Prejudice is conceptualized as a negative evaluation of a person based on group membership, whereas discrimination is a negative action directed toward that individual (Crandall, Eshleman, & O’Brien, 2002). Though some discriminatory acts are obviously motivated by prejudice (e.g., racial slurs), many real life situations contain a certain amount of ambiguity regarding the motivation behind a behavior. Such instances are ambiguous because the motivation is unclear and details such as whether the behavior is typical of the person acting are unknown. These ambiguous situations may lead to different interpretations of the same act. For example, a hotel clerk may tell a customer via telephone that rooms are available for reservation that evening while, in the next moment, he informs a customer in person that there are no vacancies. One observer may think the clerk is unpleasant because of circumstance or personality, whereas another may see the behavior as prejudicial against the customer who inquired in person at the desk. Inman and Baron (1996) suggest that the degree to which individuals interpret a behavior as prejudicially motivated may depend on the extent to which they hold expectations regarding who will perpetrate and whom will be victimized. Such expectations develop as humans organize their experiences by comparing new events to existing mental ideals or schemas (Aosved, Long, & Voller, 2009; Baldwin, 1992; Cantor, Michel, & Swartz, 1982; Hayes-Roth & Hayes-Roth, 1977). These mental images of the “most likely” scenarios involving various types of intolerance—sexism, racism, religious intolerance, and ageism, for example—can be referred to as prototypes and may influence sensitivity in identifying discriminatory behavior perpetrated against a given group. These prototypes are most frequently used in situations that involve some ambiguity (Inman & Baron, 1996) and their use may lead to the inaccurate perception of a behavior as prejudicial or failing to recognize prejudice when prototypes are absent.

Researchers have identified the human tendency to categorize, or use stereotypes, as part of normal cognitive processing, and individuals most often use these stereotypes when they are unable to give full attention to a situation. For instance, people use stereotypes more often when they are
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tired (Bodenhausen, 1990), in a hurry, (Kaplan, Wanshula, & Zanna, 1993), or in situations where there is some ambiguity (Auguostinos & Walker, 1995; Collings, 2002; Macrae, Milne & Bodenhausen, 1994). There is further evidence that stereotypes associated with race and gender play a role in the perception of prejudice. For instance, Inman and Baron (1996) found that participants were more likely to identify an ambiguous act as prejudicial when the perpetrator was White and the victim was Black than in other racial permutations, demonstrating that observers use prototypes to judge when prejudicial behavior occurs. Baron, Burgess, and Kao (1991) found a similar effect with gender, in that participants more often identified ambiguous actions as prejudiced in male/female interactions when a male actor exhibited a negative behavior towards a woman. Results of other studies support the idea that stereotypes affect the perception of discrimination (Devine, 1989; Duncan, 1976; Ruggiero & Taylor, 1997; Sagor & Schofield, 1980).

As mentioned, prototypes can be thought of as the mental constructs of the “most usual” examples by which new information is assimilated into our existing schemas (Aosved et al., 2009; Baldwin, 1992; Cantor et al., 1982; Hayes-Roth & Hayes-Roth, 1977), and the use of such prototypes can trigger held stereotypes (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). Inman and Baron (1996) applied this theoretical framework to the identification of prejudice, examining its applicability versus that of other possible explanations of the process people use to identify discrimination in ambiguous situations. In the prototype model of stereotypes, the perception of prejudice is explained by how people judge situations against the most likely example in their experiences (e.g., Hayes-Roth & Hayes-Roth, 1977). For example, individuals have been found to be more likely to identify an act as prejudiced if it is a White person acting against a Black person or a man against a woman (Baron, Burgess, & Kao, 1991). Baron et al. (1991) argued that individuals were more likely to perceive prejudice when their expectations were met; that is, when their held stereotype about who should be prejudice against whom was confirmed.

