Published in final edited form as:

Soc Sci Res. 2014 January ; 0: 16–29. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2013.08.001.

THE IMPACT OF LOCAL BLACK RESIDENTS' SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS ON WHITE RESIDENTS' RACIAL VIEWS

Marylee C. Taylor^a and Adriana M. Reyes^b

Marylee C. Taylor: mct@psu.edu; Adriana M. Reyes: amr5763@psu.edu

^aDepartment of Sociology, 211 Oswald Tower, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, Phone: 814-865-1411, FAX: 814-863-7216

^bDepartment of Sociology, 211 Oswald Tower, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802

Abstract

This paper extends the study of contextual influences on racial attitudes by asking how the SES of the local black community shapes the racial attitudes of local whites. Using responses to the 1998–2002 General Social Surveys merged with year 2000 census data, we compare the influences of black educational and economic composition on white residents' attitudes. Finally, the independence of these effects from the impact of white contextual SES is assessed. Across three dimensions of racial attitudes, white residents' views are more positive in localities where the black population contains more college graduates. However, such localities tend also to have highly educated white populations, as well as higher incomes among blacks and whites, and the multiple influences are inseparable. In contrast, many racial attitude measures show an independent effect of black economic composition, white residents reporting more negative views where the local African American community is poorer.

Keywords

Racial attitudes; Environmental effects; Contextual influences; Socioeconomic status influences

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background: Environmental Influences on Racial Attitudes

During recent decades, efforts to understand the racial attitudes of white Americans as an outgrowth of personal characteristics and experiences have been complemented by an active quest to identify environmental influences on racial attitudes.

The roles of historical events, national culture, and regional norms in shaping racial attitudes have long been recognized (Pettigrew 1958; Schuman et al. 1997). Influences of changed

© 2013 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

legal requirements and prescribed behaviors on white Americans' racial views, sometimes dubbed "fait accompli effects," have been documented (Allport 1954; Pettigrew 1971). Along with such macro-level environmental effects, the impact of the more immediate social environment is now receiving research attention, facilitated by the development of statistical tools for analyzing multi-level data.

Race composition—The earliest and most numerous multi-level studies focused on the race composition of localities, specifically on the proportion of the residents who are African American. In line with Pettigrew's (1959) claim that prejudice among white Southerners related directly to local black population share, Giles and Evans (1985, 1986) documented positive relationships between white prejudice and county-level black population concentration. Fossett and Kiecolt (1989) provided supporting information, as did Quillian (1996) from his comparison of U.S. regions. Using 1990 survey data in conjunction with census information on metropolitan areas and non-metro counties, Taylor (1998) confirmed that many dimensions of white racial attitudes are more negative in communities where blacks are numerous.¹ In short, accumulated evidence on the impact of black numbers is congruent with threat/competition perspectives (Blumer 1958; Blalock 1967; LeVine and Campbell 1972; Giles and Evans 1986), not with assumptions that black presence in the community brings the sort of inter-group contact that improves attitudes (Allport 1954)², although persuasive demonstrations that economic or political threat mediates the impact of black numbers have yet to be produced (see Taylor 1998).

Educational and economic composition of the white community—A more recent and thus less extensive line of contextual research has focused not on population proportions, but on the influence that aggregate socioeconomic status (SES) in the local white community has on the racial attitudes of white residents.

In a 2000 paper, Oliver and Mendelberg charged that local race composition has received undue emphasis in the racial attitudes literature, being relevant only under certain conditions. The more important contextual predictor, they claimed, is the aggregate socioeconomic status (SES) of whites in the locality, racial attitudes being more negative among whites who live in low-SES communities. Interpreting the SES effect demonstrated in their research with what some scholars would call "scapegoating" theory, Oliver and Mendelberg say: "Low-status settings, defined by low rates of education and employment, expose residents to a daily dose of petty crime, concentrated physical decay, and social disorder... This exposure in turn leads to a constellation of negative psychological states... In settings characterized by general anxiety and fear, anti-black affect may arise because African Americans are a salient target in a racially divided society" (2000:576).³

¹Glaser (1994) found a similar relationship of black population proportions with political attitudes, but not with traditional race prejudice – within the South. The dearth of traditional race prejudice effects reported by Glaser may seem to contradict the dominant pattern in other research cited here. However, in fact there is no contradiction with the findings of Taylor (1998), at least, who reported population composition effects on racial attitudes to exist primarily outside the South.

²Dixon (2006) suggests that historical and cultural factors explain the predominance of white Americans' group threat reactions to the presence of blacks, except when very promising forms of contact take place. In contrast, for racial/ethnic minorities such as Hispanics and Asian Americans, positive outcomes of contact are more easily achieved.

Oliver and Mendelberg's (2000) interpretation, though not their findings, was challenged in a recent paper by Taylor and Mateyka (2011), who note that Oliver and Mendelberg's depiction of the white SES findings as a function of *economic* hardship in the white community is incongruent with their use of *educational* level as the contextual SES measure. When Taylor and Mateyka pitted the two strands of contextual white SES against each other as predictors of white racial attitudes, education was clearly the stronger influence. Local white economic status has modest effects on white residents' racial views when examined alone, and has no significant impact net of locality-level white education. However, even after controls for the economic status of the white community, there are noteworthy contextual education effects on many dimensions of racial attitudes: Whites report more progressive racial attitudes in localities where college education is common in the white community.

On first reading, the predominance of contextual education effects may seem like old news, given the well-established role of individual-level education in shaping many racial attitudes (see, for example, Schuman et al. 1997). However, the influence of educational composition in the white community is distinct from the tendency for better educated white individuals to hold more progressive racial attitudes. Contextual education effects exist above and beyond any influence on whites' attitudes of their own educational achievement: The tendency for whites living in highly educated localities to hold more progressive racial attitudes is seen among well-educated and poorly-educated whites alike. To explain this contextual education effect, Taylor and Mateyka (2011) relied on the interpretation offered in Moore and Ovadia's (2006) discussion of support for civil liberties. Focusing on high SES residents rather than the bottom of the SES ladder implicated in scapegoating notions, Moore and Ovadia (2006) suggested that where white college graduates are numerically dominant, "institutional and macrosocial means" not dependent on face-to-face interaction promote progressive attitudes.⁴

Much remains to be learned and said about the impact of local white educational composition on racial attitudes, but that topic's role in the present paper is limited to framing the new research reported here.

1.2 The Present Study

The present project builds on research about how whites' racial attitudes are affected by the socioeconomic status of the local white community to ask how the socioeconomic status of the local black community may influence white residents' racial views. We might expect the

³Also, Oliver and his collaborators (see Oliver and Mendelberg 2000; Oliver and Wong 2003), insisted that the definition of local context is pivotal. These researchers are joined by Ha (2010) in suggesting that the direction of the relationship between minority population size and white attitudes may actually reverse when the definition of locality shifts from larger areas such as metropolitan regions to smaller census units that more nearly approximate neighborhoods.

⁴Mary Jackman (1994) argues that dominant groups benefit from minimizing the salience of exploitative relationships; earlier Jackman and Muha (1984) had suggested that the self-described progressive racial views of highly educated whites is largely a matter of the sophistication of this group in maintaining the appearance of liberalism. Conceivably, normative pressures supporting "the appearance of liberalism" may contribute to the positive relationship Taylor and Mateyka (2011) report between progressive racial views and contextual white educational level. Disentangling enlightenment effects from concern for appearances among highly educated whites remains a task for future research.

SES of the local black population to have at least as much impact on whites' attitudes as does white contextual SES, yet we know little about the contextual black SES story.

As noted earlier, where the impact of black population share on white racial attitudes has been assessed, competing predictions about the direction of the relationship were offered by "contact theory" and competition/threat notions. When locality-level white *SES* was dissected into its economic and educational dimensions, psychological scapegoating processes were pitted against sociological portrayals of normative influence on the operation of community institutions. Opposing predictions about the impact of black *SES* on white racial attitudes are provided not by just two, but by multiple streams of scholarship:

- A** As noted earlier, evidence that white prejudice varies directly with black population share is most often understood to reflect of whites' sense of competition or threat, whether the "realistic group conflict" described by LeVine and Campbell (1972); the economic and political threat considered by Blalock (1967); the "power threat" discussed by Giles and Evans (1986); or the threat to group position powerfully described in Blumer (1958), a perspective developed in recent years by Bobo (see, for example, Bobo 1999). Whites' feelings of competition or threat vis-à-vis blacks would presumably be magnified not only when the local black population is numerous, but also when local blacks have the relatively high educational and/or economic status that would make them more potent challengers. Thus perspectives that focus on economic or political forms of threat/competition imply that *ceteris paribus*, whites' racial attitudes will be more negative in localities where the average socioeconomic status of black residents is relatively high.

