

A Model of Authoritarianism, Social Norms, and Personal Values: Implications for Arizona Law Enforcement and Immigration Policy

Emily L. Fisher, Grace Deason, and Eugene Borgida*

University of Minnesota

Clifton M. Oyamoto, Jr.

San José State University

The enforcement of Arizona's new immigration law (Senate Bill 1070) requires police officers to make countless everyday judgments about whether individuals they encounter might be illegal immigrants. Understanding officers' attitudes about immigrants, therefore, as well as the social and personal factors that influence these attitudes, will be important to predicting the consequences of enforcing this new law. Our program of research examines the role of authoritarianism, personal values, and descriptive social norms in determining attitudes about immigrants. Given the current social and political climate, as reflected in recent Arizona and national-level polls, coupled with research on psychological predispositions, our model suggests that Arizona police officers are likely to hold negative attitudes about immigrants, and that these negative attitudes may in turn influence how officers choose to enforce Senate Bill 1070 (SB 1070). To reduce improper enforcement of SB 1070, our model suggests that police training interventions would be better informed by taking into consideration (1) the general ambiguity surrounding Americans' attitudes toward immigrants, and (2) the American tradition of egalitarianism.

In April 2010, the Arizona state legislature passed a law that called for state and local law enforcement, if given reasonable suspicion, to verify an individual's citizenship status. Arizona Senate Bill 1070, or SB 1070, as it has come to be known, is one of the most controversial and divisive anti-illegal-immigration measures to

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Eugene Borgida, University of Minnesota, Department of Psychology, 75 East River Rd, Minneapolis, MN 55455 [e-mail: borgi001@umn.edu].

be enacted in the United States in decades. Much of the controversy stems from the Act's extensive scope and questions about how it can be enforced. While U.S. federal law stipulates that illegal immigrants who are in the country for 30 days or longer must carry registration documents at all times, SB 1070 takes this obligation further, making it a *state* misdemeanor for an illegal immigrant to be in Arizona without carrying the required documents (Arizona SB 1070, §3). Moreover, the Act demands that Arizona police attempt to determine a person's immigration status if there is reasonable suspicion that the person is an illegal immigrant (Arizona SB 1070, §2). SB 1070 not only enables, but compels severe penalties for illegal immigration: It prohibits state, county, or local officials from limiting or restricting "the enforcement of federal immigration laws to less than the full extent permitted by federal law" (Arizona SB 1070, §2). Court challenges to SB 1070, not to mention media coverage of the law, have argued that the Act will result in increased racial profiling by requiring police officers to use racial criteria to make judgments about citizenship, among other constitutional violations (*National Coalition of Clergy and Christian Leaders v. Arizona*, 2010; *Escobar v. Brewer*, 2010; *American Civil Liberties Union v. Arizona*, 2010). Supporters maintain that there is nothing in the law that encourages racial or ethnic profiling (Schwartz & Archibold, 2010). The extraordinary reach of SB 1070, and extreme reactions from politicians, the public, and the media, have brought national and international attention to the state of Arizona and the pressing issues surrounding immigration along the United States' border with Mexico.

The provisions of SB 1070 at first glance appear to remove most police discretion from decisions to search and arrest persons suspected of being illegal immigrants. Indeed, Arizona officers under the new law no longer have the option of leniency in immigration disputes, and some of the first legal challenges to the Act came from police officers in Tucson and Phoenix who argued that the bill essentially forces them to violate Hispanics' rights (*Escobar v. Brewer*, 2010; *Salgado v. Brewer*, 2010). On closer inspection, however, the enforcement of SB 1070 will require Arizona police officers to make countless judgments about whether an individual might be an illegal immigrant. Police will independently define "reasonable suspicion" under the new law, for example, usually during a stop, detention, or arrest. Research suggests that such quick, ambiguous judgments are likely to be vulnerable to social cognitive biases and influenced by the social context of the encounter (Banks, Eberhardt, & Ross, 2008; Correll, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2002; 2007). Thus, understanding officers' attitudes about immigrants, as well as the social and personal factors that influence these attitudes, has important implications for understanding how the law will be enforced.

As this special collection illustrates, theory-based psychological insights can be applied to the immigration debate using a variety of perspectives. In this paper, we highlight the way that our own work, testing a theoretical model of immigration attitudes, applies to this debate. Our program of research examines the role of

authoritarianism, personal values, and descriptive social norms in determining attitudes toward immigrants. Because there is a trend of higher authoritarianism among police officers (Gatto, Dambrun, Kerbrat, & de Oliveira, 2010), these factors may be especially relevant in understanding and predicting police behavior. In several studies over the past few years (Oyamot, Borgida, & Fisher, 2006; Oyamot, Fisher, Deason, & Borgida, 2011), we find support for a model in which clear social norms for attitudes toward immigrants push authoritarians' attitudes in the direction of the norm. In the absence of clear social norms, however, we find that endorsement of humanitarian-egalitarian values attenuate the negative attitudes of authoritarians. In the next few sections, we discuss the rationale behind our model, our methods, and our findings, and the implications of our research for the enforcement of SB 1070 and similar laws.

