Chapter 4

WHITES' STEREOTYPES OF BLACKS: SOURCES AND POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES

Mark Peffley

and

Jon Hurwitz

Race continues to be a powerfully divisive force in American politics. For the last several decades, racial issues (e.g., segregation, busing, and affirmative action) have remained on the front-burner of the political agenda, polarizing the American electorate and, as a consequence, dramatically affecting voting patterns, partisan alignments, and trust in government (Carmines and Stimson 1989). It seems likely, however, that the power of race to divide Americans is not confined to explicitly racial issues, but extends to other prominent “hot button” issues like crime and welfare. Although neither issue is explicitly racial in the same fashion as affirmative action or busing, both become linked to race inasmuch as white Americans (inaccurately) tend to see the typical welfare recipient and criminal as being African-American. While a variety of forces are likely to drive whites’ attitudes on such issues, few would deny that perceptions of African-Americans comprise an important contributing factor. Whites, we may assume, who continue to negatively stereotype blacks—perceiving them to be “lazy” or “violent”—may be substantially more likely to oppose welfare payments or support “get tough” policies on crime, especially when blacks are the targets of such policies.

Our purpose in this chapter is to conduct a systematic analysis of racial stereotyping, or the images which white Americans hold of blacks, by examining the content of such beliefs as well as their antecedents and political consequences. Our purpose in exploring the content of whites’ images of blacks is to determine the extent to which whites subscribe to a jaundiced view of blacks as lazy and violent. To what extent have blacks become associated with a hostile “underclass” of the undeserving poor in the minds of whites? The

problems of contemporary urban poverty are among the most troubling of our time: skyrocketing joblessness, a disintegrating social structure, violent crime, and more. It is doubtless tempting for some whites to link such problems to the perceived shortcomings of African Americans, for such linkages become a ready-made, albeit faulty, explanation for the quintessential problems of the underclass, welfare and crime. Because respondents in the Race and Politics Survey were asked an extensive battery of stereotypic traits along a variety of trait dimensions, we are in a particularly advantageous position to evaluate the extent to which white society has shorn its historically negative views of blacks as well as to make a rough assessment of one likely source of opposition to improved race relations.

A second goal is to gain an appreciation of the major social and political antecedents of contemporary racial stereotypes to better understand the dynamics of racial prejudice and to identify types of individuals most likely to subscribe to such negative beliefs about blacks. Does the contemporary stereotype of blacks as a hostile underclass have essentially the same roots as racial prejudice in an earlier age? To what extent are such individuals likely to be found in particular regions of the country (i.e., the South) and segments of society (i.e., among the least educated)? And, even more importantly, to what extent are whites' images of blacks embedded in a wider belief system of social and political orientations such as ethnocentrism and individualism? By drawing on the wide variety of socio-demographic and attitudinal variables assessed in the national survey, we are able to heed, to some degree, Gordon Allport's (1954) admonition against looking for the roots of prejudice and stereotyping in a "single sovereign explanation."

Our principal purpose, however, is to explore the powerful consequences of racial stereotypes in shaping whites' political judgments about blacks in the context of the explosive issues of crime and welfare. In this portion of the analysis, we make use of a number of survey experiments to investigate more precisely the conditions under which racial stereotypes do and do not affect political judgments. Specifically, by experimentally varying the race and socioeconomic status of the target individual (or group) in various questions about welfare mothers, police searches, and assistance programs, we are able to determine the extent to which whites' political evaluations of blacks in the areas of welfare and crime are biased by race, as

well as the degree to which this bias is driven by racial stereotypes.

Our investigation departs from much of the extant research on racial stereotypes, which focuses on how whites feel about generic blacks and the policies—such as welfare and affirmative action—which affect minorities. While the insights from this work are invaluable, our survey experiments allow us to present whites with counter-stereotypical black targets to answer questions such as the following: What happens when whites who embrace negative stereotypes of blacks are confronted with scenarios in which blacks do not fit the pejorative impression? Does positive individuating information have any impact on their political judgments of blacks? Is it possible to inhibit the impact of negative stereotypes on “hot-button” issues like crime and welfare? And, conversely, how do whites who reject such stereotypes respond in the presence of blacks who are stigmatized and who correspond to quite negative images? Are their more positive views of blacks in the abstract mere window dressing that they quickly abandon when confronted with stigmatized blacks?

The Content of Racial Stereotyping

One of the first treatments of stereotypes appears in Walter Lippmann’s Public Opinion (1922, 16), where he argued that the “pictures in the head” which individuals form of other groups are functionally necessary for imposing order on an “environment [that is] altogether too big and complex, and too fleeting. . . . We are not equipped to deal with so much subtlety, so much variety and so many permutations and combinations. And although we have to act in that environment, we have to reconstruct it on a simpler model before we can manage with it.” This assumption that stereotyping results from limitations in human capacities for processing information squares nicely with the more contemporary social cognition perspective, which treats stereotypes as “...generalizations about social groups that are not necessarily more or less inaccurate, biased, or logically faulty than any other kinds of cognitive generalizations” (Taylor 1981, 84).¹

A serious problem with this research is that an exclusive focus on cognitive forces is unable to account adequately for the ethnocentric bias of much social stereotyping (Stroebe and Insko 1989). The fact that images of outgroups tend to be quite negative suggests that stereotypes are used not just to simplify the world but to justify discrimination and hostility toward the outgroup. This bias is emphasized in theoretical traditions as diverse as The Authoritarian Personality (Adorno et al. 1950; Altemeyer 1988) and “Realistic Conflict Theory” (Campbell 1965; Bobo 1988), and more recently by Social Identity Theory (Tajfel 1982; Tajfel and Turner 1979), which holds that stereotyping is prompted, in part, by a universal ethnocentric bias to enhance one’s own group and to disparage outgroups. This research makes plain that some group stereotypes are not simply heuristic devices to simplify experience but are destructive forces that have historically evoked punitive and discriminatory responses to ethnic, racial and religious groups.²

Just how negative are the images which white Americans hold of blacks? And to what degree do stereotypes of blacks conform to an image of a hostile, undeserving underclass? Until very recently, the survey evidence with which to answer these questions was, at best, ambiguous and incomplete. Many of the “classic” studies of racial stereotypes used small, unrepresentative samples of college students (e.g., Katz and Braly 1933; and the replication by Karlins, et al. 1969), while others have provided only a very selective glimpse at a handful of attributes (e.g., Schuman, et al. 1988). Fortunately, in the last few years several national surveys have sought to provide a more complete and contemporary portraiture of whites’ views of blacks, including the Race and Politics Survey, a principal objective of which was to assess the political impact of whites’ stereotypes of African-Americans.

Data and Measures

Respondents (N = 2,223) in the survey were asked a battery of questions designed to elicit their beliefs about the personal attributes of “most blacks.” Guided by the testing framework of Rothbart and Oliver (1993), as modified by repeated pre-testing, respondents were asked to rate the degree to which various words or phrases accurately described “most blacks” on a scale from 0 (very good description) to 10 (very inaccurate

description). The reference to “most” blacks in the question is designed to elicit “global” impressions of prototypical blacks. (See the Appendix for further details and a discussion of various measurement issues).

Whites’ Responses to Stereotype Items

Two central dimensions of whites’ (N = 1,841) African-American stereotypes are of obvious relevance here: Black Work Ethic (consisting of the traits lazy, determined, dependable, hard working, and lack discipline) and Black Hostility (aggressive or violent). To gauge the pervasiveness of negative impressions of blacks along these two dimensions, responses to the stereotype items are presented in Table 4.1, where to simplify the interpretation answers are recoded from 11-point scales to simple 3-point scales indicating whether the direction of the response was “negative” (above the mid-point of 5 for negatively worded traits, below the mid-point for positively worded traits), “positive” (less than 5 for negative traits, greater than 5 for positive traits), or “neutral” (equal to 5).

—TABLE 4.1 ABOUT HERE—

Even though positive and neutral responses outnumber negative responses for five of the seven traits, we still find a substantial proportion of whites agreeing that most blacks are lazy (31%), irresponsible (20%), aggressive (50%), and lacking in discipline (60%). In short, although whites with positive images of blacks constitute a plurality of the larger American public, a very sizable number of whites—as many as one in every two—openly endorses frankly negative characterizations of “most” blacks. We note that this distribution of whites’ responses to our stereotype measures is similar to that found in other recent national surveys, such as the 1992 American National Election Study.³

Antecedents of Whites’ Stereotypes of Blacks

The next logical question is, What types of individuals are more likely to subscribe to such negative stereotypes of blacks and what social and political antecedents help to explain the dynamics of racial

stereotyping? Two classes of explanations of prejudice and stereotyping have been investigated in survey studies: socio-demographic variables and core beliefs and values.

Social Background Characteristics. Sociological explorations of the demographic correlates of prejudice and stereotyping (e.g., Schuman, Steeh, and Bobo 1988) tend to assume that racial animus stems from an individual's social background and early socialization experiences. Consequently, important demographic variables such as education, income, gender, age, and region are the focus of our investigation of the social bases of racial stereotyping (see Appendix for measures). Two variables, in particular, are key in our analysis of contemporary stereotypes of blacks: education and region. Traditionally, declining prejudice toward blacks, Jews and other minorities has been associated with increasing levels of formal education (Page and Shapiro 1992, Selznick and Steinberg 1969), though Schuman et al. (1988) found differences in racial attitudes across educational groups to be shrinking over time. More recently, Sniderman and Piazza's (1993) San Francisco Bay Area study found education to be pivotal in predicting negative racial stereotyping among whites, at least as indicated by the simple correlation between education and agreement with negative stereotypes. Regional differences in racial attitudes have also been found to be narrowing: socioeconomic changes in the South as well as the migration of whites from the "rustbelt" to the "sunbelt" have tempered the traditionally high levels of racial prejudice evinced by southern whites (e.g., Black and Black 1986, Schuman et al. 1988). Thus, interest in both social antecedents will receive careful scrutiny in the analysis below.

