



Journal of Race, Ethnicity, and Religion

**Fit to Lead?
Perceptions of Middle Eastern and Muslim Americans
as Potential Leaders in the U.S.**

Layana C. Navarre-Jackson
laya-navarre-jackson@uiowa.edu

Middle Easterners have assimilated into the dominant U.S. culture more than many minority groups as they are less segregated in housing, are more often well-educated, and are occupying a wider range of professions than are African-Americans and Hispanics.¹ Nevertheless, the perceptions of Middle Easterners and Muslims have been inextricably tied to the political climate and the association of both the Middle East and Islam with terrorism in the minds of Americans. For instance, the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center towers and the

¹Adalberto Aguirre, Jr. and Jonathan H. Turner, *American Ethnicity: The Dynamics and Consequences of Discrimination*, 6th ed. (New York: McGraw Hill, 2009).

Pentagon on 9/11 were blamed on Islamic extremists but became an impetus for a dramatic increase in profiling and targeting Middle Easterners and Muslims for discrimination and hate crimes.²

Even before the attacks on 9/11 occurred, Middle Easterners and Muslims were portrayed as violent terrorists, oil sheiks, and fanatics.³ That stereotyping of Middle Easterners and Muslims contributed to the discrimination, harassment, and hate crimes that increased after the Persian Gulf War and, especially, after the September 11th terrorist attacks.⁴

While less than half of Middle Easterners in the United States are Muslims and very few of these Muslims are religious radicals, they are, nonetheless, held accountable for the actions of Islamic terrorists.⁵ This association in the minds of Americans has led to the stigmatization of Middle Easterners and Muslims, and, consequently, the tendency to disqualify the persons of Middle Eastern descent and Muslim religious membership from full membership in society.

²William B. Rubenstein, "The Real Story of U.S. Hate Crime Statistics: An Empirical Analysis," *Tulane Law Review*, 78, no.4 (2004): 1213-1246.

³Louise Cainkar, "Thinking Outside the Box" in *Race and Arab Americans Before and After 9/11: From Invisible Citizens to Visible Subjects*, edited by Amaney Jamal and Nadine Naber. (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2008), 46-80.

⁴Noor Al-Deen, "Understanding Arab Americans: A Matter of Diversities." in *Our Voices: Essays in Culture, Ethnicity, and Communication*, 4th edition, edited by Alberto Gonzalez, Marsha Houston, Victoria Chen, and Orlando L. Taylor. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 18-23; Cainkar, "Thinking Outside the Box", 46-80.

⁵ Amir Marvasti and Karyn D. McKinney, *Middle Eastern Lives in America*. (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2004).

Social Stigma

There are a variety of definitions and conceptualizations of social stigma. The classic social psychological definition of stigma was put forth by Erving Goffman.⁶ To him, stigma is a negative attribute that devalues an individual within a particular context or culture. In other words, Goffman defined stigma as a particular sign, or mark, which is perceived as disqualifying individuals who possess that mark from everyday interactions.

A stigma—in simple terms—is a characteristic that makes an individual different and less desirable. The stigma prevents the individual from having typical social interactions in that those with stigma tend to have disrupted and awkward social relations.⁷ In fact, individuals with stigma are often avoided during social interactions and experience greater social distance from others, resulting in feelings of isolation.

Stigma is communicated by markers that can be discerned by interactants. During social interactions, especially those involving persons not familiar with each other, the actors use markers that signal the possession of particular attributes, such as gender, age, and cognitive ability. Oftentimes, these markers may trigger the perceiver to think of negative stereotypes that stigmatize the individuals who possess them. The bearer of the mark might become linked to undesirable meanings, and experiences status loss as a result of being placed into a category that separates that person from the perceiver.⁸

⁶ Erving Goffman, *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1963).

⁷Ibid.

⁸ Bruce G. Link and Jo Phelan, "Conceptualizing Stigma". *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27 (2001): 363-385.

Relevant Type of Stigma—Tribal Stigma

In addition to the overarching definition of stigma, Goffman⁹ originally classified stigma into three types: “abominations of the body” (e.g. various physical deformities), “blemishes of individual character” (e.g. weak will, domineering or unnatural passions, treacherous and rigid beliefs, or dishonesty), and “tribal identities” (e.g. affiliations through lineages that equally contaminate all members of a family).

The third category of stigma that was noted by Goffman, which is that of tribal stigma, is the grouping of individuals who share a common undesirable trait or characteristic. The examples of tribal stigma include the stigma of race, nation, and religion. Goffman asserted that tribal stigma is transmitted through lineages and equally contaminates all of the members of a family.¹⁰

Racial and Ethnic Stigma in the U.S.

Within the United States, there have been many racial and ethnic groups that have experienced stigmatization despite the fact that most of the people in the country are descendants of immigrants from other countries. The stigmatization has virtually always included the use of negative racial and ethnic stereotypes, which were used to justify oppression and exploitation of less powerful social groups by the powerful, dominant social group in the United States—Anglo-Saxon Protestants.

⁹Goffman, *Stigma*.

¹⁰Ibid, 4.

In the United States, there has always been a standard on which people, especially immigrants, are judged, and that standard is based upon a status continuum, whereby the individuals who are closest to white are deemed more civilized than those who are darker.¹¹

Presently, Middle Eastern Americans are stigmatized in the United States. While Middle Eastern Americans come from a variety of linguistic, religious, geographical, and even racial backgrounds, they are considered a distinct ethnic category in the United States.¹² The prevailing stereotypes of Middle Eastern people portray them as savage, irrational, barbaric, cruel, and deceitful.¹³ The discrimination that is faced by Middle Eastern Americans is apparent in workplaces, schools, medical settings, and in public; this has only increased since September 11th.

Similar to the scrutiny experienced by African Americans and Latinos in travel settings, Middle Eastern Americans have increasingly been singled out at airports and on airplanes.¹⁴ Middle Eastern Americans face a similar challenge that is experienced by many of the less powerful, ethnic groups in the United States—fear of “them” and the stigma that relegates their group to social exclusion in many areas of society.

¹¹Joe R. Feagin, *Racist America: Roots, Current Realities and Future Reparations* (New York: Routledge, 2001).

¹²Marvasti & McKinney, *Middle Eastern Lives in America*.

¹³Geneive Abdo, *Mecca and Main Street: Muslim Life in America after 9/11* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.)

¹⁴Abdo, *Mecca and Main Street: Muslim Life in America after 9/11*; Marvasti & McKinney, *Middle Eastern Lives in America*.

Religious Stigma in the U.S.

While the role of stereotyping and social exclusion for religious stigma is similar to that of ethnic stigma, there is a difference between those types of tribal stigma because one cannot often ascertain a person's religion simply by physical characteristics. Individuals can conceal their religious membership, whereas members of certain ethnic groups may not be able to do so. The differences in levels of concealability for religious membership are higher for members of some religious sects than for others. For instance, wearing a crucifix, a headscarf, or yarmulke will more readily cue beliefs and stereotypes associated with specific religions that perceivers can make prior to entering into social interaction with the wearer. Those visible cues work in a fashion similar to that of skin color and phenotype with regard to allowing actors to quickly draw perceptions and develop expectations for the individual.

The First Amendment to the United States Constitution protects the freedom of religion, but certain religions have been stigmatized in the United States. Although at first blush it might seem illogical for society to view religion, which is normally an institution of social control, as a stigmatized category, the social construction of stigma linked to specific religions is ultimately a result of the perception of threat to society. For instance, the tangible and symbolic threat of Islam for the United States peaked following the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001.

