''Talk does not cook rice'': Beyond anti-racism rhetoric to strategies for social action

ANNE PEDERSEN, IAIN WALKER, & MIKE WISE

School of Psychology, Murdoch University, Murdoch, Western Australia, Australia

Abstract

Studies throughout the Western world indicate that racism against marginalised groups is an ongoing societal problem. One frequently advocated way to reduce such racism is the implementation of anti-racism strategies. But how effective are they? In the present paper, we discuss how individual and interpersonal anti-racism strategies shape up. Thus, our paper generates suggestions for anti-racism strategies within the Australian context. As well as highlighting the positive outcomes, some detail about negative outcomes is provided because it is equally important to learn from unsuccessful strategies. There are several promising avenues that can be used in anti-racism strategies (e.g., using empathy, challenging false beliefs, giving people the opportunity to discuss racial issues, interacting with people of a different background from one's own under certain conditions). However, the small number of studies that have examined long-term effects indicate that benefits are generally not sustained; more research is necessary in this regard. Additionally, some strategies have increased racism, so any strategy that is put into place must be considered very carefully. Overall, the results suggest that a top-down approach is needed (e.g., institutionally/community instigated action) as well as a bottom-up approach (e.g., addressing social–psychological variables). These two approaches are dynamic; one affects the other.

There is an old Chinese proverb ''Talk does not cook rice''. We take this to mean that theorising about an issue is all very well, but as useful as this is, we need to move beyond this to social action. This is particularly the case with respect to racism against marginalised groups, both in Australia and throughout the world. Much has been written about the pervasive and destructive nature of racism, but less has been written about the best ways to combat it. This is the focus of this paper.

The last decade has seen considerable public debate about *race*[1] and racial issues, much of it negative. For example, in the Western world, the reports in the media regarding attacks on the World Trade Center on 11 September, 2001 and the Bali bombings on 12 October, 2002 have resulted in a heightened salience of racial and religious issues, racial vilification and racial assaults. One frequently advocated way to reduce such racism is the implementation of anti-racism strategies by governments and other organisations.

But how effective are they? Our aim in this paper is to provide a generally representative list of published and unpublished accounts of actions that focus on reducing racist behaviours, attitudes, and/or beliefs primarily with respect to adult interventions. We first give an overview of anti-racism strategies, noting which of the strategies work and which do not (taking into account individual, interpersonal, and broader social issues). We concentrate on research on the effect of anti-racism strategies on adults, although some exceptions are made when findings relating to children serve to inform us. We then make suggestions on how to successfully build upon past research, and then conclude with a number of practical implications.[2]

Although other excellent non-Australian reviews have been undertaken and will be briefly touched upon, we are aiming our review at the Australian social context. In many respects, the Australian situation is unique (for example, the governmental position on asylum seekers who enter without

Correspondence: A. Pedersen at the School of Psychology, Murdoch University, Murdoch, WA 6150, Australia. Tel.: +61 8 9360 6488. Fax: +61 8 9360 6492. E-mail: A.Pedersen@Murdoch.edu.au

authorisation is significantly harsher than that of other Western countries, which can impact on community attitudes). We wish to focus on localised issues such as these, and we see this paper as a guide to generate guidelines for anti-racism strategies in the Australian context. Unfortunately, there is only a small amount of Australian studies in this area; therefore, we bring in relevant non-Australian studies also. In short, we review studies that have a particular relevance to the Australian context, which are either conducted in Australia or elsewhere.

The terms *prejudice* and *racism* are often used loosely and interchangeably in the research reviewed here (generally speaking, prejudice relates more to attitudes, while racism relates to attitudes and other more institutional practices). In reviewing this research, we will use the terms as the original authors have used them.

Racism operates at individual, institutional, and cultural levels (Jones, 1997). Therefore, anti-racism strategies need to be implemented at individual, institutional, and cultural levels. For example, previous research finds that racism relates to some personal characteristics of individuals such as empathy and right-wing authoritarianism; but it also relates to more societal variables such as lack of education and local norms. Also, it is important to acknowledge the fluidity of racism. Historical events have produced significant changes in attitudes to particular groups. An example of such fluidity was the rapid and large shifts in Americans' views of Germans and Japanese caused by World War II (Gilbert, 1951; Karlins, Coffman, & Walters, 1969). These changes point to a salutary point: big, historical, structural changes shape attitudes.

Why are anti-racism strategies needed? Racism is ideologically offensive, it results in an exclusionary segmented society, and it has considerable negative effects not only for the victim of racism, but for society as a whole. Racism is "socially disruptive, destabilises good community relations, social cohesion, and national unity . . . and decreases productivity" (Allbrook, 2001, p. 12). Thus, it is beneficial for all groups to eliminate racism, although not all groups stand to benefit equally and some groups stand to lose as well. Anti-racist strategies involve eliminating (or at the very least modifying) racist beliefs and/or behaviours. Until a number of different studies are examined with different theoretical perspectives and emphases, no firm conclusions can be reached. In this paper, we aim to further this endeavour.

This paper aims to review published and unpublished reports evaluating anti-racism strategies. A search was made of psychological (PsycINFO), sociological (SocioFile), and educational (ERIC) SilverPlatter databases; we also conducted an Internet search as well as an informal search by way of email lists and word of mouth.

Anti-racism strategies: Do they work?

