Ethnic Hierarchies, Ethnic Prejudice, and Social Dominance Orientation

ALEXANDRA SNELLMAN* and BO EKEHAMMAR

Department of Psychology, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden

ABSTRACT

Previous research in multi-ethnic societies has shown that people rank, or form hierarchies of, the ethnic groups on the basis of social distance. Based on self-report data from a community sample ($N = 150$ non-psychology students), this study examined (1) the correspondence of ratings and rankings of six ethnic target groups among various subgroups of participants (Swedish and immigrant men and women), and (2) the relationship of inclination to ethnic ranking with ethnic prejudice and social dominance orientation. In accord with our hypotheses, the results disclosed that (1) irrespective of gender and ethnic origin, the various subgroups of participants ranked and formed similar hierarchies of the six ethnic target groups, and (2) people's inclination to ethnic ranking showed significant correlations with their ethnic prejudice as well as social dominance orientation. Copyright © 2005 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Key words: ethnic hierarchies; social dominance orientation; ethnic prejudice; intergroup behaviour

INTRODUCTION

Previous research has shown that multi-ethnic societies tend to form hierarchies of their ethnic groups (e.g. Hagendoorn, Drogendijk, Tumanov, & Hraba, 1998; Hraba, Hagendoorn, & Hagendoorn, 1989; Lange, 2000). Ingroup preference and stereotyping play an important role in creating hierarchies, just like they do in ethnic and racial prejudice. Ingroup favouritism is motivated by people's need for emotional security (Hubbert, Gudykunst, & Guerro, 1999) and self-enhancement (Tajfel, 1981).

A stereotype can be seen as an automatically activated cognitive shortcut for judging information about other social groups (Macrae, Stangor, & Milne, 1994), with strong resistance to change and contradictions (Chen & Bargh, 1997; Macrae, Bodenhausen, Milne, & Jetten, 1994), at least in highly prejudiced people (Monteith, Spicer, & Tooman, 1998). Stereotypes are, however, not automatically activated to the same degree in all

---

* Correspondence to: A. Snellman, Department of Psychology, Uppsala University, P.O. Box 1225, SE-751 42 Uppsala, Sweden. E-mail: alexandra.snellman@psyk.uu.se

individuals or situations; their malleability has been extensively investigated and proved by using cognitive techniques like IAT, primed Stroop task, sequential priming and word completion tasks (Blair, 2002). The contents of stereotypes expressed about other ethnic groups are often similar in most cultures (Allport, 1954; see also the stereotype similarities reported for various outgroups by Augoustinos, Ahrens, & Innes, 1994; Devine, 1989; Lepore & Brown, 1997). Whereas stereotypes are cognitive elements, prejudice is an affective element of (often negative) valence. After World War II, new and more subtle forms of ethnic and racial prejudice have emerged (Kleinpenning, 1993; McConahay, 1986; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995; Sears, 1988). An instrument for measuring modern and classical forms of ethnic/racial prejudice in a Swedish context has recently been developed and validated by Akrami, Ekehammar, and Araya (2000).

People's beliefs in their cultural superiority, their ethnocentrism (Emessik & Mackie, 1989), and stereotypes may lead to a ranking of the outgroups closer or further away from the ingroup depending on how socially desirable the outgroup is perceived by the ingroup (e.g. Hagendoorn et al., 1998; Hraba et al., 1989). Other factors that may effect ethnic ranking are the socio-economic status of the outgroup and perceived threat from the out-group (Pepels & Hagendoorn, 2000). Ethnic ranking may be linked to fear of loosing status through interethnic contacts with a group of lower rank (Hagendoorn et al., 1998). Interethnic contacts with a socially desirable group of higher rank will on the other hand increase the person's or group's status. There is a systematic tendency to give the primary group (ingroup) in the culture or society first rank, which may indicate an acceptance of its lifestyle and values and is a way to gain status and social acceptance as well (Hagendoorn & Hraba, 1987). A common pattern in ethnic ranking seems to be that North Europeans are ranked at the top, followed by East and South Europeans, whereas Africans and Middle East groups are found at the bottom of the ranking list (e.g. Hagendoorn 1993; Hagendoorn et al., 1998; Hraba et al., 1989). Similar patterns have, for example, been found in Sidanius and Pratto's (1999) work on social dominance in the US, and in a socio-logical study by Lange (2000) in Sweden.

