Prejudice as a Concurrent Stimulus for Violence: A Case of an Asian Community

Albert Fenteng

Southern New Hampshire University, Manchester, NH, USA
Email: afenteng@yahoo.com

Abstract

Human nature and nurture were explored by Goffman and Allport in a different way by describing the human instinct and social learning to consider himself and the others as different, referring to prejudice. Different researchers extend this area or domain of research whereby aggression and violence were studied resulting from prejudice such as due to negative attitude. Prejudice is a source of many social problems including aggression and violence. **Objectives:** To know about prevalence and forms of prejudice, as general consequence, and its association with violence. **Methodology:** This study is framed under quantitative and cross-sectional design. Random and convenient sampling techniques were used whereby 390 parents were sampled. A questionnaire was constructed keeping in view Allport's conceptualization of prejudice. SPSS has been used to analyze the data whereby descriptive and regression analysis are applied to test the hypothesis. **Conclusion:** Prejudice prevails in healthcare sector, educational institutes, employment sector; it is gendered and has sexual connotations in nature etc. Prejudice leads to individual level and social harm and mental illness. Regression analysis shows that prejudice is statistically significantly associated with violence with 6 hypotheses showing significance at $p = .000$.

Keywords

Prejudice, Violence, Aggression, Negative Attitude

1. Background of the Study

Goffman (1963) and Allport (1954, 1958) were the two key researchers who started discussion over prejudice and the stigma it carries. Human nature and nurture were explored by Goffman and Allport in a different way by describing the human instinct and social learning to consider himself and the others as dif-

ferent. An individual's experiences and social life is significantly affected when he/she is considered different by the others or he/she considers the others as different; therefore, it is structural agencies leading to this phenomenon and social structures are the places where individuals perpetuate prejudice and they confront prejudice. In other words, one may be marginalized, or he/she may be a source of marginalization whereby the relationship is a complex one. The conceptualization of prejudice therefore is necessary whereby to Goffman and Allport it is:

"…an aversion or hostile attitude toward a person who belongs to a group, simply because he belongs to that group, and is therefore presumed to have the objectionable qualities ascribed to the group…"

Later on, different researchers extended this area or domain of research whereby aggression and violence were studied resulting from prejudice such as due to negative attitude. For example, Anderson & Huesmann (2003) states that prejudice is one of the leading causes of aggression. The aggression resulting from prejudice is of varying nature, for instance, physical, emotional, or even physical attacks. It has been noted so far that prejudice in many cases is responsible for individual level incidences and mass level incidences. In this regard, Correll, Park, Judd and Wittenbrink (2002) depicts the idea of *physical harm towards others.* This results in stereotypes that are connected to prejudice, for instance, a Black person may act as an aggressive person because Blacks are labeled as aggressive by the Whites as Whites consider themselves as a different group. Many incidents of shootings, beating, targeting others are resulted from stereotypes that are the outcome of prejudice.

Behm-Morawitz and Ta (2014) pointed out about the social harm resulting from prejudice that is termed as *Social Harm toward Others.* Social harm is the indicator resulting from prejudice when noted at societal level, for example, the Blacks or Asian being treated differently at hospital and educational institutes in the USA or UK or in China people seeing the Americans or Africans differently. At this level, the prejudice may be even a cause of war or tense international and cross-border relations. The social harm is observable at racial and ethnic level or basis as well, for example, a dominant race and ethnicity seeing the minority differently.

The work of Krieger (1990) is interesting in this connection. For example, the patterns of social interactions are affected by prejudice as a matter of fact that it leads to marginalization, and to Wahl (1999) marginalization is associated with aggression and violence at micro and macro level. Aggression and violence resulting from prejudice is further linked with social stressors and mass level consciousness.

Freilich and Chermak (2013) linked prejudice with crime, specifically violent crimes. For example, one may consider himself/herself being treated as other (different) and may feel victim of something leading to stress and aggression. This stress and aggression is an indicator of hate crimes in the majority of cases.

For example, Hinduja (2006) found that violence occurring at the workplace is often perpetuated by prejudice as one is considered or labeled as *other.* Media play a pivotal role in this connection to Hindjua who asserts that it is media who show people differently and then the media portrays the difference when they report about violence such as racism. Hinduja conceptualized the prejudice into different forms such as prejudice at workplace, prejudice at home, sexual prejudice, racial prejudice and violence and gendered prejudice whereby all of these may result in violence.