Core Beliefs and Values. Another tradition of research in political psychology has investigated the extent to which prejudice and other attitudes toward specific groups are embedded in the individual's wider belief system, emanating from such general orientations as liberalism, individualism, ethnocentrism, and a variety of other core values and beliefs. The value receiving the most attention in the racial attitudes literature is Individualism (Appendix items I.A and B), or a support for the components of the Protestant Ethic such as individual achievement, self-reliance, obedience, discipline, and the work ethic. According to Kinder and Sears (1981), Lipset and Schneider (1979), Kluegel and Smith (1986), and others, individualists oppose government policies such as affirmative action because they are alleged to undermine the work ethic. By extension,

because rugged individualists tend to attribute poverty to lack of effort versus structural forces (e.g., discrimination, not enough jobs), they may also tend to view blacks, who suffer more from poverty than whites, as lazy. While empirical support for the impact of individualism on racial policy attitudes and stereotypes is limited (see Sears [1988] for a review), the value continues to occupy a central place in studies of racial attitudes.

Additionally, racial stereotypes may be related to several explicitly political orientations (Appendix items II.), such as partisanship and ideology, if, for example, conservatives who oppose government assistance to blacks do so because they view them as lazy. Another political orientation, political sophistication or awareness, may also be a useful predictor of racial stereotyping if individuals who are less attentive to political life are also less sensitive to the elite consensus against more open forms of prejudice and bigotry in American politics (such as the condemnation that former Klan member, David Duke, received from both parties when he ran for higher office in Louisiana).

An important tradition in the study of racism assumes that racial prejudice and stereotyping stem from more generalized forms of ethnocentrism. Studies from Adorno, et al. (1950) to the present (e.g., Altemeyer 1988; Bierly 1985; Sidanius 1992; Snyder and Ickes 1985) continue to find that stereotyping and prejudice toward different outgroups – blacks, Jews, Hispanics, homosexuals, and others – tend to coexist in the same individuals. Accordingly, we incorporate three different aspects of ethnocentrism into our analysis of racial stereotyping: social intolerance, conformity, and anti-Semitism.

Social Intolerance (Appendix items III.B.1), or an unwillingness to accept, or “put up with” individuals or groups with different values, appearances, and behaviors, has been found to be an important predictor of both racial policy attitudes and stereotypes (Hurwitz and Peffley, 1992), most likely because blacks represent a distinct outgroup often perceived to be outside the mainstream of white, middle-class society.

A related value, Conformity (Appendix items III.B.2), has, to this point, received less empirical support as a determinant of stereotyping (Hurwitz and Peffley 1992), but has long been linked to the rejection of social and political outgroups (see, e.g., Kohn 1977; Feldman 1989), suggests that further analysis is

warranted. Defined as a desire for an orderly and structured world in which people obey authority and adhere to convention and externally imposed rules, those placing a premium on conformity are expected to view unconventional outgroups (such as minorities) as a threat to the established order, leading such persons to negative views of blacks.

Finally, in an attempt to include a more direct form of at least one form of misanthropy, we focus on anti-Semitism (items III.B.3). The logic behind focusing on linkages between stereotypes of Jews and blacks was established by Sniderman and Piazza (1993). If we find that negative stereotypes toward two very different groups are highly correlated, we have strong evidence that a wider sort of ethnocentrism and prejudice underlies both sets of beliefs.

Prior to the analysis, we constructed an index of Black Work Ethic by summing responses to the several indicators presented in Table 4.1 (Cronbach's $\alpha = .765$ for the items Lazy, Determined to Succeed, Dependable, Hard-working, and Lack Discipline). Black Hostility is measured with a single indicator (aggressive and violent). In the analysis below, we begin by regressing the two stereotyping measures (see Appendix item I.) on the set of demographic variables to identify which groups are more, and less, prone to adopt stereotypic attitudes toward blacks. Subsequently, more endogenous predictors (values and political predisposition variables) will be added in an attempt to determine the relative explanatory power of the various constructs.

Socio-Demographic Correlates of Racial Stereotyping

In the left-hand side of Table 4.2, the two stereotype dimensions are regressed on the demographic indicators identified previously. Perhaps the most obvious conclusion to be drawn from the equations is that the demographic variables (i.e., formal education, age, gender, income and living in the deep South) offer only a very partial explanation of stereotyping; in neither equation do the variables, in combination, explain more than 5 percent of the variance.

—TABLE 4.2 ABOUT HERE—

Nonetheless, the results reveal some important demographic patterns in whites' perceptions of blacks for, while income emerges as irrelevant in both models, the other variables are at least selectively important determinants. Southern respondents, for example, are more likely to perceive blacks as violent and lazy than are those from outside of the region; and these regional differences are independent of any differences in education and income that may distinguish the South from the rest of the country. Clearly, despite large-scale changes in the South over the last several decades, this area of the country remains distinct in engendering disparaging views of African Americans (see also Kuklinski and Cobb's chapter in this volume).⁴

Education is also a significant predictor of negative stereotyping, even if its effects are not particularly powerful. Despite a much-publicized upsurge of racial incidents on college campuses in the last two decades, education continues to shape more racially tolerant views. In keeping with previous studies, pejorative views of blacks are held disproportionately among the less educated segment of the population, such that less educated individuals are substantially more likely to see blacks as hostile and lazy relative to others. Additional clues about the likely process by which education promotes racial tolerance can be gleaned from the analysis below, where we examine the impact of values and ethnocentrism, which presumably mediate the effects of education.

Before addressing more fully-specified models of stereotyping, we note the significant though small effects of gender and age in the Black Work Ethic equation: older respondents and males are more likely to view blacks as lazy than are younger female respondents. While numerous explanations of the effects of the demographic variables may be offered, it will be seen below that with the exception of the South, the impact of the demographic variables is reduced to mere trace effects once value orientations are added to the equations.

Ethnocentrism and Racial Stereotyping

In the right-hand side of Table 4.2 appear the estimates of the full model regressing the two stereotype variables on political predispositions (ideology, partisanship, and political information), values

(individualism) and ethnocentrism variables (social intolerance, conformity and anti-Semitism) along with the demographic predictors. Clearly, these additional factors contribute to our understanding of stereotyping beyond the explanation provided by demographic variables; on average, we explain three to four times as much variance in these equations as those employing the demographics factors alone.

With the inclusion of the new variables, the effects of all the demographic variables except region are reduced to mere trace effects. Thus, much of the impact of these social background variables is mediated by values—namely, ethnocentrism. Apparently one reason why the less educated are less racially tolerant is that they are also more ethnocentric in general. In other words, the benefits for education in reducing racial intolerance are evidently registered through a more pervasive tempering of ethnocentrism, which in turn discourages pejorative views of African Americans.

Of the variables tapping ethnocentric orientations, anti-Semitism (i.e., negative stereotypes of Jews) stands out as far and away the strongest predictor of negative racial stereotyping, which suggests several conclusions. First, as if one needed affirmation of this fact, racial stereotyping among whites is most aptly characterized as prejudice. How else could one explain the substantial overlap between animus toward two very different groups (the zero order correlations between anti-Semitism and the stereotype variables are .41 and .33, respectively, for Black Work Ethic and Hostility)? Second, the fact that much of the covariation between anti-Semitism and racial stereotypes remains even after including social intolerance and conformity (beta coefficients for anti-Semitism shrink to .34 and .26, respectively, in the Work Ethic and Hostility models) indicates that we were only partially successful in our attempts to explicitly capture different sources of ethnocentrism that have appeared in the literature. In the Work Ethic model, social intolerance makes a respectable showing and conformity is at least statistically significant, but the effects of neither variable is impressive in the Hostility equation. The important point, however, is that we have uncovered a more sweeping form of ethnocentrism that indiscriminately targets both blacks and Jews. Generally speaking, our results are certainly reminiscent of Adorno et al.'s (1950) finding that antagonistic attitudes toward members of

various outgroups (defined along ethnic, racial, nationalistic, political, and religious lines) are tightly clustered together.

Consequences of Stereotypes

The foregoing analysis of the content and antecedents of racial stereotypes would seem much less important if we were unable to demonstrate that these beliefs also have important consequences for political behavior. Accordingly, we now turn to our principal concern, which is to determine when and how racial stereotypes influence whites' political judgments about blacks in the areas of welfare and crime policy. More specifically, we ask: to what degree, and under what circumstances, do racial stereotypes "bias" whites' political judgments about blacks in the areas of welfare and crime policy? The suspicion is that the biasing effects of race are substantial—that, for example, individuals who endorse negative stereotypes will tend to adopt harsher views of black welfare recipients and, furthermore, will express greater opposition to government assistance when the intended recipients are black than when they are described as being white.

A wealth of research on social stereotyping in cognitive psychology provides a strong theoretical basis for expecting such biasing effects. As "pictures in the head," stereotypes tend to put their imprint on data in the very process of acquiring it. The social cognition literature uses the term theory-driven processing to refer to this strategy whereby cognitive misers develop expectations based on their impressions (or theories) of others to direct their attention to information that is consistent with the theory; information that is inconsistent, on the other hand, may tend to be ignored, discounted, or somehow interpreted so that it becomes confirmatory of the initial impression (see, e.g., Hamilton and Sherman 1994). In this fashion, stereotypes are believed to be remarkably perseverant and strongly determinative of judgments that are related to the stereotype (racial policy judgments, for instance).

Empirically speaking, however, the connection between stereotypes and policy attitudes is considerably more complex (Bobo and Kluegel 1993, Carmines and Sniderman 1992, Terkildsen 1993), appearing under some conditions but not others. These findings are perfectly consistent with data-driven

models of processing, where even individuals with crystallized stereotypes will attend to, and be influenced by, information that is discrepant from the impression (e.g., Locksley et al 1980). Even one who believes blacks to be dangerous criminals would have a hard time ignoring the reality of, say, Collin Powell.

Continuum or dual process models integrate these models of stereotypic processing (e.g., Fiske and Pavelchak 1986; Fiske and Neuberg 1990) by specifying the conditions under which people tend to rely on categorical (theory-driven) or piece-meal (data-driven) processing strategies. Continuum models regard individuals as generally theory-driven, but with the flexibility to engage in more cognitively taxing data-driven processing when, for example, information about the target is clearly inconsistent with the stereotypical expectations. These models therefore predict that stereotype and policy judgment will be less closely linked when individuals are presented with information that clearly runs counter to the stereotype (e.g., see Rahn 1993).