Muslims in the United States have been stigmatized for some time but the most recent acts of discrimination have resulted as a backlash to acts of terrorism committed by radical Muslims from the Middle East. As a result of the terrorist attacks being linked to an Islamic (albeit radical) faction, the public sentiment and reaction in the United States has been one of

anxiety and fear leading to a backlash towards Muslims in America.¹⁵ Specifically, the stereotypes associated with Muslims in the United States include those of viewing them as terrorists and terrorist sympathizers.¹⁶ This perception of Muslims has influenced the affect and resulting behavior of many non-Muslims that includes verbal and physical assaults, as well as discrimination.

Theory

Status characteristics theory (SCT) is a branch of the expectation states theoretical research program that examines how task groups form and maintain the expectations for group members.¹⁷ In particular, SCT focuses on the impact of task group members' external social status on their rates of participation and influence within the group. Two key concepts that must be defined to understand SCT fully are status and status characteristics.

Status Characteristics

Status characteristics are defined as recognized social attributes, which have at least two differentially evaluated categories and are “marked” by widely-shared cultural beliefs that are specific to those social attributes.¹⁸ The widely-held beliefs associated with status characteristics

¹⁵Abdo, *Mecca and Main Street*; Jacky Rowland, “Muslim Stereotypes Challenged in US,” *BBC News*, February 3, 2008, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/3454115.stm>; Haroon Siddiqui, *Being Muslim* (Ontario: Groundwood Books, 2008).

¹⁶Abdo, *Mecca and Main Street*; Siddiqui, *Being Muslim*.

¹⁷Joseph Berger, Bernard P. Cohen, and Morris Zelditch, Jr., “Status Characteristics and Social Interaction,” *American Sociological Review*, 37 (1972): 241-255.

¹⁸Alison J. Bianchi and Donna A. Lancianese, “Accentuate the Positive: Positive Sentiments and Status in Task Groups,” *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 70 (2007): 8.

may or may not be true; however, the actors in a social interaction will act as if the beliefs are true. For instance, if people expect that a girl is unable to play basketball on a team with boys, then those people may behave as if the girl is actually incapable of playing basketball using actions which can be demoralizing as they isolate the girl from participating in games as a full member of the team.

Status characteristics of an actor are important because they influence his or her own and others' evaluation and beliefs.¹⁹ Those persons who possess one state, or category, of a status characteristic are viewed as being more socially valued and competent than those individuals possessing the complementary states of said status characteristic.²⁰

Status Defined

Status is defined as an individual's relative position in a group's system of ranking according to how valuable that person is considered to be in the group. People have status when they possess characteristics that are valued by the society in which they live – referred to as status characteristics. In fact, the more desirable characteristics they possess, the higher the status that

¹⁹Berger et al. "Status Characteristics and Social Interaction."; Joseph Berger, Susan J. Rosenholtz, and Morris Zelditch, Jr. "Status Organizing Processes," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 6 (1980): 479-508.

²⁰Joseph Berger, Bernard P. Cohen, and Morris Zelditch, Jr. "Status Characteristics and Expectation States" in *Sociological Theories in Progress*, Vol. 1, edited by Joseph Berger, Morris Zelditch, and Bo Anderson (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966), 29-46; Bianchi & Lancianese, "Accentuate the Positive"; Shirley J. Correll and Cecilia Ridgeway, "Expectation States Theory" in *Handbook of Social Psychology*, edited by John Delameter (New York: Kluwer Academic/ Plenum Publishers, 2003), 29-51.

individual is perceived to have; and group members are more likely to respect and follow the advice of individuals who have high status.²¹

Status Characteristics Theory

SCT proposes that characteristics of participants in groups can affect beliefs about competence, and how those beliefs affect the status, or prestige, hierarchy in the groups.²² When individuals in groups interact, they use status characteristics to develop expectations and beliefs about each other based upon the little information that they have, which is often observed characteristics, such as race, ethnicity, age, and gender.²³ Those characteristics are associated with specific beliefs about worth, and are used to distinguish between actors in a group.²⁴ For instance, being male is a state of the gender status characteristic that is accorded more esteem than being female.

SCT gives an account of the process by which individuals associate status characteristics with performance expectations for themselves and for others. An individual's value to a group is assessed by the group members on the basis of the possession of desirable characteristics and that assessment serves as the basis of the social status that is awarded to that individual.²⁵

²¹Michael J. Lovaglia, Robert B. Willer, and Lisa Troyer, "Power, Status, and Collective Action: Developing Fundamental Theories to Address a Substantive Problem," *Advances in Group Processes*, 20 (2003): 105-131.

²²Berger et al. "Status Characteristics and Social Interaction."

²³Ibid.

²⁴Joseph Berger, Cecilia L. Ridgeway, and Morris Zelditch, "Construction of Status and Referential Structures." *Sociological Theory*, 20 (2002), 157-179.

²⁵Berger et al. "Status Characteristics and Social Interaction."

Moreover, performance expectations influence behaviors within the group, including the likelihood of accepting or rejecting influence.

Method and Data

To test the conception that Muslim religion and Middle Eastern ethnicity bear stigma, I use a vignette-survey. Vignettes are short descriptions of a person or situation that contain references to factors believed to be important in the decisions and judgments of respondents. To achieve control over the stimulus of interest that is gained by this quasi-experimental design, different versions of a basic vignette are randomly assigned to respondents and the order of presentation of the applications in the vignette is randomized for each respondent. With vignettes, the possibilities for analyses are due to variations in the characteristics used in the vignette descriptions.²⁶

Vignette-Survey Method

The main reason for using a vignette-survey design is to establish a relationship between Muslim, Middle Eastern, and European American group memberships and the expectation formations and evaluations of the targeted individual. No secondary data exists that includes information on status evaluations of Muslims or persons of Middle Eastern ethnicity; therefore, it was not possible to use such data in this study.

²⁶Cheryl S. Alexander and Henry Jay Becker, "The Use of Vignettes in Survey Research," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 42 (1978): 93-104; Paul M. Sniderman and Douglas B. Grob. "Innovations in Experimental Design in Attitude Surveys," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22 (1996): 377-399.

Also, cross-sectional, or even quasi-experimental, surveys do not necessarily allow causal statements to be made. However, for the research questions, a vignette study of newly collected data will suffice for hypothesis testing.

For the purposes of this study, the vignette design has important advantages. It allows me to examine how Muslim and Middle Eastern individuals are perceived as group members, as well as their capacity to lead a group. Because the respondents are randomly assigned to vignettes, differences in responses to the vignette conditions can be attributed to variations in the stimulus rather than to variations in respondents' characteristics.²⁷

Nevertheless, the vignette survey design does have some liabilities. First, the vignette, not the respondent, is the unit of analysis.²⁸ The underlying presumption is that the meanings of social phenomena may be situationally specific and the vignette survey method can be applied in varying ways, but it is not actually clear how the participant would react in a natural setting. Nevertheless, the hypothetical nature of the vignette survey design dictates that it is not the participant's reactions that are the object of study, but the collective normative beliefs that are revealed.²⁹

Design

In the vignette used for this study, the respondent is advised that he or she is a member of The University Leadership Club and is serving on a special committee that is in charge of

²⁷Alexander & Becker, "The Use of Vignettes in Survey Research"; Andy Field and Graham J. Hole, *How to Design and Report Experiments* (Sage, 2003); Sniderman & Grob, "Innovations in Experimental Design in Attitude Surveys."

²⁸Alexander & Becker, "The Use of Vignettes in Survey Research."

²⁹Finch, Janet 1987. "Research Note: The Vignette Technique in Survey Research," *Sociology*, 21:105-114.

selecting a chairperson for the Youth Leadership Training Committee of the club. The respondent then reads that the Youth Leadership Training Committee is in charge of meeting, mentoring, and training of high school students who are members of the leadership club in a local high school. The respondent is given a brief description of the requirements for the position and is asked to make a decision on which target should be hired. In addition to the vignette, a small photograph is included with application information for each target. The applications are identical in all conditions except for the target name and club memberships (i.e. the Muslim target is a member of the Muslim Student Association and the Middle Eastern, non-Muslim target is a member of a Middle Eastern Student Association, and the European American target is a member of Young Life). The respondent is asked for their expectations and evaluations of the vignette target. Then, the respondent is asked to provide some basic demographic characteristics, such as race/ethnicity, age, sex, marital status, education, and religion, which I control for in the analyses.