The other two categories of stereotypes include the traditional oppressor model, in which observers are more likely to identify a behavior as prejudicially motivated when the member of an historically dominant group (e.g., White, male, elite social class) acts with intolerance (e.g., Devine, 1989). In this view, onlookers have a preconception about who will be a perpetrator of prejudice but not who will be victimized; therefore, negative behavior is more likely to be perceived as discrimination if a certain type of person is the actor. A third explanation is the out-group discrimination model, in which people more often perceive prejudice when discrimination against a group originates from the member of an out-group (Rabbie & Horwitz, 1969; Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971). This explanation is largely based on Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1985), which states group members tend to evaluate the members of their in-group more favorably than their out-group, even within groups formed by arbitrary categorization (Wilder, 1986). The out-group discrimination model relies heavily on stereotypes of intergroup conflict and the assumption that intergroup conflict is generally more common than conflict within groups. This in-group bias may lead individuals to be more likely to perceive a negative act as prejudicial or discriminating when such conflict arises between two members of different in-groups.

To examine which of these three models of stereotypes are most often used in identifying prejudicial behavior, participants in the Inman and Baron (1996) study read and responded to 15 vignettes depicting social interactions between two actors. Eight of these vignettes were “critical” vignettes, depicting a situation of ambiguous discrimination; seven were “filler” vignettes that contained a friendly interaction. Of the critical vignettes, there were two of each possible racial composition, and pictures of the actors accompanied all vignettes to clearly show actor ethnicity. After each story, participants provided two to three words to describe the main actor and rated each the extent to which the actor fit the descriptors they provided (1 to 7 Likert-type scale). Raters coded words as prejudicial if they suggested that the negative behavior of the actor in the critical vignette was motivated by prejudice (e.g., prejudicial, unfair, biased, racist). The results of Inman and Baron (1996) indicated that the prototype view is the most accurate regarding racial discrimination scenarios occurring between Whites and Blacks because participants were most likely to label a potentially prejudiced act as prejudiced if a specific perpetrator and specific victim were involved—in their case a White perpetrator and a Black victim; however, it remains unclear whether people generally have a prototype for racial discrimination between other ethnic groups.
In 2010, 50.5 million individuals (16%) living in the United States identified themselves as Latino/Hispanic (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011), and estimates are that the Latino/Hispanic population in 2050 will be 29% of the U.S. population (Passel & Cohn, 2008). In fact, Latinos are the fastest growing population in the U.S. There is evidence that despite this growth, prejudicial attitudes toward Latinos remain (Deaux & Ethier, 1998) and although reports are mixed regarding what types of discrimination against Latinos are most frequent (Bottoms, Davis, & Epstein, 2004; Carvajal, 2004; Lee, 2007), Latinos remain at a social and economic disadvantage compared to individuals of European descent, and report differential treatment because of their ethnic heritage (Pérez, Fortuna, & Alegría, 2008). The present study examined the possibility that, in the same way that individuals use prototypes to judge whether behavior between Blacks and Whites is motivated by prejudice, they may use cognitive processes to judge prejudice between Latino and White individuals.

When it comes to judging the presence of prejudicial behavior, there are characteristics of the observer that may play a role. For instance, there is evidence that prejudice is generalized. Aosved and Long (2006) found that many forms of prejudicial feelings commonly thought of as being entirely distinct—such as racism and sexism—are interrelated. That is, a person who may be religiously intolerant is also likely to hold ageist and classist views (Crandall, 1994; Snyder & Ickes, 1985). Similarly, Akrami et al. (2011) concluded that people who discriminate against a given group exhibit a generalized tendency to hold prejudicial ideals and that this tendency is related to certain personality traits. Aosved et al. (2009) developed a scale to measure this generalized tendency to hold prejudice, the Intolerant Schema Measure (ISM). They used a number of previously established scales assessing specific forms of intolerance, including attitudes toward women, homosexuality, and socioeconomic status. There is also the expectation that certain types of people will be more intolerant than others (Devine, 1989; Duncan, 1976). Because an examination of the link between the tendency to discriminate against others or carry prejudicial thoughts and the tendency to detect such prejudice is limited, the ISM was included in the present study to investigate the association of generalized prejudice and specific interactions between Whites and Latinos.

Another factor in judging prejudicial actions may be the social status of the observer. Previous studies have shown that members of traditionally oppressed groups in a society (e.g., minority groups) are more likely to perceive prejudice in a given situation than are members of a majority group (Baron et al., 1991; Flournoy, Prentice-Dunn, & Klinger, 2002; Inman & Baron, 1996; Marti, Bobier, & Baron, 2000). Thus, women are more likely to identify an action as being prejudicially motivated than are men, and Blacks are more likely to do so than their White counterparts.

