Published in final edited form as:

Race Soc Probl. 2010 December 1; 2(3-4): 149–163. doi:10.1007/s12552-010-9035-x.

Racial Prejudice and Spending on Drug Rehabilitation: The Role of Attitudes Toward Blacks and Latinos

Amie L. Nielsen,

Department of Sociology, University of Miami, P.O. Box 248162, Coral Gables, FL 33124, USA

Scott Bonn, and

Department of Sociology, Drew University, Madison, NJ, USA

George Wilson

Department of Sociology, University of Miami, P.O. Box 248162, Coral Gables, FL 33124, USA

Amie L. Nielsen: nielsen@miami.edu

Abstract

We enhance understanding of the prejudice-induced “color coding” phenomenon among whites by determining whether racial and ethnic prejudices are associated with a previously unexplored policy outcome, spending on drug rehabilitation. We examine attitudes toward both blacks and Latinos; the latter is a group largely ignored in previous research. We assess the impact of several types of racial/ethnic views, including those that manifest modern/indirect prejudice (e.g., stereotypes about violence, individualistic causal attributions) and those that reflect social-distance-based traditional prejudice (opposition to residential proximity and to interracial marriage). These relationships are examined using data from the General Social Survey. Bivariate results support the linkage between both traditional and modern prejudice and rehabilitation spending. Logistic regression analyses also indicate that support for rehabilitation is racialized: Attributing race differences in socioeconomic outcomes to “structural” factors, namely discrimination and lack of chance for education, is associated with believing rehabilitation spending is inadequate, controlling for the effects of other racial/ethnic attitudes and background factors. The relationship between this measure of modern prejudice and the outcome is consistent with color coding. The implications of the findings are discussed, and suggestions for future research that further examine the scope of color coding are offered.

Keywords

Prejudice; Drug rehabilitation; Drugs; Color coding; Racism

In the last several decades, sociologists have documented that the nature of racial prejudice among whites in the United States has become more “benign.” Specifically, whites have moved from a harsh “Jim Crow” type to a more subtle form of prejudice, encompassed under labels such as “modern prejudice” (Pettigrew 1985), “symbolic racism,” (Eberhardt and Fiske 1998), and “laissez-faire racism” (Bobo et al. 1997).¹ “Jim Crow” racism was characterized by a set of relatively harsh beliefs such as reliance on biological/genetic stereotypes, the denial of racial equality in principle, and support for segregation across institutional spheres (e.g., work, residence and education) that are typical of traditional

prejudice. Such beliefs have become less common, but in their place are a more subtle set of attitudes (Farley 2006)² distinguished by, for example, views about the cultural/motivational deficiencies of blacks and other groups, support for the principle of racial equality, and support for the principle of integration across institutional spheres (Mendelberg 2001; Schuman et al. 1984; Tuch and Martin 1997). Overall, this modern version of prejudice among whites takes the form of “indirect” or “symbolic” expressions of racial antipathy. This is evident in such ways as individualistic causal attributions for socioeconomic failures of minorities and in the advocacy of unfettered/unregulated market principles—which disproportionately impact negatively on minority life-chance opportunities. These are the crucible of socioeconomic fate in a society that has largely transcended prejudice and discrimination in the new millennium (Bobo et al. 1997; Bonilla-Silva 2006; Tuch and Martin 1997). An example of this is the tendency among some whites to blame the welfare dependency of poor, inner-city blacks on lack of work ethic rather than on a lack of meaningful employment opportunities in their neighborhoods.

Significantly, sociologists have demonstrated that modern prejudice is manifest in at least two forms—the application of invidious stereotypes explicitly toward racial groups (e.g., minorities are lazy, unintelligent) as well as through the presence of “racial coding” (Gilens 1996). Racial coding refers to situations where ostensibly race-neutral phenomena (e.g., crime) come to be imbued with implicit race or ethnic meaning or designation. That is, group generalizations related to stereotypes about motivational or cultural characteristics (e.g., laziness, criminality) of blacks and other minority groups are linked to ostensibly non-group-specific statuses/conditions (Federico 2005; Gilens 1996, 1999). An example of modern prejudice was manifested in the reaction by some whites toward victims of the Katrina Hurricane disaster—that is, blaming the stranded victims by suggesting that they (poor blacks and their inherent laziness) were responsible for their own misfortune by not leaving their homes before it was too late.

Overall, our knowledge of the scope of the color coding phenomenon remains limited. To date, sociologists have demonstrated that it is potent for two kinds of policy-based issues, welfare (Gilens 1996; Wilson 1996) and those that address the criminal justice system (Barkan and Cohn 1994, 1998; Unnever and Cullen 2007). In the context of welfare, beliefs that it is “a black problem” (Wilson 1996), that blacks are less intelligent, lazy and lack the work ethic of whites (Gilens 1996; Tuch and Martin 1997) all serve to depress support for this program. In the context of crime, racial prejudice plays a role in support for criminal justice policy attitudes (e.g., Hurwitz and Peffley 1997; Johnson 2001; Peffley and Hurwitz 2002). For example, whites who hold prejudiced views of blacks are more supportive of “excessive use” of force by police (Barkan and Cohn 1998), greater criminal justice punitiveness (Johnson 2008), and the death penalty (Barkan and Cohn 1994; Bobo and Johnson 2004; Unnever and Cullen 2007). In addition, those who view blacks as violence-prone, but not Latinos or whites, support greater spending to reduce crime (Barkan and Cohn 2005; see also Hurwitz and Peffley 2005).

This paper seeks to extend our understanding of prejudice and color coding in two ways. Specifically, we examine the role of racial and ethnic prejudice in assessing support for a previously unexplored policy-based issue, drug rehabilitation spending. We also examine a

²We are mindful of the controversy regarding the extent to which the changes in white racial attitudes in recent decades are considered to be truly meaningful. Specifically, one school of thought maintains that the “liberalization” of white racial attitudes that constitute modern prejudice is illusory and reflects an inhibition, due to lack of social acceptance, to express the true classic “Jim Crow” attitudes, that are now expressed symbolically and indirectly. It is maintained that this is manifest most clearly in the presence of the “principle-implementation” gap, namely that whites believe discrimination exists and support racial equality in principle, yet they do not support government policies to actually reduce discrimination and to help achieve equality (see Bobo and Kluegel 1993; Tuch and Martin 1997).

broader range of groups than has been considered in prior research on racialization: Both African Americans and Latinos as groups who may be subject to the color coding phenomenon are considered, something that to our knowledge has received little attention (but see Barkan and Cohn (2005)). To do so, we use data from a nationally representative survey to examine whether a range of prejudice and stereotypes that are “hallmarks of contemporary prejudice” (Gilens 1996), such as perceived proneness to violence, intelligence, and individualistic and structural causal attributions, as well as traditional prejudice (e.g., opposition to intermarriage), influence support for spending to deal with drug rehabilitation. Both bivariate relationships and multivariate relationships between these stereotypes and prejudice measures and the outcome of interest are examined, with the multivariate analyses enabling consideration of the relationships between the prejudice items and rehabilitation spending while controlling for the effects of all other variables included in the analysis. If drug rehabilitation spending is color coded as we argue, then we expect to see that racial and ethnic prejudice measures, especially our modern prejudice items (with one exception—structural causal attributions, which should have the opposite relationship), will be associated with reduced support for spending.

Racial Prejudice and Color Coding

The identification of the phenomenon of “color coding” (Edsall and Edsall 1991; Gilens 1999; Wilson 1996) or “racialization” (Bobo 1998) of social issues has enhanced our understanding of white racial prejudice. Racial prejudice is an “antipathy toward an outgroup based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization” (Allport 1954: 9). Prejudice is rooted in stereotypes, “a set of beliefs about the perceived attributes of members of a particular social category” (Bobo and Massagli 2001: 94). Stereotypes are broadly distributed across populations and are part of the “normal repertoire” (Allport 1954) that derives from day-to-day functioning in a cultural community (Bobo and Massagli 2001). Stereotypes are not in a statistical sense aberrant but are rather the product of a basic cognitive function—the need to classify, categorize, and form judgments about objects in our environment (Allport 1954; Eberhardt and Fiske 1998).

