MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
3 1293 01037 9844

This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

The Relationship of Personal Contact, Media Exposure and Racial/Ethnic Self-Esteem With Stereotypes And Racial Prejudice

presented by

Kelly Suzanne Ervin

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Psychology

Major professor

Date 9-14-93

MSU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

0-12771

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
JUN 1 6 1997	NOV 3 0 1999	NOV 2 9 2007
AUG 2 1 1997	AUG 2 9 2003	
DEC 2 2 1999	JAN 0 8 2006	
	OCT 3 1 2007	
AUG 0 6 2009		

MSU is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution
c:\circ\datedue.pm3-p.1

THE RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONAL CONTACT, MEDIA EXPOSURE AND RACIAL/ETHNIC SELF-ESTEEM WITH STEREOTYPES AND RACIAL PREJUDICE

by

Kelly Suzanne Ervin

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Psychology

1993

ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONAL CONTACT, MEDIA EXPOSURE AND RACIAL/ETHNIC SELF-ESTEEM WITH STEREOTYPES AND RACIAL PREJUDICE

By

Kelly Suzanne Ervin

Literature which has attempted to identify the attributes that one racial/ethnic group believes are characteristic of another racial/ethnic group, and the racial/ethnic prejudice between racial/ethnic groups, is lacking in its' use of non-White populations. The present research provides evidence of attributes that African-Americans believe are characteristics of Whites, Hispanics and Asians. In addition, the racial/ethnic prejudice that African-Americans feel towards these groups is examined. It has also been proposed that increased personal contact with members of different racial/ethnic groups and increased exposure to positive media images can help to reduce this racial/ethnic prejudice. These ideas were tested in this study. In addition, the relationship between racial/ethnic self-esteem and racial/ethnic prejudice was also explored.

Results indicated that African-Americans believe there are 92 different attributes which characterize Whites, 87 for Hispanics and 92 for Asians. Further analysis suggests that, for African-Americans, personal contact was significantly correlated with their prejudice for Whites. On the other

hand, there was no relationship between African-Americans' personal contact with Hispanics and Asians and their racial prejudice for Hispanics and Asians. And, African-Americans' exposure to Whites via mass media was not significantly correlated with their prejudice for them, yet, it was significantly correlated with their prejudice for both Hispanics and Asians. More specifically, the more positive media exposure to Hispanics and Asians, the more prejudice African-Americans had for them. Racial/ethnic self-esteem was not correlated with African-Americans' racial prejudice for either Whites, Hispanics or Asians.

Results also indicated that Whites believe there are 79 attributes which are characteristic of African-Americans, 10 of Hispanics and 8 for Asians. Personal contact was significantly correlated with Whites' prejudice for African-Americans and Hispanics, but not Asians. Media exposure was not correlated with Whites' prejudice for African-Americans and Hispanics and was negatively correlated with their prejudice for Asians. Racial/ethnic self-esteem was not correlated with Whites' prejudice for either African-Americans or Hispanics, but correlated with their prejudice for Asians. The importance of using non-White respondents in stereotype research is discussed.

THIS DISSERTATION IS DEDICATED

TO MY DEAR MOTHER

&

THE MEMORY OF MY LOVING FATHER:

HAZEL W. ERVIN & LAWRENCE A. ERVIN, SR.

Table of Contents

List of Tables.....vii

Chapter 1:

Introduction.....1

Purpose for study.....1

Racial Prejudice.....5

Personal Contact 6

Media Exposure 9

Racial/Ethnic Self-Esteem 10

Stereotypes & Racial Prejudice Whites have for African-Americans, Hispanics & Asians 13

Stereotypes & Racial Prejudice African-Americans have for Whites, Hispanics & Asians 21

Chapter 2: The Present Study.....28

Hypothesis #1.....28

Hypothesis #2.....29

Hypothesis #3.....29

Chapter 3: Method.....31

Materials.....34

Statistical Analyses.....40

Chapter 4: The Results.....46

Chapter 5: Discussion.....80

Limitations of Research.....90

Conclusions.....91

References.....92

Appendix A: Social Group Questionnaire.....112

Appendix B: Personal Contact Questionnaire.....125

Appendix C: Media Contact Questionnaire.....131

Appendix D: Evaluation Thermoneter Scale.....136

Appendix E: Collective Self-Esteem Scale.....140

Appendix F: Demographic Information Scale.....141

Appendix G: Factor Loadings Matrix.....142

List of Tables

Table 1 Reliabilities for Personal Contact Scale.....36

Table 2 Reliabilities for Media Exposure Scale.....38

Table 3 Attributes that African-Americans believe are diagonistic of Whites 48

Table 4 Eigenvalues of 116 attributes (Whites).....51

Table 5 Attributes that African-Americans believe are diagonistic of Hispanics 52

Table 6 Eigenvalues of 116 attributes (Hispanics).....55

Table 7 Attributes that African-Americans believe are diagonistic of Asians 56

Table 8 Eigenvalues of 116 attributes (Asians).....59

Table 9 Attributes that Whites believe are diagonistic of African-Americans 61

Table 10 Eigenvalues of 116 attributes (African-Americans) 63

Table 11 Attributes that Whites believe are diagonistic of Hispanics 65

Table 12 Eigenvalues of 116 attributes (Hispanics).....67

Table 13 Attributes that Whites believe are diagonistic of Asians 68

Table 14 Eigenvalues of 116 attributes (Asians).....70

Table 15 Means for Personal Contact.....72

Table 16 Means for Media Exposure.....75

Table 17 Means for Racial Self-Esteem & Racial Prejudice.....77

Chapter 1

Introduction

The stereotypes and racial prejudice that Whites have for African-Americans have been a focus of research since 1933. An abundance of information has been published that identifies the stereotypes and racial prejudice that Whites have for African-Americans (see Katz & Braly, 1933; Mydrall, 1944; Allport, 1954; Brink & Harris, 1964; 1967; Marx, 1967; Campbell & Schuman, 1968; Campbell, 1971; Condran, 1979; Apostle, et al., 1983; Schuman, Steeh & Bobo, 1988; Case & Greeley, 1990 and Carmines & Champagne, 1990). Likewise, the stereotypes and racial prejudice that Whites have for Hispanics and Asians[1] have also been documented, but to a much lesser degree (see Stephan & Stephan, 1985; Stevenson et al., 1990; Katz & Braly, 1933; Wong, 1990; Leong & Hayes, 1990). However, there is very little information available about the stereotypes and racial prejudice that African-Americans have for Whites, Hispanics or Asians.

Purpose of Study

There were several purposes of this study. The first

---

[1] The racial group of Hispanics consists of eight subgroups: Chicanos, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans, non-White Hispanics, and South and Central Americans. The racial group of Asians consists of twenty-four subgroups: Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Asian, Indian, Korean, Vietnamese, Laotian, Thai, Cambodian, Pakistan, Indonesian, Hmong, Bhutanese, Borneo, Celebesian, Cernan, Indochinese, Iwo-Jiman, Javenese, Maldivian, Nepali, Sikkim and Singaporean (Johnson et al., 1983). Unless otherwise indicated, citations of research pertaining to these groups consider Hispanics and Asians as homogeneous groups.

was to identify the attributes that make up the stereotype that African-Americans have for Whites, Hispanics and Asians. The second purpose was to identify the racial prejudice that African-Americans have for these three groups. The third and fourth purpose was to replicate past research findings that have identified the attributes which make up the stereotype that Whites have for African-Americans, Hispanics, Asians, along with their racial prejudice for these groups. The fifth purpose of this study was to determine the relationship (if any) between personal contact with a racial group and the degree of racial prejudice felt towards that group and the sixth purpose was to determine the relationship (if any) between media exposure to a group and racial prejudice felt towards that group. And, the seventh and final purpose of this study was to determine the relationship (if any) between an individual's racial/ethnic self-esteem and racial prejudice.

Given that one of the purposes of this study was to identify the attributes that make up the stereotype that African-Americans and Whites have for each other and Hispanics and Asians, the obvious question becomes, what is a stereotype? There is a substantial amount of literature which answers this question. Katz and Braly (1933) defined a stereotype as a collection of attributes that make up a belief about a group, Allport (1954) defined it as an exaggerated belief and Brigham (1971) defined it as an

overgeneralization about a group. Hamilton and Trolier (1986, pg. 133) clarify these definitions by defining stereotype as, "a cognitive structure that contains the perceiver's knowledge, beliefs, and expectancies about some human group".

A stereotype is also considered to be the result of the cognitive process of categorization. That is, stereotype formation results from the fact that individuals don't process all the information that is available to them about people and other social objects (Taylor, 1981). For example, in an effort to simplify their complex social world by using easily identifiable characteristics such as race, (Hamilton & Trolier, 1986) individuals will perceive others as parts of a general category rather than as unique individuals (Rosch & Lloyd, 1978). Several research studies confirm that organizing information about others into general categories helps individuals to simplify the massive amounts of stimuli they have to process on a daily basis (Taylor, 1981; Taylor & Falcone, 1982).

Although categorizing people into groups can be an efficient way to process the enormous amount of social information that individuals encounter, the process, although convenient, can lead to stereotyping. This has been demonstrated in several studies. Why does this happen? First, the process of grouping people into categories will facilitate and exaggerate any perceived <u>differences</u> between

persons from one's own racial group (a.k.a., an ingroup) and persons from a different racial group (a.k.a., an outgroup) and any perceived similarities within the outgroup (Tajfel, 1982; Wilder, 1981). Sherif et al., (1961) demonstrated this effect of categorization quite eloquently in their classic "Robbers Cave" experiment. Sherif et al., also found that when an individual processes information about persons from a different group from one's own, he or she will have the propensity to think that members of that outgroup are all alike and very different from the ingroup. Several other studies have found support for this cognitive process (see Jones et al., 1981b; Rothbart et al., 1984; Linville et al., 1986 and Quattrone, 1986).

This perception of perceived heterogeneity between groups and homogeneity within a group is called the outgroup homogeneity bias (Tajfel & Wilkes, 1963; Wilder, 1981). Meaning, a belief that the majority of members of a particular group possess all the same characteristics. This bias is a fundamental part of the process of stereotyping.

The research on stereotypes has traditionally focused on the cognitive structuring of the stereotype (Hamilton, 1981; Stephan, 1985, Taylor & Crocker, 1981 & Fiske & Taylor, 1984) and the affect (feeling) associated with the stereotype (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). Fiske (1981, 1982) argues that stereotypes are knowledge structures that contain an affective component.

In other words, individuals may have different feelings associated with different stereotypes. Fiske and Pavelchak (1982) also argue that when an individual is thinking about a racially dissimilar person, both the cognitive knowledge structure (i.e., the stereotype) and the affect (i.e., the feeling) associated with the stereotype are activated. It appears that individuals will evaluate racially dissimilar people as a function of both their stereotype and the feelings associated with the stereotype.

Racial Prejudice

A more common approach used to study affect and stereotypes has focused on an overall feeling that exists between different racial groups or what is more commonly known as racial prejudice (Converse et al., 1980; Zanna et al., 1990). Racial prejudice is an attitude (can be positive or negative, but is more often than not, negative) towards members of a racial group, based solely on their membership in that racial group. Racial prejudice has also been defined as a feeling that 'others' are dangerous, evil and inferior to members of one's own racial group (Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Stephan, 1985). Perhaps the oldest explanation for racial prejudice is the realistic conflict theory. According to this perspective, racial prejudice stems from the competition between members of different racial groups for valued commodities and scarce (perceived or real) resources (Hovland & Sears, 1940; White, 1977,

Hepworth & West, 1988).

Although American society has been described in the past as a place where persons from different racial backgrounds interact, and blend into what has been termed, a big 'melting' pot while sharing the earth's resources, recent evidence suggests that interaction between member of different races is not occurring in a manner once thought, and when it does occur it does in a very limited way. That is, the United States of America tends to be predominantly within-group in nature. In other words, Whites interact with other Whites, African-Americans with other African-Americans, Hispanics with other Hispanics and Asians with other Asians (Hacker, 1983).

Personal Contact

Some have argued that the tendency for people to only interact with members of their same racial group helps to perpetuate racial prejudice and that increased personal contact with members of different racial groups can help to reduce racial prejudice. This idea is known as the contact hypothesis (Pettigrew, 1981). Several others (see Cook, 1984; Cook, 1985; Wilder, 1984; Aronson, Bridgeman & Geffner, 1978; Rothbart & John, 1985; Stephan & Stephan, 1985 and Nichols and McAndrew, 1990) have found that increased personal contact between persons from different racial groups can indeed lead to the recognition and acknowledgment of similarities and a de-emphasis on the

differences between them. In addition, increased personal contact between racial groups can allow for counter-stereotypical information to be encountered and processed. If this happens, racial prejudiced can be reduced.

However, certain conditions must exist during personal contact for it to decrease racial prejudice. In particular, Cook (1984; 1985) and others (see Riordan (1978) and Wilder (1984) define the following six conditions that must be present during personal contact before racial prejudice can be reduced. (1) groups must be approximately equal in socio-economic status. If not, racial prejudice should increase, (2) groups must involve cooperation and interdependence while working towards shared goals, (3) inter-group contact must be informal and relaxed, (4) inter-group contact must occur within existing norms that favor group equality, (5) members of groups must act in ways that will encourage disconfirmation of negative stereotypes and (6) persons must view one another as typical of their respective groups.

According to Stephan and Stephan (1985), there are six basic dimensions of personal contact that can occur among racially dissimilar people: 1) amount of contact (low to high), 2) quality of interactions (conflict vs. no conflict), 3) perceived rules for behavior required when interacting with racially dissimilar others (formal/structured rules vs. no formal/ structured rules),

4) quality of physical contact (positive vs. negative), 5) attitudes of significant others towards racially dissimilar people (positive vs. negative) and 6) perceived socio-economic status difference (of lower status, equal status, or of higher status) between one's own racial group and another. Stephan and Stephan argue that it is the positivity of this personal contact that will determine the racial prejudice between racially dissimilar groups.

Consequently, Stephan and Stephan (1985) propose that an individual who has very little contact with others, has interactions that are tainted by conflict, uses formal rules when interacting with others, has negative physical contact with others, has perceptions that significant others have negative attitudes towards another racial group and has a perception that another racial group is of higher socio-economic status than one's own racial group, will tend to have more racial prejudice for that racial group than an individual who has more contact, positive interactions and physical contact, perceptions of significant others' positive attitudes and has a perception that their racial group is of either an equal or higher socio-economic status with that group.

Another explanation for racial prejudice is that it is the result of social categorization. As explained earlier in this chapter, categorization is a process in which individuals view other persons as belonging to either their

group (the ingroup) or another group (the outgroup). Sharp contrasting feelings are attached to members of one's own group and members of an outgroup. Members of an outgroup are often strongly disliked and have negative feelings exhibited to them by members of the ingroup (Linville et al., 1989; Schaller & Maas, 1989; Wilder, 1986). This tendency to have negative feelings for persons that don't belong to one's own group has been demonstrated in several studies (e.g., Stephan, 1985; Tajfel, 1982; Turner et al., 1987; Gaertner et al., 1989).

Racial prejudice as an attitude also has roots in certain aspects of social cognition, that is, the manner in which people notice, store, recall and use information about others. Attitudes are cognitive frameworks, or knowledge structures that are used for organizing, interpreting and recalling information (Fiske & Taylor, 1984) and to the extent that prejudice is an attitude, individuals pay more attention to, and remember more frequently social information that is consistent with their prejudiced views more so than information that is not consistent with these views (Bodenhausen, 1988; Wyer, 1988).

Media Exposure

A final explanation for racial prejudice is the idea that people acquire negative feelings towards others because they see such views being expressed by parents, friends, teachers and mass media. This social learning view of

prejudice suggests that people adopt these negative feelings because by doing so, they are directly or indirectly rewarded (e.g., receiving praise or approval) (Rajecki, 1989; Fazio & Zanna, 1981). Social learning theory suggests that it is possible that media exposure to prejudiced views can help to perpetuate racial prejudice. Media exposure is the amount of exposure individuals have to different racial groups via mass media. What is the effect of negative and/or positive portrayals of different racial groups in mass media on racial prejudice? It may be a case in which if members of various racial groups are not present in mass media in great numbers, or if they are present, but portrayed in negative ways, this exposure to racial groups via mass media could increase racial prejudice (Greenberg, 1986).

In addition, if members of different racial groups are portrayed as engaging in hostile interactions with one another, this in effect may justify any negative feelings viewers may already have towards these groups, or, in other words, help to perpetuate racial prejudice (Weigel et al., 1980). Thus, viewers whose only contact with racially dissimilar people is through mass media may deduce from media portrayals that the images are accurate reflections of reality (Greenberg, 1986).

Racial/Ethnic Self-Esteem

Another variable that may also affect racial prejudice

is racial/ethnic self-esteem. By definition, racial/ethnic self-esteem is an individual's evaluation of his or her self as a function of membership in a racial group (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Ervin & Jackson, 1990) and is a component an individual's overall social identity (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). According to Tajfel (1981, pg. 255), an individual's social identity is:

> "that aspect of the individuals' self-concept which derives from their knowledge of their membership in a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership".

The distinction between overall social identity and racial/ethnic self-esteem is that the former refers to the evaluation of oneself as a function of membership in all social groups and the latter refers to the evaluation of oneself only as a function of membership in a racial group.

Social identity theory argues that individuals are motivated to maintain a positive self-esteem and will engage in behavioral and/or cognitive strategies to protect it (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). This motivation is particularly evident when individuals perceive some form of threat to their self-esteem. For example, Tajfel and Turner (1986)

suggest that when an individual perceives that another group is of a higher status in society than that individual's group, this perception of belonging to a group of "lower status" should threaten that individual's self-esteem. Meindl and Lerner (1985) provide support for this view. Consequently, this individual will engage in a cognitive strategy of creating favorable comparisons between members of his or her group and the 'threatening' group in an attempt to protect and maintain his or her collective self-esteem by either having prejudice for that group or using negative stereotypes to describe that group. For example, individuals may derogate members of other racial groups perceived to be of higher status to ensure favorable comparisons.

This explanation suggests that perhaps African-Americans, Hispanics and Asians should have racial prejudice for Whites if they believe that they are of a lower status than Whites in American society. However, this view would not explain why Whites would have racial prejudice for African-Americans, Hispanics or Asians given that it may be feasible to assume that most Whites probably perceive themselves as being of a higher status than African-Americans, Hispanics and Asians in American society. Nonetheless, protecting collective self-esteem may be an explanation for racial prejudice among racial groups.

The following discussion is an overview of the research

from the past sixty years on stereotypes and racial prejudice that Whites have for African-Americans, Hispanics and Asians. In addition, the little research available on the stereotypes and racial prejudice that African-Americans have for Whites, Hispanics and Asians is also discussed.

Stereotypes & Racial/Ethnic Prejudice Whites Have For African-Americans, Hispanics & Asians

There are two excellent sources that examine the history of Whites' stereotypes of and prejudice for African-Americans. Apostle et al.'s, (1983) book, The Anatomy of Racial Attitudes and Schuman, Steeh and Bobo's 1988 Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations offer good reviews of the literature in this area that began in 1933 when researchers began to survey Whites about their stereotypes and feelings for African-Americans. Since 1933, there has been an explosion of research findings that identify how Whites evaluate African-Americans.

From 1933 to the present, surveys that assessed Whites stereotypes and evaluations of African-Americans have been quite regular. The bulk of White stereotypes and racial prejudice data comes from national public survey organizations and scholars generating stereotype research (Smith & Dempsey, 1983). However, there is a qualitative difference in the type of data gathered by the national organizations and the type of data gathered by stereotype researchers. For example, The National Opinion Research

Center (NORC), The Institute for Social Research (ISR), The American Institute of Public Opinion (AIPO) which is known for its "Gallup Poll", and the Harris Organization (HO) all asked "issue-specific" questions and not questions that would have identified stereotypes or racial prejudice. In other words, the questions pertained to issue-specific concerns such as busing, school integration, public facility integration, government intervention, affirmative action and interracial dating/marriage.

Data from these issue-specific questions were used to portray a picture of Whites' overall evaluations of African-Americans. However, questions that are critical to this type of evaluation were not asked. That is, questions concerning Whites' belief of common characteristics of all African-Americans and their overall feelings for them were omitted.

A common theme found in the research conducted by the national organizations was the issue of racial equality between African-Americans and Whites. Several studies have shown that although large majorities of Whites accept the principle of racial equality between Whites and African-Americans (see Smith & Sheatsley, 1984; Hyman & Sheatsley, 1956; Hyman & Sheatsley, 1964; Greeley and Sheatsley, 1971; Taylor, Sheatsley and Greeley, 1978) they do not endorse various methods used to implement racial equality (Carmines & Champagne, 1990). For example, Kinder and Sanders (1987)

and others (Lipset & Schneider, 1978; Bunzel, 1986) have found virtually little support among Whites for implementation of racial equality via affirmative action. And, it has also been suggested that this resistance to affirmative action and other legal policies designed to enforce equality between Whites and African-Americans stems from Whites' general belief that all African-Americans are generally less capable than Whites (Sniderman & Hagen, 1985).

The data collected by the national organizations showed that responses to questions pertaining to evaluations of African-Americans varied depending upon the situational context. Rovner and Sedlacek (1974) and Schuman et al., (1988) supports this view. For example, they found that Whites evaluated African-Americans more positively if African-Americans were employed in service-type occupations and viewed them less positively in situations that required African-Americans to be in close personal contact with Whites. They also discovered that level of education, geographic region and age had an affect on Whites' evaluations of African-Americans. In general, young Northern Whites who achieved high education levels had more positive overall evaluations of African-Americans than their older, less educated Southern counterparts.

On the other hand, stereotype researchers have basically ignored issue-specific questions and have

concentrated on forming indexes of the attributes that make up the stereotypes Whites hold for non-Whites. One of the earliest recorded indexes of Whites' stereotypes of African-Americans is contained within Katz and Braly's (1933) classic paper entitled: "Racial Stereotypes of One Hundred College Students". Katz and Braly surveyed one hundred White students attending Princeton University and identified twelve attributes that make up Whites' stereotype of African-Americans. The attributes are: superstitious, lazy, happy-go-lucky, ignorant, musical, ostentatious, very religious, stupid, physically dirty, naive, slovenly and unreliable. Since then, Richards (1950) and Dovidio and Gaertner (1986) have replicated Katz and Braly's findings and more recently, Stangor et al., (1991) found that, in addition to the attributes mentioned above, Whites believe also that African-Americans are: athletic, rhythmic, sociable, aggressive, lazy and inferior to Whites.

The traditional method used to assess racial stereotypes has been the adjective checklist procedure. Using this method, respondents are requested to select attributes (from a list of adjectives) that they believe are most descriptive of a racial group (Gilbert, 1951; Karlins, et al., 1969 & Zanna, 1990). Although the most common method used, the adjective checklist method has however been criticized for the specific demand it forces upon the respondent. That is, many have argued that the adjective

checklist method forces respondents to choose and assign 'researcher generated' attributes to groups, attributes that they may never have considered on their own (see, Converse, 1964; Brigham, 1971; Fairchild & Cozens, 1981; and Marin, 1984). Marin (1984) suggested that the best way to ascertain stereotypes from respondents is to allow them to generate their own lists.

