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Abstract

We studied implicit and explicit ethnic attitudes and ethnic evaluations in Russia, where ethnic prejudice and violence are on the rise. Undergraduate sociology students \((N = 54)\) judged 100 faces, varying in facial physiognomy (Eurocentric to Afrocentric) and skin tone (light to dark), and completed implicit and explicit ethnic attitude measures. Participants used skin tone when evaluating faces as \textit{Russian} or \textit{non-Russian}, and relied on facial physiognomy for finer distinctions among lighter faces. Implicit ethnic attitudes moderated the effects of skin tone and facial physiognomy on ethnic typicality judgments. Explicit and implicit attitudes were very pro-Russian with negative explicit attitudes expressed towards some ethnic groups. Implicit and explicit attitudes towards non-Russian groups were largely independent. This research has important implications for contemporary ethnic relationships in Russia, where being categorized as “non-Russian” has serious life-threatening consequences. It also has implications for models of social categorization: It addresses how variability in two dimensions (skin tone and facial physiognomy) and pre-existing implicit attitudes affect ethnic categorization judgments.
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Now One Is Russian, Now One Is Not: Ethnic Attitudes and Categorization Effects in the Russian Federation

"In Russia … the problem is that either you're Russian, or you're not Russian. You're not from Morocco, or Guinea-Bissau, or wherever. You're just non-Russian." (Khammal, cited in McWilliams, 2006, p. 40).


There is disturbing evidence that racism and xenophobia against non-Russians are on the rise in Russia (Amnesty International, 2006), yet the factors that underlie whether one is evaluated as Russian or not have not been investigated. Accordingly, this population provides a unique opportunity to examine ethnic categorization and attitudes when ethnic tensions are on the rise and the social pressure to control prejudice is low.

In the current research we examined the relative impact of skin tone and facial features on ethnic typicality judgments and explored the moderating role of implicit and explicit ethnic attitudes. In the discussion that follows, we will first describe the current climate of racism and xenophobia in the Russian Federation, which created the unique socio-cultural context for this study. Next, we will address how variability in facial cues can affect social categorization, especially when being judged as non-Russian can lead to pronounced negative consequences. Finally, we will describe the role that skin tone and facial physiognomy play in ethnic typicality and categorization judgments and review recent research on moderators of ethnic categorization.

**Socio-Historical Context**

There is disturbing evidence that xenophobia is on the rise in the Russian Federation (Hadler, 2012). According to data collected within the European Values Survey, the level of xenophobia in Russia increased from .17 (1990-1993) to .36 (2008-2010), where values reflect the proportion of participants objecting to having individuals of a different race, immigrants or
foreign workers as their neighbors. Racism is also on the rise among the 80 percent ethnic Russian population (e.g., Amnesty International, 2003; Amnesty International, 2006; Charny, 2008; Kozhevnikova, 2008; Kozhevnikova, 2009; McWilliams, 2006; Moscow Bureau for Human Rights, 2007; Moscow Bureau for Human Rights, 2008; Poirier, 2006; Putilova, 2008; Stepanishev & Charny, 2005; Stolyarova, 2006). According to those sources, the number of racially motivated attacks in Russia has grown over the years. For example, Amnesty International (2009) reported at least 87 deaths resulting from racially motivated violence in the Russian Federation. The victims included international students, asylum-seekers, refugees from Africa and Asia, people from the former republics of the USSR, Latin America and the Middle East, as well as citizens of the Russian Federation, such as Chechens and Jews, Roma, or children of multi-ethnic heritage (Amnesty International, 2003; Amnesty International, 2006). One commonality among the groups listed is that these targeted individuals differ in appearance from a typical Russian.

The current situation has complex historical roots. After the breakup of the Soviet Union in 1991, 15 independent states emerged. This emergence was associated with ethnic conflict and displacement of ethnic populations beyond (e.g., Meskhetians from Uzbekistan, Armenians from Azerbaijan) and within (Chechens, up to 300,000 people; Amnesty International, 2003) the borders of the Russian Federation. These events produced mass migration to the Russian Federation, including a large influx of migrant workers and small traders from Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Georgia, Azerbaijan, and Armenia. According to unofficial estimates, 10 to 12 million illegal immigrants currently reside in the Russian Federation (Putilova, 2008; Vladimirova, 2002). Additionally, a legacy of the imperial ambitions of the Soviet Union to spread communism across the globe resulted in strong educational ties to countries in Asia, Latin
America, and especially Africa. When foreign students initially arrived in the Soviet universities, there was a sense of curiosity on the part of Soviet citizens, and racially motivated attacks were rare; however, over time, Soviet citizens viewed international students as privileged immigrants amid the grim reality of their own existence (Poirier, 2006). There is also a long-standing history of anti-Semitism in the Russian Federation, dating back to the days of Tsarist Russia and the anti-Zionist official policy of the Soviet Union (Amnesty International, 2003; Lihachev, 2003).