It is precisely for this reason that we intensively analyze two subpopulations—those who endorse, and those who reject, negative racial stereotypes—both of which are confronted with counter-stereotypical data of a kind often found in the real world. While much of the extant research focuses on correlational linkages between stereotypes of generic blacks and policy attitudes, in the survey experiments below we manipulate the attributes of blacks to examine how whites react when confronted with counter-stereotypical black targets in the explosive context of welfare and crime. More specifically, we ask: for whites who embrace negative racial stereotypes, how will they respond to scenarios in which blacks do not fit the pejorative impression? Just how positive does individuating information about the target have to be to inhibit the impact of negative stereotypes on “hot-button” issues like crime and welfare? And, conversely, how do whites who reject such stereotypes respond in the presence of blacks who correspond to quite negative images? Are their more positive views of blacks in the abstract mere window dressing that they quickly abandon when confronted with stigmatized blacks?

We find these questions intriguing because, in the real world, they represent every day confrontations between data and theory. Those with intensely negative images of blacks—who see them as

lazy and unmotivated, for instance—doubtless often work alongside African-Americans who, by their presence in the factory or office, have demonstrated that they can, and do, conform to the work ethic. And whites who reject such negative stereotypes must regularly consume media coverage of issues such as welfare and crime in which the dominant images in such coverage strongly suggests that welfare recipients and violent criminals are disproportionately black (Entman 1990, 1992).

Methodology

In exploring the relationship between race and welfare/crime, one could begin by assessing individuals' judgments of welfare and crime policies (as well as of welfare recipient and criminal) and then methodically regressing such judgments on measures of racial stereotypes. There are, however, several difficulties with such an approach. First, it does not provide us with a way of estimating racial bias, since the race of the target has not been manipulated. Second, such a strategy does not allow us to separate the impact of the race versus the class of the target. For many whites, stigmatizing characteristics associated with the "underclass" (e.g., being unproductive or aggressive) have become commingled with race (e.g., Franklin 1991; W. J. Wilson 1987). Thus, it is necessary to manipulate other stigmatizing characteristics to disentangle the biasing effects of race on whites' political judgments from the biasing effects of class-related attributes. Finally, the aforementioned strategy does not permit us, in any systematic way, to confront respondents with counter-stereotypical information.

Consequently, we systematically vary both the race and other characteristics of the target. In the series of experiments which follow, utilizing Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) technology, we ask respondents about both black and white welfare recipients and criminal suspects, randomly varying the potentially stigmatizing information about the targets (e.g., work history, educational background, aggressiveness) to enable us to separate the effects of race from those of the associated social characteristics. In this way, our design benefits from not only the control and internal validity gained from experiments but also the generalizability and external validity gained from cross-sectional surveys, an important

consideration in the study of racial attitudes (e.g., see Sigelman, et al. 1995 and Terkildsen 1993).

Our first set of experiments explores the linkage between whites' racial stereotypes and their attitudes toward welfare and welfare recipients, an ostensibly race-neutral program that has, for many, become charged with racial connotations. How do racial stereotypes affect perceptions of black versus white welfare mothers? Are black welfare mothers more subject to stigmatizing myths of welfare recipients than similarly described whites? To what extent do racial stereotypes account for this racial bias? And how do individuals who accept and reject negative stereotypes respond when confronted with welfare mothers who confirm and challenge their more general impressions of African-Americans?

The “Welfare Mother” Experiment

To answer these questions, we constructed a set of survey experiments which asked respondents to form impressions of “welfare mothers,” variously described in the following pair of survey questions:

1. Now think about a [black woman, white woman] in her early twenties. She is a [high school dropout, high school graduate] with a ten year old child and she has been on welfare for the past year. How likely do you think it is that she will try hard to find a job in the next year—very likely (coded 1), somewhat (2), somewhat unlikely (3), or not at all likely (4)?
2. How likely is it that she will have more children in order to get a bigger welfare check?” (very likely [1], somewhat likely [2], somewhat unlikely [3], or not at all likely [4]?)

The rationale of the experiment is to determine whether respondents are more likely to subscribe to popular myths about welfare recipients if the mother is black, and to what extent racial stereotypes are responsible for any such bias. In addition, by independently manipulating the educational status of the mother, we hope to better understand the power of stereotypes to shape impressions in the face of mildly inconsistent individuating information. Having completed high school signifies an effort to improve one's lot in life (contrary to the lazy stereotype), while dropping out indicates a lack of effort (contrary to the belief that blacks are hard working). However, the manipulation of individuating information in this case is not so

strong as to be clearly inconsistent with prior expectations. The mother, after all, is described as being on welfare, and for many Americans this fact alone is indicative of a lack of effort. Furthermore, there is nothing inherently contradictory about being a high school graduate and simultaneously being on welfare. Thus, we characterize this experiment as one that provides respondents with mildly inconsistent, or mixed, individuating information.

The top panel (A) of Figure 1 displays whites' responses to the two questions across different descriptions of the welfare mother. Consistent with several survey studies (e.g., Kluegal and Smith 1986), respondents are pessimistic: from 45 to 63% think she is unlikely even to try to find a job and from 58 to 68% expect her to have another child to get bigger welfare checks. But while varying the mother's educational status generates different assessments (with more negative judgments than for the dropout than the graduate), the differences across racial treatments are small and statistically insignificant. Moreover, as the rest of Figure 1 makes clear, the virtual absence of any racial differences is a persistent finding for the remaining experiments, as well. There is little evidence in panels B and C of Figure 1 that the race of the target affects whites' support for welfare programs (Figure 1.B) or evaluations of a police search of drug suspects (Figure 1.C).

—FIGURE 4.1 ABOUT HERE—

This result, precisely because of the absence of a difference, merits the closest attention. Is the absence of a difference evidence that race has lost its stigmatizing power? More to the point, to what degree are whites' judgments of black versus white welfare mothers in the current experiment shaped by more global racial stereotypes, vis a' vis a variety of other considerations? To answer these questions, assessments of the welfare mother (for each question) were regressed on the two racial stereotypes (black work ethic and black hostility), and a variety of "control" variables, including core beliefs and values (social intolerance, conformity, individualism, and anti-Semitism), political predispositions (ideology, party ID, political sophistication), and several socio-demographic variables (education, gender, age, income, and living in the deep South), the measurement of which is described in the Appendix.⁵ These OLS results are reported in

Table 4.2.

—TABLE 4.3 ABOUT HERE—

In both tables, the noteworthy findings are the substantial coefficients for the Black Work Ethic stereotype when the mother is a black dropout (upper left-hand cells of both tables). Thus, whites who question the commitment of most blacks to the work ethic are much less likely to think that the black dropout will try to find a job in the next year ($b = .034$, $\beta = .257$ in Table 4.3.A) and are more likely to expect her to have another child to get a bigger welfare check ($b = -.037$, $\beta = -.287$ in Table 4.3.B). While other variables such as individualism, anti-Semitism, education, and age are selectively significant, none is as powerful as the Work Ethic variable in shaping judgments.

Clearly, the relationship between racial stereotypes and perceptions of welfare mothers is a conditional one, appearing selectively for some stereotypes and experimental conditions, but not others.⁶ First, racial stereotypes are important only when making assessments of black, not white, welfare mothers. Moreover, people tend to rely on stereotype dimensions that are most relevant to the task at hand: assessments of welfare mothers are closely tied to beliefs concerning blacks' commitment to the work ethic, but rarely—and never strongly—to a less relevant trait like hostility.

Plainly, racial stereotypes shape impressions of welfare mothers in theoretically explicable ways, even in the face of stringent controls for a variety of other variables. But what light do these results throw on the puzzle with which we began—namely, the absence of a difference in judgments of black and white welfare mothers? Why do racial stereotypes shape responses to the question when black high school dropouts are mentioned (Table 3), but, overall, there is little (percentage) difference in the way whites respond to black versus white welfare mothers (Figure 1.A)? And, more importantly, how do whites who accept negative racial stereotypes differ from those who reject them in the way they respond to individuating information that is consistent with or departs from stereotypical expectations?

—TABLE 4.4 ABOUT HERE—

The answers to these questions lie in the different ways that whites with varying expectations of

blacks react to the race (and the educational status) of the welfare mother. Accordingly, we now analyze how whites who accept and reject negative racial stereotypes respond to individuating information that either confirms or contradicts the stereotype. Table 4.4 displays the differences in whites' assessments of the welfare mother depending on their placement on the Work Ethic scale, showing the mean and percentage responses to the items for whites who accept the negative stereotype (i.e., scored in the top third of the scale) versus those who reject the negative characterization of blacks as lazy (bottom third of the Work Ethic scale). Treatment differences across the race and the educational status of the welfare mothers are presented in the bottom rows of the table for each of the two groups of respondents.

Why does manipulating the race of the welfare mother make no difference overall (graph in Figure 1.A), while it appears to be very important in activating the use of stereotypes in the regression analysis (Table 4.3)? Comparing in Table 4.4.A across alternative targets of judgment, the answer to the puzzle is clear. Those with negative characterizations of blacks judge black targets more harshly than white targets, while those who reject negative characterizations of blacks tend to judge blacks more positively than they judge whites. Thus, the reason there are no treatment differences for the full sample (i.e., Figure 1.A) is that these two diverging biases cancel out overall.

More interesting, for our purposes, is the substantive interpretation given to the responses of these two groups. Among whites who see blacks as lazy, we find that black welfare mothers are consistently judged more harshly than whites with a similar educational background. Blacks, more so than whites, are not expected to look for a job and are expected to "have another child to get a bigger welfare check." While the impact of the mother's educational status plays a slightly larger role in affecting such judgments, the important finding is that even when individuating information runs counter to the negative stereotype—when the mother completes high school—negative expectations continue to affect judgments. For negative stereotypers, the impact of race and the individuating information (educational status) on evaluations is clearly additive: the discriminatory bias against the black welfare mother is roughly the same whether the mother completes high school or not.

Thus, black welfare mothers who are high school dropouts have two strikes against them—being black and failing high school. Those who finish high school, according to whites who assume blacks are lazy, still have an important character deficit—being black. For by virtue of being black, welfare mothers are more likely to be treated to an assortment of stigmatizing myths about welfare recipients. In short, when mildly discrepant individuating information is presented to negative stereotypers, their stereotypes are not interrupted or undercut; rather, their tendency to hold black welfare mothers to a racially discriminatory double standard is roughly the same even in the face of positive information about the target.

The contrast with whites who reject negative stereotypes is striking, for their dominant pattern is the consistency of their reactions even in quite different settings. Whites are just as likely to say that a black high school dropout will really try to get off welfare by looking for a job as a black high school graduate.