In the present study, we examined the generalizability of previous findings regarding the perception of prejudicial behavior. As mentioned, Inman and Baron (1996) established the presence of a prototype of discrimination between Blacks and Whites. In a partial replication of their study, rather than focusing on White/Black interactions, we investigated participants’ perceptions of interactions involving White and Latino individuals. We also examined the role of gender and intolerant beliefs in whether participants judged a behavior to be prejudicial. We had three hypotheses regarding the detection of prejudice in ambiguous situations: Hypothesis 1 (H1): Participants would be more likely to describe the White actor in the White/Latino interaction with words that suggested more prejudice, confirming the prototype explanation of the perception of prejudice. Hypothesis 2 (H2): Because women have historically been an oppressed group, women would perceive the presence of prejudice more often than men. Hypothesis 3 (H3): There would be a significant negative correlation between scores on the Intolerant Schema Measure (Aosved et al., 2009) and the total number of times the participants perceived prejudice in the ambiguous situations contained in the vignettes.

Method

Participants
Participants were 63 college students (20 men, 43 women) over 18 years of age (M = 20 years, SD = 1.5), recruited from a broad range of classes at a liberal arts college in Southwest Virginia. Participants were offered extra credit at the professors’ discretion. Most of the participants were first year students of traditional age (35.5%), 27.4% were sophomores, 14.5% were juniors, 19.4% were seniors, and 3.2% reported other (e.g., 5th year senior). Most students were White/non-Hispanic (81%), with the next largest ethnic group being...
Participants and raters identified words that clearly indicated the principal actor in each vignette. To obtain numerical data on the vignettes, two independent raters identified words that clearly indicated the participant perceived the actor in the vignette to be expressing prejudice. The raters met with the researcher to discuss what types of words should be coded as prejudicial. Examples of words indicating prejudice were prejudiced, bigot, discriminating, and racist. Negative words, such as mean, unfair, hostile, and intrusive, were not counted because although they did suggest the principal actor was perceived negatively, they did not directly imply the perception of prejudice. Raters scored each participant’s responses to each vignette from 0 to 3, based on how many words the participant provided that indicated the perception of prejudice. Inter-rater agreement was 98%, indicating reliable scoring. We calculated an overall prejudice perception score by summing scores from each critical vignette. The mean score for the critical vignettes was .98 (SD = 1.18). Prejudice perception scores ranged from 0–2 for the White/White vignette, 0–3 for the White/Latino, 0–2 for the Latino/Latino, and 0–1 for Latino/White. This methodology and the coding of responses were based on similar research by Inman and Baron (1996).

Intolerant Schema Measure. Participants completed the Intolerant Schema Measure (ISM; Aosved et al., 2009), which consists of 54 items to which the participants responded using a 1 to 5 Likert-type scale describing how well each statement matched their beliefs, with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree. The ISM contains six 9-item subscales derived from previous measures of intolerance: (a) Sexual Prejudice (derived from the Modern Homophobia Scale Lesbian/Gay; Raja & Stokes, 1998); (b) Classism (derived from the Modified Economic Beliefs Scale; Stevenson & Medler, 1995); (c) Ageism (derived from the Fraboni Scale of Ageism; Fraboni, Saltstone, & Hughes, 1990); (d) Sexism (derived from the Attitudes Towards Women and Neosexism Scales; Spence & Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973; Tougas Brown, Beaton, & Joly, 1995); (e) Racism (derived from the Modern and Old-Fashioned Racism Scale; McConahay, 1986); and (f) Religious Intolerance (derived from the Religious Intolerance Scale; Godfrey, Richman, & Withers, 2000). We calculated subscales scores by averaging the 9 items (resulting in a range from 1 to 5, with higher scores indicating higher intolerance). A total score was calculated by averaging all 54 items. Aosved et al. (2009) reported acceptable internal consistency and test-retest reliability for the measure as a whole, as well as individual subscales.
Procedure
Participants were recruited from a variety of psychology and sociology courses with permission of their professors. They were given extra credit at their professor’s discretion. Participants received an email with a link to an online survey. They read and acknowledged the statement of informed consent before continuing by clicking “I agree.” After providing demographic information, including their gender and year in college, participants read and responded to the seven vignettes. All participants received identical forms of the online survey. The order of the vignettes, along with their content and racial composition, was kept constant. After completing the vignette portion, participants completed the ISM. Finally, participants received a code to email to the researcher in order to receive extra credit when appropriate. Participation in the study took approximately 20 minutes.