Yet, stereotypes are not neutral (Bobo and Massagli 2001). In other words, classification is not a “neutral” cognitive function constituting a shortcut in which order is substituted for the great confusion of reality. Instead, the manner in which functioning unfolds and thus generates stereotypes may be related to functions that they serve. Stereotypes in fact play a pivotal role in guaranteeing self-respect, and they are a basis for projecting onto the world a justification for specific values and rights and for defending positional differences and/or justifying the unequal distribution of material and symbolic rewards. In short, stereotypes are the fortress of tradition, and from behind its defenses, those who benefit from the status quo feel safe in the positions they occupy and justified in the rewards they receive (Bobo and Massagli 2001). Overall, stereotypes serve to “racialize” the most minute phenomena of daily life. That is, stereotypes ranging in content from groups’ temperament, intelligence, athletic ability, esthetic preferences, and dispositions toward wealth/poverty, criminality, work ethic, and ability to abstain from excessive engagement in vices such as alcohol consumption and—the case at hand—drug abuse—ensure that race constitutes a primary cleavage in representing the social world (Allport 1954; Bobo and Massagli 2001).

“Color coding” is a form of modern prejudice that occurs when a range of malicious stereotypes regarding the personal characteristics of racial/ethnic minorities (e.g., penchant for criminality, low intelligence, lack of work ethic) become linked to specific ostensibly non-racial statuses and circumstances believed to be disproportionately experienced by members of these groups. As such, the statuses and circumstances are evaluated in accordance with stereotypes, which are the root source of color coding. To date, ostensibly

“race-neutral” topics—most conspicuously welfare and crime—have been demonstrated to be imbued with implicit racial connotations that is evident in the relationship between prejudice and policy views. This color coding has enormous implications for the public’s views toward these issues (e.g., Beckett and Sasson 2004; Edsall and Edsall 1991; Gilens 1999; Hurwitz and Peffley 2005; Wilson and Nielsen forthcoming). Specifically, the association of welfare as “a black problem” has been demonstrated to reduce white support for it by at least 25% (Gilens 1996; Hurwitz and Peffley 2005; see also Wilson 1996). Further, the association of crime as a “racialized” phenomenon drives up white support for “punitive” crime control measures in a “statistically robust fashion” (Thompson and Bobo forthcoming; see also Barkan and Cohn 1998, 2005; Bobo and Johnson 2004; Unnever and Cullen 2007). Overall, these findings have led sociologists to speculate that the color coding phenomenon may be widespread and serve as a “fundamental road map that guides the perceptions of individuals” (Gilens 1996: 136).

Both color coding (implicit racialization of issues rooted in stereotypes) and modern prejudice (explicit racial views and stereotypes) have similar origins and are acquired through similar means (Gilens 1996; Wilson et al. 2004). Accordingly, stereotypes are acquired through several analytically distinct but often overlapping sources. Specifically, they may have a cognitive underpinning—social learning—that encompasses patterns of socialization/interaction (Bobo and Massagli 2001; Eberhardt and Fiske 1998) as well as exposure to media-disseminated messages (Gilens 1999; Wilson 1996). Also, stereotypes may have an affective base in the form of self-interest (Allport 1954; Bobo and Massagli 2001), which encompasses both individual and cooperative variants. These variants capture the importance of direct (i.e., oneself) and indirect (e.g., significant others in one’s life, co-ethnics with whom one identifies) symbolic and material advantages that accrue from stereotyping (Schuman et al. 1984). Finally, additional social psychological research establishes that stereotypes are acted on when there is both opportunity and motivation to do so (Blumer 1958; Eberhardt and Fiske 1998). Opportunity refers to power to exert formal or informal control over the objects of stereotypes (Eberhardt and Fiske 1998). Motivation encompasses having an incentive to act or deriving a benefit from acting on one’s stereotypes—such as gaining legitimacy in one’s position or socioeconomic gain (Pettigrew 1985). Individuals will act on stereotypes (and demonstrate self-interest) regarding drug rehabilitation when they decline to support spending due to prejudice and color coding. With the above in mind, we now examine the reasons why we expect drugs and drug-related issues to be identified by whites as particularly linked with blacks and Latinos.

Examining the Literature: Race and Drugs—the Perceptual Link

There are several reasons to expect that drug rehabilitation is an issue that is color coded. Historically, US drug laws have been shaped by racism and prejudice directed toward minority groups, including blacks and Latinos (Musto 1999). A central concern of the current war on drugs is its racial and ethnic tones, and it has been argued that this war has contributed to racial fears and intolerance (Reinarman and Levine 1989; Tonry 1995). Race and ethnicity are key factors in drug-related media coverage and in political rhetoric (Beckett and Sasson 2004; Reeves and Campbell 1994; Tonry 1995), with images of drugs in the mid-1980s, especially crack, framed as problems primarily associated with blacks and Latinos (Reeves and Campbell 1994; Reinarman and Levine 1989).

Drug addiction is also a problem linked to illegal behaviors: Drug possession and use. For these and related acts (e.g., distribution), blacks and Latinos are over-represented and more harshly punished than whites in the criminal justice system (e.g., Beckett 1997; Demuth and Steffensmeier 2004; Schlesinger 2005; Tonry 1995). Beckett and colleagues (2005: 436) argue that “law enforcement’s focus on black and Latino individuals *and* on the drug most

strongly associated with “blackness” [crack] suggests that law enforcement policies and practices are predicated on the assumption that the drug problem is, in fact, a black and Latino one... it appears that law enforcement practices in Seattle reflect a widespread cultural script about who and what constitutes the drug problem.” Furthermore, addiction is widely believed to lead to additional criminal acts (e.g., Beckett 1997), and research suggests that whites tend to fear minorities and associate them with criminality (St. John and Heald-Moore 1996). Drug addiction is also perceived to be a matter of choice by individuals rather than as influenced by social structural or macro-level factors (e.g., Beckett 1997; Beckett and Sasson 2004; Reeves and Campbell 1994) and thus reflects individual characteristics, namely lack of morality, criminality, and lack of work ethic. These characteristics constitute stereotypes at the individual level that are the underpinnings of color coding (Gilens 1999).

Numerous sources suggest that powerful stereotypes of blacks and Latinos associate them with drugs (e.g., Bender 2003; Portillos 2006) and criminality (St. John and Heald-Moore 1996). For example, Bender (2003: 41) states that, “The most unifying stereotype among Latina/o groups today might be their construction as drug dealers or drug users.” Some scholars speculate that drug abuse has become racialized in the public imagination (Beckett et al. 2005; Beckett and Sasson 2004; Reeves and Campbell 1994; Reinerman and Levine 1989). Thus, there are a number of reasons to expect that drug-related issues, including those such as addiction and rehabilitation, are color coded as ones that are particularly linked with blacks and Latinos.

Examining the Literature: Racial Attitudes and Drug Control

Despite reasons to expect them to be linked, only a few studies to date have considered the roles of prejudice and attitudes toward drug-related issues, including drug rehabilitation. In one study, Rossi and Berk (1997) showed that respondents in a national survey who thought minority group members have too many civil rights recommended longer federal sentences for drug-trafficking offenses than those who had less prejudiced attitudes about civil rights, findings suggestive of color coding. However, to our knowledge, only four studies (Bobo and Johnson 2004; Hurwitz and Peffley 1997; Peffley et al. 1997; Timberlake et al. 2001) explicitly examine the role of racial attitudes for drug issues and policies.

In one paper, Hurwitz and Peffley (1997) assessed whether racial stereotypes were related to attitudes toward spending to create drug rehabilitation programs as a way to address crime. In this study, a sample of adult respondents in Lexington, Kentucky, was asked about placing such programs in either a white or black neighborhood, with the racial composition of the proposed site for the rehabilitation programs randomly varied in the survey. The results showed that stereotypes toward blacks were not related to support for spending on rehabilitation programs regardless of the race of the neighborhood depicted. In another study, Peffley et al. (1997) examined whether racial stereotypes were associated with views of a police search of two people walking near a known drug sales location. The survey respondents were randomly assigned vignettes that varied the race (white or black) of the characters depicted and their demeanor (well-behaved and well-dressed or using foul language). They found that for white respondents presented with vignettes involving black characters using foul language, racial stereotypes (a measure of perceived violence proneness and aggression of blacks) were related to higher likelihoods of considering the police search to be reasonable. However, in the other scenarios presented (e.g., black characters with well-behaved demeanors), racial stereotypes were not related to views regarding how reasonable the search seemed.

Timberlake et al. (2001) examined factors associated with drug-related spending attitudes using General Social Survey data from 1984–1998. The outcome examined in their study indicated whether respondents supported greater spending on drug control (a combined measure of addiction and rehabilitation views; respondents were asked only about one of these drug spending issues, and a dummy variable indicated the one about which they were asked). The results revealed that traditionally conservative groups (i.e., men, whites, political conservatives and moderates, conservative Protestants) were less supportive of spending, especially on rehabilitation. Whites who opposed “race targeting” (i.e., spending on blacks and whether the government is obligated to improve blacks’ living standards) were less supportive of increased drug-related spending, although “traditional” prejudice (measured as whether whites have the right to segregate neighborhoods and whether there should be miscegenation laws) was not related to spending attitudes.

