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The accurate assessment of racial prejudice remains central to social science research on a diverse array of contemporary topics. Measures of negative attitudes have been included in recent research on a variety of topics, ranging from an understanding of American residential segregation patterns (Krysan et al 2009), policing levels in various geographic locations across the U.S. (Stults and Baumer (2007), voting preferences in an election that involves an African-American candidate such as Barack Obama (Tesler and Sears, 2010) to friendship and marriage patterns (Edmunds and Killen 2009; Fisman et al 2008). The centrality of race to many aspects of social, economic and political life in the United States makes the assessment of racial attitudes an active and ongoing concern for economists, political scientists, psychologists, and sociologists (for recent reviews see Feldman and Huddy 2009, Hutchings and Valentino 2004; Quillian 2006). Yet researchers differ widely in how they assess racial prejudice and racial attitudes. In this manuscript, we revive a tripartite framework for the conception and measurement of Americans racial beliefs, building on research by Kluegel (1990) and Apostle and colleagues (1983).

A Cornucopia of Racial Attitude Measures

A quick tour of recent race-related research illustrates the heterogeneous assessment of racial attitudes across the social sciences. In an investigation of racial voting in the 2008 presidential election, political psychologists Michael Tesler and David Sears (2010) rely on racial resentment – a series of questions that tap resentment over the government treatment of African-Americans and blacks’ unwillingness to improve their own economic outcomes – to assess the role of racial prejudice in driving support and opposition to Barack Obama. Sociologists Maria Krysan and colleagues (2009) study the influence of negative racial attitudes
on a preference for less racially diverse neighborhoods and measure racial negativity as the
degree to which respondents endorse racial stereotypes that portray blacks as lazy and
unintelligent. Economists Raymond Fisman and colleagues (2008) examine contextual racism
as support for miscegenation laws in a participant’s state and assess its impact on racial bias in
a speed dating study.

This fractured approach to the measurement of racial attitudes is reflected in social
science research more broadly. Many political scientists and sociologists favor a very direct
approach and measure racial prejudice as negative racial stereotypes, based on questions that
ask bluntly about the intelligence or laziness of “most blacks.” These measures have been
included with regularity in key national datasets such as the American National Election
Study (ANES), the General Social Survey (GSS), and the 1991 Race and Politics Survey (Bobo
and Kleugel 1993; Hurwitz and Peffley 2005; Gilens 1995; Sniderman and Carmines 1997;
Sniderman and Piazza 1993). In an equally direct approach, some researchers simply ask
individuals to rate their feelings towards different groups using the ANES thermometer
question or a variant (Amodio and Devine 2007; Kam 2007).

Other researchers favor a somewhat less direct approach to the assessment of racial
attitudes which focuses less on questions about group members qualities or feelings about
them and more on reasons for racial disparities and the desired level of government assistance
needed to deal with them. For example, some sociologists rely on the GSS series of questions
on explanations for black-white differences in economic outcomes. Several of those questions
focus directly on individual explanations such blacks lack the motivation need to succeed;
others focus on societal explanations such as the existence of racial discrimination (Hunt 2007;
Many political scientists rely on racial resentment, a related set of items that combines explanations for racial disparities (e.g., blacks not trying hard enough) with feelings of resentment at government assistance to blacks (e.g., blacks should work their way up without special favors). Racial resentment items are commonly included in the ANES and have been widely used in research on racial politics (Branton and Jones 2005; Huber and Lapinski 2006; Kinder and Sanders 1996; Kinder and Mendelberg 2000; Mendelberg 2001; Sears and Henry 2005; Valentino et al 2002). Social psychologists also commonly assess prejudice as modern racism, a measure closely related to racial resentment (Effron et al 2009; Payne et al 2008).

Some researchers use an even more eclectic approach, mixing diverse racial items to create large multi-item scales that combine stereotypes, reasons for racial disparities, thermometer ratings, support for miscegenation laws, whether blacks are pushing too hard for change, or whether whites should be able to keep blacks out of their neighborhoods (Dangielis et al 2007; Hunt 2007; Sidanius et al 2004; Stults and Baumer 2007).

Finally, some psychologists and a few political scientists have abandoned the direct measurement of racial attitudes in favor of implicit prejudice or include both explicit and implicit racism measures in their research (Amodio and Devine 2007; Cunningham et al 2004; Devine 1989; Dovidio et al 2002; Kam 2007; Lepore and Brown 1997; Fazio et al 1995; Payne et al 2008; Wittenbrink et al 1997). Others have moved away from direct measures to embrace approaches such as the randomized response technique which is designed to minimize social desirability pressures that prevent people from honestly reporting negative racial views (Kuklinski, Cobb, Gilens 1997; Kuklinski, Sniderman et al 1997).
New Racism Debate

Diversity in the measurement of racial attitudes begs an obvious question: are these questions conceptually and empirically equivalent and equally good at tapping racial prejudice? One of the most prominent debates on how to measure racial prejudice concerns the degree to which negative racial attitudes can be measured directly. In essence, the debate focuses on the distinction between two different forms of racial prejudice: an overt form of prejudice that is readily detected and an indirect form that is more difficult to measure. The first type of overt prejudice is reflected in negative feelings toward blacks and endorsement of negative racial stereotypes that portray blacks as inherently inferior to whites. While this form of racism is easy to define and measure it has declined substantially over time, raising the suspicion that white prejudice is no longer readily assessed by agreement with such blatantly racist statements.