Vignette Version

The vignette survey employed for this study has ten versions, which can be seen in Table 1. Vignettes 1, 2, and 3 portray only one target applicant for the position of chairperson of the Youth Leadership Training Committee. In versions 1 and 2 of the vignette, the applicant is a Muslim Middle Eastern American woman wearing a hijab and a Middle Eastern American woman who is not wearing a hijab, respectively, while the applicant in version 3 of the vignette is a European American woman.

Vignette versions 4, 5, and 6 portray two target applicants for the position of chairperson of the Youth Leadership Training Committee. In Version 4 of the vignette, the target applicants

are a Muslim Middle Eastern American woman wearing a hijab and a Middle Eastern American woman who is not wearing a hijab. In Version 5 of the vignette, the target applicants are a Muslim Middle Eastern American woman wearing a hijab and a European American woman. In Version 6 of the vignette, the target applicants are a Middle Eastern American woman who is not wearing a hijab and a European American woman.

Vignette version 7 portrays three target applicants for the position of chairperson of the Youth Leadership Training Committee: a Muslim Middle Eastern American woman wearing a hijab, a Middle Eastern American woman who is not wearing a hijab, and a European American woman.

Vignette versions 8, 9, and 10 portray four target applicants for the position of chairperson of the Youth Leadership Training Committee. In Version 8 of the vignette, the four target applicants are a Muslim Middle Eastern American woman wearing a hijab, a Middle Eastern American woman who is not wearing a hijab, a European American woman who is majoring in Communication Studies (as are the Muslim Middle Eastern American woman wearing a hijab and the Middle Eastern American woman not wearing a hijab), and a European American woman who is majoring in Business Administration. In Version 9 of the vignette, the target applicants are a Muslim Middle Eastern American woman wearing a hijab, a Middle Eastern American woman who is not wearing a hijab, a European American woman who is majoring in Communication Studies (as are the Muslim Middle Eastern American woman wearing a hijab and the Middle Eastern American woman not wearing a hijab), and a European American woman who is majoring in Computer Science. In Version 10 of the vignette, the four target applicants are a Muslim Middle Eastern American woman wearing a hijab, a Middle Eastern American woman who is not wearing a hijab, a European American woman who is

majoring in Communication Studies (as are the Muslim Middle Eastern American woman wearing a hijab and the Middle Eastern American woman not wearing a hijab), and a European American woman who is majoring in Education.

Respondents

Participants were European American undergraduates at The University of Iowa who participated in the study for the chance at entering a drawing to win an 8GB iPod nano during the 2010-2011 academic year. A total of 1,055 students responded to the invitation to participate in this study.

Recruitment

To recruit participants in the online vignette-survey, the potential participants were randomly assigned to a vignette-survey condition before the e-mail invitations were sent out. I applied to have a mass e-mail sent for each of the versions of the vignette-survey. Within the application for mass e-mail, I requested that ten batches selected be randomly assigned with only one-tenth of the total undergraduate students receiving an invitation for each of the versions of the vignette-survey. The Registrar's Office was advised of the need to have each batch contain only one-tenth of the total number of undergraduate students randomly assigned and they provided the batches of e-mail addresses, accordingly. The mass e-mail support team in Information Technology Services (ITS), then, sent the e-mails out to the batches of e-mail addresses provided by the Registrar's Office.

The e-mails were sent to the undergraduate students in Spring 2010 to invite them to complete an online survey for which there was a link in the e-mail. If the prospective participant

was interested in participating in the study, then he or she clicked on the link in the e-mail and was taken to the survey site. The link took the participant to the WebSurveyor site for one of the online vignette-surveys where he or she read a short vignette and target resume(s) and then made judgments about the target(s) based on the information that was given. In addition, the participant was asked to provide non-identifying demographic information such as sex, ethnicity, age, etc. The participant saw the consent information sheet as the first page of the on-line survey site and if, after reading the consent information, he/she agreed to be in the study, he/she was advised to begin reading the vignette below the consent information.

After four weeks, I requested that the mass e-mail support team in ITS send out a follow-up e-mail reminder stating that the undergraduate students who had not yet completed the survey still had the opportunity to do so. The reminder e-mail thanked those who had already participated and contained an invitation to participate for those who had not yet done so. The reminder e-mail also included a link to the same one of the online study sites to which the e-mail address had initially been assigned in the first e-mail recruitment phase. If the prospective participant was interested in participating in the study, then he or she clicked on the link in the e-mail and was taken to the survey site.

When the minimum goal number of respondents (n=1100) was not reached after the initial run of the online vignette-survey, I applied to send out another set of mass e-mails to all new First-Year Undergraduate³⁰ students who were not previously invited to participate in the study. Once again, I requested that ten batches of the new First-Year Students be randomly assigned with only one-tenth of the total new First-Year Students receiving an invitation for each

³⁰ The University of Iowa's Admission's Office is currently referring to students who were previously called Freshmen as First-Year Students. I use that terminology here because it is a gender neutral term.

of the versions of the vignette-survey. The e-mails were sent to the new First-Year Students in Fall 2010 to invite them to complete an online survey for which there was a link in the e-mail. If the prospective participant was interested in participating in the study, then he or she clicked on the link in the e-mail and was taken to the survey site. The link took the participants to the WebSurveyor site for one of the online vignette-surveys where he or she read a short vignette and target resume(s) and then made judgments about the target(s) based on the information that is given. In addition, the participant was asked to provide non-identifying demographic information, such as sex, ethnicity, age, etc. The participants saw the consent information sheet as the first page of the on-line survey site and if, after reading the consent information, he/she agreed to be in the study, he/she was advised to begin reading the vignette below the consent information.

After four weeks, I repeated the follow-up e-mail reminder process with the mass e-mail support team in ITS similar to that which had been carried out in Spring 2010. The reminder e-mail was sent out to the new First-Year Students thanking those who had already participated and advising those who had not yet completed the survey that they still had the opportunity to do so.

The entire process of reading the vignette and answering the questions took approximately 10-15 minutes (depending on the version of the survey that the participant received). When the participants were finished with the survey and clicked 'Submit' to submit their survey responses, they were taken to a Web page that provided information debriefing them about the nature of the study before being taken to a Web page that allowed them to enter the drawing for the iPod nano.

Sample Information

On the basis of information from the vignette-survey, 99 out of a total of 1,055 were excluded from the analysis – an attrition rate of 9 %. These participants were either not undergraduate students, not European American, or had missing information for key variables. The final study sample N is 956.

As shown in Table 2, the majority of the participants were female (62%) and stated that they had not served in the military (97%), but did personally know someone who was in the military (72%). Additionally, most of the participants (57%) stated that they did not personally know someone from the Middle East. Most were between the ages of 18 to 29 (98%) and were single (96%).

Dependent Variables

Leader Selection

All of the dependent variable measures are self-reported, as is consistent with first and second order expectations. I operationalize status using latent constructs measured by items, such as the participants' impression of the target(s) and the participants' beliefs about how the other selection committee members will evaluate the target(s) as potential leader of the Youth Leadership Training Committee. The first item in the questionnaire asks the participant to indicate a decision based upon the preceding vignette. The participant is asked to determine whether his or her choice if for the committee to select the target applicant featured or not to select the target applicant.