Bobo and Johnson (2004) also examined the relationship between racial attitudes and drug views. Using data collected through an Internet-based survey of a nationally representative sample of whites and blacks, they examined whether respondents supported more punitive sentencing for crack relative to powder cocaine. In some surveys, a “racial bias cue” was included in the wording of the item to indicate that there are racial disparities in convictions for the two drugs. Among white respondents, those more likely to support the differential sentencing for crack and powder cocaine had less education and harbored more racial resentment, were not given the “racial bias cue,” and did not believe the criminal justice system is biased against blacks.

In sum, the existing literature suggests that racial prejudice may be important for drug-related views. Yet, these studies leave unaddressed several issues. Are both “traditional” and “modern” forms of prejudice important for drug-related attitudes? As such, are drug-related issues colored coded in a fashion similar to other ostensibly non-racial policies? Do color coding processes extend to other racial or ethnic groups besides blacks—i.e., to Latinos? Few studies have examined the role of prejudice toward both Latinos and blacks for policy views (see Barkan and Cohn (2005) for an exception); yet, as discussed above, drugs are one area in which such views are likely to be especially salient.

We thus seek to extend the literature by examining whether and how whites’ prejudices and stereotypes impact attitudes toward drug rehabilitation spending. If drug-related attitudes are “color coded” as we anticipate, attitudes toward blacks and Latinos will be associated with rehabilitation spending views. Specifically, we expect to find that white respondents who hold prejudicial attitudes toward blacks and Latinos are less likely to say too little money is spent on drug rehabilitation. However, our modeling approach also enables us to explore/test whether particular types of racial and ethnic attitudes are more salient—specifically, those that manifest indirect/symbolic/modern prejudice (e.g., stereotypes about violence, work ethic, individualistic causal attributions) or those that reflect more social-distance-based traditional prejudice (e.g., attitudes toward residential segregation and interracial marriage). Consistent with the premises of color coding, we expect to find that the modern/indirect prejudice items in particular will be related to drug rehabilitation spending attitudes, such that greater prejudice should predict less support for spending on this issue.

Methods

Data

The data used in this study are from the General Social Survey (GSS). The GSS is a repeated cross-sectional survey that has been conducted annually or biannually since 1972. The GSS uses multi-stage probability sampling, and the samples are nationally representative of the English-speaking US adult population aged 18 and older living in non-

institutionalized settings (Davis et al. 2005). Similar to prior studies (e.g., Barkan and Cohn 2005; Mears et al. 2009) of the implications of racial attitudes, we examine only white respondents in these analyses.

Core questions (e.g., demographics) and others are repeated in all surveys. However, due to random question rotations, not all items of interest appear on all GSS questionnaires during each survey year (Davis et al. 2005). The measures of our key independent variables—racial and ethnic attitudes—and our dependent variable all were asked in 1990 and 2000; thus, those 2 years of data are used.³ [Response rates for the GSS, calculated using the guidelines of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (2008), were 73.9% in 1990 and 70.0% in 2000 (Davis et al. 2007, pp. 2112–2113)]. In the analyses, we include only (eligible) respondents asked all of the items used to operationalize our measures. Also, missing data are a consideration, especially for income. Overall, 63% of cases had complete data across all measures included in the drug rehabilitation spending analyses.⁴ We used multiple imputation methods in Stata to impute the missing data for the independent variables (Allison 2002; StataCorp. 2005; see Royston 2005).⁵ Following multiple imputation procedures, a total of 864 respondents are examined in this study. (We also ran the analyses using listwise deletion of cases with missing data; the results were substantively similar to those obtained using the imputed data (results not shown; available upon request)).

Variables

The dependent variable is attitudes toward “drug rehabilitation spending.” It is measured by responses to the item: “We are faced with many problems in this country, none of which can be solved easily or inexpensively... for each one [named] I’d like you to tell me whether you think we’re spending too much money on it, too little money, or about the right amount... drug rehabilitation.” Similar to prior research (e.g., Rasinski et al. 2000; Timberlake et al. 2001), “about right” and “too much” are combined (coded 0) and compared with “too little” (coded 1).

Independent Variables: Prejudice and Stereotypes—Key independent variables address attitudes toward blacks and Latinos, with similar attitudes toward whites included as controls (for general negative perceptions of people). Four types of measures are used to assess prejudice. The first type reflects “traditional” prejudice toward blacks and toward Latinos and is assessed by two sets of group-specific items. One asks the extent to which respondents would favor or oppose “living in a neighborhood where half of your neighbors were blacks (Hispanic Americans)?” The second asks the extent to which they would favor

³Specifically, of the racial/ethnic stereotypes measures, groups’ violence proneness was not asked after 2000. The hardworking/lazy and the intelligent/unintelligent measures were asked concerning blacks through 2008, but Latinos were not asked about after 2000. The measures concerning whether respondents would be willing to live in neighborhoods where half of their neighbors were black was asked through 2008 but the similar item concerning Latinos was not asked after 2000. Thus, to enable consideration of prejudice and stereotypes concerning blacks and Latinos for drug rehabilitation spending attitudes, the GSS years are limited to 1990 and 2000.

⁴Missing data are a consideration in the analyses. Seven percent of cases were missing information on the dependent variable. For the independent variables, only a handful of cases have missing data for the basic demographics and control variables (e.g., age, education, sex, residence, employment, or marital or parental status). The single item in the analyses with the largest amount of missing data is family income (9%). Of the racial and ethnic attitudes items, those with the most missing data were related to Latinos: Violence proneness, intelligence, and work ethic (7.4, 7.2, and 6.8% missing, respectively; the latter two comprise the stereotypes index). Of the other measures, two of the race difference attribution items (discrimination and motivation/will power) were missing 6.5 and 7.3% of cases. All other racial/ethnic attitudes items had complete data for 95.5% or more of cases. Among cases with missing data, half were missing information on either one or two variables, while the remainder were missing information on three or more.

⁵The results presented were obtained using random draws from the posterior predictive distribution from regression models, and five data sets were imputed for each model. Next, the five data sets were combined and logistic regression parameter estimates were obtained (the Li-Raghunathan-Rubin robust estimate of the variance-covariance matrix of coefficients was used). The results shown based on cases with imputed missing values were substantively similar to those obtained using listwise deletion of cases with missing data (results not shown; available upon request).

or oppose “having a close relative or family member marry a black person (an Hispanic American person)?” Both sets of group-specific “oppose living in neighborhood” measures and of “oppose relative marrying” measures are coded as 1 for those who said they “oppose” or “strongly oppose” and as 0 for those who “strongly favor,” “favor,” or “neither favor nor oppose.” (Similar items asking about whites were not available in the 1990 and 2000 GSS and thus could not be examined as control variables.)

The second set of measures are indexes comprised of two items asked concerning blacks, Latinos and whites, respectively, and these provide one set of measures consistent with modern/laissez-faire racism (Bobo et al. 1997). The additive indexes are based on responses to the following: “... I’m going to show you a seven-point scale on which the characteristics of people in a group can be rated... if people in the group tend to be hardworking or lazy. Where would you rate whites in general on this scale? Blacks? Hispanics?” and “Do people in these groups tend to be unintelligent or tend to be intelligent? Where would you rate whites in general on this scale? Blacks? Hispanics?” For each group, responses range from 1 to 7. On the measure for “hardworking,” 1 equals hardworking and 7 equals lazy. For “intelligence,” responses were reverse coded so that 1 equals intelligent and 7 is unintelligent. The race/ethnic-specific “hardworking” and “intelligence” measures were summed to create indexes for black stereotypes, Latino stereotypes, and white stereotypes (e.g., black work ethic and black intelligence responses were summed). For each of the stereotypes indexes, higher scores indicate more prejudiced views of that particular group.⁶

Another set of items used to assess other modern/laissez-faire racist attitudes (Bobo et al. 1997) toward blacks, Latinos, and whites is especially relevant. Respondents were asked about their views with regard to each of the three groups. The item is: “... if people in each group tend to be violence-prone or whether they tend not to be prone to violence?... Whites... Blacks? Hispanics?” Original responses ranged from 1 for violence-prone and 7 for not violence-prone. These items were reversed coded so that lower scores indicate not violence-prone and higher scores indicate greater perceived violence proneness of blacks, Latinos and whites.

