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Abstract

The media plays an important role in the process of shaping attitudes about controversial issues such as the arrival of refugees to Canada. The first aim of this research was to investigate how the Canadian newsprint media portrayed one noteworthy event involving the arrival of refugees to Canada: the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat to British Columbia in August of 2010. A media content analysis revealed that the overall portrayal of refugees in the Canadian press in response to this event was mixed. On the one hand, refugees were perceived either as bogus claimants or as criminals/terrorists. On the other hand, refugees were also perceived as victims. The second aim of this research was to investigate the effect of these media depictions on the automatic dehumanization of refugees. Results showed that exposing participants to editorials depicting refugees as bogus, terrorists or, surprisingly, as victims activated the automatic dehumanization of refugees. In contrast, exposing participants to an editorial with neutral, factual information about refugees did not activate the automatic dehumanization of refugees. The results are discussed in the context of the implicit social cognition model of media priming (Arendt, 2013). The results suggest that the best way for the media to approach controversial issues such as the arrival of refugees to Canada may be to engage in factual, non-biased journalism. The present research is the first demonstration that media portrayals of refugees can cause the automatic dehumanization of refugees.
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Chapter 1

1 Introduction

The dehumanization of outgroups is a phenomenon that has been present throughout history. In the 17th century, for example, European navigators described people living on the African coast as animals full of lust and evilness (Jahoda, 1999). The early association of Black people with apes led to predominant theories of race as represented by Charles Darwin and Franz Boas (Lott, 1999). These theories argued for a racial hierarchy, with monkeys and apes on the lower level and Whites on the higher level, as a result of the evolutionary development of these species. These scientific theories set the ground for the growing negative stereotypes and prejudice toward Black people, which are still present to the present day (Goff, Eberhardt, Williams, & Jackson, 2008).

Dehumanization is not a phenomenon unique to Blacks, however. For example, Nazis referred to Jews as ‘rats’ before and during the Second World War and the Hutu-led Radio Rwanda described the Tutsis as ‘cockroaches’ during the Rwandan genocide (Kellow & Steeves, 1998).

More recently, researchers have begun to systematically investigate the dehumanization of refugees. In Western countries there has been growing resistance to the arrival of large numbers of refugees, who are often viewed with suspicion and hostility. With over ten million refugees worldwide seeking resettlement opportunities (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2012), researchers have tried to understand the negative reaction of receiving countries toward such an underprivileged group of people. For example, Esses, Veenvliet, Hodson and Mihic (2008) investigated
the dehumanization of refugees in terms of perceiving refugees as engaging in enemy and barbarian acts and in terms of failure to uphold prosocial values. According to Schwartz and Struch (1989), if people perceive a group to lack prosocial values (e.g., helpful, considerate), then they will judge that group to be less human and thus less worthy of a human treatment. Esses et al. showed in their studies that refugees were perceived to engage in enemy and barbarian acts. Their results also showed that refugees were perceived to be less likely to uphold prosocial values in comparison to Canadians, and that refugees were perceived to be more likely to try to violate procedures and cheat the system to claim refugee status. These measures of refugee dehumanization were positively associated with negative emotions toward refugees, which in turn led to more negative attitudes toward refugees and toward Canada’s current refugee policy. Of importance, analyses indicated that dehumanization was separable from overall negative attitudes toward refugees, indicating the distinction between dehumanization and general prejudice toward refugees (Esses et al., 2008). While the previous study provided support for the dehumanization of refugees in terms of failure to uphold prosocial values, and in terms of the perception of refugees as being immoral and engaged in enemy/barbarian acts, it is not clear the extent to which refugees are also dehumanized in terms of being associated with animals. Medianu (2010) investigated this question and found that refugees are more likely to be associated with animals than humans, in comparison to Canadians. My doctoral dissertation aimed to investigate the possible causes for this association and, in particular, it aimed to understand the role of the media in the automatic dehumanization of refugees. My research program aimed to answer the following questions: First, how are refugees portrayed in the media? Second, how does
the negative portrayal of refugees as bogus and criminal/terrorists in the media impact the automatic dehumanization of refugees? Third, how does the portrayal of refugees as victims in the media impact the automatic dehumanization of refugees? Fourth, is automatic dehumanization conditional on the specific categorization task used to assess dehumanization?

In the following sections, I will first review the phenomenon of dehumanization with a special emphasis on automatic dehumanization. Second, I will review the concepts of media framing and media priming. Finally, I will introduce the event of the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat to British Columbia, Canada, in August of 2010 and provide a context to the media coverage of this event.

1.1 Dehumanization

Despite the fact that the phenomenon of dehumanization has had a long presence in human history, researchers in social psychology started to investigate dehumanization only in the last 15 years (Vaes, Leyens, Paladino, & Miranda, 2012). To understand why people deny humanness to others it is important to realize that people use social categories to better navigate through their complex environments (Srull & Wyer, 1979; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher & Wetherell, 1987). While the boundaries of these social categories are often arbitrarily constructed, people do not perceive them as such. Instead, groups develop specific group realities that are based on the assumption that the socially constructed differences between groups constitute an important reality in everyday life (Leyens & Demoulin, 2010). Ethnocentrism, for example, refers to the tendency to regard one’s group as superior on a variety of dimensions and to perceive outgroups as inferior, lacking important characteristics to be comparable to the ingroup, even when objective
measures might indicate the opposite (Leyens, Demoulin, Vaes, Gaunt, & Paladino, 2007; Summer, 1906). This ‘group reality’ may be explained or justified by attributing different ‘essences’ to the groups. This can occur by attributing the most general essence, the human essence, to the ingroup and regarding outgroups as lacking in the human essence. That is, ingroups may be perceived as human or even supra-human, while other groups may be “infra-humanized (viewed as less fully human) or even ‘bestialized’ (viewed as animals, such as apes)” (Leyens & Demoulin, 2010, p. 202). Overall, according to Leyens & Demoulin (2010), ethnocentrism reflects a group reality that together with essentialist beliefs can give rise to intergroup phenomena such as dehumanization.

Dehumanization refers to the denial of humanness to others and their exclusion from the human species (Haslam, 2006). However, the definition of what constitutes humanness is less clear-cut. Haslam (2006) proposed that humanness has two distinct senses: human uniqueness and human nature. Uniquely human characteristics refer to those characteristics that separate humans from animals, such as civility, refinement, moral sensibility, rationality and maturity. When people deny uniquely human characteristics to outgroups, they perceive these outgroups as uncivilized, coarse, amoral, irrational and childlike. In other words, they perceive outgroups as being more animal-like and thus they dehumanize them in an animalistic way.

Human nature characteristics refer to those characteristics that separate humans from inanimate objects, such as emotional responsiveness, interpersonal warmth, cognitive openness, agency and depth (Haslam, 2006). When people deny human nature characteristics to outgroups, they perceive these outgroups as inert, cold, rigid, passive
and superficial. In other words, they perceive outgroups as being object- or automaton-like and thus they dehumanize them in a mechanistic way.

Haslam (2014) points out that dehumanization can vary in its blatancy. Blatant dehumanization refers to when people state that an outgroup is animal-like. For example, Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara and Pastorelli (1996) measured the extent to which participants agreed or disagreed with statements such as ‘Some people deserve to be treated like animals’. Similarly, Esses et al. (2008) measured the extent to which participants perceived refugees as barbarians, in other words as lacking civility. Subtle dehumanization refers to when people express dehumanization of an outgroup in an indirect way. In this case, people do not explicitly compare an outgroup to animals or barbarians, but perceive the outgroup as lacking certain uniquely human characteristics. For example, Castano and Giner-Sorolla (2006) measured the extent to which participants thought Native Americans experience uniquely human emotions, such as sorrow, admiration, fondness and hope. Similarly, Leyens et al. (2001) measured the extent to which participants attributed uniquely human emotions to ingroups versus outgroups. This form of dehumanization is subtle because participants were not aware of the dehumanizing nature of the emotions they assigned to the outgroups. Furthermore, the dehumanization in terms of uniquely human emotions is subtle because it is not as extreme as the direct comparison of outgroups to animals.

It is important to note that the subtle-blatant distinction of dehumanization is not a simple dichotomy, but rather it represents a continuum (Haslam, 2014). There are studies, for example, that fall in between the two ends of the continuum. For example, Goff et al. (2008) measured the extent to which participants implicitly associated groups with apes
or animals. Similarly, Saminaden et al. (2010) found that indigenous people were more likely to be implicitly associated with animal-related words than people from modern, industrialized societies. On the one hand, in these studies dehumanization is blatant because there are direct comparisons between outgroups and animals. Indeed, the research uses directly human and animal related words as stimuli. On the other hand, in these studies dehumanization is also subtle because participants are unaware of what is being measured because of the use of indirect measures which bypass conscious control.

The main assumption of indirect measures is that attitudes influence people’s performance on various tasks and that the size of this influence can provide us with a measure of the underlying attitude (Wittenbrink & Schwarz, 2007). Because the responses required in the tasks of indirect measures are very fast (a few hundred milliseconds upon the display of the attitude object), people have limited control over their responses. In other words, indirect measures observe automatic responses toward attitude objects. This is particularly important given that with explicit self-reports, people may be either unwilling or unable to report accurately on their attitudes (for a review, see DeMaio, 1984). Indirect measures overcome these shortcomings because they do not require participants to have conscious access to their attitudes or explicitly express them.

1.1.1 Indirect Measures

Indirect measures rely on experimental paradigms to infer people’s attitudes. Some of the most known experimental paradigms are the evaluative (Fazio et al., 1995) and concept (Wittenbrink et al., 1997) priming paradigms and the Implicit Association Test paradigm (Greenwald, McGhee & Schwartz, 1998). In the evaluative priming paradigm, participants are briefly presented with attitude objects as primes (e.g., the word refugee)
followed immediately by targets that vary in their evaluative connotation (e.g., positive or negative pictures). Participants are asked to indicate as quickly as possible whether the target is positive or negative by pressing the corresponding key (Gawronski, 2009). If participants respond faster to negative targets when paired with a prime (e.g., the word refugee), then the prime is assumed to be associated with negative valence. On the other hand, if participants respond faster to positive targets when paired with the prime, then the prime is assumed to be associated with positive valence (Gawronski, 2009).

The concept priming paradigm is used to determine the kinds of attributes people associate with the attitude object (e.g., Lepore & Brown, 1997; Wittenbrink et al., 1997). The procedure in the concept priming paradigm is similar to the evaluative priming procedure with one exception. In the concept priming paradigm, participants are presented with targets that vary in their semantic meaning (e.g., animal vs. human pictures) rather than in their evaluative meaning (e.g., positive vs. negative pictures). More specifically, participants are briefly presented with attitude objects as primes (e.g., the word refugee) followed immediately by targets that vary in their semantic meaning (e.g., animal vs. human pictures). If participants respond faster to animal targets when paired with the prime, then the prime (e.g., the word refugee) is assumed to be associated with the semantic meaning of the animal concept. On the other hand, if participants respond faster to human picture targets when paired with the primes, then the prime is assumed to be associated with the semantic meaning of the human concept (Gawronski, 2009; for scoring procedures see Wittenbrink, 2007).

Finally, the IAT paradigm provides an estimate of the strength of the association between attribute categories (e.g., pleasant vs. unpleasant) and target categories (e.g.,
Black persons vs. White persons) (Greenwald et al., 1998; Blanton & Jacard, 2006). The underlying logic of the procedure is straightforward. On a computer screen, stimuli such as words or pictures related to the categories of interest are presented, one at a time, to participants. In the first task, the compatible task, participants are asked to classify the words or pictures by pressing one of two buttons. One button refers to the category White or pleasant while the other button refers to the category Black or unpleasant. In the second task, the incompatible task, participants are asked to classify words and pictures but with one button referring to the category White or unpleasant and the other button referring to the category Black or pleasant. The IAT effect is calculated by subtracting the mean latency for the compatible task from the mean latency for the incompatible task. People who have an automatic preference for White people will perform faster in the compatible task than in the incompatible task, while people who have an automatic preference for Black people will perform faster in the incompatible task than in the compatible task (Greenwald et al., 1998; Blanton & Jacard, 2006).

1.1.2 Automatic Dehumanization

Only a limited number of studies have investigated the automatic nature of the dehumanization of outgroups. For example, Paladino and colleagues (2002) found, using the IAT paradigm, that participants reacted faster to the associations between outgroup names and non-uniquely human emotions and ingroup names and uniquely human emotions, than to the opposite associations. While these results point in the predicted direction, however, they do not provide insight into whether these results are due to a stronger association of uniquely human emotions with the ingroup and/or are due to a stronger association of non-uniquely human emotions with the outgroup. Moreover, it is
not clear the extent to which participants were aware of what was being assessed and whether participants were able to strategically control their answers. Indeed, previous research suggests that during IAT tasks, participants may become aware of the attitude under investigation (Dasgupta, McGhee, Greenwald & Banaji, 2000) and may strategically influence the outcome of the IAT if they are high in self-monitoring and are highly motivated to fake the outcome (Czellar, 2006).

To overcome these problems, Boccato, Cortes, Demoulin and Leyens (2007) used a sequential priming procedure instead of the IAT. Compared to the IAT, sequential priming procedures with their short SOAs (Stimulus Onset Asynchrony) between prime and target are less likely to allow participants to exert intentional control over their answers. Furthermore, the sequential priming procedure allowed Boccato et al. (2007) to find out which association is stronger: the ingroup/uniquely human emotions association or the outgroup/non uniquely human emotions associations. Their results showed that when participants were primed with a uniquely human emotion, they were faster to identify an ingroup (White) photograph than when they were primed with a non-uniquely human emotion. Importantly, when participants were primed either with a uniquely or non-uniquely human emotion, they were equally fast to identify the outgroup photograph (Black). These results suggest that people are especially likely to automatically associate their ingroup with uniquely human emotions.

Furthermore, using a sequential priming procedure, Boccato et al. (2008) showed in their studies that participants not only automatically associated their ingroup more strongly with human beings than outgroups, but also that participants automatically associated more strongly outgroups with apes than with human beings. Similarly, Goff et
al. (2008) found support for the tendency of White Americans to associate Blacks more with apes than with other animals, while Whites were not associated with animals at all. Moreover, this Black-ape association had clear negative consequences for the treatment of Black targets. Participants who were primed with the Black-ape association were more likely to agree with the beating of Black criminal suspects.