However, several other frameworks suggest the opposite prediction:

- B** The hope that contact will improve inter-group relations is longstanding and widespread, but the point of the contact hypothesis (Allport 1954; Pettigrew 1998) is that contact between groups can make things better or worse, depending on the conditions under which the contact occurs. One condition asserted to improve the chances of positive outcomes after inter-group contact is equal status of the groups involved. This condition is not easily met, given the realities of racial stratification in the United States. (For example, the U.S. Census Bureau reports that in 2010 the average household income for non-Hispanic whites was \$54,620, while that for African American households was \$32,068.)

The average SES level of local whites is, of course, one ingredient in any comparison of black/white socioeconomic status, but our focus here is on contextual black SES. Because black SES will be lower than that of whites on average, *ceteris paribus* the equality called for in the contact hypothesis is more likely to be approximated in localities representing the high end of the black SES distribution. In sum, contact theory propositions imply that high SES in the local black community will produce more positive racial attitudes among local whites, low SES among blacks being associated with greater white prejudice—the opposite of the economic or political competition/threat prediction.

- C** For almost a century, stereotyping has been a focus in American social science discussions of inter-group attitudes and perceptions (Ottati and Lee 1995). As many observers have concluded, racial stereotyping remains prevalent in America: Stereotyping of blacks and other out-groups is evidenced in responses from white participants in recent surveys of the U.S. population, and has been identified as a key element in current forms of white racism (see e.g., Bobo and Charles 2009).

Stereotypes have often been portrayed as irrational views reflective of ignorance, inaccurate by definition. However, another perspective was represented in Gordon Allport's observation that "the human mind must think with the aid of categories" ...which are then "the basis for normal prejudgment" (1954:20). Allport went on to say: "generally a category starts to grow up from a 'kernel of truth'" (1954:22). Put differently, in the absence of full information, people will often make judgments based on statistics for the group, judgments that will not be accurate for every individual but that do reflect prevailing patterns. One source of support for this claim comes from McCauley's (1995) comparison of actual census figures with perceptions held by five samples of white subjects. Another comes from the Brezina and Winder (2003) finding that whites who see the economic disadvantage of blacks as particularly large are most likely to stereotype blacks as lazy. Indeed, recent research on stereotype accuracy has found that observers generally identify the direction of inter-group differences accurately, and are more likely to underestimate than exaggerate the magnitude of those differences (Kaplowitz, Fisher, and Broman 2003). Applied to our focus here, the implication is that insofar as whites' stereotypes of blacks are based on interaction, observation, or local media portrayals, they may in part reflect dominant local realities. Stereotypes held by whites, and the racial views they spawn, would then predictably be most negative in localities where low SES predominates among black residents—where blocked educational achievement may be attributed to limited ability, and a paucity of economic opportunities for blacks as evidence of laziness.

- D** Finally, threat to dominant group position (Blumer 1958) need not have an economic or political base; cultural threat must be considered as well. Stults and Baumer (2007) refer to Liska's (1992) book, among other sources, when they claim that "culturally dissimilar minority groups are perceived as a diffuse threat to the social order" (2007:510). "English-only" laws recently passed in a number of states reveal white Anglos' sense that growing Hispanic populations pose a cultural threat. Arguably African Americans can stimulate a sense of cultural threat among whites as well, for example through prevalent use of non-standard English or norms among school students that violate white mainstream achievement standards (Ogbu 2008). Insofar as cultural threat does provoke negative attitudes among local whites, that reaction would likely be more common in localities where the average SES of black residents is low.

In sum, economic or political threat/conflict perspectives imply that local whites will react negatively when higher SES blacks predominate in the locality. The opposite hypothesis—that whites' racial views are most negative where the SES of local blacks is low—can be derived from contact theory notions that equal status promotes positive outcomes after inter-group contact; from the acknowledgment that racial stereotyping has enough basis in reality

that whites' views will be skewed in the negative direction when circumstances in the local black community are dire; and from an understanding that "threat to group position" may take cultural forms.

The bases for predictions outlined above portray contextual black SES *per se* as having relevance for the views of local whites. A more complicated possibility is that black residents themselves react to contextual black SES in a fashion that reverberates in white attitudes. Here too, the propositions offered in previous literature are complex, suggesting that the educational and economic aspects of black contextual SES may have opposite effects:

- E A line of scholarship pursued by Gay (2004), in line with Huckfeldt and Kohlfeld's (1989) description of environmental influences on attitude formation, found that lower quality neighborhoods foster black residents' race consciousness, as well as perceptions that they are targets of discrimination (Gay 2004). Neighborhoods with more resources and fewer obstacles to mobility encourage more optimistic attitudes among black residents. White prejudice and the "racially deterministic explanations of the social world" (Gay:559) that arise within struggling black neighborhoods may form a vicious cycle: Anti-black attitudes may be accompanied by discrimination that limits black opportunity, resulting in more deeply troubled black neighborhoods where bleak perspectives are the norm; but also, the sense of blocked opportunity characterizing low quality black neighborhoods may have a polarizing effect, generating more negative racial views among whites. Insofar as poor quality neighborhoods are found where family incomes are low, these notions imply that white residents' racial attitudes may be especially negative where local black family incomes are low, in part as a reaction to the black pessimism prevalent in those settings.⁵

On the other hand, Gay (2004) found quite a different pattern for contextual black education effects: Where block groups contained large proportions of highly educated blacks engaged in predominantly-black civic associations, African Americans' perceptions of anti-black discrimination were heightened. This may mean that insofar as local black educational composition is implicated in the polarization of white and black attitudes, high contextual black education may be associated with greater challenges to whites' group position, spurring more negative white attitudes.⁶

This rich set of competing propositions makes it especially interesting to learn whether white racial attitudes are positively or negatively related to the SES of the local black population. We will also want to learn whether the educational dimension of SES in the local black community works in the same way as the economic dimension, and which has the stronger influence.

⁵Demoralization in low-SES black localities is more likely to discourage than encourage the organized black activism that would threaten whites. If widespread pessimism in low-SES black communities does generate more negative attitudes among local whites, the mediating mechanisms might include limited civic cooperation across racial lines and sub-cultural patterns that meet with white disapproval.

⁶Dailey et al. (2010) reported that among African American women, neighborhood-level income as well as education was positively related to perceived racial discrimination. However, their non-probability samples from four Connecticut communities were limited relative to the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality data used by Gay (2004).

As noted above, earlier research demonstrated that white contextual education significantly influences many racial attitudes, although the economic dimension of white contextual SES shows no effects net of contextual education. Importantly, the present research will conclude by asking to what degree black and white contextual SES work in concert, and to what extent they show independent effects.

2 METHODOLOGY

Using responses of non-Hispanic white participants in the 1998–2002 General Social Surveys (GSS) merged with year 2000 census data, we examine relationships between the SES composition of local black communities and the racial views of white residents, using outcome measures that represent traditional prejudice; perceptions related to “new” racism; and racial policy views.

2.1 1998–2002 General Social Survey Samples

General Social Surveys have been administered in alternate years to stratified, multi-stage samples of English-speaking Americans over the age of 17 by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago. The GSS data are particularly appropriate for this research because they contain many well-tested measures of racial attitudes. For example the stereotype measures, introduced in the 1990 GSS, are subtle enough to reveal evidence of racial stereotyping not detectable by traditional stereotype questions (Bobo and Kluegel 1991).

The 1998, 2000, and 2002 surveys were selected for this project because they surround the 2000 decennial census that provided the data on respondents’ communities. For these three surveys, response rates were 76%, 70%, and 70%, respectively.⁷

In each survey year, NORC randomly selected respondents from 100 Primary Sampling Units (PSUs), 70 metropolitan areas and 30 non-metropolitan counties.⁸ Details of the sampling plan are available in the [General Social Surveys 1972–2002: Cumulative Codebook](#). The PSUs are the contextual units representing localities in our analyses.