Most of the anti-racism strategies we reviewed could be categorised as using either individual or interpersonal strategies (as per Duckitt, 2001), and we maintain that distinction here. Most of these strategies report mainstream participants with minority group targets. With regard to individual strategies, three main issues are discussed: providing specific information about racial issues (in particular false beliefs), creating dissonance about having different values (e.g., believing oneself to be egalitarian, but disliking a certain cultural group), and empathy. With regard to interpersonal strategies, intergroup contact, providing consensus information (do other people agree with our views?), the benefits of dialogue with other people, and advertising campaigns are discussed. Most of the evaluations of anti-racism strategies we uncovered have some methodological flaws. We will not criticise the method of each study, but will make general comments about methodological issues at the end of the review.

Anti-racism strategies

Individual strategies

Providing information about cultural issues. It is argued by some that simply reducing stereotypes can be an effective method of reducing prejudice. For example, Louw-Potgieter, Kamfer, and Boy (1991) conducted a stereotype-reduction workshop, and although there was no pre- and post-test evaluation, the researchers received responses such as "I don't judge the book by the cover anymore" (p. 222). However, it is worth stressing that the changing of stereotypes is often easier said than done. Also, extensive retraining is often needed in this regard rather than a once-off session (Dovidio, Kawakami, & Gaertner, 2000).

Abell, Havelaar, and Dankoor (1998) reviewed antidiscrimination strategies in the Netherlands using labour market professionals. This review appeared to evaluate the quality of the training rather than its effectiveness in changing attitudes; but some interesting points were made. They found that anti-racism training (i.e., seeking the support of participants to change racism within organisations) was less popular in the Netherlands compared with other Western countries. Also, cultural awareness training (i.e., making participants more aware of other cultural issues) was less effective than diversity training (i.e., ensuring that all staff can work to their full potential). Other authors have similarly com-

mented on the drawbacks of anti-racist training: for example, Massey (1991) suggests that it can confirm stereotypes. Abell et al. (1998) stressed the need to focus on behaviour change rather than simply attitude change[3]. In particular, some participants argued that training programs are often too theoretical, and do not give them skills for dealing with racist remarks; in their words ''concrete handles''. For example, one participant reported ''during the training we were told that when you encountered discrimination you had to do 'something' and you had to handle things correctly; however, I have not learned how exactly to handle things'' (p. 4).

In an Australian study, Hill and Augoustinos (2001) measured prejudice (modern and old-fashioned), stereotypes about Indigenous Australians and knowledge about Indigenous issues before a 3-day cross-cultural awareness program (baseline). They re-assessed these attitudes directly after the program, and found pronounced increases in knowledge about Indigenous issues, and decreases in stereotyping and prejudice (both modern and old-fashioned). When re-assessing these same attitudes 3 months afterward, only knowledge about Indigenous issues was higher than at baseline. However, also at the 3-month follow-up, when separating participants into high prejudice and low prejudice by way of a median split based on baseline prejudice scores, results indicated a significant decrease in old-fashioned prejudice for high-prejudice respondents. Overall, although the program was successful in the short-term, it had limited success in the long-term. Similar findings regarding the rarity of long-term attitude change have also been found with respect to children (e.g., Bigler, 1999).

Linked to the above is the specific issue of false beliefs about target groups. Surprisingly, given that one of the leaders in social psychology described prejudice as an antipathy based on faulty and inflexible generalisations (Allport, 1954), there has been little work in this regard. However, Pedersen, Griffiths, Contos, Bishop, and Walker (2000) found a moderate relationship between racism and false beliefs such as ''Aboriginal people only have to make one car payment, and the Government will pay the rest''. Similarly, Pedersen, Attwell, and Heveli (in press) found a strong relationship between racism against asylum seekers/refugees and false beliefs such as ''Asylum seekers must be 'cashed up' [i.e., be financially well off] to pay people smugglers''. In another study, Pedersen, Clarke, Dudgeon, and Griffiths (in press) replicated the relationship between prejudice and false beliefs against asylum seekers. They additionally found a significant relationship between prejudice and explicit government misrepresentations to the Australian public documented by Marr and Wilkinson (2003) such as

''As was highly publicized, asylum seekers from the SIEV 4 threw their children overboard''. These findings clearly show the interaction between individual prejudiced attitudes and social mores.

Little research exists empirically examining how the challenging of false beliefs affects prejudice scores. However, in an Australian study by Batterham (2001), this relationship was examined. In her work, she examined the relationship between modern and old-fashioned prejudice against Indigenous Australians and the challenging of false beliefs such as ''Aboriginal people who were forcibly removed benefited from their removal in terms of education and employment opportunities''. Her results indicated that many of the participants held false beliefs about Indigenous Australians, but the challenging of such false beliefs significantly reduced the reporting of them. Also, participants whose false beliefs were challenged scored significantly lower on modern prejudice compared with a control group.

Although the prevalence of false beliefs found in these studies is disheartening, there is always potential for what is learned to be unlearned. In this regard, it may also be useful to replace false beliefs with stories or anecdotes that do not put an abrupt stop to the conversation (Guerin, 2003). In other words, rather than simply establishing correct information, it would be useful to lead into other stories or conversations; this would be particularly useful if racist talk is a way of maintaining social relationships. As well as any individual change in the acceptance of false beliefs that may occur, alternate (nonracist) talk can find its way into the community's discourse (Guerin, 2003). Thus, skills to deal with racist talk generally are important to anti-racism programs.