In my research, I was particularly interested in investigating whether refugees are more likely to be associated with animals than humans in comparison to Canadians (Medianu, 2010). Furthermore, I was interested in examining whether the automatic dehumanization of refugees is conditional on the type of categorization task. Previous research has shown that primed memory contents differ under different judgment contexts created by different tasks (Wittenbrink, Judd, & Park, 2001). Wittenbrink et al. showed in their study about prejudice toward Blacks that the concept priming procedure (Wittenbrink, Judd, & Park, 1997) activated a “stereotypic prejudice” which was related to explicit racial attitude scales, while, using the same stimuli, the evaluative priming procedure activated a “more generalized form of automatic prejudice” and did not correlate with explicit racial attitude scales. Similarly, De Houwer, Hermans, Rothermund and Wentura (2002) demonstrated that the congruence in valence of primes and targets impacted priming effects only in an evaluative judgmental task but not in a conceptual judgmental task. In other words, when participants were asked to categorize targets as persons or objects (e.g., “mother”), it did not matter whether the primes (e.g., “suffer” or “kiss”) matched the valence of the targets or not. Overall, the different tasks seem to activate different relevant goal states and influence the primed memory contents (Wittenbrink et al., 2001).
Using the concept priming paradigm (Wittenbrink et al., 1997) and the evaluative priming paradigm (Fazio et al., 1995), Medianu (2010) exposed participants first to a prime word – refugee, Canadian or no prime – and then asked the participants to classify a series of pictures of human faces and animals either as human or animal (conceptual priming task) or as positive or negative (evaluative priming task). As expected, refugees were not only more likely to be automatically associated with negative valence in comparison to Canadians, but they were also more likely to be automatically associated with animals in comparison to Canadians.

Also, the results suggested that, while the automatic evaluation of refugees was conditional on the type of categorization task, the automatic dehumanization of refugees was not conditional on the type of categorization task. Negative valence was more likely to be associated with refugees in comparison to Canadians only when participants performed the evaluative categorization task and not the conceptual categorization task. On the other hand, refugees were more likely to be automatically dehumanized in comparison to Canadians independent of the type of categorization task. This is an interesting finding which suggests that as soon as participants are primed with the word refugee, the animal concept gets activated independent of the current goals set through the task. However, because the results were only marginally significant, it is premature to draw definite conclusions about the unconditional nature of automatic dehumanization and the conditional nature of automatic evaluation. Having established that refugees are more automatically dehumanized than Canadians, a question that arises concerns the potential causes of this association. In particular, what is the role of the media in the automatic dehumanization of refugees?
1.2 Media Framing and Media Priming

In many cases, individuals form their attitudes and beliefs about other people and social groups based on direct experiences (Oliver, Ramasubramanian & Kim, 2007). Indeed, Allport (1954) set a milestone in psychology emphasizing the importance and impact of these direct experiences with social groups and their members on the quality of the intergroup relations. However, direct contact is often limited by geographical and social boundaries so that other sources of information, such as the media, become very important in the process of shaping attitudes and beliefs about other people (Oliver et al., 2007).

1.2.1 Media Framing

Besides providing information, an important characteristic of the media is its contribution to how issues are discussed. While effective journalism should report issues as they occur, many times media frames or filters are used to form, misrepresent or even censor journalism (Herman & Chomsky, 1988). An issue may be described or framed in a particular way in order to construct a certain reality and ease its interpretation, influencing people’s attitudes and behaviours (Entman, 2007; Gross & D’Ambrosio, 2004). Steuter and Wills (2009; 2010), for example, examined how 9/11 was framed in Western (including Canadian) newspaper stories to build and strengthen a clear enemy picture in order to justify the ‘War on Terror’. Interestingly, Steuter and Wills found that newspaper stories employed dehumanizing language, portraying the enemy as animals, vermin or metastatic disease. Another example is the arrival of four Chinese refugee boats to Canada in 1999, which created the impression that the immigration and refugee system was in crisis (Greenberg, 2000). Greenberg analyzed opinion discourses of five
Canadian newspapers and found that specific words were used to describe the migrants (“greedy”, “selfish” or “illegal”) and their arrival (“invasion” or “flood”).

Mahtani and Mountz (2002) investigated the media portrayal of the arrival of refugees from China to British Columbia, Canada, in 1999. The researchers found that newspaper articles portrayed the event as a crisis despite the relatively small number of refugees arriving by boat compared to the total number of refugees accepted to Canada every year. Furthermore, the researchers point out that the media portrayal of the arrival of the refugees aimed to create panic and anxiety among the public by describing them as bogus, as carriers of threatening diseases and as potential terrorists. Similarly, Henry and Tator (2002) examined the media discourse of Canadian immigration in the National Post. The results found that between 1998 and 2000 “the overwhelmingly majority of the articles, features, and editorials were opposed to current immigration policies and practices and critical of the values and norms of immigrants and refugees” (Henry & Tator, 2002, p. 111). Furthermore, the researchers found several reoccurring themes. For example, refugees were described as bogus and refugee policy was described as being lax and allowing terrorists to enter Canada.

One explanation for the impact of the media on people’s perceptions of social groups and their members is the repeated association between specific words or metaphors with the social groups (Oliver et al., 2007). These social groups, when encountered later alone, may serve as primes and activate cognitions associated with the portrayal in the media and influence attitudes toward members of the social group. Indeed, research on media effects has shown that exposure to negative stereotypes in the
media cultivates negative perceptions of how outgroups are perceived in society (e.g., Mastro, Behm-Morawitz, & Ortiz, 2007).

1.2.2 Media Priming

One theory that explains the media’s influence on people’s attitudes is the implicit social cognition model of media priming (Arendt, 2013). This model assumes that a person’s knowledge and attitudes are cognitively stored and organized in the form of an associative neural network (Anderson, 1990; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995). This associative neural network is made of many interlinked elements or mental concepts. When a mental concept is activated, interlinked concepts are activated through spreading activation. These associations between concepts can vary in their strength. Some concepts may be strongly connected to each other, while others may not. Importantly, the activation of the mental concepts increases their temporary accessibility. Frequent activation of these mental concepts in turn increases their chronic accessibility.

The implicit social cognition model of media priming (Arendt, 2013) argues that the media acts as an external stimulus which influences the associations between concepts in memory. For example, the repeated simultaneous presentation of the two concepts ‘refugee’ and ‘bogus’ in the media activates, strengthens and increases the accessibility of the association between these two concepts and their closely related concepts (e.g., animal, see Figure 1). The media also shapes the pattern of associations by providing new information that is encoded in memory, which may again directly, or indirectly through spreading activation, re-activate pre-existing memory associations. Overall, the model argues that the media can elicit a priming effect by temporarily
increasing the accessibility of concepts in people’s minds. Repeated media priming effects can then lead to the chronic accessibility of concepts in people’s minds.

**Figure 1.** The Implicit Social Cognition Model of Media Priming (based on Arendt, 2013)

Finally, the implicit social cognition model of media priming also draws upon principles from the Associative-Propositional Evaluation (APE) model (Gawronski & Bodenhausen, 2006). The implicit social cognition model of media priming argues that highly accessible mental associations are more likely to be transformed into propositions or declarative knowledge. For example, the highly accessible association between the concepts ‘refugee’ and ‘bogus’ may be transformed into the proposition ‘refugees are bogus’. This new proposition is then subjected to a validation process based on syllogistic inferences. The perceived validity of the new proposition depends on other currently available propositions. If other currently available propositions are inconsistent with the
new proposition, the new proposition is likely to be altered in order to avoid the experience of cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957). For example, if another proposition motivates us to appear unprejudiced, the new proposition may be changed into ‘refugees are not bogus’.

Previous research has investigated the effects of different types of media, such as print and audiovisual media, on the strength of automatic associations between concepts in memory. For example, research on the impact of TV advertisements showed that after exposure to anti-tobacco and anti-marijuana ads, participants showed increased negative implicit attitudes toward these substances (Czyzewska & Ginsburg, 2007). Similarly, negative political campaigns, which depicted an opponent in negative terms, led to less favourable implicit evaluations of the source of the campaign as well as the opponent mentioned in the campaign (Carraro, Gawronski & Castelli, 2010).

In respect to newspaper articles, Arendt (2010) showed that repeated exposure to a newspaper that was reporting in a negative way about the European Union increased implicit negative attitudes of the readers toward the European Union. In another study, Arendt (2012) investigated the effect of newspaper articles over-representing members of minority groups as criminals. The researcher found that these newspaper articles strengthened the automatic association in memory between the minority group and the concept ‘criminal’. Finally, Arendt (2013) examined the effect of newspaper articles depicting foreigners as criminals on implicit and explicit stereotypes. Importantly, Arendt manipulated the number of times that the nationality of the foreigner was mentioned in relation to the reported crime in the article. The results showed a consistent media priming effect on participants’ implicit stereotypes, independent of the number of times
that nationality was mentioned. However, the media priming effect on participants’ explicit stereotypes only occurred once a certain threshold was reached and declined once the newspaper article became too blatant. That is, the priming effect on participants’ explicit attitudes occurred only once the newspaper article mentioned the nationality of the foreigner several times and declined once the nationality of the foreigner was mentioned too many times. Overall, the above studies suggest that exposure to different media depictions has an impact on the strength of automatic associations in people’s memories.

1.3 Media Depictions of Refugees

The current research aimed to examine how refugees are portrayed in Canadian newspapers, and how these media depictions influence the automatic dehumanization of refugees. In particular, in my thesis, I chose to investigate the media’s coverage of the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat to British Columbia in August of 2010. There are several reasons for choosing this particular event. First, the occurrence of the event is fairly recent. Second, the event is similar to previous refugee boat arrivals to Canada, not only in the way the event was covered in the media, but also in the way it led to subsequent immigration policy changes. The purpose of my research was to deepen the understanding of the role of the media in shaping public attitudes toward refugees in Canada, in particular in terms of whether the media enhances the automatic dehumanization of refugees.

Refugee boat arrivals occur approximately once every decade in Canada (Bradimore & Bauder, 2011). For example, in October 2009, seventy-six Tamil refugees reached the shores of British Columbia, while in 2010 497 Tamil refugees reached the
same shores. These events were preceded by the 1999 arrival of 599 refugees from the Fujian province of China. Before that, in 1987, 174 Sikh refugees reached the shores of Nova Scotia, while in 1986, 152 Sri Lankan refugees reached the same shores. These refugee numbers are small in comparison to the number of refugees that Canada accepts every year (Bradimore & Bauder, 2011). In 2008, 36,000 people made refugee claims within Canada or at a Canadian port of entry and about half of them received a positive response to their applications (Maytree, 2009).

Despite this reality, with the arrival of each refugee boat, the media tends to create a feeling of panic and anxiety among the public regarding the vulnerability of the Canadian immigration system, and this eventually prompts government officials to review refugee policy. For example, the Canadian media was extremely concerned with the arrival of boats carrying Tamil refugees in 1986 and Sikh refugees in 1987 to Canada. Only two years later, Bill C-55 was officially introduced creating the Immigration and Refugee Board with the goal of reducing bogus refugee claimants (Bradimore & Bauder, 2011). In 1999, the arrival of migrants from the Fujian province of China was met with similar skepticism by the Canadian media. Not long after that, in 2002, the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act was introduced (Bradimore & Bauder, 2011). Finally, on August 13, 2010, the MV Sun Sea arrived on the shores of British Columbia carrying 497 Tamil refugees. Immediately after that, on October 21, 2010, the federal government introduced Bill C-49: Preventing Human Smugglers from Abusing Canada's Immigration System Act in Parliament (Bradimore & Bauder, 2011).

The context behind the arrival of the Tamil refugees in British Columbia in 2010 is important. The 492 Tamil refugees aboard the MV Sun Sea vessel fled Sri Lanka with
the goal of escaping the bloody aftermath of a civil war that had been going on for the last twenty years. Despite the fact that the Sri Lankan civil war officially ended in May 2009, Tamils still faced the threat of violence. Because of that, many Tamils had to flee for safety (Human Rights Watch, 2010). Indeed, human rights agencies expressed extreme concern over human rights violations in Sri Lanka. In fact, concerned citizens, many of them of Tamil origin, also protested in the streets of Toronto and condemned the ongoing violence in Sri Lanka. Despite this reality, the 492 Tamil refugees received ‘a cold welcome’ from the media and the Canadian public (Bradimore & Bauder, 2011).

According to an Angus Reid poll (2010), more than half of Canadians (64%) were following the story of the arrival of the Tamil refugees in the media ‘very closely’ or ‘moderately closely’, including 72% of respondents in British Columbia. The poll also showed that 63% of Canadians thought that the ship carrying the Tamil refugees should have been sent back and not allowed to reach the Canadian shores. Eighty-three percent of Canadians also thought that the Tamil refugees were bogus and were trying to jump the immigration queue. Even under the assumption that the refugee claims were legitimate and that there were no links between the Tamil refugees and any terrorist organization, 48% of the respondents still believed that the passengers and the crew should be deported to their country of origin. Only 35% of the respondents said that the Tamil refugees should be allowed to stay in Canada as refugees.

Based on these findings, I expected that the media coverage of the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat in Canada in 2010 would include mainly negative depictions of refugees. I also expected that exposure to these articles would elicit media priming effects that would translate into the increased automatic dehumanization of refugees.
1.4 Overview

In Study 1, I conducted a media content analysis to investigate how refugees were portrayed before and after the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat to Canada in August of 2010. Based on these results, in Study 2, I investigated the effects of negative (bogus or terrorist) and neutral media depictions of refugees on the automatic and explicit dehumanization of refugees. In Study 3, I investigated the effects of negative (bogus), potentially positive (victims), and neutral media depictions of refugees on the automatic and explicit dehumanization of refugees. In Study 3, I also examined the effects of these media depictions of refugees on explicit emotions toward refugees, willingness to have contact with refugees, and attitudes toward policies that aim to support refugees. Finally, in Studies 2 and 3, I also re-examined the question of whether the automatic dehumanization of refugees is conditional on the type of categorization task (evaluative vs. conceptual).
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2 Study 1

Why are refugees automatically associated with animals in comparison to Canadians? One possible answer may lie in how refugees are depicted in the media. Through its negative depictions of refugees, the media might build and/or strengthen the mental associations of refugees with the animal concept. Two main questions were addressed in Study 1. First, I investigated how refugees are generally portrayed in Canadian newspapers. Based on previous research (Esses et al., 2008; Greenberg, 2000), I expected that refugees would be portrayed in a negative light, describing them as immoral and likely to cheat the system to claim refugee status. Second, I was interested in how a unique event – in this case, the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat to Canada in 2010 – impacted the depiction of refugees. In order to investigate this question, I examined how refugees were portrayed six months before and six months after the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat.

2.1 Method

Newspaper articles. The newspapers were selected according to their circulation and location. I selected the most highly circulated newspapers in Canada - Toronto Star and The Globe and Mail - as well as the newspapers Vancouver Sun, Calgary Herald, National Post and Ottawa Citizen to cover the major cities in Canada. The time investigated included six months before and six months after the arrival of the Tamil refugee ship to Victoria, Canada, on the 13th of August 2010. To identify all the relevant newspaper articles, I used the ProQuest Canadian Newsstand database, an extensive
online database for Canadian newspapers. Similar to Dimitrova and Stromback’s (2005) procedure, I searched for all articles and editorials that included the key term ‘refugee’ in the headline or abstract and were longer than 400 words. The search yielded a total of 95 articles for the whole period investigated (46 articles six months before and 49 articles six months after the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat): *Toronto Star* (*n* = 36), *Vancouver Sun* (*n* = 17), *National Post* (*n* = 17), *Ottawa Citizen* (*n* = 11), *Calgary Herald* (*n* = 9) and *The Globe and Mail* (*n* = 5). One article was published on the 13th of August 2010 and was included in the six months before the event period. There was no multiple coverage of the same article or editorial in the selected newspapers.