Impression of Target Applicants

The next items focus on the participant's impressions of the target(s) featured in the vignette. For the vignettes featuring only one target applicant, the participant is asked to select "yes" or "no" with regard to whether they think that the applicant will be the best committee leader, will make a capable chairperson, is reliable, is hard-working, is honest, is qualified for the position of chairperson, "would work well with others on the Youth Leadership Training Committee," and "will be successful at training youth at the local high school." The participant is also asked to indicate what they believe other committee members will think of the target applicant. Specifically, they are required to answer "yes" or "no" in response to questions.

The vignettes that feature more than one target applicant request that the participant select which applicant he or she believes is the best match for the impression in the inquiry. For example, for the question "Which applicant do you think is the least hard-working?" participants who were assigned Vignette 7 are allowed to select from among the three applicants named in the vignette.

Social Distance

I measured social distance, the operationalization of stigma in this research, by examining how the participant would feel about having a target applicant date/marry one of his/her children, how willing the participant would be to make friends with the target applicant, how willing the applicant would be to start working closely with the participant on the job, and how willing the participant would be to have the target applicant move into a house on his/her block. The social distance questions were asked separately in reference to each target applicant. The construction of the social distance variables is outlined in Tables 3 through 10. The initial responses were

coded as ordinal responses (e.g., “Very Unwilling”, “Somewhat Unwilling”, “Somewhat Willing”, “Very Willing”) with high values representing less social distance and low values representing greater social distance. I performed principal component factor analysis (PC) on the measures to determine if the variables for each target applicant share enough common variance to represent one underlying construct.³¹ Overall, each set of variables loaded on one factor with loadings generally considered very good indicators of coherent subsets.³² I, then, performed confirmatory, maximum likelihood factor analyses (ML) and saved the standardized factor scores to represent the latent constructs. To check the internal consistency of the measurement instruments, I computed Cronbach’s alpha.

Independent Variables

The independent variables that were initially in the examination of status and stigma of the target candidate(s) described in the vignette include the gender of the respondent, the age of the respondent, the race/ethnicity of the respondent, the religious affiliation of the respondent, level of education completed by the respondent, high school GPA of the respondent, the college major of the respondent, marital status of the respondent, educational aspirations of the respondent, whether the respondent has ever served in the U.S. military, whether the respondent personally knows anyone who serves in the U.S. military, and whether the respondent knows anyone who is from the Middle East.

³¹Barbara G. Tabachnick and Linda S. Fidell, *Using Multivariate Statistics*, 5th ed. (Allyn & Bacon, 2006).

³²Andrew L. Comrey and Howard B. Lee, *A First Course in Factor Analysis*, 2nd ed. (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1992); Marjorie A. Pett, Nancy R. Lackey, and John J. Sullivan, *Making Sense of Factor Analysis: The Use of Factor Analysis for Instrument Development in Health Care Research* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd, 2003).

Results

Vignette Sets

The vignettes were arranged into sets and, therefore, it was most logical to analyze each vignette according to the set in which it belonged. The arrangement into sets depended upon the number of target applicants included in the vignette. Specifically, Set #1 is comprised of Vignettes #1, #2, and #3, which portray only one target applicant for the position of chairperson of the Youth Leadership Training Committee. In Vignette #1, the target is a Muslim Middle Eastern American woman wearing a hijab; in Vignette #2, the target is a Middle Eastern American woman who is not wearing a hijab; and in Vignette #3, the target is a European American woman. Vignettes #4, #5, and #6 are in Set #2 and portray two target applicants for the position of chairperson of the Youth Leadership Training Committee. In Vignette #4, the target applicants are a Muslim Middle Eastern American woman wearing a hijab and a Middle Eastern American woman who is not wearing a hijab; in Vignette #5, the target applicants are a Muslim Middle Eastern American woman wearing a hijab and a European American woman; and in Vignette #6, the target applicants are a Middle Eastern American woman who is not wearing a hijab and a European American woman. Set #3 consists of Vignette #7, which is the only vignette that portrays three target applicants for the position of chairperson of the Youth Leadership Training Committee: a Muslim Middle Eastern American woman wearing a hijab, a Middle Eastern American woman who is not wearing a hijab, and a European American woman. Finally, Set #4 is comprised of Vignettes #8, #9, and #10, which portray four target applicants for the position of chairperson of the Youth Leadership Training Committee. In Vignette #8, the four target applicants are a Muslim Middle Eastern American woman wearing a hijab, a Middle

Eastern American woman who is not wearing a hijab, a European American woman, and another European American woman who is majoring in Business Administration. In Vignette #9, the target applicants are a Muslim Middle Eastern American woman wearing a hijab, a Middle Eastern American woman who is not wearing a hijab, a European American woman, and another European American woman who is majoring in Computer Science. In Vignette #10, the four target applicants are a Muslim Middle Eastern American woman wearing a hijab, a Middle Eastern American woman who is not wearing a hijab, a European American woman, and another European American woman who is majoring in Education.

Analysis Strategy for Sets

First, I construct bar graphs to illustrate the selection frequency for each target applicant. However, it must be noted that the respondents were able to select more than one target applicant due to the design restrictions of the online Websurveyor survey. Specifically, the vignettes presented with multiple targets were arranged with one “application” per screen page, but there was no way to select forced choice for different screen pages within the vignette-survey such that respondents would be forced to select only one target applicant. Therefore, the respondents were allowed to choose as many target applicants as they wanted for that part of the survey due to design effects of WebSurveyor. For this reason, the bar graphs were created using the sample data as it was and another set of bar graphs were constructed after selecting those respondents who chose only one target applicant.

I also conducted cross-tabulations to examine the respondents’ beliefs about the competence of each target applicant in light of the target applicants selected for the vignettes in Set #3 and Set #4. The cross-tabulations were used in this manner to display the joint frequencies

of the selection for specific target applicants and the indirect measures of competence to verify that the respondents who voted for a particular target applicant did actually believe that the target was the best potential leader, for example, of the Youth Leadership Training Committee. Once again, cross-tabulations were created using the sample data as it originally was and another set of cross-tabulations were constructed after selecting those respondents who chose only one target applicant.

Next, I employ logistic regression to analyze the selection of target applicants according to the respondents' characteristics for Vignette Set #2 because the vignettes in that set have dichotomous outcomes. I use multinomial logistic regression for analyses of results in Sets #3 and #4 because those vignettes have more than two target applicants from which respondents may select and the categories of answers given by the respondents include nominal categories, which require the use of multinomial logistic regression.³³ Multinomial logistic regression simultaneously estimates binary logits for all possible comparisons among outcome categories, thereby allowing data to be used more efficiently. In these analyses, I conduct multinomial logistic regression to estimate the likelihood that the respondents would perceive the target applicants in Set #3 and Set #4 as the best leader (or most capable, most reliable, etc.) or the worst leader (or least capable, least reliable, etc.) according to the respondents' characteristics. Additionally, I use multinomial logistic regression to further analyze the respondents' perceptions of each target applicant according to the most significant respondent characteristics found for the vignettes in Sets #3 and #4.

³³J.Scott Long, *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables* (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 1997).

Lastly, I conduct factor analyses using the social distance measures to determine the number of factors and which of the variables belong to the factor(s) for all of the Vignette Sets. In addition, I construct a scale for the social distance measures (one social distance scale per target applicant) based upon the results of the factor analyses. I use a bar graph to illustrate the central tendency and factor loadings for the social distance scale items. Next, I use linear regression analysis to examine the social distance scale for each target according to the respondents' characteristics for all Vignette Sets. I also use linear regression analyses to inspect the more significant findings for the social distance scales and particular respondent characteristics, as were found in the initial regression analyses.

Set #1 Results

The findings of Set #1 appear to be that being European American matters with regard to selection for leadership as the European American woman target was selected more often than any of the other target applicants. The Middle Eastern American woman applicant without a hijab was the second most selected target by the participants who selected only one target and those who selected more than one target applicant, followed by the Muslim Middle Eastern woman applicant. Furthermore, the wearing of a hijab makes a difference for the Middle Eastern target applicant such that it makes the target applicant less likely to be selected when the proportions of selections for both the Middle Eastern woman target without hijab and the Middle Eastern woman target with hijab are considered together.