According to social dominance theory (SDT; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), conflicts between, and discrimination of, different social groups have the same psychological back-ground and appear in a similar pattern in all kinds of societies. However, people differ in their attitudes to group equality versus group dominance (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). A scale for measuring individual differences in social dominance orientation (SDO) has been presented by Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, and Malle (1994). SDO is the basic indi-vidual difference variable in SDT, and can be seen as 'a general attitudinal orientation toward inter-group relations, reflecting whether one generally prefers such relations to be equal, versus hierarchical' (Pratto et al., 1994, p. 742). Thus, high-SDO people tend to promote intergroup hierarchies and to rank social groups in a superior–inferior hierar-chy. A study by Pratto and Lemieux (2001) showed that the ambiguity towards immigra-tion (it brings out either people's communal egalitarian natures or their prejudicial aggressive natures) can be further explained with SDO. People high on SDO will not find a policy that increases equality between groups appealing whereas people low on SDO will not find a policy based on perceived group threat appealing (Pratto & Lemieux, 2001).

Multiple social group memberships can affect an individual simultaneously (Alderfer, 1986; Hubbert et al., 1999). Research on the effect of gender and class on ethnic ranking has not been extensive and the empirical results are contradictory. In a study by Pepels and Hagendoorn (2000), for example, the strongest prejudice against immigrant groups were found in elderly women. However, the main picture seems to be that men express more

explicit prejudice and social dominance toward outgroups than women do (e.g. Bates & Heaven, 2001; Ekehammar, Akrami, & Araya, 2003; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). In Hagendoorn's (1993, 1995) studies, the participants with an academic background showed less tendencies to rank ethnic groups than those with a working-class background. However, Sidanius and Pratto (1999) report the opposite result, that is, the higher the education the higher the tendency to express social dominance. In a recent Belgian study by Van Hiel and Mervielde (2002), SDO was strongly correlated with authoritarianism, which was not the case in the North American studies by Pratto et al. (1994). But in line with the Pratto et al. study, Van Hiel and Mervielde found that SDO was a stronger predictor of right-wing voting and conservative beliefs.

This study had two main aims. The first was to study people's ranking of various ethnic groups, and their eventual formation of ethnic hierarchies, in a Swedish community context and to examine if the ranking was the same in various subgroups of participants. In line with the results of previous studies (see earlier), our hypothesis was that the same type of ethnic hierarchies would appear in a Swedish community context and be very much the same in the different subgroups. The second aim was to examine the relationship between people's tendency to form ethnic hierarchies on the one hand and their degree of social dominance orientation and racial prejudice on the otherhand. Our hypothesis was that there would be a positive relation with social dominance orientation and racial prejudice, and a stronger relation with social dominance orientation than with racial prejudice.

METHOD

Participants

The participants were 150 non-psychology students (total age range = 18–57 years). The participants were recruited at different centres of education to avoid having only one level of education and ethnicity represented. The students at the Adult Industrial Centre are usually high-school level or just below. The purpose of the centre is to increase the chances of unemployed persons' in obtaining new employment in industry. The students at the Adult High-school Centre are of high-school/college level, the education is theoretical and aiming at either getting enough points to apply for university or obtain employment. The third education centre used for recruiting participants was Mälardalen University, which is a new university with mainly economic and engineering education.

Although certain types of education were chosen to get a satisfactorily large sample of immigrants, participants were chosen by chance. Their ethnic background varied and they came from more than 29 countries (six of them just put 'foreign' as origin). Their different ethnicities were evenly spread over the different educational levels and they were not chosen to match the target groups they eventually should rank, as ingroup favouritism was not to be measured. The number of immigrant participants, and their origin, in the different levels of education are presented in the Appendix.

The participants formed four mutually exclusive subgroups on the basis of gender and ethnic origin: Swedish women ($n = 46$), Swedish men ($n = 48$), immigrant women ($n = 25$), and immigrant men ($n = 31$).