Burgess, Stermer, & Burgess (2007) explicates about the nature of prejudice and the nature of violence connected to it. For example, the frequency of prejudice is associated with the intensity of violence such as a less frequency may result only verbal violence. Dill & Thill (2007) is of the opinion that nature of prejudice is also an indicator, for instance, sexual prejudice may not lead to violence whereas racial prejudice may instantly lead to violence. There is another link that was explored by Link, Castille and Stuber (2008). Prejudice is associated with mental illness and mental illness is a significant precursor for violence. Social stigma is a mediating factor for prejudice and mental illness and the dependent variable is aggression and violence, but this is more prevalent at individual or micro level. This is connected to the stereotype resulting from prejudice that is a wrong perception, belief or opinion about an individual or a group. Considering women as the *others* and weak results in lack of employment opportunities that is linked to mental illness and in few cases with violence as well. This research defines prejudice as an affective feeling that one shows towards a person based on a certain perceived group that they belong to as stated by Turiel (2007).

1.1. Statement of the Problem

Prejudice is a widespread phenomenon whereby different dimensions of it are under exploration by the researchers. Prejudice occurs and prevails at different levels and in educational institutes it is one of the key concerns specially in the current multi-ethnic and multiracial societies where the interaction with the *others or another* is very frequent. Keeping this in view it becomes imperative to understand how it can be associated with aggression and violence? This study aims to know the parental perception towards prejudice and how it is connected to violence which can be useful for policy makers in educational institutes.

1.2. Objectives of the Study

- To know about prevalence and forms of prejudice at the study's local;
- To describe about the general consequences of prejudice;
- to investigate into the connection between prejudice and violence.

1.3. Hypotheses

Hypothesis One: Prevalence of prejudice is statistically significantly associated with anticolution.

Hypothesis Two: Prevalence of prejudice is statistically significantly associated with avoidance.

Hypothesis Three: Prevalence of prejudice is statistically significantly associated with discrimination.

Hypothesis Four: Prevalence of prejudice is statistically significantly associated with subtle aggression.

Hypothesis Five: Prevalence of prejudice is statistically significantly associated with physical attack.

Hypothesis Six: Prevalence of prejudice is statistically significantly associated with extermination.

2. Methods

2.1. Nature of the Study

This study is framed under quantitative research design (that has been so far widely used by researchers in the field of prejudice) and cross-sectional in nature that yields good data. Quantitative and cross-sectional research designs are one of the commonly utilized research designs by researchers working in the field of digital information and information technology whereby this study is important in these connections. In the field of IT and digital information quantitative research provides the advantage of quick responses and data collection in number and in quick time as well as due to importance of numbers in digital information. Quantitative research is a methodological aspect of research that answers the questions through numerical, statistical and mathematical techniques as stated by Nueman (2006). On the other hand, by cross-sectional design it is meant that data is collected only at one point in time. As per study design, this research is deductive in nature in terms of reasoning about prejudice, its causes and consequences. To Creswell and Plano Clark (2007), deductive researcher:

> "works from the 'top down', from a theory to hypotheses to data to add to or contradict the theory".

However, in words of Trochim (2006), there is a debate over the issue of using deduction in quantitative research and induction in qualitative research as some researchers and theorists opines that both can be used in quantitative and qualitative research design. The justification of using deduction in this research is embedded in the fact that prejudice is a widely prevailing phenomenon that has been observed at some point in time in each family, educational institutes, healthcare setting in different forms.

2.2. Population and Sampling

Six schools at Changsha were sampled randomly in 2 districts namely Kaifu and Yuhua. Non-probability or non-random specifically convenient sampling techniques was utilized to select samples from the population. In addition, snowball sampling technique was utilized to select samples from population whereby

samples were approached through contact from other samples and their suggestions in context of relevancy to the current study. 390 samples were selected whereby parents of the children in the school were the target population.