Results

Primary Analyses
The standard alpha level of .05 was used to judge significance of results. We employed a repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) with a Greenhouse-Geisser (Greenhouse & Geisser, 1959) correction to examine the effect of racial composition on the prejudice perception score. Analyses revealed a significant effect for actor ethnicity, $F(2.39, 147.97) = 7.05$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2_{partial} = .10$.

Figure 1 provides a comparison of the mean ratings (with standard deviations) of prejudice across each of the four critical vignettes. We used ad hoc pairwise comparisons and the Bonferroni correction to evaluate the differences among the means for the perception of prejudice. The level of prejudice perceived in the White/Latino interaction (prototypical vignette) was significantly higher than in the White/White ($p = .001$) or Latino/White interactions (nonprototypical, $p < .001$). There was no significant difference in participants’ perceptions of prejudice when comparing the White/Latino (prototypical) and Latino/Latino (nonprototypical) interactions ($p = .477$) or White/White (nonprototypical) and Latino/Latino (nonprototypical) interactions ($p = .708$). The perception of prejudice was similar among ratings of all non-prototypical vignettes (i.e., White/White, Latino/White, and Latino/Latino). The results generally confirmed H1, that participants would employ a prototype of White perpetrator and Latino victim in the detection of prejudice.

The main effect for participant gender was not significant, $F(1, 61) = .705$, $p = .404$, indicating no gender difference in the overall detection of prejudice. Therefore, H2 was not supported.

We did not analyze the participants’ Likert ratings of the degree to which they thought the words they reported described the principal actor because once we selected only those participants who perceived prejudice in the critical vignettes, the sample size was reduced to 31 (yielding low power).

Participants’ mean scores on the Intolerant Schema Measure ranged from 1.17 to 3.24 (possible range 1 to 5), with an overall mean of 2.06 ($SD = .53$). We used a Pearson $r$ bivariate correlation to test H3, which predicted a significant negative correlation between overall ISM scores and the detection of prejudice. H3 was not confirmed, $r(55) = -.03$, $p = .86$. The overall mean ISM score was significantly lower than that previously found by Aosved et al. (2009), $M = 2.43$, $SD = .53$, $t(576) = 4.92$, $p < .001$.

Discussion
Results generally supported the first hypothesis that individuals use the prototype of White perpetrator and Latino victim to judge whether a behavior is prejudicial. This supports the research of Inman and Baron (1996), who found that participants used the prototype of White perpetrator and Black victim to identify a behavior as prejudicial in an ambiguous interaction between members of
these two groups. In the present study, participants responded in a similar way to the interaction of a White and Latino (prototypical) in that they employed a mental prototype in the identification of prejudice—at least when compared to their observations of White/White or Latino/White interactions (both nonprototypical). The finding that there was no difference in levels of perceived prejudice between the White/Latino (prototypical) and the Latino/Latino (nonprototypical) interactions was unexpected because Inman and Baron (1996) found that participants perceived the White/Black (prototypical) interaction as more prejudiced than all three nonprototypical interactions (i.e., White/White, Black/White, and Black/Black) though the effect size was relatively small. One interpretation of this may be that participants were more likely to see a Latino as the victim of prejudice overall, regardless of perpetrator ethnicity; however, because there were no differences between ratings of the Latino/Latino and other non-prototypical interactions, this interpretation is considered with caution.