Instruments

The study was carried out using a questionnaire containing scales for Social distance, SDO, Modern racial prejudice and Classical racial prejudice. Two versions of the

questionnaire were used, one for Swedish-born participants and one for immigrants. In the latter, the word immigrant was replaced by the expression 'new immigrants', defined as 'groups of immigrants that have arrived after your (the participant's) group to Sweden.'

Ethnic targets

Historically, immigration to Sweden was negligible until the end of World War II after which it came in waves of either workforce immigrants or refugees (Lund & Ohlsson, 1994). The target groups for ethnic ranking were chosen to be distinctively different as to when and why they had immigrated to Sweden. Time in the new society is one of the factors that predict how high on the local ranking a group will be placed (Hagendoorn et al., 1998). The target groups were also chosen by their numbers (Statistics Sweden, 2000), impact on local history, common reputation in the community of Västerås (where the data collection took place), and ranking in a pilot study containing 10 target groups within the same community (Snellman, 2000). The following target groups were selected: Italian, Iranian, Somalian, Syrian, Swedish, and Latin American. The rationale for using a collective name to label the last mentioned group—instead of the different national names—was that members of this local population commonly are referred to as Latin-Americans, and their outgroups obviously perceive them as similar in habits and appearance. This group, which origins mainly from Chile, arrived in the 1970s as refugees and no major negative reactions to this group were seen, which the political left-wing climate of the time might have contributed to. The Italian group (which arrived originally as workforce immigrants after World War II) was not received without problems at the beginning but they are now a part of the community and the local history; the fourth generation of local Italians have already been born. The following three target groups in this study are refugees that have arrived during the economic recessions and unemployment of the end of the 1980s and onward (the recessions was and still is a disaster for industrial communities like Västerås). Iranians and Syrians started to arrive in the 1980s and the Somalian group started to arrive in the 1990s. These groups have not had easy opportunities to quickly find work and housing, and their cultural difference from Scandinavian lifestyle is larger than for Latin-Americans and Italians.

Social distance scale

The social distance scale focused on three different domains of social contact. Although an overall conception of the hierarchies and their contents has been found, they might still vary to some degree with domain of social contact (Hraba et al., 1989). Each domain of social contact had a statement to which the participant could agree or disagree on a four-step scale, ranging from 1—I fully agree to 4—I do not agree at all. The domains of social contact was neighbours (It would be nice to have neighbours that are X-ians), school (It would be nice if my children went to a school with many pupils from X) and work (It would be nice to work together with X-ians). The three statements were repeated for each target group and the procedure was in line with that of Hagendoorn et al. (1998) and Hraba et al. (1989). The summed scores that the ethnic target groups received across the three domains of social contact (work, school, and neighbourhood) formed reliable scales with Cronbach Alphas varying between 0.78–0.86 for the various target groups. The summed scores indicated the participant's overall social distance to the groups, the higher the score the larger the social distance. The target groups were then ranked on the basis of the mean social distance scores across participants. The risk for a sequence effect by repeating the

questions for every target group was high so we did not investigate more than three domains and kept the number of target groups down to six.

Index of inclination to ethnic ranking

We wanted to examine if participants differed in their inclination to rank, that is, if some of them had a higher inclination to form a hierarchy of the target groups than other participants. So we created an index of the participants' inclination to ethnic ranking. The participants had an opportunity not to rank the target groups since it was possible to give all the groups the same social distance score. If a participant gave all the target groups the same score, either high or low, then this would indicate that the participant did not differentiate or rank the target groups. Thus, that person's inclination to ethnic ranking would be zero. An index of the participant's inclination to rank the target groups was formed by computing, for each participant, the standard deviation of the scores given to the six different target groups in each domain of social contact (work, school, and neighbours, respectively). The mean of the three standard deviations formed a reliable variable named Inclination to ethnic ranking with a Cronbach Alpha of 0.88. A low value on this variable indicates a low inclination to rank the target groups (i.e. a participant using only one or two steps when rating the target groups on the social distance scale) whereas a high value indicates a high inclination to ethnic ranking (i.e. a participant using many or all the steps when rating the groups on the social distance scale). Obviously, participants who gave all target groups the same social distance score obtained a value of 0 (no differentiation at all) on this variable.