This leads, in turn, to the concept of new racism, a subtle racial prejudice in which prejudice is conveyed through white opposition to black demands and resentment at their special treatment (Bobo, Kluegel and Smith 1997; Kinder and Sanders 1996; McConahay and Hough 1976; Henry and Sears 2002; Sears and Henry 2005). There are a number of different measures of the new racism – including symbolic racism, modern racism, and racial resentment – but all share a common definition as support for the belief that blacks are demanding and undeserving, and do not require any form of special government assistance (Henry and Sears 2002; Kinder and Sears, 1981; Kinder and Sanders 1996; McConahay and Hough, 1976). New racism is more prevalent than overt prejudice, but unlike overt prejudice
it has proven difficult to both define and measure without inviting impassioned research criticism.

One of the persistent criticisms of new racism is that it is not a measure of racial prejudice, but rather assesses other non-racial ideological beliefs (Schuman 2000; Sniderman and Tetlock 1986). Measures of new racism may be confounded with the expression of conservative ideology because they draw heavily on the language of individualism. Consider an item in the racial resentment scale, one of the most common measures of the new racism within political science, which suggests that “if blacks would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites” (Kinder and Sanders 1996). A strong individualist would agree with this statement. But they would also agree with any statement that referred to the positive effects of hard work, regardless of the target person’s race, gender, or other characteristics. Kinder and Sanders (1996) believe that individualism has become entwined with racism so that agreement with the notion that blacks are unwilling to work hard is a form of racism. But this leaves no room for racial policy opposition grounded in general, non-racist individualism.

As further evidence of the ideological nature of the new racism, we find that racial resentment is more ideological among conservative than liberals (Feldman and Huddy 2005). Among liberals, resentment conveys the political effects of racial prejudice by predicting support for a college scholarship program for black but not white students, and is better predicted by overt measures of racial prejudice. Among conservatives, however, racial resentment appears more ideological. It is closely tied to opposition to race-conscious programs regardless of recipient race and is only weakly tied to measures of overt prejudice.
Racial resentment, therefore, is not a clear-cut measure of racial prejudice for all Americans and may convey ideological principles for conservatives.

The nature of new racism is of considerable political importance because it powerfully predicts white opposition to a vast array of racial policies, and has had greater empirical clout than measures of overt prejudice (see for example, Bobo 2000; Sidanius et al. 2000; Sniderman and Piazza 1993; Sniderman et al 1991, Stoker 1998). Is new racism a different form of racial prejudice? Is it simply a more acceptable way in which to express prejudice? Do other items and scales currently used in social science research to measure racial negativity such as negative stereotypes or views on miscegenation laws measure similar beliefs? Or do they measure something different? We focus on the structure of white racial attitudes to provide some guidance and advice to researchers on how best to measure them. We hope to identify a finite number of key dimensions underlying racial negativity that will bring greater uniformity to the measurement of racial prejudice.

**Tripartite Structure of Racial Attitudes**

Political scientists, sociologists, and social psychologists are divided in their reliance on new racism measures to assess racial prejudice. We argue that the emphasis on new racism has obscured a robust set of distinctions among extant racial attitudes. We put forward a tripartite system of racial attitudes that better corresponds to Americans’ racial beliefs than a dichotomous distinction, building on the questions developed by Apostle and colleagues’ to assess individual versus societal explanations for racial differences in economic outcomes. This approach to the measurement of racial attitudes continues to have some resonance within sociology (see Hunt 2007), but has had far less influence on the assessment of racial attitudes
within political science and psychology. We will show that the tripartite system captures the key elements of new racism but also underscores the limitations of a singular reliance on new racism measures. New racism captures some key aspects of the tripartite system, but fails to assess overt prejudice, the most obviously prejudicial aspect of contemporary racial attitudes. Moreover, new racism bundles together racial attitudes that are ultimately distinct and thus obscures the complexity of contemporary white racial attitudes.

Our tripartite system begins with *overt prejudice*, beliefs linked to a view of innate black inferiority, which we believe has been prematurely and unfairly dismissed by social science researchers (Huddy, Feldman, and Perkins 2008; Virtanen and Huddy 1998). We further decompose white racial beliefs into two additional components that underlie racial resentment: the *denial of racial discrimination* in contemporary American society, and the belief that blacks *lack motivation* and the values needed to get ahead. These two dimensions correspond roughly to an external and internal explanation for a lack of black success and have obviously been noted by other race researchers (Apostle et al. 1983; Bobo and Kluegel 1993; Kluegel 1990). Overall, the three-way distinction corresponds closely to Kluegel's (1990) distinction among traditional individualism (overt prejudice), motivational individualism (lack of black motivation), and structuralism (denial of discrimination) as explanations for racial differences in poverty.

This three-pronged belief system has its origins, to some degree, in the history of recent American race relations. Kinder and Sanders (1996) date the emergence of white racial resentment to the urban race riots of the late 1960s, a time of growing black political demands. Prior to this period, negative racial beliefs were considered unitary and centered
largely on the view that blacks were inferior to whites in terms of their intelligence, morality, and other basic attributes. As government removed legal barriers to black opportunities, political figures such as George Wallace, Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan helped to create a new form of racial prejudice according to Kinder and Sanders (1996) in which black failure was seen as due to blacks’ inability to capitalize on plentiful, existing opportunities. This gave newfound political importance to the view that blacks were lazy and lacked the motivation to succeed. Instead of debating blacks’ innate ability and intelligence, whites argued over black deservingness and explanations for persistent black poverty in the light of newly available opportunities for blacks. This brought stereotypic views about blacks’ willingness to work and the existence of lingering racial discrimination to the forefront of the racial policy debate.