How should this consistency be interpreted? Do whites with a more positive image of blacks simply attach no importance to graduation as a predictor of social behavior? Plainly not. As the second cell of Table 4.4 (A) documents, it matters whether a white woman on welfare has graduated from high school: 62 percent of them believe that a white graduate will try to get off welfare, as compared to 49.6 percent who believe the same about a white dropout. This differential reaction—assigning a weight to graduating for white, but not black, women—is evidence, we suggest, of the sensitivity of whites who reject negative stereotypes to the continuing danger of stigmatizing blacks. Even in circumstances that would permit a negative response to a black, they give no evidence of “taking the bait.” In other words, whites who reject negative stereotypes in the abstract also respond more positively to blacks in a specific setting, regardless of whether the blacks in question exhibit socially desirable characteristics completing high school, presumably while raising a child or socially stigmatizing characteristics dropping out of high school. The more positive view they express of blacks in the abstract does not appear to be mere window dressing.

The “Welfare Policy” Experiment

Conceptually, racial stereotypes may be regarded as a readily accessible summary of the prototypical

black: if negative, a picture of the flaws of blacks; if positive, a picture of their virtues. From a public policy perspective though, what counts is not the pictures people carry in their minds, but the impact of such beliefs on support for policies that affect blacks. And, as we shall show, this impact hinges heavily on whether targets are consistent with stereotypical expectations. Our next experiment accordingly focuses on support for welfare programs. Our primary aim in the welfare policy experiment is to determine what difference both the race and the work history of the recipient makes. The design is similar to the previous experiment, involving two randomized variations in question wording. Specifically, one half of the respondents was asked its opinion of a welfare program “specially designed to help blacks” whereas the other half was asked its view of exactly the same program but instead directed to help “new immigrants from Europe,” who are presumably white. In addition, and quite independently, one half of the respondents was told that the beneficiaries of the program were “people who have shown that they want to work their way out of their problems;” in contrast, the other half of respondents was told that they were “people who have had trouble hanging onto their jobs.” All respondents, after hearing different descriptions of the program, were asked whether they were strongly in favor (coded 1), somewhat in favor (2), somewhat opposed (3), or strongly opposed (4) to a welfare program in the described circumstances.

Not only do we change the attitude object (from welfare recipient to welfare policy) in this experiment, but we also increase the level of discrepancy between stereotype and individuating information. For while the information in the welfare mother experiment is only modestly discrepant with the perception of laziness, “wanting to work their way out of their problems” is more unambiguously at odds with the trait of laziness. By increasing the level of discrepancy, we expect the impact of individuating information to be more pronounced, relative to the moderately discrepant condition found in the welfare mother experiment.

—TABLE 4.5 ABOUT HERE—

As indicated earlier, the graph in Figure 1.B suggests that support for welfare among whites is essentially “color-blind,” since welfare support is affected by the work history of the recipient (with higher support for those wanting to work than for those with trouble holding onto a job) but not by their race. A

substantially different interpretation, though, is suggested by examining Table 4.5.A, which displays the OLS results generated from regressing the welfare support attitudes in the four experimental conditions on the same stereotype, attitudinal, and demographic variables used to predict responses to the Welfare Mother experiment in Table 4.3. Clearly, when whites evaluate welfare for black—but not immigrant—recipients, their decision to support welfare is heavily colored by their racial stereotypes. Even in the face of stringent controls for a variety of other variables, the work ethic stereotype measures are consistently strong predictors of welfare support for black recipients.

The analysis also indicates that stereotypic expectations interact with information about past work experience in shaping welfare policy support. When black recipients have a poor work record, the Work Ethic variable is strongly positive, indicating that those perceiving blacks as lazy are substantially less supportive of welfare. The relationship is reversed, however, when blacks are described as wanting “to work their way out of their own problems”: now whites who regard blacks as lazy are far more supportive of welfare.⁷

To analyze the interaction between stereotypic expectations and individuating information in influencing welfare support, Table 4.5.B contrasts the reactions of whites who see blacks as lazy (i.e., score in the upper third of the Work Ethic scale) with those who reject such a characterization (i.e., score in the bottom third of the scale). Among whites with a negative image of blacks, support for welfare hinges heavily on the beneficiary. When the target fits their stereotypical expectations (i.e., blacks with a troubled work history), they are substantially less likely to favor welfare programs for blacks (46.8% are in favor) than for immigrants who have the same troubled history (61.7%)—a clear-cut instance of a racially discriminatory double standard. But when blacks are at odds with these stereotypes, whites’ support shoots up to 92.8 percent, as compared to 71.9 percent for European immigrants who are similarly described as “people who have shown they want to work.” From the perspective of whites with a disparaging view of blacks, then, blacks who try hard are an exception, and in consequence, deserve to be treated exceptionally well.⁸

Should we celebrate the fact that individuals with a jaundiced view of African-Americans can be persuaded to “go overboard” in their support of welfare for “hard working” blacks? Certainly not. For while we might take heart in finding that negative stereotypes are discounted in the face of clearly inconsistent individuating information, we must remember that the dominant “picture in the head” of stereotyping whites is of blacks who have problems keeping jobs. And as revealed in the welfare mother experiment, unless the individuating information presented about blacks clearly contradicts the negative stereotype (mildly discrepant individuating information did not undermine the negative stereotype in the welfare mother experiment), blacks are subject to a punitive or discriminatory response. On the other hand, these results do suggest that it is possible to inhibit negative stereotypes from affecting political judgments. Since negative stereotypes have proven remarkably tenacious in resisting change, inhibition may be one of the few practical means of interrupting stereotypical reasoning from biasing political judgments in the explosive context of welfare policy.

The implications of this important result will be explored more fully in the conclusions. For now, we focus on a very different pattern displayed by whites who reject negative characterizations of blacks (cell 2 in Table 4.5.B). As in the welfare mother experiment, there is a slight (though statistically insignificant) tendency for these individuals to favor blacks over similarly described immigrants. The dominant pattern however, is one of uniform support for government assistance, regardless of the beneficiary. Those rejecting stereotypes are, for example, as likely to favor assistance for blacks as for new European immigrants. Even more impressive, they are as likely to back assistance for blacks with a troubled work history (82.3% favor) as for blacks wanting to work out their problems (84.9% favor). This pattern of findings is consistent with those uncovered in the welfare mother experiment: whites who reject negative stereotypes in the abstract respond more positively to blacks in a specific setting, even in circumstances that would permit a negative response to a black.

The Drug Search Experiment

The crucial result of the welfare policy experiment is that whites with a negative image of blacks react very differently to black targets depending on whether individuating information runs contrary to, or is consistent with, their stereotypical expectations of blacks. But confidence and dependability go hand in hand: a result obtained with different measures in different settings bolsters faith in the results.

The drug search experiment is constructed to replicate the welfare policy experiment, now focusing on the role of stereotypes in the domain of criminal justice. Several researchers have made the forceful argument that crime in the U.S. has become a racially charged issue, due to statistics showing violent crime to be a greater problem in black neighborhoods, to the exaggerated media portrayals of blacks as violent criminals (Entman 1992; Peffley, Shields and Williams 1994), and to the political rhetoric of politicians who often talk about crime in racially coded language (e.g., Edsall and Edsall 1991; Jamieson 1992). How does the apparently widespread belief that blacks are “aggressive or violent” bias judgments of blacks in the criminal justice domain, and how does stereotypic knowledge interact with inconsistent individuating information?

We investigated these and other questions by examining whites’ responses to the Drug Search Experiment, where respondents were asked the following question:

Now consider an instance where the police see two young [black, white] men about 20 years old. They are [using foul language, well-dressed and well-behaved] and walking very near a house where the police know drugs are being sold. The police search them and find that they are carrying drugs. Do you think this is definitely a reasonable search (coded 1), probably a reasonable search (2), probably not a reasonable search (3), or definitely not a reasonable search (4)?

Because the race and the behavior of the men are independently randomized, one quarter of the time the two men are black and using foul language—obviously the deliberately inflammatory condition—and so on. Recall from the graph in Figure 1.C that, consistent with the other experiments, the race of the men does not have a major impact on judgments of whether the search was reasonable or not. However, as before, the regression results displayed in Table 4.6.A tell a different story.

—TABLE 4.6 ABOUT HERE—

As seen in the first row of coefficients, while the influence of racial stereotypes is not quite as strong here as in the Welfare Mother or Welfare Policy experiments, we find that individuals endorsing the Hostility stereotype are more likely to approve of the police search when the suspects are black and using foul language. Thus, in a different content domain we find results paralleling those from prior experiments: the more relevant stereotype dimension (in this case, black hostility) is used to shape political judgments.⁹

Table 4.6.B presents the reactions of whites who accept and reject the perception of blacks as Hostile. How does individuating information interact with the Hostility stereotype for whites who negatively view blacks (i.e., score in the top third of the Hostility scale). Plainly, being “well-dressed and well-behaved” is incompatible with the picture of criminality; the discrepancy between stereotype and individuation is comparable in this case to that of the prior (i.e., welfare policy) experiment. Predictably, then, the police search experiment strikingly corroborates the welfare policy experiment: whites with a negative image of blacks, when confronted with blacks who confirm their stereotype, utilize a discriminatory double standard in judging the police search more favorably for blacks than for similarly described whites. And when blacks depart from expectations, these same whites are now more disapproving of the police search for “well dressed and well behaved” blacks than for whites described in exactly the same manner. Once again, individuating information that clearly contradicts the negative stereotype prompts such individuals to “bend over backwards” in departing from a stereotyped response.

Also in keeping with the previous two experiments are the responses of whites who reject the negative stereotype. As Table 4.6.B shows, their response is very nearly invariant regardless of the race or the behavior of the “suspects.” Thus, 50.6% of whites with a positive image of blacks feel that the police search was reasonable when the blacks were using foul language—the deliberately inflammatory condition—as compared to 47% when the black men were “well-dressed and well-behaved.”