Dissonance. Racism can be reduced by inducing dissonance in people (i.e., psychological discomfort stemming from a perceived incompatibility among beliefs) by, for example, highlighting the discrepancy between their egalitarian principles and expressed prejudicial attitudes and/or behaviours. A Canadian study by Son Hing, Li, and Zanna (2002) targeted ''aversive racists'' (i.e., people who outwardly endorse egalitarian attitudes, believe that prejudice and discrimination are wrong, but still have negative feelings toward an outgroup). In that study, university participants were required to publicly make a declaration of nonprejudice (they had to write an essay on why it was important to treat Asian students fairly on campus, which was then made public). Afterward, they were asked to describe two incidents when they reacted negatively to an Asian person. Participants who scored high on aversive racism responded with increased feelings of guilt and discomfort, which led to a reduction in prejudicial

behaviour. Conversely, this procedure had no effect on participants who scored low on aversive racism and seemingly had more difficulty providing examples of discriminatory behaviour. Similarly, other researchers (e.g., Levy, 1999) have stressed the fact that stimulating dissonance, by highlighting the inconsistency between egalitarian values and negative attitudes, is a useful strategy for reducing prejudice. Other research finds that greater discrepancies between what participants would do and should do in interracial situations leads to guilt only in high-prejudice participants (Dovidio et al., 2000). Three weeks later, the researchers found a significant decrease in such discrepancies. Thus, self-initiated change is certainly possible under certain circumstances for certain individuals.

Empathy. There are a number of different conceptualisations of empathy (e.g., Davis, 1994). However, as we did with our definition of prejudice and racism, we use the terms as their authors originally used them.

Research indicates a strong inverse relationship between levels of prejudice and empathy (e.g., Batterham, 2001) and suggests that invoking empathy can reduce racism levels (e.g., Finlay & Stephan, 2000). However, experimentally manipulating empathy is not always straightforward. In the study by Batterham (2001) discussed earlier with relation to false beliefs, empathy levels were not affected by an empathy manipulation (the reason behind this is not entirely clear).

Some authors find that emphasising negativity interferes with experiencing positive emotions (Finlay & Stephan, 2000). Similarly, Batson, Early, and Salvarani (1997) found that imagining how the *other* feels evokes a purely empathic response, and may lead to altruistic behaviour; yet, imagining how you personally would feel in this situation evokes a more complex combination of personal distress and empathy. Therefore, different forms of empathy can lead to very different consequences.

A classic empathy study was performed in the 1960s using experiential learning by an American primary school teacher, Jane Elliott, in a primarily white rural community in Iowa. This is commonly called the "blue eyes – brown eyes" experiment (Peters, 1971). Here, Elliott separated 3rd grade children into two groups depending on their eye colour and, through a series of practical experiences, actively discriminated against the blue-eyed children, and then the brown-eyed children. Thirty years later, participants still saw this experience as life-changing and positive.

Little experimental work has been done following up on this study. One study that did so was by Byrnes and Kiger (1990), who found positive attitude change, although almost all participants also reported stress emanating from the procedure. This method has, however, been criticised by some authors due to the risks to participants such as stress, coercion and informed consent (e.g., Williams & Giles, 1992). These authors concur with the sentiments behind the blue eyes – brown eyes experiment, but believe that until the effectiveness of such programs has been established, the risks may outweigh any possible benefits. However, Byrnes and Kiger (1992) responded by noting that they were aware of these ethical issues, and argued that if debriefing occurred, the greater compassion gained outweighed the emotional discomfort of participants. This debate raises a general issue confronting all anti-racism programs: change, especially when it is not sought by participants, is often difficult, stressful, uncomfortable, unpleasant, and perhaps coercive. It may also be the case, for racism, that change is impossible without some aversive consequences for a person holding racist views. Regardless of how gentle an anti-racism program may be, people's sense of self may be caught up in their racist ideology. This can be seen in the relationship between hostile attitudes toward Australian asylum seekers and high levels of self-esteem found in studies such as that of Pedersen, Attwell, and Heveli (in press) discussed earlier. Thus, it is difficult to see how participants in anti-racism workshops could not be challenged by such interventions.

To conclude this section on individual strategies, tactics such as imparting knowledge can be effective. However, as pointed out by Pate (1981), "knowledge alone will not reduce prejudice; knowledge is something of a prerequisite to prejudice reduction, not the sole means" (p. 288). Also, creating dissonance appears to be a useful tool, as is the use of empathy. Yet, given that different forms of empathy can lead to different motivations (either leading to or away from altruistic behaviour), this variable has to be used with care.

Interpersonal strategies

Intergroup contact. The most influential social psychological model for change in intergroup relations remains the *contact hypothesis* (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998). This model specifies the conditions under which conflicting groups should have contact with one another if the aim is to reduce prevailing intergroup tensions. There are four essential conditions:

1. Conflicting groups must have equal status within the contact situation.
2. There should be no competition along group lines within the contact situation.

3. Groups must seek superordinate goals within the contact situation.
4. Relevant institutional authorities must sanction the intergroup contact and must endorse a reduction in intergroup tensions.

An important point to make here is that attempts to bring conflicting groups together to reduce conflict can easily exacerbate intergroup tensions if all four conditions are not met.

It is believed that the contact hypothesis works because it creates situational forces that compel intergroup cooperation. Once achieved, intergroup cooperation leads to a reconceptualisation of self and one's group memberships. This is also the key to creating change that generalises from one situation to another and from one outgroup to other outgroups. Many interventions designed to reduce stereotyping, prejudice, and racism produce limited effects, if any, that do not persist across time and do not generalise across situations and groups. This renders them ineffective and inefficient. Part of the problem here stems from the fact that such interventions usually try to change views of a particular outgroup. A more effective route to change is by changing views of the ingroup. If the ingroup is redefined psychologically and socially to be tolerant, inclusive, and diverse, then changes in intergroup relationships are inevitable and will more likely be persistent and generalisable (see Pettigrew, 1998, and Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, & Ropp, 1997, for an in-depth discussion on these points).