**Black Motivation**

The belief that blacks lack sufficient motivation to succeed is a central component of the new racism. For instance, Kinder and Sears (1981) originally defined symbolic racism as "resistance to change in the racial status quo based on moral feelings that Blacks violate such traditional American values as individualism and self-reliance, the work ethic, obedience, and discipline" (p. 416). According to McConahay, modern racism – another measure of the new racism– can be defined as the feeling that "Blacks are violating cherished values" (McConahay and Hough 1976, p. 38). The emphasis within the new racism on opposition to Blacks' violation of traditional values, especially the work ethic, is further illustrated by the kinds of items used to assess it which include feeling that "Blacks on welfare are lazy and don’t want to work" (Kinder and Sears 1981), "Blacks who receive money from welfare programs could get along
without it if they tried" (Kinder and Sears 1981), and "if Blacks would only try harder they could be just as well off as Whites" (Kinder and Sanders 1996).

Negative racial stereotypes persist among white Americans and such views are politically consequential. A sizable minority of Whites agree that most Blacks are lazy, complaining, and have a chip on their shoulder (Peffley and Shields 1997; Peffley and Hurwitz 1993; Sniderman and Piazza 1993). Hunt (2007) reports that roughly a third of whites singularly blame blacks’ lack of ability or willpower for extant racial economic disparities. Furthermore, Sniderman and Piazza (1993) found that Whites who believed "if Blacks would only try harder, they would be just as well off as Whites" or that "Blacks who are on welfare programs could get a job if they really tried" were much more likely to oppose government spending for programs to either help Blacks or to guarantee their fair treatment in the work force. Likewise, Peffley and Hurwitz (1993) found that Whites who believed that most Blacks violated the "work ethic" were more inclined to oppose a government program to assist Blacks who had trouble keeping their jobs, were more likely to believe that Blacks and poor Blacks preferred government assistance to working, and were less likely to believe that a mother who had dropped out of high school and was on welfare would look for work.

Negative racial stereotypes play an especially prominent role in shaping opposition to social welfare programs and a range of criminal justice policies (Hurwitz and Peffley 1997; Peffley, Hurwitz, and Sniderman 1997; Hurwitz and Peffley 2005; Peffley and Hurwitz 2002; Sniderman and Piazza 1993). The belief that blacks are lazy and lack motivation is, thus, a politically powerful view that drives opposition to a range of racial policies.
Racial Discrimination

New racism contains a second set of beliefs concerning the existence of persistent racial discrimination that can be disentangled from the view that blacks lack the motivation to succeed. As legal barriers to black participation in American society were removed in the 1950s and 1960s, questions arose about the extent to which racial discrimination continued to play a major role in American life. The view that racial discrimination no longer affected blacks was seen as part of the new racism by McConahay and Hough (1976) and items were included in various new racism scales to assess this belief (Kinder and Sanders 1996; Henry and Sears 2000). For example, one question in the resentment scale asks whether “generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for blacks to work their way out of the lower class.” Another asks whether “government officials usually pay less attention to a request or complaint from a black person than from a white person” (Kinder and Sanders 1996). A third assess whether blacks have gotten more than they deserve.

Nonetheless, only John McConahay included a denial of discrimination as a key component of the new racism. Typically new racism researchers ground racial resentment in a combination of prejudice and values. From this perspective, racial resentment derives from negative racial attitudes and real resentment at blacks’ perceived violation of cherished values, such as individualism (Kinder and Sears, 1981; Gaertner and Dovidio 1986; Henry and Sears 2002; McConahay and Hough 1976). The heat in racial resentment is thus not linked explicitly to a rejection of contemporary racial discrimination despite the fact that several items in the scale directly ask about its persistent effects.
Other researchers have focused more squarely on a denial of discrimination as a measure of prejudice. Howard Schuman (2000), a critic of the racial resentment scale, has gone so far as to suggest that the concept of racial resentment might be better measured by an emphasis on items that assess “the complete denial that there is some continuing significant discrimination against blacks” (p,321). In his view, a denial of discrimination might constitute a better measure of new racism than items assessing black effort because the latter items allude to direct government assistance by asking whether blacks could get along without assistance if they tried hard.

Moreover, a denial of racial discrimination has pervasive political effects that are stronger than those of a perceived lack of black motivation (Kluegel 1990; Bobo and Kluegel 1993). A denial of contemporary racial discrimination is linked to opposition to a range of racial policies including opportunity enhancing programs such as enterprise zones, government efforts to improve blacks’ standard of living, and general government assistance to blacks. Other studies have also reported pervasive political effects of perceived racial discrimination on a range of racial policies (Apostle et al 1983; Sniderman and Hagen 1985). These and other findings lead Kluegel (1990) to conclude that it was not enough for whites to reject negative racial stereotypes they also had to perceive continued racial discrimination in order to support racial policies.

**Overt Prejudice**

Finally we turn to overt racism as the forgotten third component of the tripartite racial attitude system. Overt racism has been measured in past research as the belief that blacks lack sufficient intelligence and other inborn abilities to get ahead (Huddy and Feldman
Overt racism is not strongly endorsed by white Americans, and has declined over time (Hunt 2007). But it has also not been well measured. In the GSS, respondents are simply asked whether or not differences in innate ability between blacks and whites account for racial economic disparities. Not surprisingly, blunt endorsement of this view has declined over the last several decades (Hunt 2007). But support for overtly racist views increases to moderate levels if white respondents are allowed to provide shaded or qualified responses (e.g., somewhat) to statements about the link between innate black ability and black success. In a study of white New York state residents, fully 35% believed that racial differences in intelligence helped to explain black-white economic differences and 27% felt negative about a family member marrying someone who is black (Huddy, Feldman, and Perkins 2008).

Not surprisingly, overt prejudice is linked to support for segregationist policies such as miscegenation laws. It is also linked to opposition to residential integration in New York state (Huddy, Feldman, and Perkins 2008). It drives opposition to general government assistance to blacks spending, black schools, increases opposition to popular opportunity enhancing programs such as enterprise zones, and drives opposition to social welfare spending more broadly (Virtanen and Huddy 1998; Kluegel 1990; Huddy and Feldman 2001). These findings suggest that overt racism has continued political relevance that is worth investigation.