Turning toward the issue of Whites' racial prejudice for African-Americans, the evidence is more piece-meal in nature than the evidence that is available for stereotypes. That is, this type of information is usually embedded within larger studies that had the major intent of assessing stereotypes or discriminatory behavior. These studies usually included only a few "How do you <u>feel</u> about African-Americans?" questions. And, the data suggest that since 1964, Whites' feelings for African-Americans has averaged a 60 on an evaluation thermometer scale (Converse et al., 1980). The evaluation thermometer scale ranges from 0 (extremely unfavorable feelings) to 100 (extremely favorable feelings) and this rating of 60 represents a slightly favorable feeling that Whites have for African-Americans. However, in other studies, when Whites were asked about their feelings for specific 'types' of African-Americans, they showed a greater tendency to indicate less positive feelings. For example, Converse et al., (1980) found that 98% of Whites in their sample rated their feelings for civil

rights leaders on an evaluation thermometer scale between 51-74 (neither favorable to fairly favorable) while only 2% rated their feelings for civil rights leaders as very favorable (between 97-100). Similarly, Whites' feelings for Black militants were the most extreme with the majority of Whites rating their feelings for Black militants a 0 (extremely unfavorable) while only .2% indicated positive feelings between 97-100 for Black militants (Kinder & Rhodeback, 1982).

Firebaugh and Davis (1988) conducted a meta-analysis and found that anti-Black attitudes as measured by questions in 1972, 1976, 1980 and 1984 via General Social Surveys have declined as a whole with these attitudes declining more rapidly in the South than in the North. Thus it would appear that Whites are becoming more accepting of the African-Americans. Yet, Staples (1987) and Lambert and Taylor (1988) also found that Whites also seem to reject the concept of a multi-cultural/multi-racial America by consistently expressing negative attitudes and feelings towards members of non-White racial groups.

In terms of Whites' evaluations of Hispanics, in 1950, Richards identified White college students' stereotype of Hispanics as having 10 attributes: 1) low moral standards, 2) thieves, 3) dirty /filthy, 4) help to keep wages low, 5) lazy/shiftless, 6) spreaders of disease, 7) artistic, 8) ignorant, 9) inferior (to Whites) and 10) a group that

doesn't have a lot of opportunities. Many researchers have found that Whites' evaluations and feelings for Hispanics are generally negative (Johnson, 1950; Pinkney, 1963; Martinez, 1969; Kaplan and Goldman, 1973; Guichard and Connolly, 1977; Bernat and Balch, 1979; Fairchild and Cozens, 1981; Marin, 1982). Purdy and Edmonds (1988) report that White college freshman categorized Hispanics into one of two groups: low vs. high types. According to Whites, low-type Hispanics have not effectively assimilated into mainstream (read, White) America and have not achieved occupational success, financial wealth or a acceptable command of Anglo-American ways. On the other hand, high-type Hispanics have achieved high educational and occupational levels, financial security and have assimilated well into mainstream America.

More recently, Triandis et al., (1982), Marin, (1984) and Stangor et al., (1991) reported more encouraging findings in that White college students stereotypes of Hispanics include attributes of: cheerful, traditional, proud, aggressive, family-oriented, hard-working, and proud.

The research that documents Whites' stereotypes and prejudice for Asians is quite sparse. Although in 1950, Richards was a vanguard in this area by being the first to use Asians as a target population. He provided the first index of twenty-one attributes that make up the stereotype Whites have for Asians. The Whites in Richards (1950) study

reported that they believed Asians are: 1) spreaders of disease, 2) industrious, 3) artistic, 4) help to keep wages low, 5) mean, 6) sly, 7) good workers, 8) should be barred from the US, 9) possess low moral standards, 10) educationally oriented, 11) possess constructive imaginations, 12) possess civil pride, 13) loyal, 14) trustworthy, 15) cooperative, 16) peaceful, 17) friendly, 18) contribute much to civilization, 19) possess good character, 20) don't have a lot of opportunities and 21) are brave people. And, more recently, Stangor et al., (1991) found that intelligence, industriousness, gentleness, selfishness, being nationalistic and passive were also attributes assigned to Asians by White college students. In 1984, Marin studied the stereotypes that White college students had for the Japanese. However, he did not include these findings in his published report. Therefore, Marin's contribution regarding the stereotypes that Whites have for Japanese remain unknown to the public and the scientific community.

In addition to an index of attributes, Richards (1950) also provided evidence of Whites' feelings, or racial prejudice for Asians. Using the evaluation thermometer scale he found that Whites' felt more favorable towards Japanese, Chinese and Filipinos than they did towards African-Americans and Hispanics. Unfortunately, the few studies mentioned above that have looked at and reported

Whites' stereotypes of and prejudice for Asians can be considered only the beginning of a very important research area. Much more research needs to be done in order to understand how Whites evaluate Asians.

Stereotypes & Racial/Ethnic Prejudice African-Americans Have For Whites, Hispanics & Asians

The first substantial national survey that questioned African-Americans about their evaluations of Whites was in 1964 (Brink & Harris, 1964). In this study, African-Americans were asked issue-specific questions regarding the concepts of racial equality and civil rights. The content of this study was divided into three issue-specific areas: How they thought Whites felt about their socio, political and economic advancement; what they believed motivated Whites to hold their views on African-American advancement; and their perception of Whites' overall evaluation of them. There were no questions assessing African-American's stereotypes (or attributes) of Whites nor their racial prejudice towards them.

However, Brink and Harris (1964) did find that 42% of the African-Americans sampled felt that all Whites wanted to keep them from advancing, 25% felt that some Whites wanted them to have a 'better break' in society, 17% felt that Whites did not care one way or another about the advancement of African-Americans and 16% claimed that they were not sure how Whites felt about African-American advancement. When

questioned about their perception of Whites' motivation underlying their views, African-Americans respondents proffered several reasons: 1) fear of losing domestic help, 2) general fear of African-Americans, 3) perceptions that all African-American men want to marry White women, 4) to feel better about themselves by believing they are better than African-Americans, 5) a psychological need for discrimination, 6) blind emotionalism, 7) ignorance, 8) guilty conscience and 9) a lack of personal contact.

The majority of the African-American respondents in the Brink and Harris study indicated that they believed that Whites' evaluations of them had improved from 1958 to 1963. That is, 53% felt that Whites had a better attitude towards African-Americans overall, 32% felt there had been no change, 14% were not sure and 2% felt that attitudes were getting worse. Brink and Harris (1964) discovered that only 4 out of every 10 African-Americans sampled felt that Northern Whites felt any better about them than Southern Whites. This finding would appear to contradict the Schuman et al., (1988) finding that young Northern Whites who achieved high education levels had more positive overall evaluations of African-Americans than their older, less educated Southern counterparts. However, given the significant differences in time periods, 1964 <u>vs</u>. 1988 this data should not be compared.

However, those who did feel that Northern Whites

treated them better than Southern Whites believed so because of the stricter laws against discrimination in the North and not because of better attitudes towards them. They also found that African-Americans believed that White real-estate and service businesses provided the major obstacles to racial equality, believed that White religion did not recognize racial discrimination as a moral issue and, ironically showed great optimism for improvement in Whites' evaluations of them. This optimism is evident in the fact that 73% of the African-Americans sampled believed that Whites would have a better attitude for African-Americans in five years, 14% were not sure, 11% felt attitudes would stay the same and only 2% felt Whites' attitudes would get worse. And, in fact, Schuman et al., (1988) and Firebaugh and Davis (1988) provide support for this optimism by finding that Whites' negative attitudes towards African-Americans have steadily declined since 1972.

Overall, Brink and Harris contributed greatly to a very neglected area of research regarding African-Americans evaluations of Whites. That is, they have provided a historical framework of how African-Americans think about Whites on a variety of issue-specific subjects. However, what is still missing is an investigation of African-Americans' stereotype of Whites and their racial prejudice towards Whites. Nonetheless, what is interesting about the Brink and Harris (1964) study is that they were able to

document very candid personal testimonies from the African-Americans they surveyed. Statements such as: "They don't like us, they are afraid of us" and "Negroes and whites [sic] founded this country together, they fought for our country's freedom together. They need one another now as never before" are just a few of the narratives provided by the African-American sample. And, in 1967, Brink and Harris conducted another national survey of African-Americans' evaluations of Whites. The questionnaire used in this study had 45 issue- specific questions that ranged in subject matter from employment, housing, pay equities, voting, public facilities, transportation usage, integration, school integration, politics, civil rights leaders, perceptions of White attitudes towards African-Americans, Black Power, riots, the armed forces and war.

A major longitudinal study that was undertaken to asses African-Americans evaluations of Whites was the Farley, Hatchett and Schuman 1979 Detroit study. They found that during the period of 1968 to 1976, the majority of African-Americans sampled believed that Whites were indifferent to their advancement of racial equality and they also endorsed the principle of using violence towards Whites to obtain racial equality. They also found that African-Americans did not trust any Whites, and felt that Whites were constantly trying to keep them from advancing economically, socially and politically.

Also during this time, Schuman and Hatchett (1979) were asking African-Americans issue-specific questions about Whites. Yet, their findings do not differ much from the Brink and Harris (1963; 1967) or Farley et al. (1979) findings. In other words, from 1963 to 1979 African-American attitudes towards issue-specific concerns (e.g., integration) have remained consistent. Again, progress was being made in terms of ascertaining African-Americans views of different political, social and education issues but the basic questions of stereotypes and prejudice were being overlooked and has yet to be addressed in the research.

In 1977, Guichard and Connolly formed the first and only index of attributes that make up the African-Americans' stereotype of Whites. Using the adjective checklist procedure, they found that African-Americans believed that all Whites possessed the following attributes: industrious, intelligent, artistic, sportsmanlike, cruel, lazy, shrewd, superstitious, scientific and pugnacious.

In regards to African-Americans' racial prejudice for Whites, it wasn't until the early eighties that this question was posed to African-Americans. Converse and his colleagues (1980) found by using an evaluation thermometer scale, African-Americans rated their overall feelings for Whites with an average score of 68. This slightly favorable feeling does not appear to be significantly different from the prejudice rating of 60 that Whites gave to African-

Americans in the same study. Unfortunately, there are no published reports of African-Americans' stereotypes and prejudice for Asians and the only information available regarding any kind of evaluation that African-Americans have of Hispanics can be found in the Brink and Harris 1963 study. Specifically, Brink and Harris did not gather measures of African-Americans' stereotype or prejudice of Hispanics per say, but gathered information on African-Americans' perceptions of Puerto Ricans' opinions regarding the African-American struggle for racial equality.

It would appear from the previous discussion that there is an abundance of information concerning Whites', African-Americans', Hispanics' and Asians' evaluations of each other. However, upon closer inspection, one finds that this information is far from complete. Most of the available information investigating intergroup evaluations is in terms of issue-specific topics, such as, integration or affirmation action. Specifically, most research has focused on how Whites think about these issues in terms of African-Americans. There is some research on the racial prejudice Whites have for African-Americans but it is scare and outdated. There is also some research available on issue-specific topics regarding African-Americans' evaluations of Whites but this research began in 1964 and seems to have ended with the Schuman and Firebaugh studies of 1988.

The scarcity of research investigating African-

Americans' stereotype and racial prejudice for other racial groups clearly emphasizes the importance of this current study which, in part, is to identify the attributes that make up the stereotype that African-Americans have for Whites, Hispanics and Asians and identify the racial prejudice they have for these groups. Thus, this current study addresses a very important, yet neglected issue of inter-group stereotypes and racial prejudice.

Chapter 2

The Present Study

One of the objectives of this study was to identify the attributes that make up the stereotype that African-Americans have for Whites, Hispanics and Asians. Other objectives included: identifying the racial prejudice that African-Americans have towards these groups, replicate past research that has identified the attributes which make up the stereotype that Whites have for African-Americans, Hispanics and Asians, identify Whites' racial prejudice for African-Americans, Hispanics and Asians, determine the relationship (if any) between personal contact and media exposure with racial prejudice and determine the relationship (if any) between racial/ethnic self-esteem and racial prejudice.

A few of the objectives did not lend themselves to the formation of explicit hypotheses. For example, the objective of identifying the attributes which make up the stereotype that African-Americans and Whites have for each other and Hispanics and Asians, were not investigated as specific predictions. However, the remaining objectives of this study were investigated in terms of predictions and thus the following hypotheses were formed and tested.

Hypothesis #1

Respondents who have more positive personal contact

with a racial group will have less racial prejudice toward that group than those who have less positive personal contact with that group.

Hypothesis #2

Respondents who have been exposed to more positive media images of racial groups will have less racial prejudice toward those groups than those who are exposed to less positive media images of those racial groups.

Hypothesis #3

Respondents who have more positive racial/ethnic self-esteem will have more racial prejudice for racial groups than those who have less positive racial/ethnic self-esteem.

Definitions

(1) **Stereotype** - For this study, the generally accepted empirical definition of stereotype was used. That is, a stereotype is a cognitive knowledge structure which contains a collection of several attributes believed to be characteristic of a particular racial group of people.

(2) **Racial Prejudice** - A general overall feeling (positive or negative) that an individual has for members of a different racial group than one's own. This feeling is based solely on the evaluated person's membership in a particular racial group.

(3) **Personal Contact** - Personal contact is a combination of six related dimensions. These dimensions include amount of contact, quality of interactions, rules for behavior,

physical contact, attitudes of significant others and socio-economic status differences. These six dimensions combined represent an overall picture of the type of personal contact that could exist between members of different racial groups. For example, higher scores on these dimensions would indicate more positive personal contact and lower scores would indicate less positive personal contact (Cook, 1984; Cook, 1985 & Stephan & Stephan, 1985).

(4) **Media Exposure** - Media exposure is defined as a combination of six dimensions of mass media exposure to different racial groups. That is, amount of exposure to different racial groups via mass media, how verbal interactions between different racial groups are represented in the media, the difference between one's own personal opinion of different racial groups versus mass media's portrayal of these groups, how physical interactions between different racial groups are represented in mass media, perceptions of significant other's attitudes towards mass media's depiction of different racial groups and, the manner in which mass media depicts socio-economic differences between different racial groups. Media exposure in this study included all forms of mass media (e.g., television, film, newspapers, etc.).

Chapter 3

Method

Respondents

100 African-American (54 males[2] and 46 females) and 130 White (64 males and 66 females) undergraduates attending Michigan State University and Bowie State University participated in the study. The African-American respondents ranged in age from 17-34 years with a mean age of 19 years. 54% of the African-American respondents were males and 46% were females. 67% of the African-American respondents reported belonging to the middle class, 18% to the lower middle class, 9% to the upper middle class and 6% to the wealthy class.

The White respondents ranged in age from 18-35 years with a mean age of 21 years. 49% of the respondents were males and 50% were females. 50% of the White respondents reported that they belonged to the upper middle class, 34% to the middle class, 13% to the lower middle class and 2% to the wealthy class. All respondents were registered in various psychology courses and were given extra course credit for participating in the study.

---

[2] Due to the lack of African-American males participating in research projects at Michigan State University, 40 of the 54 African-American males were undergraduates attending Bowie State University in Bowie, Maryland. There were no significant differences between these two groups of males on any of the measures included in this study.

Procedures

Participants in this study were surveyed in either group (3 to 25 persons) or individual sessions. Although not planned, the gender and racial compositions of the group sessions were combinations of: same race/mixed gender, different race/mixed gender and same race/all African-American males. This author administered approximately 60% of all the questionnaires used in the study while two undergraduate psychology honor students administered the rest.[3]

After signing up to participate in the study, participants were brought into a laboratory where they sat at tables and chairs which resembled a classroom setting. After participants signed consent forms, the following instructions were orally given to the participants:

> "In this study, we are interested in the characteristics that people associate with members of various groups in the United States. One of your tasks in this study will be to indicate what characteristics you believe that Whites, African-Americans, Hispanics and Asians possess. In addition to this, you will complete two questionnaires that will ask you what type

[3] This author is an African-American female and the two research assistants were also female, while one was African-American and the other was White.

of personal contact you have with these different racial groups and what type of media exposure you have had to these groups. You will also complete a questionnaire that asks you how you feel about these groups and how you feel about yourself. And last, you will complete a form that will ask you for demographic information. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions on these questionnaires and your responses will be kept strictly anonymous. Therefore, do not write your name or student ID number on any of the questionnaires. Your honest answer is most appreciated."

After the introduction, participants were given a packet containing the following questionnaires: a social groups characteristic questionnaire, a personal contact questionnaire, a media exposure questionnaire, an evaluation thermometer scale, a racial/ethnic self-esteem scale and a demographics questionnaire. These questionnaires were counterbalanced in each packet so that participants completed the set of questionnaires in different orders. There was no time limit imposed on the participants to complete the packet, however the average time taken to complete it was approximately 1 1/2 hour. Upon completion of the questionnaire packet, participants returned the completed packet of questionnaires to the researcher, were

debriefed, thanked for participating and dismissed.

Materials

Social Groups Characteristics Questionnaire

This is a shortened version of a three part questionnaire[4] developed by Jackson, Bodenhausen, Hodge, Sheppard & Ervin (1991) in which respondents indicated which attributes they believed were characteristic of a particular racial group. Respondents did this by assigning percentages (%) to 116 adjectives in terms of what percentage of members of a particular racial group they believed possessed any of those particular attributes. For example, the attribute of "lazy" was one of the 116 adjectives. If a respondent was evaluating Hispanics, he or she would indicate what percentage of Hispanics he or she believed are lazy. Thus, a score of 40 would indicate that the respondent felt that 40% of all Hispanics are lazy. In addition to the different racial groups, respondents also indicated which attributes they believed were characteristic of their own racial group (Appendix A).

Personal Contact Questionnaire

This questionnaire was based on Stephan and Stephan's (1985) personal contact scale. Via 18 questions which

---

[4] The original version of this questionnaire consisted of three parts: (1) assessed the attributes respondents perceived were characteristic of a racial group, (2) the attributes respondents perceived as typical of the general USA population and (3) respondents' affect (i.e., feelings) for these attributes when associated with different racial groups.

represented six components of personal contact, respondents indicated the type of personal contact they have with different racial groups, the norms of their racial group for behaving towards members of different racial groups, whether or not these norms are well established, their evaluation of the physical contact between them and members of different racial groups, their perception of significant others' attitudes towards racially different people and their perceived socio-economic status. Each personal contact questionnaire was designed so that respondents did not answer any questions regarding their own racial group (Appendix B). Component reliability and overall reliability for the personal contact scale used for both White and African-American respondents can be found in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Media Exposure Questionnaire

This questionnaire, developed by the author[5], assessed the types of exposure respondents have to different racial groups via mass media. There are 18 questions on the scale

---

[5] The author received guidance and suggestions from Dr. Bradley Greenberg, professor of telecommunications at Michigan State University when developing this measurement.

Table 1.

Reliabilities for Personal Contact Scale (for White & African-Americans respondents)

Dimensions	Whites	African-Americans
Amount of contact	.65	.66
Type of interaction	.75	.78
Rules for behavior	.89	.77
Physical contact	.71	.72
Perceptions of significant others attitudes	.78	.82
Socio-economic status	.91	.64
Overall reliability*	.92	.88

* Overall reliability for both personal contact and media exposure scales was computed using Lord and Novick's (1968) formula for maximizing the reliabilities of a composite scale when components of the scale are fixed. This formula provides differential weights to each dimension reliability to maximize the overall reliability (for further discussion of this statistical formula, see Thomsom (1940), Mosier (1943), Peel (1948) and Green (1950).

which represent six components of media exposure. For example, some of the questions are: "indicate the amount of exposure you have had with Hispanics by way of the mass media"; "think about the interactions you've seen in the media between African-Americans and your own racial group. In your opinion, are these interactions typically.....(conflict free or with high conflict)"; and, "compared to the way Asians are presented in the media, indicate your racial groups's socio-economic status". Each media exposure questionnaire was customized for the respondents race so that respondents did not answer any questions regarding their own racial group. For example, African-American respondents did not respond to any questions referring to their exposure to African-Americans via mass media (Appendix C). Component reliability and overall reliability for the media exposure scales for both White and African-American respondents can be found in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

Evaluation Thermometer Scale (Prejudice Measure)

The evaluation thermometer scale first used by Richards (1950), and then by Converse et al., (1980) and Zanna,

Table 2.

Reliabilities for Media Exposure Scale (for White & African-American respondents)

Dimensions	Whites	African-Americans
Amount of media exposure	.79	.50
Type of interaction depicted in media	.51	.60
Difference between personal opinion and media depictions	.67	.75
Media depictions of physical contact between different racial groups	.60	.64
Perceptions of significant others attitudes of racial media depictions	.80	.68
Media depictions of differences in socio-economic status	.81	.74
Overall reliability	.87	.83

Haddock & Esses (1990) measured respondent's racial prejudice for different racial groups. Using a scale of 0 - 100 (extremely unfavorable to extremely favorable) respondents indicated their overall feeling for a specific racial group. Unlike the personal contact and media exposure scales this scale is not a multiple-item additive scale (Appendix D).

Racial/ethnic Self-Esteem Scale

Luhtanen & Crocker's (1992) collective self-esteem scale was used to assess racial/ethnic self-esteem as defined by social identity theory. This scale measured an individual's evaluation of his or her self as a function of his or her membership in various social groups. For this study, the scale was modified by substituting the term 'social group' with 'racial group' to directly measure how an individual evaluates his or her self as a function of being a member of a particular racial group.

The scale incorporates Tajfel and Turner's (1986) theoretical notions that the following concepts: worthiness of membership in a social group, private evaluation of membership in a social group, awareness of public evaluation of the social group, and importance of membership in the social group to overall identity are additive constructs in the formation of social identity. Thus, the Racial/ethnic self-esteem Scale used in this study measured respondents' evaluation of their 'self' as a function of their membership

in their racial group, rather than all groups. Therefore, theoretically similar constructs were additive in the formation of racial/ethnic self-esteem (i.e., worthiness of membership in racial group + private evaluation of membership in racial group + awareness of public evaluation of racial group + importance of membership in racial group = racial/ethnic self-esteem) (Appendix E). Luhtanen and Crocker (1992) report a high overall reliability of .88 and a high overall reliability of .81 was also confirmed for this study.

Demographics Questionnaire

A demographics questionnaire was used to assess the respondents personal biographical information such as which racial group they belonged to, gender, age and socio-economic class. It also requested respondents to indicate which specific subgroups (if any) of Hispanics and Asians they thought of when answering questions about them (Appendix F).

Statistical Analyses

Social Groups Characteristics Questionnaire

The social groups characteristics questionnaire was used to identify the collection of attributes that make up the stereotype that African-Americans and Whites have of themselves, each other, Hispanics and Asians. All responses for each attribute for each racial group were compared with the responses for each attribute for the respondent's own

racial group. Meaning, the respondent's racial group served as a baseline or criterion from which the attribute percentages were compared. This comparison is based on the McCauley and Stitt (1978), and Zanna, et al., (1990) argument that attributes are considered part of a stereotype only if those attributes are perceived as being significantly more or less prevalent in a particular racial group other than one's own racial group. T-tests of significance were computed on each of the 116 characteristics to identify which were considered characteristic of each racial group compared to respondent's own racial group.

