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Introduction
Tajfel and Turner (1979) proposed that the groups (e.g. social class, family, football team etc.) which people belonged to were an important source of belongingness and self-esteem. Aside from personal characteristics and achievements, people derive a sense of belongingness and self-esteem by nationality, ethnicity, or gender (Koomen and van der Pligt, 2016).

Media Portrayal and Dehumanization
Dehumanization implicates the denial of full humanness to others, along with omission from the human species (Esses, Mediana, and Lawson, 2013). Esses and colleagues studied the dehumanization of refugees along the moral element of prosocial values (Esses et al., 2008). If people perceive that a group lacks prosocial values, then they will judge that group to be less human and thus less worthy of human treatment.

Discussion
The data available by Esses, Mediana and Lawson (2013) investigated the role of the media in promoting the dehumanization of immigrants and refugees. Participants in their study were asked to read an online article reviewing a biography of the actor Steve Martin and to answer some questions about it. Displayed on the bottom right-hand side of the page an editorial cartoon was shown. The cartoon showed an immigrant arriving at an Immigration Canada booth carrying several suitcases. In one condition, the immigrant was also carrying displayed labels for various diseases (e.g. AIDS, SARS). In the other condition, no labels were present. Once the participants finished the article, they answered questions about the article which was then followed by a set of unrelated additional questions; these questions included questions about immigrants. This elusive manipulation resulted in an increased tendency to associate immigrants as spreaders of diseases (Koomen & van der Pligt, 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No disease labels</th>
<th>Disease labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants as sources/spreaders of disease (1 to 7)**</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value dehumanization (0 to 4)**</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehumanization: Enemy/barbarian image (1 to 7)**</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contempt (-3 to +3)**</td>
<td>−1.69</td>
<td>−1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of admiration (-3 to +3)**</td>
<td>−0.31</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward immigrants and immigration (1 to 7)**</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note
**p < .01, *p < .05, ’p < .09.
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Radicalization and Media Exposure in Today’s Society

Radicalization is a process by which individuals are introduced to an overtly ideological message and belief system that encourages movement from moderate, mainstream beliefs towards extreme views. While radicalization is a global issue, radicalization associated with extremist beliefs is a growing concern for law enforcement domestically, as well. Radical and extremist groups recruit people who are seeking to change an established system. Historically, certain events create feelings that lead to a frame of mind focused on revenge or retaliation. Strong identification with the individual or group, where an event has led to perceived injustice often leads to seeking out association with groups that can possibly take action against the injustice. Radical thought or action does not necessarily translate into terrorism. These radical views only become a problem when they are used to promote or condone violence or other extremist behaviors. Examples of domestic radical or extremist groups include: anti-government Extremist groups, White Supremacist Groups, ACAB (All Cops Are Bastards), COPWATCH, and the New Black Panther Party.

Media exposure in our society has evolved tremendously in the past decade. Portable technology such as smartphones gives average citizens access to convenient personal recording devices that are quickly available to record important events. The result has been an increase in the use of citizen accounts of incidents that involve risk information. Furthermore, average citizens are now active participants in activities that were previously addressed by professional journalists. The increase of citizen video journalism (CVJ) has gained momentum in both the broadcast media venues and the social media venues as a means of exposing otherwise unpublicized incidences or events. With this large influx of diversity in receiving information and the increasing number of media driven members of society, it is extremely important to understand how media imagery exposure affects the attitudes of the public. More specifically, how exposure to negative media imagery affects the public’s attitudes toward police. The overall goal of this research is to gain a much needed understanding of the role of negative media imagery and the criminal justice system.