The Role of Authoritarianism, Norms, and Values in Attitudes Toward Immigrants

Early in the social-psychological study of prejudice, one significant explanation for outgroup animus was *authoritarianism*, which reflects one's orientation toward conventional authorities and social conformity. Specifically, authoritarians' stronger tendency toward conformity and deference to authorities leads to a greater tendency toward intolerance and aggression against outgroups (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Altemeyer, 1996; Feldman, 2003; Hetherington & Weiler, 2009; Jugert & Duckitt, 2009; Stenner, 2005). The first wave of research on authoritarianism focused on the direct relation between the authoritarian personality and attitudes toward outgroups (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950). Recent years have seen a shift from authoritarianism as a personality trait (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950) or a learned set of associations (Altemeyer, 1981, 1988, 1996), to a conceptualization of authoritarianism as a generalized motive for the maintenance of conformity, order, and social uniformity (Feldman 2003; Hetherington & Weiler, 2009; Jugert & Duckitt, 2009; Stenner, 2005). Rather than including a right-wing political orientation as inherent within the authoritarianism construct, such political attitudes are thought to be a conditional outcome of a prepolitical predisposition that is characterized by a need for order and a tendency to rely on established authorities to provide that order (Federico, Fisher, & Deason, 2010; Feldman, 2003; Hetherington & Weiler, 2009).

One constant in authoritarianism research over the past 5 decades is that authoritarians are intolerant of groups that they perceive as deviating from a pertinent social norm in some significant way or as different from themselves in crucial respects (i.e., ethnic background, religious beliefs, social values; Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Altemeyer, 1981, 1988, 1996). Immigrants are prime candidates for such perceptions, since they often come to

the United States with distinct physical and cultural markers of difference (Zárate & Shaw, 2010). Theorists have advanced different explanations for authoritarians' negative attitudes toward such groups, but one constant seems to be that authoritarians' habitual intolerance is connected to social norms and values that are perceived to be legitimate and traditional (e.g., Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Altemeyer, 1996).

Current conceptualizations of authoritarianism emphasize the possibility of dynamic processes in which authoritarian predispositions interact with social influences, both enduring (e.g., traditional societal value systems, individual political expertise) or transitory (e.g., perceived social norms, feelings of threat), to influence attitudes toward social groups (Duckitt & Fisher, 2003; Duriez, Van Hiel, & Kossowska, 2005; Federico et al., 2010; Feldman & Stenner, 1997; Hetherington & Weiler, 2009; Oyamot et al., 2006; Oyamot et al., 2011). Thus, while one might expect authoritarian aggression to predict hostility toward outgroups in most situations, these negative attitudes could be attenuated under the right circumstances. Our own theoretical model holds that high authoritarians' attitudes toward immigrants (more so than low authoritarians' attitudes) are contingent upon perceived social consensus about immigrants in American society and personal endorsement of traditional American humanitarian-egalitarian values.

In formulating our theory, we drew on group-norm theory and previous theories of authoritarianism to hypothesize that authoritarians' need for order and their tendency to rely on established authorities would lead to particularly strong adherence to social norms when these norms were clear (Oyamot et al., 2006). Group norm theory (Sherif & Sherif, 1953) suggests that attitudes are formed by adopting the attitudes of a valued ingroup. Thus, an individual's prejudice toward an outgroup may sometimes be a result of conforming to a consensus attitude (Crandall, Eshleman, & O'Brien, 2002; Pettigrew, 1991). Though the norms of the ingroup are descriptive, they may also imply a prescriptive component such that authoritarians, who are highly prone to conformity, extrapolate to believe that these outgroups *should* be treated positively or negatively. Prior research indicates that authoritarians are particularly prone to adjusting their attitudes in the direction of an ingroup norm. Altemeyer (1988, 1996) exposed participants to descriptive norms in the form of peer responses to questionnaire items and found that authoritarian participants adjusted their scale responses to be closer to the average. Tests of our model support our prediction that authoritarians are especially likely to conform to descriptive norms (Oyamot et al., 2006). Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) was unrelated to individuals' attitudes about groups for whom norms were positive, and associated with negative attitudes toward groups for whom norms were negative. That is, when it was socially acceptable to hold a negative attitude, we found that authoritarians did so, but when a majority held a positive attitude about an outgroup, authoritarians' tendency toward outgroup derogation was blunted.