Social dominance orientation (SDO)

The scale for measuring SDO was taken from Akrami et al. (2000), who had translated and psychometrically evaluated the original scale presented by Pratto et al. (1994). The scale comprised 16 items, like 'It is really not a big problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others'. The higher the participant's total score on this scale the higher was her or his SDO. In this sample, the Cronbach Alpha reliability of the SDO scale was 0.88.

Ethnic prejudice

The scales for Modern and Classical racial prejudice were taken from Akrami et al. (2000), where reliability and validity data for the two scales are presented. The Classical scale comprised eight items, like 'Immigrants are usually not very talented', and the Modern scale comprised nine items, like 'Immigrants is getting too demanding in their push for equal rights'. The higher the participant's total score on these scales, the higher was her or his classical or modern ethnic prejudice, respectively. Many researchers dealing with ethnic and racial prejudice (e.g. McConahay, 1986; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995; Sears, 1988) agree on the distinction between classical (blatant, old-fashioned) and modern (subtle, symbolic) forms and argue that the expression of ethnic and racial prejudice has become more subtle in modern society. Sears (1988) characterized modern racism by three components: denial of continued discrimination, antagonism toward minority group demands, and resentment about special favours for minority groups. Similarly, Pettigrew and Meertens (1995) have argued that classical prejudice is the manifestation of three components: defence of traditional values, exaggeration of cultural differences,

and denial of positive emotions. The modern and classical prejudice scales used here were based on these distinctions and definitions (see Akrami et al., 2000). In this sample, the Cronbach Alpha reliability of the Modern prejudice scale was 0.66, and on the Classical prejudice scale, it was 0.61.

Procedure

After short information about the content of the study and the rights of the participants, the students were asked if they wanted to participate, which most of them did. The questionnaires were collected directly after they had been answered at school. Participants were welcome to ask for more information or discuss the matters of the study after filling out the questionnaire. Twenty-eight questionnaires had more than one missing value per scale and were not included in the analysis. In 15 cases, there was one missing value per scale, and in these cases the participants' mean value on that particular scale was imputed. The final analyses were performed on data from 150 cases.

RESULTS

The mean social distance score of each target group was computed for all participants and for each of the four subgroups. The results are displayed in Table 1 where the target groups are presented in the same order as they were ranked by the combined sample. Table 1 shows that the social distance scores of the six target groups are very similar across subgroups of participants. The Swedish target group was ranked first, the Italian as second, and the Latin American as third by all participant subgroups. Further, the Somalian was ranked as fourth in three out of four cases, the Iranian as fifth in three out of four cases, and the Syrian as sixth in three out of four cases. The similarity among the four subgroups of participants was further analysed by computing pair wise product-moment correlation coefficients between the subgroups' mean social distance scores across the six target groups. The correlation coefficients ranged from 0.948 to 0.994.

Because of the high similarity in ethnic ranking among the subgroups, the combined sample only was further analysed using repeated measures ANOVA to test if there were statistically reliable differences in the social distance mean scores among the six target

Table 1. Mean social distance scores (standard deviations in parentheses) of the six ethnic target groups for various subgroups of participants and all participants combined

Participants	Swedish	Italian	Latin American	Somalian	Iranian	Syrian
Swedish women (*n* = 46)	5.20 (2.04)	6.59 (2.03)	6.63 (2.23)	7.37 (2.57)	7.50 (2.53)	7.67 (2.42)
Swedish men (*n* = 48)	4.85 (1.65)	6.31 (2.16)	6.73 (2.13)	7.44 (2.35)	7.52 (2.24)	7.77 (2.44)
Immigrant women (*n* = 25)	5.04 (1.88)	6.28 (2.39)	6.76 (2.67)	7.12 (2.70)	6.92 (2.50)	7.00 (2.75)
Immigrant men (*n* = 31)	4.48 (1.90)	5.26 (2.05)	5.74 (2.79)	6.32 (2.79)	6.48 (2.66)	6.48 (2.79)
Total (*N* = 150)	4.91 (1.86)	6.17 (2.16)	6.50 (2.41)	7.31 (2.57)	7.2 (2.59)	7.34 (2.59)

Note: The mean scores were based on participants' social distance scores across domains for each target group.