Theory of Cultivation

Cultivation Theory was developed by George Gerbner in the 1960s and delves deeply into the extent to which violence on television cultivates conceptions involving the risks of violence and creates feelings of mistrust. According to Gerbner and colleagues (1969), “Television’s mean and dangerous world tends to cultivate a sense of relative danger and mistrust”. Gerbner argued that television did not invent violence, but it did create daily exposure to violence in every home. Recent studies have reexamined the applicability of Cultivation Theory in light of the increase in the use of citizen videos. Cultivation theory still accounts for the majority of viewing, cultivation theory is applicable to new forms of media such as smartphones and computers (Morgan & Shanahan, 2010). Cultivation theory suggests that increased access to negative information about police behavior may influence the public's sense of danger and mistrust, particularly if the imagery portrays instances of police misconduct.

Research Questions

- What is the relationship between the source of information about police behavior and public attitudes toward the police?
- What is the relationship between the source of information about police behavior and the severity of sanctions the public might support for such behaviors?

Method

Participants (N=93), consisted of students from a historically, black, university sample. The sample consisted of a majority of participants under the age of 25 (62.5%). Of the participants, there were 66 females (71%) and 27 males (29%). The majority of the sample was undergraduates with the exception of three, which were graduate students. The majority of the sample identified themselves as being African American (63.4%), with only 14% being represented by Caucasian, 4.3% by Hispanic or Latino, 12.9% by Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and 5.4% who selected “other” or “don’t know” as their ethnic background. A survey was administered to gather information about participants’ background, including education, and their prior experience with the police and the courts. The participants completed a series of measures of their attitudes of several different occupational groups including police. Participants completed a baseline measure of cynicism, viewed a video of police behavior which was experimentally manipulated according to source, and then completed a second cynicism measure. Participants were then asked to suggest a positive or negative sanction for police behavior.

Results

A significant main effect was demonstrated for the pre/post cynicism level, indicating that while no significant difference was found between the Social Media group and the Broadcast Media group prior to viewing the videos, the predicted difference was found after viewing the videos (F(1)=0.240, p=n.s, and F(1)=4.318, p<0.041, partial η2 =.045, respectively).

Mean Cynicism by Media Type and Time

A chi square analysis revealed that a greater percentage of the participants in the social media group felt that the officers committed misdemeanor assault than did participants in the mainstream video group. Of the 93 participants, 33 (35.5%) reported that they believed the officers violated KRS statute 508.030, 28 of whom where in the Social Media group and 8 of whom were in the Broadcast Media group (χ2 (2,92)=11.871, p =.001).

Discussion

The research in this study suggests that exposure to CVJ through Social Media venues may exacerbate the problem of “homegrown terrorism” also known as domestic radicalization leading to terrorist violence. These data suggest that exposure to citizen video journalism via social media increases cynicism toward police. This reveals the importance of examining the impact of the media on public attitudes. More importantly, it shows that it has become increasingly necessary to investigate how information is presented to the public. Social media is becoming an integral part of how information is being presented to the public. Furthermore, individuals are using social media to obtain information. As a result, our focus should not be limited to how the police are being positively and negatively portrayed in the media but how that information is being delivered. The results of this research support Gerbner’s idea of investigating how television viewing influences the opinions and attitudes of the public. Research has shown that television viewing makes a consistent contribution to shaping viewer’s beliefs and perspectives (Morgan & Shanahan, 2010).

The findings of this research are important to the justice system in the United States. The public’s perception of police is vital in maintaining a cohesive relationship to ensure the success of the criminal justice system on both a micro and macro level. By creating a greater understanding of how cynicism develops among the individuals in our society, we can focus on a direction that is conducive to reducing the divide between law enforcement and citizens.
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Introduction
A way in which people rationalize the mistreatment of a group of people is by quoting statistics and studies that show the group of people to be “inferior”, “Evil”, or as against their values. For the modern era this group of people is the Muslim community. This is due in part to terrorist organizations like ISIS who give all Muslims a bad name, and fear-mongering by the media and political figures to push agendas. This poster hopes to expose some of the bad methods used and the biased interpretation of results from surveys.