Our model extends group-norm theory by focusing on situations in which there is no clear positive or negative norm to which authoritarians may conform. This is an important question when considering immigration policy, because in the United States as a whole, immigrants have been a group for which the prevailing norms are mixed (Fisher, Deason, Borgida, & Oyamoto, 2006; Esses et al., 1998; 2001; Oyamoto et al., 2006; Pratto & Lemieux, 2001). In such cases, the lack of social consensus creates ambiguity, and attitudes must be determined in another manner. We theorized that an authoritarian may instead turn to his or her personal beliefs in traditional values. One traditional value system in American culture is that of humanitarianism-egalitarianism (Katz & Hass, 1988), in which “adherence to the democratic ideals of equality, social justice, and concern for the others’ well-being” is emphasized (Katz & Hass, 1988, p. 894). In addition to its long tradition in American society, we were particularly interested in humanitarianism-egalitarianism because of the counter-intuitive connection to authoritarianism. Among those who endorsed egalitarianism as a personal value, authoritarianism was unrelated to attitudes about immigrants, but for those who did not endorse egalitarianism, authoritarianism was negatively related to attitudes about immigrants (Oyamoto et al., 2006).

Although one does not typically associate beliefs like “One should find ways to help others less fortunate than oneself” with authoritarians, some American authoritarians do endorse the American tradition of egalitarianism. In our previous research, the correlations between these two variables ranges from weakly negative ($r = -.19$ & $r = -.23$, $p < .05$; Oyamoto et al., 2006) to nonsignificant ($r = -.09$, $p = .09$; Oyamoto et al., 2011). Such small correlations are consistent with others’ work; for instance, Altemeyer (1996, p. 44) reports that RWA has only a “small” ($r = -.29$) correlation with humanism, and Duriez and van Hiel (2002) find it correlates with universalism at $r = -.20$. Further, a growing body of research supports a dual-process theory of motivated political ideology in which authoritarianism and egalitarianism are orthogonal dimensions (Altemeyer, 1996; Duckitt & Sibley, 2009; Duriez et al., 2005). Because of the ambiguity surrounding norms toward immigrants (Fisher et al., 2006; Esses et al., 1998; 2001; Oyamoto et al., 2006; Pratto & Lemieux, 2001), we suggest that authoritarians’ attitudes toward immigrants will hinge on their personal endorsement of an egalitarian ethic. To illustrate this point, we describe several studies that demonstrate the role of social norms and egalitarianism in moderating the relationship between authoritarianism and attitudes about immigrants.

Empirical Tests of a Norms \times Authoritarianism \times Egalitarianism Model

In a sample of 239 undergraduate students (160 women, 169 White, mean age = 20.8 years), Oyamoto et al., (2006) first found evidence consistent with a model in which authoritarian predispositions, clarity of social norms, and

endorsement of egalitarian values guide individual attitudes toward recent immigrants to the United States, African Americans, and homosexuals. Authoritarianism was measured using a 10-item version (Haddock, Zanna, & Esses, 1993) of Altemeyer's (1988) 30-item RWA scale, and endorsement of humanitarianism-egalitarianism was measured using 10 items devised by Katz and Hass (1988). A 9-point Likert scale ranging from *very unfavorable* to *very favorable* was used to measure participants' global evaluations of the target groups. In a second study, Oyamot et al. (2006) analyzed secondary data from a national stratified random sample of 1,359 adult respondents (728 women, 1,124 White, mean age = 46.7 years) from the 1992 American National Election Study prepost election survey using a 5-item measure of moral traditionalism as a proxy for authoritarianism, a 6-item egalitarianism scale, and a feeling thermometer measure of attitudes toward legal immigrants, African Americans, and homosexuals. In both studies, each attitude measure was regressed on authoritarianism, egalitarianism, and their interaction, along with relevant control variables. The two-way interaction between authoritarianism and egalitarianism predicted attitudes toward immigrants, providing support for our model's central tenet: Endorsement of egalitarian values can mitigate authoritarians' tendency toward derogation of outgroups when descriptive norms about a group are unclear. This pattern did not hold for attitudes toward African Americans and homosexuals, groups for which a clear descriptive norm is available.

In the initial test of the model, Oyamot et al. (2006) relied on archival opinion polls to determine the clarity of social norms regarding the three target groups, and assumed that participants were aware of these norms. To expand the model, Fisher et al. (2006) asked 149 undergraduate participants to report their own perceptions of the prevailing social norms about various social groups. Two items measured perceptions of how most Americans treat members of the target group. Participants indicated their agreement with each item on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 9 (*strongly agree*) Likert-type scale. Participants also completed the RWA scale (Haddock et al., 1993), the humanitarianism-egalitarianism scale (Katz & Hass, 1988), and a 9-point feeling thermometer measure of attitudes toward immigrants, African Americans, homosexuals, Muslims, and Arabs. In addition, the order of items was manipulated: Half of the participants completed the egalitarianism items immediately prior to the attitude about target group measures, and completed the RWA items last. For the other half of the sample, the order of these scales was reversed. As predicted, participants perceived the social norms regarding immigrants to be ambiguous, and when egalitarianism was primed, it moderated the relation between RWA and attitudes toward immigrants. These results more directly demonstrate that authoritarians' attitudes match their perceptions of what others think about specific outgroups, and also provide evidence that egalitarian values must be salient in order to influence attitudes.