Attitudinal research conducted in Russia has indicated that the general population has less than favorable attitudes toward many ethnic groups. Russian participants hold the most negative attitudes toward Gypsies, Jews, and Chechens (Petrenko, Kravtsova, Mitina, & Osipova, 2002) and the inhabitants of the Caucasus region (Caucasians), Central Asians, and Chinese (Stepanishev & Charny, 2005). Opinion polls among Russians have also indicated negative attitudes towards various non-Russian ethnic minorities such as Jews (Anti-Defamation League, 1999), Chechens, Azeri, Armenians, Georgians, inhabitants of Central Asia, Tatars, and Bashkirs (Kroz & Ratinova, 2005). The Public Opinion Foundation (Fond Obschestvennoe Mnenie) (2006) reported that about 20% of Russians had negative attitudes towards ethnic minorities; a majority of respondents (58%) believed that people of certain ethnicities should be restricted from immigration to their region or deported (42%). Anti-immigrant prejudice in Russia is one of the highest in the world (Pehrson, Vignoles, & Brown, 2009), according to data from the International Social Survey Programme 2003 module on national identity, and is similar to other post-Soviet societies (e.g., Slovenia, Bulgaria, and Slovak Republic, see Staerklé, Sidanius, Green, & Molina, 2005). Overall, psychological studies and opinion polls note clearly negative attitudes towards various ethnic minorities in the Russian Federation.
Social Categorization and Variability in Facial Cues

A noticeable feature of ethnic relations in the Russian Federation is the seemingly sharp dichotomy in the perception of people as either Russian or non-Russian. Therefore, we were particularly interested in the factors that underlie ethnic categorization in this population, specifically, what makes the face of a target person perceptually Russian versus Non-Russian. There is substantial variability in the facial features (facial physiognomy) of the various ethnic groups that reside in the Russian Federation and that variability is multidimensional. That is, faces can appear more or less Russian based on the particular pattern of facial features. Likewise, skin tone can vary considerably with important implications for ethnic categorization. African physiognomy and darker skin tones are especially salient characteristics in Russia that are not considered part of the Slavic Russian phenotype among ethnic Russians. Moreover, individuals of African ancestry have been frequent victims of racism and nationalism (Amnesty International, 2003; Amnesty International, 2006; Aref’ev, 2005; Poirier, 2006). Accordingly, we selected the African ethnic group as the other or non-Russian group to study for social categorization effects. Specifically, we were interested in how ethnic categorization is affected by skin tone and facial features.

Skin Tone and Facial Physiognomy

Skin tone (sometimes also referred to as skin color) is considered one of the most salient features in defining racial categorization judgments about non-white groups (Maddox, 2004) with most research conducted in North America and Western Europe. For Black faces, skin tone is likely to be mentioned in verbal descriptions (Ellis, Deregowski, & Shepherd, 1975), rated as the most important criterion in categorization (Brown, Dane, & Durham, 1998), and is perceived
to be darker than for White faces, even when it is matched (Levin & Banaji, 2006; MacLin & Malpass, 2003; MacLin, MacLin, & Malpass, 2001).

By comparison, the role of facial physiognomy has largely been ignored as a factor contributing to racial categorization (but see Gitter & Satow, 1969; Stepanova & Strube, 2009; Stepanova & Strube, 2012). Yet, this factor may be important because ethnic and racial judgments cannot always depend exclusively on skin tone--it varies within groups as well as between groups. Indeed, when skin tone and facial physiognomy of target dolls are orthogonally manipulated, they independently contribute to children’s judgments of their own racial identification (Gitter & Satow, 1969) and to racial typicality evaluations (Stepanova & Strube, 2009). Importantly, there is recent evidence that skin tone and facial physiognomy interact in affecting racial categorization judgments (Stepanova & Strube, 2012). Specifically, when judging faces varying in facial physiognomy and skin tone, participants primarily relied on skin tone if it was dark, and as it got lighter, they relied on both skin tone and facial physiognomy.