Table 2.   Mean scores (standard deviations in parentheses) on Inclination to ethic ranking, SDO, Modern racial prejudice, and Classical racial prejudice for various subgroups of participants and all participants combined

Participants	Inclination to ethnic ranking	SDO	Modern racial prejudice	Classical racial prejudice
Swedish women ($n = 46$)	0.39 (0.40)	1.48 (0.51)	2.09 (0.51)	1.87 (0.59)
Swedish men ($n = 48$)	0.47 (0.39)	1.51 (0.46)	2.13 (0.50)	1.96 (0.44)
Immigrant women ($n = 25$)	0.51 (0.44)	1.75 (0.63)	2.03 (0.41)	1.99 (0.40)
Immigrant men ($n = 31$)	0.42 (0.43)	1.53 (0.41)	1.90 (0.31)	1.81 (0.47)
Total ($N = 150$)	0.44 (0.41)	1.54 (0.50)	2.05 (0.47)	1.90 (0.49)

Note: Inclination to ethnic ranking was calculated as the mean of the standard deviations of participants' social distance scores across target groups in each domain.

groups. The results disclosed a highly significant overall difference between the target groups, $F(5, 745) = 66.38$, $p = 0.001$, also when using Greenhouse–Geisser correction. A Bonferroni-corrected *post hoc* test revealed that the Swedish target group differed significantly ($p = 0.001$) from all other groups whereas the Italian and Latin American did not differ significantly ($p = 0.08$) from each other but from all other groups ($p = 0.001$). Finally, the Somalian, Iranian, and Syrian groups did not differ significantly from each other (p values varying from 0.22 to 0.60) but from the other three target groups ($p = 0.001$). Thus, based on the combined data from the total sample, a clear hierarchical order was shown among the six ethnic target groups, with the Swedish ranked first, the Italian and Latin American ranked second, and the Somalian, Iranian, and Syrian ranked third.

A majority (84.7%) of participants showed an inclination to rank the ethnic target groups. (The non-ranking participants used the lowest social distance score for all target groups.) The mean standard deviation across the three domains was used as a final overall index (Inclination to ethnic ranking) of participants' degree of ethnic ranking. These scores are presented for the combined sample and the various groups of participants in Table 2 together with their scores on SDO, and modern and classical ethnic prejudice. A 2 (Participant Gender) × 2 (Participant Ethnicity: Swede, immigrant) ANOVA of the scores on Inclination to ethnic ranking displayed no significant effects of Gender [$F(1, 149) = 0.00$] or Ethnicity [$F(1, 149) = 0.24$] and no significant interaction effect [$F(1, 149) = 0.24$]. Further, a 2 (Participant Gender) × 2 (Participant Ethnicity: Swede, immigrant) ANOVA of the scores on each of the other variables (Modern and Classical ethnic prejudice and SDO) displayed no main or interaction effects of Gender or Ethnicity (F values varying between 0.03 and 3.44, p values varying between 0.11 and 0.24).

The final central question concerns the relationship between participants' degree of overall ethnic ranking on the one hand and their SDO and ethnic prejudice on the other hand. It was predicted that the inclination to ethnic ranking and SDO would show the highest relationship as, according to SDT, one of the areas where subordination of social groups occurs is between ethnic minorities and ethnic majorities. Thus, both these two indexes (SDO and Inclination to ethnic ranking) express the person's inclination to perceive relations among social groups as hierarchical. As SDO has been shown to be substantially related to various forms of prejudice (see, e.g. Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), we expected a significant but lower correlation between inclination to ethnic ranking and ethnic prejudice. A product-moment correlation analysis on the combined sample disclosed that Inclination to ethnic ranking showed the highest correlation with Modern racial

prejudice, $r(148) = 0.29$, $p = 0.000$, followed by Classical racial prejudice, $r(148) = 0.25$, $p = 0.002$, and SDO, $r(148) = 0.23$, $p = 0.004$. However, the differences between the correlation coefficients were not statistically significant (p values varying between 0.29 and 0.43). Thus, the outcome was not fully as predicted as all variables correlated with inclination to ethnic ranking to an almost similar degree.