Voting patterns in the 2008 Democratic primaries provide further evidence of overt racism. The exit polls in the Democratic primaries included a question in most states on whether “race was a factor” in the respondent’s vote. When combined across all 31 states in which this question was asked, 14% of white voters said race was a factor in their vote.
decision.\footnote{State exit poll data is combined and weighted to comprise a nationally representative sample of 2008 Democratic primary voters.} This varied substantially from a low of 8\% in New Mexico and Oregon to a high of 24\% in Mississippi. On balance, race was more likely to hurt than help Obama. There were only 3 states (Oregon, Vermont, and Illinois) in which at least 50\% of respondents for whom race was a factor said that they voted for him (see Table 2). Among all Democratic primary voters including those for whom race was not a factor, there were only two states --Vermont and Illinois, Obama’s home state --in which 5\% or more voted for Obama for racial reasons (Feldman and Huddy 2009).

Overall, we believe the tripartite system of racial attitudes better captures contemporary white racial views than simple reliance on new racism. The three-way distinction avoids some of the definitional and measurement problems that have troubled racial resentment and symbolic racism (Sniderman et al 2000; Sniderman and Tetlock 1986; Schuman 2000). It also helps to clarify the nature of racial resentment and other new racism measures by demonstrating the degree to which it is linked to overt racism, an unambiguous measure of racial prejudice, depends on blacks’ perceived motivation and thus violation of the work ethic, as claimed by new racism researchers, or rests instead on a denial of contemporary discrimination.

\textbf{Research Approach and Expectations}

Disparate measures of negative racial attitudes and lingering disagreement over whether new racism measures are needed to capture prejudice demand a different and less contentious approach to the measurement of negative racial views. We examine a tripartite structure of racial attitudes to explore the link between overt racism, a perceived lack of black motivation,
and a denial of racial discrimination. We expect varied racial attitudes to sort into these three distinct dimensions. We examine the complexity of racial attitudes by assessing the degree to which the three dimensions are related, and determine the degree to which each is related to the most direct measure of prejudice – overt racism.

**Methods**

We draw on data from the American Racial Opinion Survey (AROS), an RDD telephone interview of U.S. residents conducted in two waves. The first wave was in the field from October 23, 2003 until February 23, 2004. Analyses are based on data from all white, non-Hispanic, non-Asian respondents (N = 1,229) drawn from a total of 1,583 respondents overall. The survey was conducted by the Center for Survey Research at Stony Brook University. The cooperation rate was 44% (AAPOR COOP3; www.aapor.org). Up to 15 attempts were made at each number and efforts made to convert initial refusals. The second wave of data collection occurred in early to mid 2004 (February till June). We re-interviewed 868 non-Hispanic, non-Asian whites (out of 1,229 in the first wave) for a re-interview rate of 71%. The second wave interview focused exclusively on whites in order to obtain very detailed assessment of their racial attitudes, allowing us to expand the array of racial attitude questions included in the survey.

*Explanations for Racial Disparities*

We adapt the GSS questions concerning explanations for racial differences in economic outcomes to provide the backbone to our search for three key dimensions of racial attitudes (Hunt 2007). In the GSS series, respondents are asked four questions: whether economic differences are (1) “mainly due to discrimination”, (2) “Because most blacks have less in-born
ability to learn,” (3) “Because most blacks don’t have the chance for education that it takes to rise out of poverty,” (4) “Because most blacks just don’t have the motivation or willpower to pull themselves out of poverty” (Hunt 2007). Respondents can answer yes or no to each question. We modified this question series in several ways. First, we asked “how much of the economic difference” can be explained by various factors. Response options are “a great deal,” “some,” “a little,” or “none. This moves the question beyond a simple yes or no answer to allow for gradations in response. Second, we added another battery of questions concerning the origins of racial difference on standardized test scores. And, third, we expanded the question set from 4 to 6 as we explain next.

Overt Racism was assessed with four variables that gauged the importance of “racial differences in intelligence” and “fundamental genetic differences” as explanations for racial differences in standardized test scores and economic resources. Lack of Black Motivation was assessed with 4 items asking about the importance of motivation and a lack of values as explanations for racial differences in standardized test scores and economic resources. Two additional items were included to anchor this factor. Respondents were asked “To what extent are the economic and social problems found in the black community due to blacks’ lack of self-respect for themselves and other members of their race?” and then asked to agree or disagree with the following statement: “The root cause of most blacks’ social and economic problems is the weakness and instability of the black family.” Denial of Racial Discrimination was measured with four items which assessed the role of discrimination and poor educational opportunities as explanations for racial differences in standardized test scores and economic
resources. Details of the item wording and the links among racial variables appear in Table 1 and are discussed at greater length in the results section.

**Additional Racial Questions**

In addition to the series of questions on explanation for racial disparities, we also included other racial questions in our analyses of the structure of racial attitudes. A series of 6 items assessed negative *racial stereotypes* in Wave 2 of the survey. Respondents were asked, “On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 represents LAZY and 10 represents HARD WORKING where would you rate most blacks?” The question was repeated for “most Whites.” A second question asked respondents to place blacks and whites on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 represents LOW MORAL STANDARDS and 10 represents HIGH MORAL STANDARDS. A third question, asked respondents to place blacks and whites on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 represents MOTIVATED TO SUCCEED and 10 represents NOT MOTIVATED TO SUCCEED. A difference score was created for each stereotype in which the score for blacks was subtracted from the score for whites. These difference scores are included in analyses examining the structure of racial attitudes to validate the motivational dimension.