**Coding scheme.** The coding scheme consisted of four categories based on Snow and Benford (1988) and Roggeband and Vliegenthart (2007). The first category, voice/standing, refers to the source of the information and the use of specific quotes, statistics or alternatives provided in the articles. The second category, diagnosis, is concerned with the problem, causes and/or the entity being perceived to be responsible for causing the problem. The third category, prognosis, looks at the potential solutions to the problem. Finally, the fourth category, call for action, asks whether specific actions are suggested or not, who is acted on, what the boundaries of these actions are, and/or how non-action is legitimized (see also Appendix B).

**Coding procedure.** Two research assistants who were uninvolved in the selection of the articles independently coded the articles based on the questions within the four categories mentioned above (see coding scheme). Each research assistant was randomly assigned to half of the articles for the time period ‘six months before the arrival of the Tamil refugee ship’ and ‘six months after the arrival of the Tamil refugee ship’. After
coding all articles, I asked each research assistant what the common themes were based on their answers to the coding scheme. Then, we compared and discussed the results of each coder in order to decide on the final themes. Importantly, the final themes had to fulfill two criteria. First, each theme should not be too narrow to maintain relevance. Second, we aimed for a minimum overlap between themes in order to ensure their distinctiveness. After determining the final themes, the two research assistants assigned each article to the corresponding theme. Each article could be assigned to only one theme. The inter-rater reliability for assigning the articles to the specific themes was good (IR = .80; Holsti, 1969).

2.2 Results

The analyses showed that the newspapers depicted refugees in terms of four themes. Forty percent of the total number of articles corresponded to the victim theme, 29.5% to the bogus theme, 20% to the criminal/terrorist theme, and 10.5% to the legal debate theme. The articles using the ‘victim’ theme discussed refugees as having endured hardships, pointing out to the need for Canada to continue accepting refugees. In contrast, the articles using the ‘bogus’ theme portrayed refugees as false claimants who are trying to jump the queue and are clearly taking advantage of the Canadian immigration system, suggesting that the immigration system should be tightened. The articles using the ‘criminal/terrorist’ theme described refugees as having entered Canada with the help of human smugglers or associated them with terrorism. Finally, the articles using the ‘legal debate’ theme discussed possible solutions to current problems within the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act.
Descriptive results showed that in comparison to the six months before the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat, a larger percentage of the total number of newspaper articles contained the ‘victim’ theme in the six months period after their arrival (30.4% to 49%). At the same time, the criminal/terrorist theme increased from 8.7% to 30.6%, whereas the bogus (45.7% to 14.3%) and the legal debate theme (15.2% to 6.1%) decreased (see Table 1). To test whether these differences before and after the event were statistically significant, I conducted a chi-square test. The results showed that there was a significant association between newspaper frame and time period $X^2(3) = 17.52, p < .01$. The decrease in articles with the bogus frame after the event was significant (from 21 to 7, $p < .05$) and the increase in articles with the criminal frame after the event was marginally significant (from 4 to 15, $p < .10$).

These changes might be better understood when looking at the three spikes in number of articles published throughout the period investigated (see Figure 2). As expected, most articles were published in the second half of August 2010, when the Tamil refugee boat arrived to Canada. During this time, refugees, in particular Tamil refugees, were either portrayed as victims or criminals/terrorists. In fact, the majority of articles portraying refugees in criminal/terrorist terms were published during the three months after the arrival of the Tamil refugee ship. In line with these results, another spike in number of articles published was in October 2010, when the Canadian Government discussed a bill to prevent human smugglers from abusing Canada’s Immigration System. Finally, the third spike was in March 2010, before the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat. The majority of these articles portrayed refugees as ‘bogus’ and were related to the
discussion of a bill that aimed to speed up the decision-making process of deciding refugee status.
Table 1

Refugee Frames Used by the Media Six Months Before and After the Event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6 months before</th>
<th>6 months after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal/Terrorist</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogus</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Debate</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Number of articles published in the time investigated

There were also considerable variations between newspapers. In terms of newspaper coverage, the Toronto Star had the highest share. Indeed, the Toronto Star published 39% of the total number of articles before the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat
and 37% after the arrival. Interestingly, *The Globe and Mail*, the second largest newspaper in terms of circulation in Canada, had the lowest share of newspaper coverage before (7%) and after (4%) the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat, followed by the Calgary Herald with a share of 9% before and 10% after the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat. Both the *Vancouver Sun* and the *Ottawa Citizen* increased their shares after the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat, from 15% to 20%, and from 7% to 16%, respectively. Finally, the National Post reduced its share after the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat from 24% to 12% (see Figure 3).

*Figure 3.* Newspaper coverage of refugees before and after the arrival of the Tamil refugee ship

The *Toronto Star* and *Vancouver Sun* were more likely to frame refugees as victims after than before the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat. From all the articles published in the *Toronto Star*, 33.3% of the articles framed refugees as victims before the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat and 55.6% after the arrival. Similarly, from all the articles published in the *Vancouver Sun*, 42.9% of the articles framed refugees as victims before the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat and 80% after the arrival. In contrast, from all the articles published in the *National Post*, a conservative newspaper, 36.4% of the
articles framed refugees as bogus before the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat and 50% of the articles framed refugees as criminals/terrorists after the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat (see Figures 4 – 6).

Figure 4. Refugee frames before and after the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat: Toronto Star

Figure 5. Refugee frames before and after the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat: Vancouver Sun
2.3 Discussion

The aim of Study 1 was to investigate how refugees were generally portrayed in Canadian newspapers and how the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat to Canada in 2010 impacted their depiction. The results revealed that the overall portrayal of refugees in the Canadian press in response to this event was mixed. As expected, many Canadian newspapers portrayed refugees in a negative light, either as bogus or criminals/terrorists. Interestingly, the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat seemed to have an impact on these depictions. Whereas before the event refugees were more likely to be portrayed as bogus, after the event refugees were more likely to be portrayed as criminals/terrorists, being blamed for entering Canada with the help of human smugglers or even being suspected of terrorist links. However, unexpectedly, refugees were not only portrayed in negative terms. Canadian newspapers also depicted refugees as victims in need of help. This was particularly the case among newspapers such as the Toronto Star and Vancouver Sun. Finally, a small number of newspaper articles discussed legal issues about refugees.
It is interesting to note that there were substantial variations in the extent to which newspapers reported on the issue of refugee arrivals, as well as in their refugee portrayals. These variations are likely due to the different target audiences of the newspapers and their agenda setting. In addition, the geographical location might have had an impact on the news coverage, especially on the West Coast of Canada where the Tamil refugee boat arrived. For example, the Vancouver Sun reported on refugee issues to a larger extent after the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat, portraying them mainly as victims.

After establishing how refugees are generally portrayed in Canadian newspapers, I was interested in investigating in Study 2 the impact of the negative refugee depictions – as bogus or criminals/terrorists – on the automatic dehumanization of refugees.
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3 Study 2

Study 1 showed that six months before and after the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat to Canada in August 2010, the Canadian news print media portrayed refugees using three major themes: bogus, criminal/terrorist and victim. The aim of Study 2 was to investigate how two of these themes, the bogus and criminal/terrorist themes, influence the automatic and the explicit dehumanization of refugees. To this end, I asked participants to read either a bogus, terrorist or neutral (control) newspaper editorial before performing either the evaluative or conceptual priming task and completing a questionnaire to assess explicit dehumanization of refugees.

Based on the implicit social cognition model of media priming (Arendt, 2013), I predicted that participants would automatically dehumanize refugees more than Canadians in the bogus and terrorist editorial conditions, but not in the neutral editorial condition. The implicit social cognition model of media priming (Arendt, 2013) argues that the media can elicit a priming effect by temporarily increasing the accessibility of concepts in people’s minds. In particular, the model argues that the exposure to media portrayals of refugees as being bogus or terrorists will activate, strengthen and increase the accessibility of the association between these concepts and their closely related concepts (e.g., ‘animal’, see Figure 1) through spreading activation. I predicted that in the bogus and terrorist editorial conditions, the increased accessibility of the primed concepts (‘refugee’, ‘bogus’ and ‘terrorists’) would lead to increased automatic dehumanization of refugees in comparison to Canadians through the activation of related concepts (e.g.,
‘animal’). Furthermore, I predicted that the exposure to neutral media portrayals of refugees would not activate the concept ‘refugee’ in conjunction with concepts such as ‘bogus’, ‘terrorist’ and related concepts such as ‘animal’ and thus not lead to more automatic dehumanization of refugees in comparison to Canadians.

Moreover, I predicted that the newspaper editorials would have an effect on the explicit dehumanization of refugees. This prediction was based on previous research. Esses et al. (2008) examined the effect of negative media depictions on the explicit dehumanization of refugees. In particular, the researchers investigated the impact of a real newspaper editorial, which portrayed refugees as violating and cheating the immigration system, on the explicit dehumanization of refugees. Their results showed that, compared to a neutral editorial, the negative editorial led to increased explicit dehumanization of refugees.

Finally, I wanted to explore the extent to which automatic dehumanization is conditional on the type of categorization task (evaluative versus conceptual). Based on Medianu (2010), I expected that the automatic dehumanization of refugees would not be conditional on the type of categorization task.

3.1 Method

Participants and design. Sixty-four undergraduate students (40 females, 23 males, 1 unspecified) participated for course credit. Participants’ ages ranged from 17 to 42 (M = 20.21, SD = 4.65). The small sample size in this study was due to unusually low participant sign-ups in our department in the year in which this study was conducted. The experiment consisted of a 3 (editorial content: terrorist, bogus or neutral) x 3 (prime:
refugee, Canadian, or no prime) x 2 (targets: human pictures or animal pictures) x 2 (target valence: positive or negative) x 2 (target categorization task: human/animal or positive/negative) mixed model design, with prime, target, and target valence as within-subject factors and editorial content and target categorization task as between-subjects factors.

**Procedure and measures.** Participants were asked to participate in a study about “current affairs” and were randomly assigned to read one of the three newspaper editorials that were specifically designed for the purposes of this experiment (see Appendix D). The editorials all discussed the anticipated arrival of a fictitious refugee group by boat to the east coast of Canada. I decided to use a fictitious refugee group in order to make sure that the previous knowledge of participants about refugee groups would not contaminate the results of the study. In particular, the “bogus” editorial raised the question of whether this refugee group should be sent home before reaching the Canadian coast, arguing that many refugees seek protection even if they are clearly not at risk and engage in illegal activities to overcome the ordinary immigration system. The “terrorist” editorial raised the serious concern that terrorist leaders may be among the refugees on the boat and aim to set up a terror-based government-in-waiting in Canada and “even import their civil war into Canada”. Both the bogus and the terrorist editorial were based on real editorials depicting the arrival of the Tamil refugees to Canada. Finally, the “neutral” editorial provided a factual description of today’s refugees to Canada. After reading the editorials, participants were asked several filler questions as well as questions about the main argument to ensure that participants actually read and understood the editorials.
Next, participants completed either an evaluative or a conceptual priming task adopted, respectively, from Fazio et al. (1995) and from Wittenbrink et al. (1997). Similar to Medianu (2010), the evaluative and conceptual priming paradigms were chosen in order to be able to differentiate the extent to which participants automatically associate refugees to negative valence and Canadians to positive valence (automatic evaluation) as well as to differentiate the extent to which participants automatically associate refugees to animals and Canadians to humans (automatic dehumanization). Moreover, the evaluative and conceptual priming paradigm were chosen over the IAT paradigm to avoid any bias resulting from participants’ deliberate efforts to influence their responses (Czellar, 2006; Dasgupta et al., 2000).

In both conditions, the evaluative priming task condition and the conceptual priming task condition, participants were told that the purpose of the experiment was to investigate how people categorize pictures. First, all participants were exposed to sixteen practice trials with no preceding primes. In these practice trials the participants who performed the evaluative priming task were asked to indicate whether a given picture was positive or negative and pressed the left key as fast as possible if the picture was negative and pressed the right key if the picture was positive. The participants who performed the conceptual priming task were asked to indicate whether the same picture represented an animal or a human and pressed the left key as fast as possible if the picture was an animal and pressed the right key if the picture was human. The human pictures included pictures showing the upper body and face of either a white man or a white woman and varied in their valence. The positive human pictures included the emotions of happiness and pride, and the negative human pictures included the emotions of sadness and anger (for the
source of the pictures see Tracy et al., 2009). The animal pictures were pictures of insects and mammals and also varied in their valence. The positive animal pictures included a baby seal, a butterfly, a dragonfly, and a ladybug, and the negative animal pictures included a rat, a cockroach, worms, and a fly (see also Appendix E). These animal pictures were selected based on a pilot study for my Master’s thesis and were utilized in that research as well. The pilot assessed the perceived valence of various animal pictures and I then selected one mammal and three insect pictures that received appropriate ratings for each of the positive and negative categories. During the practice trials, each picture was presented once. Each practice trial started with a warning signal (+++) for 500 ms, followed by a blank screen for 200 ms. Then the picture was presented at the centre of the computer screen. The distance from the participants’ eyes to the centre of the screen was approximately 55 cm.

After the practice trials, participants were exposed to the critical trials with the primes. The primes included the word refugee, Canadian and a no prime condition. The primes appeared in bold 30 point Arial font letters in bright yellow colors on a black background (e.g., Deutsch, Gawronski & Strack, 2006). Following in part Judd, Blair, and Chapleau’s (2004) version of sequential priming, participants first viewed a fixation point (+++) for 500 ms. A prime then appeared for 200 ms, followed by a picture of a target object. Thus, the stimulus-onset asynchrony (the delay between the display onset of the prime and the target) was 200 ms. The inter-trial interval was 1000 ms. Each prime was paired three times with each picture (3x16x3 = 144 trials). Reaction times to categorize pictures preceded by primes or no primes were recorded. For a schematic description of the sequential priming procedure please see Tables 2 and 3.
Finally, once participants completed the sequential priming tasks, they were asked to complete the enemy/barbarian measure of dehumanization used previously by Esses et al. (2008). The reason why I decided to use this scale instead of simply asking participants whether refugees are like animals was because I was concerned that such a measure would be too blatant. The enemy/barbarian scale of explicit dehumanization consisted of twelve items that were rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). A sample item is ‘Refugees would take advantage of any efforts on our part to cooperate, and they would even try to exploit us’. The scale computed as the average of the items had very good internal consistency (Cronbach’s α = .93).
Table 2
*Sequential Priming Procedure – Practice Trials*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Screen</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Categorization Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(+++)</td>
<td>500 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blank screen</td>
<td>200 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exposure to a picture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e.g., animal, negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Evaluative condition: Negative or Positive?</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual condition: Animal or Human?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>1000 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(+++)</td>
<td>500 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blank screen</td>
<td>200 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e.g., animal, positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Evaluative condition: Negative or Positive?</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual condition: Animal or Human?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>1000 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(+++)</td>
<td>500 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blank screen</td>
<td>200 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e.g., human, negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Evaluative condition: Negative or Positive?</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual condition: Animal or Human?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>1000 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(+++)</td>
<td>500 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blank screen</td>
<td>200 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e.g., human, positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Evaluative condition: Negative or Positive?</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual condition: Animal or Human?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>1000 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

etc. ... until all 16 pictures have been randomly presented once.
### Table 3
**Sequential Priming Procedure – Critical Trials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Screen</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Categorization Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(+++)</td>
<td>500 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prime:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e.g., Refugee</td>
<td>200 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exposure to a picture</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e.g., animal, negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>1000 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(+++)</td>
<td>500 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prime:</td>
<td>e.g., Canadian</td>
<td>200 ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e.g., animal, positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>1000 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(+++)</td>
<td>500 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prime:</td>
<td>e.g., Blank screen</td>
<td>200 ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e.g., human, negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>1000 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(+++)</td>
<td>500 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prime:</td>
<td>e.g., Canadian</td>
<td>200 ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e.g., human, positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>1000 ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... until all 16 pictures have been randomly presented three times with each prime (3x16x3 = 144 trials in total).