The results also show that a higher percentage of participants who had selected the European American woman applicant than those who selected the Muslim Middle Eastern woman applicant or the Middle Eastern American woman applicant without hijab to be the

chairperson of the Youth Leadership Training Committee believed that the applicant would be the best, most capable, and most qualified for the position of chairperson.

Nevertheless, the results of the social distance measures for Set #1 indicate that knowing someone from the Middle East decreased the likelihood of social distance from the Middle Eastern target without hijab for Vignette 2 in Set #1, whereas age was a significant variable for decreasing the likelihood of social distance from the Middle Eastern target with hijab of Vignette 1.

Set #2 Results

The findings of Set #2 appear to be that being European American matters with regard to selection for leadership as the European American woman target was selected more often than the Middle Eastern women without and with a hijab for the chairperson position. Moreover, when the Middle Eastern woman target without a hijab and the Middle Eastern woman target with a hijab are considered together for the position, the hijab makes a difference and makes the target applicant less likely to be selected. However, the logistic regression results indicate that knowing someone from the Middle East increased the likelihood of selecting the Middle Eastern target applicant with hijab as the chairperson of the committee.

The social distance measures for Set #2 indicate that knowing someone from the Middle East decreased the likelihood of social distance from the Middle Eastern target without hijab for respondents who were assigned Vignette 4, although there were no significant findings for Vignettes 5 and 6 with regard to social distance.

Set #3 Results

The findings of Set #3 appear to indicate that being European American matters with regard to selection for leadership as the European American woman target was selected more often than the Middle Eastern women without and with a hijab for the chairperson position, as can be seen in the univariate statistics. Furthermore, the wearing of a hijab makes a difference for the Middle Eastern target applicant such that it makes the target applicant less likely to be selected when the proportions of selections for both the Middle Eastern woman target without hijab and the Middle Eastern woman target with hijab are both considered for the position.

In addition, cross-tabulation results verified that the respondents' selections of target applicant are correlated with their beliefs about the target applicant chosen. Moreover, the multinomial logistic regression results show that a higher percentage of respondents who had selected the European American woman applicant than those who selected the Muslim Middle Eastern woman applicant or the Middle Eastern American woman applicant without hijab to be the chairperson of the Youth Leadership Training Committee believed that the applicant would be the best, most capable, and most qualified for the position of chairperson.

Nevertheless, the results of the social distance measures for Set #3 indicate that knowing someone from the Middle East decreased the likelihood of social distance from the Middle Eastern target without hijab and the Middle Eastern target applicant with hijab for Set #3.

Set #4 Results

The findings of Set #4 seem to indicate that being European American matters with regard to selection for leadership as the European American woman target was selected more often than the Middle Eastern women without and with a hijab for the chairperson position. Those findings

include the high proportion of selection for the European American Education Major target who was selected more often than any other target applicant by respondents given Vignette 10.

The wearing of a hijab also makes a difference for the Middle Eastern target applicant such that it makes the target applicant less likely to be selected when the proportions of selections for both the Middle Eastern woman target without a hijab and the Middle Eastern woman target with a hijab are both considered for the position.

The cross-tabulations for Set #4 verified that the respondents' selections of target applicant are highly correlated with their beliefs about the target applicant chosen. Moreover, the multinomial logistic regression results show that a higher percentage of respondents who had selected the European American woman applicant than those who selected the Muslim Middle Eastern woman applicant, the Middle Eastern American woman applicant without a hijab, or one of the other European American woman applicants (Business, Computer Science, or Education Major) to be the chairperson of the Youth Leadership Training Committee believed that the applicant would be the best, most capable, and most qualified for the position of chairperson.

Lastly, the results of the social distance measures for Set #4 indicate that knowing someone from the Middle East decreased the likelihood of social distance from the Middle Eastern target without a hijab and the Middle Eastern target applicant with a hijab, as did being female and age to a lesser extent.

Conclusion

The objective of this research was to obtain a better understanding of the social psychological processes involving stigma and status. The study was designed to address the

following questions: Is being Middle Eastern and/or Muslim associated with lower status in the United States? Are people of Middle Eastern ethnicity stigmatized in the United States?

To answer these questions, I conducted a vignette-survey. The results of the vignette-survey, which was used to test the conception that Muslim religion and Middle Eastern ethnicity bear stigma directly, indicate that being European American matters with regard to selection for leadership as the European American woman target was selected more often than the Middle Eastern woman without and with hijab for the chairperson position. Furthermore, when the Middle Eastern woman target without a hijab and the Middle Eastern woman target with a hijab are considered together for the position, the hijab makes a difference and makes the target applicant less likely to be selected. In other words, the findings show that there is an overwhelming tendency to select the European American woman applicant for the leadership position. More importantly, perhaps, there is an overwhelming inclination of the respondents to select the Middle Eastern target applicant who is not wearing a hijab when faced with the choice between that target and the target wearing the hijab. This indicates that the respondents are more apt to not select the Middle Eastern target applicant wearing the hijab, who displays visible cues of membership in the Muslim religion.

In sum, the results of the vignette-survey indicate that the European American target applicant is more likely to be selected for the leadership position than either of the Middle Eastern target applicants (with or without a hijab). In addition, the findings show that the Middle Eastern target applicant who does not wear a hijab and has a more Western style of dress in her photo is more likely to be chosen than the Middle Eastern target applicant wearing the hijab, thereby suggesting that the more Muslim the target appears to be, the less likely she is to be selected as leader of the committee.

There are also interesting findings relating to the respondents' characteristics and the selections for the leader position. In particular, it appears that in some instances, the older the respondent, the less likely they are to select the European American applicant and the more likely they are to select the Middle Eastern woman applicant (with or without the hijab). Additionally, gender was influential in some cases with regard to the respondents' impressions of the Middle Eastern woman applicant (with or without the hijab) in terms of being the least capable, least hard-working, or the least qualified of the applicants, but it was not an important predictor of preference for leader selection.

Lastly, the results of the social distance measures indicate that knowing someone from the Middle East (e.g. previous contact with a Middle Easterner) decreased the likelihood of social distance from the Middle Eastern target with hijab and without hijab across the vignette conditions. This suggests that there might be less of a tendency for individuals who have had personal contact and interacted with people from the Middle East to take the "us versus them" perspective, which is necessary in order to carry out the process of stigmatization.

Implicit Expectations of Leaders

Research has linked demographic background to leadership selection and expectations, especially in regards to height, weight, and age. When minorities are in heterogeneous groups in which they are outnumbered, they tend to exert less influence and are less likely to be leaders in those groups.³⁴ For instance, leaders are usually older, taller, and weigh more than their

³⁴Bernard M. Bass, *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*, 3rd ed. (New York: Free Press, 1990); Renate R. Mai-Dalton, *Managing Cultural Diversity on the Individual, Group, and Organizational Levels in Leadership Theory and Research: Perspectives and Directions*, edited by M.M. Chemers & R. Ayman. (San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1993).

subordinates.³⁵ With regard to ethnicity, ethnic minority members of heterogeneous small groups are likely to be less influential because other group members may not take their ideas seriously or listen to what they have to say. Because of this lack of influence, ethnic minority members are less likely to emerge as leaders heterogeneous groups.