In the latest test of our theoretical model (Oyamot et al., 2011), we experimentally manipulated perceptions of the social norms regarding immigrants to determine whether we could shift attitudes in a manner consistent with our model's predictions. We surveyed 397 randomly selected California state residents (202 women, 274 White, mean age = 52.0 years) as part of an omnibus telephone survey conducted by San José State University's Survey Policy and Research Institute. Participants responded to three items from the humanitarianism-egalitarianism scale (Katz & Hass, 1988). Next, authoritarian predispositions were measured by asking participants about their child-rearing values (1992 National Election Studies; also see Stenner, 2005). Respondents were given a series of four paired qualities (e.g., independence or respect for elders; obedience or self reliance) and asked to indicate which, in their opinion, was more important for a child to have. Responses to each item were coded as 1 (*consistent with authoritarian predispositions*), 0 (*inconsistent with authoritarian predispositions*), or 0.5 (*if the participant volunteered that both qualities were important*), and then summed to create a scale.

After an interval of 17 questions unrelated to this investigation, the participants were randomly assigned to conditions to receive the social norm manipulation. Participants in the positive norm condition were told that, "According to recent opinion polls, Americans are generally positive in their feelings about immigrants and immigration. How would you describe your feelings about recent immigrants? That is, people who are in the U.S. legally, and have come here to live." Participants in the mixed and negative norm conditions were told exactly the same thing, except that the word "positive" was replaced by the word "mixed" or "negative," respectively. Participants rated their feelings about legal immigrants to the United States using a 5-point scale, from *very unfavorable* to *very favorable*.

The measure of attitudes toward immigrants was regressed on the authoritarian predisposition, egalitarianism, dummy codes representing the social norm condition, and the interactions among these variables. The three-way interaction was statistically significant in the model, indicating that the relation between authoritarianism, egalitarianism, and attitudes toward immigrants varied depending on the experimentally manipulated descriptive norm. Consistent with our theoretical model, authoritarians' tendency toward intolerance of outgroups was attenuated when they thought that Americans in general had favorable opinions about immigrants. In contrast, authoritarianism was negatively related to attitudes toward immigrants when they thought that Americans in general held unfavorable opinions about immigrants. Important to the model, when societal norms were depicted as mixed, authoritarians' attitudes depended upon endorsement of humanitarian-egalitarian values: egalitarian authoritarians held positive attitudes and nonegalitarian authoritarians held the most negative attitudes toward immigrants.

Implications of the Model for Enforcement of SB 1070

With converging evidence from several populations, using a range of research methodologies, we have demonstrated that this model is robust and has predictive power. Moreover, we believe that the model is quite relevant for thinking about immigration policy in Arizona and elsewhere. SB 1070 compels local police officers to determine who might be an immigrant and to verify this status, yet grants officers considerable discretion in the criteria that they use to make this judgment. Given the central role that police officers will play if this aspect of SB 1070 remains in place, understanding police attitudes about immigrants will shed light on how they are likely to behave when interacting with people whom they suspect to be immigrants. Research suggests that police officers' attitudes can affect their judgments and behaviors when engaging with Black or Latino suspects (Correll et al., 2002; Eberhardt, Goff, Purdie, & Davies, 2004; Sadler, Correll, Park, & Judd, 2010), so it is reasonable to assume that police attitudes about immigrants may influence their interactions with this population. Will officers be neutral and objective as the law presumes, or will they enter the situation with preexisting attitudes that may subtly or overtly bias their behaviors? We highlight three major ways that our theoretical model is relevant in answering this question.

First, the model makes predictions for attitudes about immigrants based on one's level of authoritarianism. Because obedience (to laws) is at the core of law enforcement, one might anticipate that law enforcement officers will be especially concerned with obedience (a core element of authoritarianism). Indeed, several decades of research in the United States and other nations show that police officers tend to have higher levels of authoritarianism than the general public (Altemeyer, 1996; Colman & Gorman, 1982; Gatto et al., 2010; Smith, Locke, & Walker, 1968; Worden, 1995). This discrepancy is likely due to a self-selection process, in that individuals who are high in authoritarianism may choose careers that match their psychological tendencies. Indeed, a similar process may drive officers to be higher than average in social dominance, a construct that encompasses antiegalitarianism (Sidanius & Pratto, 2001). The implication is that police officers, in general, may be predisposed to be intolerant of outgroups such as immigrants. However, our model indicates that authoritarianism levels alone are not sufficient for understanding police officers' attitudes toward immigrants.

Second, our research suggests that we must also examine the social norms about a target group when determining if and how authoritarians' attitudes toward that group will be expressed. If prevailing social norms are clearly negative toward immigrants, then we would expect that police officers who are predisposed to authoritarianism will have an inclination toward intolerance of immigrants. If the prevailing social norms are mixed toward immigrants, then we must consider another variable—endorsement of egalitarian values—to arrive at a clear prediction.

