*, 1168-1199.
- Schindler, R. (1993). Education and the Black Jews of Ethiopia: Dealing with bereavement and loss. *International Social Work, 36*, 7-19.
- Sears, D. O. (1988). Symbolic racism. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 53-85). New York: Plenum.
- Sherif, M. (1966). *Group conflict and cooperation*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Sidanius, J. (1994). *Consensual social dominance orientation and its covariates across major American ethnic groups: A social dominance perspective*. Jerusalem: International Congress on Prejudice, Discrimination and Conflict.
- Sidanius, J., Devereux, E., & Pratto, F. (1992). A comparison of symbolic racism theory and social dominance theory as explanations for racial policy attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology, 132*, 377-395.
- Spencer, W. (1980). *Historical dictionary of Morocco*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow.
- Stangor, C., Sullivan, L. A., & Ford, T. E. (1991). Affective and cognitive determinants of prejudice. *Social Cognition, 9*, 359-380.
- Stephan, W. G., Ageyev, V. S., Coates-Shrider, L., Stephan, C. W., & Abalakina, M. (1994). On the relationship between stereotypes and prejudice: An international study. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20*, 277-284.
- Stephan, W. G., Ageyev, V. S., Stephan, C. W., Abalakina, M., Stefanenko, T., & Coates-Shrider, L. (1994). Soviet and American stereotypes: A comparison of methods. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 56*, 54-64.

- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. (1984). The role of ignorance in intergroup relations. In N. Miller & M. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 229-257). New York: Academic Press.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues, 41*, 157-176.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. (1989). Antecedents of intergroup anxiety in Asian-Americans and Hispanic-Americans. *International Journal of Intercultural Communication, 13*, 203-219.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. (1992). Reducing intercultural anxiety through intercultural contact. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 16*, 96-106.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. (1993). Cognition and affect in stereotyping: Parallel interactive networks. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. (1996). Predicting prejudice. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 20*, 1-12.
- Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., & Bachman, G. (1997). *Prejudice toward immigrants: An integrated threat theory*. Unpublished manuscript, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces.
- Sumner, W. G. (1906). *Folkways*. Boston: Ginn.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper Collins.
- Tilly, C. (1978). Migration in modern European history. In W. H. McNeill & R. S. Adams (Eds.), *Human migration: Patterns and policies*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Triandis, H. C. (1972). *The analysis of subjective culture*. New York: John Wiley.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- United Nations Population Fund. (1993). *The state of the world population 1993*. New York: Author.
- Wagaw, T. G. (1993). *For our soul: Ethiopian Jews in Israel*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
- Weigel, R. H., & Howes, P. W. (1985). Conceptions of racial prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues, 41*, 117-138.
- Weil, S. (1995). Ethiopian Jews in the limelight: Introduction. *Israel Social Science Research, 10*, iii-viii.
- Ybarra, O. J., & Stephan, W. G. (1994). Perceived threat as a predictor of stereotypes and prejudice: Americans' reactions to Mexican immigrants. *Boletín de Psicología, 42*, 39-54.
- Zemach, M., Leshem, E., & Veisel, R. (1993). *Adaptation of immigrants from the former Soviet Union*. Report to Dahaf Research Institution, Tel-Aviv, Israel.

Walter G. Stephan is an American. He is professor of psychology at New Mexico State University. He received his Ph.D. in psychology from the University of Minnesota. He has published articles on a variety of social psychological topics including attribution processes, social cognition, intergroup relations, and intercultural relations. His most recent book (1998) concerns improving intergroup relations in schools.

Oscar Ybarra is an American. He received his Ph.D. from New Mexico State University. He is an assistant professor of psychology at the University of Michigan. His primary areas of interest are social cognition, intergroup relations, and cultural psychology.

Carmen Martínez Martínez is Spanish. She received her Ph.D. from La Universidad de Murcia, Spain. She is author of Psychosocial Aspects of Prejudice (1996) and Persons, Groups, and Organization (1997) and many articles on intergroup relations. Her primary areas of interest are prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination, particularly when they are based on gender or ethnicity.

Joseph Schwarzwald is an Israeli. He received his Ph.D. at the University of Texas at Austin. He is professor of psychology at Bar-Ilan University. He has also served as director of the Winston Institute for the Study of Prejudice. His main research interests include intergroup relations, social power, and posttraumatic stress disorders.

Michal Tur-Kaspa is an Israeli. She is a graduate student in psychology at Bar-Ilan University. She also works as an industrial counselor. Her areas of interest are intergroup relations and organizational citizenship.