The fourth type of racial attitudes measures, also consistent with modern prejudice, assesses whether respondents attribute race differences in socioeconomic outcomes to individual or structural factors. Race differences—“individual” and race differences—“structural” are based on responses to the following items: “On the average (Negroes/Blacks/African Americans) have worse jobs, income, and housing than white people. Do you think these differences are (A) mainly due to discrimination? (B) because most (Negroes/Blacks/African Americans) have less in-born ability to learn? (C) because most (Negroes/Blacks/African Americans) don’t have the chance for education that it takes to rise out of poverty? (D) because most (Negroes/Blacks/African Americans) just don’t have the motivation or will power to pull themselves up out of poverty?” For each item, the response choices were yes (coded 1) or no (coded 0). Race differences—“individual” sums respondents’ answers to the inborn ability and motivation items; race differences—“structural” sums those from the discrimination and chance for education items.⁷ Although the items compare only whites and blacks, they are also included in the analyses to assess whether views concerning Latinos are associated with drug rehabilitation attitudes since individualistic and structural attributions for racial group differences may be relevant even if they are not specifically referencing Latinos.

⁶The correlations for the work ethic and intelligence items included in the indexes were .41 for black stereotypes, .36 for Latino stereotypes, and .37 for white stereotypes.

⁷The correlations for the two sets of items comprising the race differences—“individual” and race differences—“structural” measures were both .29.

Independent Variables: Control Measures—Following prior research (e.g., Barkan and Cohn 2005; Timberlake et al. 2001), other independent variables are included. To control for period effects, we include a dummy variable for GSS year (2000 = 1; 1990 = 0). Age is measured as a continuous variable. Sex is coded as males (1) and females (0). A continuous variable indicates the number of years of education completed. Total family income is continuous (base 1986 dollars divided by 1,000). Employment status is a dummy variable coded 1 for employed (full or part-time) and 0 for not employed. Marital status is represented by a dummy variable (yes = 1, no = 0) for married. An item indicates whether respondents have any children (yes = 1, no = 0). Political party is represented by one dummy variable (yes = 1, no = 0) for republicans. Political ideology is measured by a seven-point variable ranging from 1 for extremely liberal to 7 for extremely conservative. One item is included for conservative Protestants (yes = 1); other religious affiliations are coded as 0. Two dummy variables (yes = 1) represent residence in the South and urban areas (central city of largest 100 MSA), respectively.

Analyses

In order to examine the role of racial and ethnic attitudes for drug rehabilitation spending views, the relationships between the independent variables and spending attitudes, along with the interrelationships among the predictors, are analyzed. Bivariate analyses enable initial consideration of these relationships, and they involve zero-order correlations between all variables. Logistic regression is used for the multivariate analyses; this technique enables examination of the relationship between each of the independent variables and drug rehabilitation spending net of the effects of the other predictors included in the analysis. Parallel approaches are used to examine the role of attitudes toward blacks and toward Latinos for spending attitudes. In the first set of multivariate analyses, we examined the control variables (including attitudes toward whites). In the second set of models, the measures of “traditional” prejudice, opposition to a relative marrying a member of that group and to living in a neighborhood where half of the residents are black or Latino, respectively, are examined. In the next sets of models, measures of “modern” prejudice are included in the analyses. In the third model, the stereotypes indexes and violence proneness measures are entered. In the fourth set of models, whether individualist and structural explanations for race differences are related to drug rehabilitation spending attitudes is considered. In the fifth set of analyses, the robustness of the results is assessed by controlling for (including) all racial or ethnic attitudes items. This modeling approach enables consideration of the individual and combined effects of both traditional and modern prejudice for drug rehabilitation spending views net of each other and of the control measures. The results presented for all multivariate analyses are odds ratios, logistic regression coefficients, and their accompanying standard errors.

In all analyses, we checked for collinearity because of the possible overlap in the prejudice predictors. For the models involving attitudes toward blacks and drug rehabilitation spending attitudes, the highest variance inflation factor (VIF) in any of the models was 1.61 (with a highest model mean VIF of 1.26), while for attitudes toward Latinos the highest VIF was 1.54 (and the highest model mean VIF equals 1.24). The obtained VIFs thus indicated no collinearity problems involving the independent variables included in any of the models (Chatterjee and Price 1991).

Results

Descriptive Results

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics for the variables included in the analyses. Overall, just under two-thirds (62%) of respondents said too little money is spent on drug rehabilitation.

More than half (55%) of the respondents oppose a relative marrying a black person, while about 40% are opposed to living in a black or Latino neighborhood and to a relative marrying a Latino person. Higher means are evident for both black and Latino stereotypes than for white stereotypes, suggesting that blacks and Latinos are viewed as less hard-working and less intelligent than whites. Similarly, higher means are evident for perceived violence proneness of blacks and Latinos than for whites. For the race differences—“individual” and race differences—“structural” items, on average people agreed with just under one of the two items comprising each of the indexes.

Bivariate Results

Table 2 shows zero-order correlations involving the dependent variable and the prejudice predictor variables. In the bivariate analyses, drug rehabilitation attitudes are associated with some views toward racial and ethnic groups. Those opposed to a relative marrying a black person ($-.08$) and to living in a neighborhood where half of the residents are black ($-.07$) are less likely to view spending as inadequate. Respondents who are opposed to a relative marrying a Latino person ($-.09$) and to living in a neighborhood where half of the neighbors are Latinos ($-.08$) are also less likely to consider spending to be too low. Those who hold negative stereotypes ($-.07$) and consider blacks to be violence-prone ($-.08$) are less likely to say that too little money is spent on rehabilitation. However, for attitudes toward Latinos, neither stereotypes nor perceived violence proneness is related to rehabilitation spending views. Respondents who view differences between whites and blacks as due to individual differences (i.e., inborn ability to learn, motivation and willpower) are less likely ($-.10$) to say that drug rehabilitation spending is too low. On the other hand, those who attribute differences between whites and blacks to discrimination and lack of chances for education (structural factors) are more likely ($.12$) to say too little money is spent on rehabilitation. For attitudes toward whites, which are used here as control measures for general negativity toward people, neither stereotypes nor perceived violence proneness was related to rehabilitation spending attitudes. For the racial and ethnic attitudes variables, there are correlations in the directions that might be expected for the various measures (e.g., people who view race differences as due to individual differences tend not to also view differences as due to structural factors, people who hold negative stereotypes of blacks and Latinos are more likely to oppose living in neighborhoods where half of the residents are members of these groups).

Table 3 shows the zero-order correlations between the dependent variable, the prejudice items, and the control variables. Of the control measures, only sex ($-.10$), urban residence ($.13$), and republican party affiliation ($-.10$) are associated with drug rehabilitation spending attitudes in the bivariate results. Consistent with the notion of changes in racial views over time, less prejudiced views are evident in 2000 than in 1990, especially for the traditional prejudice measures (opposition to a relative marrying or living in a neighborhood where half of the neighbors are black or Latino). In addition, people with more education tend to be less prejudiced. Those who are older, have children, hold more conservative political ideologies, or are republicans tend to have more prejudiced views of blacks and Latinos.

Multivariate Results

Table 4 shows the logistic regression results, including odds ratios, beta coefficients, and standard errors, for views about blacks and attitudes toward drug rehabilitation spending. Model 1 shows the baseline model with just the control items included; Models 2 through 4 include sets of particular types of attitudinal measures. Model 5 includes all of the prejudice measures to consider their combined effects for views toward drug rehabilitation spending.