Interventions that target changing the view of the ingroup rather than views of outgroups also circumvent the problem of whether interventions should emphasise sameness or diversity. The question of whether it is better to emphasise sameness or diversity is wrongly framed. Interventions must address both simultaneously, and must succeed in producing a view of the ingroup that allows the recognition of the fact that people and groups are the same and different at the same time. Categorisation of the *other* as different does not necessarily lead to increased prejudice (Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2000). The Pettigrew (1998) reformulation of Allport's classic statement of the contact hypothesis specifically addresses this issue. Pettigrew advises that any systematic attempt to change intergroup tensions must adopt a longitudinal framework that focuses initially on sameness and then, having achieved acceptance of a common humanity, works to allow diversity within commonality. This must be an essential element of any programmatic attempt to engineer positive intergroup relationships.

Thus, the relationship between the reduction of prejudice and intergroup contact is not straightforward. In fact, contact alone may do more harm than good. For example, Walker and Crogan (1998) found that a "jigsaw classroom" (where each student learns a unique piece of information that he or she then teaches to the other members of the group) resulted in enhanced liking of both ingroup and outgroup peers. This pattern was not found with a cooperative learning group where the group was asked to learn material by cooperating with one another, but there was no structural requirement to do so. Under these circumstances, there was an exacerbation of pre-existing tension; seemingly, there was no cooperation in the cooperative learning group.

Another example where intergroup contact may increase tension was outlined by Connolly (1995). Here, a British primary school encouraged African Caribbean primary school boys to participate in sport; in particular, football. However, the intervention backfired in some respects. Not only were Asian boys systematically excluded by the other boys, but more racist incidents occurred toward them. The authors suggested that this was because the context became more competitive and masculine. The more aggressive/competitive relations between the boys became, the more they became racialised (e.g., calling a child a "stupid Paki"). The authors stressed that racism can be understood only as a multifaceted context-specific phenomenon, and other forms of inequality (e.g., gender) must be taken into account.

However, intergroup contact under Allport's required conditions can produce positive results. For example, Nesdale and Todd (1998) examined the effect of intercultural contact in a university residence between Chinese and Australian students over a 6-month period. Results indicated that contact increased intercultural knowledge and acceptance for both groups and, importantly, generalised to other university settings outside the residence hall. In that study, Allport's four conditions were in place. The quantitative research described above indicates that contact alone is not enough. In a qualitative study conducted by Tilbury (1999), who examined cross-cultural friendships of New Zealand adults, similar conclusions were reached. She established that cross-cultural friendships may help reduce racist attitudes, but there are many other factors that are important such as cultural ideologies, identity issues, and perceived ingroup threat. Thus, both quantitative and qualitative research clearly indicates that the reduction of racism is multifaceted, and contact alone is not enough.

Providing consensus information. Some Australian research finds a relationship between racism against Indigenous Australians and the belief that such views are shared by the wider population (e.g., Pedersen &

Griffiths, 2002). In other words, people who were prejudiced were more likely to think that other people thought the same way as them. Believing that your views are the norm helps to justify your position. Can being provided with different consensus information reduce racism? Some research found that the provision of feedback to White American university students that their views about African Americans were not shared by all, resulted in a decrease in negative attitudes 1 week later. This was especially the case for those who were given information regarding the views of ingroup members (Stangor, Sechrist, & Jost, 2001).

Similarly, Blanchard, Crandall, Brigham, and Vaughn (1994) found that a few outspoken people can affect racism and anti-racism regardless of their cultural background. In their study of three U.S. college campuses, they found that simply hearing somebody speak out about racism led to participants in the study expressing significantly stronger anti-racist opinions. These findings indicate the malleability of ethnic attitudes. These findings can also be linked to the political situation in a number of Western countries over the last few years, and especially to the implicit or explicit endorsement of particular views by community and political leaders.

Dialogue. By this we mean ''talking with'' rather than ''talking at''. The positive effects of dialogue were noted more than 50 years ago in an American study by Lewin (1947). During World War II, because of severe food shortages, people were encouraged to eat more available foods such as beef hearts. Lewin found that housewives were 10 times more likely to feed their families these new types of meals if they were actively engaged in the change process (not simply given a lecture on nutrition, the war effort, and the merits of beef hearts). With respect to cultural issues, in a study by Mitnick and McGinnies (1958), 162 participants from two high schools completed an ethnocentrism scale, then watched an anti-racism film, and completed the ethnocentrism scale again then, and 1 month later. Although ethnocentrism scores decreased directly after watching the film regardless of discussion, only the participants who discussed the film afterward retained attitude gains 1 month later.

In a more recent study, Byrnes and Kiger (1990) found that participants who took part in their blue eyes – brown eyes experiment were more willing to act when confronted with discrimination compared with the control group. However, lectures on prejudice and discrimination had no effect on the control group.

In an Australian context, giving people the opportunity to discuss racial issues is also a useful anti-racist strategy. A deliberation forum was held where respondents from all over Australia met to discuss issues regarding Indigenous Australians and reconciliation (Issues Deliberation Australia, 2001). After intense discussion, there were marked shifts in reported knowledge of Indigenous concerns (e.g., perception of disadvantage of Indigenous Australians; levels of political knowledge). There was also an increase in support for an official apology to the Stolen Generations, and support for reconciliation. However, there were some initiatives put forward at that forum where opinions did not change (e.g., treaty; allocation for Indigenous seats in Parliament).

Advertising campaigns. A raft of interpersonal strategies can be delivered to a wide audience through advertising campaigns. Advertising itself is not an anti-racism strategy or mechanism, but rather a medium for the delivery of such strategies. Advertising campaigns can be very broad (e.g., free-to-air television and radio), or can be more tailored (e.g., using particular print outlets to reach target groups).