Instrument
This poster will be referencing a survey conducted by Wenzel Strategies for WorldNetDaily.com an independent online news website. This survey is quoted on the website BareNakedMuslim.com which is where the poster will be quoting its statistics from.

“The poll also found 40 percent of Muslims in America believe they should not be judged by U.S. law and the Constitution, but by Sharia standards.” (Barenakedmuslim.com)

Do you agree or disagree that Sharia law should be considered by U.S. courts when adjudicating cases involving Muslims?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First of all the quote is misrepresenting the question that was asked. Secondly Specifically 38.8% percent of Muslims agreed that Sharia Law should be CONSIDERED in cases. The quote also fails to mention the 44.7% who disagree with the statement.

“32 percent – believe Sharia should be the supreme law of the land in the United States” (Barenakedislam.com)

While 32% may sound like a large number, what they are not saying is that is both “Strongly Agree” and “Somewhat Agree” combined while “Strongly Disagree” is 41% on it’s own.

Discussion
As demonstrated the results of a study can be misrepresented and construed to fit an agenda. This poster was only able to showcase 4 of the 16 questions asked on the survey, and even fewer of the claims made by the website. One that was completely left out was how 72.8% of Muslims surveyed agreed that if there was a conflict between the Constitution and Sharia Law Muslims should follow the Constitution and only 6.8% believed they should follow Sharia Law, with 20.3% being unsure.

References
BareNakelslam. (2012, October 31). Next time someone tells you Muslims in America are just like you and me, show them these stats. http://www.barenakedislam.com/2012/10/31/next-time-someone-tells-you-muslims-in-america-are-just-like-you-and-me-show-them-these-stats/

Women’s suffrage refers to an international social movement that began around 1820. The Industrial Revolution brought about great social change, including the movement away from family-owned businesses and agricultural enterprises in which fathers and sons worked the family farm. Multiple generations lived together and work was divided along a gender divide which included clearly prescribed roles for men and women. Men were the providers, while women were the homemakers and caregivers, requiring the support and protection of the men in the household. Families moved to industrialized areas where work was available, and the traditional nuclear family consisting of father, mother, and offspring evolved.

The first gathering devoted to women’s rights in the United States was held July 19–20, 1848, in Seneca Falls, New York. In the late 1880s and early 1890s, when the nation experienced a surge of volunteerism among middle-class women—activists in progressive causes, members of women’s clubs and professional societies, temperance advocates, and participants in local civic and charity organizations. The determination of these women to expand their sphere of activities further outside the home helped legitimate the suffrage movement.

Propaganda against women’s suffrage centered largely around sex roles and gender expectations. Women who wanted the vote were ridiculed and portrayed as bitter, sexually unappealing, masculinized, and criminalized. Suffragettes were beaten and arrested, and force fed in jail when they went on hunger strikes. Men and children were portrayed as victims of neglect and abuse by anti-suffragists.

Propaganda in favor of women’s suffrage tended to focus more on the civil rights denied to them. Propaganda argued against the position that women were intellectually inferior to men.

Finally ratified, enfranchising all American women and declaring for the first time that they, like men, deserve all the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.
Political Polarization Within the United States
Chandler Al Namer and Taleb Al Namer, Kentucky State University

*We dance around the ring and suppose, But the Secret sits in the middle and knows*  
—Robert Frost

**Polarization**

Since the mid-twentieth century, the political parties of the United States have drifted further and further apart. Now more than ever, there are extreme left and right political wings rather than a centralized system, demonstrating the phenomenon known as group polarization. Merriam-Webster defines polarization as “Division into two opposites, concentration about opposing extremes of groups or interests formerly ranged on a continuum.”

**Framing the Issues**

Those on the opposite ends of the ideological spectrum disagree about everything from the type of community in which they prefer to live to the type of people they would welcome into their families. For example:

- Liberals are more likely than conservatives to say racial and ethnic diversity are important in a community.
- Conservatives are more likely than liberals to want to live in a place where many people share their religious faith.