Recent public opinion polling data can help to ascertain whether the prevailing norms are negative, positive, or ambiguous.

Because SB 1070 applies only to Arizona, one could argue that the opinions of state residents comprise the most relevant social norm, and in this case, the data suggest a social climate in which immigration is seen in a negative light. Polls of Arizona residents reveal negative opinions of immigration: In April 2010, 70% of state residents were in favor of SB 1070 even though 53% believed that such strict enforcement was likely to violate some citizens' rights in the process (Rasmussen Reports, 2010). As the debate unfolded over the year, support for the law decreased, but remained the majority opinion. A poll conducted in July 2010 finds 55% of Arizona residents in support of the bill, even as 48% of residents believe that Latino residents will face increased discrimination as a result, and that the debate over SB 1070 has stirred up a deeper sense of racism among Arizonans. Moreover, these levels of support exist even as only 27% of Arizona residents believe that SB 1070 would resolve the illegal immigration problem (Hansen & Holstege, 2010).

Given this information about authoritarianism and social norms, what would our theoretical model predict about police officers' attitudes about immigrants? Recall that the model predicts different effects of authoritarianism on attitudes about outgroups depending on one's perceptions of prevailing social norms. When one perceives the prevailing social norms about a group to be negative, authoritarianism will have a negative effect on attitudes about that group. It appears that this is the condition in Arizona. As such, the combination of negative norms prevailing in the social milieu and higher than average levels of authoritarianism in police officers means that such officers are likely to hold negative attitudes about immigrants and, in turn, these attitudes may influence their perceptions and how they behave while on duty. Unfortunately, such biases do not bode well for the goals of neutral and fair policing. When people are biased against a group, their behavior is more likely to be influenced by stereotypes about the group. For example, racial bias is associated with negative stereotypes about African Americans and with police officers' responses in the "shooter bias" paradigm, a research task that requires rapid judgments about whether or not a suspect is armed and often reveals a tendency to automatically treat African Americans as if they pose a threat (Correll et al., 2002; Sadler et al., 2010). Although supporters of SB 1070 claim that police can be fair and objective when enforcing immigration laws and determining who looks suspicious, the negative social context and officers' levels of authoritarianism make this a much more difficult task. It may be more prudent to expect that police officers will, on average, be biased against immigrants, and to consider ways to attenuate or eliminate the bias.

One could also argue that police officers may sense a more ambiguous social climate regarding immigrants, and if so, our model suggests a different pathway to officers' formation of outgroup attitudes, but not necessarily a different outcome.

Anecdotally, vivid news stories both in support of and in opposition to SB 1070 (e.g., calls for boycotting Arizona businesses) soon followed the passage of SB 1070. More formally, in contrast to Arizona, at the national level pollsters found more mixed opinions about immigration. Polls in the first half of 2010 show 50–60% of Americans are in favor of increasing enforcement of immigration laws via bills such as SB 1070 (CNN Opinion Research Corporation, 2010; Cohen & Bahrapour, 2010; Jones, 2010; Pew Research Center, 2010). When asked specifically about that bill in mid-July, 23% of Americans said they believe it goes too far and 17% said it does not go far enough in cracking down on illegal immigration (Condon, 2010). Asking about immigration more generally, Gallup reports in late July 2010 that 45% of Americans think immigration rates should decrease, 17% think they should increase, and 34% prefer to keep immigration at its current rates. Compared to the more negative responses to this poll item through 2008 and 2009, it seems that the poll “marks an easing of views from last year . . . and a return to the more divided views of 2007” (Morales, 2010, p. 2). Finally, Arizona police officers themselves are not monolithically in support of SB 1070, with some of the first challenges to the law coming from concerned Arizona police officers (*Escobar v. Brewer*, 2010; *Salgado v. Brewer*, 2010).

If social norms regarding immigration and SB 1070 issues are unclear, then our research suggests that another variable must be taken into consideration, namely, personal endorsement of egalitarian values is likely to moderate the relation between officers’ authoritarianism and attitudes (Oyamoto, Borgida, & Fisher, 2006; Oyamoto, Fisher, Deason, & Borgida, 2010). Because people high in authoritarianism no longer have a clear norm to inform their attitudes, they turn to more abstract factors such as values. An authoritarian who believes the social norms are ambiguous could have negative or neutral attitudes about immigrants, depending on his or her endorsement of egalitarian values. Indeed, as noted above, some of the first challenges to SB 1070 came from officers concerned about fair treatment for their communities (*Escobar v. Brewer*, 2010; *Salgado v. Brewer*, 2010). Unfortunately, research suggests that egalitarian values may not be widespread among police officers; as noted above, police officers tend to be higher in social dominance orientation than the general public (Sidanius & Pratto, 2001). Our model predicts that in a context with ambiguous social norms, high authoritarians who do not endorse egalitarian values are likely to hold negative attitudes about the outgroup. Thus, whether prevailing social norms are construed as negative or ambiguous, a police officer may be more predisposed than average to hold biased views of immigrants.