**Moderators of Racial/Ethnic Typicality Ratings**

Ethnic categorization research has addressed several potential moderators of categorization judgments. Broadly defined, these moderators tap into in-group identification, in-group favorability and out-group derogation. Most of this research is conducted with faces featuring a degree of ambiguity. Ambiguous faces are more likely to get categorized as out-group faces by high in-group identifiers (Castano, Yzerbyt, Bourguignon, & Seron, 2002), take highly prejudiced individuals (who supposedly identify highly with their in-group) longer to categorize (Blascovich, Wyer, Swart, & Kibler, 1997), and get included in the extreme group, rather than intermediate groups by prejudiced individuals (Pettigrew, Allport, & Barnett, 1958). There is also evidence that implicit measures of prejudice moderate racial categorization and
racial typicality ratings: participants high in implicit racial prejudice (as measured by the IAT) are more likely to categorize angry, but not happy or neutral, ambiguous-race faces as Black (Hutchings & Haddock, 2008; Hugenberg & Bodenhausen, 2003). When making racial categorization judgments, participants with high implicit racial prejudice rely on skin tone more compared to participants with low implicit racial prejudice (Stepanova & Strube, 2012). Accordingly, we investigated whether implicit and explicit ethnic attitudes moderate weighting of skin tone and facial physiognomy in ethnic typicality judgments.

**The Current Study**

Although previous findings on the effects of facial physiognomy and skin tone for typicality judgments revealed that skin color and facial physiognomy might interact (in a US sample), it is not clear if these effects hold for a totally different population (e.g., Russian), one that possesses strongly ethnocentric attitudes. When the group has very prominent ethnocentric attitudes, the impact of skin color and facial physiognomy may be more complex; specifically, skin color might provide a stronger initial screen than facial physiognomy for an out-group status, with facial physiognomy providing a finer-grained cue for further classification. This study also investigated the factors that moderate perceptions of ethnic typicality and judgments in this context, where negative attitudes towards ethnic minorities were prevalent and racism was on the rise.

For this purpose, participants performed an ethnic typicality task on computer-generated faces. To create these faces, we orthogonally manipulated skin tones (from dark to light with ten levels total), and facial physiognomy (Afrocentric to Eurocentric with ten levels total), which resulted in 100 different faces (see Figure 1 and methods). In addition, we assessed implicit ethnic attitudes using the implicit association test (IAT, with a Russian-non-Russian category
judgment) and explicit ethnic attitudes with traditional scale measures, such as feeling thermometers.

We expected that both skin tone and facial physiognomy would affect ethnic typicality and categorization judgments; dark faces and faces with high Afrocentric physiognomy were expected to receive non-Russian ratings whereas light faces and faces with high Eurocentric physiognomy were expected to receive Russian ratings. We also hypothesized that skin tone and facial physiognomy would interact, similar to findings reported by Stepanova and Strube (2012). Faces with the darkest skin tone were expected to be perceived as non-Russian, regardless of facial physiognomy, but light faces were expected to be perceived as Russian only when facial physiognomy was Eurocentric. We predicted this effect because dark skin tone is a strong out-group marker for Russians and more salient than facial features that are an unnecessary cue when skin color is dark. Light skin tone, on the other hand, is an in-group marker for Russians and cannot be relied upon by itself to indicate a person’s group membership. We also expected that those participants with more pro-Russian explicit or implicit ethnic prejudice would likely weight skin color and facial physiognomy differently in their ethnic typicality ratings, perhaps by relying more on one of the markers (e.g., skin tone) than those with less pro-Russian explicit or implicit ethnic prejudice.

We expected that both implicit and explicit ethnic attitudes would be pro-Russian. We also predicted that participants would have negative attitudes towards various minority ethnic groups.

**Method**

**Participants**
Fifty-four undergraduate and graduate students of Yaroslavl Demidov State University (Yaroslavl, Russian Federation) participated in the study. All students (13 men, 41 women) were sociology majors with an age range of 17 to 30 years ($M = 19$, $SD = 1.92$). The majority of the participants identified themselves as “Ethnic Russian” (89 %). Four participants identified themselves as “multi-ethnic” (7%), one as “Jewish” (2%), and one as “Georgian” (2%).