### 3.2 Results

**Manipulation check.** Based on analyses by two independent raters, I found that all sixty-four participants were able to correctly state the main argument of the editorials. That is,
participants in the bogus editorial condition were able to correctly state that the editorial was about the arrival of a refugee boat to Canada and that the editorial claimed that the refugees on the boat were bogus. Participants in the terrorist editorial condition were able to correctly state that the editorial was about the arrival of a refugee boat to Canada and that the editorial claimed that the refugees on the boat had terrorist links. Finally, participants in the neutral editorial condition were able to correctly state that the editorial was about the arrival of a refugee boat to Canada and about refugees in Canada in general. Overall, these results suggest that the manipulation was successful.

Data aggregation for automatic dehumanization and automatic evaluation. The focus of the analysis was on the participants’ reaction times to the 144 trials in which word primes (refugee, Canadian, or no prime) were immediately followed by picture targets (animal, human, positive or negative). In order to analyze the data, I first excluded the reaction times for error trials (incorrect categorization of the targets; less than 5% of all responses) and the reaction times outside the 300 – 1000 ms time interval (less than 5% of all responses). Next, based on the valid reaction times of the participants to the targets I calculated scores for automatic dehumanization and automatic evaluation as follows.

First, to assess dehumanization, I calculated the facilitation scores, that is, the difference in reaction time (RT) responses to the same target as a function of primes. The facilitation scores were calculated as follows: Refugee-Animal Association = RT (no prime, animal) – RT (Refugee, animal); Canadian-Animal Association = RT (no prime, animal) – RT (Canadian, animal); Refugee-Human Association = RT (no prime, human) – RT (Refugee, human); and Canadian-Human Association = RT (no prime, human) –
RT (Canadian, human). Next, I calculated the dehumanization scores, that is, the difference between animal facilitation scores (subsequently referred to as animal associations) and human facilitation scores (subsequently referred to as human associations). Specifically, I calculated two separate dehumanization scores depending on whether the prime ‘refugee’ or the prime ‘Canadian’ was used. The dehumanization scores were calculated as follows: Refugee Dehumanization = Refugee-Animal Association – Refugee-Human Association; Canadian Dehumanization = Canadian-Animal Association – Canadian-Human Association. By calculating the scores for Refugee Dehumanization, I was able to determine the extent to which the prime refugee facilitated participants’ reaction to the animal target vs. the human target. If people had a stronger mental association between refugees and animals, then the prime refugee should have facilitated the participants’ reaction to the animal targets more than to the human targets. By calculating the score for the Canadian Dehumanization category, I was able to determine the extent to which the prime Canadian facilitated the participants’ reaction to the animal targets vs. human targets. If people had a stronger mental association between Canadians and animals, then the prime Canadian should have facilitated the participants’ reaction to the animal targets more than to the human targets. For a schematic description of these calculations please see Tables 4 and 5.
Table 4
*Formula for the Calculation of the Automatic Dehumanization of Refugees*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refugee-Animal Association</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>Average RT for all trials with...</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Average RT for all trials with...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(++)</td>
<td>Prime: Blank Screen</td>
<td>(++)</td>
<td>Prime: Refugee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All animal pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td>All animal pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(++)</td>
<td>Prime: Blank Screen</td>
<td>(++)</td>
<td>Prime: Refugee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All human pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td>All human pictures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refugee Dehumanization = Refugee-Animal Association - Refugee-Human Association
### Table 5

*Formula for the Calculation of the Automatic Dehumanization of Canadians*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canadian-Animal Association</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>Average RT for all trials with…</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Average RT for all trials with…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(+++)&lt;br&gt;Prime: Blank Screen&lt;br&gt;All animal pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td>(+++)&lt;br&gt;Prime: Canadian&lt;br&gt;All animal pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian-Human Association</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Average RT for all trials with…</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Average RT for all trials with…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(+++)&lt;br&gt;Prime: Blank Screen&lt;br&gt;All human pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td>(+++)&lt;br&gt;Prime: Canadian&lt;br&gt;All human pictures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Canadian Dehumanization} = \text{Canadian-Animal Association} - \text{Canadian-Human Association} \]
The valence scores were calculated in a similar way to the dehumanization scores. The Refugee Valence scores and Canadian Valence scores were calculated as follows:

Refugee Valence = [RT (no prime/negative – refugee/negative) – RT (no prime/positive - refugee/positive)]; Canadian Valence = [RT (no prime/negative – Canadian/negative) – RT (no prime/positive – Canadian/positive)]. By calculating the scores for Refugee Valence, I was able to determine the extent to which the prime refugee facilitated the reaction to the negative targets vs. the positive targets. If people have a stronger mental association between refugees and negative valence, then the prime refugee should facilitate the participants’ reaction to the negative targets more than to the positive targets. By calculating the scores for Canadian Valence, I was able to determine the extent to which the prime Canadian facilitated the reaction to the negative targets vs. positive targets. If people have a stronger mental association between Canadians and negative valence, then the prime Canadian should facilitate the participants’ reaction to negative targets more than to positive targets. For a schematic description of these calculations please see Tables 6 and 7.

Please note that the automatic dehumanization and the automatic evaluation scores are based on facilitation scores. That is, they are based on calculations that indicate the extent to which a prime facilitated a participant’s reaction to an animal or a human picture or to a negative or a positive picture. However, in the following pages I will use the terms automatic dehumanization and automatic evaluation without explicitly referring to the facilitation scores. For example, I will talk about the extent to which the primes (‘refugee’ and ‘Canadian’) were associated with animals or humans instead of talking about the extent to which the primes (‘refugee’ and ‘Canadian’) facilitated the
categorization of animal pictures as ‘animal’ and the categorization of human pictures as ‘human’.

Finally, please note that regardless of the fact that half of the participants performed the conceptual task and the other half of the participants performed the evaluative task, all participants have, based on the calculations mentioned above, scores reflecting automatic dehumanization and automatic evaluation. This is because all participants were exposed to the same primes (no prime, refugee or Canadian) and targets (positive human picture, negative human picture, positive animal picture or negative animal picture). The purpose of the different tasks was to see whether automatic dehumanization is conditional on the nature of the task.
### Table 6

#### Formula for the Calculation of the Automatic Evaluation of Refugees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refugee-Negative Association</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>Average RT for all trials with…</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Average RT for all trials with…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+++)</td>
<td>Prime: Blank Screen</td>
<td>(+++)</td>
<td>Prime: Refugee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All negative pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td>All negative pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee-Positive Association</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Average RT for all trials with…</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Average RT for all trials with…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+++)</td>
<td>Prime: Blank Screen</td>
<td>(+++)</td>
<td>Prime: Refugee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All positive pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td>All positive pictures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

=> **Refugee Evaluation** = Refugee-Negative Association - Refugee-Positive Association
### Table 7

**Formula for the Calculation of the Automatic Evaluation of Canadians**

- **Canadian-Negative Association**
  
  \[
  \text{Canadian - Negative Association} = \frac{\text{Average RT for all trials with...}}{\text{Average RT for all trials with...}}
  \]

  ![Negative pictures](image)

- **Canadian-Positive Association**
  
  \[
  \text{Canadian - Positive Association} = \frac{\text{Average RT for all trials with...}}{\text{Average RT for all trials with...}}
  \]

  ![Positive pictures](image)

  

  \[\text{Canadian Evaluation} = \text{Canadian-Negative Association} - \text{Canadian-Positive Association}\]
**Automatic dehumanization.** One of the main goals of this study was to examine the influence of the three different editorials on the automatic dehumanization of refugees and Canadians. Also, similar to my Master’s thesis (Medianu, 2010), this study aimed to examine whether automatic dehumanization was conditional on the type of categorization task. To this end, I conducted a 3 (type of editorial: bogus, terrorist or neutral) x 2 (target group: refugees or Canadians) x 2 (type of categorization task: conceptual or evaluative) mixed model ANOVA, with target group as a within-subject factor and type of editorial and type of categorization task as between-subjects factors. The analyses revealed a main effect of target group on automatic dehumanization, $F(1,58) = 8.74, p = .004, \eta_p^2 = .13$. Participants automatically dehumanized refugees ($M = 11.20, SD = 44.36$) more than Canadians ($M = -2.41, SD = 44.95$; see Figure 7). Furthermore, the mean for refugee dehumanization was significantly different from zero, $t(63) = 1.73, p = .04$, while the mean for Canadian dehumanization was not significantly different from zero, $t(63) = -.42, p = .34$. In other words, refugees were automatically associated with animals more than with humans. This main effect was qualified by a significant interaction between target group and type of editorial, $F(2,58) = 3.67, p = .03, \eta_p^2 = .11$. Pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni adjustment showed that participants automatically dehumanized refugees more than Canadians only after reading the bogus, $F(1,58) = 5.88, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = .09$, and the terrorist editorial, $F(1,58) = 8.93, p = .004, \eta_p^2 = .13$, but not the neutral editorial, $F(1,58) = .20, p = .66, \eta_p^2 = .003$; see Figure 8. While Figure 8 shows an apparent increase in automatic Canadian dehumanization in the neutral condition, the analysis reveals that the values for automatic Canadian dehumanization do not significantly differ across conditions, $F(2,58) = 1.32, p = .28, \eta_p^2 = .04$. Finally, in the
bogus and terrorist conditions, the refugee dehumanization scores were marginally significantly different from zero, bogus: \( t(19) = 1.37, p = .09 \) and terrorist: \( t(19) = 1.53, p = .07 \), whereas in the neutral condition, the refugee dehumanization score was not significantly different from zero, \( t(23) = .26, p = .40 \).

Further, the analyses revealed a main effect of categorization task, \( F(1,58) = 9.27, p = .004, \eta_p^2 = .14 \). Participants performing the evaluative categorization task (\( M = 19.30, SD = 35.98 \)) showed more dehumanization across both refugees and Canadians than participants performing the conceptual categorization task (\( M = -10.51, SD = 39.33 \)). The interaction between target group and categorization task was not significant, \( F(1, 58) = .05, p = .82, \eta_p^2 = .001 \). This means that participants dehumanized refugees more than Canadians regardless of the type of categorization task. Finally, there was no three-way interaction between editorial content, target group and categorization task, \( F(2, 58) = 1.52, p = .23, \eta_p^2 = .05 \), indicating that the effects of the editorials on refugee dehumanization were not conditional on the categorization task.
**Figure 7.** Automatic dehumanization for each target group. Higher values indicate more dehumanization. The value zero refers to the following equations: Refugee-Animal Association – Refugee-Human Association = 0 or Canadian-Animal Association – Canadian-Human Association = 0. The symbol * within a bar refers to the bar being significantly different from zero. The symbol ** between two bars refers to a significant difference between the two bars. ** p < .01, * p < .05

**Figure 8.** Automatic dehumanization for each target group and type of editorial. Higher values indicate more dehumanization. The value zero refers to the following equations: Refugee-Animal Association – Refugee-Human Association = 0 or Canadian-Animal Association – Canadian-Human Association = 0. The symbol † within a bar refers to the
bar being marginally significantly different from zero. The symbol ** between two bars refers to a significant difference between the two bars. ** $p < .01$, † $p < .10$

**Automatic evaluation.** To examine the influence of the three editorials on the automatic evaluation of refugees and Canadians, and to test whether automatic evaluation is conditional on the type of categorization task, I conducted a 3 (type of editorial: bogus, terrorist, or neutral) x 2 (target group: refugees or Canadians) x 2 (type of categorization task: conceptual or evaluative) mixed-model ANOVA, with target group as a within-subject factor and type of editorial and type of categorization task as between-subjects factors. The results showed that participants did not significantly associate more negative valence to refugees ($M = 11.77$, $SD = 53.24$) than to Canadians ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 49.12$), $F(1,58) = 1.77$, $p = .19$, $\eta^2_p = .03$. Also, the editorials (bogus, terrorist, or neutral) did not significantly influence the automatic evaluation of either target group, $F(2,58) = .16$, $p = .85$, $\eta^2_p = .005$. Further, the analyses revealed a significant main effect of task on automatic evaluation, $F(1,58) = 5.25$, $p = .03$, $\eta^2_p = .08$. Participants performing the conceptual categorization task ($M = 20.52$, $SD = 38.72$) associated more negative valence to refugees and Canadians than participants performing the evaluative categorization task ($M = -5.26$, $SD = 49.02$). Finally, there was no significant interaction between target group and categorization task, $F(1,58) = .10$, $p = .76$, $\eta^2_p = .002$, and no significant three-way interaction between type of editorial, target group, and categorization task, $F(2,58) = .46$, $p = .63$, $\eta^2_p = .02$.

**Explicit dehumanization.** Overall, participants reported higher than mid-scale levels of explicit dehumanization of refugees ($M = 4.94$, $SD = 1.18$). However, there was no main effect of type of editorial on explicit dehumanization of refugees, $F(2,59) = .64$,
Explicit dehumanization of refugees did not correlate with automatic dehumanization or automatic evaluation of refugees, \( r(60) = -.01, \text{n.s.} \), and \( r(60) = .01, \text{n.s.} \); see also Table 8. Also, automatic dehumanization of refugees was not correlated with automatic evaluation of refugees \( r(62) = -.06, \text{n.s.} \).

Table 8
Correlations Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Automatic dehumanization of refugees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Automatic dehumanization of Canadians</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Automatic evaluation of refugees</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Automatic evaluation of Canadians</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Explicit dehumanization of refugees</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* **\( p < .01 \)

### 3.3 Discussion

Study 2 showed that after exposure to the bogus and terrorist editorials, which were based on real editorials that appeared in Canadian newspapers in 2010, refugees were more likely to be automatically associated with animals than with humans and were more likely to be automatically dehumanized than Canadians. In contrast, there was no significant difference in automatic dehumanization between refugees and Canadians when participants first read a neutral article. These results suggest that media depictions of refugees as either bogus or terrorist may increase the strength of the automatic association between refugees and the animal concept. According to the implicit social cognition model of media priming (Arendt, 2013), one explanation for the impact of the bogus and terrorist editorials on the automatic dehumanization of refugees could be that both editorials activate mental concepts that are closely related to the ‘animal’ concept, such as a lack of civility and morality. Indeed, Haslam (2006) suggests that an important way in which others may be denied full humanness is in an animalistic sense in which
they are seen as not having risen above their animal origins, that is, as less than human. Media depictions of refugees as bogus may activate concepts associated with a lack of civility and morality which in turn may activate the animal concept and lead to automatic dehumanization.