DISCUSSION

As predicted, the present results obtained in a Swedish context disclosed that people tend to form ethnic hierarchies when judging persons with various ethnic backgrounds. In the studies by Hagendoorn and his co-workers (Hagendoorn, 1993; Hagendoorn et al., 1998; Hraba et al., 1989) participants usually preferred their own ingroups over other groups. In this study, however, the participants in the immigrant group did not have their own ingroup represented among the target groups, so they did as expected, that is, chose the original ingroup of the Swedish society. All subgroups of participants ranked the Swedish target group at the top of the hierarchy with a significant distance to the five other target groups. Further, there was a high congruence in the ethnic hierarchy formation among all subgroups of participants. Thus, irrespective of gender and ethnicity, the ranking at group level was very much the same in all subgroups. According to Hagendoorn (1993) and Hagendoorn and Hraba (1987), the congruence obtained here between Swedish and immigrant participants might be due to status thinking. Consensus among groups in this respect may emerge from acceptance of the dominating primary group's lifestyle and values, and those values form guidelines for the own judgement of outgroups. Further, the pattern of ethnic ranking found in the present study resembles very much the pattern reported by Hagendoorn and co-workers from their studies in the Netherlands and the former Soviet Union (Hagendoorn, 1993; Hagendoorn et al., 1998; Hraba et al., 1989). Although every society has its own unique mix of ethnic groups, and they in turn have their own unique historical reasons for living there, the tendency to build hierarchies of the groups seems to be a phenomenon that can be observed in many different societies. The pattern with North Europeans at top levels, South Europeans at middle levels, and Middle East groups at bottom levels also appeared in Lange (2000), Sidanius and Pratto (1999), and Snellman (2000).

Stereotypes often lead to a ranking of the outgroups closer or further away from the ingroup depending on what is socially and culturally acceptable in the ingroup (Hagendoorn et al., 1998). A study of the ranking of ethnic groups can thus show to what extent outgroups are stereotyped as culturally deviant. Immigration to Sweden in large numbers is quite a new phenomenon and it is still possible to get a historical view of the processes involved (Lund & Ohlsson, 1994). The various groups and their different reasons for immigrating to the area made the community of Västerås a natural choice for further investigating the formation of ethnic hierarchies. The various subgroups of participants placed the target groups Italians and Latin Americans in the second place after the Swedes. The Italian immigrants are, except for the native Swedes, the ethnic group (among the target groups) that had spent the longest time in the present local community (their immigration started after 1945). With their European background they are the target group most likely to share a common culture with the Swedes. The South American immigrant group started their immigration to this local community in the 1970s and in spite of descending from another continent many of their cultural habits, like clothing style and degree of secularization, can be seen to be similar to those of the Swedes. Like in

Hagendoorn's (1993) study, the three ethnic target groups ranked at the third level in the hierarchy represent African and Middle-East countries, and they had spent the shortest time in the local community in Sweden as well. As stated by Hagendoorn and Hraba (1987), cultural similarity and time spent in the country seem to be two of the most important factors when placing a group in the local ethnic hierarchy. When a group is perceived as strongly united and having a patriarchal lifestyle it is ranked further down in the ethnic hierarchies (Hagendoorn & Hraba, 1987; Kleinpenning, 1993), which probably contributed to the ranking of targets at the third level.

The second aim of our study dealt with the participants' inclination to rank order the ethnic target groups and to what degree this tendency was associated with their SDO and ethnic prejudice. To examine this issue, we constructed an index named Inclination to ethnic ranking. A large majority of participants did show a tendency to rank the ethnic target groups. There were no general differences between men and women or between Swedes and immigrants on this index. However, the analysis of the relationship between this index and SDO did not quite show the expected outcome. In accord with Pratto et al. (1994), we predicted that high-SDO people would rank social groups in a superior–inferior hierarchy whereas low-SDO people would not. Thus, we thought that our constructed ethnic ranking index would be closely linked to the main idea of SDO, and consequently, we predicted a high correlation between this index and SDO scores. However, we found that this relation was only moderately high ($r = 0.23$), and not significantly different from the correlations between the ethnic ranking index and ethnic prejudice. In the Hagendoorn (1993) study, both respondents with a positive attitude and respondents with a negative attitude to ethnic outgroups ranked these groups in more or less the same way. Thus, forming ethnic hierarchies does not necessarily make an individual a racist. Still, we found a significant correlation of inclination to ethnical ranking with modern and classical ethnic prejudice. To the best of our knowledge, no previous study has made a similar examination, so comparisons with earlier research are not possible.