Our analyses revealed no significant gender difference in overall perceived prejudice. Thus, our second hypothesis, that women would detect prejudice more often than men, was unsupported. This contradicts previous findings suggesting that traditionally oppressed groups in our society, such as women and ethnic minorities, tend to identify prejudice more readily because they are more sensitive to incidents of prejudicial behavior (e.g., Baron et al., 1991; Inman & Baron, 1996; Marti et al., 2000). For example, women and Black participants have been more likely to detect prejudice than men and White participants. It may seem that the present findings related to gender were possibly influenced by the fact that all of the actors being judged were men; however, previous studies have found that even when participants are observing male/male interactions only, women and Blacks were more likely to detect prejudice in ambiguous situations. Another related issue is that there were twice as many women as men in the present study; however, the number of men was not too small to make a meaningful comparison. It may be that because the mean age of the women in the sample was 20, their experience with sexism was limited or unacknowledged; therefore, the sensitization that comes with actual experience of prejudice did not exist, though earlier studies using college-aged participants did find women to be more sensitive to prejudice than men (e.g., Baron et al., 1991). It is certainly possible that the women in the sample simply did not have significant experience with intolerance, which could account for the lack of sensitization. We did not examine the role of participant ethnicity due to the ethnically homogenous nature of demographics of the location in which the study was conducted (primarily White). It is clear that further research should address how participant characteristics (e.g., gender, ethnicity, religion) may influence the perception of prejudice.

Also contrary to expectations, there was no significant negative correlation between participants’ total score on the Intolerant Schema Measure (ISM) and their detection of prejudice; therefore, results did not support the third hypothesis which predicted those who were less prejudiced would be more likely to perceive prejudice in the interactions than those who indicated greater intolerance (more prejudice). Previous research has indicated that there may be individual characteristics that predict intolerance and prejudice (Allport, 1954; Devine, 1989; Duncan, 1976; Sidanius et al., 2004; Akrami et al., 2011). In the present study, no relationship was found between intolerance and the perception of prejudice. It must be noted that, overall, there was very little variability in scores as participants did not report extremely high levels of intolerance. Means on the overall ISM were all below the midpoint on the 5-point Likert-type scale used to assess intolerance. In fact, the mean was significantly lower than that found by Aosved et al. (2009).

In contemplating the unexpected finding that there was no difference between participants’ reactions to the White/Latino and Latino/Latino interactions, we examined our methodology for a possible explanation. In the present study, we used story content from Inman and Baron (1996), who had raters judge actors’ behaviors in eight critical vignettes as comparably ambiguous. Due to the sample size required in using eight critical vignettes, two of each race permutation, we randomly chose four critical vignettes for our study; therefore, all participants responded to the same four critical vignettes. Though we believed we had controlled for the effect of the story content by using vignettes judged as comparable, it could be possible that if participants considered the actor in a particular vignette to be extremely offensive because of a certain behavior, responses to that particular vignette could be negative regarding actor, regardless of perpetrator and victim ethnicity.
After we reexamined the vignettes, we realized that the Latino/Latino interaction was the only one that included a verbal insult or a physical assault; the other incidents included instances that could be considered more subtle prejudice (e.g., a police officer pulling over and choosing to search a vehicle, telling a customer in a restaurant there is no table available because they are closing due to lack of business while telling a friend they have been incredibly busy all night). This may be the reason there was no difference between the White/Latino interaction and the Latino/Latino interaction. Participants may have reacted to the actor in the Latino/Latino interaction more negatively than those in the other non-prototypical interactions and were more likely to describe him in prejudiced terms because of the verbal insult and physical assault. Still, the actor’s behavior in the Latino/Latino permutation was not perceived as so prejudicial that it differed significantly from the other nonprototypical vignettes. It would be useful to examine this further and determine whether the specific action of the actor (e.g., verbal insult, physical attack) affects results and whether the combination of the ethnicity of the perpetrator and victim is important or if it is simply the ethnicity of the victim that matters.

Conclusions
The present study confirms previous research that individuals may use prototypes to identify prejudice in some observed interactions because they were most likely to see a negative behavior as prejudicial when it was enacted by a specific perpetrator and a specific victim: in this case, a White perpetrator and a Latino victim. These prototypes may lead onlookers to recognize prejudice in typical circumstances and ignore prejudicial behavior when the prototype is not present. This may be particularly applicable to prejudice that exists between members of the same ethnicity or gender, as well as discrimination that takes place outside of the expectations of the typical perpetrator and most likely victim. The use of prototypes may also contribute to inaccurate judgments of others, such as viewing a prototypical victim as inferior and a prototypical perpetrator as dominant, or failing to recognize prejudicially motivated behavior that occurs between minority groups. The use of prototypes in identifying prejudicial behavior puts such groups at a disadvantage because discriminatory behaviors due to an identifying trait may go undetected. Prototype use in the detection of prejudice also may lead to the misperception of majority members as prejudiced, which could negatively influence interracial/ethnic interactions. The awareness of the use of prototypes in judging a behavior as prejudicial is essential to accurately interpreting situations that may appear ambiguous to some observers.