Material Development

The facial stimuli presented to participants were identical to those used in Stepanova and Strube (2012). Poser 6™ animation software had been used to create the faces varying in skin tone and facial physiognomy but equivalent for affective expressions (see Figure 1). Skin tone varied from dark to light (10 levels) and facial physiognomy varied from Afrocentric to Eurocentric (10 levels). The facial physiognomy manipulation encompassed several pre-set phenotypic characteristics (e.g., width of the nose, fullness of the lips, bone structure, etc.). The Poser 6™ software manipulated those characteristics simultaneously using two controls embedded in the program (less/more European and less/more African) that globally modified the faces. Two sets of stimuli insured generalizability, with each set consisting of 100 faces. One set was created from a Eurocentric physiognomy face by using less or more of the African program function and then applying the skin tone manipulation; the other set was created from an Afrocentric physiognomy face by using less or more of the European program function and then applying the skin tone manipulation. Both sets were pre-tested and matched on racial typicality, attractiveness, happiness, anger, and sadness. Additionally, the faces were verified as appearing life-like and incremental changes in skin color and facial physiognomies were easily perceived (for detailed description and pre-testing of these stimuli, see Stepanova & Strube, 2012).
English-Russian bilinguals translated all experimental materials from English into Russian, and then retranslated from Russian into English to compare the two English versions, thus insuring the correct meaning.

**Materials and Procedure**

**Ethnic typicality ratings task.** Participants rated faces on a 7-point scale: (1) Very non-Russian, (2) Moderately non-Russian, (3) Somewhat non-Russian, (4) Not Clearly non-Russian or Russian, (5) Somewhat Russian, (6) Moderately Russian, and (7) Very Russian. Participants also completed an ethnic categorization task. For the ethnic categorization task, they rated the faces on a 3-point scale: (1) non-Russian, (2) Cannot Tell, and (3) Russian.\(^4\) Each participant rated one of the two sets of faces (determined randomly) and the order of faces within a set was randomized individually for each participant.

**The IAT.** The IAT task consisted of seven different blocks requiring participants to categorize faces or words (see Greenwald, Nosek, & Banaji, 2003 for a detailed description). Participants categorized 10 target faces as Russian or non-Russian. Participants categorized target words such as pleasure, happiness, love, awful, agony, pain as either pleasant or unpleasant. The IAT employed facial stimuli that were a subset of faces used during the ethnic typicality ratings task, namely, faces with high Afrocentric physiognomy and dark skin tone and faces with high Eurocentric physiognomy and light skin tone. The IAT score was calculated according to the procedures described by Greenwald et al. (2003) and represents a standardized response time difference. Higher scores indicate more favorable implicit attitudes toward Russians compared to non-Russians.

**Questionnaire measures.** Participants completed Feeling Thermometers\(^5\), for which they indicated how they felt towards the following groups: Russians, non-Russians, Slavs,
Caucasians (people from the Caucasus region), Chinese, Arabs, Georgians, Armenians, Azeri, Tajiks, Moldovans, Jews, Gypsies (Roma), Tatars, Africans, Americans, foreigners, foreigners from far abroad (a term signifying persons from countries that were never a part of the Soviet Union), foreigners from near abroad (a term signifying persons from neighboring post-Soviet republics), people from the republics of the former USSR, Europeans, Western Europeans, Eastern Europeans, and blacks. In the Russian translation, black refers to dark people, which is frequently a derogatory term for non-Russian and non-European people, and encompasses people of Arabic, Asian, or African descent, but most commonly persons coming from the Caucasus region. Participants indicated their feelings on a 10-point scale, from 1 (Very Cold/Unfavorable) to 10 (Very Warm/Favorable).

Participants completed the study via computer in approximately one and a half hours. Half of the participants performed the explicit measures first, followed by the implicit and ethnic categorization tasks. The other half completed the measures in the reverse order. No order effects emerged for any of the above measures. At the end of the study, participants provided demographic information (e.g., age, gender, parents’ income, and ethnicity). All experimental materials were in Russian with the study conducted by a native Russian speaker and all communication between participants and the experimenter was in Russian. Participants received a monetary incentive of 100 Russian rubles, the equivalent of $4 US, for their participation, and were paid in cash immediately after debriefing.

**Results**

**Ethnic Typicality and Categorization Tasks Ratings**

Preliminary analyses indicated no stimulus set effects so they are not discussed further. Initial analyses of typicality and categorization ratings also indicated no significant interactions
involving any of the explicit attitude questionnaire measures (e.g., MCP, etc.). Accordingly, the analyses that we report include only implicit attitudes. Additionally, because most of the effects that emerged for the ethnic typicality ratings emerged for the categorization ratings as well, we only report results for the ethnic typicality ratings. Indeed, the category and typicality ratings were highly consistent at the level of the individual participant. The median within-participant correlation was .78, with all but 1 participant having a within-participant correlation of above .52. All participants were included in the analyses, because similar patterns of results were found when non-Russian participants were excluded from the analyses.

When the assumption of sphericity was violated, as indicated by Mauchly’s test of sphericity, we used the Greenhouse-Geisser corrected degrees of freedom for the F tests. This procedure reduces the degrees of freedom in proportion to the violation, resulting in values that are not whole numbers. All follow-up comparisons were conducted with Bonferroni corrections at the level of the effect being examined.