Lastly, gender is also an influential factor in the expected demographic characteristics of leaders in that men are more likely to be leaders than are women, although women possess the skills that are needed to be a successful leader.³⁶ In fact, prior research demonstrates that a man in otherwise all-female group usually emerges as the leader, while a woman in an otherwise all-male group has very little influence.³⁷ And, in mixed-gender dyads, the dominant man became the leader 90% of the time, whereas the dominant woman became the leader only 35% of the time.³⁸

One might think that a group would want to be logical and rational in the selection of a leader and, thereby, choose the person who is intelligent, has the most experience with whatever task is at hand, and is dedicated to the success of the group; however, groups are no more rational or logical than any single individual member as they appear to select leaders based on relatively superficial characteristics. After all, it is not rational to select a particular person as a leader simply because that individual is tall, extraverted, physically fit, European American, or a

³⁵Ralph M. Stogdill, "Personal Factors Associated With Leadership," *Journal of Psychology*, 23 (1948): 35-71; Ralph M. Stogdill, *Handbook of Leadership*, (New York: Free Press, 1974).

³⁶Alice H. Eagly, W. Wood, and A.B. Diekmann, "Social Role Theory of Sex Differences and Similarities: A Current Appraisal" in *The Developmental Social Psychology of Gender*, edited by Thomas Eckes and Hanns T. Trautner. (Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2000): 123-174.

³⁷Jennifer Crocker and K.M. McGraw, "What's Good for the Goose is Not Good for the Gander: Solo Status as An Obstacle to Occupational Achievement for Males and Females," *American Behavioral Scientist*, 27 (1984): 357-369.

³⁸L.V. Nyquist and J.T. Spence, "Effects of Dispositional Dominance and Sex Role Expectations on Leadership Behaviors," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50 (1986): 87-93.

man. There are some theoretical explanations for this type of group behavior with regard to leadership selection, which I will now briefly review and relate to the findings of this study.

Implicit Leadership Theory (ILT) is one explanation for the tendency of small groups to select leaders based on specific sets of prototypes.³⁹ According to ILT, each group member comes to the group with general beliefs about the qualities of leaders, and all group members expect the leader to be prototypical of their group.⁴⁰ For example, a Math Club group that prizes intelligence and analytic ability would have different expectations for its leader and, consequently, different ILTs than would a Survivalist group, which may stress endurance, creativity, and adventure.

Although ILT may explain the thinking behind groups' seemingly irrational selection of leaders, they do not work as actual theories for group members because the group does not abandon their expectations when they fail to help them select an effective leader. In fact, the group members do not even consider revamping expectations when they are biased in favor of individuals who fit the prototype, regardless of whether or not they are qualified to be leader. This partly explains why men are more likely to emerge as leaders than are women. The automatic thought of leader for group members is often "male."⁴¹

³⁹Roseanne J. Foti, Scott L Fraser, and Robert G. Lord, "Effects of Leadership Labels and Prototypes on Perceptions of Political Leaders," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, no. 3 (1982): 326-333.

⁴⁰Ibid.

⁴¹Alice H. Eagly and S.J. Karau, "Role Congruity Theory of Prejudice Toward Female Leaders," *Psychological Review*, 109 (2002): 573-598.

Another theoretical explanation for the bias against female leaders in groups is Alice Eagly's⁴² social role theory, which argues that men have different types of social roles in society and the role expectations generate gender stereotypes and differences in men and women's behavior. Specifically, women are expected to be sentimental, affectionate, and nurturing, whereas men are viewed as productive, strong, and energetic.⁴³ The leadership role is believed to be one that requires someone who can take command and control, which are expectations that may be congruent with the male gender stereotype, but incongruent with the female gender stereotype.⁴⁴ Due to the gender role incongruity, women are disqualified from taking the leadership position in groups, and those who do insist upon leading are met with a double standard of evaluation, whereby, they must outperform men to be evaluated as positively as men. An example of this double standard is seen in a study by Alice Eagly and colleagues⁴⁵ in which the performances of male leaders were viewed more positively than those of female leaders who had the same outcomes.

I believe that the aforementioned theories can assist in explaining why the results of the vignette-survey indicate that—in the context of being selected as a leader of an organization—the Middle Eastern woman applicant wearing a hijab and the Middle Eastern woman applicant without a hijab are less likely than a European American woman applicant to be selected as the

⁴²Alice H. Eagly, *Sex Differences in Social Behavior: A Social-Role Interpretation* (Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1987).

⁴³John E. Williams and Deborah L. Best, *Measuring Sex Stereotypes: A Multination Study* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1990).

⁴⁴Donelson R., Forsyth, Michele M. Heiney, and Sandra S. Wright, "Biases in Appraisals of Women Leaders," *Group Dynamics*, 1, no. 1 (1997): 98-103.

⁴⁵Alice H. Eagly, M.G. Makhijani, and B.G. Klonsky, "Gender and the Evaluation of Leaders: A Meta-Analysis," *Psychological Bulletin*, 111(1992): 3-22.

leader of a special committee in the organization. If we use the ILT explanation, neither the Middle Eastern woman applicant with a hijab nor the Middle Eastern woman applicant without a hijab fit the respondents' prototype as closely as does the European American woman applicant. Since the respondents were not presented with an absolute ideal prototypical leader in the form of a tall, European American man, they selected the applicant who was as close to the prototype as they were allowed for the most part—the European American woman.

With regard to Eagly's social role theory, I believe that we can extrapolate it to race and ethnicity to further explain the findings of the vignette-survey. Specifically, the roles that Middle Eastern women are expected to enact given that all of the applicants from which the respondents have to select are female, so the female gender stereotype alone would not suffice to explain the overwhelming tendency to select the European American woman applicant as the leader of the committee in the vignette. As previously stated, the leadership role is assumed to be that which requires an individual who can take command and control. Given that the stereotypes of Middle Eastern women portray them as quiet, passive and oppressed, the expectations for the Middle Eastern woman applicant with a hijab and Middle Eastern woman applicant without a hijab may not be congruent with the European American male stereotype that the respondents had in mind for the leadership position. This theory would account for the findings indicating that a higher percentage of respondents who had selected the European American woman applicant than those who selected the Muslim Middle Eastern woman applicant with a hijab or the Middle Eastern American woman applicant without a hijab to be the chairperson of the Youth Leadership Training Committee believed that the applicant would be the best, most capable, and most qualified for the position of chairperson.

Finally, an explanation should take into account the identity of the group with regard to leadership selection, rather than simply looking at status of the candidates for leader. The group may have a sense of identity because of a shared sense of commonality originating from some sort of collective action in which the group is involved. Moreover, the leader is a type of symbolic representation of the group's identity in that the group leader represents what "the group understands itself to be."⁴⁶ Judging from the results of the vignette-survey, respondents view the Middle Eastern woman applicant with the hijab and the Middle Eastern woman applicant without a hijab as stigmatized persons, and—as such—they do not believe those applicants are suitable to represent the group as a whole.

The rationale behind this decision to reject stigmatized persons as representatives of a heterogeneous group (assumed to be composed of non-stigmatized persons) probably lies within Goffman's notion of "courtesy stigma," which is also referred to as stigma by association. Courtesy stigma refers to that which is attached to people who do not possess stigmatizing characteristics themselves, but are merely associated with a stigmatized person.⁴⁷ There are several studies that indicate that courtesy stigma occurs even when the association with the stigmatized individual is casual. For instance, Neuberg and colleagues⁴⁸ showed that heterosexuals who just casually interact with homosexuals tend to get devalued by others, and

⁴⁶Zacchary G. Green, "Group Process," in *Encyclopedia of Leadership*, vol. 2, edited by George R. Goethals, Dr. Georgia L. Sorenson, and James MacGregor Burns (New York, NY: Sage Publications, 2004), 630.

⁴⁷Goffman, *Stigma*.

⁴⁸Steven L. Neuberg, Dylan M. Smith, Jonna C. Hoffman, and Frank J. Russell, "When We Observe Stigmatized and "Normal" Individuals Interacting: Stigma by Association," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, no. 2 (1994): 196-209.