2.3. Tool for Data Collection

A structured questionnaire was designed to collect information from the respondents. The link to the online questionnaire constructed in Qualitrics/survey monkey/hand to hand distribution or collection as well as shared through social media by the researcher. The tool was tested for reliability through SPSS using Cronbach's alpha. Only those items were considered which provided values of .70 and above. The questionnaire consisted of socio-demographic information and questions specific to the research questions. In addition, the questions specific to research questions were framed under Likert scale such as strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree. The Allport's scale (1954) and conceptualization of prejudice was considered a classic model of the description of prejudice.

2.4. Data Analysis

The collected information is analyzed through SPSS whereby descriptive and inferential statistics (regression) were applied to test the hypotheses. The significance level for both tests was .05. The independent variable was improvement Prevalence of Prejudice (Allport's conceptualization) and whereas the dependent variables were anticolution, avoidance, discrimination, subtle aggression, physical attack, and extermination.

The conceptual framework of this study is: Conceptual Framework (Table 1).

2.5. Ethics

Ethical considerations were important to this research activity. In this regard, the participant was told that they can leave the study at any point in time. Confidentiality and anonymity of the respondents is ensured, and the data collection process was designed in a way so that the respondents are protected from any sort of harm. The information collected is solely used for research purposes.

Table 1. Prevalence of Prejudice (Allport's Conceptualization) dependents and independent variables.

Independent variable	Dependent variable
	Anticolution
	Avoidance
Prevalence of Prejudice (Allport's conceptualization)	Discrimination
	Subtle aggression
	Physical attack
	Extermination

3. Results and Analysis

Table 2 explains the forms and prevalence of prejudice in the study's locale. It has been found that healthcare related prejudice prevails whereby 148 (37.9%) respondents marked to a greater extent while 235 (60.3%) opted for to some extent. Regarding gender prejudice 217 (55.6%) respondents replied to some extent and 166 (42.6%) marked to greater extent. 218 (55.9%) and 159 (40.9%) respondents opted for to some extent and to greater extent respectively to prevalence of racial prejudice. 217 (55.6%) and 166 (42.6%) respondents opted for to some extent and to greater extent respectively to prevalence of racial prejudice. Regarding employment related prejudice 237 (60.8%) respondents replied with to some extent and 139 (35.6%) marked to greater extent. 222 (56.9%) and 161 (41.3%) respondents opted for to some extent and to greater extent respectively to prevalence of racial prejudice. Lastly, 207 (53.1%) and 166 (42.6%) respondents opted for to some extent and to greater extent respectively to prevalence of Age related prejudice or ageism. The mean score for all forms of prejudice has been found higher such as 2.36 for healthcare related prejudice, 2.41 for gendered prejudice, 2.37 for racial prejudice, 2.41 for individual or personal level prejudice, 2.32 for employment related prejudice, 2.39 for education related prejudice and 2.38 for age related prejudice which indicates an intense prevalence of prejudice.

Table 3 illustrates the general consequences in the opinion of the respondents whereby prejudice results in stereotyping as 259 (66.4%) marked to some extent

Table 2. Forms of prejudice prevailing.

Form of prejudice prevailing	Not at all	To some extent	To greater extent	Mean
Healthcare related	7 (1.8%)	235 (60.3%)	148 (37.9%)	2.36
Gendered prejudice	7 (1.8%)	217 (55.6%)	166 (42.6%)	2.41
Racial prejudice	13 (3.3%)	218 (55.9%)	159 (40.9%)	2.37
Individual/personal	7 (1.8%)	217 (55.6%)	166 (42.6%)	2.41
Employment related	14 (3.6%)	237 (60.8%)	139 (35.6%)	2.32
Educational	7 (1.8%)	222 (56.9%)	161 (41.3%)	2.39
Age related/ageism	17 (4.4%)	207 (53.1%)	166 (42.6%)	2.38

Table 3. General consequences of Prejudice.

General consequences	Not at all	To some extent	To greater extent	Mean
stereotypes	9 (2.3%)	259 (66.4%)	122 (31.3%)	2.29
Self-harm	16 (4.1%)	227 (58.2%)	147 (37.7%)	2.34
Social harm	9 (2.3%)	251 (64.4%)	130 (33.3%)	2.31
Mental illness	19 (4.9%)	224 (57.4%)	147 (37.7%)	2.33

while 122 (31.3%) marked to greater extent. In terms of self-harm resulting from prejudice 227 (58.2%) marked to some extent while 147 (37.7%) marked to greater extent. 251 (64.4%) and 130 (33.3%) respondents opted for to some extent and to greater extent respectively to social harm resulting from prejudice. 224 (57.4%) and 147 (37.7%) respondents opted for to some extent and to greater extent respectively to mental illness resulting from prejudice. The mean score for prejudice resulting in stereotyping is 2.39, 2.34 for self-harm resulting from prejudice, 2.31 for social harm resulting from prejudice while 2.33 for mental illness resulting from prejudice. The mean scores are higher which shows that prejudice results in stereotypes, self-harm, social harm and mental illness.