There is surely value in studying smaller geographical units, as has been done elsewhere (see, for example, Ha 2010; Oliver and Wong 2003). However, characteristics of the larger contextual units used here have been shown to influence attitudes (Baumer, Messner, and Rosenfeld 2003; Taylor 1998), and for readily understandable reasons. U.S. government labor statistics and research on equity in wages are presented for metropolitan areas because these serve as labor markets (see, for example, Cohen and Huffman 2003; McCall 2001). Metropolitan area often defines newspaper readership and the scope of other media (see, for example, Lacy 1984; Maier 2005). Furthermore, research at the intersection of sociology and geography has shown that Americans’ daily activities typically range throughout their metropolitan areas, far outside their neighborhoods (Matthews 2008; Matthews, Detwiler, and Burton 2005). The choice of geographical unit in studies such as ours makes a

⁷These response rates are completed cases as a percentage of the net sample, where the net sample is the original sample minus out-of-sample units, non-dwelling units, vacant units, and those where language was a problem, plus new dwelling units.

⁸One exceptional non-metro Primary Sampling Unit encompasses two counties.

difference (see Hipp 2007; McDermott 2011), and there are good reasons to focus on metropolitan areas.⁹

For twelve of these PSUs, census information represented fewer than 100 black residents, and (because the information came from the decennial census long form) values on key measures were actually obtained from many fewer individuals. We judged that black locality-level data to be inadequate and excluded these twelve PSUs from our analyses. The 88 remaining contextual units contained 5577 non-Hispanic whites. The GSS practice of administering selected questions to random sub-samples of respondents, inclusion of some measures in only one or two survey years, and item-specific refusals leave us with smaller samples for any given analysis. *Ns* range from 2558 to 4631.

2.2 Dependent Variables

Responses to twenty-three questions were used individually or in scales to yield eight measures of race-related views and feelings. Included in this set are measures of “traditional prejudice,” perspectives related to “new” forms of racism (Kinder and Sanders 1996), and race-policy opinions. Scholarly literature on racial attitudes indicates the importance of each dimension.

Three scales represent traditional prejudice: *Stereotyping* is the unweighted mean of three quantities, differences in the white respondents’ ratings of whites and blacks on seven-point scales representing trait dimensions of intelligence, industriousness, and propensity to violence. *Affect* is the mean of two quantities, differences in reported warmth or coldness felt toward whites and blacks, and differences in respondents’ feelings of closeness toward whites and blacks. *Social Distance* is the mean of reported reactions to living in a half-black neighborhood and to having a close family member marry a black person. The persistence of racial stereotyping among whites has been amply documented. Although its persistence over the decades earns stereotyping the label “traditional prejudice,” it is also seen as a crucial element of some forms of modern racism (see especially the Bobo et al. (1997) discussion of “laissez faire” racism). Some writers (Pettigrew, 1997, Smith 1993) have insisted on the preeminence of affect in anti-black prejudice. Evidence of whites’ insistence on “social distance” lies in the rate of black/white intermarriage, which although rising is still relatively low (see, for example, Passel et al. 2010); in residential segregation (see, for example, Feagin 2010; Iceland et al. 2002); and in stated residential preferences of whites for predominantly white neighborhoods (Krysan et al. 2009).

Three measures assessing perceptions associated with “new” forms of racism are used in this study. *Attributions for Racial Inequality* is a four-item scale registering respondents’ assignment of responsibility for racial inequality to “victim” factors -- blacks’ inborn ability and lack of effort -- and not to “system” factors -- inadequate schools, and discrimination. *Belief in Reverse Discrimination* records respondents’ assessments of how often white job

⁹There may be an additional benefit to use of larger contextual units: There is less cause for concern about causal ambiguity. Looking at blocks or even census tracts, researchers might wonder whether the racial attitudes that predominate among white residents attract or repel potential African American neighbors who are privileged enough to choose their neighborhood. Insofar as white residents’ racial attitudes as well as employment opportunities and family ties influence African Americans’ residential choices, we would expect evidence of that dynamic to appear in the selection of neighborhood rather than metropolitan area or county.

seekers lose out to less qualified blacks. *Racial Resentment* is a two item scale registering sentiment that blacks should work their own way up and should not push where they are not wanted. Whites' attributions for racial inequality, emphasizing black effort and de-emphasizing discrimination and blocked educational opportunity, have been identified as major foundations for new forms of white racism (Bobo and Charles 2009). "Racial resentment" (Kinder and Sanders 1996; Taylor 2002), the sense that blacks are demanding and receive undeserved benefits, is often portrayed as the core of current racial negativity among whites. Beliefs about the prevalence of discrimination against blacks and against whites are important aspects of attributions for racial inequality and of racial resentment.

The last two measures used in the present study assess views on racial policy questions. *Opposition to Affirmative Action* records opinions about racial preferences in hiring and promotion. *Opposition to Government Help* is a scale registering respondents' preferred level of government spending to assist blacks and their opinions about whether the government is obliged to help blacks. White Americans' resistance to ameliorative interventions on behalf of racial equity, represented in our racial policy measures, is estimated by many analysts to far outstrip expressed negativity to blacks (Schuman et al. 1997; Krysan 2000), and to be a major impediment to racial equity.

It would be interesting if previous literature pointed to differential predictions for these several dimensions of racial attitudes. However, findings in earlier related studies do not display systematic patterns (Taylor 1998; Taylor and Mateyka 2011). This much is certain: Given the distinctiveness of these dimensions of racial views and their prominence in the race literature, we would be remiss if we included only a handful of measures and ignored the rest.

Details on GSS question wording and alpha coefficients for the scales are presented in Table 1. All measures were coded so that unfavorable racial views and feelings score high.

2.3 Individual-level controls

Four characteristics of individual respondents were included in all analyses: *Education*, measured as years of schooling; *Family Income* on a 23-point scale¹⁰; gender, labeled *Male* to indicate coding of males as 1, females as 0; and *Age* in years. We also included two dummy variables to indicate year of the survey, *Year 2000* and *Year 2002*; 1998 was the reference year.

2.4 Locality-level controls

Population Size, the natural log of the 2000 population count for the locality, was included in all analyses, as was *Metro Status*, coded 1 for metropolitan localities and 0 for non-

¹⁰We chose the individual-level family income control to be in accord with relevant earlier research (especially Taylor and Mateyka 2011), realizing that survey income questions typically suffer from more respondent refusals than most other measures. In these GSS data, across our eight dependent variables, missing data on family income prompted the exclusion of 6.27% to 7.25% of the respondents. To be assured that the missing data on income were not creating problems, we replicated central analyses substituting values on the Hodge, Siegel, Rossi occupational prestige scale for family income. Occupational prestige scores, pertaining to respondents' current employment or (for the non-employed) work the respondents "normally" did, suffer from fewer missing values, as respondents are evidently less reticent to describe their work than their income. Results were not substantially altered.

metropolitan counties. Region was represented by a variable *South*, coded 1 for Southern localities, 0 otherwise.¹¹ Also included was a contextual variable described earlier as a well-documented influence on many dimensions of white racial attitudes: *Race Composition*, a straightforward measure of proportion of the population that is African American.

2.5 Focal Locality-Level Predictors

The two focal environmental predictors are built from information gathered in the 2000 census for the 88 included metropolitan and non-metropolitan GSS primary sampling units. *Proportion Non-College Blacks* is the proportion of black residents who have not attained a college degree; *Proportion Lower-Income Blacks* is the proportion of local blacks with family income lower than \$50,000.

In order to interpret these two focal predictors appropriately, we also employ two measures of contextual SES for local whites: *Proportion Non-College Whites* is the proportion of white residents who have not attained a college degree; *Proportion Lower-Income Whites* is the proportion of local whites having family income lower than \$50,000.¹²

Note that the coding of the contextual SES predictors, with high scores assigned where lower-status individuals predominate, means we would see positive relationships with racial prejudice if disparaging racial attitudes were encouraged where SES composition in the community is low.

The two black contextual SES measures are substantially positively correlated with each other ($r = .688$), as are the two white contextual SES measures ($r = .794$). The black contextual SES measures are also highly correlated with the corresponding measures for whites ($r = .769$ for black and white educational composition; $r = .729$ for black and white economic composition). These inter-correlations are not so high as to prohibit the joint inclusion of the contextual measures in common analyses¹³, but they do have implications for our interpretations of results (Cohen and Cohen 1975), as will be seen below.

2.6 Descriptive statistics

Descriptive statistics for dependent and independent variables are presented in Table 2.

2.7 Analyses

The multi-stage samples from which our GSS data come, with survey respondents clustered in eighty-eight geographical areas, call for specialized data analysis. On a whole range of unmeasured as well as measured characteristics, co-residents of localities are presumably more similar to each other than to individuals randomly-picked from across the country.

¹¹Census-Bureau-defined South Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central regions were considered Southern, the remaining six regions non-Southern.