The different subgroups of participants, varying in gender and ethnicity, did not show any significant differences in their SDO or ethnic prejudice whereas previous research has shown that men have higher explicit ethnic prejudice (e.g. Ekehammar et al., 2003) and SDO (e.g. Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) than women. In this study, however, one reason for the lack of gender differences can be multiple group memberships. Quite a few of our participants were recruited from technical study programmes and the women attending these programmes might represent a group of women with more male-oriented opinions and interests. Further, that field of study is of importance for people's ethnic and social inequality attitudes has been shown by Ekehammar, Nilsson, and Sidanius (1987). The similarity between immigrants and Swedes in their tendency to express social dominance and ethnic prejudice is probably a question of assimilation and might be explained in the same way as for their similarities in ethnic ranking (see earlier).

Finally, this was a study performed in a local context, and to examine the generality of our present results, the study should be replicated using a larger sample of participants, chosen from another local context, and using other ethnic target groups. Finally, in future research, it would be an advantage to collect data about when participants with immigrant origin have settled in Sweden to make possible more detailed analyses of assimilation effects, among other things. Anyhow, despite these shortcomings, the present study has given some important findings in a Swedish context. First, that people tend to form ethnic hierarchies with the primary group ranked first. Second, that people's formations of ethnic hierarchies seem to be more or less the same regardless of their gender and ethnic origin.

Third, that there are also individual differences in the inclination to form ethnic hierarchies, and a method to measure these differences was proposed and tested. Fourth, that the differences in people's inclination to form ethnic hierarchies are meaningfully related to their ethnic prejudice and social dominance orientation. From a more applied point of view, knowing the pattern of the ethnic hierarchy in this community, the present results can be used in, for example, community planning concerning issues of integration and for affirmative actions towards the immigrant groups that are in need of it. Investigating hierarchies can also be a guide when communities are facing new immigration. Knowledge about how previous immigrant groups have made, or not made, their ways into the community can make prevention of ethnic conflicts easier. Further, in this study we used an instrument which provided data that made it possible to compare social distances to various social groups and to form an index of inclination to ethnic ranking. This will help us to construct an improved instrument for investigating ethnic hierarchies that hopefully will be simpler to use and make the measurement more efficient.

REFERENCES

Akrami, N., Ekehammar, B., & Araya, T. (2000). Classical and modern racial prejudice: A study of attitudes toward immigrants in Sweden. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30*, 521–532.

Alderfer, P. C. (1986). An intergroup perspective on group dynamics. In J. Lorsh (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 190–219). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

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

Augoustinos, M., Ahrens, C., & Innes, J. M. (1994). Stereotypes and prejudice: The Australian experience. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 125–141.

Bates, C., & Heaven, P. C. L. (2001). Attitudes to women in society: The role of social dominance orientation and social values. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 11*, 43–49.

Blair, I. V. (2002). The malleability of automatic stereotypes and prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3*, 242–261.

Chen, M., & Bargh, J. A. (1997). Nonconscious behavioral confirmation processes: The self-fulfilling consequences of automatic stereotype activation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 33*, 541–560.

Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 5–18.

Ekehammar, B., Akrami, N., & Araya, T. (2003). Gender differences in implicit prejudice. *Personality and Individual Differences, 34*, 1509–1523.

Ekehammar, B., Nilsson, I., & Sidanius, J. (1987). Education and ideology: Basic aspects of education related to adolescents' sociopolitical attitudes. *Political Psychology, 8*, 395–410.

Emessik, D., & Mackie, D. M. (1989). Intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology, 40*, 45–81.

Hagendoorn, L. (1993). Ethnic categorization and outgroup exclusion: Cultural values and social stereotypes in the construction of ethnic hierarchies. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 16*, 27–51.