**Ethnic typicality ratings.** The 10 (Skin Tone) x 10 (Facial Physiognomy) x (Implicit Ethnic Attitudes) repeated measures multiple regression revealed significant main effects for both skin tone and facial physiognomy. Dark faces were rated as more non-Russian than light faces, Greenhouse-Geisser $F(2.61, 135.45) = 33.95, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .40$, and faces with Afrocentric physiognomy were rated as more non-Russian than faces with Eurocentric physiognomy, Greenhouse-Geisser $F(3.03, 157.68) = 70.41, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .58$. There was also a significant Skin Tone x Facial Physiognomy interaction, Greenhouse-Geisser $F(22.61, 1175.53) = 4.14, MSE = 11.23, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .07$ (see Figure 2). Follow-up comparisons indicated that effect sizes for simple effects of skin tone within each level of physiognomy were less variable (as indicated by the proportion of variance explained, $\eta_p^2$) than effect sizes for simple effects of
facial physiognomy within skin tone, even though all of the follow-up comparisons were statistically significant ($p < .001$). Specifically, although effect sizes for simple effects of skin color within each level of physiognomy gradually increased from $\eta_p^2 = .5$ (Afrocentric physiognomy) to $\eta_p^2 = .91$ (Eurocentric physiognomy, level 7), effect sizes for simple effects of physiognomy within each level of skin color increased from $\eta_p^2 = .35$ (dark) to $\eta_p^2 = .94$ (light, level 9). That is, dark faces were rated consistently as non-Russian (the out-group for these participants), regardless of facial physiognomy, but as faces get lighter, they received more varied racial typicality judgments and ratings depended on both skin color and facial physiognomy.

In addition, there was a Skin Tone x Implicit Attitudes interaction, Greenhouse-Geisser $F(2.61, 135.45) = 7.42, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .13$, and a Facial Physiognomy x Implicit Attitudes interaction, Greenhouse-Geisser $F(3.03, 157.68) = 2.81, p = .041, \eta_p^2 = .05$. Note that the Facial Physiognomy x Implicit Attitudes interaction was only marginally significant when all non-Russian participants were excluded, Greenhouse-Geisser $F(3.17, 145.78) = 2.18, p = .089, \eta_p^2 = .05$.

Participants with high implicit pro-Russian ethnic attitudes rated faces as less Russian than participants with low implicit pro-Russian ethnic attitudes, but only when faces were light (see Figure 3). At the same time, participants with higher implicit ethnic prejudice rated faces as less Russian (and more non-Russian) than participants with lower implicit ethnic prejudice for more Afrocentric levels of physiognomy; that pattern reversed for Eurocentric levels of physiognomy (see Figure 4). Stated differently, facial physiognomy was more related to ethnic typicality ratings for participants with higher implicit ethnic prejudice than for participants with lower implicit prejudice.
Implicit and Explicit Ethnic Attitudes

Participants exhibited strong pro-Russian implicit attitudes, $D = .88$, $SD_D = .61$ with a range of -.50 to 2.25 and with an approximately normal distribution of $D$ scores. The explicit feeling thermometer ratings for the different target groups were significantly different, $F(23, 1219) = 27.36, p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .34$. Results revealed highly favorable pro-Russian attitudes, $M = 8.85$, $SD = 1.66$, which were significantly different from attitudes towards every ethnic group, including Africans (see Table 1). Participants expressed the most negative feelings towards the following groups: Gypsies (Roma), Tajiks, Azeri, Georgians, Moldovans, Arabs, people from the Caucasus, Armenians, Americans, and Jews. Both implicit and explicit measures revealed more favorable attitudes towards Russians than towards other groups.

There were no significant correlations between the IAT and other questionnaire measures used in the experiment, except for two items on feeling thermometers: attitudes towards Russians ($r = .32, p < .05$) and attitudes towards Jews ($r = -.35, p < .01$). The results indicated that participants with higher pro-Russian implicit attitudes also tended to have less favorable attitudes towards Jews; participants with higher implicit pro-Russian attitudes also had higher explicit pro-Russian attitudes.

