CHAPTER TWO

FEAR, HATE, ANGER, RESENTMENT,
AND ENVY IN YOUTHS’ RACIST ATTITUDES
TOWARD IMMIGRANTS

CAMILLA PAGANI

INSTITUTE OF COGNITIVE SCIENCES AND TECHNOLOGIES
NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (CNR), ROME, ITALY

Abstract & Keywords
Introduction
Emotions at Work: an exemplar drawn from our data
Envy, Resentment, and Anger
Conclusion: Knowledge and Social Cohesion
References
Short Biography

Abstract
In our earlier studies on Italian youths’ attitudes toward multiculturalism, we identified fear, hate, anger, resentment, and envy as significant emotions underlying youths’ racism toward immigrants. Here, these emotions are compared and contrasted within the context of cross-cultural relations and, more precisely, of youths’ attitudes toward cultural...
diversity. Surprisingly, our research indicates that envy can sometimes play a significant role in youths’ non-acceptance or slight acceptance of diversity. Some main constituents of each of these emotions, particularly of envy, anger, and resentment, are considered, especially those constituents that most specifically characterize each emotion and differentiate it from the others. The various reciprocal interactions among these emotions and the relationships between them and perception of threat and perception of social cohesion respectively are also considered. What is more, it can be clearly seen that in various ways these emotions and these perceptions are related to knowledge, another element of the theoretical model I am proposing. Here knowledge embraces such conceptualizations as: a) general information about immigration; b) the various types of socio-cultural patterns provided both by school and by the family regarding attitudes toward multiculturalism; c) the different experiences of direct contact with specific immigrants. Furthermore, the importance of cultural differences per se in youths’ cross-cultural relations is questioned.
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Introduction

In this chapter, I shall especially focus on the role of emotions like fear, hate, anger, resentment, and envy in youths’ racist attitudes. However, it would be useful to present a few preliminary considerations. This study is a follow-up of two previous studies we conducted on (a) youths’ attitudes to multiculturalism (e.g., Pagani & Robustelli, 2010) and (b) the relationship between these attitudes and social cohesion (Pagani, 2012).

One of the results of the first study (age of participants: 9-18) was the identification of different kinds of fears related to youths’ non-acceptance or slight acceptance of multiculturalism. Among the results of the second study (age of participants: 15-19) was improvement of the understanding of the relationship between social cohesion and fear and between social cohesion and attitudes to diversity. The data were gathered with the use of anonymous open-ended essays and focus groups respectively among children and adolescents living in central Italy (Rome, the province of Rome, and the province of Florence).

In the last few years, the number of immigrant pupils enrolled in Italian schools has considerably increased, with 9% in the 2011/2012 school year.
This fact has unequivocally strengthened the potential notable contribution that school can provide to help youths develop constructive cross-cultural relations at school and outside school. Consequently, it has also strengthened the potential contribution that school can provide to helping youths positively address the enormous social transformations that multiculturalism has produced in our society.

One significant motivation of my study on the role of emotions like fear, hate, anger, resentment, and envy in youths’ hostile attitudes toward immigrants was the acknowledgment that (a) racism is still deeply-rooted in a part of the juvenile population; (b) in order to thoroughly understand the phenomenon it is urgent to improve the analysis of the emotions underlying it; and (c) the results of this analysis might help educators develop more effective interventions to eradicate racism.

I acknowledge that the adjective “racist” is in some way improper in this context and in many other contexts. In the scientific literature, adjectives like “subtle” or “aversive” have often been used to modify the meaning of “racism” (e.g., Brewer, 1999; Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998). My opinion is that true racism, that is pure, absolute racism, totally without nuances and contradictions, is not as frequent in the juvenile population as is generally believed. Thus, instead of “racism” and “racist”, the use of a phrase like “non-acceptance (or “slight acceptance”) of (cultural) diversity” and of adjectives belonging to the semantic field of “acceptance” would probably be more recommendable.

Obviously, another reason for avoiding to use terms like “racism” or “racist” might be that the biological bases of race have been widely disproved (e.g., Cavalli-Sforza & Feldman, 1973; Jacquard, 1981/1986; Lewontin, Rose & Kamin 1984) and that the idea of race is a social construction (Banks & Eberhardt, 1998; Pagni & Robustelli, 2011).

Thirdly, it is important to point out that all these five emotions – fear, hate, anger, resentment, and envy - are triggered by one common experience, namely the perception of threat. What is more, this experience and the five emotions are related in different ways to knowledge or lack of knowledge.