¹²The \$50,000 cutoff was selected for black and white contextual income measures because we judged results to be more interpretable if the same income cut point was used for the white and black contextual measures, and we wanted these results to intersect with those from the Taylor and Mateyka (2011) paper, which had used \$50,000 as the cutoff for the white measure. As a robustness check, we replicated central analyses substituting “lower than \$35,000” as the black and white contextual income measures, a cutoff chosen simply because it divided the black contextual income values roughly in half. Results were substantially the same.

¹³For the final model, tolerance values were all within the acceptable range, the lowest values being about .2.

More technically, there is a lack of independence among errors within clusters.¹⁴ Ignoring autocorrelation in error terms can downwardly bias estimates of standard errors. Thus this project employs the multi-level modeling program HLM that adjusts for the structure of these data. The random-intercepts models used here add a locality-level component to the error term, thus allowing the average level of the dependent variable to vary across sampling units. By absorbing this variation, the additional parameter renders the individual-level error terms independent and provides more accurate significance tests. For a full explanation of the method, see Raudenbush and Bryk (2002). In the analyses described below, individual-level control variables are constrained to have identical effects across primary sampling units.

Our strategy is to begin examination of each dependent measure with an analysis that includes the individual-level control variables, the four locality-level controls, and our first focal predictor, Proportion Non-College Blacks. In Model 2 we remove Proportion Non-College Blacks and introduce the other focal contextual predictor, Proportion Lower-Income Blacks. Model 3 incorporates both Proportion Non-College Blacks and Proportion Lower-Income Blacks. Finally, Model 4 adds the two parallel white contextual SES measures, Proportion Non-College Whites and Proportion Lower-Income Whites. Supplementary tests for interaction were performed at several points.

3 RESULTS

Results of the HLM analyses are reported in Tables 3 and 4. Partial slope coefficients for the individual-level variables are not a focus of this paper, and they change little from one model to the next. Thus the coefficients for the individual-level variables are presented just once, in Table 3, as estimated for the most inclusive, fourth model. There are no surprises here. As established in earlier research, more highly educated respondents express more progressive racial views. (Given the coding, this is revealed in negative coefficients for individual-level education.) On the social distance scale and the two policy opinion measures, the partial effect of respondents' family income, controlling for education, runs in the opposite direction: When education is controlled, the higher-income whites, who have the most to lose, are most negative. On five of the eight racial attitude dimensions, women are more progressive than men. (Across the racial attitude literature, gender effects are inconsistent; see Hughes and Tuch 2003.) As in earlier studies (see e.g. Taylor 1998) the young are generally more progressive than older respondents, presumably reflecting "cohort effects," growing from the racial norms prevalent when the various cohorts came of age.

Coefficients for the contextual variables are presented in Table 4 for each of the eight racial attitude measures. Looking first at the locality-level control variables, in the four cases where region made a significant difference, the positive coefficients indicate that Southerners held more negative attitudes than non-Southerners, as earlier findings lead us to expect (see e.g. Tuch and Martin 1997). In the few instances where population size showed a significant effect, views of whites from smaller localities were more negative. Metropolitan status of the locality never made a significant difference. As demonstrated in

¹⁴In fact, recall that for our central measures of community characteristics, all residents from the same locality have identical values.

Taylor and Mateyka (2011), black population share had a significant effect for five of the eight racial attitude measures—all except Affect, Social Distance, and Opposition to Affirmative Action. The observed effects all run in the same direction: White residents of localities where African Americans make up a large share of the population hold more negative racial views.¹⁵

These observations serve as backdrop for consideration of the contextual black SES measures that are the focus of this paper. In the Model 1 coefficients, we see that Proportion Non-College Blacks has a significant effect on seven dimensions of racial attitudes, and a nearly significant effect on the eighth. Given the coding of this SES indicator – high values representing low rates of college completion -- the positive coefficients for Model 1 indicate that white residents' racial views are more negative where smaller proportions of African Americans in the community are college educated.

Model 2 addresses the analogous question for contextual black economic status. Significant positive coefficients are reported for seven of the eight dependent measures: White residents hold less progressive racial views where large proportions of African American families have incomes of less than \$50,000. The one exception, Belief in Reverse Discrimination, is understandable. Because overestimating reverse discrimination correlates with more explicitly negative racial views, researchers often consider the belief that reverse discrimination is common to represent a negative racial attitude. However, white residents of communities where African Americans are foundering economically probably find it hard to believe that blacks are given advantages whites don't have.

Model 3 allows us to assess the independent effect of each black contextual SES indicator, controlling for the other. It will be recalled that Proportion Non-College Blacks and Proportion Lower-Income Blacks are correlated with each other at the level of $r = .688$, which means that each accounts for about 47% of the variance in the other. Yet each dimension of black contextual SES has an independent effect on some racial attitudes, the impact of Proportion Lower-Income Blacks being the most consistent and pronounced. On the seven dimensions of racial attitudes where Model 2 estimates indicate a significant effect of Proportion Lower-Income Blacks, Model 3 coefficients reveal similarly significant estimates of the economic indicator even when Proportion Non-College Blacks is also in the model.

Proportion Non-College Blacks effects, in contrast, fall below the statistical significance threshold for five of the eight dimensions of racial attitudes when Proportion Lower-Income Blacks is included in the analysis.¹⁶ Only on Attributions for Racial Inequality, Racial Resentment, and Opposition to Government help are white residents' views more negative when smaller proportions of local blacks are college educated.¹⁷

¹⁵We looked for signs of interaction between proportion black and the contextual SES measures. It is reasonable to suspect that such interaction might exist, but the phenomenon is not evidenced in these data.

¹⁶One dimension of racial attitudes showing null effects was stereotyping. The Stereotyping scale included a measure of the gap in perceived intelligence of blacks and whites, which on its face seems a plausible attitudinal correlate of Proportion Non-College Blacks. However, when we deconstructed the Stereotyping scale and looked at the intelligence stereotype alone, no impact of Proportion Non-College Blacks was evident.

Looking across the spectrum of racial attitudes represented here, we see a pattern for the contextual black SES measures that is, in some respects, the reverse of the pattern seen in earlier research for white contextual SES measures: Between the two *white* contextual SES indicators, educational composition is clearly dominant (Taylor and Mateyka 2011); in the case of *black* contextual SES, economic composition has the more sweeping influence on white residents' racial views.

We now turn to another question about the independence of observed effects: To what extent should the confounding of locality-level black SES with contextual white SES condition our interpretation of these results? The correlation of $r = .769$ between the black and white educational composition means that approximately 59% of the variance in each indicator is accounted for by the other. For economic composition, the situation is similar: The correlation of $r = .729$ implies that about 53% of the variance in each indicator can be attributed to the other. Considering the black and white, educational and economic contextual SES indicators as a set, where should we speak of shared impact, and where do we find independent effects? Addressing this question is the job of Model 4.¹⁸

In the Model 4 results, for no racial attitude dimension does Proportion Non-College Blacks have a significant effect independent of the other contextual SES indicators.¹⁹ In contrast, Proportion Lower-Income Blacks does have an effect on many dimensions of racial attitudes even when the influence of Proportion Non-College Blacks and the contextual white SES measures are factored out. White residents' attitudes tend to be more negative in localities that are home to high proportions of lower-income black families. This independent effect of Proportion Lower-Income Blacks is significant for the measures of Stereotyping, Affect, Attributions for Racial Inequality, and Racial Resentment, and it is nearly significant for the measure of Opposition to Government Help.²⁰

4 CONCLUSIONS

We have assessed the influence of educational and economic composition in the local black community on eight dimensions of white residents' racial attitudes. Insofar as educational and economic composition effects are evidenced, they all run in the same direction: Lower

¹⁷The implications of residential segregation for whites' racial attitudes have been an important focus of race/ethnicity scholarship (see, for example, Welch et al. 2001). Using the dissimilarity index, we assessed the interaction of residential segregation with each aspect of contextual black SES. For six dimensions of racial attitudes no significant interaction was evidenced. However, residential segregation did interact significantly with Proportion Non-College Blacks and Black Economic Composition in their effect on two racial attitude dimensions, Stereotyping and Attributions for Racial Inequality. Positive partial relationships of each form of SES with these two outcome measures were stronger in more segregated localities. It is probable that in more heavily segregated localities the existence of a black "underclass" is especially prominent in local media coverage, if not in first-hand experiences of the average white resident. This may account for the more pronounced impact, where segregation is acute, of black SES on whites' perceptions of blacks' qualities, the focus of the Stereotyping and Attribution scales.