The current findings provide support for the idea that individuals use prototypes in their identification of prejudice. Results do not support the out-group discrimination model, suggesting that people are more likely to identify behavior as prejudiced when they observe an interaction between individuals who clearly belong to different groups, whether it be due to ethnicity, gender, religious affiliation, social class, or geographic region. If results had supported this model, then participants would have perceived significantly more prejudice in all interactions between Whites and Latinos, regardless of the ethnicity of the actor.

On the other hand, when considering findings from the present study and those of previous research, the traditional oppressor model may be somewhat accurate, particularly in observations of White/Latino and White/Black interactions. The traditional oppressor model holds that the behaviors of group members who have traditionally held power in a society are more likely to be perceived as prejudicial, when compared to the behaviors of lower status groups. Though the current study supported the idea that prejudice is most often perceived when a negative behavior is enacted by a White individual, it is difficult to separate the effect of the actor’s social status from that of the victim. Future research should involve an examination of the prototype theory with additional ethnicities as well as other traits that may contribute to the rigid use of prototypes in the identification of prejudicial behavior. Future studies could also investigate whether observers see the actor as prejudiced because he or she is interacting with a minority group (with lower status), the perpetrator and victim fit a given prototype, or if it is an interaction of both variables. Perhaps the traditional oppressor model leads to the use of prototypes.

To reduce instances of prejudice and inter-group conflict, it is important to accurately identify the motivations behind negative behaviors. Because individuals may hold expectations regarding who will perpetrate and whom will be victimized, “false positives” and “misses” in terms of prejudice identification will likely result. According to Devine (1989), when cognitive biases are recognized, they are more likely to be overcome;
thus, by knowing that prototypes may play a role in a person determining whether a behavior is prejudicial, individuals can attempt to consciously force objectivity in assessing whether prejudicial behavior has actually occurred. It is important for diversity awareness programs to include information regarding how the perception of prejudice may be influenced by the use of prototypes so that individuals can consider how these stereotypes may lead to inaccurate interpretations of behavior. Understanding the origins of such prototypes can also enhance intergroup relationships in society generally but more specifically in the workplace, schools, organizations, and in situations where ethnicity or race may become salient and identified as a motive for discrimination.
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### Appendix

#### Critical Vignette Content

**Basic Content Taken From Inman & Baron (1996)**

| 1. White/White | While out driving with some friends one afternoon, Will notices a police car coming up behind him with its lights flashing. Despite feeling certain that he had done nothing to break the law, he pulls over. OFFICER MULLINS questions the group thoroughly about where they had been and their plans for the day while looking around inside the car for anything suspicious. |
| 2. White/Latino | Before his business trip, Pedro calls in a reservation to a hotel. When he arrives in town, he finds the hotel and carries his luggage into the hotel lobby. When Pedro attempts to check in to his room, ALLEN, the front desk clerk, tells Pedro that the hotel has no vacancies and that his reservation must have been a mistake. |
| 3. Latino/Latino | Julio is watching his favorite band in concert. He is enjoying the music until suddenly the man in the row behind him, JUAN, jabs Julio in the back with his feet. Julio glances back at him and then tries to go on enjoying the show. A moment later, he hears JUAN mutter, “Why would they let scum like him in here, anyway?” |
| 2. Latino/White | At around 9 on a Tuesday night, John and his wife decide to go to dinner at their favorite local restaurant, La Taqueria. When John asks for a table, the host, a man named JORGE, informs him that the restaurant will be closing early due to a lack of business. As the couple turns towards the door, JORGE answers his cell phone and tells the person on the other end that he has been swamped all night and cannot wait to leave work. |