For example, reconsider the attribute of lazy. The stereotype that African-Americans have for Whites, Hispanics and Asians would be formulated in the following manner: If African-American respondents indicated that they felt that 60% of all African-Americans are lazy, this 60% would serve as the criteria for all the other racial groups. Meaning, if African-American respondents believed that 80% of Hispanics are lazy, 20% of Asians are lazy and 55% of Whites are lazy, the 80%, 20% and 55% would be statistically compared to the 60% to determine if "laziness" was believed to be more or less prevalent in these groups compared to African-Americans. If these numbers were significantly different, then, lazy would be considered as one of the attributes that make up the stereotype African-Americans

have of Hispanics since it is thought to be more prevalent in this group than in African-Americans (80% vs. 60%).

Likewise, lazy would also be considered one of the attributes that make up the stereotype African-Americans have for Asians since it is believed to be less prevalent within the Asian racial group than it is among African-Americans (20% vs. 60%). On the other hand, the probable insignificant difference between the percentage of Whites (i.e., 55%) African-Americans believe are lazy compared to the percentage of African-Americans (i.e., 60%) they believe are lazy would indicate that lazy is not an attribute that makes up the stereotype African-Americans have for Whites. That is, African-Americans do not believe that lazy is a characteristic trait of Whites given that they believe there is no difference between the laziness of Whites and African-Americans.

This comparison procedure was done for each of the 116 adjectives listed on the social groups questionnaire. The end result was separate lists of attributes that were considered more prevalent, less prevalent or no different for each racial group and it is this collection of attributes that made up the stereotype for each racial group. This author acknowledges that other tests of comparison could have been used to determine which characteristics were characteristic of a racial group (e.g., Dunnett's test or an analysis of variance) and would have

been just as appropriate as the t-test of significance. However, the t-test of significance was the most simple and straightforward analysis for this dissertation. Principal components analysis with a varimax rotation was computed on the 116 characteristics for each racial group to identify clusters of attributes that were similar and to eliminate those attributes that did not significantly contribute to the overall stereotype.

Personal Contact

Respondents used a rating scale of 1 to 9 (1 = least positive, 9 = most positive). The scores from each question were summed and averaged to produce a composite score. This score represented personal contact with higher scores indicating more positive personal contact and lower scores indicating less positive contact. That is, more positive personal contact would be reflective of high levels of contact, conflict free interactions, no established norms for personal contact with members of different racial groups, positive physical contact, positive attitudes of significant others and a perception of equal inter-racial group status. Pearson's product-moment correlation (Pearson's R) was computed to determine the relationship between personal contact and racial prejudice. In addition, Pearson's R was used to determine if the perception of being of a lower status in society than a particular racial group is positively correlated with racial prejudice towards that

particular racial group. This analysis was used to test Tajfel and Turner's (1986) theory that negative feelings for a different group will increase if there is a perception of being of a lower socio-economic status than that group.

Media Exposure Questionnaire

Respondents also used a rating scale of 1 to 9 (1 = least positive, 9 = most positive) and the scores from each question were summed and averaged to produce a composite score for media exposure with higher scores indicating more positive media exposure to different racial groups than lower scores. Positive media exposure was represented by high scores for: amount of exposure to different racial groups via mass media; positive depictions of verbal interactions between different racial groups; the difference between one's own personal opinion of different racial groups versus mass media's portrayal of these groups[6]; depiction of physical interactions between different racial groups; perceptions of significant other's attitudes towards mass media's depiction of different racial groups and the manner in which mass media depict socio-economic differences between the different racial groups. Pearson's R was computed to determine the relationship between media exposure and racial prejudice.

---

[6] Because a large difference between one's personal opinion of a racial group and media's depiction of that racial group could mean that the individual is not relying heavily on media images to formulate his or her assessment of that group.

Racial/ethnic self-esteem Scale

The racial/ethnic self-esteem measure was the sum and average of respondents' responses on the sixteen items on this scale with higher scores indicating more positive racial/ethnic self-esteem and lower scores indicating less positive racial/ethnic self-esteem. Pearson's R was computed to determine the relationship between racial/ethnic self-esteem and racial prejudice.

Additional Analyses

T-tests were computed to determine any gender differences in racial prejudice and within-subject t-tests of variance were computed to determine any significant differences between African-American's and Whites' personal contact and media exposure with different racial groups. And, a t-test of significance was computed to determine any significant differences in racial/ethnic self-esteem between the African-American and White respondents.

Chapter 4

The Results

Before proceeding with the results of this study, a description of the subgroups that African-Americans and Whites thought of when evaluating Hispanics and Asians will be provided. Presented with the task of evaluating Hispanics, 85% of the African-American respondents indicated they thought of Hispanics "as one group" whereas, 7% thought of Mexicans, 4% thought of Chicanos, 3% thought of Puerto Ricans, and 1% thought of Dominicans. And, 93% of the African-American respondents indicated they thought of Asians "as one group" when evaluating them, 3% thought of Japanese, 2% thought of Chinese, 1% thought of Koreans and 1% thought of Indonesians. These percentages suggest that African-Americans engage in the homogeneity bias when evaluating others of different racial groups. Even though there are eight different subgroups of Hispanics and 24 different subgroups of Asians, the majority of the African-American respondents in this study evaluated them as homogeneous groups.

63% of White respondents indicated they thought of Hispanics "as one group" while 16% thought of Mexicans, 9% thought of Puerto Ricans, 8% thought of Chicanos, 3% thought of Cubans and 1% thought of Dominicans. On the other hand, 85% thought of Asians "as one group", 10% thought of Japanese, 4% thought of Chinese and 1% thought of Koreans.

Similar to African-American respondents, it appears that Whites also engaged in the homogeneity bias when evaluating Hispanics and Asians, thus supporting previous research findings (Jones et al., 1981b; Rothbart et al., 1984; Linville et al., 1986 and Quattrone, 1986).

The Attributes That Make Up the Stereotype of African-Americans, Whites, Hispanics and Asians

African-American respondents: First, out of 116 characteristics, t-tests identified 92 attributes that African-Americans believed were characteristic of Whites. That is, 92 attributes were believed to be either more or less prevalent among Whites than African-Americans (Table 3).

Insert Table 3 about here

A principal components analysis with a varimax rotation revealed that the 92 attributes loaded on 13 factors. The attributes that loaded on the first four factors accounted for 67% of the total variance. The first four factors were used as the criterion for establishing the list of attributes that made up the stereotype that African-Americans have for Whites. This criteria was used because each of the remaining twelve factors contributed only minimally to the total variance (Table 4).

Table 3

Attributes That African-Americans (AAs) Respondents Believe Are Diagnostic Of Whites

Believe is more prevalent among Whites than AAs	% of African-Am. (Mean)	(SD)	% of Whites (Mean)	(SD)
Ambitious	48.96	12.66	59.10	17.12
Assertive	52.22	18.78	67.95	13.92
Business-wise	55.48	15.10	74.20	14.06
Competent	44.90	16.11	65.34	16.92
Conscientious	25.60	23.18	33.03	24.66
Conservative	60.85	19.84	67.34	17.18
Criminal tendencies	22.07	19.47	59.65	24.45
Cruel	30.43	17.68	48.71	17.59
Deceitful	34.75	13.51	43.75	20.06
Dependable	31.76	19.49	55.30	16.03
Dirty/Smelly	13.26	10.15	53.64	22.47
Eccentric	36.54	20.13	67.09	16.33
Effeminate	30.25	11.60	47.51	20.29
Efficient	49.22	19.17	64.05	16.09
Emotional	49.43	16.08	71.84	19.14
Fair-minded	30.17	12.95	48.12	21.63
Fearful	47.07	23.54	57.72	24.71
Feminine	50.79	11.23	60.90	17.65
Friendly	59.73	18.80	60.90	21.41
Generous	36.62	20.37	48.99	14.97
Happy-go-Lucky	47.47	23.96	64.38	20.92
Hardworking	60.43	15.84	63.31	20.22
Ignorant	32.02	15.29	42.87	16.30
Imaginative	38.13	19.52	46.25	17.91
Independent	49.21	16.35	59.82	17.20
Individualistic	36.70	17.31	48.73	19.46
Industrious	52.33	14.48	57.59	14.72
Meddlesome	30.91	13.21	46.26	24.52
Noisy	38.01	16.35	44.54	19.15
Old-fashioned	36.49	15.14	52.15	26.07
Patriotic	39.35	10.72	48.06	18.53
Persevering	44.09	14.49	55.09	17.20
Plans ahead	29.26	25.37	57.83	24.76
Polite	50.65	18.11	56.78	22.18
Productive	59.97	18.83	69.32	16.22
Prompt	39.99	17.85	50.71	18.90
Quiet	41.55	13.14	46.30	17.60
Reliable	45.28	12.24	63.34	19.77
Rigid/Inflexible	27.60	14.08	52.90	15.40
Self-centered	29.76	23.92	48.83	14.59
Self-disciplined	31.73	26.61	46.54	22.09
Self-sacrificing	39.52	18.36	46.95	23.04
Sexually perverse	28.70	26.33	50.40	19.92
Show off	27.02	26.39	58.63	16.67
Sly	23.15	23.04	40.15	19.34
Sophisticated	56.68	13.57	62.21	20.35
Stingy	30.62	16.06	44.63	18.76
Understanding	33.42	28.02	56.30	16.92
Uses Drugs	50.10	13.47	53.97	24.64

Table 3 (cont'd)

Believe is less prevalent among Whites than AAs	% of African-Am. (Mean)	(SD)	% of Whites (Mean)	(SD)
Aggressive	67.55	16.76	47.00	19.78
Angry	69.54	18.66	56.99	17.97
Artistic	56.29	19.46	37.67	22.23
Athletic	66.90	21.81	44.33	18.51
Bossy	58.30	12.31	49.18	20.92
Competitive	65.87	19.64	50.78	17.07
Cooperative	65.75	23.24	52.44	19.22
Cultured	53.23	19.74	47.84	15.75
Defensive	73.54	16.65	45.23	21.25
Devout	53.45	17.52	40.39	18.48
Flamboyant	57.89	20.82	40.01	14.90
Forgetful	58.91	22.13	40.07	16.17
Good-natured	53.11	18.64	45.05	16.76
Grateful	57.40	17.15	39.17	22.22
Helpful	47.81	12.28	39.45	18.19
Intelligent	67.75	16.18	58.53	15.76
Interesting	65.60	17.02	37.09	19.00
Isolated/lonely	38.70	17.40	30.18	16.02
Knowledgeable	66.35	11.35	61.54	17.52
Logical	59.19	20.69	40.28	24.11
Masculine	58.78	14.08	39.95	16.16
Materialistic	84.20	21.88	45.04	19.85
Militant	64.19	18.32	37.65	17.59
Musical	74.83	16.37	42.15	22.28
Optimistic	43.90	14.86	53.30	15.40
Passionate	60.81	15.04	41.47	17.15
Poor	51.99	23.58	44.92	18.00
Prosperous	53.50	16.66	68.35	14.14
Proud	77.00	22.20	48.87	18.98
Realistic	57.74	10.16	50.60	13.23
Rebellious	53.73	18.22	46.51	29.48
Religious	58.60	17.00	45.28	13.96
Shy	41.15	17.72	32.05	14.59
Sociable	72.43	17.53	64.62	26.50
Strong family commitment	73.99	17.43	51.16	22.60
Superstitious	55.90	19.79	34.29	19.08
Thrifty	48.60	17.69	37.48	18.44
Tradition loving	69.72	20.42	57.08	17.25
Trusting	53.77	16.67	33.96	18.34
Unpredictable	50.62	27.58	38.62	12.35
Uneducated	44.40	12.54	35.68	14.61

Insert Table 4 about here

From the four heavily loaded factors, each attribute that had a factor loading of at least .70 was then considered as one of the attributes that made up the stereotype that African-Americans have for Whites. Based on this criteria, a total of 18 attributes made up the stereotype: conservative, polite, fair, conscientious, individualistic, strong family commitment, uneducated, devout, grateful, progressive, passionate, criminal tendencies, show-off, quiet, uses drugs, generous, bossy and dirty.

Second, out of 116 characteristics, t-tests identified 87 attributes that African-American respondents believed were characteristic of Hispanics (Table 5).

Insert Table 5 about here

Principal components analysis with a varimax rotation loaded the 87 attributes on 13 factors. Similar to the attributes that made up the stereotype African-Americans have for Whites, the attributes that made up the stereotype for

Table 4.

EIGENVALUES OF 116 ATTRIBUTES

Attributes That African-Americans Believe Are Diagnostic of Whites

Factor	Eigenvalue	Pct of Var	Cum Pct
1	18.15147	19.9	19.9
2	17.24649	19.0	38.7
3	13.58754	14.9	53.8
4	12.28166	13.5	67.3
5	6.21171	6.8	74.2
6	3.80438	4.2	78.3
7	2.93334	3.2	81.6
8	2.07243	2.3	83.8
9	1.63953	1.8	85.6
10	1.43424	1.6	87.2
11	1.30595	1.4	88.6
12	1.14206	1.3	89.9
13	1.09587	1.2	91.1

Table 5

Attributes That African-Americans (AAs) Respondents Believe Are Diagnostic Of Hispanics

Believe is more prevalent among Hispanics than AAs	% of African-Am. (Mean)	(SD)	% of Hispanics (Mean)	(SD)
Active	37.91	28.70	52.72	19.36
Artistic	52.69	19.46	63.98	16.33
Competent	44.90	16.11	66.15	22.00
Conscientious	25.60	23.18	39.94	15.54
Criminal tendencies	22.07	19.47	45.84	16.08
Cruel	30.43	17.68	43.55	19.57
Cultured	53.23	19.74	62.02	21.56
Dependable	31.76	19.49	57.09	19.08
Dirty	13.26	10.15	38.52	17.93
Deceitful	34.75	13.51	42.02	19.08
Efficient	49.22	19.17	63.84	16.34
Fair	30.17	12.95	47.44	15.05
Generous	36.62	20.37	57.19	15.73
High morals	48.61	18.35	60.25	11.25
Ignorant	32.02	15.29	36.17	18.35
Individualistic	36.70	17.31	48.48	23.04
Industrious	52.33	14.48	59.26	15.84
Isolated	38.70	17.40	50.39	27.16
Mediative	32.61	12.89	55.95	18.18
Patriotic	39.35	10.72	43.06	16.93
Persevering	44.09	14.19	49.96	20.02
Plans ahead	29.26	25.37	60.70	17.23
Progressive	53.50	16.66	57.08	15.11
Prompt	39.99	17.85	53.22	14.11
Reliable	45.28	12.24	46.02	18.30
Reserved	26.13	19.34	42.27	22.15
Rigid	27.60	14.08	48.67	15.83
Self-disciplined	31.73	26.61	65.33	16.02
Sexually perverse	28.70	26.33	35.70	18.94
Show-off	27.02	26.39	37.08	19.09
Shrewd	49.14	18.91	53.38	22.78
Shy	41.15	17.72	50.06	23.60
Sly	23.15	23.04	32.10	15.79
Stingy	30.62	16.06	46.26	20.29
Understanding	33.42	28.02	58.12	15.51
Wise	34.48	30.78	42.16	23.43
Believe is less prevalent among Hispanics than AAs	**% of African-Am. (Mean)**	**(SD)**	**% of Hispanics (Mean)**	**(SD)**
Aggressive	67.55	16.76	50.80	16.23
Alert	54.30	19.11	49.00	21.23
Anxious	56.27	16.41	37.49	13.68
Assertive	52.22	18.78	41.15	24.14
Athletic	66.90	21.81	32.57	21.06
Bossy	58.30	12.31	36.74	14.90
Business wise	55.48	15.10	37.93	14.77
Competitive	65.87	19.64	55.68	15.01
Conservative	60.85	19.84	50.90	20.54
Cooperative	65.75	23.24	51.65	21.71
Defensive	73.54	16.62	46.32	14.22
Democratic	74.49	10.89	43.14	17.94

Table 5 (cont'd)

Believe is less prevalent among Hispanics than AAs	% of African-Am. (Mean)	(SD)	% of Hispanics (Mean)	(SD)
Dependent	59.57	21.85	37.10	15.90
Eccentric	36.54	20.13	60.19	16.36
Feminine	50.79	11.23	48.05	14.32
Flamboyant	57.89	20.82	48.43	17.13
Forgetful	58.91	22.13	36.37	16.68
Friendly	59.73	18.80	49.02	18.77
Good looking	62.00	32.37	38.70	22.95
Good natured	53.11	18.64	49.93	13.53
Grouchy	58.39	25.80	44.79	15.96
Happy-go-lucky	47.47	23.96	40.64	12.70
Hard working	60.43	15.84	49.49	31.82
Intelligent	67.75	16.18	55.19	18.87
Interesting	65.60	17.02	60.50	13.55
Knowledgeable	66.35	11.35	55.08	18.41
Lazy	49.19	12.72	43.85	12.53
Logical	59.19	20.69	53.06	19.28
Materialistic	84.20	21.88	28.26	23.57
Militant	64.19	18.32	41.37	15.18
Musical	74.83	16.37	37.53	23.09
Noisy	38.01	16.35	33.41	17.59
Old-fashioned	36.49	15.14	57.21	19.41
Optimistic	43.90	14.86	36.42	15.68
Physically violent	49.35	23.61	42.03	13.91
Productive	59.97	18.83	51.30	21.43
Prone to use drugs	50.10	13.47	45.45	16.34
Proud	51.99	23.58	59.85	13.38
Quarrelsome	56.97	18.17	32.39	13.28
Realistic	57.74	10.16	37.02	18.08
Religious	58.60	17.00	40.47	21.75
Romantic	50.74	26.48	34.64	20.03
Self-centered	29.76	23.92	24.34	13.94
Self-sacrificing	39.52	18.36	33.34	19.18
Sexually loose	60.56	17.22	45.24	22.32
Sociable	72.43	17.53	49.54	15.44
Superstitious	55.90	19.79	37.10	16.61
Thrifty	48.60	17.69	29.78	15.42
Tradition loving	69.72	20.42	58.61	16.44
Trusting	53.77	16.67	41.97	15.01
Well-adjusted	55.61	17.81	48.88	17.02

Hispanics loaded heavily on the first four factors. That is, the first four factors accounted for 66% of the total variance (Table 6).

Insert Table 6 about here

Again, using the criteria of factor loadings of at least .70, the following 17 attributes made up the stereotype that African-Americans have for Hispanics: Hispanics are more moral, dependable, fair, understanding, individualistic, deceitful, cruel, stingy, mediative, superstitious. And furthermore, they believe they are less self-centered, dependent, criminal tendencies, athletic, quarrelsome, friendly and isolated. Third, t-tests identified 92 attributes that African-Americans believed were characteristic of Asians (Table 7).

Insert Table 7 about here

Principal components analysis with a varimax rotation loaded the 92 attributes on 15 factors with four heavily loaded clusters that made up 69% of the total variance (Table 8).

Table 6.

EIGENVALUES OF 116 ATTRIBUTES

Attributes That African-Americans Believe Are Diagnostic of Hispanics

Factor	Eigenvalue	Pct of Var	Cum Pct
1	29.14160	25.1	25.1
2	19.71837	17.0	42.1
3	16.88372	14.6	56.7
4	11.69425	10.1	66.8
5	5.91437	5.1	71.9
6	4.23781	3.7	75.5
7	4.04102	3.5	79.0
8	2.89538	2.5	81.5
9	2.61395	2.3	83.7
10	2.33014	2.0	85.8
11	1.90181	1.6	87.4
12	1.75091	1.5	88.9
13	1.69849	1.5	90.4
14	1.49274	1.3	91.7
15	1.28305	1.1	92.8
16	1.23306	1.1	93.8
17	1.05049	.9	94.7
18	1.03689	.9	95.6

Table 7

Attributes That African-Americans (AAs) Respondents Believe Are Diagnostic Of Asians

Believe is more prevalent among Asians than AAs	% of African-Am. (Mean)	(SD)	% of Asians (Mean)	(SD)
Ambitious	48.96	12.66	67.45	25.07
Alert	54.30	19.11	71.27	20.02
Anxious	65.77	17.42	64.85	21.54
Competent	44.90	16.11	54.15	13.75
Contented	43.49	11.06	56.88	21.59
Criminal tendencies	22.07	19.47	30.25	17.02
Dependable	31.76	19.49	55.61	24.60
Devout	53.45	17.52	66.12	17.69
Dirty	13.26	10.15	31.75	19.52
Eccentric	36.54	20.13	45.69	26.44
Fair minded	30.17	12.95	44.48	20.18
Generous	36.62	20.37	62.06	20.44
Good natured	53.11	18.64	64.89	18.13
Hard working	60.43	15.84	68.32	24.30
High morals	48.61	18.35	57.40	18.55
Imaginative	38.13	19.52	56.77	21.68
Industrious	52.33	14.48	57.02	16.13
Intelligent	67.75	16.18	76.37	18.36
Meddlesome	30.91	13.21	40.13	28.56
Mediative	32.61	12.89	41.10	13.03
Old fashioned	36.49	15.14	51.48	24.39
Patriotic	39.35	10.72	56.60	14.14
Observing	44.09	14.19	62.49	23.14
Polite	50.65	18.11	66.88	24.42
Plans ahead	29.26	25.37	65.51	24.13
Productive	59.97	18.83	75.18	13.77
Prompt	39.99	17.85	71.98	18.65
Prosperous	60.00	14.66	63.96	14.07
quiet	41.55	13.14	49.38	31.40
Realistic	57.74	10.16	76.80	23.02
Reliable	45.28	12.24	75.12	18.51
Reserved	26.13	19.34	62.63	25.73
Rigid	27.60	14.08	42.64	17.88
Show off	27.02	26.39	46.91	22.58
Self discipline	31.73	26.61	56.86	21.24
Self sacrificing	39.52	18.36	46.07	22.97
Sexually perverse	28.70	26.33	42.31	26.17
Sly	23.15	23.04	44.58	16.86
Sophisticated	56.68	13.57	69.30	17.84
Understanding	33.42	28.02	45.73	19.75
Wise	34.48	30.78	64.20	24.95

Table 7 (cont'd)

Believe is less prevalent among Asians than AAs	% of African-Am. (Mean)	(SD)	% of Asians (Mean)	(SD)
Aggressive	67.55	16.76	52.68	19.70
Angry	69.54	18.66	35.77	19.14
Artistic	56.69	19.46	42.08	21.23
Athletic	66.90	21.81	28.26	16.18
Bossy	58.30	12.31	50.35	15.96
Competitive	65.87	19.64	53.18	22.11
Conscientious	25.60	23.18	51.39	29.00
Cooperative	65.75	23.24	56.94	15.89
Deceitful	34.75	13.51	27.31	12.62
Defensive	73.54	16.65	53.01	16.13
Dependent	59.57	21.85	48.36	19.95
Democratic	74.49	10.89	41.65	14.84
Effeminate	30.25	11.60	25.87	12.12
Emotional	49.43	16.08	41.55	17.63
Feminine	50.79	11.23	38.89	19.44
Flamboyant	57.89	20.82	50.65	24.50
Forgetful	58.91	22.13	19.42	10.50
Friendly	59.73	18.80	51.79	21.68
Good looking	62.00	32.37	30.01	22.67
Grateful	57.40	17.15	45.70	27.29
Grouchy	58.39	25.80	37.11	14.28
Happy-go-lucky	47.47	23.96	40.79	14.98
Honest	59.80	14.21	40.87	19.42
Ignorant	32.02	15.29	22.53	13.80
Individualistic	36.70	17.31	58.48	20.03
Interesting	65.60	17.02	37.45	23.04
Logical	59.19	20.69	50.85	25.71
Materialistic	84.20	21.88	49.48	25.89
Mercenary	36.51	12.29	23.74	10.75
Militant	64.19	18.32	31.82	23.75
Moody	57.28	29.84	32.62	10.30
Musical	74.83	16.37	27.20	23.56
Noisy	38.01	16.35	31.68	14.41
Optimistic	43.90	14.86	33.82	15.68
Passionate	60.81	15.04	47.59	19.23
Physically violent	49.35	23.61	34.02	13.32
Poor	51.99	23.58	37.05	16.28
Prone to use drugs	50.10	13.47	20.27	18.88
Proud	77.00	22.20	58.72	21.04
Quarrelsome	56.97	18.18	28.02	12.66
Rebellious	53.73	18.22	30.67	14.00
Religious	58.60	17.00	51.48	21.67
Romantic	50.74	26.48	37.59	15.94
Self pitying	39.71	12.42	26.61	22.42
Sexually loose	60.56	17.22	21.10	15.59
Shrewd	49.14	18.91	32.02	10.77
Sociable	72.43	17.53	43.51	18.68
Superstitious	55.90	19.79	29.13	19.50
Thrifty	48.60	17.69	56.86	17.47
Uneducated	44.40	12.54	22.92	11.52
Unpredictable	50.62	27.58	26.66	17.93

And, the following 19 attributes made up the stereotype that African-Americans have for Asians: good-natured, moral, imaginative, fair, eccentric, wise, reserved, intelligent, self-sacrificing, patriotic, devout, superstitious, optimistic, religious, sexually perverse, polite, show-off and musical.