In Table 4, Allport's conceptualization of Prejudice scores attained on Allport's questionnaire through Likert scale.

Table 4 describes the mean score attained on Allport's questionnaire through Likert scale. Strong agreement to the statement is scored by 1 while strong disagreement is present by 5. The lower score means that respondents are strongly agreeing with item/statements about prejudice.

1.95 and 1.90 were the mean scores respectively for the statement about hearing different jokes about others and hateful expressions are present about others. The mean score was 2.08 for the statement that hearing hate speech about others. 2.12 was the mean score for the statement that in society, there is a negative image of others. 2.19 was the mean score for the statement that individuals see people avoiding the others (being a different group) whereas the mean score was 2.28 for the statement that people feel isolated due to being treated as others. 2.44 was the mean score for that item that people fear of being treated as a stranger.

1.93 and 2.11 were the mean scores respectively for the statement people are treated in discriminatory behavior in educational institutes due to belonging to the other group and that people are treated in discriminatory behavior healthcare setting due to belonging to the other group. 1.96 was the mean score for the belief that people are treated in discriminatory behavior at workplace due to belonging to the other group, while 2.32 was the mean score for belief that people are treated in discriminatory behavior due to different sexual orientation. 2.06 was the mean score for two statement that were the belief that people are treated in discriminatory behavior due to their age and people are treated in discriminatory behavior due to their race and ethnicity.

The mean score was 2.02 for that statement that there is feeling of unrest among those who are discriminated in the educational institutes, health-care setting, workplace while for the statement that one may also feel a hate towards the others the mean score was 1.69. The mean score was 1.97 for the statement that one perceives that one may consider himself as different. The mean score was 1.93 for the statement that one may try to answer in same discriminatory manner as he/she confronts.

1.95 was the mean score for the statement that vandalism is the outcome of prejudice while the mean score was 2.15 for the statement that one may hate

Table 4. Allport's conceptualization of Prejudice.

S. No.	Statements	Mean	Item reliability
ANTILOCUTION			
1	You hear different jokes about others	1.95	.824
2	Hateful expressions are present about others	1.90	
3	You hear hate speech about others	2.08	
4	In this society, there is negative image of others	2.12	
AVOIDANCE			
1	You see people avoiding the others (being a different group)	2.19	.855
2	Do you think that people feel isolated due to being treated as others	2.28	
3	Do you believe that people fear of being treated as stranger	2.44	
DISCRIMINATION			
1	Do you think people are treated in discriminatory behavior in educational institutes due to belonging to the other group	1.93	.913
2	Do you think people are treated in discriminatory behavior healthcare setting due to belonging to the other group	2.11	
3	Do you think people are treated in discriminatory behavior at workplace due to belonging to the other group	1.96	
4	Do you think people are treated in discriminatory behavior due to different sexual orientation	2.32	
5	Do you think people are treated in discriminatory behavior due to their age	2.06	
6	Do you think people are treated in discriminatory behavior due to their race and ethnicity	2.06	
SUBTLE AGGRESSION			
1	Do you believe that there is feeling of unrest among those who are discriminated at educational institute, health-care setting, workplace and other indicators mentioned above	2.02	.972
2	Do you think that one may also feel a hate towards the others	1.69	
3	Do you perceive that may consider himself as different	1.97	
4	Do you believe that one may try to answer in same discriminatory manner as he/she confronts	1.93	
PHYSICAL ATTACK			
1	Do you think that vandalism is the outcome of it	1.95	.964
2	Do you think that one may hate people of a particular group because they exclude them	2.15	
3	Do you perceive that a physical harm is expected when one face prejudice (keeping in view the above indicators)	2.10	
4	Do you believe that it can lead to intentions of physical violence among those considered as others (excluded)	2.23	
EXTERMINATION			
1	Do you think that prejudice is responsible for genocide	2.24	.949
2	Do you think that prejudice is responsible for ethnic cleansing	1.82	
3	Do you believe that prejudice is responsible for riots	1.81	

people of a particular group because they exclude them. The mean score was 2.10 for the statement that one may perceive that a physical harm is expected when one face prejudice. 2.23 was mean score for the statement that it can lead to intentions of physical violence among those considered as others (excluded).