¹⁸In light of the strong inter-correlations among the four contextual SES measures, estimates of "tolerance" were of interest. For Model 4 and each of the preceding models, applied to each dependent measure, estimates of tolerance were in the acceptable range.

¹⁹Unsurprisingly, of the six significant Proportion Non-College Whites effects reported in Taylor and Mateyka (2011) for these 1998–2002 GSS data, only those for Belief in Reverse Discrimination and Racial Resentment are significant in Model 4, where the black contextual SES indicators are playing a role. (The Model 4 Proportion Non-College Whites coefficient for an additional measure, Attributions for Racial Inequality, approaches significance.) The implications of intertwined white SES and black SES effects are symmetrical. Thus the interpretation of the White Education Composition effects observed in Taylor and Mateyka (2011) must be amended: In part, White Education Composition was serving as a proxy for contextual black SES effects. (The samples for this study and the earlier one differ slightly, owing to the necessity of our excluding twelve localities with black populations too small to yield reliable black SES data. However, the overlap is substantial enough that the coefficients for Model 4 presented here are directly relevant to the Taylor and Mateyka [2011] discussion.)

SES in the local black community is associated with more negative racial views among white residents. As in earlier research (Taylor 1998, Taylor and Mateyka 2011), the results are not different in any clear and systematic way for traditional prejudice, perceptions associated with “new” forms of racism, and racial policy views.²¹ The use of multiple dependent variables, representing three domains of racial perspective, was important, however, providing assurance that we are not over-generalizing from patterns that exist only for certain aspects of racial views.

In effect estimates for the two dimensions of black contextual SES, we do not see educational composition overshadowing economic composition, as it did when these two dimensions of white contextual SES were compared by Taylor and Mateyka (2011). If anything, the opposite is true for black contextual SES. For the four dimensions of racial attitudes where black contextual educational and economic predictors differed in their impact, black economic composition showed a significant effect while black educational composition did not. On reflection, we should not be surprised at this discrepancy between the two studies: The significance of white and black contextual SES for white residents’ racial views is so different that there is no reason to expect parallel effects. The socioeconomic composition of the local white community has repercussions for the community in which white residents are *members*. In contrast, many white residents are *observers* of patterns in the local black community, and economic status is more visible than education.

For the several dimensions of racial attitudes which do show an impact of black educational SES net of black economic SES, that impact recedes to non-significance when the white contextual SES measures are included in the model. Evidently, insofar as black educational composition plays a role in influencing white racial attitudes, it is as part of a package that includes black economic composition and contextual white SES, a point to which we shall return.

In the end, the impact of black economic composition stands out. Net of the white contextual SES dimensions as well as black educational composition, black economic composition was shown to have a significant influence on Stereotyping, Affect, Attributions for Racial Inequality, and Racial Resentment, as well as a nearly significant influence on Opposition to Government Help: When the local black community is characterized by low economic status, white residents’ racial views are more negative.

²⁰Readers may wonder which of the two variables differentiating Models 3 and 4 had a crucial impact. Generally speaking, introducing either of the contextual white SES measures into the analysis lowered the size of the estimated black SES effect. However, with one exception, where a contextual black SES effect that was significant in Model 3 dropped below the significance threshold in Model 4, the single *corresponding* white SES measure made the difference. So, for the three Black Economic Composition effects significant in Model 3 but not in Model 4, significance held when the Proportion Non-College Whites measure alone was introduced into the analysis, but introducing Proportion Lower-Income Whites alone reduced the three black economic effects to non-significance. Similarly, for two of the three Proportion Non-College Blacks effects significant in Model 3 but not in Model 4, significance held when the Proportion Lower-Income Whites measure alone was introduced into the analysis, but introducing Proportion Non-College Whites alone reduced those two black education effects to non-significance. (For the third black education measure, introducing either white SES measure reduced the black measure to non-significance.) Full results are available from the authors.

It is important to note that supplementary analyses for each dependent variable revealed no significant interaction between contextual SES measures.

²¹Methodological factors may sometimes be the telling distinction among dependent variables, weak or null effects reflecting unreliability where data limitations left no alternative to single-item measures.

These findings run contrary to predictions derived from economic and political versions of competition/threat perspectives (Blalock 1967; Blumer 1958; Giles and Hertz 1994; LeVine and Campbell 1972) that higher-status blacks would represent competition or threat, thus generating more negative racial attitudes among white residents.²²

Instead, the findings are congruent with four earlier-outlined race literature perspectives that converge to predict relationships in the opposite direction: 1) Black/white contact in the community may have more positive outcomes where the SES of black residents is relatively high, placing them on more equal footing with whites. 2) Low-SES black communities may reinforce white residents' stereotypes and other negative racial views derived from them. 3) Although low-SES black communities often don't pose substantial economic or political threat, they may present cultural threats, for example through use of non-standard English or norms among youth that undercut school achievement, in that sense challenging white residents' sense of dominant group position. 4) Finally, insofar as low black economic composition signals lower quality neighborhoods, African Americans in low-economic-composition localities may show greater in-group racial identification and conviction of widespread discrimination, thereby evoking more negative attitudinal reactions from local whites.

The present project does not allow adjudication among these alternative possibilities, but it may spark valuable subsequent research that advances our understanding of these community-level social psychological processes. We are inclined to think that stereotyping must be an important part of the picture. On average, white respondents represented in our study lived in communities where the dissimilarity index indicated black/white segregation to be about 56. Among the set of possible explanatory processes outlined here, stereotyping is the one that can take place from afar, on the basis of media coverage or views from the freeway. The other processes would probably require more proximate relationships than often exist in such heavily segregated localities.

The indication in our results that black and white educational composition work largely in concert calls not only for thoughtful interpretation of these findings. Also, there is need for some recasting of Taylor and Mateyka's (2011) discussion of *white* SES effects. White residents' racial views may be more positive in response to the coinciding prevalence of college-educated whites and blacks for many reasons. The processes underpinning this relationship may indeed include the operation of local institutions influenced by progressive norms that college graduate promote, in line with Moore and Ovadia's (2006) ideas discussed in Taylor and Mateyka (2011). But the joint black/white contextual education effect also may reflect dynamics outlined in this paper—positive contact effects, stereotyping that takes off from “kernels of truth” evident in local communities, cultural threat, and reciprocal relationships between black and white inter-group attitudes. Future research will be needed to assess the relative importance of these processes.²³

²²Readers may also recall our introductory discussion of Gay's (2004) finding that blacks perceive greater discrimination in areas where highly educated African Americans reside and participate in predominantly-black civic associations. We had suggested that insofar as open expression of black residents' discontent may result, such a dynamic could work to increase white negativity to blacks in communities where black education levels are relatively high. Our results provide no indication that such a dynamic is at work.

Learning more about processes that underlie the contextual patterns observed here is not the only task requiring additional research. Data limitations left just 88 large geographical units -- metropolitan areas or non-metro counties -- serving as our localities. Conclusions from earlier studies underline the importance of the geographical unit used in contextual research: Replicating the design used here with smaller units, such as census tracts, and more of them, would add an important dimension to our understanding. The strong but not perfect correlations of black and white educational and economic contexts necessitate thoughtful interpretation of multivariate results. Those correlations can be discussed as statistically inconvenient collinearity, but they are central facets of the phenomenon researchers are seeking to understand. Working with smaller geographical units, ethnographers could provide insight into the character of communities where educational and economic contexts are in accord, and those in which contextual education is higher than the economic context would suggest, or vice versa.

Insofar as the patterns reported here provide at least a good start at understanding the impact that contextual SES in black communities has on white residents' attitudes, there are important implications for public policy (Burstein 2003). Most analysts believe that where black communities experience particularly severe economic disadvantage, discrimination associated with white residents' negative racial views play a role. The results presented above suggest that vicious cycles may exist, with economic hardship among local African American families driving white racial attitudes to become more negative. This possibility provides additional reason for public policy initiatives aimed at improving economic outcomes in black communities. In the first instance, the lives of black residents would be improved. But also, that improvement could be echoed in more positive attitudes of white residents, diminishing the forces that may perpetuate or recreate black disadvantage.