Insert Table 8 about here

White Respondents: The same t-tests, principal components analyses and a criteria of factor loadings of at least .70 was used as the criterion to define the attributes that Whites believe are more or less prevalent among African-Americans, Hispanics and Asians compared to Whites and to determine which of these attributes make up the stereotype Whites have for these groups.

Whites believed that 79 attributes were characteristic of African-Americans (Table 9) and these 79 attributes loaded on 21 factors with a cumulative variance of 82% (Table 10). Of these 79 attributes only eight had factor loadings of at least .70. The attributes are as follows: athletic, fair-minded, hard-working, logical, honest, cooperative, helpful and industrious. The findings indicate that Whites believed that only 18 of the 116 attributes were more prevalent among African-Americans compared to Whites

Table 8.

EIGENVALUES OF 116 ATTRIBUTES

Attributes That African-Americans Believe Are Diagnostic of Asians

Factor	Eigenvalue	Pct of Var	Cum Pct
1	23.46549	26.1	26.1
2	17.77848	19.8	45.8
3	13.05612	14.5	60.3
4	7.54942	8.4	68.7
5	3.66116	4.1	72.8
6	3.22420	3.6	76.4
7	2.71576	3.0	79.4
8	2.31917	2.6	82.0
9	2.02562	2.3	84.2
10	1.80537	2.0	86.2
11	1.46603	1.6	87.9
12	1.27683	1.4	89.3
13	1.18026	1.3	90.6
14	1.10813	1.2	91.8
15	1.02146	1.1	92.9

and of those 18 attributes, 15 can be considered negative. Yet, 62 attributes were thought to be more prevalent among Whites than African-Americans. It appears that Whites' don't believe that African-Americans possess as many of the same attributes as they do. That is, they apparently believe that Whites possess a much wider range of diverse attributes compared to African-Americans.

Insert Tables 9 and 10 about here

Using the same formula indicated above, the following five attributes: ambitious, plans ahead, intelligent, knowledgeable and logical made up Whites' stereotype of Hispanics. A similar pattern was found in the perception Whites have of Hispanics, in that it consisted of the attributes Whites think Hispanics <u>do not</u> possess as much as Whites. That is, out of 116 different attributes, Whites believed that only ten of these attributes were characteristics found more prevalent in the Hispanic population compared to the White. And, similar to their assessment of African-Americans, six of the ten can be considered negative. The following eight attributes made up the stereotype for Asians: productive, fair-minded, self-disciplined, plans ahead, honest, hardworking, grateful and

Table 9

Attributes That White Respondents
Believe Are Diagnostic Of African-Americans (AAs)

Believe is more prevalent among AAs than Whites	% of Whites (Mean)	(SD)	% of AAs (Mean)	(SD)
Angry	38.22	18.94	53.69	21.78
Athletic	50.63	20.81	61.19	23.16
Criminal tendencies	28.08	18.91	41.60	23.60
Defensive	52.45	25.94	58.85	23.67
Dirty/Smelly	19.71	16.32	29.71	23.07
Ignorant	36.86	24.48	41.38	22.39
Lazy	38.78	20.80	53.45	23.24
Musical	38.78	20.80	53.45	23.24
Noisy	43.01	20.99	59.12	22.62
Physically violent	33.72	21.04	49.53	24.25
Poor	32.97	18.53	50.22	20.11
Prone to use drugs	37.24	19.70	47.47	21.69
Rebellious	38.12	19.43	52.25	23.65
Religious	54.75	24.08	59.82	21.41
Sexually perverse	31.29	21.49	35.72	24.77
Superstitious	31.92	19.33	38.68	20.34
Uneducated	30.21	17.48	44.66	20.38
Unpredictable	42.96	22.86	48.92	24.42

Believe is less prevalent among AAs than Whites	% of Whites (Mean)	(SD)	% of AAs (Mean)	(SD)
Alert	56.65	19.45	52.62	17.54
Ambitious	60.12	18.98	49.49	19.68
Anxious	49.07	21.80	41.32	19.91
Assertive	56.18	17.36	48.42	19.19
Business wise	51.18	17.42	33.29	14.59
Competent	56.76	18.73	51.74	18.29
Competitive	61.34	25.10	52.67	20.45
Conscientious	45.14	18.75	34.82	17.20
Conservative	57.95	16.66	35.40	19.73
Contented	48.32	21.98	34.21	19.77
Cooperative	52.81	19.52	41.82	18.93
Dependable	55.32	17.31	44.03	18.53
Effeminate	36.98	19.31	31.05	19.90
Efficient	52.22	18.09	44.70	17.39
Emotional	56.98	21.48	51.44	24.11
Fair-minded	54.94	17.12	45.18	21.25
Fearful	47.45	24.74	41.60	21.62
Feminine	45.78	15.91	38.72	19.06
Forgetful	38.14	20.19	30.92	16.28
Friendly	59.75	18.92	49.19	22.45
Generous	47.00	19.27	37.84	21.06
Good-looking	51.08	22.19	39.02	23.71
Good-natured	54.85	20.46	49.19	16.73
Hardworking	61.80	16.47	50.25	18.31
Helpful	57.12	14.50	42.16	20.62
Honest	46.26	20.67	42.33	19.90
Imaginative	50.16	20.14	41.45	21.07
Independent	62.91	18.45	50.41	18.89

Table 9 (cont'd)

Believe is more prevalent among AAs than Whites	% of Whites (Mean)	(SD)	% of AAs (Mean)	(SD)
Individualistic	56.82	20.83	49.57	20.91
Industrious	57.34	14.45	43.67	17.34
Interesting	64.22	22.94	53.48	22.81
Knowledgeable	58.09	18.88	49.88	18.85
Logical	59.69	16.85	49.69	18.67
Materialistic	51.29	19.60	40.12	21.34
Moody	66.66	23.78	57.57	23.80
Optimistic	49.30	21.12	42.05	18.20
Passionate	58.41	21.24	48.08	22.01
Patriotic	67.54	21.37	47.28	22.06
Persevering	45.74	19.14	36.73	20.46
Plans ahead	53.21	18.89	38.73	18.74
Pleasure loving	69.82	23.33	60.23	23.72
Polite	51.98	23.42	42.88	21.24
Productive	64.24	17.27	48.18	17.01
Progressive	47.92	15.22	40.49	17.60
Prompt	55.52	19.15	44.67	22.13
Prosperous	52.77	16.13	39.80	20.61
Quiet	38.83	17.09	25.39	17.29
Realistic	51.71	18.50	46.84	20.11
Reserved	40.75	19.69	29.60	18.10
Self-centered	49.50	23.62	45.33	24.10
Self-disciplined	49.92	18.01	40.73	17.14
Sly	41.21	20.24	40.80	21.81
Shrewd	43.33	19.34	34.33	19.74
Sophisticated	46.28	18.79	34.45	19.25
Thrifty	50.43	18.59	40.12	19.33
Tradition loving	50.83	22.15	43.85	21.89
Trusting	48.56	18.19	39.98	20.19
Understanding	51.06	19.25	41.70	15.92
Well-adjusted	56.00	18.98	43.75	21.48
Wise	39.62	22.00	35.01	19.83

Table 10.

EIGENVALUES OF 116 ATTRIBUTES

Attributes That Whites Believe Are Diagnostic of African-Americans			
Factor	**Eigenvalue**	**Pct of Var**	**Cum Pct**
1	22.67845	19.6	19.6
2	15.02935	13.0	32.5
3	5.53365	4.8	37.3
4	4.82475	4.2	41.4
5	3.95410	3.4	44.8
6	3.57623	3.1	47.9
7	3.40083	2.9	50.9
8	3.24876	2.8	53.7
9	3.13328	2.7	56.4
10	2.94858	2.5	58.9
11	2.72433	2.3	61.3
12	2.46313	2.1	63.4
13	2.37873	2.1	65.4
14	2.36160	2.0	67.5
15	2.16043	1.9	69.3
16	1.99432	1.7	71.0
17	1.93730	1.7	72.7
18	1.88062	1.6	74.3
19	1.73099	1.5	75.8
20	1.68954	1.5	77.3
21	1.59074	1.4	78.7
22	1.48671	1.3	79.9
23	1.42504	1.2	81.2
24	1.35858	1.2	82.3
25	1.29256	1.1	83.5
26	1.24060	1.1	84.5
27	1.18691	1.0	85.5
28	1.13572	1.0	86.5

prompt. The attributes that were considered characteristic of Hispanics and Asians and results from both principal components factor analyses can be found respectively in Tables 11, 12, 13 and 14.

Insert tables 11, 12, 13 and 14 about here

Results of Hypotheses

Hypothesis #1: Respondents who have more positive personal contact with a racial group will have less racial prejudice toward that group than those who have less positive personal contact with that group.

In terms of African-Americans's personal contact with Whites, the hypothesis was supported. Pearson's R revealed that for African-Americans, personal contact was significantly correlated with their prejudice for Whites. That is, the more positive the personal contact is with Whites, the more positive their feelings are towards Whites (r=.37)[7]. On the other hand, the hypothesis was not supported in terms of African-Americans' personal contact with either Hispanics (r=.-18) or Asians (r= -.13). Meaning, there was not a significant correlation between

[7] Significant at p < .01.

Table 11

Attributes That White Respondents Believe Are Diagnostic Of Hispanics

Believe is more prevalent among Hispanics than Whites	% of Whites (Mean)	(SD)	% of Hispanics (Mean)	(SD)
Criminal tendencies	28.08	18.91	37.87	22.58
Dirty	19.71	16.32	29.97	21.50
Grateful	41.63	23.03	50.60	21.36
Lazy	33.25	16.55	37.87	19.85
Old fashioned	38.08	16.30	48.40	20.83
Poor	32.97	18.53	54.29	20.22
Religious	54.75	24.08	61.33	23.02
Superstitious	31.92	19.33	44.85	23.51
Tradition loving	50.83	22.15	60.00	22.03
Uneducated	30.21	17.48	42.69	19.26

Believe is less prevalent among Hispanics than Whites	% of Whites (Mean)	(SD)	% of Hispanics (Mean)	(SD)
Active	53.70	17.15	48.12	18.22
Aggressive	50.10	20.96	42.36	18.79
Alert	56.65	19.45	48.20	22.84
Ambitious	60.12	18.98	46.90	17.90
Angry	38.22	18.94	34.06	20.48
Anxious	49.07	21.80	38.63	19.06
Assertive	56.18	17.36	44.28	19.87
Athletic	50.63	20.81	36.36	18.46
Bossy	46.31	18.34	34.43	19.91
Business wise	51.18	17.42	35.33	16.25
Competent	56.76	18.73	47.95	18.26
Competitive	61.34	25.10	39.90	16.45
Conscientious	45.14	18.75	38.92	21.37
Conservative	57.95	16.66	37.64	20.88
Contented	48.32	21.98	40.80	18.19
Cooperative	52.81	19.52	45.37	21.03
Deceitful	39.72	22.85	31.35	17.95
Defensive	52.45	25.94	45.37	19.01
Democratic	55.03	20.05	49.01	21.74
Dependable	55.32	17.31	46.35	19.64
Eccentric	33.87	20.92	27.79	18.07
Effeminate	36.98	19.31	30.90	18.10
Efficient	52.22	18.09	44.70	19.67
Emotional	56.98	21.48	47.98	23.14
Family oriented	52.59	20.75	65.91	18.60
Fair minded	54.94	17.12	46.51	19.86
Fearful	47.45	24.94	39.60	20.17
Feminine	45.78	15.91	39.62	14.26
Flamboyant	41.75	21.44	34.35	19.17
Forgetful	38.14	20.19	30.71	15.91
Friendly	59.75	18.92	54.98	19.21
Helpful	57.12	14.50	46.16	20.50
Imaginative	50.16	20.14	44.67	19.09
Independent	62.91	18.45	44.40	18.54
Individualistic	56.82	20.83	44.14	21.32
Industrious	57.34	14.45	43.26	21.06

Table 11 (cont'd)

Believe is less prevalent among Hispanics than Whites	% of Whites (Mean)	(SD)	% of Hispanics (Mean)	(SD)
Intelligent	58.09	18.88	47.93	20.60
Interesting	64.22	22.94	51.55	26.41
Knowledgeable	59.69	16.85	50.43	18.81
Logical	51.29	19.60	42.36	19.50
Materialistic	66.66	23.78	41.61	21.05
Meddlesome	44.69	22.39	29.55	17.27
Militant	37.03	24.70	31.46	20.45
Moody	53.63	21.96	37.50	19.21
Passionate	58.41	21.24	49.67	22.42
Patriotic	67.54	21.37	45.84	24.26
Plans ahead	53.21	18.89	40.10	20.12
Productive	64.24	17.27	50.22	17.44
Progressive	47.92	15.22	37.98	19.24
Prompt	55.52	19.15	45.50	23.21
Prosperous	52.77	16.13	37.96	19.60
Quiet	38.83	17.09	34.11	14.92
Realistic	51.71	18.50	47.45	20.45
Reliable	54.62	22.82	48.80	20.59
Reserved	40.75	19.69	33.19	20.75
Rigid	39.37	17.86	33.89	18.90
Self-centered	49.50	23.62	33.04	17.53
Self-discipline	49.92	18.01	44.91	18.76
Self-pitying	42.41	18.81	34.57	18.70
Sexually loose	49.36	23.82	48.80	20.59
Show off	41.36	23.98	30.01	20.91
Shrewd	43.33	18.34	31.31	19.34
Shy	34.35	18.30	28.86	15.25
Sly	41.21	20.24	36.59	18.53
Sociable	61.70	22.34	54.80	19.36
Sophisticated	46.28	18.79	32.50	21.08
Stingy	35.24	18.99	30.40	17.52
Thrifty	50.43	18.59	40.78	18.37
Unpredictable	42.96	22.86	37.51	19.21
Understanding	51.06	19.25	46.50	19.41
Well adjusted	56.00	18.98	46.17	20.08

Table 12.

EIGENVALUES OF 116 ATTRIBUTES

Attributes That Whites Believe Are Diagnostic of Hispanics

Factor	Eigenvalue	Pct of Var	Cum Pct
1	15.90795	20.1	20.1
2	9.36962	11.9	32.0
3	4.61179	5.8	37.8
4	3.46148	4.4	42.2
5	3.25099	4.1	46.3
6	2.96536	3.8	50.1
7	2.59014	3.3	53.4
8	2.42757	3.1	56.4
9	2.30787	2.9	59.4
10	2.13666	2.7	62.1
11	2.01413	2.5	64.6
12	1.91181	2.4	67.0
13	1.74902	2.2	69.2
14	1.56452	2.0	71.2
15	1.53752	1.9	73.2
16	1.39571	1.8	74.9
17	1.29211	1.6	76.6
18	1.21415	1.5	78.1
19	1.14284	1.4	79.6
20	1.08160	1.4	80.9
21	1.04684	1.3	82.3

Table 13

Attributes That White Respondents
Believe Are Diagnostic Of Asians

Believe is more prevalent among Asians than Whites	% of Whites (Mean)	(SD)	% of Asians (Mean)	(SD)
Alert	56.65	19.45	62.47	17.21
Ambitious	60.12	18.98	64.95	21.73
Business wise	51.18	17.42	62.50	23.59
conscientious	45.14	18.75	53.82	23.64
conservative	57.95	16.66	68.36	17.65
Cultured	45.49	20.99	55.29	23.02
Dependable	55.32	17.31	63.03	18.92
Efficient	52.22	18.09	66.95	18.37
Fair minded	54.94	17.12	60.69	19.06
Family oriented	52.59	20.75	72.04	17.98
Generous	47.00	19.27	52.10	17.85
Good natured	54.85	20.46	59.11	18.16
Grateful	41.63	23.03	55.99	19.84
Hardworking	61.80	16.47	71.29	18.69
High morals	45.42	22.73	60.91	23.15
Honest	46.26	20.67	56.98	20.01
Imaginative	50.16	20.14	52.94	20.70
Industrious	57.34	14.45	62.88	22.27
Intelligent	58.09	18.88	67.45	19.25
Logical	51.29	19.60	63.31	21.63
Meditative	30.12	17.45	48.47	20.95
Old fashioned	38.08	16.30	55.54	23.91
Optimistic	49.30	21.12	59.36	19.11
Persevering	45.74	19.14	57.66	21.77
Plans ahead	53.21	18.89	66.12	20.42
Polite	51.98	23.42	66.92	21.86
Productive	64.24	17.29	69.16	17.56
Progressive	47.92	15.22	52.46	22.24
Prompt	55.52	19.15	66.67	21.06
Prosperous	52.77	16.13	61.50	20.80
Proud	58.51	24.05	64.12	21.92
Quiet	38.83	17.09	59.25	21.26
Realistic	51.71	18.50	57.18	21.98
Reliable	54.62	22.82	70.33	17.70
Reserved	40.75	19.69	56.74	23.44
Self-disciplined	49.92	18.01	65.18	19.54
Self-sacrificing	38.55	20.01	51.21	20.30
Shy	34.35	18.30	49.86	21.68
Tradition loving	50.83	22.15	68.98	22.06
Wise	39.62	22.00	57.66	21.52

Believe is less prevalent among Asians than Whites	% of Whites (Mean)	(SD)	% of Asians (Mean)	(SD)
Active	53.70	17.15	48.52	23.03
Aggressive	50.10	20.96	41.43	24.36
Angry	38.22	18.94	29.00	20.51
Anxious	49.07	21.80	37.72	22.70
Athletic	50.63	20.81	29.91	19.62
Bossy	46.31	18.34	35.20	20.82

Table 13 (cont'd)

Believe is less prevalent among Asians than Whites	% of Whites (Mean)	(SD)	% of Asians (Mean)	(SD)
Criminal tendencies	28.08	18.91	20.10	14.84
Cruel	31.85	19.01	34.36	21.52
Defensive	39.72	22.85	26.71	19.11
Democratic	52.45	25.94	35.10	20.42
Dependent	55.03	20.05	50.16	19.20
Emotional	56.98	21.48	40.07	21.50
Fearful	47.45	24.94	37.08	23.68
Flamboyant	41.75	21.44	28.62	18.86
Forgetful	38.14	20.19	24.07	15.20
Friendly	59.75	18.92	53.99	20.01
Good-looking	51.08	22.19	31.02	21.22
Grouchy	37.08	19.64	34.98	15.67
Helpful	57.12	14.50	51.93	18.07
Ignorant	36.86	24.48	25.08	17.73
Independent	62.91	18.45	51.96	22.24
Individualistic	56.82	20.83	39.50	21.69
Interesting	64.22	22.94	52.65	22.62
Lazy	33.25	16.55	20.06	14.38
Masculine	50.63	18.39	39.87	17.27
Materialistic	66.66	23.78	43.64	24.73
Meddlesome	44.69	22.39	26.61	18.65
Moody	53.63	21.96	30.98	21.47
Musical	38.78	20.80	36.68	21.49
Noisy	43.01	20.99	20.47	13.77
Passionate	58.41	21.24	41.38	21.75
Patriotic	67.34	21.37	52.92	24.01
Physically violent	33.72	21.04	21.37	13.93
Pleasure loving	69.82	23.33	52.40	23.71
Prone to use drugs	37.24	19.70	26.75	18.88
Quarrelsome	48.60	18.33	29.02	19.26
Rebellious	38.12	19.43	25.27	16.53
Romantic	46.96	21.11	36.68	21.65
Self-centered	49.50	23.62	33.48	20.78
Self-pitying	42.41	18.81	30.49	21.31
Sexually loose	49.36	23.71	26.45	17.70
Sexually perverse	31.29	21.49	22.12	16.64
Show off	41.36	23.98	26.64	19.60
Shrewd	43.33	18.34	35.16	19.78
Sly	41.21	20.21	32.90	20.71
Sociable	61.70	22.34	44.02	21.02
Suspicious	44.00	22.59	34.26	20.89
Uneducated	30.21	17.48	20.06	16.92
Understanding	51.06	19.25	42.79	19.33
Unpredictable	42.96	22.86	28.12	18.65

Table 14.

EIGENVALUES OF 116 ATTRIBUTES

Attributes That Whites Believe Are Diagnostic of Asians

Factor	Eigenvalue	Pct of Var	Cum Pct
1	20.16843	17.4	17.4
2	15.25130	13.1	30.5
3	5.98887	5.2	35.7
4	4.97088	4.3	40.0
5	4.52133	3.9	43.9
6	4.06003	3.5	47.4
7	3.91073	3.4	50.8
8	3.35947	2.9	53.6
9	3.25260	2.8	56.5
10	2.92798	2.5	59.0
11	2.74954	2.4	61.3
12	2.72678	2.4	63.7
13	2.56278	2.2	65.9
14	2.42678	2.1	68.0
15	2.16565	1.9	69.9
16	2.03215	1.8	71.6
17	1.84173	1.6	73.2
18	1.80258	1.6	74.8
19	1.74184	1.5	76.3
20	1.63449	1.4	77.7
21	1.55498	1.3	79.0
22	1.49864	1.3	80.3
23	1.43174	1.2	81.5
24	1.39942	1.2	82.7
25	1.29195	1.1	83.9
26	1.24358	1.1	84.9
27	1.17745	1.0	85.9
28	1.09190	.9	86.9

African-Americans' personal contact with Hispanics and Asians and their overall feelings for these two groups.

For White respondents, personal contact with both African-Americans (r=.42)[8] and Hispanics (r=.22)[9] was significantly correlated with their prejudice for them. Thus, the hypothesis was supported in terms of these two groups. However, Whites' personal contact with Asians was not significantly correlated with their prejudice for Asians (r=.06). The hypothesis was not supported in terms of Asians. The means and standard deviations for personal contact (for both African-American and White respondents) can be found in Table 15.