A mean score of 2.24 has been noted for the item that prejudice is responsible for genocide. 1.82 mean score has been noted for the statement that prejudice is responsible for ethnic cleansing while a mean score of 1.81 has been noted for the statement that that prejudice is responsible for riots

These mean scores are low which shows that respondents showed agreement and strong agreement with the statements regarding prejudice.

Regarding the reliability of scale .824 value of Cronbach's alpha has been achieved that shows that antilocution items devised in accordance with Allport's scale on prejudice are reliable. In the context of avoidance, a value of .855 on Cronbach's alpha has been achieved that shows that the items devised in accordance with Allport's scale on prejudice are reliable. A value of .913 on Cronbach's alpha has been achieved for discrimination about the items devised in according Allport's scale on prejudice are reliable. A value of .972 on Cronbach's alpha has been achieved for SUBTLE AGGRESSION about the items devised in accordance with Allport's scale on prejudice. For physical attack a value of .964 on Cronbach's alpha has been achieved showing that the items devised in accordance with Allport's scale on prejudice are reliable. A value of .949 on Cronbach's alpha has been achieved for extermination; the items devised in accordance with Allport's scale on prejudice are reliable.

The mean score of the statement that *Have you ever been violent with a close person to you belong to another group?* is 1.95 while it is 2.10 for the statement that a close person to one has ever been violent with him/her belonging to another group. The mean score is 2.20 for the statement/item that a distant person to one has ever been violent with him/her belonging to another group. A 1.97 of mean score has been noted for the item that strong people are the ones that generally commit a violent action against the weaker ones specially when they belong to a different group. In addition, the reliability value on Cronbach's alpha for this scale is .982 which shows that it is reliable (see Table 5).

Regression Analysis

Hypothesis One: Prevalence of prejudice is statistically significantly associated with antilocution (see Table 6).

The R value (i.e., .544) in the model summary table indicates about a moderate correlation between antilocution and violence whereas the R^2 values suggest a low degree of correlation among antilocution and violence (i.e., .296).

The F value of 162.1 with signification level of $p = .000$ in ANOVA shows a significant correlation among the antilocution and violence whereby violence is dependent on antilocution showing the data is good for fit (see Table 7).

Table 5. Violence observed.

S. No.	Statements	Mean	Item reliability
1	Have you ever been violent with a close person to you who belongs to another group?	1.95	.982
2	Have you experienced a closed person that is from another group is violent with a person of other group?	2.10	
3	Consider yourself being violent with a different and distant person who is from another group?	2.08	
4	Now be different, is another person who is stranger and is from a different group has ever been violent with you?	2.20	
5	What is your opinion about strong people? Are they more violent when strong people are from another group?	1.97	

Table 6. R value of correlation among antilocution and violence with emphasis on prejudice.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.544[a]	.296	.294	4.07407

[a]Predictors: (Constant), antilocution.

Table 7. Antilocution, predictors of dependent variable violence.

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	2692.067	1	2692.067	162.192	.000[a]
1	Residual	6406.840	386	16.598		
	Total	9098.907	387			

[a]Predictors: (Constant), antilocution; [b]Dependent Variable: violence

Table 8. Regression analysis antilocution and violence.

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.412	.595		5.735	.000
	antilocution	.881	.069	.544	12.735	.000

[a]Dependent Variable: violence.

The Coefficients in the regression analysis ($p = .000$) provides a statistically significant relationship among antilocution and violence (see Table 8).

Hypothesis Two: Prevalence of prejudice is statistically significantly associated with avoidance

The R value (i.e., 0.631) in the model summary table indicates a moderate correlation between avoidance and violence whereas the R^2 values suggests a moderate degree of correlation among avoidance and violence (i.e., 0.399) (see Table 9).