**Perceived Threat and Risky Shift**

“Risky shift” refers to the observed tendency for people to make more daring decisions when they are in groups, than when they are alone (Dictionary of Sociology). When political identities become salient, risky shift may increase due to the presence of real or implied others that share one’s ideology. It is more difficult to disagree with a majority of group members; lone dissenters seldom “hold out” against the majority opinion. Diverse opinions produce the most effective outcomes, but the belief that negative consequences will ensue after voicing a dissenting opinion often prevents the candid exchange of ideas. Group polarization has the potential to increase risky shift as opposing parties campaign by pointing out the strengths of their candidates and the flaws of the opponents.

**Constructing Threat**

Some disparities between opposing political parties can be views about the sources of threat that are made salient by propaganda.
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Job Discrimination and the Civil Rights Movement

Eddie Wright, Kentucky State University

Background

Job discrimination is a form of discrimination based on race, gender, religion, national origin, physical or mental disability, and age by employers. In this study I will be sequencing disadvantages barriers to employment facing young black and white men with criminal records. Although the Civil Rights Act of 1964 outlaws discrimination based on race, religion, color, sex or national origin, Personal experience is often radicalizing, sexism, racism, poverty, and perceived injustices radicalize people to chance the world. When people are discriminated against because of uncontrollable factors such as race, it can change their views on the world. The results of a large-scale field experiment conducted in New York City investigating the effects of race and a prison record on employment.

Data & Method

The New York City Hiring Discrimination Study sent matched teams of testers to apply for 250 real entry-level jobs throughout New York City over nine months in 2004. The testers were well-spoken, clean-shaven young men, ages twenty-two to twenty-six. The only difference was their race. The first team paired two white applicants, one presenting a criminal record and the other a clean record. The second team paired two similar black applicants. None of the testers had real criminal backgrounds, but presented fictitious records to employers. Testers rotated which member of the pair presented criminal background information, which allowed for control of within-pair differences that might affect hiring outcomes. Testers in each team applied to each job within a twenty-four-hour period, randomly varying the order of the applicants. Our dependent variable recorded positive responses in which a tester was either offered a job or called back for a second interview. Callbacks were recorded by voice mail boxes set up for each tester. For more information about the research design and methods, see Pager, Western, and Bonikowski (2007) and points to special barriers facing blacks in the transition from prison to work. Employers, already reluctant to hire blacks, appear particularly wary of blacks with known criminal histories. In the remainder of this article, we examine the sequence of interactions that lead to this ultimate pattern of results. As job applicants pass from the point of application to an interview, and from an interview to an offer, we witness some of the underlying dynamics that may shape employers’ decision making and result in the systematic disadvantage of blacks with criminal records.

Results

Two key findings emerge from the audit results. First, as in earlier research, a criminal record has a significant negative impact on hiring outcomes, even for applicants with otherwise appealing characteristics. Across teams, a criminal record reduces the likelihood of a callback or job offer by nearly 50 percent (28 vs. 15 percent). Second, the negative effect of a criminal conviction is substantially larger for blacks than for whites. As shown in Figure 1, the magnitude of the criminal record penalty suffered by black applicants (60 percent) is roughly double the size of the penalty for whites with a record (30 percent). This interaction between race and criminal record is large and statistically significant, which indicates that the penalty of a criminal record is more disabling for black job seekers than whites. The intensification of the criminal record effect among blacks is consistent with earlier audit research (Pager 2007) and points to special barriers facing blacks in the transition from prison to work. Employers, already reluctant to hire blacks, appear particularly wary of blacks with known criminal histories. In the remainder of this article, we examine the sequence of interactions that lead to this ultimate pattern of results. As job applicants pass from the point of application to an interview, and from an interview to an offer, we witness some of the underlying dynamics that may shape employers’ decision making and result in the systematic disadvantage of blacks with criminal records.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the results of this study show a strong reluctance among employers to hire applicants with criminal records, especially when considering black ex-offenders. As I said before, In this study I have conducted sequencing disadvantages barriers to employment facing young black and white men with criminal records. The graphs and data that has been displayed to you are proven facts that blacks are less likely to receive a job offer. Furthermore, although the distribution of reactions from employers is roughly similar among black and white applicants with criminal backgrounds, actual employment outcomes differ for those who have little opportunity to discuss their criminal record: among whites, these limited interactions are not overly consequential; whereas for blacks, job opportunities appear substantially reduced. Even though some blacks are given the job they have an equal pay barrier to face. Blacks are more likely to be paid less than whites, and even with the Equal Pay Act of 1963 that aimed to abolish they wage disparity based on races. One example to prove this to be true is in some professions whites are more likely to receive higher pay than Black African Americans.
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Black Lives Matter was created by 3 women: Alicia Garza, Opal Tometi, Patrisse Cullors. A call to action for Black people after the murder of Trayvon Martin and the lack of accountability George Zimmerman had held against him by the court system. It represents a response to the anti-Black racism that permeates our society and also, unfortunately, our movements.