Hagendoorn, L. (1995). Intergroup biases in multiple group systems: The perception of ethnic hierarchies. *European Review of Social Psychology, 6*, 199–224.

Hagendoorn, L., & Hraba, J. (1987). Social distance toward Holland minorities: Discrimination against and among ethnic outgroups. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 10*, 316–333.

Hagendoorn, L., Drogendijk, R., Tumanov, S., & Hraba, J. (1998). Inter-ethnic preferences and ethnic hierarchies in the former Soviet Union. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 22*, 483–503.

Hubbert, K. N., Gudykunst, W. B., & Guerro, S. L. (1999). Intergroup communication over time. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 23*, 13–46.

Hraba, J., Hagendoorn, L., & Hagendoorn, R. (1989). The ethnic hierarchy in the Netherlands: Social distance and social representation. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 28*, 57–69.

Kleinpenning, G. L. M. (1993). *Structure and content of racist beliefs: An empirical study of ethnic attitudes, stereotypes and the ethnic hierarchy*. Utrecht: University Press.

Lange, A. (2000). *Diskriminering, integration och etniska relationer: Sammanfattning och diskussion* [Discrimination, integration, and ethnic relations: A summing-up and a discussion]. Norrköping: Integrationsverket.

Lepore, L., & Brown, R. (1997). Category and stereotype activation: Is prejudice inevitable? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 275–287.

Lund, C., & Ohlsson, R. (1994). *Från arbetskraftsimport till flyktinginvandring* [From workforce import to refugee immigration]. Stockholm: SNS.

Macrae, C. N., Bodenhausen, G. V., Milne, A. B., & Jetten, J. (1994). Out of mind—back in sight: Stereotypes on the rebound. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5*, 108–117.

Macrae, C. N., Stangor, C., & Milne, A. B. (1994). Activating social stereotypes: A functional analysis. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 30*, 370–389.

McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In J. F. Dovidio, & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination and racism* (pp. 91–126). New York: Academic Press.

Monteith, J. M., Spicer, C. V., & Tooman, G. D. (1998). Consequences of stereotype suppression: Stereotypes on and not on the rebound. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 34*, 355–377.

Pepels, J., & Hagendoorn, L. (2000). *A model explaining the ethnic hierarchy of the Dutch*. Utrecht: University Press.

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

Pratto, F., & Lemieux, A. F. (2001). The psychological ambiguity of immigration and its implications for promoting immigration policy. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 413–430.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable relevant to social roles and intergroup relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 741–763.

Sears, D. O. (1988). Symbolic racism. In P. A. Katz, & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 53–84). New York: Plenum Press.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge, MA: University Press.

Snellman, A. (2000). *Etniska grupper, social distans och hierarkier* [Ethnic groups, social distance, and hierarchies]. Unpublished manuscript. Eskilstuna: Mälardalen University.

Statistics Sweden. (2000). *Population statistics*. Stockholm: Central Bureau of Statistics.

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Hiel, A., & Mervielde, I. (2002). Explaining conservative beliefs and political preferences: A comparison of social dominance orientation and authoritarianism. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*, 965–976.

APPENDIX

Table A1.   Ethnic background and educational level of non-Swedish participants

Origin	School			Total
	Industry	College	University	
Finland	2	3	0	5
Iran	2	2	2	6
Yugoslavia	1	0	0	1
Pakistan	1	0	0	1
Kurdistan	1	2	2	5
Sri-Lanka	1	0	0	1
Eritrea	0	1	0	1
Denmark	0	1	0	1
Chile	0	1	1	2
Africa	0	1	0	1
Croatia	0	1	0	1
Estonia	0	1	0	1
China	0	7	0	7
Korea	0	1	0	1
Poland	0	1	0	1
Japan	0	1	0	1
Russia	0	2	0	2
Bulgaria	0	1	0	1
South Korea	0	1	0	1
USA	0	1	1	2
Somalia	0	0	2	2
Ecuador	0	1	0	1
Laos	0	0	1	1
Iraq	0	0	1	1
Tanzania	0	0	1	1
Vietnam	0	0	1	1
Ethiopia	0	0	1	1
'Foreiggin'	0	4	2	6
Total	8	33	15	56