Furthermore, the results showed that reading the editorials did not impact the automatic evaluation of refugees. This is an important finding because it contradicts another possible explanation for why both negative editorials – the bogus and terrorist editorials – led to the automatic dehumanization of refugees. One might prematurely assume that the negative valence, and not the specific content of these two editorials, is responsible for their influence on automatic dehumanization. However, if this were the case, the negative editorials should have, compared to the neutral editorial, also influenced the automatic evaluation of refugees. Overall, these results support the notion that the media’s depiction of refugees as bogus and terrorists increases the automatic association between the concepts ‘refugee’ and ‘animal’. It also confirms the distinction between negative attitudes and dehumanization per se.

The different editorials did not have an effect on the explicit dehumanization of refugees. Instead, participants reported relatively high levels of explicit dehumanization across all editorials. This is inconsistent with previous research which found that participants explicitly dehumanized refugees more after reading an article depicting refugees as immoral individuals who are trying to cheat the system than after reading an article depicting refugees in neutral terms (Esses et al., 2008). However, an important difference between these two studies is the extent to which participants endorsed explicit dehumanization. In the present study, participants reported higher explicit
dehumanization values across conditions than did participants in Esses et al.’s study. Thus, in the present study, the values of explicit dehumanization may have been too high to be influenced by the different types of editorials.

In the current study, an explanation for the discrepancy between the effects of the different types of editorials on the automatic and explicit measures of dehumanization could be a lack of conceptual correspondence between the two measures (Hofmann, Gawronski, Gschwender, Le & Schmitt, 2005). Whereas automatic dehumanization of refugees reflects the automatic association between the concepts ‘refugee’ and ‘animal’, the explicit dehumanization of refugees refers to explicit judgments about the extent to which participants believe that refugees engage in enemy/barbarian acts (Alexander et al., 1999). In order to establish a better conceptual correspondence between the two measures, one may have to ask participants to what extent they think that ‘refugees are more like animals than Canadians’. However, as discussed earlier, participants may disagree with such a statement due to self-presentational concerns (Nosek, 2005) and/or participants may disagree with such a statement based on their own explicit beliefs despite the activation of the refugee-animal association (Devine, 1989).

It is important to note that neither the implicitly assessed automatic association between the concepts ‘refugee’ and ‘animal’ nor the explicit refugee dehumanization should be considered sole ‘true’ attitudes (Gawronski, 2009). Indeed, one is the ‘true spontaneous attitude’ while the other is the ‘true deliberate attitude’. In other words, the automatic dehumanization of refugees and the explicit dehumanization of refugees reflect different processes (Fazio, 1990; Gawronski & Bodenhausen, 2006; Strack & Deutsch,
2004). The first one is the outcome of a spontaneous, automatic process, whereas the other one is the outcome of a more deliberate process.

Although there was no automatic dehumanization of refugees in comparison to Canadians in the neutral editorial condition, the results showed an unexpected tendency for participants to also dehumanize Canadians. To clarify this unexpected result, Study 3 included two changes: the addition of a second control condition and a significant increase in the sample size. First, I wanted to examine whether a neutral editorial about refugees has the same effect on the automatic dehumanization of refugees as an editorial with unrelated content to refugees. Second, Study 2 had a relatively small sample size and low statistical power and thus raised the question of whether the study’s significant results reflected true effects (Button et al., 2013).

Finally, the results of this study showed that the automatic dehumanization of refugees is not conditional on the type of categorization task. Participants automatically dehumanized refugees more than Canadians regardless of whether they were asked to categorize the pictures as humans versus animals or as positive versus negative. This replicates the findings of my Master’s Thesis (Medianu, 2010). The results for the automatic evaluation scores were less clear. First, unexpectedly, participants did not automatically attribute more negative valence to refugees in comparison to Canadians. Second, participants associated more negative valence to both groups (refugees and Canadians) when they were asked to categorize pictures as humans versus animals than when they were asked to categorize pictures as positive versus negative.
Chapter 4

4 Study 3

Besides clarifying the pattern of results in the neutral editorial condition, the aim of Study 3 was to explore another important question. Can a media editorial depicting refugees as victims decrease automatic dehumanization? Based on the results of Study 1, which showed that Canadian newspapers also portray refugees as victims, I considered it important to investigate the impact of an editorial depicting refugees as victims on automatic dehumanization. The prediction for such a manipulation is not clear-cut. On the one hand, Study 2 showed that a neutral depiction of refugees did not activate automatic dehumanization of refugees in comparison to Canadians. Thus, I might predict that a victim editorial would similarly not activate the automatic dehumanization of refugees. On the other hand, very little research has investigated the extent to which dehumanization can be reduced (Haslam & Loughnan, 2014). Indeed, the reduction of dehumanization may prove to be a complicated process. There are several reasons for this. First, dehumanization may have a long history shaped by enduring stereotypes and intergroup relations. Second, the dehumanized perceptions of other groups are many times unconscious and automatic. Third, dehumanization may be the product of strong motives and biases such as the desire to protect ingroup identity (Koval, Laham, Haslam, Bastian & Whelan, 2012) and self-image (Greenwald, 1980) against threats. Thus, an editorial depicting refugees as victims might not counteract such effects and reduce dehumanization.
Overall, then, in Study 3, first I aimed to test whether the effects of the bogus and neutral editorials on automatic dehumanization shown in Study 2 would replicate, to test the effects of the victim editorial, and to add an additional control editorial with content entirely unrelated to refugees. In Study 3, I decided to focus on the bogus editorial and not on the terrorist editorial because the bogus depiction of refugees seems to be ongoing and is relatively consistent across refugee groups coming to Canada whereas the terrorist depiction is more focused on specific refugee groups. The addition of a second control editorial was to see whether an editorial with unrelated content to refugees would have the same effect on the automatic dehumanization of refugees as a neutral editorial about refugees. Second, I aimed to examine the effect of the editorials on explicit dehumanization, as well as on participants’ explicitly expressed emotions toward refugees, willingness to have contact with refugees, and attitudes toward policies that aim to support refugees. Finally, I wanted to confirm with a larger sample the extent to which automatic dehumanization is not conditional on the type of categorization task (evaluative versus conceptual).

4.1 Method

Participants and design. Three hundred twenty-one undergraduate students (197 females, 122 males, 2 unspecified) took part in the study in exchange for course credit. Participants’ ages ranged from 17 to 32 ($M = 18.83, SD = 1.78$). The experiment consisted of a 4 (type of editorial: victim, bogus, neutral, or control) x 3 (prime: refugee, Canadian, or no prime) x 2 (targets: human pictures or animal pictures) x 2 (target valence: positive or negative) x 2 (target categorization task: conceptual or evaluative)
mixed model design, with prime, target, and target valence as within-subject factors and type of editorial and target categorization task as between-subjects factors.

**Procedure and measures.** As in Study 2, participants were randomly assigned to read one of the four newspaper editorials that were specifically designed for the purposes of this experiment (see Appendix D). Three editorials (victim, bogus and neutral) discussed the anticipated arrival of a fictitious refugee group by boat to the east coast of Canada and one editorial (control) discussed a scientific expedition to the Canadian glaciers without mentioning refugees at all. The three editorials about the arrival of the fictitious refugee group to Canada, however, differed in their specific portrayal of the refugee group. The “victim” editorial told the story of a mother of two who was forced to leave her home country in order to protect her children. The editorial described the horrible conditions during their journey on the boat and the shock they experienced upon their arrival to Canada when they were held in custody by Canadian authorities. The “bogus” editorial was the same as in Study 2. Both the bogus and the victim editorials were based on real editorials depicting refugees (Newark, 2010; Quan, 2010). Finally, as in Study 2, the “neutral” editorial provided a factual description of today’s refugees in Canada.

After reading the editorials, participants were asked several filler questions as well as questions about the main argument to ensure that participants had actually read and understood the editorials. Third, participants completed the sequential priming task as in Study 2. Finally, participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire to assess their emotions towards refugees, the degree to which they explicitly dehumanize refugees,
their willingness to have contact with refugees, and their support for policies that aim to help refugees (see also Appendix G).

To assess positive and negative emotions toward refugees, participants were asked to indicate on a 7-point Likert scale how often they had felt 21 emotions when thinking about refugees (1 = never to 7 = always; Batson et al., 1997; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick & Xu 2002). Emotions included, for example, ‘angry’ or ‘compassionate’. Overall, both positive and negative emotion scales computed as the average of the positive and negative emotions had very good internal consistencies (positive emotions: Cronbach’s α = .93 and negative emotions: Cronbach’s α = .93). Explicit dehumanization was measured exactly as in Study 2. The scale had very good internal consistency (Cronbach’s α = .92).

To measure participant’s willingness to have contact with refugees, participants were asked to rate a list of 12 statements regarding potential behaviours toward refugees (Esses & Dovidio, 2002). For each statement, participants indicated their willingness to perform the behaviour on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not at all willing to 7 = extremely willing). The following are sample items: ‘If given the opportunity, I would be willing to have a refugee person as a close friend’ and ‘If given the opportunity, I would accept a refugee person as a work colleague’. The scale computed as the average of the items had very good internal consistency (Cronbach’s α = .96).

Policy attitudes were measured using six items on 7-point Likert scales (Cottrell, Richards & Nichols, 2010; Esses et al., 2008; Verkuyten, 2004). For example, participants were asked ‘Do you agree or disagree that refugees to Canada should be
encouraged?’ with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 7 ‘strongly agree’ and ‘How much would you support a government action that deports refugees from Canada?’ with 1 being ‘no support at all’ and 7 ‘total support’. Where appropriate, items were recoded so that an average score was calculated with higher values reflecting more positive attitudes toward policies that aim to support refugees (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .83$).

### 4.2 Results

**Manipulation check.** In total, 262 participants out of 321 participants (81.6%) were able to correctly state the main argument of the editorials. The remaining participants either suspected that the editorials were not real or were not able to correctly state the main argument of the editorials. Thus they were excluded from subsequent analyses. The reason why more participants failed to correctly state the main argument of the editorials in this study compared to Study 2 could be that a number of the participants signed up for participation just before the end of the term with the main goal to collect the required course credits and thus did not pay close attention to the materials.

**Data aggregation.** The scores for the automatic dehumanization and evaluation of refugees and Canadians were computed as in Study 2.

**Automatic dehumanization.** One of the main goals of Study 3 was to examine the influence of the four different editorials on the automatic dehumanization of refugees. Furthermore, similar to Study 2, Study 3 aimed to examine whether the automatic dehumanization of refugees was conditional on the type of categorization task. To this end, I conducted a $4 \times 2 \times 2$ ANOVA with the factors type of editorial (victim, bogus, neutral or control) and target group (refugees or Canadians) as between-participants factors and type of categorization task (conceptual or evaluative) as a within-participants factor.
mixed model ANOVA with target group as a within-subject factor and type of editorial and type of categorization task as between-subjects factors.

The analyses revealed a main effect of target group on automatic dehumanization, $F(1,254) = 27.87, p = .00, \eta^2_p = .10$. Participants automatically dehumanized refugees ($M = 8.18, SD = 47.65$) more than Canadians ($M = -6.42, SD = 45.55$; see Figure 9). Furthermore, the mean for refugee dehumanization and the mean for Canadian dehumanization were both significantly different from zero, $t(261) = 2.77, p = .003$, and $t(261) = -2.63, p = .005$. In particular, refugees were automatically associated with animals more than with humans and Canadians were automatically associated with humans more than with animals. This main effect was qualified by a significant interaction between target group and type of editorial, $F(3,254) = 2.88, p = .04, \eta^2_p = .03$.

Pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni adjustment showed that participants automatically dehumanized refugees more than Canadians only after reading the victim, $F(1,254) = 23.46, p = .00, \eta^2_p = .09$ and the bogus editorials, $F(1,254) = 13.01, p = .00, \eta^2_p = .05$, but not after reading the neutral editorial, $F(1,254) = 1.72, p = .19, \eta^2_p = .01$ and the control editorial, $F(1,254) = 1.22, p = .27, \eta^2_p = .01$ (see Figure 10). Furthermore, in the victim and in the bogus editorial conditions, the means for refugee and Canadian dehumanization were significantly or marginally significantly different from zero, with refugees more likely to be associated with animals than humans and Canadians more likely to be associated with humans than animals, victim: $t(68) = 1.96, p = .03$ and $t(68) = -2.18, p = .02$, bogus: $t(73) = 1.42, p = .08$ and $t(73) = -1.75, p = .04$. In contrast, in the neutral and control conditions, these differences from zero were not significant: neutral
refugees: \( t(50) = .94, p = .18 \) and neutral Canadians: \( t(50) = -.73, p = .24 \), control refugees: \( t(67) = 1.03, p = .15 \) and control Canadians: \( t(67) = -.28, p = .40 \).

The analyses also revealed a main effect of categorization task, \( F(1,254) = 24.76, p = .00, \eta^2_p = .09 \). Participants performing the evaluative categorization task (\( M = 13.12, SD = 41.71 \)) showed more automatic dehumanization across both refugees and Canadians than participants performing the conceptual categorization task (\( M = -11.36, SD = 36.23 \)). The interaction between target group and categorization task was not significant, \( F(1, 254) = 1.98, p = .16, \eta^2_p = .01 \). This means that participants dehumanized refugees more than Canadians regardless of the type of categorization task. Finally, there was no significant three-way interaction between type of editorial, target group and categorization task, \( F(3, 254) = 1.80, p = .15, \eta^2_p = .02 \), indicating that the effects of the editorials on the automatic dehumanization of refugees were not conditional on the categorization task.
Figure 9. Automatic dehumanization for each target group. Higher values indicate more dehumanization. The value zero refers to the following equations: Refugee-Animal Association – Refugee-Human Association = 0 or Canadian-Animal Association – Canadian-Human Association = 0. The symbol ** within a bar refers to the bar being significantly different from zero. The symbol ** between two bars refers to a significant difference between the two bars. ** p < .01.

Figure 10. Automatic dehumanization for each target group and type of editorial. Higher values indicate more dehumanization. The value zero refers to the following equations: Refugee-Animal Association – Refugee-Human Association = 0 or Canadian-Animal Association – Canadian-Human Association = 0. The symbols * and † within a bar refer to the bar being significantly or marginally significantly different from zero. The symbol
** between two bars refers to a significant difference between the two bars. ** p < .01, * p < .05, † p < .10

**Automatic evaluation.** To examine the influence of the four editorials on the automatic evaluation of refugees and Canadians, and to test whether automatic evaluation is conditional on the type of categorization task, I conducted a 4 (type of editorial: victim, bogus, neutral or control) x 2 (target group: refugees or Canadians) x 2 (type of categorization task: conceptual or evaluative) mixed-model ANOVA, with target group as a within-subject factor and type of editorial and type of categorization task as between-subject factors. The results showed that participants significantly associated more negative valence to refugees (M = 5.49, SD = 41.60) than to Canadians (M = -.06, SD = 46.69), F(1,254) = 3.98, p = .05, $\eta_p^2 = .02$ (see Figure 11). Furthermore, the mean for refugee evaluation was significantly different from zero, $t(261) = 2.39, p = .01$, while the mean for Canadian evaluation was not significantly different from zero, $t(261) = .09, p = .47$. In other words, refugees were automatically associated with negative valence more than with positive valence. The different editorials (victim, bogus, neutral and control) did not significantly influence the automatic evaluation of either target group, $F(3,254) = 1.92, p = .13, \eta_p^2 = .02$. 
Figure 11. Automatic evaluation for each target group. Higher values indicate more negative valence. The value zero refers to the following equations: Refugee-Negative Association – Refugee-Positive Association = 0 or Canadian-Negative Association – Canadian-Positive Association = 0. The symbol ** within a bar refers to the bar being significantly different from zero. The symbol * between two bars refers to a significant difference between the two bars. * p < .05, ** p < .01.