Insert Table 15 about here

Hypothesis #2

Respondents who have been exposed to more positive media images of racial groups will have less racial prejudice toward those groups than those who are exposed to less positive media images of those groups.

African-Americans' exposure to Whites via mass media was not significantly correlated with their prejudice for

---

[8] Significant at p < .000.

[9] Significant at p < .01.

Table 15.

Means for Personal Contact

	Mean	Std Dev.
African Americans		
Whites	5.33	1.03
Hispanics	4.67	1.14
Asians	4.55	1.19
Whites		
African-Americans	5.25	1.05
Hispanics	4.36	.89
Asians	4.35	.80

them (r=.12). On the other hand, their exposure to both Hispanics (r=-.26)[10] and Asians (r=-.23)[11] was negatively correlated with their prejudice for them. In terms of African-Americans' media exposure to Whites, the hypothesis was not supported. However, the opposite of what was predicted was found in terms of African-Americans' media exposure and racial prejudice with Hispanics and Asians. More specifically, the more positive media exposure to Hispanics and Asians, the more prejudice African-Americans had for these two groups.

Whites' exposure to African-Americans (r=-.12) and Hispanics (r=-.10) via mass media was not correlated with their prejudice for them. However, there was a negative correlation between Whites' exposure to Asians (r=-.24)[12] and their prejudice for them. Therefore, the hypothesis was not supported in terms of Whites' prejudice for African-Americans and Hispanics and their media exposure to these groups. However, the more exposure to positive media images of Asians, the more prejudice Whites had for them. The means and standard deviations for media exposure (for African-American and White respondents) can be found in Table 16.

---

[10] Significant at $p < .01$.

[11] Significant at $p < .05$.

[12] Significant at $p < .006$.

Insert Table 16 about here

Hypothesis #3

Respondents who have more positive racial/ethnic self-esteem will have more racial prejudice for different racial groups than those who have less positive racial/ethnic self-esteem.

For African-Americans, racial/ethnic self-esteem was not significantly correlated with their racial prejudice for either Whites (r=-.05), Hispanics (r=.08) or Asians (r=.12). Thus, for African-Americans, hypothesis three was not supported. Likewise, Whites' racial/ethnic self-esteem was not significantly correlated with their racial prejudice for African-Americans (r=-.11) or Hispanics (r=-.09). However, Whites' racial/ethnic self-esteem was negatively correlated with their racial prejudice for Asians (r=-.18)[13]. Meaning, the hypothesis was supported in terms of Whites and Asians in that the more positive racial/ethnic self-esteem Whites had, the more prejudice they had for Asians. The means and standard deviations for racial/ethnic self-esteem and racial prejudice (for African-American and White respondents) can be found in Table 17.

---

[13] Significant at $p < .03$.

Table 16.

Means for Media Exposure

	Mean	Std Dev.
African Americans		
Whites	5.47	.99
Hispanics	4.76	1.21
Asians	4.50	1.03
Whites		
African-Americans	6.25	.82
Hispanics	5.48	.57
Asians	5.07	.68

Insert Table 17 about here

Additional Analyses

Gender Differences in Racial Prejudice

For African-American respondents, t-tests revealed a significant gender difference in racial prejudice for Hispanics and Asians. African-American females were much less prejudice towards Hispanics (M=63.47) than their male counterparts (M=50.74), $t(99)=-3.09$, $p < .003$. As well as, African-American females were far less prejudice towards Asians (M=62.60) than African-American males (M=47.96), $t(99)=-3.75$, $p < .000$. There was no significant gender difference between African-American males' (M=52.59) and females' (M=50.65) prejudice towards Whites. And, there were no significant gender differences between White males' and females' prejudice for African-Americans, Hispanics or Asians.

Personal Contact & Media Exposure

African-Americans reported having significantly more positive personal contact with Hispanics (M=4.67) than Whites did (M=4.36), $t(229)=6.00$, $p < .000$. And, African-Americans had significantly more positive personal contact with Asians (M=4.55) than Whites did (M=4.35), $t(229)=6.77$,

Table 17.

Means for Racial Self-Esteem

	Mean	Std Dev.
African Americans		
Racial Self-Esteem	5.58	.63
Whites		
Racial Self-Esteem	4.95	.67

Means for Racial Prejudice

	Mean	Std Dev.
African Americans		
Racial Prejudice for:		
Whites	51.70	22.06
Hispanics	56.60	21.51
Asians	54.70	20.76
Whites		
Racial Prejudice for:		
African-Americans	59.85	21.35
Hispanics	62.69	16.83
Asians	65.53	18.67

$p < .000$. On the other hand, Whites reported having more positive media exposure to Hispanics ($M=5.48$) than African-Americans did ($M=4.76$), $t(229)=11.53$, $p < .000$ and had more positive media exposure to Asians ($M=5.07$) than African-Americans did ($M=4.50$), $t(229)=8.24$, $p < .000$.

Racial/ethnic self-esteem

African-Americans had significantly higher racial/ethnic self-esteem ($M=5.58$) than Whites ($M=4.95$), $t(229)=5.64$, p .000.

Socio-Economic Status & Racial Prejudice

The majority of African-American respondents (79%) felt that their racial group was of a lower socio-economic status compared to Whites. The correlation however between perception of comparative socio-economic status with Whites was not significantly correlated with African-Americans' racial prejudice for Whites when we would have expected this to be true. 69% of these same respondents felt that they were of an equal socio-economic status with Hispanics and 76% felt they were of an equal socio-economic status with Asians. Consequently, there was no significant correlation between African-American's perception of comparative socio-economic status with Hispanics and Asians and their prejudice for them.

On the other hand, 84% of White respondents felt that Whites were of a higher socio-economic status compared to African-Americans and Hispanics while 58% felt that Whites

were of a higher status than Asians. Whites' perception of status difference between Whites and African-Americans was negatively correlated with their racial prejudice for African-Americans (r=-.20)[14]. Meaning, the higher Whites perceive their socio-economic status compared to African-Americans, the less racial prejudice they felt for them. There was no significant correlation between Whites' perception of socio-economic status difference between Hispanics and Asians and their racial prejudice for them.

[14] Significant at $p < .01$.

Chapter 5

The Discussion

We now know what attributes African-Americans believe are characteristic of Whites, Hispanics and Asians. We also know their racial prejudice for these groups. The data in this study both supports and contradicts earlier findings by Guichard and Connolly (1977) in that the African-Americans in their study and the African-Americans in this study both believed that Whites are industrious and cruel. However, unlike the Guichard and Connolly findings, African-Americans in this study did not believe that intelligent, artistic, lazy, shrewd and superstitious were characteristics of Whites. Given the difference in era, the Guichard and Connolly study was conducted in the late seventies whereas this study was conducted in early 1992, the differences in perception of attributes should not be surprising.

Prior to this investigation, there were no studies in the literature on the attributes that made up the stereotype that African-Americans had for Hispanics and Asians. Therefore, this study contributes to stereotype research by documenting these attributes. In addition, the racial prejudice that African-Americans feel for Hispanics and Asians is documented for the first time in this study. It appears that African-Americans feel the most favorable towards Hispanics, followed by Asians and then Whites.

The majority of the attributes that whites identified as being characteristic of African-Americans are identical to the attributes found in earlier studies (see Katz and Braly, 1933; Richards, 1950; Dovidio and Gaertner, 1986 and Stangor et al., 1991) and thus the findings in this study regarding Whites' stereotype of African-Americans replicates past research. Like the attributes found in previous research, most attributes that Whites use to describe African-Americans are overwhelming negative in nature. And, Whites racial prejudice towards African-Americans appears to remain constant at an average of 60 on a prejudice measure both in earlier studies (Converse et al., 1980) and in this present study. The data from this study suggest that African-Americans are more racially prejudice towards Whites than Whites are towards African-Americans.

Generally, the attributes identified in this study are similar to those identified in earlier studies in regards to Whites' stereotype of Hispanics and Asians (see Richards, 1950; Martinez, 1969; Kaplan and Goldman, 1973; Marin, 1983; and Stangor et al., 1991). In terms of Whites' racial prejudice for Hispanics and Asians, earlier research determined that Whites felt most favorable toward Asians, than Hispanics, than African-Americans. The data in this study reflect the same pattern. That is, Whites reported having the least amount of racial prejudice for Asians, then Hispanics and the most racial prejudice for African-

Americans. As Hacker (1992) suggests, African-Americans and Whites simply don't have positive feelings for one another.

In summation, African-Americans felt that Whites were more ambitious, business-wise, competent, imaginative, industrious and sophisticated than African-Americans. In addition, they also felt that Whites were more apt to have criminal tendencies, be cruel, be dirty, ignorant, meddlesome and prone to use drugs compared to African-Americans. In fact, African-Americans in this study believed that twenty-eight "good" and sixteen "bad" attributes were characteristic of Whites. Thus, it seems that African-Americans have a varied impression of Whites and don't view them as overwhelmingly "good" or "bad".

On the other hand, Whites felt that African-Americans were more angry, apt to have criminal tendencies, dirty, physically violent, and sexually perverse. Furthermore, Whites believed African-Americans were athletic, musical, religious and unpredictable. In fact, out of the eighteen characteristics Whites felt "described" African-Americans, fifteen were "bad" attributes. Thus, it seems that compared to African-Americans, Whites have a less varied impression of African-Americans than African-Americans have of them.

This "lopsided" mixture of "good" and "bad" characteristics used to describe each other (i.e, African-Americans & Whites) shouldn't be surprising if we keep in

mind that African-Americans in the United States of America have much more personal contact with Whites than Whites have with African-Americans. Thus, African-Americans have more experience with Whites and these experiences have obviously helped to contribute to the diverse impression African-Americans have of Whites. In fact, the other results of this study support this hypothesis. In that African-Americans indicated their average amount of personal contact with Whites as being much higher that the reported personal contact Whites say they have with African-Americans.

Given the inequitable impressions African-Americans and Whites have of each other based of the unequal amounts of personal contact they have with each other, do African-Americans and Whites share similar impressions of Hispanics and Asians? According to the data in this study, African-Americans have much more personal contact with Hispanics than Whites have with Hispanics. Thus we would expect African-Americans to have a more varied and diverse impression of Hispanics than Whites do. In fact, African-Americans described Hispanics with twenty-two "good" and 9 "bad" characteristics. Whereas Whites described Hispanics with 6 "good" and 4 "bad" characteristics. Again, it seems to bear that as a result of their higher level of personal contact with Hispanics, African-Americans have a more diverse impression of them compared to Whites.

Likewise, African-Americans in this study indicated a

higher level of personal contact with Asians compared to Whites' personal contact with Asians. And, African-Americans described Asians with twenty-seven "good" and 8 "bad" characteristics. On the other hand, Whites described Asians with thirty-four "good" and zero "bad" characteristics. Again, African-Americans have a mixture of good and bad characteristics when they describe Asians while Whites have an overwhelmingly good impression of Asians. It could be that if Whites had more personal contact with Asians and gained more experience with them, their impressions of them would become more reflective of reality, that is, believing Asians as having both good and bad traits.

The relationship between the stereotypes and racial prejudice is less clear. It is apparent that the African-Americans in this study felt far less positive for Hispanics and Asians than Whites felt for them and African-Americans felt far less positive for Whites than Whites felt for African-Americans. It would be easy to think that the more varied one's stereotype is of another group, the more diffused their feelings would be towards that group. For example, given that Whites described Asians with all good attributes, one would expect their prejudice for Asians to be low. In fact, in this study this is exactly what happened. Whites' prejudice for Asians is the <u>lowest</u> compared with their prejudice for either Hispanics or

African-Americans. And, although African-Americans had a mixture of good and bad descriptions of Asians, their prejudice for them was also the lowest compared to their prejudice for Hispanics and Whites.

The explanation for this relationship appears less clear. However, it is the opinion of this author that the high racial prejudice between African-Americans and Whites should not be surprising, nor should it be solely thought of as a function of personal contact. Given the complexity of the relationship between African-Americans and Whites since they first came in contact with each other, the clear reasons for stereotypes and prejudice may never be identified by empirical investigations. Indeed, strip away all cognition and there a lot of bad feelings between African-Americans and Whites that have existed for many generations and have far outlasted any cognition as to why the feelings exist.

The theoretical basis for supposing that positive personal contact with a racial group will lead to a decrease in racial prejudice was based on the previous work of Pettigrew (1981), Stephan and Stephan (1985), Nichols and McAndrew (1990) and others. These researchers suggested that positive personal contact between groups can decrease any negative feelings between members of these groups. However, the data in this study present mixed conclusions.

For African-Americans, positive personal contact with

Whites was indeed a catalyst for more favorable feelings towards Whites. Yet, positive personal contact with Hispanics and Asians made no difference in African-Americans' feelings for them. It may be that since African-Americans in this study had significantly less personal contact with either Hispanics or Asians compared to Whites, the effect of this contact on their feelings for them was not large enough to create a relationship between contact and prejudice. An alternative explanation may be that the size of the population of this study was too small to identify any relationships between personal contact and racial prejudice that may have existed. Thus, the data here suggest a relationship between positive personal contact and racial prejudice exists, depending upon which racial group is evaluation whom.

Social learning theory as proposed by Fazio and Zanna, 1981; Weigel, et al., 1980; and Greenberg, 1986 suggests that being exposed to negative media images of a racial group can help to perpetuate negative feelings towards that group. The data in this study suggest some very interesting findings. In fact, in some instances the opposite of what was predicted was found to be true. For example, for African-Americans, the more exposure to positive media images of Hispanics and Asians, the more racial prejudice they felt for these two groups. This may be a reflection of downward social comparison. In that if African-Americans

view positive images of Hispanics and Asians via mass media, while concurrently viewing negative images of other African-Americans, feelings of resentment and dis-enfranchisement can develop. On the other hand, exposure to positive media images of Whites had no bearing on African-Americans' feelings for Whites.

The same contradictory pattern was found for Whites' exposure to positive media images of Asians. Meaning, the more Whites are exposed to positive media images of Asians, the more prejudiced they have towards them. This unexpected finding could be explained by a possible feeling among Whites that Asians, as a group, are exceeding Whites in terms of academic ability, developing advanced technologies and entrepreneurial success. Thus, any positive portrayal of Asians via mass media can serve to facilitate this negative feeling. On the other hand, Whites' exposure to African-Americans and Hispanics had no influence on Whites feelings towards them.

The idea that individuals who have positive racial/ethnic self-esteem, that is, those who feel good about being a member of their particular racial group, will have more racial prejudice for different racial groups in based on Tajfel and Turner's (1986) social identity theory. They argue that people are motivated to maintain a positive self-esteem which includes the self-esteem as a whole, and self-esteem specifics, like racial/ethnic self-esteem.

According to Tajfel and Turner and Meindel and Lerner (1985), if a person perceives another group as a threat (e.g., perceiving another group is of a higher socio-economic status than one's own), then that person will be motivated to protect his or her group self-esteem (or, in this case racial/ethnic self-esteem) by having negative feelings and thoughts about that group. Having these negative feelings and thoughts creates favorable comparisons between one's own group and the threatening group in an attempt to protect one's group self-esteem.

For African-Americans, the data in this study do not bear out this supposition at all. On the contrary, racial/ethnic self-esteem was not correlated with their prejudice for either Whites, Hispanics or Asians. Even when there was a control for socio-economic status, the same pattern of results materialized. For example, the majority of African-Americans felt they were of a lower socio-economic status compared to Whites. Thus, one would expect African-Americans to view Whites as a threat using Tajfel and Turner's definition of threat. Therefore, one would expect the relationship between racial/ethnic self-esteem and comparative socio-economic status with Whites to be significant. Likewise, since the African-Americans in this study perceive themselves to be of an equal socio-economic status with Hispanics and Asians, these groups are also not perceived as a threat and thus the relationship between

racial/ethnic self-esteem and socio-economic status would not be significant. In fact, the data in this study support this view.

Similar findings were also identified in terms of Whites' racial/ethnic self-esteem and their prejudice for African-Americans and Hispanics. That is, there was no relationship between their racial/ethnic self-esteem and their feelings for these two groups. This is not surprising for an overwhelming majority of the Whites in this study believed they were of a higher socio-economic status than both African-Americans and Hispanics. Thus, a threat did not exist. However, even though over half of the Whites believed they were of a higher socio-economic status than Asians, the relationship between Whites racial/ethnic self-esteem and racial prejudice for Asians was significant. Not only was it significant, an inverse relationship was found. That is, it appears that Whites feel negative towards Asians even though there is no perception of threat, given that Whites believe Asians are of a lower socio-economic status than Whites.

This unexpected relationship could be explained by the same reasons given for why Whites are more prejudice towards Asians the more they are exposed to positive media images of Asians. The disconnect between socio-economic status and prejudice could be reflected in the possible idea that Whites may believe that although they happen to have an

upper hand in terms of socio-economic status, Asians are gaining a very fast and strong foothold in this same status category.

Limitations of Research

There were a few limitations to this study that need to be acknowledged. First, the respondents should not be considered representative samples of the African-American and White populations. Second, the population size of this study (100 African-Americans and 130 Whites) was small enough to inhibit the discovery of possible correlations between the variables under study. And third, it is possible that some of the attributes identified by the social groups questionnaire may be more reflective of respondents' desire to quickly complete the questionnaire without careful consideration of each attribute given that it took respondents over one hour to complete all questions. Thus, the task of rating 116 attributes for five racial groups was quite an arduous task for the respondents. This task presents a limitation in the research because the percentage (%) estimate method is a very time consuming task and places and very heavy burden on the respondent. Another method, such as having respondents self-generate stereotype lists could be employed in future research.

Future research should concentrate on using non-traditional respondents such as Hispanics and Asians in order to identify the stereotypes and racial prejudice they

have for one another, Whites and African-Americans. If this is done, stereotype researchers can begin to paint a holistic picture of the stereotyping and racial prejudice phenomena that includes all racial groups instead of continually making an assumption (as implicit as it may be) that African-Americans and Whites are the only racial groups that matter.

Conclusions

Stereotype and racial prejudice research is now more inclusive with the findings of this study. There exists now indexes of attributes that African-Americans consider characteristic of Whites, Hispanics and Asians. In addition, a barometer of feelings that African-Americans have towards these groups has also been documented. The data in this study also demonstrated that the relationships between personal contact, media exposure, racial/ethnic self-esteem and racial prejudice do exist, yet they exist depending upon which racial group is doing the evaluating and which racial group is being evaluated. Thus, the issue of racial stereotypes and prejudice and the factors that influence them is very complex and deserves further study with larger, more diverse populations.

References

Allport, G. (1954). The nature of prejudice. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley.

Amir, Y. (1976). The role of intergroup contact in change of prejudice and ethnic relations. In P. Katz (Ed.), Towards the elimination of racism. New York: Pergammon Press.

Anderson, N.H., & Barrios, A.A. (1961). Primacy effects in impression formation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 9, 272-279.

Anderson, N.H., & Huber, S. (1963). Effects of concomitant verbal recall on order effects in personality impression formation. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 2, 379-391.

Anderson, N.H., & Jacobson, A. (1965). Effects of stimulus inconsistency and discounting instructions in personality impression formation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2, 531-539.

Apostle, R.A., Glock, C.Y., Piazza, T. & Suelzle, M. (1983). The Anatomy of Racial Attitudes. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, LTD.

Aronson, E., Bridgeman, D.L., Geffner, R. (1978). Interdependent interactions and prosocial behavior. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 12, 16-27.

Bernat, G., & Balch, P. (1979). The Chicano racial attitude measure (CRAM): Results of an initial investigation. American Journal of Community Psychology, 7, 137-146.

Bodenhausen, G.V. (1988). Stereotypic biases in social decision making and memory: Testing process models ofstereotype use. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 726-737.

Brigham, J.C. (1971). Ethnic stereotypes. Psychological Bulletin, 76, 15-38.

Brink, W. & Harris, L. (1964). The Negro Revolution in America. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Brink, W. & Harris, L. (1967). Black and White: A study of U.S. racial attitudes today. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Brown, V., & Geis, F.L. (1984). Turning lead into gold: evaluations of men and women leaders and the alchemy of social consensus. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 978-989.

Bunzel, J.H. (1986). Affirmative re-actions. Public Opinion, 9, 45-49.

Campbell, A., & Schuman, H. (1968). Racial attitudes in fifteen American cities. In Supplemental Studies for the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Washington, D.C.

Campbell, A. (1971). White attitudes toward Black people. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research.

Carmines, E.G. & Zeller, R.A. (1979). Reliability and validity assessment. Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences. J.L. Sullivan (Ed.) Sage publications: Beverly Hills, CA.

Carmines, E.G. & Champagne, R.A. (1990). The changing content of American racial attitudes: A fifty year portrait, Research in Micropolitics, 3, 187-208.

Casas, J.M., Ponterotto, J.G., & Sweeney, M. (1987). Stereotyping the stereotyper: A Mexican-American perspective. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 18 , 1, 45-57.

Case, C.E., & Greeley, A.M., (1990). Attitudes toward racial equality, Humboldt Journal of Social Relations, 16, 1, 67-94.

Clark, M. (1959). Health in the Mexican-American culture: A community study. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Condran, J.G. (1979). Changes in white attitudes towards Blacks: 1963-1977. Public Opinion Quarterly, (Winter), 43, 463-476.

Converse, P.E., Dotson, J.D., Hoag, W.L. & McGee, W.H. (1980). American Social Attitudes Data Sourcebook 1947-1978. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Cook, S.W. (1984). Cooperative interaction in multiethnic contexts. In N. Miller & M. Brewer (Eds.), Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation (pp. 155-185).

New York: Academic Press.

Cook, S.W. (1985). Experimenting on social issues: The case of school desegregation. American Psychologist, 40, 452-460.

Crocker, J., & Luhtanen, R. (1990). Collective self-esteem and ingroup bias. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 1, 60-67.

Cross, W.C., & Maldonado, B. (1971). The counselor, the Mexican-American, and the stereotype. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 6, 1, 27-31.

Darley, J.M., & Gross, P.H. (1983). A hypothesis-confirming bias in labelling effects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 20-33.

Dovidio, J.F., & Gaertner, S.L. (1986). Prejudice, discrimination, and racism: Historical trends and contemporary approaches. In J.F. Dovidio and S.L. Gaertner (Eds.), Prejudice, Discrimination and Racism. Academic Press.

Duncan, S.L. (1976). Differential social perception and attribution of intergroup violence: Testing the lower limits of stereotyping blacks. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 590-598.

Ervin, K.S. & Jackson, L.A. (1990). Personal and racial self-esteem of African-Americans: Facets of social identity. Unpublished manuscript.

Evuleocha, S.U., & Ugbah, S.D. (1989). Stereotypes, counter-

stereotypes, and Black television images in the 1990s. Western Journal of Black Studies, Winter, 13(4), 197-205.

Fairchild, H.H., & Cozens, J.A. (1981). Chicano, Hispanic, or Mexican-Americans: What's in a name? Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 3, 191-198.

Farley, R., Hatchett, S., & Schuman, H. (1979). A note on changes in Black racial attitudes in Detroit: 1968-1976. Social Indicators Research, 6, 439-443.

Fazio, R.H., & Zanna, M.P. (1981). Direct experience and attitude-behavior consistency. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 14, pp. 161-202). New York: Academic Press.