Conclusions

What light do our specific findings throw on the role of racial stereotypes in shaping the

contemporary thinking of whites about issues of race in America? To begin with, How pervasive are negative impressions of blacks among whites today, approximately three decades after the civil rights movement and the passage of historic civil rights legislation? As other studies have shown, a majority of whites now rejects blatantly racist beliefs (e.g., the genetic inferiority of blacks) once popular in the 1940's (Page and Shapiro 1992; Schuman, Steeh, and Bobo 1988). Judging from the results of the Race and Politics Survey, however, it is clear that while many whites reject negative characterizations of blacks, many others continue to hold negative stereotypes of African Americans. In fact, from a third to half of the white population now views "most" blacks as "lazy" and "violent." Assuming that there may be a slight tendency for whites to under-report negative sentiments toward blacks, these percentages are disturbing, to say the least. They strongly suggest that a substantial minority of whites views blacks as a hostile underclass of the undeserving poor.

Our analysis of the antecedents of these beliefs clearly demonstrates that a purely demographic explanation of the phenomenon is inadequate. For, even though stereotyping is more prevalent among southerners and those with less education, our analysis of social background factors provided only a very incomplete accounting of the phenomenon. A more sufficient explanation requires an examination of the core beliefs and values of citizens, particularly those falling under the rubric of ethnocentrism. Social intolerance and, particularly, anti-Semitism were, by a wide margin, consistently the strongest predictors of whites' acceptance of negative racial stereotypes. In one sense, the fact that stereotypes of Jews and blacks are so highly correlated—even after controlling for a variety of social characteristics and value orientations—provides additional testament to the fact that such beliefs should be treated as prejudice. Many (though not all) whites who endorse negative views of blacks have bigoted views of other minorities. Our results are certainly reminiscent of Adorno et al.'s (1950) finding that different types of prejudice tend to go together in the same ethnocentric individuals. On the other hand, these same results indicate that more work needs to be done to identify the sources of this covariation between anti-Semitism and racial prejudice. For, neither of the two orientations included in the analysis to account for ethnocentrism (social intolerance and

conformity) adequately explain the strong tendency for different types of prejudice to covary in the same individual.

Even at this point one might argue that negative racial stereotypes do not constitute “true” prejudice if, for example, whites come by their erroneous beliefs through negative media portrayals of blacks. In our view, however, this argument overlooks the conceptual overlap between negative stereotyping and prejudice underlined in Chapters 1 and 2 of this volume: negative stereotypes are clearly evaluative, over-generalizations, and highly resistant to change, regardless of their source (Hamilton and Sherman 1996). More importantly, the pernicious effects of stereotyping in biasing political evaluations of blacks are likely to be the same irrespective of how such beliefs are formed.

And on this score, our results clearly demonstrate that racial stereotypes play a powerful role in shaping whites’ political views of blacks in the highly charged contexts of welfare and crime. But in contrast to previous studies that have looked at the association between whites’ views of generic blacks and various policy attitudes, we have taken a different tack. Specifically, through the use of computer-assisted survey technology, we manipulated both the race and other attributes of welfare recipients and drug suspects to: (1) assess the power of racial stereotypes to bias political judgments of black (versus white) targets, and (2) examine how two groups of whites—those who embrace and those who reject negative racial stereotypes—respond to particular blacks who confirm and challenge their more general impressions of African-Americans.

Whites who embrace negative stereotypes provide some of the more theoretically interesting but morally distressing results. Under most circumstances, their judgments are clearly theory-driven. When responding to scenarios of blacks who confirm (or only mildly disconfirm) their negative expectations—welfare mothers, welfare recipients with poor work histories, or drug suspects using foul language—such respondents consistently display a discriminatory double standard in judging black targets more harshly than similarly described white targets. Importantly, our experiments were designed as a conservative tests of racial bias. Inasmuch as the experiments manipulate both the race and stigmatizing “class”-related characteristics of

the targets, the racial bias of negative stereotypers is clearly independent of (or in addition to) any class bias displayed by these respondents. Plainly, cultural conservatives will find sympathetic audiences among this group, as long as they frame their anti-welfare and law-and-order policies as essential for the purpose of regulating undeserving and lawless minorities.

The responses of the negative stereotypers confronted with counter-stereotypical individuating information clearly depends on the degree of the discrepancy between information about the target and negative expectations about blacks. Modest discrepancies, as in the welfare mother experiments, failed to inhibit the impact of negative stereotypes. In the welfare policy and police search experiments, however, where the level of discrepancy between information and stereotype is more pronounced, favorably described blacks are judged far more approvingly than the white counterparts, with almost consensual support of welfare for blacks who “work their way out of their problems” among negative stereotypers. In short, even whites with strongly negative perceptions of blacks respond quite favorably to them when confronted with individuating information that cleanly contradicts their stereotype.

Why do these whites seem to “bend over backwards” on behalf of nonstigmatized blacks? This tendency toward overcorrection is consistent with a veritable grab-bag of models in psychology designed to explain contrast effects (e.g., Manis, Biernat and Nelson 1991; Martin, Seta and Crelia 1990; and Schwartz and Bless 1992) which arise when people are confronted with targets who diverge from their prior expectancies (for two excellent studies of racial bias in the selection of political candidates, see Sigelman, et al. 1995, and Terkildsen 1993).¹⁰ A more politically compelling explanation, for our purposes, however, draws on models of impression formation by Fiske and associates (e.g., Fiske and Neuberg 1990), which assume perceivers often rely on category subtypes to evaluate individuals who do not fit more global categories. Positive racial subtypes of especially hard-working or well-behaved blacks (e.g., the businessman black) may exist alongside negative global categories (e.g., lazy or violent), with subtypes being reserved for the few exceptions that “prove the rule.” Such subtyping may also allow negative stereotypers to deny, in a sense, their own prejudice by being able to conceptualize “good” blacks while simultaneously disparaging

most others.

Clearly, the architects of the Republican campaign to sell Clarence Thomas to the country during his Senate confirmation hearings understood this tendency toward over-compensation well and employed it for purposes of political manipulation, with powerful results. Realizing that focusing on Thomas's conservative ideology would ignite the liberal opposition, the strategists in the White House emphasized his "biography"—how he was born in Pin Point, Georgia, pulled himself up by his bootstraps, worked extremely hard, and so on. Despite the fact that the story was greatly exaggerated (even mythical), this "Pinpoint strategy" was extremely effective in selling Thomas to socially conservative whites, who continue to hold Thomas up as an atypical model while at the same time disparaging most blacks for failing to measure up (Mayer and Abramson 1994).

By way of contrast, respondents who reject negative stereotypes of African-Americans display a remarkable consistency in their responses across both the race and the individuating information of the target. While there is a slight (though rarely significant) tendency for these whites to respond more generously toward black welfare recipients or criminal suspects than toward similarly described whites, the dominant pattern is the consistency of their responses, regardless of whether the blacks in question exhibit socially desirable attributes (are high school graduates, are well-behaved and well-dressed, are working hard to improve their lives) or display socially undesirable attributes (are high school dropouts, use foul language, have trouble hanging on to their jobs).¹¹

Importantly, this consistency does not appear to be due to social desirability pressures of impression management. In fact, the randomized experiments are designed in part to "smoke out" the prejudices even of self-proclaimed racially tolerant subjects. And we found that a substantial number of such whites, even when given the ammunition that blacks are "drop outs" or use "foul language" or have a history of work problems, do not take advantage of the opportunity to respond negatively.¹²

Another more likely possibility, in our view, is that people who reject negative racial stereotypes genuinely do not want to disparage blacks. This position is consistent with the experimental work of Devine

and her colleagues (1989, 1991), which indicates that “those who report being low in prejudice actually are low in prejudice” (1989, 195). Neither we nor Devine, however, suggest that whites who reject racial stereotypes never engage in prejudicial responses toward blacks. Rather, the responses of such individuals are likely to depend on whether they are able to consciously control their responses. According to Devine, when people who reject negative stereotypes are unconsciously “primed” to think about negative cultural stereotypes of blacks, they are as susceptible to racially intolerant responses as are individuals who accept negative stereotypes. The important point is that under most circumstances, such individuals are likely to avoid prejudice and even actively reject stigmatizing responses (e.g., when race becomes an issue in a political campaign). Yet, there are many circumstances under which negative cultural stereotypes may be unconsciously activated (for instance, when crime and welfare are discussed in racially-coded language) and these are equally worrisome. Quite likely, the producers of the infamous “Willie Horton” ad employed against Democratic candidate Michael Dukakis in 1988 understood this principle fully (see, e.g., Jamieson 1992).

Our results also have important implications for the power of individuating information to inhibit the racial beliefs of negative stereotypers. Given the dim chances of ever actually changing such stereotypes (e.g., Rothbart and Evans 1993), individuating information that cleanly contradicts extant beliefs may be one of the few feasible means for “decoupling” racial stereotypes from welfare and crime policy judgments, as was demonstrated in the welfare policy and police search experiments. Clearly, vivid anecdotes that deviate from our general beliefs can go a long way toward mitigating the power of stereotypes and other sources of base-rate information (e.g., Nisbett and Ross 1980). Just as President Reagan excelled at using “Horatio Alger” anecdotes to demonstrate that poverty and drug abuse were not the problems of the federal government (e.g., Pratkanis and Aranson 1991, 131-133), President Clinton has often used vivid, personal anecdotes of successful (black) welfare mothers being helped by the federal government to get off the public dole. In this respect, then, our results are consistent with studies that show that popular support for a given policy depends on the way that policy is framed. Just as income-targeted policies engender more support

than race-targeted policies, in part because they suppress the activation of negative racial stereotypes (e.g., Bobo and Kluegal 1993; Sniderman and Piazza 1993), personal, vivid anecdotes that are counter to stereotype may also suppress (or even reverse) racial biases in evaluating policies that benefit African-Americans.

The likelihood of this happening in the current environment, however, is slight, given political discourse that discusses welfare and crime in racially-coded terms and media coverage that portrays welfare recipients and criminal suspects as black. Stereotype inhibition requires sufficiently powerful and plentiful contrary examples so that whites have enough anecdotes in their minds that problems such as welfare and crime do not immediately and automatically suggest the involvement of African-Americans. Regrettably, however, blacks face a double problem in this regard. First, welfare recipients and criminals are far too often portrayed as black in the media and, second, the media focus far more often on atypical blacks in a stigmatizing context. Thus, while stereotypes can, and doubtless are, often inhibited by information that undercuts the stereotype, this type of information is far from abundant in our culture. Given the manner in which race is linked with welfare and crime in the current political environment, therefore, it is likely that public attitudes on these issues will continue to be biased by the racial stereotypes prevalent in the culture.