The results in Model 1 show that only sex, living in an urban area, and republican party affiliation are associated with attitudes toward drug rehabilitation spending, findings that hold across the subsequent models (except for sex). In Model 2, neither opposition to a relative marrying a black person nor opposition to living in a neighborhood where half of the residents are black, both measures of traditional prejudice, are related to rehabilitation spending attitudes, and the addition of these variables to the model does not improve its fit relative to Model 1 ($\Delta\chi^2 = 4.39, 2 \text{ df}, p > .05$). In Model 3, neither black stereotypes nor violence proneness, two measures of modern prejudice, are associated with rehabilitation spending attitudes net of the effects of the other variables in the analysis. In addition, the inclusion of these variables does not significantly improve the fit of the model relative to Model 1 ($\Delta\chi^2 = 4.23, 2 \text{ df}, p > .05$). In Model 4, two other measures of modern prejudice, race differences—“individual” and race differences—“structural,” are statistically significant predictors of drug rehabilitation spending attitudes. Those who attribute differences between blacks and whites to individual factors are less likely to say that spending on rehabilitation is too low. On the other hand, those who attribute race differences to structural factors are more likely to say that spending is inadequate. Model 4 represents a significant improvement in fit over Model 1 ($\Delta\chi^2 = 14.83, 2 \text{ df}, p < .01$). In Model 5, which includes all of the measures of attitudes toward blacks, of these only race differences—“structural” is significant. In particular, people who said that differences between whites and blacks in jobs, income, and housing were due to structural factors (discrimination and less chance for education) are more likely to believe that “too little” money is spent on drug rehabilitation. None of the other measures of racial and ethnic attitudes were related to drug rehabilitation spending attitudes, and Model 5 does not represent a significantly better fitting model than Model 4 ($\Delta\chi^2 = 3.16, 4 \text{ df}, p > .05$). As the pseudo R^2 indicates, about 5% of the variance in spending attitudes is explained in the full model. Thus, overall, except for the race differences—“structural” item, the relationships between the traditional and modern black prejudice items and rehabilitation spending evident in the bivariate analyses are accounted for by the other predictors in the analysis, primarily the demographic and control measures.

Table 5 shows the parallel results for the effects of attitudes toward Latinos for drug rehabilitation spending views, and Models 1 and 4 are identical to those shown in Table 3. Model 2 includes the traditional prejudice measures of opposition to a relative marrying a Latino person and to living in a neighborhood where half of the residents are Latino. Neither of these items are significantly related to drug rehabilitation spending, although the model is significantly improved relative to Model 1 ($\Delta\chi^2 = 7.02, 2 \text{ df}, p < .05$). Model 3 of Table 4 includes the Latino stereotypes and violence proneness measures; neither is significantly related to rehabilitation spending attitudes. In addition, the fit of Model 3 is not significantly improved relative to Model 1 ($\Delta\chi^2 = 1.73, 2 \text{ df}, p > .05$). In Model 4, both race differences—“individual” and race differences—“structural” are statistically significant predictors of drug rehabilitation spending attitudes. Model 4 represents a significant improvement in fit over Model 1 ($\Delta\chi^2 = 14.83, 2 \text{ df}, p < .01$). In Model 5, all of the racial and ethnic attitude variables are included to assess the role of views toward Latinos for drug rehabilitation spending. Of these items, only the race differences—“structural” item is significantly related to rehabilitation spending views. Model 5 does not represent a significantly better fitting model than Model 4, however ($\Delta\chi^2 = 3.03, 4 \text{ df}, p > .05$).⁸ In Model 5, as indicated by the pseudo R^2 , 5% of the variance in spending attitudes is explained in the full model. Thus,

⁸In results not shown (available upon request), we also examined a model that included all of the measures for blacks, Latinos, and whites in the analysis (collinearity diagnostics indicated that inclusion of all items was acceptable (highest VIF was 2.16; model mean VIF was 1.47)). The results were essentially identical to those presented in Model 5 in Tables 3 and 4. Of all of the racial and ethnic attitudes measures, only race differences—“structural” was significantly related to drug rehabilitation spending views. Of the other predictors, year, urban residence, and republican were also significant.

overall, except for the race differences—“structural” item, the significant bivariate relationships between the traditional and modern Latino prejudice items and drug rehabilitation spending views are accounted for by the other predictors in the analysis, especially by the demographic and control measures.

Discussion/Conclusion

In the last decade or so, examinations of the “color coding” phenomenon among whites—that is, the assignment of racialized meaning to ostensibly non-racial phenomena—have been fruitful and have led to the call for additional analyses to assess its parameters. In this paper, we do so in two ways: By examining whether racial/ethnic prejudices among whites are associated with a previously unexplored policy outcome, spending on drug rehabilitation, and by considering whether the color coding phenomenon extends to Latinos, a group largely ignored in previous research (but see Barkan and Cohn 2005). Specifically, we considered the impact of items that tap modern/ symbolic prejudice, including stereotypes about violence, work ethic, and intelligence, as well as individualistic and structural causal attributions about race differences in socioeconomic standing. We also consider traditional prejudice measures including opposition to a relative marrying a black or Latino person and to living in a black or Latino neighborhood.

Findings from items that tap both modern prejudice and those that reflect more social-distance-based traditional prejudice suggest that racial and ethnic prejudices have some influence on drug-related attitudes. The bivariate results indicate that views toward blacks especially, as well as some toward Latinos, were associated with drug rehabilitation spending attitudes. In the multivariate results, net of the effects of the background and other control measures, only one of the measures of traditional or modern prejudice was significant. Specifically, white respondents who explained race differences in socioeconomic standing as due to structural reasons (i.e., blacks’ lack of educational opportunity and discrimination) were more likely to say too little money is spent on rehabilitation. The finding of the effects of this indirect/modern prejudice item for drug rehabilitation spending is consistent with our argument of the color coding of drug issues.

Our results have some similarities with the limited research that has considered the implications of racial attitudes for drugs (Bobo and Johnson 2004; Hurwitz and Peffley 1997; Peffley et al. 1997; Timberlake et al. 2001) and with studies that demonstrate that such attitudes influence the American public’s views of crime control and criminal justice issues (e.g., Barkan and Cohn 2005; Hurwitz and Peffley 1997; Johnson 2001, 2008; Peffley and Hurwitz 2002) in that racial attitudes do indeed play a role in support for policies. The finding of the effects of the structural attribution factor is also consistent with those from other studies: It is a predictor of several other ostensibly non-racial spending policies, particularly crime control and welfare (Barkan and Cohn 2005; Bobo and Kluegel 1993; Bobo et al. 1997; Bobo and Johnson 2004; Wilson and Nielsen forthcoming). Similar to these other spending policies, apparently the force of race- and ethnic-based attributions that run counter to the dominant ideology of individualism (Huber and Form 1973; Kluegel and Smith 1986) are sufficiently deeply rooted to effectuate more support for policies viewed as being linked to minorities.

However, this is one of the first studies to consider not only attitudes toward blacks but also toward Latinos (see Barkan and Cohn (2005)). Such views may be especially relevant for drugs given stereotypes regarding connections between Latinos and drugs (Bender 2003; Portillos 2006), media depictions of blacks and Latinos, perceived linkages between these groups, drugs and violence (Bender 2003; Reinerman and Levine 1989), as well as the harsh treatment of Latinos and blacks in the criminal justice system for drug offenses (e.g.,

Demuth and Steffensmeier 2004; Schlesinger 2005). Thus, providing limited support to the important role of laissez-faire racism (Bobo et al. 1997) found in other studies of welfare (Gilens 1996; Shelton and Wilson 2006) and criminal justice policies (Barkan and Cohn 2005; Johnson 2008), we find that some racial and ethnic attitudes are important for drug-related views. However, it should be noted that while statistically significant, the size of the relationships between racial/ethnic prejudice and drug rehabilitation spending is relatively small substantively in both the bivariate and multivariate results. Thus, while racialized views are important for spending attitudes, other factors play a role as well.

In general, beyond the race differences—"structural" item, other predictors were important for drug rehabilitation attitudes. Sex, urban residence, and republican party affiliation were related to such attitudes in most of the analyses. In the case of sex, its effects disappeared when there was consideration of individualistic and structural causal attributions for race differences in socioeconomic standing, indicating that such views account for differences in rehabilitation attitudes for men and women. Indeed, there are clear sex differences in causal attributions evident in the bivariate results. Urban residence was consistently positively associated with viewing rehabilitation spending as too low. This perhaps reflects urban residents' proximity and exposure to drug addiction and recognition of the need to address it. Republican party affiliation was consistently predictive of viewing drug rehabilitation spending as adequate or too high. This may reflect a lower willingness by republicans to support government spending on social problems in general. It may also reflect an individualistic view of addiction and the need for individuals to "pull themselves up by their bootstraps," instead of using government monies to address drug problems (Edsall and Edsall 1991; Musto 1999; Timberlake et al. 2001). However, it might be generalized social-political conservatism, which is more characteristic of republicans than political independents or democrats, that drives beliefs about policy. Social-political conservatism is a broad social psychological construct that encompasses racist attitudes which might arguably predispose people to adopt conservative policy positions. This should be explored in future research.