Firebaugh, G., & Davis, K.E. (1988). Trends in anti-black prejudice, 1972-1984: Region and cohort effects. Journal of Sociology, 94, 2, Sept., 251-272.

Fiske, S.T. (1987). Intent and category-based responses. Unpublished manuscript.

Fiske, S.T. (1981). Social cognition and affect. In J. Harvey (Ed.), Cognition, Social Behavior, and the Environment. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Fiske, S.T. (1982). Schema-triggered affect: Applications to social perception. In M.S. Clark & S.T. Fiske (Eds.), Affect and Cognition: The 17th Annual Carnegie Symposium on Cognition. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Fiske, S.T. & Neuberg, S.L. (1990). A continuum model 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, 23. New York: Academic.

Fiske, S.T., & Pavelchak, M.A. (1986). Category based versus piece-meal based affective responses: Developments in schema-triggered affect. In R.M. Sorrentino & E.T. Higgins (Eds.), Handbook of Motivation and Cognition: Foundations of Social Behavior. New York: Guildford Press.

Fiske, S.T., & Taylor, S.E. (1984). Social Cognition. New York: Random House.

Fitzpatrick, J.P. (1971). Puerto Rican Americans (the meaning of migration to the mainland). In M.M. Gordon (Ed.), Ethnic Groups in America Life Series. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Gaertner, S.L., & Dovidio, J.F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In S.L. Gaertner & J.F. Dovidio (Eds.), Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism. Orlando: Academic.

Gaertner, S.L., Mann, J., Murrell, A., & Dovidio, J.F. (1989). Reducing intergroup bias: The benefits of recategorization. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 239-249.

Gilbert, G.M. (1951). Stereotypes persistence and change among college students. Journal of Abnormal and Social

Psychology, 46, 245-254.

Greeley, A.M., & Sheatsley, P.B. (1971). Attitudes toward racial integration. Scientific American, 225, 13-19.

Green, B.F., Jr. (1950). A note on the calculation of weights for maximum battery reliability. Psyckometrika, 15, 57-61.

Greenberg, B. (1986). Minorities and the mass media. In J. Bryant and D. Zillmann (Eds.), Perspectives on Media Effects. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Guichard, C.P., & Connolly, M.A. (1977). Ethnic group stereotypes: A new look at an old problem. The Journal of Negro Education, 46, 344-357.

Hacker, A. (Ed.) (1983). US: A statistical portrait of the American people. New York: Penguin Books.

Hacker, A. (1992). Two Nations: Black and White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal. New York: Ballantine Books.

Hamilton, D.L. (1981). Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hamilton, D.L. (1981c). Illusory correlation as a basis for stereotyping. In D.L. Hamilton (Ed.), Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior, pp. 115-144. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Hamilton, D.L., & Gifford, R.K. (1976). Illusory correlation in interpersonal perception: A cognitive basis of stereotyping judgments, Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 12, 392-407.

Hamilton, D.L., & Rose, T.L. (1980). Illusory correlation and the maintenance of stereotypic beliefs. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 832-845.

Hamilton, D.L., Dugan, P.M., & Trolier, T.K. (1985). The formation of stereotypic beliefs: further evidence for distinctiveness-based illusory correlations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 5-17.

Hamilton, D.L., & Trolier, T.K. (1986). Stereotypes and stereotyping: An overview of the cognitive approach. In J.F. Dovidio & S.L. Gaertner (Eds.), Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism: Theory and Research. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Harding, J., Proshansky, H., Kutner, B., & Chein, I. (1969). Prejudice and ethnic relations. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson, (Eds.), Handbook of Social Psychology, (Vol 5.), 2nd Ed. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hepworth, J.T., & West, S.G. (1988). Lynchings and the economy: A time-series reanalysis of Hovland and Sears (1940). Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 239-247.

Hewstone, M., & Jaspers, J.M.F. (1982). Social dimensions of attribution. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), The Social Dimension: European Developments in Social Psychology, pp. 379-404. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hewstone, M., & Jaspers, J.M.F. (1982). Intergroup relations and attribution processes, In H. Tajfel (Ed.), Social

Identity and intergroup relations. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Higgins, E.T., & Bargh, J.A. (1987). Social cognition and social perception. Annual Review of Psychology, 38, 369-425.

Hogg, M.A., & Abrams, D. (1988). Social identification: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hovland, C.I., & Sears, R.R. (1940). Minor studies in aggression: VI. Correlation of lynchings with economic indices. Journal of Social Issues, 33, 190-221.

Hyman, H.H. (1954). Interviewing in Social Research. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Hyman, H.H., & Sheatsley, P.B. (1956). Attitudes towards desegregation. Scientific American, 195, 35-39.

Hyman, H.H., & Sheatsley, P.B. (1964). Attitudes towards desegregation. Scientific American, 211, 16-23.

Jackson, L.A., Bodenhausen, G.V., Hodge, C., Ervin, K. & Sheppard, L. (1991). Social Groups Perception Survey. Unpublished.

Johnson, G.B. (1950). The origin and development of the Spanish attitude toward the Anglo and the Anglo attitude toward the Spanish. Journal of Educational Psychology, 41, 428-439.

Johnson, P.A., Burgess, D.L., Berman, P.A., Porter, G.J. & Frazier, A. (1983). Asian and Pacific Islander

Population by State: 1980. U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census: Washington, D.C..

Jhally, S., & Lewis, J. (1992). Unpublished manuscript. University of Massachusetts.

Jones, E.E., Wood, G.C., & Quattrone, G.A. (1981b). Perceived variability of personal characteristics in-groups and out-groups: The role of knowledge and evaluation. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 7, 523-528.

Jones, E.E., Farina, A., Hastork, A.H., Markus, H., Miller, D.T., & Scott, R.A. (1984). Social stigma: The psychology of marked relationships. New York: W. H. Freeman.

Jones, E.E., & Goethals, G.R. (1987). Order effects in impression formation: Attribution context and the nature of the entity. In E.E. Jones, D.E. Kanouse, H.H. Kelley, R.E. Hisbett, S. Valins, & B. Weiner (Eds.), Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior (pp. 27-46). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kaplan, R.M., & Goldman, R.D. (1973). Interracial perception among Black, White and Mexican-American high school students, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 28, 383-389.

Karlins, M., Coffman, T.L., & Walters, G. (1969). On the fading of social stereotypes: Studies of three generations of college students. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 13, 1-16.

Katz, D., & Braly, K. (1933). Racial stereotypes of one hundred college students. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 28, 280-290.

Katz, I., & Glass, D.C. (1979). An ambivalence-amplification theory of behavior toward the stigmatized. In W. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Kinder, D.R., & Rhodeback, L.A. (1982). "Continuities in support for racial equality, 1972-1976". Public Opinion Quarterly, 46, 195-215.

Kinder, D.R., & Sanders, L.M. (1987). Pluralistic foundations of American opinion on race. Prepared for the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois, September.

Lalonde, R.N., & Gardner, R.C. (1989). An intergroup perspective on stereotype organization and processing. British Journal of Social Psychology, 28, 289-303.

Lam, F.K.S. (1986). Suburban residential segregation of Chinese and Japanese Americans 1960, 1970, and 1980. Sociology and Social Research, 70, 4, July, 263-265.

Lambert, W.E., & Taylor, D.M. (1988). Assimilation vs. multiculturalism: The views of urban Americans, Sociological Forum, 3,1, Winter, 72-88.

Landy, D. (1959). Tropical Childhood: Cultural Transmission and Learning in a Rural Puerto Rican Village. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press.

Leong, F.T.L., & Hayes, T.J. (1990). Occupational stereotyping of Asian Americans. The Career Development Quarterly, 39, 143-155.

Linville, P.W., Salovey, P., & Fischer, G.W. (1986). Stereotyping and perceived distributions of social characteristics: An application to in-group outgroup perception. In J.F. Dovidio & S.L. Gaertner (Eds.), Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism. pp. 165-208. New York: Academic Press.

Linville, P.W., Fischer, G.W., & Salovey, P. (1989). Perceived distributions of the characteristics on in-group and out-group members: Empirical evidence and a computer simulation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 165-188.

Lipset, S.M., & Schneider, W. (1978). The Bakke case: How would it be decided at the Bar of Public Opinion? Public Opinion, 1, 38-44.

Loftus, G.R., & Loftus, E.F. (1976). Human Memory: The Processing of Information. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erblaum Associates.

Lord, F.M., & Novick, M.R. (1968). Statistical Theories of Mental Test Scores. (pages 123-124). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of ones's social identity. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18, 302-318.

Marin, G. (1982). The effects of labels on anglos' perceptions of Chicanos. Paper presented at the Second Symposium on Chicano Psychology, Riverside, California, March.

Marin, G. (1984). Stereotyping Hispanics: The differential effect of research method , label, and degree of contact. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 8, 17-27.

Martinez, T.M. (1969). Advertising and racism: The case of the Mexican-American. El Grito, 2, 3-13.

Marx, G.T. (1967). Protest and Prejudice. New York: Harper and Row.

McCauley, C., & Stitt, C.L. (1978). An individual and quantitative measure of stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 689-703.

McConahay, J.B., Hardee, B.B., & Batts, V. (1981). "Has racism declined in America? It depends on who is asking and what is asked." Journal of Conflict Resolution, 25, 563-579.

McKelvie, S.J. (1990). The Asch primacy effect: Robust but not infallible. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 5(4), 135-150.

Meindl, J.R., & Lerner, M.J. (1985). Exacerbation of extreme responses to an outgroup. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47, 71-84.

Mosier, C.I. (1943). On the reliability of weighted

composites. Psyckometrika, 8, 161-168.

Mydral, G. (1944). An American dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy. 2 Vols., New York: Random House.

Nichols, K., & McAndrew, F.T. (1990). Stereotyping and autostereotyping in Spanish, Malaysian, and American college students. Journal of Social Psychology, 124(2), 179-189.

Ogletree, E.J., & Ujlaki, V.E. (1985). American Hispanics in a pluralistic society, Migration Today, 13, 3, 31-34.

Peel, E.A. (1948). Prediction of a complex criterion and battery reliability. British Journal of Psychology, 1, 84-94.

Pettigrew, T.F. (1981). Extending the stereotype concept. In D.L. Hamilton (Ed.), Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior (pp. 303-331). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pinkey, A. (1963). Prejudice toward Mexican and Negro Americans: A comparison. Phylon, 24, 353-359.

Portes, A., Parker, R.N., & Corbas, J.A. (1980). Assimilation or consciousness: Perceptions of U.S. society among recent Latin American immigrants to the U.S. Social Forces, 59, 200-224.

Purdy, D.A. & Edmonds, M.M. (1988). Minority stereotyping by college freshmen. Student Affairs Office, Bowling Green State University, Ohio, 43403. Paper presented at the 1988 annual meeting of the North Central Sociological

Association. April 14-17, Pittsburgh, PA.

Quattrone, G.A. (1986). On the perception of a groups' variability. In S. Worchel & W.G. Austin (Eds.), Psychology of Intergroup Relations (2nd ed.). Chicago, Ill: Nelson Hall.

Rajecki, D.J. (1989). Attitudes (2nd ed.). Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates.

Richards, E.S. (1950). Attitudes of college students in the Southwest toward ethnic groups in the United States. Sociology and Social Research, 35, 22-30.

Riordan, C.A. (1978). Equal-status interracial contact: A review and revision of a concept. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 2, 161-185.

Rosch, E. & Lloyd, B. (Eds.) (1978). Cognition and Categorization. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Rothbart, M., Dawes, R., & Park, B. (1984). Stereotyping and sampling biases in intergroup perception. In R. Eiser (Ed.), Attitudinal Judgment. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Rothbart, M., & John, O.P. (1985). Social categorization and behavioral episodes: A cognitive analysis of the effects of intergroup contact. Journal of Social Issues, 41, 81-104.

Rovner, R., & Sedlacek, W.E. (1974). The study of a simplified version of the situational attitude scale (SAS). Cultural Study Center Report, 7-14. College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Sager, H.A., & Schofield, J.W. (1980). Racial and behavioral cues in black and white children's perceptions of ambiguously aggressive acts. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 590-598.

Schaller, M., & Maas, A. (1989). Illusory correlation and social categorization: Toward an integration of motivational and cognitive factors in stereotyping formation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56, 709-721.

Schuman, H., & Converse, J.M. (1971). The effects of Black and White interviewers on Black responses in 1968. Public Opinion Quarterly, 35, 46-68.

Schuman, H., & Hatchett, S. (1974). Black Racial Attitudes: Trends and Complexities. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Schuman, H., Steeh, C., & Bobo, L. (1988). Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations. In J.A. Davis & J. Modell (Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Seggar, J.F., Hafen, J., & Hannonen-Gladden, H. (1981). Television's portrayals of minorities and women in drama and comedy drama, 1971-1980. Journal of Broadcasting, 25(3), 277-288.

Sherif, M., Harvey, O.J., While, B.J., Hood, W.E., & Sherif, C.W. (1961). Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The

Robbers cave experiment. Norman, OK: Institute of Group Relations.

Simmons, O.G. (1961). The mutual images and expectations of Anglo-Americans and Mexican-Americans, Deadalus, 90, 2, 286-299.

Slusher, M.P., & Anderson, C.A. (1987). When reality monitoring fails: The role of imagination in stereotyping maintenance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 653-662.

Smith, T.W., & Sheatsley, P.B. (1984). American attitudes toward race relations. Public Opinion Quarterly, 44, 171-175.

Snidereman, P.M., & Hagen, M. (1985). Race and inequality. New York: Chatham House.

Stangor, C., Sullivan, L.A., & Ford, T.E. (1991). Affective and cognitive determinants of prejudice. Social Cognition. In press.

Stangor, C., Lynch, L., Duan, C., Glas, B. (1992). Categorization of individuals on the basis of multiple social features. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 62(2), Feb, 207-218.

Staples, R. (1987). Black make genocide: A final solution to the race problem in America, The Black Scholar, 18, 3, May-June, 2-11.

Stephan, W.G. (1985). Intergroup relations. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. 3,

pp. 599-658. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Stephan, W.G., & Stephan, C.W. (1985). Intergroup Anxiety. Journal of Social Issues, 41, 157-175.

Stevenson, H.W., Chen, C., & Uttal, D.H. (1990). Beliefs and achievement: A study of Black, White, and Hispanic children. Child Development, 61, 508-523.

Tajfel, H. (1981). Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. Annual Review of Psychology, 33, 1-39.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1986). The social identity theory of inter-group behavior. In S. Worchel & W.G. Austin (Eds.), Psychology of Intergroup Relations. 2nd Ed. Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.

Tajfel, H., & Wilkes, A.L. (1963). Classification and quantitative judgment. British Journal of Psychology, 54, 101-114.

Taylor, S.E. (1981). A categorization approach to stereotyping, In D. Hamilton (Ed.), Cognitive Processes in Stereotyping and Intergroup Behavior. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Taylor, S.E. & Crocker, J. (1981). Schematic bases of social information processing. In E.T. Higgins, C.P. Herman, & M.P. Zanna Social Cognition: The Ontario Symposium (Vol 1.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Taylor, D.G., Sheatsley, P.B., & Greeley, A. (1978). Attitudes toward integration. Scientific American, 238, 42-49.

Taylor, S.E., & Falcone, H. (1982). Cognitive basis for stereotyping: The relationship between categorization and prejudice. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8, 426-432.

Thomson, G.H. (1940). Weighting for battery reliability and prediction. British Journal of Psychology, 30, 357-366.

Totti, X.F. (1987). The making of a Latino ethnic identity, Dissent, 34, 4, Fall, 537-542.

Trandis, H.C., Lisansky, J., Setiadi, B., Marin, G., & Betancourt, H. (1982). Stereotyping among Hispanics and Anglos: The uniformity, intensity, direction, and quality of auto- and heterostereotypes. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 13(4), 409-426.

Turner, J.C., Hogg, M.A., Oakes, P.J., Reicher, S.D., Wetherell, M.S. (1987). Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory. Oxford, England: Blackwell.

White, R.K. (1977). Misperception in the Arab-Israeli conflict. Journal of Social Issues, 33, 190-221.

Wilder, D.A. (1981). Perceiving persons as a group: Categorization and intergroup relations. In D.L. Hamilton (Ed.), Cognitive Processes in Stereotyping and Intergroup Behavior, pp. 213-257. Hillsdale, N.J.:

Erlbaum.

Wilder, D.A. (1984). Intergroup contact: The typical member and the exception to the rule. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 20, 177-194.

Wilder, D.A. (1986). Social categorization: Implications for creation and reduction of intergroup bias. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (pp. 291-355). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Wilder, D.A. (1987b). Perceiving persons as a group: Effects on attributions of causality and beliefs. Social Psychology, 1, 13-23.

Williams, J.A. (1964). Interviewer-respondent interaction: A study of bias in the information interview. Sociometry, Vol. 27, 338-352.

Wong, M.G. (1990). The education of White, Chinese, Filipino, and Japanese students: A look at high school and beyond, Sociological Perspectives, 33, 3, Fall, 355-374.

Wyer, R.S., Jr. (1988). Social memory and social judgment. In P.R. Solomon, G.R. Goethals, C.M. Kelley, & B.R. Stephens (Eds.), Perspectives on memory research. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Zanna, M.P., Haddock, G., & Esses, V.N. (1990). The nature of prejudice. Paper presented at the Nags Head conference on "Stereotypes and Intergroup Relations", Nags Head Conference Center, Kill Devil Hills, North Carolina, June 25-30, 1990.

APPENDIX A

SOCIAL GROUP CHARACTERISTICS QUESTIONNAIRE

(SECTION 1)

Instructions: We are interested in the characteristics that people associate with members of various groups in the United States. In particular, we are interested in the percentage of group members that you believe have the characteristics listed on the following pages. Your task is to indicate the percentage of **Hispanics, Asians, Black/African-Americans**, and **Whites** that **you think** have these characteristics.

For example, take the characteristic "overweight". If you think that about 25% of all Black/African-Americans are overweight, you would write a 25% next to this characteristic. If you think that only 10% of members of this group are overweight, you would write 10% next to this characteristic.

There are no right or wrong answers. We are interested only in your beliefs about the percentage of Hispanics, Asians, Black/African-Americans, and Whites that have these characteristics. There is a separate questionnaire for each group. Your honest opinion is most appreciate.

Indicate the percentage (%) of **Hispanics** that you think have the following characteristics:

Characteristic	(%)	Characteristic	(%)
lazy	_____	religious	_____
superstitious	_____	materialistic	_____
productive	_____	ignorant	_____
conservative	_____	competitive	_____
musical	_____	passionate	_____
strong family commitment	_____	high moral character	_____
poor	_____	unpredictable	_____
proud	_____	meddlesome	_____
aggressive	_____	contented	_____
anxious	_____	imaginative	_____
good-natured	_____	uneducated	_____
pleasure loving	_____	effeminate	_____
militant	_____	rigid/inflexible	_____
optimistic	_____	feminine	_____
tradition-loving	_____	business-wise	_____
reliable	_____	quarrelsome	_____
sexually loose	_____	assertive	_____
sociable	_____	dependable	_____
defensive	_____	fair-minded	_____
ambitious	_____	flamboyant	_____
polite/ well-mannered	_____	eccentric	_____
fearful	_____	old-fashioned	_____
athletic	_____	rebellious	_____

independent	_____	quiet	_____
physically violent	_____	intelligent	_____
interesting	_____	sophisticated	_____
artistic	_____	persevering	_____
active/energetic	_____	honest/trustworthy	_____
sly/cunning	_____	prone to use drugs	_____
self-centered	_____	good-looking	_____
criminal tendencies	_____	mercenary/grasping	_____
understanding	_____	forgetful	_____
self-disciplined	_____	masculine	_____
plans ahead	_____	competent	_____
sexually perverse	_____	emotional	_____
dirty/smelly	_____	suspicious	_____
show-off	_____	friendly	_____
wise	_____	well-adjusted	_____
reserved	_____	dependent	_____
irresponsible	_____	moody	_____
conscientious	_____	shrewd	_____
progressive	_____	grouchy	_____
efficient	_____	romantic	_____
individualistic	_____	thrifty	_____
deceitful/devious	_____	cooperative	_____
shy	_____	imaginative	_____
noisy/loud	_____	cruel	_____
realistic	_____	stingy	_____

helpful	_____	grateful	_____
self-sacrificing	_____	prompt	_____
bossy/demanding	_____	generous	_____
patriotic	_____	trusting	_____
friendly	_____	self-pitying	_____
industrious	_____	mediative	_____
prosperous	_____	isolated/lonely	_____
democratic	_____	angry	_____
knowledgeable	_____	progressive	_____
hardworking	_____	cultured	_____
alert	_____	happy-go-lucky	_____
devout	_____	logical	_____

Indicate the percentage (%) of **Asians** that you think have the following characteristics:

Characteristic	(%)	Characteristic	(%)
lazy	_____	religious	_____
superstitious	_____	materialistic	_____
productive	_____	ignorant	_____
conservative	_____	competitive	_____
musical	_____	passionate	_____
strong family commitment	_____	high moral character	_____
poor	_____	unpredictable	_____
proud	_____	meddlesome	_____
aggressive	_____	contented	_____
anxious	_____	imaginative	_____
good-natured	_____	uneducated	_____
pleasure loving	_____	effeminate	_____
militant	_____	rigid/inflexible	_____
optimistic	_____	feminine	_____
tradition-loving	_____	business-wise	_____
reliable	_____	quarrelsome	_____
sexually loose	_____	assertive	_____
sociable	_____	dependable	_____
defensive	_____	fair-minded	_____
ambitious	_____	flamboyant	_____
polite/ well-mannered	_____	eccentric	_____
fearful	_____	old-fashioned	_____
athletic	_____	rebellious	_____

independent	_____	quiet	_____
physically violent	_____	intelligent	_____
interesting	_____	sophisticated	_____
artistic	_____	persevering	_____
active/energetic	_____	honest/trustworthy	_____
sly/cunning	_____	prone to use drugs	_____
self-centered	_____	good-looking	_____
criminal tendencies	_____	mercenary/grasping	_____
understanding	_____	forgetful	_____
self-disciplined	_____	masculine	_____
plans ahead	_____	competent	_____
sexually perverse	_____	emotional	_____
dirty/smelly	_____	suspicious	_____
show-off	_____	friendly	_____
wise	_____	well-adjusted	_____
reserved	_____	dependent	_____
irresponsible	_____	moody	_____
conscientious	_____	shrewd	_____
progressive	_____	grouchy	_____
efficient	_____	romantic	_____
individualistic	_____	thrifty	_____
deceitful/devious	_____	cooperative	_____
shy	_____	imaginative	_____
noisy/loud	_____	cruel	_____
realistic	_____	stingy	_____

helpful	_____	grateful	_____
self-sacrificing	_____	prompt	_____
bossy/demanding	_____	generous	_____
patriotic	_____	trusting	_____
friendly	_____	self-pitying	_____
industrious	_____	mediative	_____
prosperous	_____	isolated/lonely	_____
democratic	_____	angry	_____
knowledgeable	_____	progressive	_____
hardworking	_____	cultured	_____
alert	_____	happy-go-lucky	_____
devout	_____	logical	_____

Indicate the percentage (%) of **Black/African-Americans** that you think have the following characteristics:

Characteristic	(%)	Characteristic	(%)
lazy	_____	religious	_____
superstitious	_____	materialistic	_____
productive	_____	ignorant	_____
conservative	_____	competitive	_____
musical	_____	passionate	_____
strong family commitment	_____	high moral character	_____
poor	_____	unpredictable	_____
proud	_____	meddlesome	_____
aggressive	_____	contented	_____
anxious	_____	imaginative	_____
good-natured	_____	uneducated	_____
pleasure loving	_____	effeminate	_____
militant	_____	rigid/inflexible	_____
optimistic	_____	feminine	_____
tradition-loving	_____	business-wise	_____
reliable	_____	quarrelsome	_____
sexually loose	_____	assertive	_____
sociable	_____	dependable	_____
defensive	_____	fair-minded	_____
ambitious	_____	flamboyant	_____
polite/ well-mannered	_____	eccentric	_____
fearful	_____	old-fashioned	_____
athletic	_____	rebellious	_____

independent	_____	quiet	_____
physically violent	_____	intelligent	_____
interesting	_____	sophisticated	_____
artistic	_____	persevering	_____
active/energetic	_____	honest/trustworthy	_____
sly/cunning	_____	prone to use drugs	_____
self-centered	_____	good-looking	_____
criminal tendencies	_____	mercenary/grasping	_____
understanding	_____	forgetful	_____
self-disciplined	_____	masculine	_____
plans ahead	_____	competent	_____
sexually perverse	_____	emotional	_____
dirty/smelly	_____	suspicious	_____
show-off	_____	friendly	_____
wise	_____	well-adjusted	_____
reserved	_____	dependent	_____
irresponsible	_____	moody	_____
conscientious	_____	shrewd	_____
progressive	_____	grouchy	_____
efficient	_____	romantic	_____
individualistic	_____	thrifty	_____
deceitful/devious	_____	cooperative	_____
shy	_____	imaginative	_____
noisy/loud	_____	cruel	_____
realistic	_____	stingy	_____

helpful	_____	grateful	_____
self-sacrificing	_____	prompt	_____
bossy/demanding	_____	generous	_____
patriotic	_____	trusting	_____
friendly	_____	self-pitying	_____
industrious	_____	mediative	_____
prosperous	_____	isolated/lonely	_____
democratic	_____	angry	_____
knowledgeable	_____	progressive	_____
hardworking	_____	cultured	_____
alert	_____	happy-go-lucky	_____
devout	_____	logical	_____

Indicate the percentage (%) of **Whites** that you think have the following characteristics:

Characteristic	**(%)**	**Characteristic**	**(%)**
lazy	_____	religious	_____
superstitious	_____	materialistic	_____
productive	_____	ignorant	_____
conservative	_____	competitive	_____
musical	_____	passionate	_____
strong family commitment	_____	high moral character	_____
poor	_____	unpredictable	_____
proud	_____	meddlesome	_____
aggressive	_____	contented	_____
anxious	_____	imaginative	_____
good-natured	_____	uneducated	_____
pleasure loving	_____	effeminate	_____
militant	_____	rigid/inflexible	_____
optimistic	_____	feminine	_____
tradition-loving	_____	business-wise	_____
reliable	_____	quarrelsome	_____
sexually loose	_____	assertive	_____
sociable	_____	dependable	_____
defensive	_____	fair-minded	_____
ambitious	_____	flamboyant	_____
polite/ well-mannered	_____	eccentric	_____
fearful	_____	old-fashioned	_____
athletic	_____	rebellious	_____

independent	_____	quiet	_____
physically violent	_____	intelligent	_____
interesting	_____	sophisticated	_____
artistic	_____	persevering	_____
active/energetic	_____	honest/trustworthy	_____
sly/cunning	_____	prone to use drugs	_____
self-centered	_____	good-looking	_____
criminal tendencies	_____	mercenary/grasping	_____
understanding	_____	forgetful	_____
self-disciplined	_____	masculine	_____
plans ahead	_____	competent	_____
sexually perverse	_____	emotional	_____
dirty/smelly	_____	suspicious	_____
show-off	_____	friendly	_____
wise	_____	well-adjusted	_____
reserved	_____	dependent	_____
irresponsible	_____	moody	_____
conscientious	_____	shrewd	_____
progressive	_____	grouchy	_____
efficient	_____	romantic	_____
individualistic	_____	thrifty	_____
deceitful/devious	_____	cooperative	_____
shy	_____	imaginative	_____
noisy/loud	_____	cruel	_____
realistic	_____	stingy	_____

helpful	_____	grateful	_____
self-sacrificing	_____	prompt	_____
bossy/demanding	_____	generous	_____
patriotic	_____	trusting	_____
friendly	_____	self-pitying	_____
industrious	_____	mediative	_____
prosperous	_____	isolated/lonely	_____
democratic	_____	angry	_____
knowledgeable	_____	progressive	_____
hardworking	_____	cultured	_____
alert	_____	happy-go-lucky	_____
devout	_____	logical	_____

APPENDIX B

PERSONAL CONTACT QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: We are interested in your relationships with people from different racial groups (these relationships include both work and social relations). There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. We are interested in only in your honest thoughts about your relationships with others from different racial groups.

Please indicate your answers to the following questions:

---

1. Indicate the amount of contact you have with African-Americans:

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Very Low Medium
High

2. Indicate the amount of contact you have with Hispanics:

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Very Low Medium
High

3. Indicate the amount of contact you have with Asians:

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Very Low Medium
High

4. Think about your prior interactions with African-Americans and answer the following question: "My prior interactions with African-Americans have been....."

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Conflict Free Neutral
High Conflict

5. Think about your prior interactions with Hispanics and answer the following question: "My prior interactions with Hispanics have been....."

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Conflict Free Neutral
High Conflict

6. Think about your prior interactions with Asians and answer the following question: "In general, my prior interactions with Asians have been....."

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Conflict Free Neutral
High Conflict

7. Think about the 'rules' for behavior that your racial group has for interacting with people from different racial groups. Please indicate whether or not your racial group has formal/structured rules for interacting with African-Americans.

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

No Formal/Structured Rules
Formal/Structured Rules

8. Think about the 'rules' for behavior that your racial group has for interacting with people from different racial groups. Please indicate whether or not your racial group has formal/structured rules for interacting with Hispanics.

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

No Formal/Structured Rules
Formal/Structured Rules

9. Think about the 'rules' for behavior that your racial group has for interacting with people from different racial groups. Please indicate whether or not your racial group has formal/structured rules for interacting with Asians.

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

No Formal/Structured Rules
Formal/Structured Rules

10. Think about the physical contact you have had with African-American persons. Overall, how would you rate this contact?

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Negative Neutral
Positive

11. Think about the physical contact you have had with Hispanic persons. Has this contact been more negative? more positive?

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Negative Neutral
Positive

12. Think about the physical contact you have had with Asian persons. Has this contact been more negative? more positive?

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Negative Neutral
Positive

13. Think about those people in your own racial group who are significantly important to you (e.g., your parents, brothers, sisters, teachers, etc.). In general, what do you believe their attitudes are towards interacting with African-Americans?

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Negative Neutral Positive

14. Think about those people in your own racial group that are significantly important to you (e.g., your parents, brothers, sisters, teachers, etc.). In general, what do you believe their attitudes are towards interacting with Hispanics?

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Negative Neutral
Positive

15. Think about those people in your own racial group that are significantly important to you (e.g., your parents, brothers, sisters, teachers, etc.). In general, what do you believe their attitudes are towards interacting with Asians?

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Negative Neutral
Positive

16. Think about the status (e.g., social, economical, political) your racial group has in the United States. Compared to African-Americans, indicate your racial group's status difference.

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Of Lower Status Of Equal Status Of Higher Status

17. Think about the status (e.g., social, economical, political) your racial group has in the United States. Compared to Hispanics, indicate your racial group's status difference.

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Of Lower Status Of Equal Status Of Higher Status

18. Think about the status (e.g., social, economical, political) your racial group has in the United States. Compared to Asians, indicate your racial group's status difference.

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Of Lower Status Of Equal Status Of Higher Status

APPENDIX C

MEDIA CONTACT QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: We are interested in your exposure to different racial/ethnic groups in the mass media. Mass media include television, films, newspapers and magazines. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. We are interested only in your honest thoughts about the media's presentation of different racial groups.

Please indicate your answers to the following questions:

---

1. Indicate the amount of exposure you have to African-Americans in the mass media.

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Very Low Medium
High

2. Indicate the amount of exposure you have to Hispanics in the mass media.

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Very Low Medium
High

3. Indicate the amount of exposure you have to Asians in the mass media.

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Very Low Medium
High

4. Think about the interactions you've seen in the media between African-Americans and your own racial group. In your opinion, are these interactions typically ....."

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Conflict Free Neutral
High Conflict

5. Think about the interactions you've seen in the media between Hispanics and your own racial group. In your opinion, are these interactions typically....."

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Conflict Free Neutral
High Conflict

6. Think about the interactions you've seen in the media between Asians and your own racial group. In your opinion, are these interactions typically....."

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Conflict Free Neutral
High Conflict

7. Think about your own personal opinions of how African-Americans are as a group. In your opinion, are media images of African-Americans in agreement or in disagreement with your personal opinions of this group?

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Disagreement
Agreement

8. Think about your own personal opinions of how Hispanics are as a group. In your opinion, are media images of Hispanics in agreement or in disagreement with your personal opinions of this group?

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Disagreement
Agreement

9. Think about your own personal opinions of how Asians are as a group. In your opinion, are media images of Asians in agreement or in disagreement with your personal opinions of this group?

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Disagreement
Agreement

10. Think about the way the media depicts physical contact between African-Americans and your racial group. In your opinion, is the contact usually depicted in the media as.....?

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

No Conflict Some Conflict
Conflict

11. Think about the way the media depicts physical contact between Hispanics and your racial group. In your opinion, is the contact unusually depicted in the media as.....?

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

No Conflict Some Conflict
Conflict

12. Think about the way the media depicts physical contact between Asians and your racial group. In your opinion, is the contact usually depicted in the media as.....?

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

No Conflict Some Conflict
Conflict

13. Think about those people in your own racial group who are significantly important to you (e.g., your parents, brothers, sisters, teachers, etc.). In general, what do you believe their attitudes are towards the media's presentations of African-Americans?

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Negative Neutral Positive

14. Think about those people in your own racial group who are significantly important to you (e.g., your parents, brothers, sisters, teachers, etc.). In general, what do you believe their attitudes are towards the media's presentations of Hispanics?

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Negative Neutral Positive

15. Think about those people in your own racial group who are significantly important to you (e.g., your parents, brothers, sisters, teachers, etc.). In general, what do you believe their attitudes are towards the media's presentations of Asians?

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Negative Neutral Positive

16. Think about the status (e.g., social, economical, political) your racial group has in the United States. Compared to the way African-Americans are presented in the media, indicate your racial group's status.

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Of Lower Status Of Equal Status Of Higher Status

17. Think about the status (e.g., social, economical, political) your racial group has in the United States. Compared to the way Hispanics are presented in the media, indicate your racial group's status.

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Of Lower Status Of Equal Status Of Higher Status

18. Think about the status (e.g., social, economical, political) your racial group has in the United States. Compared to the way Asians are presented in the media, indicate your racial group's status.

1 5 9
I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I----------I

Of Lower Status Of Equal Status Of Higher Status

APPENDIX D

EVALUATION THERMOMETER SCALE

Instructions: We are interested in people's overall evaluations of various groups in the United States. Below you will see something that looks like a thermometer. You will use this thermometer to indicate your overall evaluation of various racial groups (including your own racial group). Here's how it works.

If you have a favorable evaluation of a group you would give the group a score somewhere between 50° and 100° depending on how favorable your evaluation is (higher numbers indicate greater favorability). If your overall evaluation of a group is unfavorable, you would give the group a score somewhere between 0° and 50°, depending on how unfavorable you feel about the group (lower numbers indicate greater unfavorability).

Feel free to use any number between 0° and 100° to indicate the degree of favorability or unfavorability of your evaluations of different racial groups (Including your own racial group). Please be honest. Remember that your responses are anonymous and confidential.

Using the thermometer below, circle the number between 0 and 100 to indicate your overall evaluation of: **Whites** as a group.

POSITIVE	100°	Extremely Favorable
	90°	Very Favorable
	80°	Quite Favorable
	70°	Fairly Favorable
	60°	Slightly Favorable
	50°	Neither Favorable nor Unfavorable
	40°	Slightly Unfavorable
	30°	Fairly Favorable
	20°	Quite Unfavorable
	10°	Very Unfavorable
NEGATIVE	0°	Extremely Unfavorable

Evaluation Thermometer Page Two

Using the thermometer below, circle the number between 0 and 100 to indicate your overall evaluation of: **African-Americans** as a group.

POSITIVE	100°	Extremely Favorable
	90°	Very Favorable
	80°	Quite Favorable
	70°	Fairly Favorable
	60°	Slightly Favorable
	50°	Neither Favorable nor Unfavorable
	40°	Slightly Unfavorable
	30°	Fairly Favorable
	20°	Quite Unfavorable
	10°	Very Unfavorable
NEGATIVE	0°	Extremely Unfavorable

Evaluation Thermometer Page Three

Using the thermometer below, circle the number between 0 and 100 to indicate your overall evaluation of: **Hispanics** as a group.

POSITIVE	100°	Extremely Favorable
	90°	Very Favorable
	80°	Quite Favorable
	70°	Fairly Favorable
	60°	Slightly Favorable
	50°	Neither Favorable nor Unfavorable
	40°	Slightly Unfavorable
	30°	Fairly Favorable
	20°	Quite Unfavorable
	10°	Very Unfavorable
NEGATIVE	0°	Extremely Unfavorable

Evaluation Thermometer Page Four

Using the thermometer below, circle the number between 0 and 100 to indicate your overall evaluation of: **Asians** as a group.

POSITIVE	100°	Extremely Favorable
	90°	Very Favorable
	80°	Quite Favorable
	70°	Fairly Favorable
	60°	Slightly Favorable
	50°	Neither Favorable nor Unfavorable
	40°	Slightly Unfavorable
	30°	Fairly Favorable
	20°	Quite Unfavorable
	10°	Very Unfavorable
NEGATIVE	0°	Extremely Unfavorable

APPENDIX E

COLLECTIVE SELF-ESTEEM SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS: We are all members of different social groups or social categories. Some of such social groups or categories pertain to gender, race, religion, nationality, ethnicity, and socioeconomic class. We would like you to consider your membership in your **racial group only** and respond to the following statements on the basis of how you feel about this group and your membership in it. There are no right or wrong answers to any of these statements; we are interested in your honest reactions and opinions. Please read each statement carefully, and respond by using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Disagree Somewhat**	**Neutral**	**Agree Somewhat**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**

____ 1. I am a worthy member of the racial group I belong to.

____ 2. I often regret that I belong to the racial group that I do.

____ 3. Overall, my racial group is considered good by others.

____ 4. Overall, my racial group has very little to do with how I feel about myself.

____ 5. I feel I don't have much to offer to the racial group I belong to.

____ 6. In general, I'm glad to be a member of the racial group I belong to.

____ 7. Most people consider my racial group on the average, to be more ineffective than other racial groups.

____ 8. The racial group I belong to is an important reflection of who I am.

____ 9. I am a cooperative participant in the racial group I belong to.

____10. Overall, I often feel that the racial group of which I am a member is not worthwhile.

____11. In general, others respect the racial group that I am a member of.

____12. The racial group I belong to is unimportant to my sense of what kind of person I am.

____13. I often feel I'm a useless member of the racial group I belong to.

____14. I feel good about the racial group I belong to.

____15. In general, others think that the racial group I belong to is unworthy.

____16. In general, belonging to my racial group is an important part of my self-image.

APPENDIX F

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. What racial group do you belong to?

   White [ ]

   Black/African-American [ ]

   Hispanic [ ] Subgroup (e.g., Mexican, Puerto Rican, etc.): _____

   Asian [ ] Subgroup (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, etc.): _____

   Bi-Racial [ ]

   (Please indicate the mixture)_____

2. What is your sex? Male Female

3. What is your age? _____

4. What socioeconomic class to you belong to?

   Lower Middle Class [ ], Middle Class [ ], Upper Middle Class [ ], Wealthy [ ]

5. When you were answering questions about **Hispanics**, were you thinking of Hispanics <u>as one group</u>, or were you thinking of a particular subgroup of Hispanics?

   [ ] As one group.

   [ ] A subgroup. Please write in the subgroup you were thinking of: _____ _____.

   (For example, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, etc.)

6. When you were answering the questions about **Asians**, were you thinking of Asians <u>as one group</u>, or were you thinking of a particular subgroup of Asians?

   [ ] As one group.

   [ ] A subgroup. Please write in the subgroup you were thinking of: _____ ____. (For example, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, etc.)

APPENDIX G

FACTOR MATRIX
AFRICAN-AMERICANS'S PERCEPTION
OF
WHITES' CHARACTERISTICS

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4
Lazy	.48190	.59817	-.19346	.45570
Superstitious	-.03188	.36395	-.62250	.55988
Productive	-.13412	-.28732	.42385	.58349
Conservative	.42568	-.17797	.00311	.71488
Musical	-.54044	.27622	.67724	.04718
Strong family commitment	-.45693	-.02436	.80256	.08986
Poor	.73949	-.28412	.13564	.33001
Proud	-.67069	.26702	.21172	.28985
Aggressive	.16761	-.70050	.10786	.26321
Anxious	-.16450	-.29175	-.44958	.70538
Good-natured	-.31845	-.48388	.46832	.34863
Pleasure loving	.20450	.31682	.75834	-.08987
Militant	-.30663	.43411	-.44916	.38757
Optimistic	-.78358	.08710	-.13327	.49815
Tradition loving	-.17433	.48531	.27757	.32526
Reliable	.14637	-.29143	.41737	.50850
Sexually loose	.79357	-.22490	-.12499	.22951
Sociable	.37448	-.44548	.56905	.11891
Defensive	-.31383	.56323	-.10163	.36229
Ambitious	.00228	.57335	.42953	.02349
Polite	.24880	.77900	.12208	.26331
Fearful	.75573	-.25978	.38599	.08368
Athletic	.10104	-.74608	.16843	.28771
Religious	-.47683	-.17859	.44191	.32778
Materialistic	-.25879	.08028	-.72159	.46611
Ignorant	.45428	.35351	-.27558	.23892
Competitive	-.63693	-.06608	.26235	.34833
Passionate	-.39972	.61921	.26548	.31107
Of high moral character	-.51028	.48593	.34084	.19958
Unpredictable	.30856	.05877	-.34963	.36732
Meddlesome	.54162	.56161	-.38096	.06876
Contended	.56231	.26288	-.56914	.18722
Imaginative	-.63150	.08019	-.40849	.46752
Uneducated	.69018	.51816	.26674	-.15630
Effeminate	.61412	.25324	-.27363	.23086
Rigid/ Inflexible	.13239	.51202	.43647	.24995
Feminine	.05378	.61164	.48473	.14799
Business-wise	.36131	-.16301	.37224	.66177
Quarrelsome	.51917	-.15110	.72468	.05677
Assertive	.16878	-.11414	.18071	.60472
Dependable	.07089	.70646	.04109	.45051
Fair-minded	-.56216	.63553	.03589	.36146
Flamboyant	-.25339	-.57095	-.18749	.45868
Eccentric	.43953	.19596	-.07026	.66955
Old-fashioned	.70468	.51267	.21621	-.04379
Rebellious	-.52696	-.16443	-.48235	.52964
Independent	-.12507	.33183	-.76882	.21048
Physically violent	.44041	.73240	-.16784	.17511

Factor Matrix (cont'd)

Interesting	-.66999	.34303	.38765	.15092
Artistic	-.69570	-.06374	-.02164	.42867
Active	.23876	-.42365	-.36095	.38880
Sly	.03351	-.13508	-.64614	.42035
Self-Centered	.22187	-.55658	-.28468	.41040
Have criminal tendencies	.69282	.55584	-.10609	.18405
Understanding	.13938	.63491	.52606	.14252
Self-disciplined	-.23367	-.77463	.39697	.20485
Plans ahead	-.52457	-.41213	-.02979	.53143
Sexually perverse	.48873	.67490	.07847	.18260
Dirty/smelly	.81461	-.12668	-.12259	.39214
Show-off	.54450	.05016	-.20368	.66045
Wise	.76735	-.16195	-.31358	.11699
Reserved	.74229	-.20992	.05018	-.08357
Conscientious	.70712	.44857	-.38225	.05102
Progressive	.18524	-.23824	.16664	.75225
Efficient	.35481	.00231	-.02002	.59190
Individualistic	-.27193	.63450	.38647	.00264
Deceitful	-.08410	.67716	-.53347	.33583
Shy	-.07951	.59854	-.32132	.11099
Noisy	.19758	.13440	-.71395	.40439
Realistic	-.12300	.09336	.32505	.29819
Quiet	.76275	.17606	-.03766	.24417
Intelligent	.00564	-.12240	.46555	.51202
Sophisticated	.53031	.22300	.59126	.18836
Persevering	.33248	.22431	.44802	.40269
Honest	.77704	-.06611	.43368	-.09206
Uses Drugs	.78274	.24882	-.08824	.24463
Good-looking	.12835	-.37219	.60283	.09645
Mercenary	.08503	.08024	.61165	.17715
Forgetful	.44786	.60464	.02221	.06549
Masculine	-.61555	.08831	.10517	.45116
Competent	.17888	-.30814	.35098	.55565
Emotional	.53127	-.17753	-.00980	.64595
Suspicious	.55991	.29392	-.43731	.39255
Friendly	.46791	.37065	.69528	-.05069
Well-adjusted	-.06348	-.62614	.55407	.29468
Dependent	-.06326	-.32711	.80280	.19502
Moody	.38570	-.13975	.52047	.38604
Shrewd	.03502	-.49965	-.19903	.52860
Grouchy	.00648	-.52509	-.30222	.53044
Romantic	.14243	.23807	.85618	-.04450
Thrifty	-.57499	.15352	.45911	.20382
Cooperative	-.55866	.17572	-.06942	.51813
Cruel	.51632	-.05821	.47973	.09961
Stingy	.17001	.63076	.00342	.25616
Helpful	-.45152	.48109	.63538	-.08402
Self-sacrificing	.17097	.56855	.69990	-.03259
Bossy	-.43523	.67721	-.27471	.29790
Patriotic	-.46972	.55890	-.10945	-.00455
Industrious	.17767	-.42924	.38440	.43923
Prosperous	-.68097	-.30664	.09874	.09874
Democratic	-.13413	.39901	-.12368	-.29249
Knowledgeable	-.02605	-.30640	.52541	.35782
Hardworking	.13303	-.44792	.67243	.21025
Alert	-.79957	.30136	.22601	.02801

Devout	-.39999	.63209	.38723	.04912
Grateful	-.53028	.65286	-.15234	.19389
Prompt	-.59832	.37024	.05907	.31728
Generous	-.23470	.74849	.14757	.33422
Trusting	.42832	.47953	.55486	-.21692
Self-pitying	-.04107	.70020	-.21698	.10901
Mediative	-.15084	.80824	.15693	.31985
Isolated/ lonely	.26895	.43758	.51158	-.22843
Angry	.22345	-.14267	.08656	.56200
Cultured	-.38406	-.43122	.21658	.25446
Happy-go-lucky	.46433	.42093	.19013	.28060
Logical	-.77666	-.05000	.02498	.41002