**Emotions at work: an exemplar drawn from our data**

A short anonymous essay written by a 10-year-old girl, who participated in the study on youths’ attitudes toward multiculturalism, shows these emotions and their interactions in non-acceptance or slight acceptance of (cultural) diversity. One important advantage of this essay is the special, almost naive, directness and immediacy with which she
describes her emotions, thoughts, and beliefs characterizing her aversion to her immigrant classmates. This directness and immediacy allow us to identify and analyze the emotional and cognitive processes underlying her attitude. The essay is written in very poor Italian. Therefore, translating this linguistic poverty into another language is particularly difficult. Communicating the weak and confused structure of ideas, beliefs, and emotions expressed in this essay is also difficult. I will quote only the last two thirds of it:

In our class there are more immigrant than Italian pupils, they came here for different reasons […]. We should accept all of them.

Our immigrant classmates maltreat us and we have to put up with them and if we react against them we will be put in jail, we have to defend ourselves!

And if we do not do it, they will conquer us!

Here at school, they are in a privileged position; they receive snacks and sweets and do whatever they like. Pupils should come to school to study. They shouldn’t come to school to eat and get warm.

When I was in the third year, the girls in my class teased me because my father is Sardinian and is short, but not only Sardinians are short.

In the study on youths’ attitudes toward multiculturalism (Pagani & Robustelli, 2010) we identified three kinds of fears in Italian pupils’ attitudes toward immigrants: (a) fear for their own safety and welfare, (b) fear of losing their identity and (c) fear of losing other people’s affection. In this essay, the girl clearly expresses her fear of losing her teachers’ affection, since she believes they provide excessive help and attention to her immigrant classmates.

The description of the privileges that allegedly these pupils are granted by their teachers is ridiculous (receiving snacks, sweets, and unspecified warmth). This leads us to identify envy instead of resentment as one emotion underpinning the girl’s aversive attitude (Miceli & Castelfranchi, 2007). I will go back to this point later. In addition, the surprising, as it is utterly unjustified, fear of being put in jail, in case one should react against these immigrant classmates’ alleged abuses, and her fear of being “conquered” by them, support this view. It is easy to suspect that the girl

---

4 I have quoted some parts of this same essay and analyzed them from a different perspective elsewhere (Pagani & Robustelli, 2011)
herself is not completely convinced that the motives she has put forward to support her ill will against her immigrant classmates are real and correct. What is more, her view sounds primitive as it echoes the rules of a zero-sum game, in which one player’s success is at the expense of the other. This zero-sum attitude, which is present in “deprivation societies” (Foster, 1972; Miceli & Castelfranchi, 2007), also characterizes wealthier societies. Some authors have pointed out this attitude in contemporary western societies with their hierarchical structures and competitive life pattern (Miceli & Castelfranchi, 2007; Pagani & Robustelli, 2011; Robustelli & Pagani, 1996).

The girl’s view is common in the general population. At best, the media do not disapprove of it clearly or widely. This view is also vehemently expressed by another participant in the same study, a boy of 13. He complains about Italians’ ingenuous generosity toward immigrants (especially about providing them with job opportunities) to their compatriots’ detriment. As an implicit consequence of this state of affairs, he puts forward an incredible and imaginary case, given that in Italy a National Health Service still exists. He tells of those Italians who have large families or some children who are ill or need a delicate operation they cannot afford, because they are jobless and they can’t, and they suffer because they see their children die.

The girl’s attitude toward her immigrant classmates is significant from many points of view. Here, I will mention only two of them. Her aversion to them is not only tinged with envy, but also with anger and hate. This fact is more astounding considering that even youths who express true racist feelings toward immigrants, can sometimes express interest in and friendly feelings toward their immigrant classmates simultaneously. This blend of feelings strongly supports Allport’s theory (1954) about the potential beneficial effects of positive contact in intergroup relations. In the girl’s case the strength of her hate, anger, and envy is fueled by a more powerful emotion, namely the fear of losing significant others’ affection. Other emotions have probably contributed to causing this fear and to strengthening her hate, anger, and envy. One of these is mentioned in the last two lines of her essay: the distress she experienced when the girls in her class teased her because her father is Sardinian and is short. Berkowitz (2005), for example, maintains that the experience of a variety of aversive events can provoke reacting with anger, shame, hate, and, I would suggest, envy. For example, as Berkowitz (2005) also points out, hate can arise from a feeling of humiliation and a perceived threat to one’s self-concept. Miceli and Castelfranchi (2007) say
that a feeling of humiliation and a perceived threat to one’s self-esteem are among the constituents of envy. These authors also maintain that another component of envy is ill will against the envied person. We will see how ill will is another constituent of the girl’s hostile attitudes toward her immigrant classmates.