The analyses also revealed a significant main effect of categorization task on automatic evaluation, $F(1,254) = 13.59, p = .00, \eta^2_p = .05$. Participants performing the evaluative categorization task ($M = -5.57, SD = 39.94$) associated less negative valence to both groups than participants performing the conceptual categorization task ($M = -11.32, SD = 33.80$). This main effect was qualified by a significant interaction between task and target group, $F(1,254) = 17.70, p = .00, \eta^2_p = .07$ (see Figure 12). Participants associated more negative valence to refugees ($M = 2.79, SD = 45.58$) than to Canadians ($M = -14.44, SD = 48.48$) when performing the evaluative categorization task, $F(1,254) = 18.28, p = .00, \eta^2_p = .07$, but not the conceptual categorization task (refugees: $M = 8.18, SD = 37.56$ and Canadians: $M = 14.33, SD = 40.37$), $F(1,254) = 2.58, p = .11, \eta^2_p = .01$. In addition, the difference in automatic evaluation of Canadians across categorization tasks was significant, $F(1,254) = 26.67, p = .00, \eta^2_p = .10$. Participants associated more negative
valence to Canadians in the conceptual categorization task condition ($M = 14.33, SD = 40.37$) than in the evaluative categorization task condition ($M = -14.44, SD = 48.48$). Finally, there was no significant three-way interaction between type of editorial, target group and categorization task, $F(3,254) = .36, p = .79, \eta^2_p = .004$.

![Figure 12. Interaction between target group and categorization task on automatic evaluation. Higher values indicate more negative valence. The value zero refers to the following equations: Refugee-Negative Association – Refugee-Positive Association = 0 or Canadian-Negative Association – Canadian-Positive Association = 0. The symbol ** between two bars refers to a significant difference between the two bars. ** p < .01.](image)

**Explicit measures.** Descriptive statistics showed that, on average, participants indicated that they experience negative emotions toward refugees ($M = 5.45, SD = 1.32$) more frequently than positive emotions toward refugees ($M = 3.69, SD = 1.21$; see also Table 9). Similarly, participants reported a low willingness to have contact with refugees ($M = 2.98, SD = 1.35$) and they were also likely to explicitly dehumanize refugees ($M = 4.90, SD = 1.07$). Finally, participants showed a slight tendency to disagree with policies that aim to support refugees ($M = 3.47, SD = .99$).
Table 9
*Descriptive statistics for the explicit measures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotions (1-7 scale)</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.00-7.00</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive emotions (1-7 scale)</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.00-7.00</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to have contact (1-7 scale)</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.00-6.83</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit dehumanization (1-7 scale)</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.42-7.00</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy attitudes (1-7 scale)</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.00-6.67</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to assess the effect of the editorials (victim, bogus, neutral and control) on negative and positive emotions toward refugees, willingness to have contact with refugees, explicit dehumanization of refugees, and policy attitudes. The omnibus test, using Pillai’s Trace, revealed no significant effect of type of editorial, $V = .08, F(15,768) = 1.35, p = .17, \eta^2 = .03$. This suggests that the editorial did not significantly affect any of the explicit dependent variables. Finally, automatic dehumanization of refugees and automatic evaluation of refugees did not correlate with each other nor with any of the explicit measures, $r(260) = -.08$ to $.03$, *n.s.* (see also Table 10).¹

¹ In Study 3, I also investigated whether the personality variable Social Dominance Orientation (SDO; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) moderated any of the investigated effects. The results showed that SDO did not moderate the effect of the different types of editorials on automatic dehumanization, automatic evaluation, and the explicit measures. However, SDO predicted all explicit measures in the expected direction. That is, higher social dominance orientation was associated with less positive emotions toward refugees, more negative emotions toward refugees, a lower willingness to have contact with refugees, more explicit dehumanization of refugees and less support for policy attitudes that aim to support refugees. In contrast, SDO did not predict the automatic measures.
Table 10
Correlations Study 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Automatic dehumanization of refugees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Automatic dehumanization of Canadians</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Automatic evaluation of refugees</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Automatic evaluation of Canadians</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Explicit dehumanization of refugees</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Negative affect</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Positive affect</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.49**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Policy attitudes</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.67**</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Willingness to have contact</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.70**</td>
<td>-.60**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** p < .01

4.3 Discussion

The first aim of Study 3 was to investigate the impact of an editorial depicting refugees as victims on automatic dehumanization. The results showed that exposing participants to an editorial depicting refugees as victims did not decrease the automatic dehumanization of refugees. In fact, exposing participants to a victim editorial led to a similar effect on the automatic dehumanization of refugees as the bogus editorial. Interestingly, exposing participants to a neutral editorial with factual information on refugees or exposing participants to an editorial with content entirely unrelated to refugees did not activate the automatic dehumanization of refugees.

One explanation for these results could be that the victim and the neutral editorial with factual information on refugees activated different mental concepts. In particular, the victim editorial may have threatened the moral image of Canadians in regards to
refugees. In the final paragraph of the victim editorial, Canadians are encouraged to be more generous to refugees. This takes place after the victim editorial points out that upon their arrival to Canada, the refugees were immediately sent to detention by the authorities. Participants may have felt that Canada was unjustly being accused of immoral behaviour in terms of incarcerating refugees and not doing enough to help refugees. In other words, participants may have experienced a threat to their moral image.

According to Noor, Shanbel, Halabi and Nadler (2012), groups compete not only in terms of resources but also in terms of their victimhood status. When members of a perpetrator group learn about the injustices inflicted by their group on another group, they feel that their own sufferings are being downplayed. More importantly, they feel that they are being portrayed as evil and immoral. In order to restore their victimhood status, they may engage in further dehumanization of the other group (Castano & Giner-Sorolla, 2006).

Another explanation for the unexpected effect of the victim editorial on automatic dehumanization may have to do with the fact that the victim editorial consisted of the story of one individual refugee as opposed to refugees in general. Thus, participants may have not generalized the victim story to the entire refugee concept but kept it as a separate exemplar. Indeed, the literature shows that when a person is confronted with a counterstereotypical exemplar that does not fit the existing stereotype, a contrast effect will take place leading to an even greater dissimilarity between the counterstereotypical exemplar and the existing stereotype (Mastro & Tukachinsky, 2011). In our study, the exposure to one individual refugee story may have conflicted with the already existing perception of refugees. This may have led to a contrast effect and worsened the perception of refugees in general.
An explanation as to why exposing participants to the neutral editorial with factual information on refugees did not lead to the automatic dehumanization of refugees as did the bogus condition might have to do with the context in which refugees were mentioned in the neutral editorial. According to Gawronski and Bodenhausen (2006), context determines which associative patterns will be activated for a particular attitude object. For example, previous research has shown that automatic negative reactions toward African Americans were less negative if an African American was portrayed in a positive context (e.g., family barbeque) than in a negative context (e.g., gang incident; Wittenbrink et al., 2001). In a similar way, it could be argued that refugees in this study were portrayed in two different contexts. On the one hand, one editorial depicted refugees in the context of illegal entries to Canada (bogus). On the other hand, the other editorial depicted refugees in the context of a factual and neutral description of refugees to Canada in general.

Another aim of Study 3 was to investigate the impact of the editorials on explicit dehumanization, emotions toward refugees, willingness to have contact with refugees, and attitudes toward policies that aim to support refugees. Overall, the editorials did not significantly affect any of these explicit measures. As mentioned in Study 2, one explanation for the lack of influence of the different types of editorials on explicit dehumanization of refugees could be that participants’ endorsement of explicit dehumanization of refugees was already too strong in order to be changed by the editorials. Furthermore, the dissociation between the effects on implicit and explicit measures can be explained by the fact that implicit and explicit attitudes reflect different processes (Fazio, 1990; Gawronski & Bodenhausen, 2006; Strack & Deutsch, 2004).
Implicit attitudes are the outcome of a spontaneous, automatic process, whereas explicit attitudes are the outcome of a more deliberate process. Finally, another explanation as to why the different types of editorials did not produce explicit changes could be that they were too blatant. For example, Arendt (2013) showed that the number of concept representations in newspaper articles (e.g., the number of times foreigners are mentioned in relation to crimes in one newspaper article) mattered in order to elicit an effect on explicit stereotypes. The researcher was able to observe an effect on explicit measures only with a moderate number of concept representations. Importantly, the number of concept representations elicited a noticeable effect on implicit stereotypes regardless of whether they were too blatant or not.

Furthermore, as in Study 2, the different types of editorials did not have an effect on the automatic evaluation of refugees. That is, the negative bogus editorial and the ‘positive’ victim editorial did not lead to more negative or positive automatic evaluations of refugees compared to the neutral editorials. This is an interesting finding because it demonstrates that the automatic dehumanization of refugees is not simply an artefact of the negative evaluation of refugees. It also confirms the distinction between negative attitudes and dehumanization per se.

Finally, the results showed that the automatic dehumanization of refugees is not conditional on the type of categorization task. Participants automatically dehumanized refugees more than Canadians regardless of whether they were asked to categorize the pictures as humans versus animals or as positive versus negative. Moreover, the results showed that the automatic negative evaluation of refugees is conditional on the type of categorization task. Participants associated more negative valence to refugees than to
Canadians only when performing the evaluative categorization task, but not when performing the conceptual categorization task. This replicates the findings of my Master’s Thesis (Medianu, 2010).

The unconditional nature of automatic dehumanization of refugees in response to specific media depictions could have important implications. If refugees elicit the unconditional activation of the animal concept, this activation could influence an individual’s information processing, judgments, and behaviour in significant ways (see Fazio, 1995, 2000, for reviews). Indeed, according to the MODE model (Fazio & Towles-Schwen, 1999), an automatically activated attitude will influence how one spontaneously appraises the attitude object and then how one spontaneously behaves toward that attitude object. Thus, the unconditional nature of the automatic dehumanization of refugees could lead to spontaneous avoidant behaviour towards refugees (Fazio, 2001).
5 General Discussion

5.1 Summary of Findings

The main goals of this research were threefold. First, I aimed to investigate how refugees are generally portrayed in Canadian newspapers. In addition, I was interested in how the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat to British Columbia, Canada in August 2010 impacted the depiction of refugees in Canadian newspapers. Second, I was interested in examining how these media portrayals of refugees (as bogus, terrorists or victims) influence the automatic and explicit dehumanization as well as the automatic and explicit evaluation of refugees. Third, I examined the question of whether the automatic dehumanization of refugees is conditional on the type of categorization task used to assess automatic dehumanization (evaluative vs. conceptual).

The results of Study 1 showed that during the time investigated – six months before and after the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat to Canada in August 2010 – the portrayal of refugees in the Canadian media was mixed. On the one hand Canadian newspapers portrayed refugees in a negative light, either as bogus or criminals/terrorists. Moreover, the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat seemed to have an impact on these depictions. Whereas before the event refugees were more likely to be portrayed as bogus, after the event refugees were more likely to be portrayed as criminals/terrorists, being blamed for entering Canada with the help of human smugglers or being suspected of terrorist links. On the other hand, refugees were not only portrayed in negative terms. Canadian newspapers also depicted refugees as victims in need of help. Furthermore, a
small number of newspaper articles discussed legal issues about refugees. Finally, there appeared to be variations in the extent to which newspapers reported on the issue of refugee arrivals, as well as in their refugee portrayals. For example, the *Vancouver Sun* reported on refugee issues to a larger extent after the arrival of the Tamil refugee boat, portraying them mainly as victims. These variations may be due to the different target audiences of the newspapers, their agenda setting and their geographical location.

Studies 2 and 3 investigated how real media depictions of refugees as bogus, terrorists and victims found in Study 1 impact the automatic dehumanization of refugees. The bogus editorial described refugees as trying to cheat the immigration system. The terrorist editorial described refugees as having terrorist links. Finally, the victim editorial described the story of a refugee, a mother of two, who was forced to flee her country and sought safety in Canada. The results of Studies 2 and 3 showed that media portrayals of refugees as either bogus or terrorists influence the automatic dehumanization of refugees but not the automatic evaluation of refugees. In particular, the results showed that participants automatically dehumanized refugees more than Canadians after reading editorials that described refugees as bogus or terrorists. Unexpectedly, media portrayals of refugees as victims also led to automatic dehumanization. In contrast, a neutral media portrayal of refugees that simply provided factual information did not lead to automatic dehumanization. This is the first demonstration that media portrayals of refugees can cause the automatic dehumanization of refugees.

Studies 2 and 3 also showed that the media portrayals of refugees as bogus, terrorists or victims did not impact the automatic evaluation of refugees. Moreover, across both studies automatic evaluation was not correlated with automatic
dehumanization. This finding supports the idea that cognitive and affective processes are actually independent (Zajonc, 1980). Indeed, animalistic stereotypes of refugees could be separate and partly independent from negative affect towards refugees. In fact, Haslam and Loughnan (2012) point out that dehumanization does not necessarily have to take place within the context of negative affect. In short, automatic dehumanization cannot be just reduced to an artefact of automatic negative evaluation.

Studies 2 and 3 also showed that the media portrayals of refugees as bogus, terrorists or victims did not influence the explicit dehumanization or evaluation of refugees. One explanation for the lack of influence of the different types of editorials on explicit dehumanization of refugees could be that participants’ endorsement of explicit dehumanization of refugees was already too strong to be increased by the editorials. Furthermore, the discrepancy between the results of the different editorials on the automatic and explicit dehumanization could be due to a lack of conceptual correspondence between the two measures (Hofman et al., 2005). On the one hand, the automatic dehumanization of refugees captures the association between the concepts ‘animal’ and ‘refugee’. On the other hand, the explicit measure of dehumanization of refugees refers to explicit judgments about the extent to which participants believe that refugees engage in enemy/barbarian acts (Alexander et al., 1999).

Finally, Studies 2 and 3 found that the automatic dehumanization of refugees is not conditional on the type of categorization task. Participants automatically dehumanized refugees more than Canadians in response to the bogus, terrorist, and victim editorials, regardless of whether they were asked to categorize the pictures as humans versus animals or as positive versus negative. If refugees elicit the unconditional
activation of the animal concept, this activation could influence and individual’s information processing, judgments, and behaviour in significant ways (Fazio, 1995, 2000). For example, the unconditional nature of the automatic dehumanization of refugees could lead to spontaneous avoidant behaviour towards refugees (Fazio, 2001).