The F value of 257.2 with signification level of $p = .000$ in ANOVA shows a significant correlation among the avoidance and violence whereby violence is dependent on avoidance showing the data is good for fit (see Table 10).

The Coefficients in the regression analysis ($p = .000$) provides a statistically significant relationship among avoidance and violence (see Table 11).

Hypothesis Three: Prevalence of prejudice is statistically significantly associated with discrimination

The R value (i.e., 0.871) in the model summary table indicates about a high degree of correlation between discrimination and violence whereas the R^2 values suggests a high degree of correlation among discrimination and violence (i.e., .759) (see Table 12).

The F value of 1.22 with signification level of $p = .000$ in ANOVA shows a significant correlation among the discrimination and violence whereby violence is dependent on discrimination showing the data is good for fit (see Table 13).

The Coefficients in the regression analysis ($p = .000$) provides a statistically significant relationship among discrimination and violence (see Table 14).

Table 9. Moderate correlation, avoidance and violence.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.631[a]	.399	.397	3.75631

[a]Predictors: (Constant), avoidance.

Table 10. F values as violence is dependent of avoidance.

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	3630.837	1	3630.837	257.326	.000[a]
1	Residual	5474.640	388	14.110		
	Total	9105.477	389			

[a]Predictors: (Constant), avoidance; [b]Dependent Variable: violence.

Table 11. Avoidance and violence.

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.219	.493		6.534	.000
	Avoidance	1.054	.066	.631	16.041	.000

[a]Dependent Variable: violence.

Table 12. R2 values associations of discrimination and prejudice.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.871[a]	.759	.759	2.37583

[a]Predictors: (Constant), discrimination.

Hypothesis Four: Prevalence of prejudice is statistically significantly associated with subtle aggression

The R value (i.e., 0.902) in the model summary table indicates about a high degree of correlation between subtle aggression and violence whereas the R^2 value suggests a high degree of correlation among subtle aggression and violence (i.e., 0.296) (see Table 15).

The F value of 1.69 with signification level of p = .000 in ANOVA shows a significant correlation among the subtle aggression and violence whereby violence is dependent on subtle aggression showing the data is good for fit (see Table 16).

The Coefficients in the regression analysis (p = .000) provides a statistically significant relationship among subtle aggression and violence (see Table 17).

Hypothesis Five: Prevalence of prejudice is statistically significantly associated

Table 13. Violence as a dependent variable on discrimination.

	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	6915.392	1	6915.392	1.225E3	.000[a]
1	Residual	2190.085	388	5.645		
	Total	9105.477	389			

[a]Predictors: (Constant), discrimination; [b]Dependent Variable: violence.

Table 14. Relationship among discrimination and violence.

	Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	−.026	.324		−.081	.936
	discrimination	.847	.024	.871	35.002	.000

[a]Dependent Variable: violence.

Table 15. R^2 values and degree of correlation among subtle aggression and violence.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.902[a]	.814	.814	2.08853

[a]Predictors: (Constant), subtle aggression.

Table 16. Aggression and violence dependent on subtle aggression.

	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	7413.044	1	7413.044	1.699E3	.000[a]
1	Residual	1692.433	388	4.362		
	Total	9105.477	389			

[a]Predictors: (Constant), subtle aggression; [b]Dependent Variable: violence.

with physical attack

The R value (i.e., .949) in the model summary table indicates about a high degree of correlation between physical attack (in the Allport's scale) and violence whereas the R^2 value suggests a high degree of correlation among physical attack (in the Allport's scale) and violence (i.e., .901) (see Table 18).

The F value of 3.51 with signification level of p = .000 in ANOVA shows a significant correlation among the physical attack (on Allport's scale) and violence whereby violence is dependent on physical attack (on Allport's scale) showing the data is good for fit (see Table 19).

The Coefficients in the regression analysis (p = .000) provides a statistically significant relationship among physical attack (on Allport's scale) and violence (see Table 20).

Table 17. Relationship among subtle aggression and aggression.

Model		Un-standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.259	.270		.960	.338
	Subtle aggression	1.346	.033	.902	41.225	.000

[a]Dependent Variable: violence.

Table 18. Prejudice significantly associated with physical attack.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.949[a]	.901	.900	1.52716

[a]Predictors: (Constant), physical attack.