Discussion

We assessed the nature of ethnic classifications in a culture where ethnic tensions were on the rise and Africans were common victims of violent racism. Specifically, we examined the relative impact of skin tone and facial features on ethnic typicality judgments. As predicted, skin tone and facial physiognomy each affected racial typicality judgments and they also interacted in their influence. Dark faces were rated consistently as non-Russian (the out-group for these participants), regardless of facial physiognomy, but as faces got lighter, they received more
varied racial typicality judgments that depended on facial physiognomy as well. The findings are consistent with results obtained by Stepanova and Strube (2012), indicating that people rely upon a constellation of cues when making ethnic categorization judgments: They seem to primarily use one of the cues (i.e., dark skin tone) to exclude a target face from their in-group, if the face passes this initial screening, facial features become important as well. These results suggest that people may use a dichotomous classification: As long as a target’s skin tone is dark, facial features are not factored into categorization judgments, and that person is perceived as “the other”; if a target’s skin tone is light, perceivers attend to both skin tone and facial features, which results in more variable judgments. Notably, although our results were similar to Stepanova and Strube (2012), the pattern of dichotomy described was even stronger for this Russian sample, perhaps indicating that dark skin tone is a more salient “out-group” marker for Russians than for European Americans. Given the current state of affairs in Russia, with prejudice and even violence towards various ethnic minorities on the rise, dark skin tone individuals are particularly in danger, as they are most certainly identified as non-Russian. Given that the pattern of our results is similar to that of Stepanova and Stube (2012), it appears that the relative weighting of skin color and facial features in ethnic/racial categorization may be general across cultures. Admittedly, both Stepanova and Strube and this study used Afrocentric physiognomy, and investigating these effects with different types of facial features (e.g., Asian) would be the next step to insure generalizability of these findings to other facial phenotypes.

Most importantly, implicit attitudes also affected ethnic typicality ratings as was evidenced by the Skin Tone x Implicit Attitudes interaction and the Facial Physiognomy x Implicit Attitudes interaction. Participants with high implicit pro-Russian ethnic attitudes rated faces as more non-Russian than participants with low implicit pro-Russian ethnic attitudes, but
only when skin tone was light. Perhaps when skin tone is dark, all Russians feel confident that they can exclude these faces from their in-group; yet when faces are light, perceivers with high implicit pro-Russian attitudes still do not feel confident enough to categorize the faces as Russian. In addition, as Afrocentric physiognomy increased, participants with high pro-Russian implicit ethnic prejudice rated faces as less Russian than did participants with low pro-Russian implicit ethnic prejudice; that pattern reversed for Eurocentric levels of physiognomy. Perhaps facial physiognomy carries more weight for participants with high pro-Russian implicit attitudes than for those with low pro-Russian implicit attitudes. These findings might be due to the importance of correct in-group identification for those with high pro-Russian ethnic prejudice: they are more attuned to any out-group cue, even those that are less salient such as facial physiognomy. This study thus shows that ethnic judgments depend on more than visual cues alone by identifying implicit attitudes as an important moderating factor for ethnic/racial categorization. Our pattern of results was somewhat different from results obtained in previous research (e.g., in Stepanova & Strube, 2012, participants with high implicit racial attitudes relied more on skin tone than those with low attitudes). However, the moderating role of implicit attitudes in both samples obtained from distinctly different populations underscores the importance of implicit ethnic attitudes in ethnic categorization effects. However, contrary to some of the studies described previously, we found no moderating effects of explicit ethnic attitudes on ethnic typicality evaluations, perhaps because we used more variable stimuli than Pettigrew, Allport, and Barnett (1958) or Castano, Yzerbyt, Bourguignon, and Seron (2002).

Implicit and Explicit Ethnic Attitudes in the Russian Federation

Results for both implicit and explicit ethnic measures were indicative of ethnocentric attitudes. Pro-Russian implicit attitudes were very high in this study with one of the highest
mean $D$ values reported (and quite different from the neutral point of 0, $t[53] = 10.59$, $p < .001$). Most IAT studies report $Ds$ no greater than .5 (Lane, Banaji, Nosek, & Greenwald, 2007; but see Nosek et al., 2009 for $D = .65$, based on a study in Tunisia). Participants also exhibited strongly pro-Russian attitudes on the explicit feeling thermometers measure. When young university sociology majors, who are usually the least prejudiced individuals (Elchardus & Spruyt, 2009; Guimond & Palmer, 1996) exhibit pro-Russian implicit and explicit attitudes, it is an indication that Russian society has strong pro-Russian biases and negative attitudes toward minority groups that are widespread. Our sample came from a younger and more educated stratum of the population, with some knowledge of the social processes happening in Russia, and so could be expected to be more tolerant and less ethnically biased. Our findings also suggest that explicit ethnic attitudes did not moderate any of the ethnic categorization effects because our sample (i.e., more tolerant sociology students) resembles Western European or North American samples and thus perhaps less willing to rely upon explicit biases in their race-based decisions (analogous to Stepanova & Strube, 2012).