Moreover, while the results in Study 2 provided inconclusive evidence concerning the conditional or unconditional nature of the automatic evaluation of refugees, the results of Study 3 showed that the automatic negative evaluation of refugees is conditional on the type of categorization task. That is, participants associated more negative valence to refugees than to Canadians only when performing the evaluative categorization task, but not when performing the conceptual categorization task, and this occurred regardless of the editorial read.

5.2 Theoretical Implications

The present research supports the implicit social cognition model of media priming (Arendt, 2013) as well as its underlying model, the Associative-Propositional Evaluation (APE) model (Gawronski & Bodenhausen, 2006). The implicit social cognition model of media priming (Arendt, 2013) argues that the media acts as an external stimulus which influences the associations between concepts in memory. In particular, the model argues that the media shapes the pattern of associations between concepts by activating pre-existing associations or by providing new information that is encoded in memory, which in turn, may also re-activate pre-existing memory associations. The present research suggests that the exposure to the editorials influenced participants’ memory associations. In particular, the terrorist and bogus editorials may have activated concepts that are closely related to the animal concept, such as a lack of civility and morality.
The unexpected effect of the victim editorial suggests that the victim editorial may have also activated the animal concept. The means through which this was accomplished is not entirely clear. One possibility could be that the victim editorial threatened the moral image of Canadians in regards to refugees by insinuating that Canadians are not doing enough to help refugees. This threat to the moral image may have activated processes related to competitive victimhood status. According to Noor et al. (2012) groups compete not only in terms of resources but also in terms of their victimhood status. When members of a group feel that they are unjustly being portrayed as evil and immoral, they may engage in dehumanization of the outgroup to restore their victimhood status (Castano & Giner-Sorolla, 2006). That is, Canadians may have felt unjustly accused for not doing enough for refugees. This eventually may have led to further automatic dehumanization of refugees. The victim editorial points out how important the context is in determining which concepts get activated (Gawronski & Bodenhausen, 2006). Despite the presence of the concept ‘victim’, the context of competitive victimhood that the editorial elicits seems to have activated the animal concept in relationship to refugees.

The media did not have an effect on the explicit dehumanization of refugees. The finding that the media exposure had an effect only on automatic dehumanization is important because implicit measures were able to uncover the otherwise hidden effects of the media. This is especially relevant given that implicit measures can predict spontaneous behaviours when standard self-report measures cannot (e.g., Asendorpf, Banse & Mücke, 2002; Egloff & Schmukle, 2002; Fazio et al., 1995; McConnell &
Leibold, 2001) and that they can explain behavioural variation over and above the variation explained by self-report measures (e.g., Perugini, 2005).

However, this is not to say that implicit measures should replace explicit measures in the investigation of media effects on perceptions of outgroups such as refugees. Explicit and implicit attitudes are not identical or exchangeable (Briñol, Petty & Wheeler, 2006; Hofmann et al., 2005). Furthermore, neither implicit nor explicit attitudes can be considered to be the ‘real’ attitude of people (Gawronski, 2009). Instead, implicit measures should be considered as a valuable addition to explicit measures in the study of media effects on outgroups such as refugees.

5.3 Practical Implications

In theory, effective journalism should report issues as they occur and provide an unbiased account of social issues so that people are enabled to form their own opinions and to make informed decisions (Herrman & Chomsky, 1988). However, many times media frames or filters are used to form, misrepresent or even censor journalism (Herman & Chomsky, 1988). By repeatedly referring to refugees as bogus and terrorists, the media can have a lasting effect on how Canadians perceive refugees. The media can also potentially affect how refugees are treated in society and how Canadians respond to current and future immigration legislation concerning refugees. If people perceive refugees as less than human, then they will be more likely to perceive refugees as less worthy of a human treatment (see Opotow, 1995). Interestingly, the present research suggests that the media may produce similar effects when portraying refugees as victims. This seems especially to be the case when the media refers to refugees as victims and implies that Canada needs to do more to help refugees or, in other words, it implies that
Canada is not doing enough for refugees. In contrast, exposure to news editorials depicting refugees in a factual, neutral way does not activate the dehumanization of refugees. The findings have an important practical implication. One way to reduce the dehumanization of refugees could be to engage in effective journalism, that is, to report issues in news articles as they occur, in a factual, non-biased way. This is essential given that Canada is a signatory of the 1951 Geneva Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol and has already committed to protect refugees.

5.4 Future Research Directions

The current research opens up many new avenues for future research. First, I investigated the effect of one mass medium, newspaper editorials, on the automatic dehumanization of refugees. It would be interesting to see if the results replicate with other mass mediums such as television news and with other immigrant groups such as skilled immigrants.

Second, it would be interesting to incorporate time in future investigations of media effects on automatic dehumanization to examine decays over time and possible effects of repeated exposures. For example, it would be interesting to see how long after reading one newspaper editorial (e.g., victim, bogus or terrorist) the automatic activation of concepts begins to decay. It would also be interesting to examine the effects of multiple exposures overall and in terms of decay.

Third, future research may be interested in examining the differential impact of media portrayals on explicit and implicit measures. To accomplish this, future research would have to counterbalance the order of the explicit and implicit measures. The main goal of the present research was to examine the effects of media portrayals of refugees on
the automatic dehumanization. Therefore any investigations of the differential effects of media portrayals of refugees on automatic and explicit dehumanization were secondary.

Fourth, future research may want to investigate whether the same results apply to light versus heavy news users. The media’s impact on the strength of automatic associations between concepts in memory is a gradual process, which takes place in time and with repeated exposures. Future research could thus investigate whether heavy news users are more likely to demonstrate the automatic dehumanization of refugees than light news users and whether this depends on the specific sources of news that they consume.

Finally, future research may want to continue to investigate ways to reduce dehumanization through media depictions that are framed in different ways.

5.5 Conclusion

In the present research, I used an experimental approach to examine the immediate effect of the media’s depiction of refugees on people’s automatic dehumanization of refugees. In particular, I showed that exposing participants to editorials depicting refugees as bogus, terrorists or, surprisingly, as victims activated the automatic dehumanization of refugees. In contrast, exposing participants to an editorial with neutral, factual information about refugees or an editorial with content unrelated to refugees did not activate the automatic dehumanization of refugees. Furthermore, I showed that reading the editorials did not impact the automatic evaluation of refugees. This is important because it demonstrates that the automatic dehumanization of refugees is not simply an artefact of the negative evaluation of refugees and that the media has significant effects on automatic dehumanization. Although much remains to be understood about the role of
the media in the automatic dehumanization of refugees, the current research demonstrates the causal relation between specific media depictions and the automatic association of refugees with animals and points to the importance of unbiased, factual journalism to prevent such effects.
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Appendix B: Coding From Media Content Analysis

MEDIA CONTENT ANALYSIS PROJECT

Full Title of the Article
Issue (main issue, detail if necessary)
Date
Type of document (editorial or news)
Number of Pages
Event/reason/occasion for appearance
Audience

Please answer the following questions using excerpts from the article.

1. Voice/Standing

Where is the information in the article coming from? Are there quotes from politicians, researchers, or law enforcement agencies? Documentation/statistics, and who provided them? Are alternatives presented?

2. Diagnosis

What is presented as the problem? Why is it seen as a problem?

Causality (What is seen as the cause of what?)

Who is seen as responsible for causing the problem?

Problem holders (Whose problem is it seen to be? Active/passive roles, perpetrators/victims, etc?)

3. Prognosis
What to do? Which action is deemed necessary and why?
Hierarchy/priority in goals
How to achieve goals (strategy/means/instruments)?
Attribution of roles in prognosis

4. Call for action

Is there a call for action or non-action?
Who is acted upon? (target groups)
Boundaries set to action and legitimization of non-action

Overall, how positive or negative is the article as depicting the refugees in general?
Please indicate this by circling the appropriate number on the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Negative</th>
<th>2 Moderately Negative</th>
<th>3 Slightly Negative</th>
<th>4 Neither Negative or Positive</th>
<th>5 Slightly Positive</th>
<th>6 Moderately Positive</th>
<th>7 Strongly Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If applicable, how positive or negative is the article as depicting the Tamils on the MV Sun See ship arriving to British Columbia? Please indicate this by circling the appropriate number on the scale below.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Negative</td>
<td>Moderately Negative</td>
<td>Slightly Negative</td>
<td>Neither Negative or Positive</td>
<td>Slightly Positive</td>
<td>Moderately Positive</td>
<td>Strongly Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How are refugees portrayed? What words are used to describe them? Please use excerpts from the article.
### Appendix C: Definition of the Frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>When refugees are described as having endured hardships and this comes in combination with an attitude rating of 4 or above, it was decided to code the frame as VICTIM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal/Terrorist:</td>
<td>When refugees are described as having entered Canada with the help of smugglers or they are described in association with terrorism and this comes in combination with a negative attitude rating of 4 or below, it was decided to code the frame as CRIMINAL/TERRORIST.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogus:</td>
<td>When refugees are described as false claimants or bogus refugees or jumping the immigration queue and this comes in combination with a negative attitude of 4 or below, it was decided to code the frame as BOGUS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Debate:</td>
<td>When the discussion is about a legal solution to the refugee problem and the article is neither positive nor negative, it was decided to code the frame as LEGAL DEBATE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Media Editorials

Neutral Editorial (Study 2 & Study 3)

Globe editorial

Refugee claimants entering Canadian waters

By John Robson

Editorial Board

A ship believed to hold as many as 250 Syrian refugees is now inside Canada's 200-nautical mile exclusive economic zone and heading for the East coast, a senior federal official confirmed on Wednesday.

"We expect it will land on the Canadian East coast either late (Thursday) evening or early Friday morning," he said of the 60-metre refugee vessel.

The imminent arrival of the Syrian refugee boat raises important questions about refugees coming to Canada. For example, who are today's refugees to Canada? According to the authorities, refugees are people in or outside of Canada who fear returning to their home country and in keeping with its humanitarian tradition and international obligations, Canada, just like other western country, provides protection to thousands of refugees every year.

Refugees to Canada are representative of refugees to many western countries. They do not differ substantially from refugees to our neighbor to the south. Some refugees to Canada live in urban centers, whereas others take up residence in rural areas. Many are between the ages of 12 and 65 at the time of their arrival in Canada, with a relatively even balance of males and females.

In Canada, refugee patterns during the period 2000-2009 were reflections of changes observed internationally. That is, as refugee rates increased and decreased in Canada, they were representative of fluctuations experienced in western countries worldwide.

Refugees to Canada are so diverse that it is difficult to make generalizations about them. There has been a great deal written about them but, in fact, few conclusions can be drawn. Thus, one person's opinions are as valid as the next's.

Canada, just like any other western country, is open to refugees from all over the world and the Syrian refugee ship is just another example of the great variety of refugees coming to Canada.
Bogus Editorial (Study 2 & Study 3)

Globe editorial

Suspected bogus refugee claimants entering Canadian waters

A ship believed to hold as many as 250 Sudanese refugees is now inside Canada’s 200-mile exclusive economic zone and heading for the east coast, a senior federal official confirmed on Wednesday.

“We expect it will land on the Canadian east coast either late Thursday evening or early Friday morning,” he said of the 80-metre refugee vessel.

The imminent arrival of the Sudanese refugee boat raises important questions about how we should deal with refugee boats that might arrive in the future. Should Canada turn the refugee boat away before they enter Canadian waters?

Canadian authorities are concerned that the Sudanese refugee ship currently arriving in Eastern Canada is engaged in human smuggling and human trafficking. According to immigration experts, many people choose the refugee-smuggling route because they cannot meet the requirements for getting into Canada as legal landed immigrants.

Phony refugee claims are made every day at our missions abroad, at Canadian ports of entry, and within Canada. This is the practice where people declare to Canada claiming a need for protection, even though they are actively coming from a place where they are clearly not at risk. If the arrival of the Sudanese ship is just another organized effort to subvert our immigration and refugee system and jump the queue.

If we have an immigration system that is not hijacked by bogus refugees, we may have an immigration system that is not hijacked by bogus refugees.

Canada is a generous nation but we must have our limits. We should not be taken advantage of by jumpers. Until we have reformed our refugee system and made it easier to deport failed asylum seekers, the last thing we need is boatload after boatload of bogus refugees.
Globe editorial

Suspected terrorist refugee claimants entering Canadian waters

From Friday's Globe and Mail
Published Thursday, Dec. 30, 2010 6:05P M ET

By Jane Bokesan
Editorial Board

A ship believed to hold as many as 250 Sandinian refugees is now inside Canada’s 200-mile exclusive economic zone and heading for the East coast, a senior federal official confirmed on Wednesday.

"We expect it will land on the Canadian East coast either late (Thursday) evening or early Friday morning" he said of the 60-metre refugee vessel.

The imminent arrival of the Sandinian refugee boat raises important questions about how we should deal with refugee boats that might arrive in the future. Should Canada turn the refugee boats away before they enter Canadian waters?

"Canadian authorities are concerned that members of the Sandinian refugee ship currently arriving in Eastern Canada are part of an outlawed terrorist group. According to immigration experts, the Sandinian refugee vessel may have been used for gun running in the past and 'hardcore' terror leaders may among the refugees. It is too dangerous for Canada to admit possible members of banned terror organizations who could easily use our generosity to raise funds, recruit new members, and refine the violence in their homeland."

Canada has no obligation to accept refugees with possible terrorist links and thus be dragged into a deadly, far off conflict. Of even greater concern is the distinct possibility that terror leaders who may be hiding on the Sandinian refugee ship are seeking to set up a terror-based government-in-waiting in our midst and even import their civil war into Canada.

"We should not put our citizenry by introducing refugees with criminal and terrorist ties into our fold. Our goal must be to ensure that our citizens are safe and that our refugee system is not hijacked by terrorists."

Canada is a generous nation but we must have our limits. Until we have reformed our refugee system and made it easier to deport failed claimants, the last thing we need is boatload after boatload of refugees with terrorist ties."
Victim Editorial (Study 3)

Globe editorial

Driven from Sandiria: One woman's story

From Friday's Globe and Mail
Published Thursday, Dec. 09, 2010 8:30PM EST

BY John Robson
Editorial Board

A ship believed to hold as many as 250 Sandirian refugees is now inside Canada’s 200-mile exclusive economic zone and heading for the East Coast, a senior federal official confirmed on Wednesday.

"We expect it will land on the Canadian East Coast either late (Thursday) evening or early Friday morning," he said of the 60-metre refugee vessel. The imminent arrival of the Sandirian refugee boat raises important questions, including who these Sandirian refugees actually are.

We spoke to a mother of two who arrived in one of the previous ships that landed in Canada several months ago. She agreed to talk to Postmedia News on condition of anonymity because of her pending refugee claim and concern for her family still in Sandiria.

Sitting a little apprehensively on a couch, the Sandirian mother asked Canadians try to understand her plight. She explained that life back home was like "walking on pins." She couldn’t walk around without being harassed by soldiers. Farmland once owned by her family was seized by the government so that she was left with nothing to support her family.

The woman packed two sets of clothes for each of her children. They flew to Thailand and waited for six months before boarding a ship bound for Canada. "Life in the bowels of the vessel was cramped and tense," she said. The migrants had very little to eat and rarely ventured outside for fear of being spotted by authorities. "We hardly saw the ocean or the sky for the entire time we were on the ship. We were plagued by sea-sickness and often wondered whether we would survive."