The following series of items tapping beliefs about racial discrimination was also included in analyses: “Do you think whites or blacks on average have the greater chance of getting a college scholarship?” “Do you think whites or blacks on average have the greater chance of getting a job promotion in government jobs such as firefighter or police officer?” “Do you think whites or blacks on average have a greater chance to live where they want?” “Do you think whites or blacks on average have the greater chance of being treated fairly by the police?” For those who said that either whites or blacks had a better chance, the question
was followed by another: “Would you say that [whites/ blacks] have a much better or somewhat better chance?” This led to a combined set of 5 possible responses for each area (e.g., getting a college scholarship) that ranged from blacks have a much better chance to whites have a much better chance.

Three additional questions, linked to prior questions on the pace of the civil rights movement, racial agitation, and racial integration, were included in analyses. Respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the following statement: “The problem of racial prejudice in American history has been greatly exaggerated by the media.” They were also asked “How responsible are blacks for creating the racial tension that exists in the United States today?” and “Do you think it is right or wrong to ask Americans to accept racial integration if they honestly don’t believe in it?”

Racial Resentment. Five items were included to tap racial resentment. The first four are taken from Kinder and Sanders’ (1996) racial resentment scale and include the following items: (1) “Irish, Italians, Jewish and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without any special favors.” (2) “Over the past few years blacks have gotten less than they deserve.” (3) “It's really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if blacks would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites.” (4) “Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for blacks to work their way out of the lower class.” To further strengthen the scale, the following item was also included: (5) “Most blacks who don’t get ahead should not blame the system; they only have themselves to blame.” All items included four-point agree-disagree response categories.
Results

Structure of Racial Attitudes

The key survey questions used to measure the hypothesized three dimensions of racial attitudes are shown in Table 1. As noted, one battery of questions taps explanations for racial differences in standardized test scores (“On average, African-American students get lower scores on standardized tests than do whites”) and the other assesses explanations for socio-economic differences between blacks and whites (“On average, African-Americans have lower income and worse housing than white people”). In both cases large numbers of whites endorse explanations grounded in blacks’ perceived motivation and discrimination. Thus large numbers of whites say that a lack of opportunities for a good education and the failure of black families to teach their children appropriate values and skills account for “a great deal” or “some” of the racial gap. Substantial minorities also say that discrimination against blacks and a lack of motivation or will power are also important factors. In contrast, a majority of whites reject the genetic explanations. Nonetheless, a minority of whites endorse such views; 27% say that a great deal or some of the racial difference in economic outcomes is due to racial differences in intelligence and 22% say that a great deal or some of this difference is due to fundamental genetic differences between the races.

***INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE***

We begin by examining the factor structure of these two sets of questions. Both question sets contain a mix of overt racism, perceptions of racial discrimination and black motivation. Based on our tripartite model, we expect a three-factor model to account for
responses to all items. Each set of racial explanation items includes two indicators of each factor. Genetic factors are assessed through questions about racial differences in intelligence and fundamental genetic differences. Motivation is gauged by questions on black values and skills and motivation or will power. Discrimination is measured by questions – black educational opportunities and racial discrimination. There are, thus, four indicators of each factor across the two series of questions on explanations for racial disparities.

Since all twelve questions have the same response options, estimates of the underlying factor structure could be influenced by a common response tendency. If some people consistently say that each explanation accounts for a “great deal” or conversely “none” of the racial disparity this would induce artificially heightened positive correlations among the three latent factors. We therefore include a methods factor in our model on which all of the twelve items load positively. In order to help estimate this model, we include two other indicators of motivation that have different response scales (the origins of economic failure in the instability of the black family and blacks’ lack of self-respect). This creates two indicators of motivation that do not load on the response set factor. As a consequence of inclusion of the methods factor, the factor loadings and correlations among factors will not be affected by common response options.

We used the software package Mplus to estimate the parameters all factor models (Muthen and Muthen 2010). Mplus estimates latent variable models with discrete observed variables. For identification purposes, the loadings of the items are all fixed at 1.0. Model diagnostics suggest that there would be little improvement in the model fit if this assumption were dropped. We thus only estimate the variance of the response set. We also restrict the response set factor to have zero covariances with the substantive latent variables.
variables by modeling the relationship between the factors and responses as an ordered probit function. This dispenses with the common assumption that the interval scoring of the response options is valid. We used a robust weighted least squares estimator of the coefficients, standard errors, and goodness-of-fit statistics. In order to avoid losing observations to item non-response, we used the full information missing data estimator in Mplus. The sample size for the analyses is 1228.

The standardized factor loadings (and standard errors) for the three-factor model are shown in Table 2. The goodness-of-fit measures for this model are quite good. The CFI (comparative fit index) is .96, and the RMSEA (root mean square error of approximation) is .077. Moreover, all of the indicators have large and statistically significant loadings on their hypothesized factors. While the fit could be somewhat better, a close examination of the model diagnostics shows that there is little benefit gained by adding additional parameters to the model and that the modeled response effects are small. The standardized loadings of the twelve racial explanation variables on the response set factor is .32. The modification indices for the remaining constrained parameters were used to selectively add additional parameters to the model. However, none of these parameters were large, nor did their addition have any noticeable effect on the remaining parameter estimates. Any further improvement in the fit of

---

3 This uses the EM algorithm to deal with the missing data.
4 The three stereotype items were included in wave 2 which has a smaller sample size due to panel attrition. The Mplus missing values estimator allows us to estimate the full model with all of the wave 1 observations.
5 The CFI varies between 0 and 1, with higher values indicating a better fit to the data. Values close to 1 are common for well fitting factor models. Smaller RMSEA values indicate a better model fit. A good fitting model should have an RMSEA below .1; values near .05 are considered an excellent fit.
6 The variance of the response set factor is approximately one-fifth of the variance of the three substantive factors.
this model would require the addition of many substantively insignificant parameters.\textsuperscript{7} We thus consider this simple model to be a good fit to these data and a good baseline for further analysis of other racial attitude items.

*** INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE ***

The correlations among the three factors are shown in Table 2. There is a hefty correlation of .49 between the overt racism and motivation factors. If we assume that a high score on the overt racism factor is a clear indication of prejudice, this correlation indicates that a significant amount of the variation in the motivation factor is also a function of racial prejudice. Surprisingly, there is only a very modest correlation between discrimination and the other two factors. The correlation between the discrimination and genetics factors is -.13 and its correlation with motivation is -.25. Thus, while there is significant shared variance between the genetics and motivation factors, there is almost no correlation between discrimination and genetics. More significantly, our estimates show that there is only a small negative correlation between the discrimination and motivation factors. The fact that a denial of racial discrimination goes together only loosely with the belief that blacks lack motivation is especially striking since the two types of items are liberally mixed together in the racial resentment and other new racism scales. On the other hand, this modest connection confirms Kluegel’s (1990) earlier findings and reinforces his conclusion about the empirical distinction between beliefs about discrimination and black motivation

\textsuperscript{7} The twelve explanation items are made up of two sets of six identical items. It is therefore possible that some methods covariance is introduced by the common question wording. We therefore also estimated a model with six covariances between the common pairs of questions. These covariances were all fairly small and their addition had little effect of the other coefficient estimates and the goodness-of-fit. We thus decided not to include these covariance terms in the final model to maintain as much parsimony as possible.
The Range of the Three Factor Model

We have argued that the three-factor racial attitudes model should account for the structure of a wide range of racial attitude measures not just explanations for racial disparities. We therefore estimated a second model that added fifteen additional variables to the model. Each of these new variables was allowed to load on all three factors. In order to insure that the definition of the three factors is not altered by the expanded specification we fixed the factor loadings for the twelve explanation variables based on the estimates shown in Table 2. Several of the new variables were measured on five-point agree-disagree scales. We therefore added a second measurement factor to account for any agreement response set. The estimates for the new variables are shown in Table 3 (we do not repeat the coefficients for the variables in Table 2 since they are fixed at the same values as shown in that table).

Consider the three stereotyping items first. All three load most strongly on the motivation factor, as expected, with substantively small to nonexistent loadings on the other two factors. The stereotyping items are thus relatively clean indicators of the motivation factor. This adds to the factor’s validity since all three stereotypes refer in one way or another to internal qualities linked to the motivation to succeed. On the other hand, the standardized loadings on the motivation factor are small to moderate in size. The weakness of these items can also be seen in the estimated communalities which are smaller for the stereotyping items

---

8 The factor loadings on the agreement response set factor were constrained to be equal to facilitate identification of the model. As was the case with the response factor for the racial explanation items there is no evidence that allowing these factor loading to vary would significantly improve the fit of these models. This methods factor was also assumed to be uncorrelated with the three substantive factors and the other response set factor.
than any of the other racial attitude questions. The weak factor loadings for stereotype items when compared to other racial attitudes is consistent with empirical evidence that stereotype questions are not the best way to gauge racial attitudes. White respondents are reluctant to answer blatant race-related stereotype questions and tend to choose the scale mid-point in large numbers effectively evading the question (Feldman and Huddy 2009).

As expected, the four new discrimination/reverse discrimination items all load substantially on the discrimination factor. The responses to these questions range from the perception that blacks have considerable advantage over whites (reverse discrimination) to the view that whites are greatly advantaged over blacks (discrimination). The sizeable factor loadings suggest that the discrimination factor goes beyond the denial of discrimination against blacks to a belief in reverse discrimination. The discrimination items have relatively small loadings on the other two factors.

The three additional racial attitude items have very different properties. Responses to the question: “The problem of racial prejudice in American history has been greatly exaggerated by the media” primarily reflects discrimination – those who do not see discrimination against blacks or who believe in reverse discrimination are also like to say the media has exaggerated racial prejudice. There is also some evidence in Table 2 that this argument is linked to overt racism with a factor loading of .29. The view that blacks are responsible for creating racial tension is largely a function of motivation. Interestingly, the question “Do you think it is right or wrong to ask Americans to accept racial integration if they honestly don’t believe in it” reflects overt racism for the most part. This suggests that it
is quite possible to create questions that tap overt racism. 35% of whites in our sample say that it is wrong to ask people to accept integration if they don’t believe in it.

Racial Resentment

To further evaluate the generality of the tripartite model of racial attitudes we now consider the relationship of racial resentment to these three factors. As noted above, five questions from the racial resentment scale were included in the survey. The estimated factor loadings in Table 3 show that the racial resentment items load primarily on the discrimination factor. All five items load on this factor and the largest loading for each item is on the discrimination factor. There is almost no relationship between overt racism and responses to the racial resentment items. This is consistent with arguments that modern racism is a new, distinct form of prejudice. All but one of the five resentment items also load on the motivation factor though most of these loadings are small. But it also raises questions about the degree to which racial resentment measures prejudice.

Overall, the racial resentment items load most strongly on the discrimination factor, suggesting that racial resentment most powerfully reflects perceptions of discrimination against blacks. Three of the racial resentment items also have moderate loadings on the motivation factor suggesting that variation in this measure is a joint function of these two dimensions. It is possible that the large effects of racial resentment often seen in multivariate analyses of racial issue preferences are due to its connections to both perceived discrimination and beliefs about black motivation. The larger loadings on the discrimination factor are somewhat surprising given arguments in the modern racism literature that the concept is
largely a function of perceptions that blacks violate traditional American values (the motivation factor).