Hebl and Mannix⁴⁹ demonstrated that male participants of average weight who sat next to an overweight female stranger were disfavored by evaluators. The consequences of courtesy stigma can include discrimination in the form of lost employment and, consequently, the same types of problems in terms of life chances that stigmatized persons, themselves, face. Stigma is often referred to as “social death” and, as stigma seems to be easily transmissible (almost like a contagion) in the form of courtesy stigma, this explanation for why the stigmatized applicants were not selected as leader of the committee might be the most logical when taking the group identity aspect into account.

Contributions of Study

The vignette-survey findings of this research have shown that there are organizational boundaries for individuals who are racial/ethnic minorities that have high-status in some contexts. In other words, individuals who are members of ethnic groups that are considered to be more competent, intelligent, or even more successful than members of the racial/ethnic majority group may not necessarily emerge as leaders of heterogeneous groups because there are expectations held by the group members upon which they base their notion of a leader, and that leader is likely to be someone the group can agree is representative of them. If an individual is stigmatized, he or she is not even considered to be part of the group; therefore, a person from a stigmatized group is hardly likely to be selected to represent the group as a leader.

In the United States, people from the Middle East are in a type of panethnic limbo wherein they are legally classified as “White” by the United States government, and, yet, many

⁴⁹Michelle R. Hebl and Laura M. Mannix, “The Weight of Obesity in Evaluating Others: A Mere Proximity Effect,” *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, no. 1 (2003): 28-38.

Middle Eastern Americans argue that they are not treated as “White” and identify more closely with being people of color. Although the stereotypes against people from the Middle East have similarities with those of other minority groups (e.g. Middle Easterners and Muslims were portrayed as violent terrorists, oil sheiks, and fanatics),⁵⁰the racial classification of Middle Easterners as “White” set up a status quo and caused a distancing between Middle Eastern Americans and other people of color in the United States. Therefore, while people from the Middle East may be viewed as part of the “White” in-group on paper for the purpose of the U.S. Census, they are not really considered or treated as in-group members.

Future Directions

Future research should include conducting another online vignette-survey targeted towards a national sample, in addition to an online vignette-survey with vignettes featuring male target applicants included. Further understanding of the mechanisms involved in status and stigma is needed, as is more insight directed towards research on stigma. Not unlike racism, many people may hope that by ignoring the issue of stigma as it pertains to race, ethnicity, and religion, it will cease to exist. Unfortunately, those persons who belong to social groups that are branded with stigma do not have the option of ignoring the consequences of it, which, in fact, reduce their life chances through discrimination. The findings of this research have demonstrated that social groups that do not hold power in every societal context are not safe from being stigmatized, regardless of their high placement in the status hierarchy in one context or another. This research has made a small contribution to social psychology, but there remains much more to be done because, while people of Middle Eastern backgrounds have often been all but

⁵⁰Cainkar, “Thinking Outside the Box,” 46-80.

disconnected from U.S. society by the prevalent “us versus them” mentality that has been more common since 9/11, the real enemy of democracy has been allowed to flourish in American society—stigma.

Table 1. Vignette Versions

	Muslim Middle Eastern American woman target	Middle Eastern American woman target	European American target	Business Admin. Major European American target	Computer Science Major European American target	Education Major European American target
Vignette 1	X					
Vignette 2		X				
Vignette 3			X			
Vignette 4	X	X	X			
Vignette 5	X		X			
Vignette 6		X	X			
Vignette 7	X	X	X			
Vignette 8	X	X	X	X		
Vignette 9	X	X	X		X	
Vignette 10	X	X	X			X

Table 2. Characteristics of Respondents for Vignette-Surveys (N=956)

	<u>N (%)</u>		<u>N (%)</u>
<u>Gender</u>		<u>Education Completed</u>	
Male	360 (38%)	High School	883 (92%)
Female	596 (62%)	Associate's Degree	73 (8%)
<u>Age</u>		<u>Religion</u>	
17-29	935 (97.8%)	Protestant	548 (57%)
30-49	19 (1.99%)	Catholic	219 (23%)
50-64	2 (0.21%)	Jewish	16 (1.7%)
		Muslim	5 (0.52%)
<u>Marital Status</u>		Other	163 (17%)
Single	920 (96%)	Unknown	5 (0.52%)
Married	28 (3%)		
Separated/Divorced	6 (0.6%)	<u>Served in Military</u>	
Widowed	1 (0.1%)	Yes	25 (2.6%)
Unknown	1 (0.1%)	No	931 (97.4%)
<u>Know Someone from Middle East</u>		<u>Know Someone Who Serves in Military</u>	
Yes	414 (43%)	Yes	685 (72%)
No	542 (57%)	No	271 (28%)

Source: 956 Undergraduates, 2010-2011

Table 3. Vignettes #1, 2, and 3: Measures of Central Tendency, Reliability, and Factor Loadings for Dependent Variables (Measures of Social Distance)

	<u>Min</u>	<u>Max</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>STD</u>	<u>PC</u>	<u>ML</u>
Vign. #1: Social Distance from Middle Easterner with Hijab ONLY (Cronbach's Alpha .928)						
Date/Marry Children	1	4	2.27	1.00	.71	.57
Make Friends	1	4	2.96	1.04	.84	.77
Work Closely	1	4	3.16	.93	.84	.81
Move Into Neighborhood	1	4	3.12	1.09	.90	.93
Vign. #2: Social Distance from Middle Easterner without Hijab ONLY (Cronbach's Alpha .893)						
Date/Marry Children	1	4	2.66	.83	.61	.44
Make Friends	1	4	3.14	.68	.81	.71
Work Closely	1	4	3.29	.71	.81	.79
Move Into Neighborhood	1	4	3.28	.74	.86	.86
Vign. #3: Social Distance from European American ONLY (Cronbach's Alpha .839)						
Date/Marry Children	1	4	3.24	.56	.46	.30
Make Friends	1	4	3.52	.65	.82	.84
Work Closely	1	4	3.53	.69	.75	.70
Move Into Neighborhood	1	4	3.60	.61	.67	.51

Source: 956 Undergraduates, 2010-2011

Notes: ^a PC = principle component factor loadings.

^b ML = maximum likelihood factor loadings.

Table 4. Vignette #4: Measures of Central Tendency, Reliability, and Factor Loadings for Dependent Variables (Measures of Social Distance) (N=102)

	<u>Min</u>	<u>Max</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>STD</u>	<u>PC</u>	<u>ML</u>
Social Distance from Middle Easterner without Hijab (Cronbach's Alpha .890)						
Date/Marry Children	1	4	2.82	.67	.56	.65
Make Friends	1	4	3.36	.59	.71	.61
Work Closely	1	4	3.36	.54	.73	.51
Move Into Neighborhood	1	4	3.40	.53	.70	.55
Social Distance from Middle Easterner with Hijab (Cronbach's Alpha .949)						
Date/Marry Children	1	4	2.37	1.01	.80	.77
Make Friends	1	4	2.86	1.13	.90	.89
Work Closely	1	4	3.01	1.07	.87	.88
Move Into Neighborhood	1	4	2.94	1.06	.88	.88

Source: 956 Undergraduates, 2010-2011

Notes: ^a PC = principle component factor loadings.

^b ML = maximum likelihood factor loadings.

Table 5. Vignette #5: Measures of Central Tendency, Reliability, and Factor Loadings for Dependent Variables (Measures of Social Distance) (N=84)

	<u>Min</u>	<u>Max</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>STD</u>	<u>PC</u>	<u>ML</u>
Social Distance from Middle Easterner with Hijab (Cronbach's Alpha .963)						
Date/Marry Children	1	4	2.36	1.12	.84	.75
Make Friends	1	4	2.76	1.10	.93	.92
Work Closely	1	4	2.85	1.13	.94	.93
Move Into Neighborhood	1	4	2.93	1.17	.91	.86
Social Distance from European American (Cronbach's Alpha .872)						
Date/Marry Children	2	4	3.31	.56	.54	.35
Make Friends	2	4	3.54	.57	.78	.64
Work Closely	2	4	3.55	.59	.83	.86
Move Into Neighborhood	2	4	3.64	.48	.78	.78

Source: 956 Undergraduates, 2010-2011

Notes: ^a PC = principle component factor loadings.