Chapter 4 Notes

1. By studying stereotypes as the products of normal, everyday cognitive processes, this perspective has successfully documented the pervasive impact that such beliefs have on all stages of information processing, biasing what information is perceived, how that information is interpreted and stored in memory, and hence how that information is used to form appraisals of individual group members (for reviews see Stephan 1985; Bar-Tal, et al. 1989; and Hamilton and Trolie 1986).
2. As Hamilton and Trolie (1986, 153) point out, social cognition theorists do not deny the importance of motivational and other noncognitive variables in the stereotyping process, but push the cognitive analysis as far as it can go—exploring the extent to which cognitive factors alone can produce stereotyping and its effects.
3. The post-election interview of the 1992 National Election Survey asked respondents to rate “blacks in general” on two 7-point semantic differential scales (i.e., lazy vs hard-working and prone to violence vs peaceful) which are comparable to the lazy and aggressive/violent scales in the Race and Politics Survey. The percentage of white respondents falling into negative (1-3), neutral (4) and positive (5-7) categories on the two ANES scales are as follows: lazy to hard working (36.5, 40.4 and 23.1%); violent to peaceful (50.5, 33.3, and 15.9%). While the wording and format of our stereotype items differ from those used by the NES, it is reassuring that responses appear robust and comparable across the two measures.
4. To examine the possibility that regional differences in socialization patterns have faded over recent years, south-nonsouth comparisons were analyzed across age cohorts. If region and generation interact, we would find that regional differences would diminish among younger respondents. We found, however, that regional comparisons are essentially constant across cohorts.
5. The regression model implicitly assumes, consistent with the prevailing wisdom in the area (e.g., Bobo and Kluegel 1993), that racial stereotypes are causally prior to political judgments—an assumption consistent with findings that such general beliefs are acquired in early childhood, whereas political attitudes are formed in late adolescence and early adulthood (e.g., Sears 1975). We also consider global racial

stereotypes, which are general dispositions, to be logically prior to more specific political judgments. On the other hand, causal assumptions are not absolutely crucial to our analysis, which is designed to show the conditions under which stereotypes are, and are not, connected to political judgments.

6. The coefficients for the Black Work Ethic variable are significantly different from one another at the .05 level or less across the race of the welfare mother (columns 1 and 2 versus 3 and 4) and between black dropout and black high school graduate conditions (column 1 versus 2). Significance tests were conducted by pooling the data for all four experimental conditions and including appropriate interaction terms representing Black Work Ethic times the race and educational status dummy variables. We report the separate regressions (instead of the interactive models estimated with pooled data) in Table 2 because they are more informative and allow the effects for all the variables to vary across experimental conditions (not just Black Work Ethic).

7. The coefficient for Black Work Ethic varies significantly (at the .05 level or less) across both the race and the work history of the proposed welfare recipient (i.e., across columns 1 and 2 versus 3 and 4 and across columns 1 versus 2), as indicated by a regression analysis of the pooled data including appropriate interaction terms for Black Work Ethic times the race and work history dummies.

8. Possible explanations for this result, which recurs in the drug search experiment discussed below, are explored in the conclusions.

9. The coefficient for Black Hostility varies significantly (at the .05 level or less) across both the race and the behavior of the men (i.e., across columns 1 and 2 versus 3 and 4 and across columns 1 versus 2), as indicated by a regression analysis of the pooled data including appropriate interaction terms for Black Hostility times the race and behavior dummies.

10. While our data do not allow us to choose between contrast and subtyping explanations, one advantage of the subtyping explanation, in our judgment, is that it views over-compensation as a habitual response on the part of negative stereotypers (similar to the familiar refrain, “I’m not prejudiced, but...”), whereas contrast effects tend to resemble transitory and artifactual response biases.

11. As a barometer of their consistency, these respondents evidence an average percentage difference (across the four experiments) of only 4.3% between judgments of stigmatized versus nonstigmatized black targets. Among those holding negative stereotypes, the average difference between stigmatization groups is 24.1%.

12. Moreover, we sought to control for social desirability biases in another way. Regardless of how whites rejecting negative stereotypes score on the eight-item Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Index (Crowne and Marlowe 1964), their responses were consistent across the experimental conditions.

Chapter 4 Appendix

Survey Measures

I. Racial Stereotypes. Scales were formed to measure two central dimensions of whites' stereotypes of African-Americans: Black Work Ethic (Cronbach's $\alpha = .765$ for the items Lazy, Determined to Succeed, Dependable, Hard-working, and Lack Discipline) and Black Hostility (Aggressive or Violent), which were found to tap distinct dimensions of whites' beliefs about African-Americans (r between the two dimensions is .45) and in preliminary analyses were found to play a significant, non-redundant role in predicting various policy attitudes in the survey, especially attitudes toward crime and welfare. Both scales are coded so that higher values indicate more negative assessments of "most" blacks.

All of the stereotype items except one (Lack Discipline) are based on the following item: "Now I'll read a few words that people sometimes use to describe blacks. Of course, no word fits absolutely everybody, but, as I read each one, please tell me, using a number from 0 to 10, how well you think it describes blacks as a group. If you think it's a very good description of most blacks, give it a 10. If you feel a word is a very inaccurate description of most blacks, give it a 0." Lack Discipline is based on the Likert statement, "Most black parents don't teach their children the self-discipline and skills it takes to get ahead in America," where responses to the 4-point scale are also coded such that higher values indicate more negative assessments of most blacks (i.e., agreement with the statement).

Others have used different measurement strategies. Bobo and Kluegel (1993), for example, subtract ratings of "whites in general" from ratings of "blacks in general" on five 7-point semantic differential scales (e.g., hard-working—lazy, violence-prone—not violence-prone, unintelligent—intelligent, etc.) to measure "prejudice," a concept which they argue involves attributing less positive characteristics to blacks than whites. However, other studies have found that the impact of stereotypes of blacks on political evaluations to be unaffected by stereotypes of whites (Terkildsen 1993; Hurwitz and Peffley 1997). Moreover, we control for more general forms of ethnocentrism (and other possible confounds)

in our analyses of the consequences of racial stereotypes by including measures of Social Intolerance, Conformity, and Anti-Semitism as control variables.

II. Social and Political Variables. In the regression analyses in Tables 4.3 through 4.6, we include a variety of social, political, and attitudinal variables in the analysis to remove any obvious sources of spurious covariance between racial stereotypes and our dependent variables. Party identification and ideological self-placement are measured using the standard seven-point scales. Household income is categorized in increments of ten thousand dollars per year. “South” is a dummy variable where 1 represents the “Deep South” (the eleven Confederate states) and 0 represents the “Nonsouth.” The Education variable categorizes respondents into groups of eighth grade or lower, some high school, high school graduates, some college, college graduates, and some graduate work or a graduate degree. Political Sophistication is a summed index based on a respondent’s ability to place correctly the political parties on three issues (reducing unemployment, reducing rich/poor income differences, and permitting school prayer); to identify oneself as a liberal, moderate, or conservative; and to respond accurately to two factual questions (knowing that there are nine Supreme Court justices and that presidents can serve a maximum of two terms).

III. Core Beliefs and Values. Additionally, we incorporate various measures of basic values that have been linked with stereotypes, policy attitudes, or both, in prior research.

A. Individualism (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .444$; $r = .285$) was formed by summing ratings to two value scales (“Self-reliance—having everybody stand on their own two feet” and “Emphasizing individual achievement and excellence on the job”) from a larger battery of value items where respondents were asked to rate various value statements on a scale from 0 (one of the least important values) to 10 (one of the absolutely most important things to you). Consistent with prior research (Sniderman and Piazza 1993), correlations between racial stereotypes and Individualism and Ideology are minimal (e.g., r ’s between Black Work Ethic and Individualism and Ideology are .12 and .13, respectively).

B. Ethnocentrism.

1. Social Intolerance (Cronbach's $\alpha = .363$) was measured with two 11-point scales from the value battery ("Tolerating different beliefs and lifestyles" and "Allowing people to speak out for ideas that most people disagree with") and two 4-point Likert items ("We should be more tolerant of different groups in society, even if their values and behavior are very different from ours," and "Groups with very different ideas and values should try their best to fit in with the rest of society").
2. Conformity (defined here as a desire for an orderly world in which people obey authority and adhere to convention) (Cronbach's $\alpha = .711$) was assessed with three 11-point scales from the value battery ("Preserving the traditional ideas of right and wrong," "Respect for authority," and "Improving standards of politeness in everyday behavior") and three 3-point childhood value priorities ("Independence or Respect for elders," "Obedience or self-reliance" and "Curiosity or good manners").
3. Anti-Semitism (Cronbach's $\alpha = .775$) is measured by summing responses to the following Likert statements, "Most Jews are more willing than other people to use shady practices to get ahead in life," "Most Jews believe that they are better than other people," "Most Jews in general are inclined to be more loyal to Israel than to America," and "Most Jews don't care what happens to people who aren't Jewish."

Chapter 4 References

- Adorno, T.W., E. Frenkel-Brunswik, D.J. Levinson, and N. Sanford. 1950. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper.
- Altemeyer, Bob. 1988. Enemies of Freedom. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bobo, Lawrence. 1988. "Group Conflict, Prejudice, and the Paradox of Contemporary Racial Attitudes." In Phyllis Katz and Dalmas Taylor eds., Eliminating Racism: Profiles in Controversy, 85-114. NY: Plenum Press.
- Bobo, Lawrence, and James Kluegel. 1993. "Opposition to Race-Targeting: Self-Interest, Stratification, Ideology, or Racial Attitudes?" American Sociological Review 58: 443-464.
- Bodenhausen, Galen V. 1988. "Stereotypic Biases in Social Decision Making and Memory: Testing Process Models of Stereotype Use." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 55: 726-37.
- Carmines, Edward G., and Paul M. Sniderman. 1992. "The Asymmetry of Race as a Political Issue: Prejudice, Political Ideology, and the Structure of Conflict in American Politics." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago.
- Crowne, D. P., and Marlowe, D. 1964. The Approval Motive. New York: Wiley.
- Devine, Patricia G. 1989. "Automatic and Controlled Processes in Prejudice: The Role of Stereotypes and Personal Beliefs." In Anthony Pratkanis, Steven Breckler, and Anthony Greenwald eds., Attitude Structure and Function. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Devine, Patricia G., and Sara M. Baker. 1991. "Measurement of Racial Stereotype Subtyping." Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 17: 44-50.
- Devine, Patricia G., Margo J. Monteith, Julia R Zuwerink, and Andrew J. Elliot. "Prejudice without Compunction." 1991. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 60: 817-830.
- Edsall, Thomas B., and Mary D. Edsall. 1992. Chain Reaction: The Impact of Race, Rights, and Taxes on American Politics. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Entman, Robert. 1990. Modern Racism and the Images of Blacks in Local Television News. Critical

Studies in Mass Communication 7: 332-45.