It is an ideological and political intervention in a world where Black folks’ contributions to humanity, and our resilience in the face of deadly oppression.

It is the wake up call to ALL people that there are schemes and underhanded practices going on in America against its citizens, starting with and not limited to Black people. For in the perspective of the Black Lives Matter movement, if all other groups and cultures open their minds to the problems of Black people and look into how their own interact with the lives of Black people they will see that there is something going on that needs to be solved. But enlightenment through investigation is the only way it can begin to be handled.

Black Lives Matter is against the 13th amendment being used to enslave American citizens in part of a conglomerate business of prisons across the U.S. by use of loopholes in 13th amendment they are enslaving Men of all races but mainly minorities. These people are the new slaves being used to make goods at severely under minimum wage prices. While Americans feel that people over seas making a few cents an hour is a crime against humanity, Little do they know it is happening in their own country. Prisons don’t stop crime. They take advantage of it. They are against Systematic Oppression and Systematic Racism/Bigotry present in American Culture towards many groups.

Many people feel that Black Lives Matter needs to learn how to protest “Peacefully” as their methods have had severe reactions and consequences. In such protest as the one shown below the obstruction of traffic caused an ambulance to be halted in which its passenger died.

“For when Black people are free, ALL people are free.” -Black Lives Matter
For: Empowerment of Black People through Education
They are against Systematic Oppression and Systematic Racism/Bigotry present in American Culture towards many groups.
Identity politics: It is not uncommon for a person to take the side of another, a group, or a politician who will empower them the most, the person or group they identify with.

What is Identity politics?

Identity politics is political action to advance the interests of a group whose members share a marginalized identity. Most identity politics are benign, but identity politics may reach the extent of radicalization as identities become threatened by political action. Identity Politics is based on a person/group demanding “authenticity,” and civil power.

People can have multiple identities, as they occupy their various roles. Women may simultaneously be scientists, mothers, wives, and softball players; men may be chefs, fathers, husbands, and car enthusiasts; identities may be tied to religion, race, sex, national origin, sexual orientation, age, or other statuses.

Identities are made salient in many ways, and are often imbedded in social context. When at home, the woman/mother/wife identities may be more salient for an individual than are the politician/church member/painter identities that the woman may occupy elsewhere.

Many forms of identity politics are related to MASTER STATUSES, or characteristics that are immutable and immediately salient. Master statuses include such attributes as race and sex, which in many instances are immediately apparent to observers. Master statuses also invoke stereotypes and may also elicit prejudice and discrimination from others.

Stereotypical thinking elicited by master statuses may lead to group polarization when groups have competing interests. Polarization results from a “we vs. they” mindset.