References

- Allport, Gordon W. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday Anchor Books; 1954.
- Baumer, Eric P.; Messner, Steven F.; Rosenfeld, Richard. Explaining Spatial Variation in Support for Capital Punishment: A Multilevel Analysis. *American Journal of Sociology*. 2003; 108:844–875.
- Blalock, Hubert M. *Toward a Theory of Minority-Group Relations*. New York: Wiley; 1967.
- Blumer, Herbert. Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position. *Pacific Sociological Review*. 1958; 23:3–7.
- Bobo, Lawrence D. Prejudice as Group Position: Microfoundations of a Sociological Approach to Racism and Race Relations. *Journal of Social Issues*. 1999; 55:445–472.
- Bobo, Lawrence D.; Charles, Camille Z. Race in the American Mind: From the Moynihan Report to the Obama Candidacy. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 2009; 621:243–259.
- Bobo, Lawrence D.; Kluegel, James R. Whites' Stereotypes, Social Distance, and Perceived Discrimination Toward Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians: Toward A Multi-ethnic Framework. Paper presented at the 86th Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association; 1991.

²³As shown in earlier, related research, contextual SES effects often coexist with effects of racial proportions (e.g. Taylor and Mateyka 2011). The correlations between them are quite modest (virtually zero in the case of white contextual SES). Possible mediators of white and black contextual SES effects, outlined above, are distinct from dynamics often hypothesized to account for racial proportions effects – for example media portrayals of crime and racially-charged local politics. Thus it is not surprising that the present research provides additional evidence of the relatively independent influences of racial proportions, treated here as a locality-level control, and contextual SES effects.

- Bobo, Lawrence; Kluegel, James R.; Smith, Ryan A. Laissez-Faire Racism: The Crystallization of a Kinder, Gentler, Antiblack Ideology. In: Tuch, Steven A.; Martin, Jack K., editors. *Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change*. Westport CT: Praeger Publishers; 1997. p. 15-42.
- Brezina, Timothy; Winder, Kenisha. Economic Disadvantage, Status Generalization, and Negative Racial Stereotyping by White Americans. *Social Psychology Quarterly*. 2003; 66:402-418.
- Burstein, Paul. The Impact of Public Opinion on Public Policy: A Review and an Agenda. *Political Research Quarterly*. 2003; 56:29-40.
- Cohen, Jacob; Cohen, Patricia. *Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 1975.
- Cohen, Philip N.; Huffman, Matt L. Individuals, Jobs, and Labor Markets: The Devaluation of Women's Work. *American Sociological Review*. 2003; 68:443-463.
- Dailey, Amy B.; Kasl, Stanislav V.; Holford, Theodore R.; Lewis, Tene T.; Jones, Beth A. Neighborhood- and Individual-Level Socioeconomic Variation in Perceptions of Racial Discrimination. *Ethnicity and Health*. 2010; 15:145-163. [PubMed: 20407967]
- Dixon, Jeffrey C. The Ties That Bind and Those That Don't: Toward Reconciling Group Threat and Contact Theories of Prejudice. *Social Forces*. 2006; 84: 2179-2204.
- Feagin, Joe R. *Racist America: Roots, Current Realities, and Future Reparations*. New York: Routledge; 2010.
- Fossett, Mark A.; Jill Kiecolt, K. The Relative Size of Minority Populations and White Racial Attitudes. *Social Science Quarterly*. 1989; 70:820-835.
- Gay, Claudine. Putting Race in Context: Identifying the Environmental Determinants of Black Racial Attitudes. *The American Political Science Review*. 2004; 98:547-562.
- Giles, Micheal W.; Evans, Arthur S. External Threat, Perceived Threat, and Group Identity. *Social Science Quarterly*. 1985; 66:50-66.
- Giles, Micheal W.; Evans, Arthur S. The Power Approach to Intergroup Hostility. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 1986; 30:469-486.
- Giles, Micheal; Hertz, Kaenan. Racial Threat and Partisan Identification. *American Political Science Review*. 1994; 88:317-326.
- Glaser, James M. Back to the Black Belt: Racial Environment and White Racial Attitudes in the South. *Journal of Politics*. 1994:5621-41.
- Ha, Shang E. The Consequences of Multiracial Contexts on Public Attitudes Toward Immigration. *Political Research Quarterly*. 2010; 63:29-42.
- Hipp, John R. Block, Tract, and Level of Aggregation. *American Sociological Review*. 2007; 72:659-680.
- Huckfeldt, Robert; Kohlfeld, Carol W. *Race and the Decline of Class in American Politics*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press; 1989.
- Hughes, Michael; Tuch, Steven A. Gender Differences in Whites' Racial Attitudes: Are Women's Attitudes Really More Favorable? *Social Psychology Quarterly*. 2003; 66:384-401.
- Iceland, John; Weinberg, Daniel H.; Steinmetz, Erika. *US Census Bureau, Series CENSR-3, Racial and Residential Segregation in the United States: 1980-2000*. Washington, D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office; 2002.
- Jackman, Mary R. *The Velvet Glove*. Berkeley CA: University of California Press; 1994.
- Jackman, Mary R.; Muha, Michael J. Education and Intergroup Attitudes: Moral Enlightenment, Superficial Democratic Commitment, or Ideological Refinement? *American Sociological Review*. 1984; 49: 751-769.
- Kaplowitz, Stan A.; Fisher, Bradley J.; Broman, Clifford L. How Accurate Are Perceptions of Social Statistics about Blacks and Whites? Effects of Race and Education. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 2003; 67:237-243.
- Kinder, Donald R.; Sanders, Lynn M. *Divided by Color: Racial Politics and Democratic Ideals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1996.
- Krysan, Maria. Prejudice, Politics, and Public Opinion: Understanding the Sources of Racial Policy Attitudes. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 2000; 26:135-168.

- Krysan, Maria; Farley, Reynolds; Couper, Mick P.; Forman, Tyrone A. Does Race Matter in Neighborhood Preferences? Results from a Video Experiment. *American Journal of Sociology*. 2009; 115:527–559.
- Lacy, Stephen. Competition Among Metropolitan Daily, Small Daily and Weekly Newspapers. *Journalism Quarterly*. 1984; 61:640–646.
- LeVine, Robert A.; Campbell, Donald T. *Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes, and Group Behavior*. New York: Wiley; 1972.
- Liska, Allen E. *Social Threat and Social Control*. Albany: State University of New York Press; 1992.
- Maier, Scott R. Accuracy Matters: A Cross-Market Assessment of Newspaper Error and Credibility. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*. 2005; 82:533–551.
- Matthews, Stephen A. The Salience of Neighborhood: Some Lessons from Sociology. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 2008; 34:257–259. [PubMed: 18312814]
- Matthews, Stephen A.; Detwiler, James E.; Burton, Linda M. Geo-ethnography: Coupling Geographic Information Analysis Techniques with Ethnographic Methods in Urban Research. *Cartographica*. 2005; 40:75–90.
- McCall, Leslie. Sources of Racial Wage Inequality in Metropolitan Labor Markets: Racial Ethnic, and Gender Differences. *American Sociological Review*. 2001; 66:520–541.
- McCauley, Clark R. Are Stereotypes Exaggerated? A Sampling of Racial, Gender, Academic, Occupational and Political Stereotypes. In: Lee, Y.; Jussim, L.; McCauley, C., editors. *Stereotype Accuracy: Toward Appreciating Group Differences*. Washington, D.C: American Psychological Association; 1995. p. 215–45.
- McDermott, Monica. Racial Attitudes in City, Neighborhood, and Situational Contexts. *ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 2011; 634:153–173.
- Moore, Laura M.; Ovadia, Seth. Accounting for Spatial Variation in Tolerance: The Effects of Education and Religion. *Social Forces*. 2006; 84:2205–2219.
- Ogbu, John U., editor. *Minority Status, Oppositional Culture, and Schooling*. New York: Taylor & Francis; 2008.
- Oliver, J Eric; Mendelberg, Tali. Reconsidering the Environmental Determinants of White Racial Attitudes. *American Journal of Political Science*. 2000; 44:574–589.
- Oliver, J Eric; Wong, Janelle. Intergroup Prejudice in Multiethnic Settings. *American Journal of Political Science*. 2003; 47:567–582.
- Ottati, Victor; Lee, Yueh-Ting. Accuracy: A Neglected Component of Stereotype Research. In: Lee, Y-T.; Jussim, LJ.; McCauley, CR., editors. *Stereotype Accuracy: Toward Appreciating Group Differences*. Washington, D.C: American Psychological Association; 1995. p. 29–59.
- Passel, Jeffrey S.; Wang, Wendy; Taylor, Paul. *Marrying Out: One-In-Seven New US Marriages is Interracial or Interethnic*. Washington D.C: Pew Research Center, A Social & Demographic Trends Report; 2010.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. Personality and sociocultural factors in intergroup attitudes: A cross-national comparison. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 1958; 2:29–42.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. Regional Differences in Anti-Negro Prejudice. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 1959:28–36.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. *Racially Separate or Together?*. McGraw-Hill; 1971.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 1998; 49:65–85.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. The Affective Component of Prejudice: Empirical Support for the New View. In: Tuch, Steven A.; Martin, Jack K., editors. *Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change*. Westport CT: Praeger Publishers; 1997. p. 76–90.
- Quillian, Lincoln. Group Threat and Regional Change in Attitudes Toward African Americans. *American Journal of Sociology*. 1996; 102:816–860.
- Raudenbush, Stephen W.; Bryk, Anthony S. *Hierarchical Models: Applications and Data Analysis Methods*. 2. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 2002.
- Schuman, Howard; Steeh, Charlotte; Bobo, Lawrence; Krysan, Maria. *Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; 1997.