Interventions That Could Moderate Officers’ Attitudes

Despite the sobering predictions that our theoretical model makes about police officers’ current attitudes toward immigrants, the model can also instruct

us on ways to mitigate these tendencies and promote less-prejudiced attitudes among this population. Within our theory, attitudes about immigrants vary based on three factors: authoritarianism, egalitarian values, and perceived social norms. Insofar as authoritarianism is a stable predisposition (Altemeyer, 1996), attempts to lower officers' authoritarianism levels are likely to fail. However, our research suggests that perceptions of social norms about immigrants are malleable; when told that the consensus viewpoint is positive, negative, or mixed, people find all three options equally believable (Oyamot et al., 2011). Therefore, an important first step in reducing bias in authoritarian populations is changing perceptions of the social norm from negative to ambiguous, and eventually to positive. One way to do this might be to shift the social context for the norm away from the state of Arizona and toward the country overall, where attitudes are more divided. For instance, rather than focusing on the fact that SB 1070 is an Arizona law, officers could be reminded that they are charged with enforcing federal immigration law (i.e., on behalf of the entire United States) when they interact with immigrants. Given that the federal government represents an even higher authority than the state, an authoritarian officer might find it an even more compelling source of normative information. It will also be important for police training sessions to discuss a full range of viewpoints about immigration to reinforce the idea that plenty of Americans and Arizonans feel positively about immigrants, and for the media to highlight the viewpoints of citizens who welcome immigrants.

Changing perceptions of the relevant social norms is a first step, but our model implies that an additional path to attitude change will be necessary. An authoritarian may have a neutral (rather than negative) attitude about an outgroup when the social norms about that group are positive, but the current state of public opinion suggests that we are far from a state of positive norms regarding immigrants. Realistically, the norms might at best shift from negative to ambiguous. Thus, we must look to the third variable in our model: Egalitarianism. Although individuals differ in their endorsement of this value, it is possible to prime egalitarianism and temporarily elicit more positive attitudes about an outgroup (Katz & Hass, 1988; Wyer, 2010). Priming egalitarianism can also reduce discriminatory decisions about an outgroup (Pereira, Vala, & Leyens, 2009). If police officers were repeatedly reminded of egalitarian values and their obligation to enforce federal laws, then they might be more inclined to respond to immigrants in a less-biased way despite their lower levels of chronic egalitarianism. Our own research (Fisher et al., 2006) primed egalitarianism by asking participants to respond to questions about the value just before sharing their attitudes about immigrants. A variation on this or other laboratory tasks that primed egalitarianism, such as writing a reflective essay on egalitarian values (Wyer, 2010) or reading passages that evoke egalitarianism (Pereira et al., 2009) might be adapted for inclusion in police training exercises. It will be important for police training to emphasize equal rights

for all suspects, and police departments should promote egalitarian norms in their day-to-day interactions with the public.

More research will be needed to determine the most effective ways to translate these theoretical predictions into workable interventions that reduce bias against immigrants among law enforcement officials. It will doubtless be difficult to design and implement such interventions, but effective theory-based solutions may be possible. After all, social psychology has a record of small, simple interventions that lead to significant and substantive real-world effects (e.g., Walton & Cohen, 2007). Although our suggested remedies may seem unduly optimistic, our research suggests that reframing social norms and making egalitarianism salient could be effective ways to reduce bias in law enforcement. Empirical data support these theory-based predictions, and suggest that under the right conditions, law enforcement officers should be more likely to fairly enforce the provisions of SB 1070.

On the other hand, we recognize the difficulties of the interventions we propose. The negative norms against immigrants in places such as Arizona may be too difficult to ignore, and might overwhelm attempts to refocus on a more neutral context. Priming egalitarianism may not have long-term effects in a population that does not chronically endorse this value. Empirical research with police populations might demonstrate that these factors are too entrenched to shift and allow for attitude change. If this is the case, we must then move to change the law rather than change the attitudes of the officers who enforce it.