In the girl’s case, one significant aversive event that produced envy and hostility toward her immigrant classmates was her experience of being teased by the girls in her class because of her father’s origins and shortness. What is more, I suggest that another process may have occurred in this case, namely hostility displacement. Her hostility to the girls in her class who teased her because her father is Sardinian and is short is displaced and directed toward her immigrant classmates. In some way she shares the experience of “feeling a stranger” with her immigrant classmates (Sardinia is an Italian island and Sardinians usually refer to the rest of Italy as “the continent”, thus underlining their “isolationism”). Within this perspective, both she and her immigrant classmates belong to minority groups, namely to outgroups that have a negative cue value for many Italians. This, probably unconscious, awareness strengthens her need to assert her belonging to the ingroup and to attack the socially and economically weaker outgroup. Berkowitz (2005) justly suggests that people often regard their in-group as closely tied to their personal image of themselves so that in discriminating in favor of their ‘own kind’, they essentially are favoring themselves […] (p. 170).

Another particularly interesting aspect of the girl’s attitude toward her immigrant classmates is that her aversion to them has no relationship at all with cultural diversity. Contrary to what most people, including many social psychologists, think, our research findings show that cultural differences per se very seldom represent a major problem in pupils’ cross-cultural relationships (Pagani, Robustelli, & Martinelli, 2011). Apparently, difficulties originate at a deeper level and concern those emotions that often negatively affect human interactions and the frequent tendency to exercise some kind of power over others.

**Envy, Resentment, and Anger**

Let us now go back to the girl’s essay and try to examine it in the light of some theoretical considerations regarding envy, resentment, and anger. Referring to her immigrant classmates, the girl writes, “Here at school they are in a privileged position.”
As we can see here and as Miceli and Castelfranchi point out (2007), social comparison processes are inherent in envy. The girl’s immediately following words disclose another essential component of envy, namely ill will.

They receive snacks and sweets and do whatever they like. Pupils should come to school to study. They shouldn’t come to school to eat and get warm.

Ill will is the desire that the envied person lack the specific possession craved for by the envier. This desire distinguishes envy from resentment, since resentment is grounded in a sense of injustice and, thus, on the desire to reestablish justice. Justice is obtained also through a redistribution of resources, trying to counteract a power imbalance, and is consequently very different from a mere act of depriving someone of something.

What is more, in the case of envy, the desire for a specific object that the envied person has and the envier lacks, is accompanied by the envier’s “perceived inferiority to the envied” (Miceli & Castelfranchi, 2007). These authors suggest that it is the envier’s feeling of inequality, and not inequality per se, that produces envious feelings, and that the envier would not feel indignation were she/he the advantaged one. The girl does not really want the sweets, snacks, and “warmth” her immigrant classmates receive from their teachers. She wants what these objects symbolize, namely her teachers’ attention and affection. More precisely, this girl’s desire to be the object of her teachers’ attention and affection is strongly supported, or perhaps even prompted, by her belief that the recipient of these benefits is not herself but someone else, who she believes is treated better than she is.

Envy presupposes a sense of inferiority relative to another person’s perceived superiority. The envier’s low self-esteem is strengthened by her or his perception that she/he will be unable to attain the specific object the envied person possesses. This perceived unattainability reinforces her/his feelings of “helplessness and hopelessness with regard to overcoming [her/] his inferiority” (Miceli & Castelfranchi, 2007, p. 456). Where does this sense of inferiority come from, in the girl’s case? To answer this question we can only rely on her short written text. As we have seen, in the third year the girl painfully experienced the other girls’ criticism that her father was Sardinian and short. This situation produced insecurity and contributed to strengthening her probably already low self-esteem.

Interestingly, according to Miceli and Castelfranchi (2007), either consciously or unconsciously, the envier may often be aware that her/his hostility is not appropriate. This awareness can further threaten her/his
already vulnerable self-image. This might be true in the girl’s case, but also for the boy of 13, who complains about some Italian families’ ill children who are dying. As we have seen, the girl vehemently describes her immigrant classmates’ presumed privileges and the threats they pose to Italian pupils’ well-being. In the same vein, the boy rhetorically refers to immigrants’ purported advantages that he maintains have been obtained to Italians’ detriment. In both cases, the girl and the boy’s statements are tinged with some bizarre, unrealistic, and fanciful connotations. Hence, it might be possible that the girl and the boy, at least unconsciously, are not fully convinced of the justness of their claims. They may try to “persuade [themselves] (and others) that [their] hostility is grounded in some suffered wrong” (Miceli & Castelfranchi, 2007, p. 459).