- Smith, Eliot R. Social Identity and Social Emotions: Toward New Conceptions of Prejudice. In: Mackie, Diane M.; Hamilton, David L., editors. *Affect, Cognition, and Stereotyping: Interactive Processes in Group Perception*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press; 1993. p. 297-315.
- Stults, Brian J.; Baumer, Eric P. Racial Context and Police Force Size: Evaluating the Empirical Validity of the Minority Threat Perspective. *American Journal of Sociology*. 2007; 113:507–46.
- Taylor, Marylee C. How White Attitudes Vary with the Racial Composition of Local Populations: Numbers Count. *American Sociological Review*. 1998; 63:512–535.
- Taylor, Marylee C. Fraternal Deprivation, Collective Threat, and Racial Resentment: Perspectives on White Racism. In: Walker, Iain; Smith, Heather J., editors. *Relative Deprivation: Specification, Development and Integration*. NY: Cambridge University Press; 2002. p. 13-43.
- Taylor, Marylee C.; Mateyka, Peter J. Community Influences on White Racial Attitudes: What Matters and Why? *The Sociological Quarterly*. 2011; 52:220–243. [PubMed: 21910274]
- Tuch, Steven A.; Martin, Jack K. Regional Differences in Whites' Racial Policy Attitudes. In: Tuch, Steven A.; Martin, Jack K., editors. *Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change*. Westport CT: Praeger Publishers; 1997. p. 165-174.
- Welch, Susan; Sigelman, Lee; Bledsoe, Timothy; Combs, Michael. *Race and Place: Race Relations in an American City*. NY: Cambridge University Press; 2001.

Table 1**Dependent Variables -- Measures of Racial Attitudes.****Traditional Prejudice***Stereotyping* (alpha = .740)

Where would you rate whites in general/Blacks [on this 7-point scale that runs from Hard-Working to Lazy]?

Where would you rate whites in general/Blacks [on this 7-point scale that runs from Intelligent to Unintelligent]?

Where would you rate whites in general/Blacks [on this 7-point scale that runs from Violence-Prone to Not Violence-Prone]?

Affect (alpha = .681)

In general, how warm or cool do you feel towards African Americans/white or Caucasian Americans? [9-point scale]

In general, how close do you feel to Blacks/Whites? [9-point scale]

Social Distance (alpha = .695)

Now I'm going to ask you about different types of contact with various groups of people. In each situation would you please tell me whether you would be very much in favor of it happening, somewhat in favor, neither in favor nor opposed to it happening, somewhat opposed, or very much opposed to it happening? ...

Living in a neighborhood where half of your neighbors were blacks?

What about having a close relative or family member marry a black person? (Would you be very in favor of it happening, somewhat in favor, neither in favor nor opposed to it happening, somewhat opposed, or very opposed to it happening?)

Perceptions Associated with "New" Forms of Racism.*Attributions for Racial Inequality* (alpha = .512)

On average Blacks/African-Americans have worse jobs, income, and housing than white people. Do you think these differences are...

Mainly due to discrimination? (coding reversed)

Because most (Blacks/African-Americans) have less in-born ability to learn?

Because most (Blacks/African-Americans) don't have the chance for education that it takes to rise out of poverty? (coding reversed)

Because most (Blacks/African-Americans) just don't have the motivation or will power to pull themselves up out of poverty?

Belief in Reverse Discrimination

What do you think the chances are these days that a white person won't get a job or promotion while an equally or less qualified black person gets on instead? Is this very likely, somewhat likely, or not very likely to happen these days?

Racial Resentment (alpha = .522)

Here are some opinions other people have expressed in connection with black-white relations. Which statement on the card comes closest to how you, yourself, feel? [Card contains responses Agree strongly, Agree slightly, Disagree slightly, Disagree strongly]

The first one is...

Blacks/African-Americans shouldn't push themselves where they're not wanted.

Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with the following statement [statement appears on card]:

Irish, Italians, Jewish and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without special favors.

Racial Policy Opinions*Opposition to Affirmative Action*

Some people say that because of past discrimination, blacks should be given preference in hiring and promotion. Others say that such preference in hiring and promotion of blacks is wrong because it discriminates against whites. What about your opinion – are you for or against preferential hiring and promotion of blacks? IF FAVORS: Do you favor preference in hiring and promotion strongly or not strongly? IF OPPOSES: Do you oppose preference in hiring and promotion strongly or not strongly?

Opposition to Government Help (alpha = .562)

[Now look at CARD.] Some people think that (Blacks/African-Americans) have been discriminated against for so long that the government has a special obligation to help improve their living standards. Others believe that the government should not be giving special treatment to (Blacks/African-Americans). Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you made up your mind on this?

We are faced with many problems in this country, none of which can be solved easily or inexpensively. I'm going to name some of these problems, and for each one 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...

[Data were combined for the two split-ballot versions of this question.]

Version A: Improving the conditions of Blacks

Version B: Assistance to Blacks

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics

A. Dependent Measures	Mean	S.D.	Min.	Max.	N
Stereotyping	0.64	1.08	-4.00	6.00	2841
Affect	-0.02	0.95	-4.59	3.66	3698
Social Distance	-0.02	0.87	-2.03	1.81	2933
Attributions for Racial Inequality	-0.01	0.78	-1.56	2.09	2669
Belief in Reverse Discrimination	1.94	0.69	1.00	3.00	2662
Racial Resentment	-0.04	0.95	-2.76	1.63	3985
Opposition to Affirmative Action	3.44	0.85	1.00	4.00	2558
Opposition to Government Help	-0.02	0.92	-2.41	1.39	4631

B. Independent Measures	Mean	S.D.	Min.	Max.	N
Individual-Level					
Education	13.68	2.88	0.00	20.00	4631
Family Income	16.28	5.14	1.00	23.00	4631
Male	0.47	0.50	0.00	1.00	4631
Age	46.26	16.88	18.00	89.00	4631
Year 2000	0.32	0.47	0.00	1.00	4631
Year 2002	0.33	0.47	0.00	1.00	4631
Locality-Level					
Population Size	13.23	1.61	9.68	16.79	88
Metro Status	0.78	0.41	0.00	1.00	88
South	.44	0.50	0.00	1.00	88
Proportion Black	0.13	0.12	0.01	0.57	88
Prop. Non-College Blacks	0.86	0.07	0.55	0.96	88
Prop. Low-Income Blacks	0.69	0.09	0.43	0.89	88
Prop. Non-College Whites	0.73	0.09	0.45	0.88	88
Prop. Low-Income Whites	0.44	0.10	0.18	0.69	88

Note: Statistics for dependent variables are limited to cases for which valid data exists on all independent variables. Statistics for individual-level independent variables were computed on the sample for which valid data exists on all other independent variables and on the dependent variable with the largest N (Opposition to Government Help). Statistics for locality-level independent variables were computed with locality as the unit of analysis.

