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**Abstract**

This study focuses on assessing overt and covert forms of prejudice. Overt, “Old-fashioned”, forms of prejudice, which imply displaying of open unfriendliness or hostility towards other groups and their members, are a fairly old subject of discussion in the psychological literature (Allport, 1954). Beginning in the 1970s, modern, usually covert or subtle, prejudice began to be actively discussed (Brown, 2010). There are three forms that are most often distinguished. Symbolic racists (sexists, etc.) believe that disadvantaged groups demand attention in vain, since equality of rights has already been achieved. Ambivalent forms combine negative and positive (or conditionally positive) feelings towards the same group. Aversive forms are characterized by a genuine sharing of egalitarian values, which is suddenly replaced by alienation and negative attitudes due to adoption of intergroup anxiety and negative stereotypes. In Russian studies these forms have rarely become the subject of interest, with several exceptions of scales adaptation (see, for example, Agadullina, 2018; Gulevich, 2015).

Covert forms of prejudice attract attention primarily because they determine the “response amplification”: the sharp transition of intergroup behavior from outwardly benevolent forms to hostile ones (Brown, 2010). In addition, these forms are very diverse in content and are resistant to calls to “be open-minded” (symbolic racists do not consider themselves as racists). All this complicates the process of creating tools for the correct assessment of hidden biases. In Russia, this problem exists in the absence of a measurement tradition and obvious forms of prejudice. There are various methods, scales (domestic and adapted), however, there are no studies on their comparison and evaluation. Accordingly, the purpose of this study is to evaluate and compare the traditions of measuring overt and covert forms of prejudice and to propose a tool for their measurement that is valid and effective for the Russian cultural context.

Analysis of the content of existing theoretical approaches and measurement techniques allows us to formulate several statements that form the basis of the methodology being created. First, it is necessary to separate the core of the prejudice per se from the factors associated with it, but still not being a prejudice. In existing methodologies it is a common case, when, for example, perceived threats from a target group are assessed as a subscale of prejudice (Pettigrew, Merteens, 1995). However, meta-analytic studies indicate that threats are more correctly considered as predictors rather than the content of prejudice (Riek et al., 2006). Secondly, to assess the hidden forms of prejudice, it is necessary to clarify the content of the inner conflict, which, according to G. Allport, underlies the transition of prejudice from explicit to hidden forms (Allport, 1954). First of all, it is a conflict of value orientations. Third, explicit bias is also not a one-dimensional construct and contains at least three aspects of attitudes towards the other group that are most often mentioned in studies.

Accordingly, in the developed methodology, the assessment of the content of explicit prejudices included subscales of derogatory judgments, the desire for exclusion, distrust, and perceived distance. To assess symbolic covert forms, subscales were developed to measure denial of discrimination, opinions that migrants have already received excessive support, and opinions that migrants are simply not working hard to achieve well-being. The ambivalence score relies on a combination of respondents' responses to statements on the empathy for migrants subscale and the symbolic prejudice subscale, as well as a measure of the respondent's support for Protestant values ​​and egalitarian values.

The empirical study included several stages. At the preliminary stage, using the method of measuring individual values ​​(PVQ-R, Shwartz, Butenko, 2014), we assessed the values ​​that describe a typical Russia, according to the respondents perception (N= 152). This stage was necessary to compare the content of the inner conflict of values ​​proposed by G. Allport for the US with the possible content of a similar conflict in Russia. Also, a pool of judgments was collected about groups that are objects of negative attitudes in Russia, or, on the contrary, enjoy special opportunities (N=496). The second stage consisted in evaluating the proposed measure of overt and covert forms of prejudice against migrants. Respondents (N= 372) filled out an online questionnaire that contained the scales of the validated technique, as well as the PVQ-R methodology (respondents to assessed their own values in this case), a modification of the Bogardus scale, the system justification scale, scales for measuring ethnic, civil and religious identity, parameters of psychological well-being.

The results indicate that our key assumptions about the structure of the methodology were correct. Indeed, models that include three or four subscales of overt prejudice fit the data better than single-factor models. Further, the symbolic form of prejudice constitutes a separate scale that is not mixed with old-fashion prejudice (and its subscales). Statements suggesting sympathy for migrants also constitute a separate scale. This scale average score is positively associated with the egalitarian values expression, while the symbolic prejudice subscales are positively associated with Protestant values. However, it should be mentioned, that ambivalent prejudice is much less pronounced; the overall attitude toward migrants gravitates more towards symbolic prejudice. The graphical structure of the models tested, patterns of relationships with subjective well-being and different types of identity, additional hypotheses about the structure and the overt and covert forms of prejudice content will be presented in the oral report in more detail.
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