Some strategies have aimed to reduce prejudice by way of advertising campaigns. However, these campaigns can sometimes backfire (Maio, Watt, Hewstone, & Rees, 2002; Vrij, Van Schie, & Cherryman, 1996). Maio et al. examined the effects of anti-racism advertisements on attitudes and found that advertisements run the risk of backlash effects. Surprisingly, although they had a small positive effect on people whose attitudes were wholly positive or negative, they tended to make those who were ambivalent in their feelings about other groups more racist. Thus, generally broad advertising campaigns can have quite different effects on different segments of the community. Also, the literature review of Vrij et al. indicated that poorly thought out campaigns can have negative effects in promoting ideas such as ''strangeness'' of ethnic eating behaviour, and ethnic groups being criminal and making trouble.

To overcome these problems, Vrij et al. (1996) argued strongly that researchers often ignore important theoretical issues. In their study with white Dutch community members, they saw three factors as important in changing attitudes. First, they stressed the similarities between the mainstream population and ethnic groups. Second, they suggested using a number of ethnic minorities rather than just one. Third, they suggested providing commentaries about the communication. They found that by including all of these three factors, prejudice was reduced. However, this effect was not particularly strong, especially with respect to the inclusion of more ethnic groups. In a further study by Vrij and Smith (1999), they found that a visual campaign using cue cards launched by the British Government produced increased prejudice scores compared with a control group. A second similar

campaign produced no difference in prejudice scores. Thus, the designers of anti-racism campaigns must be very careful about their content (this is discussed later regarding theoretical content).

An interesting study was performed in Bunbury, Western Australia, by Donovan and Leivers (1993). The aim of that study was to change negative beliefs about unemployed Aboriginal people (e.g., they don't want to work; they never stay in a job long, etc.). In a pre-test questionnaire, respondents were asked questions such as ''What percentage of Aborigines in the town who are able to work, do work?'' and general questions such as whether respondents believed Aboriginal people were lazy or honest. Then a television campaign was run featuring short interviews with 12 different employed Aboriginal people. In a post-test questionnaire, there was a 15.8% increase in positive attitudes toward Aboriginal people both with respect to employment and general attitudes. The authors argued that the mass media can be used to modify beliefs underlying prejudice against Indigenous people. As Donovan and Leivers argue, beliefs about employment are a good place to start, because unemployment is seen by many non-Aboriginal Australians as ''a violation of white Australians' values'' (p. 208). Thus, in some situations, advertising campaigns can be effective.

To conclude, interpersonal anti-racism strategies can be effective, although care must be taken given the complex nature of the problem and these strategies. Although intergroup contact can reduce intergroup tensions, it can also exacerbate them (Allport, 1954). Also, the provision of consensus information is a promising avenue to explore. The research clearly shows that it is more effective to have participants in anti-racism strategies engage in dialogue, rather than just being lectured at. And finally, advertising campaigns may be effective, or conversely they can increase hostility depending upon their implementation. Thus, generally speaking, we would question the effectiveness of general advertising campaigns to deliver anti-racism messages.

Broader issues

The first point to make is that no strategy for change will be successful without significant political will. It is not apparent that everyone wants to reduce prejudice and racism, or that these are seen as issues worthy of significant investment of community time and resources. Indeed, it can be argued that significant sections of the general community currently benefit from prevailing intergroup tensions and hostilities. Any attempt to reduce prejudice and racism is likely to encounter resistance if sections of the community stand to lose something, or believe that they stand to lose something. Thus, racism (or anti-racism) is inextricably linked to broader political issues. One example previously discussed is the relationship between explicit government misrepresentations about Australian asylum seekers and negative attitudes as found by Pedersen, Attwell, and Heveli (in press). Individual racist attitudes are not separable from the social, structural and political situation surrounding them.

Second, while implementing anti-racism strategies, it is essential to look at the broad social or geographical context. There are differences between contexts. What may be a useful strategy in one context may not be in another. For example, classic work by Pettigrew (1958) demonstrated that anti-Black prejudice in the United States varied systematically between regions, with the South demonstrating more prejudice than the North. This variation persisted even after controlling for levels of authoritarianism, suggesting that regional differences in prejudice were due more to normative and contextual factors than to individual differences such as authoritarianism. These normative factors need to be taken into account when developing anti-racism strategies.

In a more recent Australian anti-racism campaign known as *Different Colours, One People*, teenagers in country areas were more racist than their city counterparts; or at least less politically correct in their language and views (Zelinka, 1995). In another study, Dunn and McDonald (2001) found some evidence of urban–rural variation on ethnocentrism. Specifically, attitudes toward Indigenous Australians were less positive with rural participants. As well as regional variation, they found variation across target groups, and noted the necessity to tailor anti-racist strategies to location.

Prejudice can vary regionally not only in its strength but also in its functional base. We turn now to a recent study that was conducted in Perth (capital of Western Australia) and Kalgoorlie (a Western Australian mining town) by Pedersen et al. (2000). Here, it was found that attitudes were linked to both personal values (especially about fairness and equity) as well as experience with Aboriginal people (both positive and negative). However, there were differences between the two locations in that modern prejudice scores were significantly higher in Kalgoorlie. Also, although there was evidence of both functions in both locations, the attitudes of Kalgoorlie residents were more linked to their experiences compared with their value system. Therefore, it seems clear that any anti-racism strategies need to carefully examine the root cause of such prejudice (whether prejudice relates to values, to experience, or to any other variable), and fit such strategies to locations.