Table 3HLM Estimates – Fixed Effects of Individual-Level Controls on Racial Attitudes.^a

	<i>Stereotyping</i> (N = 2841)	<i>Affect</i> (N = 3698)
Education	-.044 *** (-.116)	-.019 ** (-.058)
Family Income	.001 (.004)	.002 (.009)
Male	.110 ** (.051)	-.039 (-.021)
Age	.010 *** (.157)	.004 *** (.065)
Year 2000	.188 *** (.087)	.046 (.022)
Year 2002	.091 (.033)	.011 (.006)

	<i>Social Distance</i> (N = 2933)	<i>Attributions for Racial Inequality</i> (N = 2669)
Education	-.041 *** (-.133)	-.063 *** (-.229)
Family Income	.012 ** (.069)	.003 (.022)
Male	.140 *** (.081)	.118 *** (.076)
Age	.012 *** (.242)	.002 ** (.053)
Year 2000	-.083 * (-.047)	.006 (.004)
Year 2002	-.163 *** (-.073)	.035 (.018)

	<i>Belief in Reverse Discrimination</i> (N = 2662)	<i>Racial Resentment</i> (N = 3985)
Education	-.019 *** (-.080)	-.073 *** (-.221)
Family Income	.001 (.010)	-.000 (-.001)
Male	.007 (.005)	.149 *** (.078)
Age	.003 ** (.064)	.007 *** (.132)
Year 2000	-.054 ⁺ (-.038)	-.020 (-.010)
Year 2002	.037 (.022)	.012 (.005)

	<i>Opposition to Affirmative Action</i> (N = 2558)	<i>Opposition to Government Help</i> (N = 4631)
Education	-.018 ** (-.061)	-.030 *** (-.093)
Family Income	.017 *** (.102)	.016 *** (.088)
Male	.033 (.019)	.109 *** (.059)
Age	.001 (.013)	.002 * (.032)
Year 2000	-.111 ** (-.064)	-.047 (-.024)
Year 2002	.029 (.014)	.063 * (.032)

^a Values are unstandardized HLM coefficients (and their standardized counterparts) estimated from analyses where the model also included all focal contextual variables and controls.

⁺ p<.10

* p<.05

**
p<.01

p<.001

Table 4

HLM Estimates – Contextual Effects on Racial Attitudes.^a

<i>Stereotyping (N=2841)</i>				
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Population Size	-.033 (-.044)	-.021 (-.028)	-.021 (-.028)	-.048 (-.064)
Metro Status	.085 (.029)	.080 (.027)	.085 (.029)	.099 (.034)
South	.025 (.010)	-.018 (-.007)	-.016 (-.006)	-.011 (-.005)
Proportion Black	1.111 *** (.110)	1.078 *** (.107)	1.066 *** (.106)	.937 *** (.093)
<i>Prop. Non-College Blacks</i>	1.083* (.063)		.233 (.013)	.143 (.008)
<i>Prop. Low-Income Blacks</i>		1.279 *** (.095)	1.160 *** (.086)	1.695 *** (.126)
<i>Prop. Non-College Whites</i>				.160 (.012)
<i>Prop. Low-Income Whites</i>				-.917 (-.076)
<i>Affect (N=3698)</i>				
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Population Size	-.008 (-.013)	.001 (.001)	.001 (.001)	.001 (.002)
Metro Status	.049 (.020)	.047 (.019)	.047 (.019)	.049 (.020)
South	-.019 (-.009)	-.043 (-.022)	-.043 (-.021)	-.038 (-.019)
Proportion Black	.185 (.022)	.159 (.019)	.159 (.019)	.140 (.017)
<i>Prop. Non-College Blacks</i>	.548+ (.038)		.014 (.001)	-.379 (-.027)
<i>Prop. Low-Income Blacks</i>		.742 *** (.067)	.735* (.066)	.863* (.078)
<i>Prop. Non-College Whites</i>				.476 (.043)
<i>Prop. Low-Income Whites</i>				-.284 (-.028)
<i>Social Distance (N=2933)</i>				
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Population Size	-.044 *** (-.086)	-.037* (-.072)	-.037* (-.071)	-.019 (-.037)
Metro Status	.065 (.032)	.056 (.028)	.064 (.032)	.058 (.029)
South	.188 *** (.113)	.157 *** (.095)	.161 *** (.097)	.166 *** (.100)
Proportion Black	.183 (.026)	.181 (.026)	.156 (.023)	.217 (.031)

<i>Social Distance (N=2933)</i>				
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
<i>Prop. Non-College Blacks</i>	1.015 ^{***} (.086)	.452 (.038)	.091 (.008)	
<i>Prop. Low-Income Blacks</i>	.995 ^{***} (.108)	.764 [*] (.083)	.533 (.058)	
<i>Prop. Non-College Whites</i>			.425 (.046)	
<i>Prop. Low-Income Whites</i>			.283 (.034)	
<i>Attributions for Racial Inequality (N=2669)</i>				
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Population Size	-.015 (-.029)	-.009 (-.016)	-.009 (-.017)	-.015 (-.030)
Metro Status	.020 (.010)	.000 (.000)	.019 (.009)	.029 (.014)
South	.119 ^{**} (.071)	.086 [*] (.051)	.098 [*] (.058)	.107 ^{**} (.064)
Proportion Black	.670 ^{***} (.096)	.701 ^{***} (.100)	.647 ^{***} (.092)	.589 ^{**} (.084)
<i>Prop. Non-College Blacks</i>	1.470 ^{***} (.122)		1.008 ^{***} (.084)	.469 (.039)
<i>Prop. Low-Income Blacks</i>		1.154 ^{***} (.124)	.633 [*] (.068)	.921 [*] (.099)
<i>Prop. Non-College Whites</i>				.686 ⁺ (.074)
<i>Prop. Low-Income Whites</i>				-.608 (-.072)
<i>Belief in Reverse Discrimination (N=2662)</i>				
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Population Size	-.019 (-.045)	-.017 (-.041)	-.017 (-.041)	-.015 (-.037)
Metro Status	-.018 (-.011)	-.026 (-.016)	-.018 (-.011)	-.009 (-.005)
South	-.016 (-.012)	-.024 (-.018)	-.020 (-.015)	-.008 (-.006)
Proportion Black	.492 ^{***} (.088)	.508 ^{***} (.091)	.488 ^{***} (.087)	.462 ^{***} (.083)
<i>Prop. Non-College Blacks</i>	.496 [*] (.052)		.407 (.042)	-.477 (-.050)
<i>Prop. Low-Income Blacks</i>		.326 (.044)	.121 (.016)	.347 (.047)
<i>Prop. Non-College Whites</i>				1.089 ^{**} (.146)
<i>Prop. Low-Income Whites</i>				-.576 (-.086)

Racial Resentment (N=3985)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Population Size	-.027 ⁺ (-.056)	-.019 (-.039)	-.018 (-.037)	-.001 (-.002)
Metro Status	.087 (.046)	.059 (.031)	.085 (.045)	.086 (.045)
South	.111 [*] (.071)	.072 (.046)	.084 ⁺ (.054)	.102 [*] (.065)
Proportion Black	.501 [*] (.077)	.549 [*] (.084)	.475 [*] (.073)	.491 [*] (.076)
Prop. Non-College Blacks	1.971^{***} (.227)	1.394^{**} (.161)	.238 (.021)	
Prop. Low-Income Blacks		1.496^{***} (.173)	.799[*] (.092)	.846[*] (.098)
Prop. Non-College Whites			1.435^{**} (.166)	
Prop. Low-Income Whites			-.362 (-.046)	

Opposition to Affirmative Action (N=2558)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Population Size	-.022 (-.045)	-.016 (-.031)	-.016 (-.032)	-.012 (-.008)
Metro Status	.067 (.034)	.056 (.029)	.066 (.034)	.064 (.022)
South	.049 (.030)	.022 (.014)	.026 (.016)	.026 (.018)
Proportion Black	-.012 (-.002)	-.016 (-.002)	-.039 (-.006)	-.022 (-.025)
Prop. Non-College Blacks	.918^{**} (.080)		.438 (.038)	.429 (.217)
Prop. Low-Income Blacks		.876^{**} (.099)	.650[*] (.073)	.583 (.103)
Prop. Non-College Whites			.008 (.010)	
Prop. Low-Income Whites			.106 (.106)	

Opposition to Government Help (N=4631)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Population Size	-.031 [*] (-.053)	-.024 ⁺ (-.042)	-.025 ⁺ (-.043)	-.025 (-.043)
Metro Status	-.016 (-.007)	-.033 (-.015)	-.016 (-.007)	-.016 (-.007)
South	.102 [*] (.055)	.077 ⁺ (.041)	.083 [*] (.045)	.084 ⁺ (.045)
Proportion Black	.564 ^{**} (.073)	.582 ^{**} (.075)	.544 ^{**} (.070)	.541 ^{**} (.070)
Prop. Non-College Blacks	1.124^{***} (.085)		.724[*] (.054)	.688 (.052)
Prop. Low-Income Blacks		.923^{***} (.089)	.554[*] (.054)	.570⁺ (.055)

Opposition to Government Help (N=4631)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Prop. Non-College Whites				.045 (.004)
Prop. Low-Income Whites				-.034 (.004)

a. Values are unstandardized HLM coefficients (and their standardized counterparts) estimated from analyses where the model also included all individual-level controls. The metropolitan areas or non-metro counties from which GSS samples were drawn are the contextual units.

+ p<.10
* p<.05
** p<.01
*** p<.001