Overall, these confirmatory factor analyses strongly support our contention that current racial attitudes can be characterized by three core dimensions. The fit statistics for the expanded model are very good. The CFI is .94 and the RMSEA is .057, an indication of a very good fitting model. It is also interesting to note that the correlations among the three substantive factors are almost identical to the original estimates from the core model in Table 2. In particular, perceptions of discrimination against blacks are almost completely unrelated to the other two dimensions of racial attitudes. If the rejection of discrimination against blacks is a form of racial prejudice it is surprisingly distinct from other indicators of prejudice.

Conclusion

The results of this study strongly validate a three factor model of racial attitudes – overt racism, perceptions of racial discrimination, and belief in a lack of black motivation. The three-way distinction rests on three types of explanations for racial differences in economic outcomes: uncontrollable internal genetic factors, controllable internal factors linked to willpower and individual motivation, and external forces such as racial discrimination. We demonstrated that a three factor model based on responses to these questions can incorporate a wide range of other racial attitude questions. Sorting racial attitudes into these three dimensions helps to illuminate the nature of contemporary white racial attitudes and underscores their complexity.

---

As a check we re-estimated the model in Figure 3 with the constrained loadings for the twelve explanation items allowed to be free. The estimates were virtually unchanged as were the fit statistics. The three factor model is quite robust to changes in the specification.
We show, for example, that standard racial stereotype questions cleanly measure positive and negative perceptions of black motivation and willpower. At the same time, the stereotype questions are noisy measures that load only weakly on the motivation factor. Much of their variance is unaccounted for by the model and other questions included in the battery on explanations for racial disparities provide a much better and more reliable way to tap the dimension.

Views on the continued persistence of racial discrimination in the US create an important second dimension of racial beliefs. Explanation for racial disparities grounded in continuing discrimination or a lack of educational opportunity go together with questions about whether whites have superior opportunities to blacks when it comes to obtaining college scholarships, government job promotions, housing choice, or police treatment. The discrimination dimension arrays whites from those who believe, on one hand, that anti-white reverse discrimination is more prevalent than anti-black discrimination, to those who, on the other hand, believe anti-black discrimination persists in many realms of contemporary American life. The connection between negative views of black character and a denial of continuing anti-black discrimination are only modestly related, suggesting that some whites do not hold negative stereotypes of blacks but deny the existence or discrimination or even embrace the reality of anti-white reverse discrimination. This disjuncture between the two dimensions serves to complicate our view of white racial attitudes.

The existence of a clear third dimension tapping overt racism further illuminates the nature of contemporary white racial attitudes. The concept of new racism has led researchers (especially within psychology and political science) to largely ignore the political relevance of
overt racism. Our findings suggest, however, that it is premature to jettison such measures (Huddy and Feldman 2009). Despite arguments that racial prejudice has changed in recent decades (Kinder & Sears 1981; Kinder 1986), overt racial prejudice persists. Somewhere between a fifth to a quarter of whites in our data think that racial differences in intelligence or fundamental genetic differences between the races explain some or a great deal of the economic and educational gap between blacks and whites. When whites who think that such explanations might account for a little of the gap are also included, over 40% of whites accept that genetic racial differences play at least some role in accounting for contemporary racial differences in educational and economic outcomes.

The existence of such blatant racism is clearly troubling but also allows us to assess the overtly prejudicial nature of the other two dimensions. Overt racism assesses the belief that blacks are genetically inferior to whites, and is thus an unambiguous measure of racial prejudice. Moreover, there is a substantial connection between perceived black motivation and overt racism. The two factors are correlated among whites at a hefty .46 in our model. The view that blacks lack the willpower to get ahead is thus driven in large part by an underlying belief in black inferiority and exhibits characteristics of prejudice. Since a larger number of whites perceive a lack of black motivation than endorse overt prejudice, the view that blacks are unwilling to improve their situation may represent a more socially acceptable form of contemporary racial prejudice, as argued by some new racism researchers (McConahay and Hough 1976).

In contrast, the denial of discrimination or a belief in reverse discrimination proved to be a much less clear-cut measure of prejudice. It is largely unrelated to overt racism. It is also only
weakly related to the belief that blacks lack the motivation to succeed. The lack of connection between perceived discrimination and other racial beliefs is puzzling and suggests that individuals who support overt racism or view blacks as unmotivated do not necessarily deny the existence of racial discrimination. It also suggests that some individuals who believe blacks are unwilling to work hard perceive persistent racial discrimination in American society. Such ambivalence characterizes beliefs about the causes of poverty more generally (Kluegel and Smith 1986) and deserves further careful scrutiny.

The lack of direct connection in our data between beliefs about discrimination and racism raises questions about the origins of beliefs about racial discrimination. Discrimination is difficult for experts to conclusively demonstrate; the same undoubtedly holds true for ordinary people. It is therefore possible that the denial of discrimination is linked to an inherent difficulty in attributing unequal racial outcomes to differential treatment, especially for individuals unschooled in scientific research methods. Some whites may feel they have never witnessed or seen direct evidence of such categorical discrimination. The denial of discrimination could also arise from ideological considerations that make it more difficult for political conservatives than liberals to accept the existence of discrimination as a determinant of an individual’s economic and educational outcomes. Clearly more research is needed to explore the origins and nature of views concerning racial discrimination within American society. This research is especially important within political science because white beliefs about racial discrimination have powerful influence on support for a variety of racial policies.

*Is racial resentment racism?*
This brings us to a discussion of racial resentment. Items in the racial resentment scale loaded on two of the three key racial attitude dimensions: a denial of discrimination and a lack of black motivation. But as already noted, these two dimensions differ in terms of their link to overt racism and they go together only weakly. It is thus surprising that the two concepts of discrimination and motivation are mixed together in the scale, with some items equally reflecting both (e.g., blacks should try harder). Of the two dimensions, the denial of racial discrimination plays a far more powerful role in anchoring racial resentment than motivation. Yet it is the component least tied to an unambiguous measure of racial prejudice in our data and the component least discussed by new racism researchers (apart from McConahay).