Underlining the particular role played by anger in the girl’s aversive attitude toward her immigrant classmates and the specific meaning of this emotion might be useful. Miceli and Castelfranchi (2011) provide a very good distinction between anger and resentment. According to them, harm by itself can produce anger, while wrongful harm can produce resentment. More precisely, anger presupposes impairment in reaching a perceived goal “plus causal attribution” of the impairment “to another agent”, and not necessarily “attribution of responsibility proper” (p. 265). Hence, while the experience of anger is not necessarily linked to the experience of having suffered some wrong, resentment is experienced as “anger […] grounded in the assumption of having suffered some wrong” (p. 266). This is an important distinction, which can help us distinguish also between resentment and envy. In both the girl and the boy’s cases, I identify anger and envy, and not resentment, as the main emotions characterizing their hostile attitudes. They are probably not fully convinced they have suffered some real wrong.

Conclusion: Knowledge and Social Cohesion

What are the relationships between knowledge and these emotions, namely fear, hate, anger, and envy? It can be clearly seen that in various ways these emotions are related to knowledge, another element of the theoretical model I am proposing. Here knowledge embraces such ideas as general information regarding immigration, the various types of socio-cultural patterns provided by school and the family relating to attitudes toward multiculturalism, and the different experiences of direct contact with specific immigrants. Knowledge and these emotions reciprocally interact and fuel one another (see, for example, Pagani & Robustelli, 2011). For envy, the interaction is probably a little more complex, since
we have seen that, to preserve a good self-image, the envier sometimes
pretends not to know.

Besides, knowledge and these emotions interact with the perception of
social cohesion and social cohesion itself. For example, some data
obtained in the second study (Pagani, 2012) show that lack of general
social cohesion creates fear and that fear can provoke aggression. Our data
also show that young participants’ perception of social cohesion, at the
level of the nation, hometown, or community at large, does not exist or
exists only in part. What is more, these data also show that social cohesion
itself actually does not exist or exists only in part. In fact, a real social
cohesion in a group presupposes the members of the group have a good
knowledge of the most significant aspects of the group itself. Instead,
participants’ views are often characterized by misinformation regarding
notable aspects of present Italian social reality, including immigration and
cross-cultural relations. Participants’ misinformation was often characterized
by the presence of many erroneous and frequently contradictory beliefs,
such as:

(a) all Italian politicians are Mafiosi;
(b) all Italians are unable to make both ends meet;
(c) immigrants receive a lot of money from the Italian government
when they arrive in Italy;
(d) immigrants are granted special privileges (this idea is
considered by some participants a main cause of the social and
economic problems afflicting Italy);
(e) immigrants who arrived here illegally are criminals;
(f) immigrants who commit a crime very easily get away with it
while Italians are severely punished and are put in jail for less
serious wrongs;
(g) jails are nice comfortable places to live in;
(h) all Italians are Christian;
(i) Muslims have requested that the crucifix should be removed
from Italian schools.

Finally, since social cohesion should be grounded in a “well-reasoned
analysis of diversities” (Pagani, 2012), we can deduce that a lack of social
cohesion thwarts knowledge and understanding. This process can easily
contribute to the perception of threat and, in particular, of what we labeled
“unjustified or partly justified threat” (Pagani, 2011; Pagani & Robustelli,
2010; Pagani & Robustelli, 2011). Indeed, when we examined our
participants’ anonymous open-ended essays we elaborated a distinction
between real and justified threats (threats that are rational and grounded on
real, concrete and verifiable circumstances) on the one hand, and
unjustified or partly justified threats (threats that are imaginary and irrational or partly imaginary and irrational) on the other. The criteria we followed in labeling threats were based on a thorough and attentive analysis of the socio-political context. The perception of threat and, in particular, of unjustified or partly justified threat is clearly a kind of perception that is usually connected to prejudice (Pagani, 2011; Pagani & Robustelli, 2010; Pagani & Robustelli, 2011).

Educators should clearly be aware of the complex and profound relationships among emotions such as fear, hate, envy, anger, and resentment and between these emotions on the one hand and knowledge and social cohesion on the other. This could certainly help them address the problem of youths’ non-acceptance or slight acceptance of diversity with more sophisticated and accurate perspectives and strategies.
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