———. 1992. "Blacks in the News: Television, Modern Racism, and Cultural Change." Journalism Quarterly 69: 341-361.

Feldman, Stanley. 1989. "The Roots of Moral Conservatism." Paper presented at the 1989 Annual Meeting of the International Political Psychology Association, Tel Aviv, Israel.

Fiske, Susan T., and S.L. Neuberg. 1990. "A Continuum of Impression Formation, from Category-Based to Individuating Processes: Influences of Information and Motivation on Attention and Interpretation." In M. P. Zanna (ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol. 23). New York: Academic Press.

Fiske, Susan T., and Mark A. Pavelcheck. 1986. "Category-Based Versus Piecemeal-Based Affective Responses: Developments in Schema-Triggered Affect." In R. M. Sorrenti and E. T. Higgins eds., The Handbook of Motivation and Cognition: Foundations of Social Behavior. New York: Guilford Press.

Franklin, Raymond S. 1991. Shadows of Race and Class. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Hamilton, David, and Jeffrey W. Sherman. 1994. "Stereotypes." In R. S. Wyer, Jr. and T. K. Srul eds., Handbook of Social Cognition, 2nd ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hamilton, David and Trolie, T.K. 1986. "Stereotypes and Stereotyping: An Overview of the Cognitive Approach." In J. Dovidio and S. L. Gaertner eds., Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism. New York: Academic Press.

Hurwitz, Jon, and Mark Peffley. 1992. "Traditional Versus Social Values as Antecedents of Racial Stereotyping and Policy Conservatism." Political Behavior 14: 395-421.

Jamieson, Kathleen Hall. 1992. Dirty Politics: Deception, Distraction, and Democracy. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kinder, Donald R., and David O. Sears. 1981. "Prejudice and Politics: Symbolic Racism Versus Racial Threats to the Good Life." Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology 40: 414-31.

- Kluegel, James R., and Elliot R. Smith. 1986. Beliefs about Inequality. New York: Aldine.
- Kohn, M.L. 1977. Class And Conformity. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lippmann, Walter. 1922. Public Opinion. New York: The Free Press.
- Lipset, Seymour M., and William Schneider. 1978. "The Bakke Case: How Would It Be Decided at the Bar of Public Opinion?" Public Opinion 1: 38-44.
- Locksley, Anne, Eugene Borgida, Nancy Brekke, and Christine Hepburn. 1980. "Sex Stereotypes and Social Judgments." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 39: 821-31.
- Lodge, Milton, Kathleen M. McGraw, and Patrick Stroh. 1989. "An Impression-driven Model of Candidate Evaluation." American Political Science Review 83: 399-419.
- Manis, Melvin, Monica Biernat, and Thomas F. Nelson. 1991. "Comparison and Expectancy Processes in Human Judgment." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 61: 203-211.
- Martin, Leonard L., Jon Seta, and Rick A. Crelia. 1990. "Assimilation and Contrast as a Function of People's Willingness and Ability to Expend Effort in Forming an Impression." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 59: 27-37.
- Mayer, Jane, and Jill Abramson. 1994. Strange Justice: The Selling of Clarence Thomas. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Nisbett, Richard, and Lee Ross. 1980. Strategies and Shortcomings of Social Judgment. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Peffley, Mark, Todd Shields, and Bruce Williams. 1994. "The Intersection of Race and Crime in Television News Stories: An Experimental Study." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Political Science Association, Chicago, April 6 to 9.
- Pratkanis, Anthony, and Eliot Aronson. 1991. Age of Propaganda: The Everyday Use and Abuse of Persuasion. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Rahn, Wendy M. 1993. "The Role of Partisan Stereotypes in Information Processing About Political Candidates." American Journal of Political Science 37: 472-496.

- Rothbart, Myron and John Oliver. 1993. "Race, Politics, and the American Dilemma." In Paul Sniderman, Philip Tetlock, and Edward Carmines eds., Prejudice, Politics, and the American Dilemma. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Schuman, Howard, C. Steeh, and Lawrence Bobo. 1988. Racial Attitudes In America. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Schwartz, Norbet, and Herbert Bless. 1992. "Constructing Reality and Its Alternatives: An Inclusion/Exclusion Model of Assimilation and Contrast Effects in Social Judgment." In Leonard L. Martin and Abraham Tesser eds., The Construction of Social Judgments. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sears, David O. 1975. Political Socialization. In Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson W. Polsby eds., Handbook of Political Science, vol. 4. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Selznick, Gertrude J., and Stephen Steinberg. 1969. The Tenacity of Prejudice; Anti-Semitism in Contemporary America. New York: Harper & Row.
- Sidanius, James. 1992. A Comparison of Symbolic Racism Theory and Social Dominance Theory: Explanations for Racial Policy Attitudes. Journal of Social Psychology 132: 377-395.
- Sigelman, Carol K., Lee Sigelman, Barbara J. Walkosz, and Michael Nitz. 1995. "Black Candidates, White Voters: Understanding Racial Bias in Political Perceptions." American Journal of Political Science 39: 243-265.
- Sniderman, Paul M., and Thomas Piazza. 1993. The Scar of Race. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Snyder, Mark, and William J. Ickes. 1985. "Personality." In Gardner Lindzey and Elliot Aranson eds., The Handbook of Social Psychology, 3rd ed. New York: Random House.
- Terkildsen, Nadya. 1993. "When White Voters Evaluate Black Candidates: The Processing Implications of Candidate Skin Color, Prejudice and Self-Monitoring." American Journal of Political Science 37: 1032-1053.

Wilson, William Julius. 1987. The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass and Public Policy. Chicago: Univeristy of Chicago Press.

Table 4.1. Percentage of Whites Giving Negative, Neutral and Positive Responses to Racial Stereotype Items

<u>Stereotype Item</u>	<u>Negative Response</u>	<u>Neutral Response</u>	<u>Positive Response</u>
<i>Black Work Ethic</i>			
Lazy*	31.1 %	30.6 %	38.3 %
Determined to Succeed*	22.0	29.0	49.0
Hard working*	16.8	26.1	57.1
Dependable*	13.0	31.6	55.4
Lack Discipline**	59.7	0.0	40.3
<i>Black Hostility</i>			
Aggressive or Violent*	50.0	27.4	22.6

Source: 1991 Race and Politics Survey.

Note: Percentages are based on N's that range from 1,767 to 1,780.

*Responses to the positively worded items were first reflected so that higher values on all the scales indicate more negative assessments. To simplify the display of responses for this table, the 11-point scales were collapsed into three categories, such that a score of 5 at the mid-point of the original scale is considered a Neutral Response, while Negative Responses are scores above the midpoint (6-10), and Positive Responses are scores below the mid-point (0-4) of the original scale.

**Responses are based on the Likert item, "Most black parents don't teach their children the self-discipline and skills it takes to get ahead in America." Negative Responses are those which agree (either strongly or somewhat) with the statement, while Positive Responses are those which disagree (either strongly or somewhat).

Figure 4.1. Marginal Responses to Survey Experiments, Whites Only

A. Welfare Mother Experiments: Assessments of welfare mother described as: [black; white], [high school dropout; high school graduate]

Likely to try to hard to find a job?

Likely to have kids to get bigger welfare check?

B. Welfare Policy Experiment: Favor welfare programs to help: [blacks; new immigrants from Europe]...[with trouble; who want to work]?

C. Police Search Experiment: Drug search is reasonable for suspects described as: two young [black; white] men [using foul language; well-dressed and well-behaved]?

Source: 1991 Race and Politics Survey. *Note:* Percentages are based on the first two response categories of 4-point scales (e.g., very likely + somewhat likely, etc.). None of the percentage differences across similarly described blacks vs. whites are significant at the .05 level.

Table 4.2. Predicting Racial Stereotypes from Demographic, Value and Ethnocentrism Variables

Demographic Model								
Full Model								
	<u>Blk Work Ethic</u>		<u>Black Hostility</u>		<u>Blk Work Ethic</u>		<u>Black Hostility</u>	
	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta
	(se)		(se)		(se)		(se)	
Demographic								
Education	-.683** (.148)	-.121	-.34** (.05)	-.176	.093 (.148)	.016	-.135* (.053)	-.070
South	2.06** (.393)	.126	.593** (.133)	.106	1.68** (.367)	.103	.510** (.132)	.091
Age	.031** (.01)	.073	.00 (.004)	.001	.017 (.010)	.040	-.002 (.004)	-.016
Gender	-.832* (.340)	-.059	-.01 (.005)	-.021	.053 (.324)	.004	.058 (.116)	.012
Income	.003 (.05)	.016	-.02 (.017)	-.031	.067 (.047)	.035	-.013 (.017)	-.020
Values, Predisp's								
Ideology	--	--	--	--	.054 (.111)	.013	-.019 (.040)	-.013
Party ID	--	--	--	--	-.043 (.089)	-.012	.021 (.032)	.017
Pol Sophistication	--	--	--	--	.009 (.154)	.002	-.122* (.005)	-.056
Social Tolerance	--	--	--	--	-.300** (.042)	-.174	-.042** (.015)	-.070
Individualism	--	--	--	--	-.136* (.065)	-.048	-.072** (.023)	-.075
Antisemitism	--	--	--	--	-.417** (.030)	-.343	-.109** (.011)	-.262
Conformity	--	--	--	--	-.140* (.071)	-.050	-.019 (.025)	-.020
R ² /Adj R ²	.040	.037	.048	.045	.216	.210	.140	.135
Number of cases	1637		1693		1592		1592	

Source: 1991 Race and Politics Survey.

Note: Entries in left-hand columns are unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses; standardized coefficients in right-hand columns. Lower values on the above variables indicate: rejection of negative stereotypes, lower education, not living in the deep South, younger, male, lower income, conservative, Republican, low political sophistication, social intolerance, individualism, anti-Semitism, and conformity. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Table 4.3. Regression Analysis of Assessments of Welfare Mother on Racial Stereotypes across Different Descriptions of Target

Table 4.3.A. Likely to try hard to find a job?