Table 19. Significant correlation among the physical attack (on Allport's scale).

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	8200.576	1	8200.576	3.516E3	.000[a]
	Residual	904.901	388	2.332		
	Total	9105.477	389			

[a]Predictors: (Constant), physical attack; [b]Dependent Variable: violence.

Table 20. Significant relationship among physical attack (on Allport's scale) and violence.

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.086	.177		6.143	.000
	Physical attack	1.118	.019	.949	59.298	.000

[a]Dependent Variable: violence.

Hypothesis Six: Prevalence of prejudice is statistically significantly associated with extermination.

The R value (i.e., .919) in the model summary table indicates about a high degree of correlation between extermination and violence whereas the R^2 value suggests a high degree of correlation among extermination and violence (i.e., .844) (see Table 21).

The F value of 2.09 with signification level of p = .000 in ANOVA shows a significant correlation among the extermination and violence whereby violence is dependent on extermination showing the data is good for fit (see Table 22).

The Coefficients in the regression analysis (p = 0.000) provides a statistically significant relationship among extermination and violence (see Table 23).

4. Discussion

Prejudice is one of the social problems that prevailed throughout human history; however, it is relative and variable, for example, it prevails in numerous forms, intensity and variation on other indicators. The current study indicates that in the study's locale people perceive it to be prevailing in different sectors of life in different form such as prejudice prevails in the healthcare sector, employment and job sector. In addition, prejudice can be gendered such as women thinking about men as others or men and women thinking of transexual as the others.

Table 21. Model Summary of correlation between extermination and violence with R values.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.919[a]	.844	.844	1.91389

[a]Predictors: (Constant), extermination.

Table 22. ANOVA of significant correlation among the extermination and violence.

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	7684.249	1	7684.249	2.098E3	.000[a]
1	Residual	1421.228	388	3.663		
	Total	9105.477	389			

[a]Predictors: (Constant), extermination; [b]Dependent Variable: violence.

Table 23. Coefficients of significant relationship among extermination and violence.

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.468	.220		6.677	.000
	extermination	1.542	.034	.919	45.802	.000

[a]Dependent Variable: violence.

Individual level prejudice also prevails and sometimes groups are labeled as others on the basis of gender and or race. Racial prejudice is one the key prospects of modern society due to cultural and ethnic mix as shown by the findings of this study as well.

In general, the consequences of prejudice are evident, for example, stereotypes are the most common such as women being another group as weak or Black being another group as violent or aggressive. This leads to social harm, for instance, social stigma, riots, social negation and discrimination. In addition, individual level consequences also prevail as indicated by this study that may include mental illnesses, felt stigma and rejection etc.

The descriptive analysis indicates mean scores which suggests that antilocution, for example, hear different jokes about others and hateful expressions are present about others prevails in the study's locale. Hate speech about others and a negative image of others is also a part of prejudice as per the findings of this study. This study indicates that there are people who avoid the others (being a different group), feel isolated due to being treated as others as well as people fear of being treated as strangers.

Discrimination also is evident in case of feeling different from others, for instance, based upon gender, race, personal basis as well as discrimination on such basis prevails in healthcare sector, educational sector, job acquisition etc. Further, subtle aggression and physical attacks results whereby the key indicators are feeling of unrest among those who are discriminated at educational institute, health-care setting, workplace, feeling of hate towards the others, considering himself as different, vandalism, hating people of a particular group because they exclude them, a physical harm is expected when one face prejudice as well as the intentions of physical violence among those considered as others (excluded). The extermination is the final stage whereby prejudice is responsible for genocide, ethnic cleansing and prejudice is responsible for riots as well.

The prevalence of violence linked to prejudice is evident from this study, for instance, being violent with a close person to you belongs to another group or a close person to you has ever been violent with you belonging to another group. A distant person to you belonging to another group may be violent or a distant person to you has ever been violent with you belonging to another group. For the purpose of this research violence used here is in reference to the psychological impact prejudice has as compared to causing physical harm.