Conclusions

The fate of SB 1070 is not yet certain, as legal challenges have arisen. Nevertheless, other states are moving to enact similar laws (Munsey, 2010), and supporters of the bill are fighting hard to ensure that it is enforced in Arizona. SB 1070 places police officers in a difficult position. We expect that the vast majority of police officers work hard to execute their responsibilities in a conscientious and fair manner. However, research has shown that subtle (or not so subtle) situational and personal factors can influence enforcement decisions. As police officers become more and more involved in the enforcement of federal immigration laws, their attitudes about immigrants will be important determinants of the way that these laws are enforced—fairly and neutrally, or in a biased and discriminatory manner. After several years of studying attitudes about immigrants, we have developed a theoretical model that predicts these attitudes are a function of authoritarianism, egalitarianism, and social norms. Unfortunately, this model predicts that in the current social climate, police officers are likely to hold negative attitudes about immigrants. In order to moderate these attitudes, effort must go into developing and testing interventions that remind officers that many Americans feel positively about immigrants, and to reinforce the traditional American value of treating people equally. With enough organizationally sanctioned repetition and

appropriate incentives, officers' attitudes may shift from negative to neutral, which may help them engage in less-biased law enforcement whether or not SB 1070 is successfully challenged in the courts. Should such interventions fail, however, overturning immigration laws that cannot be enforced in a fair and unbiased manner will no doubt become the focus of attention.

References

- American Civil Liberties Union v. Arizona*, No. 10–1061 (D. Ariz., filed May 17, 2010).
- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Altemeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of freedom*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The authoritarian specter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Banks, R. R., Eberhardt, J. L., & Ross, L. (2008). Race, crime and antidiscrimination. In E. Borgida & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), *Beyond common sense: psychological science in the courtroom* (pp. 3–22). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- CNN Opinion Research Corporation. (2010, July 28). Opinion on immigration. In *CNN opinion research poll*. Retrieved September 4, 2010 from <http://i2.cdn.turner.com/cnn/2010/images/07/28/re110h.pdf>.
- Cohen, J., & Bahrapour, T. (2010, June 17). Most Americans back new Arizona law, Washington Post-ABC News poll finds. *Washington Post*, Retrieved September 4, 2010 from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/06/17/AR2010061700008.html>.
- Colman, A. M., & Gorman, L. P. (1982). Conservatism, dogmatism, and authoritarianism in British police officers. *Sociology*, 16, 1–11.
- Condon, S. (2010, July 13). Poll: Support for Arizona immigration law hits 57 percent. *CBS News*, Retrieved September 4, 2010 from http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-20010460-503544.html.
- Correll, J., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2002). The police officer's dilemma: Using ethnicity to disambiguate potentially threatening individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 1314–1329.
- Correll, J., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2007). The influence of stereotypes on decisions to shoot. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37, 1102–1117.
- Crandall, C. S., Eshleman, A., & O'Brien, L. (2002). Social norms and the expression and suppression of prejudice: The struggle for internalization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 359–378.
- Duckitt, J., & Fisher, K. (2003). The impact of social threat on worldview and ideological attitudes. *Political Psychology*, 24, 199–222.
- Duckitt, J., & Sibley, C. G. (2009). A dual-process motivational model of ideological attitudes and system justification. In J. T. Jost, A. C. Kay, & H. Thorisdottir, (Eds.), *Social and psychological bases of ideology and system justification*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Duriez, B., & Van Hiel, A. (2002). The march of modern fascism: A comparison of social dominance orientation and authoritarianism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32, 1199–1213.
- Duriez, B., Van Hiel, A., & Kossowska, M. (2005). Authoritarianism and social dominance in Western and Eastern Europe: The importance of the socio-political context and of political interest and involvement. *Political Psychology*, 26, 299–320.
- Eberhardt, J. L., Goff, P. A., Purdie, V. J., & Davies, P. G. (2004). Seeing black: Race, crime and visual processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 876–893.
- Escobar v. Brewer*, No. 10–0249 (D. Ariz., filed April 29, 2010).
- Esses, V. M., Dovidio, J. F., Jackson, L. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (2001). The immigration dilemma: The role of perceived group competition, ethnic prejudice, and national identity. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(3), 389–412.