<i>Racial Stereotypes</i>	<i>DESCRIPTION OF WELFARE MOTHER</i>							
	<u>Black Dropout</u>		<u>Black Graduate</u>		<u>White Dropout</u>		<u>White Graduate</u>	
	b (se)	Beta	b (se)	Beta	b (se)	Beta	b (se)	Beta
Black Work Ethic	.034** (.009)	.257	.006 (.008)	.052	.013 (.008)	.102	.003 (.009)	.023
Black Hostility	.019 (.013)	.098	.021 (.013)	.109	.006 (.012)	.032	-.013 (.013)	-.067
R ² /Adj R ²	.149	.118	.160	.129	.092	.062	.069	.035
Number of cases	395		395		450		398	

Table 4.3.B. Likely to have another child to get a bigger welfare check?

<i>Racial Stereotypes</i>	<i>DESCRIPTION OF WELFARE MOTHER</i>							
	<u>Black Dropout</u>		<u>Black Graduate</u>		<u>White Dropout</u>		<u>White Graduate</u>	
	b (se)	Beta	b (se)	Beta	b (se)	Beta	b (se)	Beta
Black Work Ethic	-.037** (.008)	.287	-.015 (.010)	-.114	-.014 (.008)	-.103	-.005 (.010)	-.041
Black Hostility	.009 (.012)	.047	-.016 (.013)	-.08	-.026* (.012)	-.135	.006 (.013)	.031
R ² /Adj R ²	.235	.207	.159	.190	.152	.180	.120	.151
Number of cases	391		403		446		395	

Source: 1991 Race and Politics Survey.

Note: Entries in left-hand columns are unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses; standardized coefficients in right-hand columns. Lower values on the above variables indicate: predict welfare mother is likely to try to find a job, likely to have more children to get a bigger welfare check and rejection of negative stereotypes. Coefficients are also controlled for various political predispositions (social intolerance, conformity, anti-Semitism, partisan and ideological identifications, and political sophistication) and sociodemographic characteristics (education, gender, age, income, and residing in the deep South).

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 4.4. Responses to Different Descriptions of Welfare Mother among Whites Accepting and Rejecting Negative Racial Stereotypes

Table 4.4.A. Welfare Mother [description] is likely to ...try really hard to find a job in the next year?

<u>Description of Welfare Mother.</u>	<i>Accept Neg. Stereotype</i>			<i>Reject Neg. Stereotype</i>		
	<u>%Likely</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%Likely</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
<i>Black dropout</i>	32.3%	2.976	(127)	67.1%	2.179	(140)
Black graduate	51.1	2.610	(141)	70.1	2.150	(127)
White dropout	40.1	2.841	(157)	49.6	2.558	(129)
<u>White graduate</u>	<u>60.9</u>	<u>2.397</u>	<u>(151)</u>	<u>62.1</u>	<u>2.207</u>	<u>(116)</u>
<i>Diff. Bl - Wh dropout</i>	-7.8%	.135*		17.5%	-.379*	
<i>Diff. Bl - Wh graduate</i>	-9.8	.213*		8.0	-.057	
<i>Diff. Bl drop - Bl grad</i>	18.8	.366*		3.0	.029	
<i>Diff. Wh drop - Wh grad</i>	20.8	.444*		12.5	.351*	

Table 4.4.B. Welfare Mother [description] is likely to...have another child to get a bigger welfare check?

<u>Description of Welfare Mother</u>	<i>Accept Neg. Stereotype</i>			<i>Reject Neg. Stereotype</i>		
	<u>%Likely</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%Likely</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
<i>Black dropout</i>	81.9%	1.748	(127)	52.9%	2.529	(136)
Black graduate	74.3	1.986	(140)	44.4	2.595	(126)
White dropout	82.1	1.949	(156)	50.8	2.460	(126)
<u>White graduate</u>	<u>60.3</u>	<u>2.265</u>	<u>(151)</u>	<u>51.3</u>	<u>2.522</u>	<u>(115)</u>
<i>Diff. Bl -Wh dropout</i>	-.20% ^a	-.201*		2.1% ^a	.069	
<i>Diff. Bl -Wh graduate</i>	14.0	-.279*		-6.9	.073	
<i>Diff. Bl drop - Bl grad</i>	7.6	-.238*		8.5	-.066	
<i>Diff. Wh drop - Wh grad</i>	21.8	-.316*		1.5	-.062	

Source: 1991 Race and Politics Survey.

Note: Means are computed on 4-point scales ranging from very likely (1) to very unlikely (4); percentages based on first two categories (i.e., very likely + somewhat likely).

^aIndicates differences run in unexpected direction, with those accepting negative stereotypes offering more positive evaluations of black than white targets.

*Indicates means are significantly different from one another ($p < .05$) using ANOVA contrast analysis.

Table 4.5. Welfare Policy Experiment

Table 4.5.A. Regression Analysis of Support for Welfare Program on Racial Stereotypes across Different Descriptions of Recipients

	RECIPIENTS							
	Blacks with Trouble		Blacks Who Work		Immigrants with Trouble		Immigrants Who Work	
	b (se)	Beta	b (se)	Beta	b (se)	Beta	b (se)	Beta
<i>Racial Stereotypes</i>								
Black Work Ethic	.029** (.013)	.210	-.025* (.011)	-.227	.007 (.012)	.066	-.010 (.012)	-.087
Black Hostility	.005 (.019)	.024	.024 (.017)	.144	.023 (.017)	.134	.031 (.018)	.175
R ² /Adj R ²	.253	.197	.114	.041	.165	.088	.161	.088
Number of cases	199		185		176		177	

Note: Entries in left-hand columns are unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses; standardized coefficients in right-hand columns. Lower values on the above variables indicate: favor welfare programs and rejection of negative stereotypes. Coefficients are also controlled for various political predispositions (social intolerance, conformity, anti-Semitism, partisan and ideological identifications, and political sophistication) and sociodemographic characteristics (education, gender, age, income, residing in deep South).

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 4.5.B. Favor Welfare Policy across Whites Who Accept and Reject Negative Racial Stereotypes

<i>Description of Group</i>	<i>Accept Neg. Stereotype</i>			<i>N</i>	<i>Reject Neg. Stereotype</i>			<i>N</i>
	<i>%Favor</i>	<i>Mean</i>			<i>%Favor</i>	<i>Mean</i>		
<i>Blacks with trouble</i>	46.8%	2.684	(79)		82.3%	1.952	(62)	
<i>Blacks who work</i>	92.8	1.536	(69)		84.9	1.604	(53)	
<i>Immigrants with trouble</i>	61.7	2.426	(47)		78.3	2.083	(60)	
<i>Immigrants who work</i>	71.9	2.078	(64)		87.9	1.707	(58)	
<i>Diff. Bl - Im. trouble</i>	-14.9%	.258*			4.0%	-.131		
<i>Diff. Bl - Im. work</i>	20.9 ^a	-.542* ^a			-3.0	-.103		
<i>Diff. Bl trouble - Bl work</i>	46.0	1.148*			2.6	.348*		
<i>Diff. Im trouble - Im work</i>	10.2	.348*			9.6	.376*		

Source: 1991 Race and Politics Survey.

Note: Means are computed on a 4-point scale ranging from strongly favor (1) to strongly oppose (4); percentages based on first two categories (i.e., strongly favor + somewhat favor).

^aIndicates differences run in unexpected direction, with those accepting negative stereotypes offering more positive evaluations of black than white targets.

*Indicates means are significantly different ($p < .05$) using ANOVA contrast analysis.

Table 4.6. Analysis of Police Search Experiment

Table 4.6.A. Regression Analysis of Evaluations of Police Search on Racial Stereotypes across Different Descriptions of Suspects

	SUSPECTS							
	Blacks Using Foul		Blacks		Whites Using Foul		Whites	
	Language		Well Behaved		Language		Well Behaved	
	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta
<i>Racial Stereotypes</i>	(se)		(se)		(se)		(se)	
Black Work Ethic	-.006 (.007)	-.044	-.005 (.007)	-.034	-.001 (.006)	-.007	-.004 (.008)	-.030
Black Hostility	-.051** (.019)	-.151	-.004 (.019)	-.011	-.021 (.019)	-.057	-.015 (.021)	-.037
R ² /Adj R ²	.282	.256	.187	.157	.209	.181	.176	.147
Number of cases	412		411		413		414	

Note: Entries in left-hand columns are unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses; standardized coefficients in right-hand columns. Lower values on the above variables indicate: police search reasonable and rejection of negative stereotypes. Coefficients are also controlled for various political predispositions (social intolerance, conformity, anti-Semitism, partisan and ideological identifications, and political sophistication) and sociodemographic characteristics (education, gender, age, income, residing in deep South).

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 4.6.B. Evaluations of Police Search across Whites Who Accept and Reject Negative Stereotypes

<i>Description of Suspects</i>	<i>Accept Neg. Stereotype</i>			<i>Reject Neg. Stereotype</i>		
	<u>%Reason</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%Reason</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Blacks using foul language	86.0%	1.710	(100)	50.6%	2.556	(89)
Blacks well behaved	62.0	2.304	(92)	47.0	2.610	(100)
Whites using foul language	73.5	2.041	(98)	56.6	2.425	(106)
Whites well behaved	72.9	2.104	(96)	53.2	2.587	(109)
<i>Diff. Bl - Wh foul lang.</i>	12.5%	-.333*		-6.6%	.131	
<i>Diff. Bl - Wh well beh.</i>	-10.9 ^a	.200* ^a		-6.2	.023	
<i>Diff. Bl foul - Bl behaved</i>	24.0	-.594*		3.6	-.054	
<i>Diff. Wh foul - Wh behaved</i>	.6	-.186		3.4	-.162	

Source: 1991 Race and Politics Survey.

Note: Means are computed on a 4-point scale ranging from search definitely reasonable (1) to definitely not reasonable (4); percentages based on first two categories (i.e., definitely + possibly reasonable).

^aIndicates differences run in unexpected direction, with those accepting negative stereotypes offering more positive evaluations of black than white targets.

*Indicates means are significantly different ($p < .05$) using ANOVA contrast analysis.