In large crowds where competing interests are being voiced, deindividuation may occur, resulting in radical mob behavior. Deindividuation and the anonymity of the crowd reduces personal responsibility and the need to adhere to psychological and social norms. The “mob mentality” becomes problematic when it leads to acts of violence, defiance towards police authority, or highly disruptive towards others and their property. Sometimes it can even be the beginning of behavior that leads to extremism and terrorism.

Examples of instances of identity politics:

Some women may always vote for female candidates regardless of policies. The most recent general election was an opportunity to observe identity politics as issues were framed in female vs. male terms. Threats to women’s health issues and the denial of fundamental rights resulted in the Women’s March, which was joined by millions of people around the world.

Some minority individuals choose not to vote because they do not feel that their interests are represented by any of the candidates. Of the people who voted in 2008, 95% of those who were Black supported President Barack Obama. The crowd at President Obama’s 2008 inauguration was the largest crowd ever to attend a Presidential inauguration.

Some marginalized groups such as LGBTQ persons may not fully participate in society because of social norms and taboos. Same sex marriage laws are still hotly contested in some areas, evoking activists and protesters to engage in social movement activities. California’s Proposition 8 and Colorado’s Amendment 43, which both banned same sex marriage, were overturned on Constitutional grounds after gay rights activists raised human and civil rights issues in the courts.
What is Radicalization:
To radicalize someone is to shift a person or group’s opinions toward either end of the political spectrum. To radicalize people is to cause a shift in their beliefs that make them want to take action for social reform. Once they’re radicalized, they’ll want big political or social changes and work to make them happen. Personal experience is often radicalizing — sexism, racism, poverty, and perceived injustices radicalize many people to try to change the world.

Introduction/Background:
Social Psychological research has shown that humans are inclined to separate into groups and formed identities based on group membership. Once apart of that group, members tend to evaluate in-group members positively and out groups negatively. When concrete rewards are involved, they reward in-group members more generously than out group members. It turns out people will do this based on almost any characteristic and, in fact, will even do so when grouped randomly and informed that the groups are random. This is called minimal group paradigm. In 1971, Henri Tajfel conducted experiments to find out what the minimal conditions were for intergroup bias. Tajfel demonstrated that the minimal condition needed for group favoritism is simply categorization into a group, no matter how arbitrary the criteria for categorization.

Method:
In the first phase, participants are randomly and anonymously divided into two groups “Group A” and “Group B.” Sometimes, these participants are strangers to one another. In the second phase, participants take part in an “resource” distribution task. (money or points) between other participants who are only identified by code number and group membership (i.e participant number 34 of Group A”). Participants are told that, after the task is finished, they will receive the total amount of the resource that has been allocated to them by the other participants.

Results:
✓ Subjects favored members of their own group
✓ Subjects frequently sacrificed higher in-group profits in favor of relative gain over the out-group
✓ Social categorization is a sufficient condition for the arousal of in-group bias
✓ Tendency to discriminate against out-group members is even stronger when people have chosen their group

Procedure:
Two experiments were conducted:
EXPERIMENT 1: 64 male subjects aged 14 to 15 who estimated the number of dots projected on a screen. They were divided into four groups, under two different experimental conditions. -“neutral” condition, subjects were told that some overestimate and others underestimate, but this did not reflect accuracy. -“value” condition, the subjects were told that some people are more accurate than others. The subjects were then randomly assigned to one of the four groups regardless of their actual performance (which was irrelevant for this experiment).

Discussion:
Tajfel’s original experiments were criticized based on the fact that he used young students, who are generally competitive and susceptible to bias. The methodology he used was also criticized by those who argued that the nature of the experiment led students to assume the idea was to favor their group. Decades of follow up studies have altered the conditions and tested for these moderators, yet Tajfel’s theory still remains strong. It is important to note that Tajfel’s work did not demonstrate that out-group discrimination was the result of these minimal conditions; simply that in-group favoritism was. In social identity theory, people are thought to award more points to their own group than to the out-group in the minimal group paradigm because, in those circumstances, in-group favoritism is the only way in which to achieve positive distinctiveness.
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