Further research on the origins of perceived racial discrimination, or denial of its existence, will thus shed needed light on the nature of racial resentment. Our findings complicate assumptions that a denial of discrimination is simply a reflection of racial prejudice. It may be, for example, that racial resentment varies in its meaning among whites. We have found in other data, for example, that overt racism predicted racial resentment among white liberals but not white conservatives (Feldman and Huddy 2005).

Overall, we believe our analyses increase an understanding of white racial attitudes. White views are more complex and less singularly prejudicial than has been acknowledged in the past. Nonetheless, our findings also raise many unanswered questions. Why do some whites deny the existence of racial discrimination whereas others see it as pervasive? How is it that some overtly racist whites acknowledge the persistence of discrimination (an inevitable occurrence given the weak link between the two sets of beliefs)? Should we continue to assume that racial resentment is a measure of prejudice? Or can researchers continue to use the
scale, acknowledging that its political potency may derive from a denial of discrimination that arises for reasons other than outright racial prejudice? Finally, does the weak link between prejudice and resentment suggest that resentment is a dynamic response to ongoing societal events such as the election of a black president or the existence of a highly successful black CEO? We hope for a growing number of answers to these and related questions in the near future that will help to provide greater nuance to the study of white racial attitudes in the United States.
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## Table 1
Frequency Distributions of Explanations For Racial Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanations for Differences in Test Scores</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occurs because most Blacks do not have the chance to get a good education?</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be explained by discrimination against blacks?</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurs because most blacks just don’t have the motivation or will power to perform well?</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurs because most blacks do not teach their children the values and skills which are required to be successful in school?</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is due to racial differences in intelligence?</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurs because of fundamental genetic differences between the races?</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, African-Americans have lower income and worse housing than white people. How much of the economic difference between blacks and whites:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Differences Between Blacks and Whites</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occurs because most Blacks do not have the chance to get a good education?</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be explained by discrimination against blacks?</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurs because most blacks just don’t have the motivation or will power to perform well?</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurs because most blacks do not teach their children the values and skills which are required to be successful in school?</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is due to racial differences in intelligence?</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurs because of fundamental genetic differences between the races?</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

**Factor Structure: White Explanations for Racial Disparities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Scores:</th>
<th>Factor 1: Discrimination</th>
<th>Factor 2: Genetic Differences</th>
<th>Factor 3: Motivation/Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational opportunities</td>
<td>.74 (.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>.51 (.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td>.71 (.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetic differences</td>
<td></td>
<td>.79 (.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71 (.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation/will power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.69 (.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Differences:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational opportunities</td>
<td>.76 (.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>.59 (.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83 (.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetic differences</td>
<td></td>
<td>.81 (.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.74 (.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation/will power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.76 (.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakness of black families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.63 (.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of self-respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.58 (.03)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor Correlations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Genetic Differences</th>
<th>Motivation/Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>-.13 (.05)</td>
<td>-.25 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetic Differences</td>
<td>.49 (.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CFI: .96  
RMSEA: .077  
$X^2$: 608  
d.f.: 73

Note: Entries are standardized factor loadings with standard errors in parentheses. The model was estimated via Mplus 6.0. CFI = comparative fit index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation.
Table 3
Factor Structure: White Racial Attitudes Including Racial Resentment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1: Discrimination</th>
<th>Factor 2: Genetic Differences</th>
<th>Factor 3: Motivation/Values</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Working/Lazy</td>
<td>-.06 (.03)</td>
<td>.09 (.03)</td>
<td>.37 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High/Low Moral Standards</td>
<td>-.11 (.04)</td>
<td>.15 (.04)</td>
<td>.39 (.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated to Succeed</td>
<td>-.01 (.04)</td>
<td>.15 (.04)</td>
<td>.23 (.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Scholarship</td>
<td>-.49 (.03)</td>
<td>-.13 (.05)</td>
<td>.18 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Job Promotion</td>
<td>-.59 (.04)</td>
<td>-.17 (.05)</td>
<td>.17 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Where They Want</td>
<td>-.53 (.04)</td>
<td>.11 (.05)</td>
<td>-.18 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated Fairly By Police</td>
<td>-.52 (.04)</td>
<td>.18 (.05)</td>
<td>-.16 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Prejudice Exaggerated?</td>
<td>-.43 (.03)</td>
<td>.29 (.04)</td>
<td>.11 (.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks Create Racial Tension?</td>
<td>-.22 (.03)</td>
<td>.00 (.04)</td>
<td>.49 (.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept Racial Integration</td>
<td>-.17 (.04)</td>
<td>.41 (.05)</td>
<td>.09 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Resentment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Special Favors</td>
<td>-.56 (.03)</td>
<td>.20 (.04)</td>
<td>.32 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than They Deserve</td>
<td>-.66 (.03)</td>
<td>-.12 (.04)</td>
<td>.21 (.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks Should Try Harder</td>
<td>-.43 (.03)</td>
<td>.23 (.04)</td>
<td>.40 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavery and Discrimination</td>
<td>-.70 (.02)</td>
<td>-.06 (.04)</td>
<td>.07 (.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Themselves to Blame</td>
<td>-.48 (.03)</td>
<td>.17 (.04)</td>
<td>.35 (.03)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor Correlations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrimination</th>
<th>Genetic Differences</th>
<th>Motivation/Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- .13 (.05)</td>
<td>- .25 (.05)</td>
<td>.46 (.03)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CFI: .94  
RMSEA: .057  
X²: 1738  
d.f.: 351

Note: Entries are standardized factor loadings with standard errors in parentheses. The model was estimated via Mplus 6.0. CFI = comparative fit index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation. The full model includes all items in Table 2 which are not shown here. See the text for greater detail.