^b ML = maximum likelihood factor loadings.

Table 6. Vignette #6: Measures of Central Tendency, Reliability, and Factor Loadings for Dependent Variables (Measures of Social Distance) (N=121)

	<u>Min</u>	<u>Max</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>STD</u>	<u>PC</u>	<u>ML</u>
Social Distance from Middle Easterner without Hijab (Cronbach's Alpha .913)						
Date/Marry Children	1	4	2.92	.82	.81	.75
Make Friends	1	4	3.19	.78	.80	.75
Work Closely	1	4	3.37	.70	.77	.70
Move Into Neighborhood	1	4	3.25	.75	.80	.73
Social Distance from European American (Cronbach's Alpha .872)						
Date/Marry Children	2	4	3.30	.53	.58	.44
Make Friends	2	4	3.60	.57	.74	.61
Work Closely	2	4	3.54	.59	.85	.85
Move Into Neighborhood	2	4	3.62	.61	.77	.71

Source: 956 Undergraduates, 2010-2011

Notes: ^a PC = principle component factor loadings.

^b ML = maximum likelihood factor loadings.

Table 7. Vignette #7: Measures of Central Tendency, Reliability, and Factor Loadings for Dependent Variables (Measures of Social Distance) (N=92)

	<u>Min</u>	<u>Max</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>STD</u>	<u>PC</u>	<u>ML</u>
Social Distance from Middle Easterner without Hijab (Cronbach's Alpha .907)						
Date/Marry Children	1	4	2.37	.79	.77	.64
Make Friends	1	4	2.98	.81	.94	.96
Work Closely	1	4	3.07	.78	.91	.92
Move Into Neighborhood	1	4	2.86	.81	.91	.85
Social Distance from Middle Easterner with Hijab (Cronbach's Alpha .937)						
Date/Marry Children	1	4	1.90	1.06	.88	.82
Make Friends	1	4	2.47	.98	.92	.89
Work Closely	1	4	2.68	.95	.93	.92
Move Into Neighborhood	1	4	2.43	1.08	.94	.93
Social Distance from European American (Cronbach's Alpha .786)						
Date/Marry Children	2	4	3.15	.49	.44	.27
Make Friends	2	4	3.57	.52	.83	.71
Work Closely	2	4	3.50	.67	.90	.92
Move Into Neighborhood	2	4	3.60	.52	.90	.88

Source: 956 Undergraduates, 2010-2011

Notes: ^a PC = principle component factor loadings.

^b ML = maximum likelihood factor loadings.

Table 8. Vignette #8 Measures of Central Tendency, Reliability, and Factor Loadings for Dependent Variables (Measures of Social Distance) (N=90)

	Min	Max	Mean	STD	PC	ML
Social Distance from Middle Easterner without Hijab (Cronbach's Alpha .929)						
Date/Marry Children	1	4	2.54	.85	.93	.90
Make Friends	1	4	2.98	.79	.84	.75
Work Closely	1	4	3.06	.77	.94	.92
Move Into Neighborhood	1	4	3.04	.70	.94	.95
Social Distance from Middle Easterner with Hijab (Cronbach's Alpha .937)						
Date/Marry Children	1	4	1.89	1.03	.85	.91
Make Friends	1	4	2.52	1.08	.94	.78
Work Closely	1	4	2.87	.99	.92	.92
Move Into Neighborhood	1	4	2.74	1.07	.95	.95
Social Distance from European American (Cronbach's Alpha .901)						
Date/Marry Children	1	4	3.14	.53	.67	.52
Make Friends	1	4	3.57	.60	.95	.97
Work Closely	1	4	3.58	.60	.96	.99
Move Into Neighborhood	1	4	3.64	.57	.92	.86
Social Distance from Business Major (Cronbach's Alpha .916)						
Date/Marry Children	1	4	3.03	.69	.85	.77
Make Friends	1	4	3.48	.72	.93	.91
Work Closely	1	4	3.57	.72	.90	.87
Move Into Neighborhood	1	4	3.67	.58	.91	.89

Source: 956 Undergraduates, 2010-2011

Notes: ^a PC = principle component factor loadings.

^b ML = maximum likelihood factor loadings.

Table 9. Vignette #9: Measures of Central Tendency, Reliability, and Factor Loadings for Dependent Variables (Measures of Social Distance) (N=88)

	<u>Min</u>	<u>Max</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>STD</u>	<u>PC</u>	<u>ML</u>
Social Distance from Middle Easterner without Hijab (Cronbach's Alpha .925)						
Date/Marry Children	1	4	2.53	.90	.85	.77
Make Friends	1	4	2.84	.84	.93	.89
Work Closely	1	4	2.95	.76	.90	.89
Move Into Neighborhood	1	4	2.95	.83	.94	.94
Social Distance from Middle Easterner with Hijab (Cronbach's Alpha .938)						
Date/Marry Children	1	4	2.09	1.035	.85	.77
Make Friends	1	4	2.56	1.092	.94	.91
Work Closely	1	4	2.77	1.139	.93	.92
Move Into Neighborhood	1	4	2.78	1.069	.95	.96
Social Distance from European American (Cronbach's Alpha .885)						
Date/Marry Children	1	4	3.28	.66	.79	.62
Make Friends	1	4	3.52	.64	.87	.74
Work Closely	1	4	3.59	.62	.92	.97
Move Into Neighborhood	1	4	3.63	.59	.88	.89
Social Distance from Computer Science Major (Cronbach's Alpha .886)						
Date/Marry Children	1	4	2.61	.81	.87	.84
Make Friends	1	4	2.76	.86	.89	.88
Work Closely	1	4	3.13	.66	.83	.74
Move Into Neighborhood	1	4	3.17	.70	.88	.81

Source: 956 Undergraduates, 2010-2011

Notes: ^a PC = principle component factor loadings.

^b ML = maximum likelihood factor loadings.

Table 10. Vignette #10: Measures of Central Tendency, Reliability, and Factor Loadings for Dependent Variables (Measures of Social Distance) (N=94)

	<u>Min</u>	<u>Max</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>STD</u>	<u>PC</u>	<u>ML</u>
Social Distance from Middle Easterner without Hijab (Cronbach's Alpha .934)						
Date/Marry Children	1	4	2.45	.77	.77	.68
Make Friends	1	4	2.87	.82	.95	.96
Work Closely	1	4	2.90	.79	.95	.96
Move Into Neighborhood	1	4	2.94	.88	.95	.93
Social Distance from Middle Easterner with Hijab (Cronbach's Alpha .949)						
Date/Marry Children	1	4	2.00	.93	.85	.76
Make Friends	1	4	2.57	1.13	.95	.94
Work Closely	1	4	2.65	1.01	.96	.96
Move Into Neighborhood	1	4	2.67	1.11	.96	.97
Social Distance from European American (Cronbach's Alpha .879)						
Date/Marry Children	1	4	3.04	.39	.66	.52
Make Friends	1	4	3.20	.60	.92	.90
Work Closely	1	4	3.15	.64	.90	.86
Move Into Neighborhood	1	4	3.30	.58	.93	.94
Social Distance from Education Major (Cronbach's Alpha .882)						
Date/Marry Children	2	4	3.45	.58	.68	.54
Make Friends	2	4	3.68	.53	.93	.92
Work Closely	2	4	3.71	.48	.93	.94
Move Into Neighborhood	2	4	3.77	.47	.92	.89

Source: 956 Undergraduates, 2010-2011

Notes: ^a PC = principle component factor loadings.

^b ML = maximum likelihood factor loadings.