A third relevant point is that racial prejudice may be tied into other structures such as class (Pate,

1981). As Pate points out, it may not be just that white people do not like black people; black people may be seen as poor and lower class. So not only are they seen as an outgroup regarding race, but they are also seen as an outgroup regarding class and general lifestyle and aspirations. Gurnah (1984) similarly points out that racism affects people differently depending upon their class, culture, and educational backgrounds.

Conclusions, and implications

The evidence regarding anti-racism strategies is mixed. In fact, there are probably more failures than are reported here because of the "file drawer problem" (i.e., studies that do not result in significant findings not being published). This is unfortunate given that it would be useful to have reports of failure as a learning tool. Nevertheless, with respect to a tentative policy framework and recommendations for future anti-racism strategies, past research suggests that successful anti-racism workshops might involve the major issues discussed below. These tools can be applied in a range of different anti-racism strategies.

But first, we briefly describe some limitations within the field that we can perhaps learn from. Kiselica, Maben, and Locke (1999) reviewed multi-cultural education and diversity-appreciation training and found that, although there was tentative support for the training, the absence of sound measures of specific forms of prejudice made it difficult to reach any conclusion confidently. Additionally, cause and effect could not be established because of the lack of experimental designs. Studies often used only a small pool of participants (often white middle class university students). Often anti-racism strategies involve a one-off training session; clearly this cannot reverse racism; the best one can hope for is that the session will be a stimulant for ongoing change. Also, a uniform anti-racist strategy is likely to be less effective than one tailored to the audience for whom it is designed. Most interventions did not examine the differences between high-racist participants and low-racist participants. Thus, very racist participants may not respond in the same way as those who are somewhat racist, who may in turn be different from more egalitarian participants.

We now move on to eight suggestions for implementing anti-racism strategies taking into account the limitations outlined above.

Combat false beliefs. The Australian research described here stresses the importance of eliminating false beliefs by providing accurate information (although it is likely that the relationship between prejudice and false beliefs is bi-directional). Researchers need to be aware of the extent of inaccurate information in the community. For example, "Aboriginals have funerals paid for, plus $80 for each person to attend" and "Asylum seekers get the money to come to Australia by robbing banks before they go" (Griffiths & Pedersen, 2003). Future research could look at how people reconcile information that contradicts former information that they saw as "obviously true" (see Potter's 1996 work on "fact construction"). This may help in the attitude-change process. Furthermore, as Guerin (2003) suggests, it would be useful to lead into other stories or conversations rather than simply categorically refute false information.

Involve the audience. Rather than the participant being lectured at, a discussion between individuals should be entered into. Building on the findings of Pedersen et al. (2000) that prejudice can relate to negative experience, it is essential that the environment is conducive to a frank and open discussion. If participants feel that they cannot speak about negative experiences, they are less likely to pay attention, and less attitude change is likely. Also, give practical skills on how to speak out against racism; not speaking out can lead those with negative attitudes to feel they have more support than they have, thus justifying their views. However, there is little point in hitting people over the head with angry accusations such as "racist!". If people feel under attack, they are less likely to listen.

Invoke empathy. How this should be done needs a great deal of thought, taking into account previous literature. However, past research indicates that imagining how the other feels may be more likely to lead to altruistic behaviour (Batson et al., 1997).

Emphasise commonality and diversity. There needs to be recognition that people and groups are both similar and different; but it is better not to over-emphasise differences. Attempts to portray particular groups as "different but nice" do not work, especially in political climates such as Australia's, in which there are currently significant community divisions and tensions over issues such as terrorism and asylum seekers (which have pushed Indigenous issues off the front page).

Focus on changing behaviours as much as changing attitudes. Attitudes are generally seen as a significant cause of behaviours, and prejudice and racism are no different: they are seen as being significant causes of discriminatory behaviours. Accordingly, in commonsense understandings as well as in much public policy, attempts to change behaviour often directed

target attitudes, on the assumption that changes in attitudes will lead to changes in behaviours. However, attitudes have only a tenuous relationship with behaviours, and attempts to change behaviours by inducing prior changes in attitudes are ineffective and inefficient. Thus, it may be more useful to focus on changing of racist behaviours directly. It is likely that nonracist behaviour is not only more achieveable than are nonracist attitudes, but social psychological research suggests that altered behaviour change can lead to altered attitudes.

Meet local needs. Anti-racism strategies should meet particular local needs, and should be targeted for particular issues and for particular subpopulations. The best interventions for the classroom are unlikely to be the best in the workplace; the best interventions for those from a high socioeconomic background are unlikely to be the best for those from a lower socioeconomic background. Targeting local needs means that different functional bases of racism can be addressed directly.

Evaluate properly. A notable feature of many reports of anti-racism strategies is that they do not provide enough information to be able to evaluate their effectiveness. For political, as well as social scientific, reasons anti-racism programs must be evaluated thoroughly. Ideally, such evaluations should be multimethodological and longitudinal.

Consider the broader context. Prejudice-reduction programs focus on the individual and often overlook wider structural contexts (Hill & Augoustinos, 2001). Because those contexts support, and arguably benefit from or even depend on, prejudice and racism, interventions that ignore them are unlikely to succeed. Interventions may perhaps be most effective when they target key individuals or key positions within the broader context, rather than attempting to influence relatively powerless individuals.

In summary, there are no easy solutions to the problems of prejudice, racism, and discrimination. If there were, they would have been found by now. Any strategy must not expect instant results. Prejudice and racism have been around a long time; they will not disappear from the community immediately. Strategies must target different aspects of prejudice and racism at different times in a sequenced program. Although attitudes do not have strong, direct effects on behaviours, they may well be important to address as precursors for attempts to introduce major structural or legislative change.