The mother said the biggest shock after arriving in Canada was being held in custody by Canadian authorities and now facing such an uncertain future. "After all we have been through, it is difficult to see my children continue to suffer," she said.

Canada must be generous to refugee claimants in need. Our refugee system must ensure that these victims of tragedy obtain our protection so that we can maintain our reputation as one of the most "generous and fair" refugee protection and immigration systems in the world.
Globe editorial

A glacier runs through it: The structure of ice sheets in Canada's Arctic

BY John Robson
Editorial Board

Dini Tarasov has a novel "plumbing" inspection planned for July. A helicopter will drop him near a five-kilometre-long crevasse field on the Devon Ice Cap in the Canadian Arctic. He and the other members of his team will set up camp and venture off to measure the icy chasms that produce the icebergs peeling off a glacier and crashing into Baffin Bay. Then they'll trek to the coast and use an inflatable boat to study the meltwater pouring out from under the massive glacier, lubricating its slide into the sea.

"We're trying to find out what the plumbing's like in an ice sheet," said Tarasov, a glacial physicist at Memorial University in St. John's, Newfoundland, who is heading to the North as part of an ambitious international project.

The scientists say Devon Island, just south of Ellesmere Island, is one of best places on Earth to get a feel for ice sheets. And they are probing Devon's fastest flowing glacier, the Bercher, from top to bottom.

Global positioning sensors are clocking the speed of the 40-kilometre-long glacier, a "river of ice" that runs through the ice cap, while seismic devices are keeping tabs on internal cracks and fractures as the giant slab of ice flows through a deep trough of bedrock toward the ocean.

Field crews are setting up a series of weather stations, as well as snow, ice and water gauges to monitor the ice expanse. Time-lapse cameras are being strategically placed near meltwater lakes that can drain like giant bathtubs on top of the glacier.

The Devon Ice Cap is like a "mini-version" of the Greenland ice sheet, says Martin Sharp, the University of Alberta glaciologist leading the project. The structure of the ice sheets and the forces shaping them are basically the same - huge masses of snow and ice cut by fast-flowing glaciers that run into the ocean, taking huge amounts of ice with them. But, he says, the diminutive Devon Ice Cap is a much easier place to measure and tease out the dynamics at work.

Sharp says lessons learned on Devon are expected to help improve the forecast for what is in store for Greenland.
Appendix E: Pictures for Sequential Priming Procedure

Negative Animal Pictures
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Positive Animal Pictures
Negative Human Pictures
Positive Human Pictures
Appendix F: Questionnaire Study 2

1. MANIPULATION

Please read the following editorial carefully.

[Editorial]

2. MANIPULATION CHECK 1

Please answer the following questions by checking the number that best corresponds with your response on the scales below.

1. How well written is the editorial?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very poorly written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very well written</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How difficult or easy is the editorial to understand?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very easy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How persuasive is the editorial?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all persuasive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very persuasive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How interested would you be in reading another editorial by the same author?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very interested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. In the box below, please describe what came to mind while you were reading the editorial.

   [Blank box]

   [Blank box]
6. What is the editorial about? What is the main argument of the author?

3. AUTOMATIC DEHUMANIZATION

The next part of the study investigates how individuals categorize various objects in their environment.

In the task, you will be asked to classify pictured objects into meaningful categories.

You will be presented with a series of pictures and your task is to categorize the object in the picture as “ANIMAL” or “HUMAN” (resp. “POSITIVE” or “NEGATIVE”).

It is VERY IMPORTANT to make these categorizations as QUICK AS YOU POSSIBLY CAN, but without making too many errors.

Please note that to help focus your attention, you will be presented with a fixation cross (“+”) in the center of the screen.

On certain trials, you will be briefly presented with a word appearing immediately before the pictures. These words serve as simple warnings for the presentation of the pictures.

Please press the “A” key to categorize the picture as “ANIMAL” (resp. “NEGATIVE”), and please press the “5” key of the number pad to categorize the pictures as “HUMAN” (resp. “POSITIVE”).

In order to facilitate faster responses, please keep your left-hand finger on the “A” key and your right-hand finger on the “5” key.

You will now complete some practice trials in order to familiarize yourself with the task.

Press “Continue” when you are ready to begin.
4. EXPLICIT DEHUMANIZATION

For each statement, please indicate how much you agree or disagree with it by checking a number from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Refugees value cooperative solutions to problems and try to avoid conflict.

2. Refugees would take advantage of any efforts on our part to cooperate, and they would even try to exploit us.

3. Refugees are quite naive; they mean well but need guidance and leadership from other people.

4. Refugees take whatever they want from others.

5. Refugees are weak and inefficient in decision-making.

6. Refugees will not exploit our trust in them but instead reciprocate and contribute their fair share.

7. Refugees are motivated by legitimate and reasonable concerns and aspirations.

8. Refugees enjoy getting their way even if it spoils things for others.

9. Refugees are extremely competitive and want to dominate but will play by the rules.

10. Most refugees want to have things better for themselves, but they lack discipline and are not likely to work very hard.

11. Refugees are crude, unsophisticated, and willing to cheat to get their way.

12. Refugees’ objectives are self-centred and harmful to others.
5. MANIPULATION CHECK 2

*Finally, please think back to the editorial you read earlier and answer the following questions by checking the number that best corresponds with your response on the scales below.*

1. **How similar do you think Sandirian refugees are to other refugees to Canada?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all similar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very similar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **How similar do you think Sandirian refugees are to Canadians?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all similar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very similar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **How much do you know about Sandirian refugees?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a great deal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **How much have you read previously about Sandirian refugees?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a great deal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Where is Sandiria?**


6. **What do you think is the race of Sandirian refugees?**


7. How much do you know about the Tamil refugee boat that arrived in Victoria, British Columbia in August 2010?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a great deal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. DEMOGRAPHICS

1. What is your sex (check one)?
   a. _____ Female
   b. _____ Male

2. What is your age? _____ years

3. To which ethnic group(s) do you belong? (check as many as apply)
   a. _____ African American/Black
   b. _____ Asian
   c. _____ Hispanic
   d. _____ Native American
   e. _____ White
   f. _____ Other (Please specify) ___________

4. What is your native (first) language? __________________________

5. Were you born in Canada? ___yes ___no

6. If you were not born in Canada, how long have you been a Canadian resident (# of years)? ___________________

7. Are you a Canadian citizen? __________ If not, please specify citizenship __________________

8. If you are not a Canadian citizen, do you have landed immigrant status in Canada? ___yes ___no

9. When was it granted (year)? ___________________
10. What is your political leaning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Liberal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Conservative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Questionnaire Study 3

1. SOCIAL DOMINANCE ORIENTATION

For each statement, please indicate how much you agree or disagree with it by checking a number from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Some groups of people are just more worthy than others.
2. We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.
3. In getting what your group wants, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups.
4. If certain groups of people stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems.
5. We would have fewer problems if we treated different groups more equally.
6. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups.
7. No one group should dominate in society.
8. Group equality should be our ideal.
9. All groups should be given an equal chance in life.
10. We must increase social equality.
11. Superior groups should dominate inferior groups.
12. It's probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom.
13. We must strive to make incomes more equal.
14. Sometimes other groups must be kept in their place.
15. It would be good if all groups could be equal.
16. Inferior groups should stay in their place.
2. DEMOGRAPHICS

1. What is your gender? ________________

2. What is your age? _____ years

3. To which ethnic group(s) do you belong? (check as many as apply)
   a. _____ White
   b. _____ Chinese
   c. _____ South Asian
   d. _____ Black
   e. _____ Filipino
   f. _____ Latin American
   g. _____ Southeast Asian
   h. _____ Arab
   i. _____ West Asian
   j. _____ Korean
   k. _____ Japanese
   l. _____ Other (Please specify) ___________

4. What is your native (first) language? ________________________________

5. Were you born in Canada? ___yes ___no

6. If you were not born in Canada, how long have you been a Canadian resident (# of years)? ______________

7. Are you a Canadian citizen? __________ If not, please specify citizenship __________

8. If you are not a Canadian citizen, do you have landed immigrant status in Canada?
   ___yes ___no

9. When was it granted (year)? ________________

10. What is your political leaning?
    
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
    Very Liberal  Very Conservative
3. MANIPULATION

*Please read the following editorial carefully.*

[Editorial]

4. MANIPULATION CHECK 1

*Please answer the following questions by checking the number that best corresponds with your response on the scales below.*

1. How well written is the editorial?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very poorly written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very well written</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How difficult or easy is the editorial to understand?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very easy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How persuasive is the editorial?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all persuasive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very persuasive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How interested would you be in reading another editorial by the same author?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very interested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. In the box below, please describe what came to mind while you were reading the editorial.


6. What is the editorial about? What is the main argument of the author?

5. AUTOMATIC DEHUMANIZATION

The next part of the study investigates how individuals categorize various objects in their environment.

In the task, you will be asked to classify pictured objects into meaningful categories.

You will be presented with a series of pictures and your task is to categorize the object in the picture as “ANIMAL” or “HUMAN” (resp. “POSITIVE” or “NEGATIVE”).

It is VERY IMPORTANT to make these categorizations as QUICK AS YOU POSSIBLY CAN, but without making too many errors.

Please note that to help focus your attention, you will be presented with a fixation cross (“+”) in the center of the screen.

On certain trials, you will be briefly presented with a word appearing immediately before the pictures. These words serve as simple warnings for the presentation of the pictures.

Please press the “A” key to categorize the picture as “ANIMAL” (resp. “NEGATIVE”), and please press the “5” key of the number pad to categorize the pictures as “HUMAN” (resp. “POSITIVE”).

In order to facilitate faster responses, please keep your left-hand finger on the “A” key and your right-hand finger on the “5” key.

You will now complete some practice trials in order to familiarize yourself with the task.

Press “Continue” when you are ready to begin.
6. EMOTIONS

Please indicate the extent to which refugees make you feel each of the following emotions by checking a number from 1 (never) to 7 (almost always).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>almost always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. To what extent do you feel disgusted when thinking of refugees?
2. To what extent do you feel admiration when thinking of refugees?
3. To what extent do you feel inspired when thinking of refugees?
4. To what extent do you feel proud when thinking of refugees?
5. To what extent do you feel resentful when thinking of refugees?
6. To what extent do you feel angry when thinking of refugees?
7. To what extent do you feel ashamed when thinking of refugees?
8. To what extent do you feel jealous when thinking of refugees?
9. To what extent do you feel fond when thinking of refugees?
10. To what extent do you feel frustrated when thinking of refugees?
11. To what extent do you feel hateful when thinking of refugees?
12. To what extent do you feel uneasy when thinking of refugees?
13. To what extent do you feel envious when thinking of refugees?
14. To what extent do you feel respectful when thinking of refugees?
15. To what extent do you feel contemptuous when thinking of refugees?
16. To what extent do you feel sympathetic when thinking of refugees?
17. To what extent do you feel compassionate when thinking of refugees?
18. To what extent do you feel soft-hearted when thinking of refugees?
19. To what extent do you feel warm when thinking of refugees?

20. To what extent do you feel tender when thinking of refugees?

21. To what extent do you feel moved when thinking of refugees?

### 6. EXPLICIT DEHUMANIZATION

*For each statement, please indicate how much you agree or disagree with it by checking a number from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Refugees value cooperative solutions to problems and try to avoid conflict.

2. Refugees would take advantage of any efforts on our part to cooperate, and they would even try to exploit us.

3. Refugees are quite naive; they mean well but need guidance and leadership from other people.

4. Refugees take whatever they want from others.

5. Refugees are weak and inefficient in decision-making.

6. Refugees will not exploit our trust in them but instead reciprocate and contribute their fair share.

7. Refugees are motivated by legitimate and reasonable concerns and aspirations.

8. Refugees enjoy getting their way even if it spoils things for others.

9. Refugees are extremely competitive and want to dominate but will play by the rules.

10. Most refugees want to have things better for themselves, but they lack discipline and are not likely to work very hard.

11. Refugees are crude, unsophisticated, and willing to cheat to get their way.

12. Refugees’ objectives are self-centred and harmful to others.
7. POLICY ATTITUDES

Please indicate your personal response to each of the following items on the scales provided.

1. What is your overall attitude toward refugees to Canada?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extremely Unfavourable

2. How positive or negative do you feel toward refugees to Canada?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extremely Positive

3. Do you agree or disagree that refugees to Canada should be encouraged?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly Agree

4. If it were your job to plan Canada’s refugee policy, would you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly Disagree

5. How much would you support a government action that deports refugees from Canada.

6. How much would you support a government action that makes it easier for authorities to detain illegal refugees in Canada.
8. CONTACT

Below you will see a list of statements regarding potential behaviours that people might perform in response to refugees if given the opportunity. For each of these statements, please indicate your willingness to perform the behaviour if given the opportunity by checking a number from 1 (not at all willing) to 7 (extremely willing).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all willing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extremely willing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. If given the opportunity, I would be willing to confide personally in a refugee.

2. If given the opportunity, I would be willing to marry a refugee.

3. If given the opportunity, I would be willing to be involved in an intimate relation with a refugee.

4. If given the opportunity, I would be willing to accept a refugee as a family member through marriage.

5. If given the opportunity, I would be willing to have a refugee as a close friend.

6. If given the opportunity, I would be willing to have a refugee visit my home.

7. If given the opportunity, I would be willing to accept a refugee as a neighbour.

8. If given the opportunity, I would be willing to accept a refugee as a work colleague.

9. If given the opportunity, I would be willing to have a refugee as a casual acquaintance.

10. If given the opportunity, I would be willing to accept a refugee as my boss.

11. If given the opportunity, I would be willing to attend a cultural activity sponsored by a refugee organization.

12. If given the opportunity, I would be willing to visit a refugee in his/her home.
9. MANIPULATION CHECK 2

Finally, please think back to the editorial you read earlier and answer the following questions by checking the number that best corresponds with your response on the scales below.

1. How similar do you think Sandirian refugees are to other refugees to Canada?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all similar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very similar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How similar do you think Sandirian refugees are to Canadians?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all similar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very similar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How much do you know about Sandirian refugees?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a great deal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How much have you read previously about Sandirian refugees?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a great deal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Where is Sandiria?


6. What do you think is the race of Sandirian refugees?


7. How much do you know about the Tamil refugee boat that arrived in Victoria, British Columbia in August 2010?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a great deal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Curriculum Vitae

**STELIAN MEDIANU**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University of Western Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, ON, Canada N6A 5C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:smedianu@uwo.ca">smedianu@uwo.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.), Psychology</td>
<td>The University of Western Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Master of Science (M. Sc.), Psychology</td>
<td>The University of Western Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts (B.A.), Psychology</td>
<td>The University of British Columbia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Doctoral Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010, 2012</td>
<td>Ontario Graduate Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2014</td>
<td>Western Graduate Research Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>The Joseph-Armand Bombardier CGS Master's Scholarships Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Dean’s Graduate Scholarship in Migration and Ethnic Relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


RELATED WORK EXPERIENCE

2008 – 2012  Teaching Assistant, University of Western Ontario
2012 – 2014  Lecturer, University of Western Ontario