- Esses, V. M., Jackson, L. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (1998). Intergroup competition and attitudes toward immigrants and immigration: An instrumental model of group conflict. *Journal of Social Issues, 54*(4), 699–724.
- Federico, C. M., Fisher, E. L., & Deason, G. (2010). Expertise and the ideological consequences of the authoritarian predisposition. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Feldman, S. (2003). Enforcing social conformity: A theory of authoritarianism. *Political Psychology, 24*, 41–74.
- Feldman, S., & Stenner, K. (1997). Perceived threat and authoritarianism. *Political Psychology, 4*, 741–770.
- Fisher, E. L., Deason, G., Borgida, E., & Oyamoto, C. (2006, May). *Perceived social norms and egalitarian value salience drive RWAs' outgroup evaluations*. Poster presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Psychological Science, New York, NY.
- Gatto, J., Dambrun, M., Kerbrat, C., de Oliveira, P. (2010). Prejudice in the police: On the processes underlying the effects of selection and group socialization. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 40*, 252–269.
- Haddock, G., Zanna, M. P., & Esses, V. M. (1993). Assessing the structure of prejudicial attitudes: The case of attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 1105–1118.
- Hansen, R. J., & Holstege, S. (2010, August 2). Poll: Debate over new Arizona immigration law may heighten racism in state. *The Arizona Republic*. Retrieved September 4, 2010 from <http://www.azcentral.com/news/articles/2010/08/02/20100802immigration-racial-profiling.html>.
- Hetherington, M. J., & Weiler, J. (2009). *Authoritarianism and polarization in American politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, J. M. (2010, April 29). More Americans favor than oppose Arizona immigration law. *Gallup Polls*. Retrieved September 4, 2010 from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/127598/Americans-favor-oppose-arizona-immigration-law.aspx>.
- Jugert, P., & Duckitt, J. (2009). A motivated model of authoritarianism: Integrating personal and situational determinants. *Political Psychology, 30*, 693–719.
- Katz, I., & Hass, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and American value conflict: Correlational priming studies of dual cognitive structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*(6), 893–905.
- Morales, L. (2010, July 27). Amid immigration debate, Americans' views ease slightly. *Gallup Polls*. Retrieved September 4, 2010 from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/141560/amid-immigration-debate-americans-views-ease-slightly.aspx>.
- Munsey, C. (2010). Deciding who belongs. *APA Monitor, 41*, 18–20.
- National Coalition of Clergy and Christian Leaders v. Arizona*, No. 10–0943 (D. Ariz., filed July 30, 2010).
- Oyamoto, C. M., Jr., Borgida, E., & Fisher, E. L. (2006). Can values moderate the attitudes of Right-Wing Authoritarians? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 486–500.
- Oyamoto, C., Fisher, E., Deason, G., & Borgida, E. (2011). Attitudes toward immigrants: The interactive role of social norms, personal values, and the authoritarian predisposition. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Pereira, C., Vala, J., & Leyens, J. P. (2009). From infra-humanization to discrimination: The mediation of symbolic threat needs egalitarian norms. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*, 336–344.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1991). Normative theory in intergroup relations: Explaining both harmony and conflict. *Psychology and Developing Societies, 3*, 3–16.
- Pew Research Center. (2010, May 12). Public supports Arizona immigration law: Democrats divided, but support provisions. Retrieved September 4, 2010 from <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1591/public-support-arizona-immigration-law-poll>.
- 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.
- Rasmussen Reports. (2010, April 21). 70% of Arizona voters favor new state measure cracking down on illegal immigration. Retrieved September 4, 2010 from http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/politics/elections/election_2010/election_2010_

- senate_elections/arizona/70_of_arizona_voters_favor_new_state_measure_cracking_down_on_illegal_immigration.
- Sadler, M. S., Correll, J., Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (2010). The world is not black and white: Shooter bias in a multi-ethnic context. Unpublished manuscript.
- Salgado v. Brewer*. No. 10–0951 (D. Ariz., filed April 29, 2010).
- Schwartz, J., & Archibold, R. C. (2010, April 17). A law facing a tough road through the courts. *New York Times*. Available at: http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/28/us/28legal.html?_r=1.
- Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. W. (1953). *Groups in harmony and tension*. New York: Harper.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (2001). *Social dominance*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, A. B., Locke, B., & Walker, W. F. (1968). Authoritarianism in police college students and non-police college students. *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 59, 440–443.
- Stenner, K. (2005). *The authoritarian dynamic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2007). A question of belonging: Race, social fit, and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 82–96.
- Worden, R. E. (1995). Police officers' belief systems: A framework for analysis. *American Journal of Police*, 14, 49–81.
- Wyer, N. A. (2010). Salient egalitarian norms moderate activation of out-group approach and avoidance. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 13, 151–165.
- Zárate, M., & Shaw, M. P. (2010). The role of cultural inertia in reactions to immigration on the U.S./Mexico border. *Journal of Social Issues*, 66, 45–57.

EMILY L. FISHER is a Ph.D. candidate in psychology at the University of Minnesota, with a minor in political psychology through the Center for the Study of Political Psychology. Her research interests are broadly in the area of intergroup relations. More specifically, she studies intergroup contact and its effect on social categorization and attitudes about outgroups, cognitive and motivational predictors of political attitudes, and perceptions of social capital in subordinate and superordinate communities.

GRACE DEASON is a Ph.D. Candidate in Social and Political Psychology at the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities. She is interested in the social-psychological processes that perpetuate inequality (stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination) and ways they manifest in politics and the workplace. Her dissertation research examines the role of motherhood and traditional maternal values in political campaigns.

EUGENE BORGIDA is Professor of Psychology and Law, and the Morse-Alumni Distinguished Professor of Psychology, at the University of Minnesota. He is a Fellow of the APS and the APA, and Past President of SPSSI. He has served on the Board of Directors for the Association of Psychological Science (APS) and the Social Science Research Council (SSRC). His research interests include social cognition, attitudes and persuasion, psychology and law, and political psychology.

CLIFTON M. OYAMOT, JR. is an Assistant Professor of Psychology at San José State University. His research interests include prejudice, the self, and interpersonal relationships.