These findings suggest that explicit ethnic attitudes are largely dichotomous: negative toward most non-Russian groups, and positive toward Russians. However, explicit and implicit attitudes were largely independent with the exception of implicit pro-Russian attitudes and explicit attitudes towards Russians and Jews, as indicated by the correlations between the IAT and two items on feeling thermometers. It is not surprising that implicit pro-Russian attitudes and explicit attitudes towards Russians were related, as nationalism is on the rise in contemporary Russia (e.g., Verhovsky, 2007), fueled by massive propaganda (e.g., Linan, 2010). These correlations were consistent with previous findings in the literature (e.g., average $r$ for implicit-explicit correlations is .31, see Lane et al., 2007).
The negative attitudes towards Jews were consistent with overall negative attitudes towards non-Russians, but the link to implicit attitudes might indicate a long-standing history of nationalism and anti-Semitism dating back to the days of the Russian Empire. Anti-Semitism was prevalent and ingrained in the fabric of Russian life for centuries whereas negative attitudes towards other groups (e.g., Tajiks) is a more recent phenomenon. These findings are consistent with previous work indicating that implicit attitudes accumulate slowly and incrementally through associations based on similarity and change through different processes (e.g., Sloman, 1996; Rydell & McConnell, 2006; Rydell, McConnell, Mackie, & Strain, 2006).

Limitations

There are some procedural limitations in this study. First, we used computer generated images for facial stimuli, which limits the ecological validity of the study. Note that we extensively pre-tested our facial stimuli on how life-like they appear (see Stepanova & Strube, 2012 for details). Similar race-based effects have been reported for computer generated faces and photographs of real individuals (for effects of skin tone and facial physiognomy on racial biases, see Hagiwara, Kashy, & Cesario, 2012 and Stepanova & Strube, 2012b; for effects of race on categorization of affective expressions, see Hugenberg, 2005 and Craig, Mallan, & Lipp, in press). Yet, these effects are not always identical (e.g., Hugenberg, 2005 and Kubota & Ito, 2007) raising questions about processing of computer generated facial images versus photos of real faces (Carlson, Gronlund, Weatherford, & Carlson, 2012). Although computer generated faces allowed us to achieve better control and manipulation over key features, an important next step would be to replicate our findings using real-life photographs that achieve similar levels of control.
Secondly, Eurocentric physiognomy may not necessarily convey information about a Russian phenotype. Specifically, the typical Russian physiognomy might include the presence of varying degrees of Slavic and other ethnic features (e.g., Mongol, Tatar), yet these features were not present in our physiognomy manipulation. Importantly, the ratings scales used required respondents to rate the level of "Russianness". The nature of our physiognomy manipulation as well as types of the scales used has implications for how our results are interpreted, that is, whether they are tapping into more racial (along African-European continuum) and less ethnic (along Russian-non-Russian continuum) categorization.

Thirdly, while explicit attitudes towards Africans were significantly less favorable than attitudes towards Russians, attitudes towards some other groups were even more negative. We found the most negative explicit attitudes were towards Gypsies, Tajiks, Azeri, Georgians, Moldovans, Arabs, people from the Caucasus region, Armenians, Jews, and Americans. With the exception of Americans, all other groups were ethnic minorities endemic to the Russian Federation. Future research on social categorization and biases should consider using phenotypes representative of the most disparaged groups and categorization judgments more endemic to the cultural context.

Conclusion

Ethnically relevant decisions occur in many important contexts with potential for ethnic violence, as currently witnessed in Russia. Determining the factors that drive those decisions will have substantial applied importance. The current findings are especially worrisome, as they were obtained in a sample (supposedly) least likely to express negative ethnic attitudes.
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Footnotes

1 Unfortunately, due to historical factors (e.g., denial of such prejudices by the official Communist regime and inability of non-Soviet researchers to carry out such studies due to the Iron Curtain), no empirical data is available regarding racial and ethnic intolerance in Russia prior to 1990s.

2 From here on, facial physiognomy refers to a set of features (e.g., width of nose, size of lips and eyes, etc.) rather than one specific facial feature.

3 Our pre-testing was conducted to insure that there were no differences between these two sets (e.g., that one set did not appear more African or attractive than the other), so it is highly unlikely that ethnicity of our participants could have affected these ratings. By contrast, within-set differences would be fully expected because research evidence suggests that emotional expressions of Black faces are perceived differently than those of White faces by White participants high in implicit racial prejudice (see Hugenberg & Bodenhausen, 2003; Hugenberg & Bodenhausen, 2004). Indeed, as we report, implicit attitudes moderate the rated typicality of faces that vary in skin tone and physiognomy.