FACTOR MATRIX
AFRICAN-AMERICANS'S PERCEPTION
OF
HISPANICS' CHARACTERISTICS

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3
Lazy	-.55995	.59036	.24989
Superstitious	-.75453	.06279	.07945
Productive	.69724	.44669	-.14502
Conservative	.73272	.45252	.16946
Musical	.02825	-.69370	.59005
Strong family commitment	-.25775	.13925	.66506
Poor	-.75608	.36037	.22831
Proud	-.03802	.05902	.43341
Aggressive	.72313	.17576	.14121
Anxious	.42103	-.36604	.27968
Good-natured	.27034	.44725	.00483
Pleasure loving	.40739	-.18267	.66823
Militant	-.49050	.06523	.63080
Optimistic	.55442	.12953	.51509
Tradition loving	-.05624	.02664	.65525
Reliable	.36569	.44368	-.21009
Sexually loose	-.32703	-.52545	.46708
Sociable	-.44157	.05515	.28535
Defensive	.54592	.22084	.25093
Ambitious	.77838	.10811	.07904
Polite	.43581	.10279	.59447
Fearful	-.74211	.28690	.31093
Athletic	-.81081	.07375	.29614
Religious	-.29176	-.52568	.55787
Materialistic	-.05362	-.67467	.50498
Ignorant	-.63137	.06566	.02043
Competitive	-.10128	.34568	.39809
Passionate	-.40329	.56862	.42446
Of high moral character	.09413	.09793	.75559
Unpredictable	.30797	.00878	.78984
Meddlesome	-.67045	-.03044	.28716
Contended	.81324	-.20085	.25892
Imaginative	.19140	-.64008	.42429
Uneducated	.42119	.73153	-.12921
Effeminate	-.40042	.41679	.30084
Rigid/Inflexible	-.55123	.25676	.50711
Feminine	.12119	.59383	.30496
Business-wise	-.05652	.49260	.20500
Quarrelsome	.04487	.00045	.18024
Assertive	.80490	.12434	.28228
Dependable	.19059	.80744	-.12505
Fair-minded	.15105	.72502	-.16356
Flamboyant	.55531	-.04072	.43597
Eccentric	-.15029	.19273	.68877
Old-fashioned	-.38883	.67964	.31553
Rebellious	.75126	.39951	.22727
Independent	.28347	-.13547	-.18438
Physically violent	-.52414	-.00776	.25666
Interesting	.14368	-.17817	.35126
Artistic	-.15324	.58201	.41121
Active	.59274	.10549	.55421
Sly	-.22433	-.42644	.51478

Factor Matrix (cont'd)

Self-Centered	.07218	-.21871	.26902
Have criminal tendencies	-.71535	.09364	.11416
Understanding	-.37508	.77958	.15114
Self-disciplined	-.59184	.56653	.23790
Plans ahead	.30734	.20572	.41358
Sexually perverse	-.42405	-.19060	.54444
Dirty/smelly	-.36129	.60101	-.21739
Show-off	.08890	-.39702	.64701
Wise	.92854	.00669	.18222
Reserved	.74912	.30946	-.10848
Conscientious	-.37102	.65300	-.06705
Progressive	.62089	.15954	.29460
Efficient	.51077	.45291	.10063
Individualistic	-.87225	-.02690	.25333
Deceitful	-.90182	.02572	.06512
Shy	.65549	.34246	-.19247
Noisy	-.21337	-.42345	.52719
Realistic	.45441	.50185	-.14727
Quiet	.25809	.68979	-.12424
Intelligent	.42910	.27710	.56323
Sophisticated	.19774	.52949	.24035
Persevering	-.64632	.46280	.17542
Honest	-.42612	.59331	.09565
Uses Drugs	-.68264	.01714	.29639
Good-looking	.17305	-.56017	.59444
Mercenary	-.19685	-.56557	.34608
Forgetful	-.58579	.41921	.09937
Masculine	-.15222	.25244	.41002
Competent	-.27052	.45594	.53710
Emotional	.13327	.25632	.66276
Suspicious	-.75456	.04786	.30802
Friendly	.41568	-.01379	.76756
Well-adjusted	.68851	.37638	.12700
Dependent	-.72142	-.06657	.37365
Moody	.39764	.70174	.05181
Shrewd	-.63101	-.18171	.52676
Grouchy	.39178	.32013	.53676
Romantic	-.60670	-.58775	.70518
Thrifty	.38067	-.42298	.33190
Cooperative	.69721	.42532	.34100
Cruel	-.27223	-.30754	.28696
Stingy	-.05691	-.24266	.14689
Helpful	.79816	.38083	.23392
Self-sacrificing	.73712	.39250	.02535
Bossy	-.31975	.20143	.27600
Patriotic	-.33279	.47393	.22389
Industrious	-.43246	.56585	.41121
Prosperous	-.32475	.89035	-.17868
Democratic	-.03541	-.60510	.51533
Knowledgeable	.75913	-.15217	.52989
Hardworking	.94333	.05648	.00481
Alert	.87489	-.08311	.29694
Devout	.43346	-.19960	.65699
Grateful	.27481	.03744	.64595
Prompt	.01359	.49105	.35074
Generous	.09349	.72876	.24102
Trusting	.40977	.63038	-.08430
Self-pitying	.69166	.02721	.21588
Mediative	-.39357	.75650	.08292

Isolated/lonely	-.76478	.27732	-.15536
Angry	-.60956	.35607	.31900
Cultured	-.35100	.51572	.16689
Happy-go-lucky	-.30094	.48033	.03700
Logical	.34488	.44781	.48762

FACTOR MATRIX
AFRICAN-AMERICANS'S PERCEPTION
OF
ASIANS' CHARACTERISTICS

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4
Lazy	.18086	-.78237	.32574	.41511
Superstitious	.36685	.75577	.23170	-.21669
Productive	.62466	.21191	.14110	.47576
Conservative	.45702	.42583	.31634	.36680
Musical	.43519	.69502	.41951	-.19235
Strong family commitment	.84356	.18363	-.06524	-.13254
Poor	.63985	-.27787	.29514	-.09695
Proud	.41744	.19842	-.49458	.23077
Aggressive	.51094	-.46220	.35609	.38947
Anxious	.48383	-.26840	.30110	.46473
Good-natured	.72478	-.24207	.10161	.29242
Pleasure loving	.57371	.37611	-.27917	.37762
Militant	-.24809	.44070	.76505	.13256
Optimistic	-.09239	.90701	-.05458	.28184
Tradition loving	.78230	.10255	.15679	.06639
Reliable	.65978	.30602	-.20701	.34097
Sexually loose	.37212	.27894	.22418	-.34778
Sociable	.14117	.27443	-.70722	.11888
Defensive	.20769	.48446	.30386	.54805
Ambitious	.49726	.67707	-.43012	.00561
Polite	.83519	.21675	-.06565	.11641
Fearful	.77650	-.41572	.26212	-.13559
Athletic	.37861	-.39800	.59669	-.05864
Religious	.73561	.22386	.34627	-.14591
Materialistic	.70470	-.14201	.51908	-.03786
Ignorant	-.42997	-.14928	.18785	.36190
Competitive	-.04838	.84743	-.18349	.01647
Passionate	.32315	.76258	.05156	.04223
Of high moral character	-.23311	.33090	-.10974	.69647
Unpredictable	.26358	.09079	.76739	.04238
Meddlesome	.33281	-.80901	.26999	.02261
Contended	.64330	-.05599	.50563	.14440
Imaginative	.81589	.00754	.41039	-.18285
Uneducated	.46080	-.43282	-.34633	-.24028
Effeminate	.72154	.08932	.10296	-.24716
Rigid/ Inflexible	.44101	.35466	-.62176	.01496
Feminine	.31360	.60415	-.50281	-.03686
Business-wise	.51045	.71865	-.32427	-.01114
Quarrelsome	.36064	-.07523	-.41923	-.30692
Assertive	.37712	.79501	-.33781	-.03086
Dependable	.58092	.68745	-.27379	-.03707
Fair-minded	.79909	-.31119	.04010	-.27468
Flamboyant	.65689	-.36165	-.41982	.17693
Eccentric	.86397	.11879	.30984	-.15009
Old-fashioned	.66728	.54431	-.07161	-.12107
Rebellious	.58336	.47369	-.29231	-.06486
Independent	-.37024	.04783	-.03544	-.33326
Physically violent	.67238	-.03451	-.53055	-.02956
Interesting	.49726	.71348	.12023	-.31214

Factor Matrix (cont'd)

Artistic	.24969	.41248	.65310	-.00350
Active	.74776	.27355	.29650	-.25300
Sly	.38097	-.55189	.39385	.39607
Self-Centered	.67450	.23001	.43999	-.31100
Have criminal tendencies	.44189	-.37838	-.41371	-.12420
Understanding	.43969	-.03645	-.66515	.16844
Self-disciplined	.69683	.39335	-.12703	-.26486
Plans ahead	.67889	.35710	-.38656	-.02958
Sexually perverse	.79884	-.05682	.42018	-.26179
Dirty/smelly	.58529	-.61018	-.16098	-.15061
Show-off	.83745	.08161	.16453	-.00538
Wise	.88798	.03265	-.05965	-.11546
Reserved	.84670	.00906	-.11778	-.14002
Conscientious	.62295	-.65602	-.30919	-.03838
Progressive	-.22783	.88643	.07333	.25988
Efficient	-.28048	.81107	.24542	.19133
Individualistic	.25076	-.26787	.75399	.42305
Deceitful	-.49242	.16739	.04889	.33022
Shy	-.23297	.45682	-.36587	.21848
Noisy	.53006	-.36202	.10191	-.39737
Realistic	.57499	-.06767	.20177	.37314
Quiet	.52432	-.72678	-.03994	-.18755
Intelligent	.29798	.05452	.04881	.73103
Sophisticated	.62671	-.08884	.40629	.38136
Persevering	.63107	-.25959	.55688	.14024
Honest	.24812	.75775	-.30994	.10475
Uses Drugs	.30729	.22912	-.02150	-.31121
Good-looking	-.44168	.17164	.65628	.26291
Mercenary	.18162	-.58175	-.05700	-.14688
Forgetful	.08306	-.13720	-.27233	-.26108
Masculine	.63616	-.41784	-.10791	.39268
Competent	.55888	-.52735	-.31911	.45392
Emotional	-.17714	.57687	-.11925	.60845
Suspicious	.28483	-.58155	.63648	.11377
Friendly	.75309	-.31138	-.12733	-.09339
Well-adjusted	.58345	-.28944	-.36183	.27487
Dependent	-.27347	.28759	-.53019	.52379
Moody	-.33381	.00378	.20756	.26449
Shrewd	.27231	.44044	.17891	.07922
Grouchy	.11277	-.83930	-.02705	.15883
Romantic	.56367	.15985	-.16087	-.05950
Thrifty	.43385	-.52631	-.30713	.40262
Cooperative	.01275	-.21094	-.56517	.51822
Cruel	.62446	.29088	.38706	-.27966
Stingy	.39012	-.07805	-.49428	-.49428
Helpful	.32019	.13034	-.83912	.07468
Self-sacrificing	.05253	.36909	.78446	.08028
Bossy	.37551	.36615	.71977	.15109
Patriotic	.03344	-.26467	-.00480	.71637
Industrious	.12813	.58673	.37724	.37150
Prosperous	.46875	.61944	.07394	.20042
Democratic	.56681	-.33034	-.28781	-.13546
Knowledgeable	.04529	.55301	.06561	.41215
Hardworking	.71366	.37802	-.43443	-.09835
Alert	.80482	.09985	-.31785	.16347
Devout	.67765	-.31697	.14809	.28717
Grateful	-.13436	.85499	.17823	.14870

Prompt	.08140	-.44995	-.44432	.65377
Generous	.48977	-.60379	-.28747	.41862
Trusting	.48830	-.60541	-.50321	.20194
Self-pitying	.36492	.60325	.48822	-.13432
Mediative	.19287	-.54104	.24646	.16412
Isolated/lonely	-.15748	.13251	.47294	.42687
Angry	.25863	.56392	.60276	-.05557
Cultured	.07016	-.46631	.63317	.10541
Happy-go-lucky	.45084	-.45930	-.38107	.01616
Logical	.19902	.49490	-.72092	.12108

FACTOR MATRIX
WHITES' PERCEPTION
OF
AFRICAN-AMERICANS' CHARACTERISTICS

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2
Lazy	-.62962	.36639
Superstitious	-.22702	.48475
Musical	-.19118	.58853
Poor	.14292	.41604
Defensive	-.19118	.58853
Athletic	-.04994	.71051
Religious	.14292	.41604
Competitive	.06716	.62462
Unpredictable	-.33330	.45546
Uneducated	-.36145	.50397
Rebellious	-.42536	.53550
Physically violent	-.38197	.60755
Have criminal tendencies	-.54486	.42914
Sexually perverse	-.39352	.51186
Dirty/smelly	-.33170	.46785
Noisy	-.34705	.47617
Uses Drugs	-.28255	.53293
Angry	-.38553	.50785
Ignorant	-.46019	.29193
Productive	.65486	-.17703
Conservative	.11451	.42450
Anxious	-.10871	.56076
Good-natured	.63754	-.09054
Pleasure loving	.28264	.35298
Optimistic	.28264	.35298
Tradition loving	.54146	.16828
Ambitious	.36683	.24756
Polite	.58539	.08320
Fearful	.64022	.15565
Materialistic	.11946	.43997
Passionate	-.15581	.46500
Contended	.47670	.42975
Imaginative	.43020	.36597
Effeminate	.32854	.27305
Feminine	-.14982	.23661
Business-wise	.16796	.22778
Assertive	.39452	.34409
Dependable	.64865	-.01844
Fair-minded	.71520	.01354
Interesting	.37267	.24766
Self-Centered	-.42611	.55943
Understanding	.59871	.10411
Self-disciplined	.52143	.23701
Plans ahead	.48960	.18617
Wise	.35029	.47041
Reserved	.08850	.46474
Conscientious	.44637	.24475
Progressive	.46237	.28529
Efficient	.65097	.06037
Individualistic	.25534	-.03549
Sly	-.36017	.56826
Realistic	.54414	.15255
Quiet	.41057	.26765
Intelligent	.61722	.20839

Factor Matrix (cont'd)

Sophisticated	.53168	.20149
Persevering	.66991	.11431
Honest	.76574	-.02296
Good-looking	.60278	.10770
Forgetful	-.08435	.45420
Competent	.60231	.01979
Emotional	.13968	.14763
Friendly	.69192	-.00569
Well-adjusted	.62223	.03737
Moody	-.05674	.43241
Shrewd	-.12196	.48198
Thrifty	.34535	.15992
Cooperative	.72862	.01929
Helpful	.75564	.07844
Patriotic	.47969	.31999
Industrious	.78303	.12844
Prosperous	.35582	.43056
Knowledgeable	.67358	.04277
Hardworking	.75815	.01124
Alert	.52002	.14673
Generous	.56668	-.10109
Trusting	.58756	.16321
Logical	.63402	.07054
Independent	.35262	.12491
Rigid/Inflexible	.64865	-.01844
Quarrelsome	.12510	-.11051
Flamboyant	.042625	-.09718
Eccentric	-.30232	.02463
Old-fashioned	-.10267	.18726
Artistic	.24571	-.00047
Active	-.19786	-.18591
Show-off	-.11626	-.16341
Deceitful	.34251	-.11934
Shy	.13368	.03496
Mercenary	-.05385	.04367
Masculine	.16228	-.05400
Suspicious	.75309	-.22915
Dependent	.23880	.17465
Grouchy	.11663	.05504
Romantic	-.23006	.05533
Cruel	.10435	.00256
Stingy	.05035	-.20069
Self-sacrificing	.24894	-.08238
Bossy	.15185	.10049
Democratic	.02592	-.05043
Devout	.62962	.36639
Grateful	.42536	.60175
Prompt	.75261	-.56120
Self-pitying	.65486	-.17703
Mediative	-.46019	.29193
Isolated/lonely	-.38197	.60755
Cultured	-.34705	.47614
Happy-go-lucky	-.46019	.70895

FACTOR MATRIX
WHITE'S PERCEPTION
OF
HISPANICS' CHARACTERISTICS

	FACTOR 1
Lazy	.77997
Superstitious	.77473
Productive	.69724
Conservative	.73272
Musical	-.02827
Strong family commitment	.72837
Poor	.77608
Proud	-.03802
Aggressive	-.72313
Anxious	-.42103
Good natured	.27034
Pleasure loving	.40739
Militant	-.49070
Optimistic	.77442
Tradition loving	-.78624
Reliable	.36769
Sexually loose	.32703
Sociable	.44177
Defensive	.74792
Ambitious	.77838
Polite	.43781
Fearful	.74211
Athletic	.81081
Religious	.79176
Materialistic	-.07362
Ignorant	-.63137
Competitive	.10128
Passionate	.40329
Of high moral character	.09413
Unpredictable	-.30797
Meddlesome	-.67047
Contended	.81324
Imaginative	.19140
Uneducated	.42119
Effeminate	-.40042
Rigid/Inflexible	.77123
Feminine	.12119
Business wise	.07672
Quarrelsome	.04487
Assertive	-.80490
Dependable	-.19079
Fair minded	-.17107
Flamboyant	.77731
Eccentric	.17029
Old fashioned	.38883
Rebellious	.77126
Independent	-.28347
Physically violent	-.72414
Interesting	-.14368
Artistic	-.17324
Active	-.79274
Sly	.22433
Self Centered	.07218

Factor Matrix (cont'd)

Have criminal tendencies	.71737
Understanding	.37708
Self disciplined	.79184
Plans ahead	.30734
Sexually perverse	.42407
Dirty/smelly	-.36129
Show off	-.08890
Wise	.92874
Reserved	.74912
Conscientious	.37102
Progressive	.62089
Efficient	-.71077
Individualistic	.87227
Deceitful	.90182
Shy	.67749
Noisy	.21337
Realistic	.47441
Quiet	.27809
Intelligent	-.42910
Sophisticated	.19774
Persevering	.64632
Honest	.42612
Uses Drugs	.68264
Good looking	-.17307
Mercenary	-.19687
Forgetful	.78779
Masculine	.17222
Competent	-.27072
Emotional	-.13327
Suspicious	.77476
Friendly	.41768
Well adjusted	.68871
Dependent	.72142
Moody	.39764
Shrewd	.63101
Grouchy	.39178
Romantic	.60670
Thrifty	.38067
Cooperative	.69721
Cruel	.27223
Stingy	.07691
Helpful	.79816
Self sacrificing	.73712
Bossy	.31977
Patriotic	.33279
Industrious	.43246
Prosperous	.32477
Democratic	.03741
Knowledgeable	.77913
Hardworking	-.94333
Alert	-.87489
Devout	-.43346
Grateful	-.27481
Prompt	.01379
Generous	.09349
Trusting	.40977
Self pitying	-.69166
Mediative	.39377
Isolated/lonely	.76478
Angry	-.60976

Cultured	.37100
Happy go lucky	.30094
Logical	-.34488

FACTOR MATRIX
WHITES' PERCEPTIONS
OF
ASIANS CHARACTERISTICS

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2
Lazy	.28090	.59803
Superstitious	-.05088	.56595
Productive	-.05702	-.28755
Conservative	.72568	-.07797
Musical	-.57077	.27623
Strong family commitment	-.75695	-.02756
Poor	.75979	-.28702
Proud	-.67069	.26702
Aggressive	.06760	-.70050
Anxious	-.06750	-.29075
Good-natured	-.50875	-.78588
Pleasure loving	.20750	.50682
Militant	-.50665	.75700
Optimistic	-.78558	.08700
Tradition loving	-.07755	.78550
Reliable	.07657	-.29075
Sexually loose	.79557	-.22790
Sociable	.57778	-.77578
Defensive	-.50585	.56525
Ambitious	.00228	.57555
Polite	.27880	.77900
Fearful	.75575	-.25978
Athletic	.00007	-.77608
Religious	-.77685	-.07859
Materialistic	-.25879	.08028
Ignorant	.75728	.55550
Competitive	-.65695	-.06608
Passionate	-.59972	.60920
Of high moral character	-.50028	.78595
Unpredictable	.50856	.05877
Meddlesome	.57062	.56060
Contended	.56250	.26288
Imaginative	-.65050	.08009
Uneducated	.69008	.50806
Effeminate	.60702	.25527
Rigid/Inflexible	.05259	.50202
Feminine	.05578	.60067
Business-wise	.56050	-.06500
Quarrelsome	.50907	-.05000
Assertive	.06878	-.00707
Dependable	.07089	.70676
Fair-minded	-.56206	.65555
Flamboyant	-.25559	-.57095
Eccentric	.75955	.09596
Old-fashioned	.70768	.50267
Rebellious	-.52696	-.06775
Independent	-.02507	.55085
Physically violent	.77070	.75270
Interesting	-.66999	.57505
Artistic	-.69570	-.06577
Active	.25876	-.72565
Sly	.05550	-.05508
Self-Centered	.22087	-.55658
Have criminal tendencies	.69282	.55587

Factor Matrix (cont'd)

Understanding	.05958	.65790
Self-disciplined	-.25567	-.77765
Plans ahead	-.52757	-.70205
Sexually perverse	.78875	.67790
Dirty/smelly	.80760	-.02668
Show-off	.57750	.05006
Wise	.76755	-.06095
Reserved	.77229	-.20992
Conscientious	.70702	.77857
Progressive	.08527	-.25827
Efficient	.55780	.00250
Individualistic	-.27095	.65750
Deceitful	-.08700	.67706
Shy	-.07950	.59857
Noisy	.09758	.05770
Realistic	-.02500	.09556
Quiet	.76275	.07606
Intelligent	.00567	-.02270
Sophisticated	.55050	.22500
Persevering	.55278	.22750
Honest	.77707	-.06600
Uses Drugs	.78277	.27882
Good-looking	.02855	-.57209
Mercenary	.08505	.08027
Forgetful	.77786	.60767
Masculine	-.60555	.08850
Competent	.07888	-.50807
Emotional	.55027	-.07755
Suspicious	.55990	.29592
Friendly	.76790	.57065
Well-adjusted	-.06578	-.62607
Dependent	-.06526	-.52700
Moody	.58570	-.05975
Shrewd	.05502	-.79965
Grouchy	.00678	-.52509
Romantic	.07275	.25807
Thrifty	-.57799	.05552
Cooperative	-.55866	.07572
Cruel	.50652	-.05820
Stingy	.07000	.65076
Helpful	-.75052	.78009
Self-sacrificing	.07097	.56855
Bossy	-.75525	.67720
Patriotic	-.76972	.55890
Industrious	.07767	-.72927
Prosperous	-.68097	-.50667
Democratic	-.05705	.59900
Knowledgeable	-.02605	-.50670
Hardworking	.05505	-.77792
Alert	-.79957	.50056
Devout	-.59999	.65209
Grateful	-.55028	.65286
Prompt	-.59852	.57027
Generous	-.25770	.77879
Trusting	.72852	.77955
Self-pitying	-.07007	.70020
Mediative	-.05087	.80827
Isolated/lonely	.26895	.75758
Angry	.22575	-.07267
Cultured	-.58706	-.75022

Happy-go-lucky	.76755	.72095
Logical	-.77666	-.05000

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES
31293010379844