Not to be overlooked are the implications of the findings for assessing the likelihood that drug addiction as a social problem will be rectified. First, drug rehabilitation is likely to be a low priority item on the national and state/local political agendas, as most drug-related attention and funding focuses on supply-side reduction (e.g., interdiction, arrests) than on demand-side reduction (rehabilitation, prevention) (e.g., Office of National Drug Control Policy 2009). The white public's racialization of this issue—similar to, most conspicuously, welfare (see Wilson 1996)—depresses support for calls for government intervention, and politicians are likely to pay heed to the public's disinterest. Sociological research on social problems, in fact, has documented that across a variety of issues, politicians are responsive to the public will—whether that will is supportive, non-supportive, or not deeply concerned—on an issue-specific basis (Burstein 1985; Lee et al. 1992; Wilson 1996). Along these lines, there is evidence that politicians are particularly responsive when it is the dominant group (i.e., whites) who is asserting its will in a context that has racial signifiers that, for example, invokes phenomena such as racialization of social problems (Allport 1954; Wilson 1996). Second, the racialization of drug rehabilitation likely produces relatively unsympathetic and even harsh treatment across the myriad of day-to-day encounters such as attempts to rent an apartment, find a job, and basic treatment in public areas, which ultimately amount to significant life-chance events/opportunities.

Overall, the results of this study provide some support for our central premise: Drug rehabilitation is "color coded." That is, similar to other phenomena, such as crime (Edsall and Edsall 1991; Hurwitz and Peffley 1997, 2005; Mendelberg 2001) and welfare (Gilens 1999; Peffley et al. 1997), the ostensibly race-neutral issue of drugs emerges as "racialized"

(Bobo 1998) in some ways. This provides limited support to speculation about the key role of race and racial coding of drugs and crime (Beckett and Sasson 2004; Beckett et al. 2005; Tonry 1995) and more broadly indicates that the color coding phenomenon, a manifestation of “modern prejudice” (Pettigrew 1985) of whites, can be extended to drug-related issues. We believe it is vital that future research attempts to gain a better handle on the overall scope of the color coding phenomenon. Possible racialization of, for example, geography (urban vs. suburban locus) and immigration are just two examples of cognitive referents and/or “hot button” political issues that need to be investigated in the future. Future research should also extend beyond just whether phenomena are coded as “black” issues, but should take into account other racial and ethnic groups. As our research suggests, attitudes toward Latinos appear to be salient for views toward ostensibly race/ethnic neutral issues. Others have clearly demonstrated that such color coding of issues has critically important political and policy outcomes (Edsall and Edsall 1991; Gilens 1999; Hurwitz and Peffley 2005; Mendelberg 2001; Peffley et al. 1997).

There are limitations in this study that must be acknowledged. First, our dependent variable does not span the entire domain of drug-related policy concerns (e.g., support for demand-side versus supply-side policies; see Rasinski et al. 2000). Second, missing data among the sample are a concern. However, that both multiple imputation techniques and listwise deletion (see Allison 2002) yielded similar results increase confidence in our findings. We are also aware that social acceptability may be relevant concerning the responses given by some respondents to measures of racial and ethnic prejudice and stereotype items (e.g., Bobo and Kluegel 1993; Tuch and Martin 1997). However, that many of the bivariate relationships between items are in the directions that might be expected (e.g., more prejudiced responses on some measures tend to be associated with more prejudiced responses on others) enhances our confidence in the results. Two other measurement issues must be acknowledged. Our dependent variable is assessed through a single item as are many of our key prejudice predictor variables; those that are not comprised of two items. The use of two or more items comprising the measures would be ideal in order to improve their construct validity and to determine their reliability. In addition, in the GSS, there were no comparable Latino-specific items that would enable direct assessment of the role of both racial and ethnic differences in individualist and structural causal attributions for differences in socioeconomic standing relative to whites. Despite these limitations, however, we believe this study offers important insights into the implications of modern forms of prejudice for policy attitudes specifically and insights into the racial and ethnic coding of social issues more broadly. The color coding of issues warrants future research, including into the realm of other types of phenomena that although explicitly non-racial may be imbued with implicit racial and ethnic characterizations.

Acknowledgments

Financial assistance for this study was partially provided to the first author by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (R01 AA13167) and National Institute on Drug Abuse (grants R01 DA018645 and 3P50 DA07705). The authors are entirely responsible for the research and results reported in this paper, and their positions or opinions do not necessarily represent those of the University of Miami, Drew University, the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism or the National Institute on Drug Abuse.

References

- Allison, PD. Missing data. Sage University series on quantitative applications in the social sciences. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 2002. p. 07-136.
- Allport, G. The nature of prejudice. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co; 1954.
- American Association for Public Opinion Research. Standard definitions: Final dispositions of case codes and outcome rates for surveys. 2008 [Accessed 02 December 2009].

http://www.aapor.org/Content/NavigationMenu/ResourcesforResearchers/StandardDefinitions/Standard_Definitions_07_08_Final.pdf

- Barkan SE, Cohn SF. Racial prejudice and support for the death penalty by whites. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 1994; 31:202–209.
- Barkan SE, Cohn SF. Racial prejudice and support by whites for police use of force: A research note. *Justice Quarterly*. 1998; 15:743–753.
- Barkan SE, Cohn SF. Why whites favor spending more money to fight crime: The role of racial prejudice. *Social Problems*. 2005; 52:300–314.
- Beckett, K. Making crime pay. New York: Oxford University Press; 1997.
- Beckett K, Nyrop K, Pflingst L, Bowen M. Drug use, drug possession arrests, and the question of race: Lessons from Seattle. *Social Problems*. 2005; 52:419–441.
- Beckett, K.; Sasson, T. The politics of injustice: Crime and punishment in America. 2nd ed.. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 2004.
- Bender, SW. Greasers and gringos: Latinos, law and the American imagination. New York: New York University Press; 2003.
- Blumer H. Race prejudice as a sense of group position. *Pacific Sociological Review*. 1958; 3:17–29.
- Bobo L. Reassessing affirmative action. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 1998; 455:105–125.
- Bobo LD, Johnson D. A taste for punishment: Black and white Americans' views on the death penalty and the war on drugs. *Du Bois Review*. 2004; 1:151–180.
- Bobo L, Kluegel J. Opposition to race-targeting: Self-interest, stratification ideology, or racial attitudes. *American Sociological Review*. 1993; 58:443–464.
- Bobo, LD.; Kluegel, JR.; Smith, RA. Laissez-faire racism: The crystallization of a kinder, gentler, antiblack ideology. In: Tuch, SA.; Martin, JK., editors. *Racial attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and change*. Westport, CT: Praeger; 1997. p. 15–42.
- Bobo, LD.; Massagli, M. Stereotyping and urban inequality. In: O'Connor, A.; Tilly, C.; Bobo, LD., editors. *Urban inequality: Evidence from four cities*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2001. p. 89–162.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. Racism without racists. New York: Routledge; 2006.
- Burstein, P. Race, job discrimination, and politics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1985.
- Chatterjee, S.; Price, B. Regression analysis by example. 2nd ed.. New York: Wiley; 1991.
- Davis, JA.; Smith, TW.; Marsden, PV. Chicago, IL: National Opinion Research Center [producer]; 2005. General Social Surveys, 1972–2004 [Cumulative Computer File]. Storrs, CT: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut/Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributors]
- Davis, JA.; Smith, TW.; Marsden, PV. General Social Surveys, 1972–2006: Cumulative Codebook. 2007 [Accessed 02 December 2009].
<http://www.publicdata.norc.org:41000/gss/Documents/Codebook/FINAL%202006%20CODEBOOK.pdf>
- Demuth S, Steffensmeier D. Ethnicity effects on sentence outcomes in large urban courts: Comparisons among white, black, and Hispanic defendants. *Social Science Quarterly*. 2004; 85:994–1011.
- Eberhardt, JL.; Fiske, S., editors. Confronting racism: The problem and the response. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 1998.
- Edsall, TB.; Edsall, MD. Chain reaction: The impact of race, rights, and taxes on American politics. New York: Norton; 1991.
- Farley, R. The American people. New York: Russell Sage; 2006.
- Federico, CM. The political psychology of race. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2005.
- Gilens M. Race coding and white opposition to welfare. *American Political Science Review*. 1996; 90:593–604.
- Gilens, M. Why Americans hate welfare: Race, media and the politics of antipoverty policy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1999.