To conclude, it is clear that much more research, especially longitudinal research, is required before a definitive answer can be given to this dilemma. When implementing anti-racism strategies, it is important that the wider context in which it is embedded is examined. The strategies needed in 1930 are different from those needed in 1960 and 1990. The strategies needed after September 11 and after October 12 are different again. Furthermore, the problems associated with racism in one context may not be the same as in another; racism is fluid across times and contexts. Social change takes time; sometimes a generation, sometimes more, given the need for structural change.

Acknowlegements

Notes

1. We note the problems associated with using the term *race*, which implies a biological reality (Dobbins & Skillings, 1991) that is refuted by biologists and geneticists (e.g., Miles, 1989). However, we use this term for consistency with past research and with contemporary colloquial use.
2. The commonsensical view is that behaviour changes stem from attitude change. An alternative, and initially somewhat counter-intuitive, approach seeks alternative routes to induce behaviour change, ignoring attitudes. Once achieved, behaviour change induces attitude change. Behaviour is generally under strong situational and institutional control. The most effective and efficient route to behaviour change is by changing the situational norms. This can sometimes be achieved by legislative or other top-down approaches. This requires significant and strong leadership from the top. Similarly, on a more individual bottom-up level, Bem's self-perception theory posits that attitudes are based on self-observed behaviours (Bem, 1967); this is particularly the case when the situation is weak or ambiguous (Bem, 1972).
3. We note that this review deals primarily with adult strategies. However, the importance of children's strategies are also important (Aboud & Fenwick, 1999; Aboud & Levy, 2000; Bigler, 1999; Cotton, 2001; Graves, 1999; McGregor, 1993; Liebkind & McAlister, 1999; Pate, 1981, 1988; Slone, Tarrasch, & Hallis, 2000).

References

Abell, J. P., Havelaar, A. E., & Dankoor, M. M. (1998). The documentation and evaluation of anti-discrimination training activities in the Netherlands. *International Migration Papers, 16*. Retrieved on 31 July, 2002, from http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/migrant/papers/nldoceva/

Aboud, F. R., & Fenwick, V. (1999). Exploring and evaluating school-based interventions to reduce prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*, 767–785.

Aboud, F. E., & Levy, S. R. (2000). Interventions to reduce prejudice and discrimination in children and adolescents. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 269–293). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Allbrook M. R. (2001). *Strategies for change: Anti-racism initiatives from Australia, Canada, the United States of America, and the United Kingdom*. Perth, Western Australia: The Office of Citizenship and Multicultural Interests.

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

Batterham, D. (2001). *Modern racism, reconciliation and attributions for disadvantage: A role for empathy and false beliefs?* Paper presented at the 2nd Victorian Postgraduates in Psychology Conference, Swinburne University of Technology, 24 November, 2001.

Batson, C. D., Early, S., & Salvarani, G. (1997). Perspective taking: Imagining how another feels versus imagining how you would feel. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*, 751–758.

Bigler, R. (1999). The use of multicultural curricula and materials to counter racism in children. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*, 687–707.

Bem, D. J. (1967). Self-perception: An alternative interpretation of cognitive dissonance phenomena. *Psychological Review, 74*, 183–200.

Bem, D. J. (1972). Self-perception theory. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 6, pp 1–62). New York: Academic Press.

Blanchard, F. A., Crandall, C. S., Brigham, J. C., & Vaughn, L. A. (1994). Condemning and condoning racism: A social context approach to interracial settings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 993–997.

Byrnes, D. A., & Kiger, G. (1990). The effect of a prejudice-reduction simulation on attitude change. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 20*, 341–356.

Byrnes, D. A., & Kiger, G. (1992). Prejudice-reduction simulations: Ethics, evaluations and theory into practice. *Simulation and Gaming, 23*, 457–471.

Connolly, P. (1995). Reconsidering multicultural/antiracist strategies in education: Articulations of 'race' and gender in a primary school. In M. Griffiths, & B. Troyna (Eds.), *Antiracism, culture and social justice in education* (pp. 1–19). Oakhill, UK: Trentham Books.

Cotton, K. (2001). Fostering intercultural harmony in schools: Research finding. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved on 31 July, 2002, from www.nwel.org/scpd/sirs/8/topsyn7.html

Davis, M. H. (1994). *Empathy: A social psychological approach*. Wisconsin: Brown & Benchmark.

Dobbins, J. E., & Skillings, J. H. (1991). The utility of race labeling in understanding cultural identity: A conceptual tool for the social science practitioner. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70*, 37–44.

Donovan, R. J., & Leivers, S. (1993). Using paid advertising to modify racial stereotype beliefs. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 57*, 205–218.

Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S. L. (2000). Reducing contemporary prejudice: Combating explicit and implicit bias at the individual and intergroup level. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 137–163). London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Duckitt, J. (2001). Reducing prejudice. In M. Augoustinos, & K. J. Reynolds (Eds.), *Understanding prejudice, racism, and social conflict* (pp. 253–272). London: Sage.

Dunn, K. M., & McDonald, A. (2001). The geography of racisms in NSW: A theoretical exploration and some preliminary findings from the mid-1990s. *Australian Geographer, 32*, 29–44.

Finlay, K. A., & Stephan, W. G. (2000). Improving intergroup relations: The effects of empathy on racial attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*, 1720–1737.

Gilbert, G. M. (1951). Stereotype persistence and change among college students. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 46*, 245–254.

Graves, S. B. (1999). Television and prejudice reduction: When does television as a vicarious experience make a difference? *Journal of Social Issues, 55*, 707–727.

Griffiths, B., & Pedersen, A. (2003). *Attitudes toward different cultural groups*. Unpublished data set, Murdoch University, Perth, Western Australia.