5. Conclusion

Human nature and nurture were explored by Goffman and Allport in a different way by describing the human instinct and social learning to consider himself and the others as different, referring to prejudice. Different researchers extend this area or domain of research whereby aggression and violence were studied resulting from prejudice such as due to negative attitude. Prejudice is a source of many social problems including aggression and violence. This study focused on

three objectives: 1) to know about prevalence and forms of prejudice at the study's local; 2) to describe the general consequences of prejudice; 3) to investigate into the connection between prejudice and violence.

It is concluded that in the study's locale people perceive it to be prevailing in different sectors of life in different forms such as prejudice prevails in the healthcare sector, employment and job sector; prejudice can be gendered or racial etc. The consequences of prejudice are evident such as stereotypes, social harm, social stigma, riots, social negation and discrimination and individual level consequences such as mental illness. The prevalence of violence which is linked to prejudice is evident from this study, whereby Allport's conceptualization was used as a guide to better understand the active variables of prejudice. For example, anti-locution, hate speech, discrimination, subtle aggression, physical harm and extermination are all statistically significantly and associated with violence. It is evident that offensive behaviors, a lost of opportunities within the education, career, social and within the health setting could happen to people who are the victims of prejudices. The harboring of resentments and a loss of sense of community, are some of the social and practical implication based on this research.

6. Suggestions for Future Research

Keeping in view the findings of the current study, few suggestions for the researchers are:

1) To investigate how school level children perceive being treated as the *other* and how it impacts the future life. This significant aspect of the future life is within a multi-ethnic and global society.

2) What is the extent of violence resulting from prejudice and how is it different when it occurs in different settings such as at school and at hospital?

3) What are the ways in which tolerance can be internalized at school level children to avoid being prejudiced? This suggestion is important at policy level.

4) The need to include culture and the history of people during data collection.

5) Future researchers in this area of interest should investigate more into a much broader sample population.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice.* Addison-Wesley.

Allport, G. W. (1958). *The Nature of Prejudice: Abridged.* Doubleday.

Anderson, C. A., & Huesmann, L. R. (2003). Human Aggression: A Social-Cognitive View. In M. A. Hogg & J. Cooper (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 296-326). SAGE Publications.

Burgess, M. C. R., Stermer, S. P., & Burgess, S. R. (2007). Sex, Lies, and Video Games: The

Portrayal of Male and Female Characters on Video Game Covers. *Sex Roles, 57,* 419-433. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9250-0

Behm-Morawitz, E., & Ta, D. (2014). Cultivating Virtual Stereotypes?: The Impact of Video Game Play on Racial/Ethnic Stereotypes. *Howard Journal of Communications, 25,* 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/10646175.2013.835600

Correll, J., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2002). The Police Officer's Dilemma: Using Ethnicity to Disambiguate Potentially Threatening Individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83,* 1314-1329. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.83.6.1314

Creswell, J. W., & Plano-Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research.* SAGE Publications.

Dill, K. E., & Thill, K. P. (2007). Video Game Characters and the Socialization of Gender roLes: Young People's Perceptions Mirror Sexist Media Depictions. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 57,* 851-864. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9278-1

Freilich, J. D., & Chermak, S. M. (2013). *Problem-Oriented Guides for Police.* Problem-Specific Guides, Series No. 72. Center for Problem-Oriented Policing.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity.* Simon and Schuster.

Hinduja, S. (2006). Employee Perceptions of Prejudice and Violence in the Workplace: Implications for Corporate Security. *Risk Management, 8,* 175-191. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3867875 https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.rm.8250007

Krieger, N. (1990). Racial and Gender Discrimination: Risk Factors for High Blood Pressure? *Social Science & Medicine, 30,* 1273-1281. https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(90)90307-E

Link, B., Castille, D. M., & Stuber, J. (2008). Stigma and Coercion in the Context of Outpatient Treatment for People with Mental Illnesses. *Social Science & Medicine, 67,* 409-419. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.03.015

Nueman, L. (2006). *Social Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Research.* Pearson Publications.

Trochim, W. M. K. (2006). *The Qualitative Debate.* Research Methods Knowledge Base. http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/qualmeth.php.Retrieved on 30/11/2022

Turiel, E. (2007). Commentary: The Problems of Prejudice, Discrimination, and Exclusion. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 31,* 419-422. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025407083670

Wahl, O. F. (1999). Mental Health Consumers' Experience of Stigma. *Schizophrenia Bulletin, 25,* 467-478. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.schbul.a033394