4 Participants completed both the ethnic typicality and ethnic categorization tasks in both random and systematic presentations to test hypotheses related to a nonlinear dynamics model of racial judgment. Preliminary analysis did not find any effects of order ($p > .05$) in racial category or racial typicality ratings. To simplify reporting, we collapsed across this factor.

We considered respondents’ burden in rating so many faces, specifically reactance that may have been precipitated by the effort to make very fine perceptual judgments, as well as the time involved. Our goal was to create stimuli with sufficient distinctions in both physiognomy and skin tone dimensions for testing interactive and additive effects of these factors, and
employing too few faces would have masked the complexity of skin tone and facial
physiognomy effects. Additionally, the actual mean rating times for each face varied from 2.6 s.
to 5.5 s. for the ethnic typicality task and from 1.9 s. to 4 s. for the ethnic categorization task.
This suggests that the actual time involved in rating facial stimuli was reasonable and likely did
not impose undue strain on participants.

5 We also administered the following questionnaire measures: Tolerance of Ambiguity
Scale (Bunder, 1982), Need for Closure Scale (Webster & Kruglanski, 1994), Need for
Cognition Scale (Cacioppo, Petty, & Kao, 1984), Social Dominance Orientation Scale (Pratto et
al., 1994), and Motivation to Control Prejudice Scale (Dunton & Fazio, 1997; adapted for a
Russian population). These scales did not moderate any key findings and will not be discussed
any further.

6 When a predictor was continuous, the regression equation was used to generate
predicted responses in this and all subsequent figures. “Low” and “high” values for the
continuous predictor were defined as one standard deviation below (-1 SD) and one standard
deviation above (+1 SD) the continuous variable mean.

7 All the other main effects and interactions reported here remained significant when non-
Russian participants were excluded from the analyses. Because our number of non-Russian
participants was very low (n = 6), we could not test whether ethnicity of participants was a
moderating factor in our analyses. Prior research (Stepanova & Strube, 2012) has indicated that
ethnicity of participants can be a moderating factor in racial typicality judgments. However, our
analyses indicated that findings described are similar whether or not non-Russian participants are
included. Additionally, all participants in this sample share a common cultural background, in
which Africans or Blacks are perceived as a clearly disliked out-group. None of the multi-ethnic participants shared Black/African ethnic background.

8 Although we acknowledge that a large number of faces varying on two factors might have cued participants to respond in a certain manner, there is at least some evidence that a smaller number of levels for these two factors (two for skin color and three for physiognomy) produces similar main effects for both skin color and facial physiognomy (Stepanova & Strube, 2009). Also, we believe that the facial physiognomy manipulation cannot be easily recognized as one factor, because it consists of multiple features.
### Table 1
*Means, Standard Deviations, Follow-up Comparisons and Effect Sizes for Feeling Thermometer Ratings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Cohen d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Russians</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavs</td>
<td>8.29*</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasians</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabs</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgians</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenians</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azeri</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajiks</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldovan</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsies</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>9.81</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatars</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africans</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigners-far abroad</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigners-near abroad</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People from the former USSR</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europeans</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europeans</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europeans</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Feeling thermometer ratings indicate participants’ feelings towards various ethnic groups. $t$ statistics provided indicates results of follow-up comparisons between the Russian group and each of the groups listed. Cohen $d$ is a measure of effect size (e.g., how large is the difference between feeling thermometer ratings for the Russian group and each of the ethnic groups) calculated by using Morris and DeShon (2002) equation 8 for within-subjects comparisons. * $p < .05$. All other follow-up comparisons were significant at $p < .001$. 
Figure 1. Facial stimuli used in current research (a sample set). Skin tone varies from 1 (dark) to 10 (light), left to right, and physiognomy varies from 1 (Afrocentric) to 10 (Eurocentric), top to bottom. Adapted from “The role of skin color and facial physiognomy in racial categorization: Moderation by implicit racial attitudes” by E. V. Stepanova and M. J Strube, 2012, *Journal Experimental Social Psychology, 48*, p. 870. Copyright 2012 by Elsevier. Reprinted with permission.
Figure 2. Effects of skin tone and facial physiognomy on ethnic typicality ratings for average implicit ethnic attitudes. Face 1= highest Afrocentric physiognomy and face 10= highest Eurocentric physiognomy.
Figure 3. The effects of skin color and implicit ethnic attitudes on ethnic typicality judgments.
Figure 4. The effects of facial physiognomy and implicit ethnic attitudes on ethnic typicality judgments.