Guerin, B. (2003). Combating prejudice and racism: New interventions from a functional analysis of racist language. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 13*, 29–45.

Gurnah, A. (1984). The politics of racism awareness training. *CSP, Critical Social Policy, 4*(2), 6–20.

Hill, M. E., & Augoustinos, M. (2001). Stereotype change and prejudice reduction: Short- and long-term evaluation of a cross-cultural awareness program. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 11*, 243–262.

Jones, J. M. (1997). *Prejudice and racism*. Sydney: McGraw Hill.

Issues Deliberation Australia (2001). Australia deliberates: Reconciliation – Where to from here? Retrieved on 31 July, 2002, from www.i-d-a.com.au/reconciliation.htm

Karlins, M., Coffman, T. L., & Walters, G. (1969). On the fading of social stereotypes: Studies in three generations of college students. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 13*, 1–16.

Kiselica, M. S., Maben, P., & Locke, D. C. (1999). Do multicultural education and diversity appreciation training reduce prejudice among counseling trainees? *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 21*, 240–254.

Levy, S. R. (1999). Reducing prejudice: Lessons from social–cognitive factors underlying perceiver differences in prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*, 745–765.

Lewin, K. (1947/66). Group decision making and social change. In E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, & E. E. Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in social psychology* (pp. 330–344). London: Methuen.

Liebkind, K., & McAlister, A. L. (1999). Extended contact through peer modelling to promote tolerance in Finland. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 29*, 765–780.

Louw-Potgieter, J., Kamfer, L., & Boy, R. G. (1991). Stereotype reduction workshop. *South African Journal of Psychology, 21*, 219–224.

Maio, G.R., Watt, S.E., Hewstone, M. & Rees, K.J. (2002). *Effects of anti-racism messages on explicit and implicit intergroup attitudes: The moderating role of attitudinal ambivalence*. Unpublished manuscript, Cardiff University.

Marr, D., & Wilkinson, M. (2003). *Dark Victory*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Massey, I. (1991). *More than skin deep: Developing anti-racist multicultural education in schools*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

McGregor, J. (1993). Effectiveness of role playing and antiracist teaching in reducing student prejudice. *Journal of Educational Research, 86*, 215–226.

Miles, R. (1989). *Racism*. London: Routledge.

Mitnick, L. L., & McGinnies, E. (1958). Influencing ethnocentrism in small discussion groups through a film communication. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 56*, 82–90.

Nesdale, D., & Todd, P. (1998). Intergroup ratio and the contact hypothesis. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28*, 1196–1217.

Pate, G. S. (1981). Research on prejudice reduction. *Educational Leadership, 38*, 288–291.

Pate, G. S. (1988). Research on reducing prejudice. *Social Education, 52*, 287–289.

Pedersen, A., Attwell, J., & Heveli, D. (in press). *Prediction of negative attitudes toward Australian asylum seekers. False beliefs, nationalism and self-esteem*. Australian Psychologist.

Pedersen, A., Clarke, S., Dudgeon, P., & Griffiths, B. (in press). Attitudes toward Indigenous-Australians and asylum-seekers: The role of false beliefs and other social–psychological variables. *Australian Psychologist.*

Pedersen, A., Griffiths, B., Contos, N., Bishop, B., & Walker, I. (2000). Attitudes toward Aboriginal-Australians in city and country settings. *Australian Psychologist, 35*, 109–117.

Pedersen, A. & Griffiths, B. (2002). *Summary: Attitudes toward Indigenous-Australians: The effect of empathy, guilt, and social factors*. Perth, Western Australia: Murdoch University.

Peters, W A. (Producer and Director) (1971). *The eye of the storm* (Video). New York: American Broadcasting Company.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1958). Personality and socio-cultural factors in intergroup attitudes: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 2*, 29–42.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65–85.

Potter, J. (1996). *Representing reality; discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. London: Thousand Oaks.

Slone, M., Tarrasch, R., & Hallis, D. (2000). Ethnic stereotypic attitudes among Israeli children: Two intervention programs. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 46*, 370–389.

Son Hing, L. S., Li, W., & Zanna, M. P. (2002). Inducing hypocrisy to reduce prejudicial responses among aversive racists. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 38*, 71–78.

Stangor, C., Sechrist, G. B., & Jost, J. T. (2001). Changing racial beliefs by providing consensus information. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 486–494.

Tilbury, F. (1999). *"Some of my best friends are Maori but …": Cross-ethnic friendships, ethnic identity and attitudes to race relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.

Vrij, A., & Smith, B. J. (1999). Reducing ethnic prejudice by public campaigns: An evaluation of a present and a new campaign. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 9*, 195–215.

Vrij, A., Van Schie, E., & Cherryman, J. (1996). Reducing ethnic prejudice through public communication programs: A social–psychological perspective. *Journal of Psychology, 130*, 413–420.

Walker, I., & Crogan, M. (1998). Academic performance, prejudice, and the Jigsaw Classroom: New pieces to the puzzle. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 8*, 381–393.

Williams, A., & Giles, H. (1992). Prejudice-reduction simulations: Social cognition, intergroup theory, and ethics. *Simulation & Gaming, 23*, 472–484.

Wolsko, C., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2000). Framing interethnic ideology: Effects of multicultural and color-blind perspectives on judgments of groups and individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 635–654.

Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 73–90.

Zelinka, S. (1995). Racism and one response. In C. Guerra, & R. White (Eds.), *Ethnic minority youth in Australia: Challenges and myths* (pp. 213–221). Australia: National Clearinghouse for Youth Studies.