- Huber, J.; Form, W. *Income and ideology: An analysis of the American political formula*. New York: Basic Books; 1973.
- Hurwitz J, Peffley M. Public perceptions of race and crime: The role of racial stereotypes. *American Journal of Political Science*. 1997; 41:375–401.
- Hurwitz J, Peffley M. Playing the race card in the post-Willie Horton era: The impact of racialized code words on support for punitive crime policy. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 2005; 69:99–112.
- Johnson D. Punitive attitudes on crime: Economic insecurity, racial prejudice, or both? *Sociological Focus*. 2001; 34:33–54.
- Johnson D. Racial prejudice, perceived injustice, and the black-white gap in punitive attitudes. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 2008; 36:198–206.
- Kluegel, J.; Smith, E. *Stratification beliefs*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter; 1986.
- Lee B, Lewis D, Jones S. Are the homeless to blame. *Sociological Quarterly*. 1992; 33:535–552.
- Mears DP, Mancini C, Stewart EA. Whites' concerns about crime: The effects of interracial contact. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 2009; 46:524–552.
- Mendelberg, T. *The race card: Campaign strategy, implicit messages, and the norm of equality*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; 2001.
- Musto, DF. *The American disease: Origins of narcotic control*. 3rd ed.. New York: Oxford University Press; 1999.
- Office of National Drug Control Policy. *National Drug Control Strategy FY 2010 Budget Summary*. 2009 [Accessed 22 August 2010].
<http://www.whitehousedrugpolicy.gov/publications/policy/10budget/index.html>
- Peffley M, Hurwitz J. The racial components of “raceneutral” crime policy attitudes. *Political Psychology*. 2002; 23:59–75.
- Peffley M, Hurwitz J, Sniderman PM. Racial stereotypes and whites' political views of blacks in the context of welfare and crime. *American Journal of Political Science*. 1997; 41:30–60.
- Pettigrew TF. New black-white patterns: How best to conceptualize them? *Annual Review of Sociology*. 1985; 11:329–346.
- Portillos, EL. Latinos, gangs, and drugs. In: Mann, CR.; Zatz, MS.; Rodriguez, N., editors. *Images of color, images of crime*. 3rd ed.. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company; 2006. p. 212–220.
- Rasinski KA, Timberlake JM, Lock ED. Public support for increased spending on the drug problem in America is not a simple matter. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*. 2000; 12:431–440.
- Reeves, JL.; Campbell, R. *Cracked coverage: Television news, the anti-cocaine crusade, and the Reagan legacy*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press; 1994.
- Reinarman, C.; Levine, HG. The crack attack: Politics and media in America's latest drug scare. In: Best, J., editor. *Images of issues: Typifying contemporary social problems*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter; 1989. p. 115–137.
- Rossi, PH.; Berk, RA. *Just punishments: Federal guidelines and public views compared*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter; 1997.
- Royston P. Multiple imputation of missing values: Update. *The Stata Journal*. 2005; 5:188–201.
- Schlesinger T. Racial and ethnic disparity in pretrial criminal processing. *Justice Quarterly*. 2005; 22:170–192.
- Schuman, H.; Steeh, C.; Bobo, L. *Racial attitudes in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 1984.
- Shelton JE, Wilson G. Socioeconomic status and racial group interests among black Americans. *Sociological Spectrum*. 2006; 26:183–204.
- St. John C, Heald-Moore T. Racial prejudice and fear of criminal victimization by strangers in public settings. *Sociological Inquiry*. 1996; 66:267–284.
- StataCorp. *Stata statistical software: Release 9.0*. College Station, TX: StataCorp, LP; 2005.
- Thompson V, Bobo LD. Thinking about crime: Race and lay accounts of law-breaking behavior. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. (forthcoming).
- Timberlake JM, Rasinski KA, Lock ED. Effects of conservative sociopolitical attitudes on public support for drug rehabilitation spending. *Social Science Quarterly*. 2001; 82:184–196.

- Tonry, M. Malign neglect: Race, crime and punishment in America. New York: Oxford University Press; 1995.
- Tuch, SA.; Martin, JK. Introduction. In: Tuch, SA.; Martin, JK., editors. Racial attitudes in the 1990's. Westport: Praeger; 1997. p. 1-14.
- Unnever JD, Cullen FT. The racial divide in support for the death penalty: Does white racism matter? *Social Forces*. 2007; 85:1281–1301.
- Wilson G. Toward a revised framework for examining beliefs about the causes of poverty. *The Sociological Quarterly*. 1996; 37:413–428.
- Wilson G, Dunham RG, Alpert G. Prejudice in police profiling: Assessing an overlooked aspect in prior research. *American Behavioral Scientist*. 2004; 47:896–909.
- Wilson G, Nielsen AL. 'Color coding' and support for social spending: Assessing its parameters among whites. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. (Forthcoming).

Table 1Descriptive statistics for variables in drug rehabilitation spending ($n = 864$) analyses

<i>Dependent variable: rehabilitation spending</i>	
Too little (1)	.62
Too much/about right (0)	.38
<i>Independent variables</i>	
Racial attitudes variables	
Relative marrying black person (oppose = 1)	.55
Living in black neighborhood (oppose = 1)	.41
Relative marrying Latino person (oppose = 1)	.36
Living in Latino neighborhood (oppose = 1)	.38
Black stereotypes index	8.40 (2.49)
Latino stereotypes index	8.12 (2.06)
Blacks—violence proneness	4.51 (1.67)
Latinos—violence proneness	4.30 (1.38)
Race differences—individual	.75 (.70)
Race differences—structural	.86 (.78)
Background variables	
White stereotypes index	6.65 (3.29)
Whites—violence proneness	3.63 (1.33)
Year (2000 = 1)	.37
Age	45.96 (17.72)
Males (yes = 1)	.43
Education	13.24 (2.84)
Income (in constant 1986 \$)	34.51 (31.87)
Conservative Protestant (yes = 1)	.21
Married (yes = 1)	.52
Any children (yes = 1)	.71
Employed (yes = 1)	.64
Southern region (yes = 1)	.31
Urban community (yes = 1)	.17
Republican (yes = 1)	.42
Political ideology	4.09 (1.68)

Note: Standard deviations in parentheses for continuous variables

Table 2

Zero-order correlations for dependent variable and prejudice predictors

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Rehabilitation spending	1.00												
2. Black stereotypes	-.07*	1.00											
3. Black—violence-prone	-.08**	.26**	1.00										
4. Opp. marry blacks	-.08*	.25**	.13**	1.00									
5. Opp. black neighbor.	-.07*	.39**	.19**	.48**	1.00								
6. Latino stereotypes	-.06	.59**	.20**	.19**	.22**	1.00							
7. Latino—violence-prone	-.02	.18**	.63**	.05	.09**	.22**	1.00						
8. Opp. marry Latinos	-.09*	.20**	.12**	.60**	.34**	.25**	.07*	1.00					
9. Opp. Latino neighbor	-.08*	.32**	.19**	.37**	.71**	.35**	.17**	.42**	1.00				
10. Differences—individual	-.10**	.35**	.19**	.31**	.32**	.22**	.08*	.25**	.26**	1.00			
11. Differences—structural	.12**	-.21**	-.13**	-.17**	-.19**	-.08*	-.11**	-.18**	-.14**	-.28**	1.00		
12. White stereotypes	-.03	.11**	-.14**	-.17**	-.16**	.16**	-.06	-.14**	-.13**	-.22**	.03	1.00	
13. White—violence-prone	.02	-.09**	.10**	-.16**	-.07*	-.05	.11**	-.10**	-.08*	-.10**	.03	.24**	1.00

*
p < .05;**
p < .01; results based on pairwise deletion of missing data (valid n's range from 722 to 851)

Table 3

Zero-order correlations for dependent variable, prejudice predictors, and control variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14. Year 2000	-.04	-.08*	-.04	-.29**	-.21**	-.12**	-.02	-.19**	-.24**	-.16**	-.04	.10**	.11**
15. Age	-.06	.15**	-.06	.26**	.12**	.10**	-.10**	.18**	.07	.15**	.04	-.13**	-.14**
16. Males	-.10**	.06	.07*	.02	.05	-.00	.05	.02	.02	.12**	-.14**	.01	-.01
17. Education	.05	-.18**	-.10**	-.21**	-.13**	-.09*	-.06	-.18**	-.06	-.29**	.20**	.12**	.09**
18. Income	.01	-.01	-.03	-.11**	-.05	-.02	-.03	-.05	-.05	-.10**	.08*	.02	.01
19. Conservative Protestant	-.02	.07*	.01	.18**	.07*	.05	.01	.19**	.06	.13**	-.17**	-.03	-.06
20. Married	-.02	.10**	.06	.06	.07*	.08*	.06	.00	.06	.04	-.04	.01	-.06
21. Any children	-.02	.13**	.01	.20**	.09**	.09*	-.00	.13**	.09**	.06	-.10**	-.04	-.06
22. South	.02	.07	.04	.14**	.07*	-.01	.03	.13**	.06	.14**	-.21**	-.09*	-.10**
23. Urban	.13**	-.06	-.02	-.05	-.03	-.05	-.02	-.03	-.03	.02	.06	-.02	.01
24. Political ideology	-.06	.13**	.11**	.21**	.15**	.10**	.09*	.16**	.13**	.14**	-.22**	-.04	-.02
25. Republican	-.10**	.02	.02	.12**	.09**	.06	.09*	.09*	.07	.03	-.03	.03	-.02

Notes:

*
 $p < .05$;

**

 $p < .01$; results based on pairwise deletion of missing data (valid n 's range from 721 to 864);

1 = drug rehabilitation spending, 2 = black stereotypes, 3 = black violence proneness, 4 = opposition to relative marrying black person, 5 = opposition to living in black neighborhood, 6 = Latino stereotypes, 7 = Latino violence proneness, 8 = opposition to relative marrying Latino person, 9 = opposition to living in a Latino neighborhood, 10 = individual causal attributions, 11 = structural causal attributions, 12 = white stereotypes, 13 = white violence proneness

Table 4

Logistic regression coefficients for “Too Little” spent on drug rehabilitation ($n = 864$): odds ratios, unstandardized coefficients, and standard errors for attitudes toward blacks

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
<i>Racial attitudes variables</i>					
Relative marrying black person (oppose = 1)	—	.78	—	—	.83
		-.25(.19)			-.18(.19)
Living in black neighborhood (oppose = 1)	—	.86	—	—	.96
		-.15(.17)			-.04(.18)
Black stereotypes index	—	—	.96	—	1.00
			-.04(.04)		.00 (.04)
Blacks—violence-prone	—	—	.93	—	.95
			-.07(.07)		-.05(.06)
Differences—individual	—	—	—	.76	.79
				-.28* (.13)	-.24(.14)
Differences—structural	—	—	—	1.28	1.26
				.25* (.11)	.23* (.11)
<i>Background variables</i>					
White stereotypes index	.97	.96	.97	.96	.96
	-.03(.04)	-.04(.04)	-.03(.04)	-.04(.04)	-.04(.05)
Whites—violence-prone	1.03	1.02	1.04	1.02	1.03
	.03(.07)	.02(.07)	.04(.07)	.02(.07)	.03(.07)
Year (2000 = 1)	.77	.70	.75	.75	.71
	-.26(.15)	-.35* (.16)	-.28(.15)	-.28(.16)	-.34* (.16)
Age	.99	.99	.99	.99	.99
	-.01(.01)	-.01(.01)	-.01(.01)	-.01(.01)	-.01(.01)
Male (yes = 1)	.70	.70	.71	.76	.76
	-.36* (.15)	-.36* (.15)	-.34* (.15)	-.28(.15)	-.27(.15)
Education (years)	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.03	1.02
	.05(.03)	.05(.03)	.04(.03)	.03(.03)	.02(.03)
Family income (/1000)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Conservative Protestant (yes = 1)	.00(.00)	.00(.00)	.00(.00)	.00(.00)	.00(.00)
	.97	.99	.96	.99	1.00
	-.04(.19)	-.01(.20)	-.04(.19)	-.01(.20)	.00(.20)
Married (yes = 1)	1.02	1.02	1.04	1.02	1.03
	.02(.17)	.02(.17)	.04(.17)	.02(.17)	.03(.17)
Any children (yes = 1)	.99	1.03	1.00	1.04	1.06
	-.01(.19)	.03(.19)	.00(.19)	.04(.19)	.06(.19)
Employed (yes = 1)	.75	.75	.75	.75	.75
	-.29(.18)	-.29(.18)	-.29(.18)	-.28(.18)	-.28(.18)
Southern region (yes = 1)	1.19	1.22	1.20	1.32	1.34
	.17(.17)	.20(.17)	.18(.17)	.28(.17)	.29(.17)
Urban community (yes = 1)	2.08	2.08	2.08	2.16	2.15
	.73**(.22)	.73**(.22)	.73**(.22)	.77**(.22)	.77**(.22)
Political ideology	1.01	1.02	1.01	1.03	1.04
	.01(.05)	.02(.05)	.01(.05)	.03(.05)	.03(.05)
Republican (yes = 1)	.65	.67	.65	.66	.67
	-.42**(.16)	-.40**(.16)	-.43**(.16)	-.41**(.16)	-.40**(.16)
Constant	.78	.98	1.40	1.01	1.31
Likelihood ratio χ^2	42.10**	46.49**	46.33**	56.93**	60.09**
df	15	17	17	17	21
Pseudo- R^2	.04	.04	.04	.05	.05

*

 $p < .05$

**

 $p < .01$; standard errors in parentheses

Table 5

Logistic regression coefficients for “Too Little” spent on drug rehabilitation ($n = 864$): odds ratios, unstandardized coefficients, and standard errors for attitudes toward Latinos

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
<i>Racial attitudes variables</i>					
Relative marrying Latino person (oppose = 1)	—	.76	—	—	.80
		-.28(.18)			-.22(.18)
Living in Latino neighborhood (oppose = 1)	—	.81	—	—	.87
		-.21(.17)			-.14(.18)
Latino stereotypes index	—	—	.95	—	.99
			-.05(.04)		-.01(.04)
Latinos—Violence-prone	—	—	1.00	—	1.03
			.00(.06)		.02(.06)
Differences—individual	—	—	—	.76	.79
				-.28* (.13)	-.24(.13)
Differences—structural	—	—	—	1.28	1.25
				.25* (.11)	.23* (.11)
<i>Background variables</i>					
White stereotypes index	.97	.96	.98	.96	.96
	-.03(.04)	-.04(.04)	-.02(.04)	-.04(.04)	-.04(.04)
Whites—Violence-prone	1.03	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.01
	.03(.07)	.02(.07)	.02(.07)	.02(.07)	.01(.07)
Year (2000 = 1)	.77	.70	.75	.75	.70
	-.26(.15)	-.35* (.16)	-.29(.16)	-.29(.16)	-.35* (.16)
Age	.99	.99	.99	.99	.99
	-.01(.01)	-.01(.01)	-.01(.01)	-.01(.01)	-.01(.01)
Male (yes = 1)	.70	.69	.69	.76	.75
	-.36* (.15)	-.37* (.15)	-.37* (.15)	-.28(.15)	-.29(.15)
Education (years)	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.03	1.03
	.05(.03)	.05(.03)	.05(.03)	.03(.03)	.03(.03)
Family income (/1000)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Conservative Protestant (yes = 1)	.00(.00) .97 -.04(.19) 1.02 .02(.17) .99 -.01(.19) .75 -.29(.18) 1.19 .17(.17) 2.08 .73**(.22) 1.01 .01(.05) .65 -.42**(.16) .78 42.10** 15 .04	.00(.00) 1.00 -.00(.20) 1.01 .01(.17) 1.02 .02(.19) .76 -.28(.18) 1.23 .21(.17) 2.10 .74**(.22) 1.02 .02(.05) .67 -.40**(.16) .99 49.12** 17 .04	.00(.00) .97 -.03(.19) 1.02 .02(.17) 1.00 .00(.19) .75 -.29(.18) 1.18 .17(.17) 2.06 .72**(.22) 1.01 .01(.05) .66 -.42*(.16) 1.11 43.83** 17 .04	.00(.00) .99 -.01(.20) 1.02 .02(.17) 1.04 .04(.19) .75 -.28(.18) 1.32 .28(.17) 2.16 .77**(.22) 1.03 .03(.05) .66 -.41**(.16) 1.01 56.93** 17 .05	.00(.00) 1.02 .02(.20) 1.01 .01(.17) 1.06 .06(.19) .76 -.28(.18) 1.35 .30(.17) 2.16 .77**(.22) 1.03 .03(.05) .67 -.40*(.16) 1.13 60.96** 21 .05
Married (yes = 1)					
Any children (yes = 1)					
Employed (yes = 1)					
Southern region (yes = 1)					
Urban community (yes = 1)					
Political ideology					
Republican (yes = 1)					
Constant					
Likelihood ratio χ^2					
df					
Pseudo- R^2					

Model 1, which includes the control variables, and Model 4, which includes the individualist and structural causal attributions items, are identical to Models 1 and 4 presented in Table 4. They are shown again in this table to aid the evaluation of the effects of attitudes toward Latinos for drug rehabilitation spending. Models 2, 3, and 5 contain the Latino-specific prejudice measures parallel to the black-specific prejudice measures included in Table 4

*
p < .05

**
p < .01; standard errors in parentheses