Ethno-Racial Attitudes and Social Inequality

22

Frank L. Samson and Lawrence D. Bobo

Introduction

Sociologists ordinarily assume that social structure drives the content of individual level values, attitudes, beliefs, and ultimately, behavior. In some classic models this posture reaches a point of essentially denying the sociological relevance of any micro-level processes. In contrast, psychologists (and to a degree, economists) operate with theoretical models that give primacy to individual level perception, cognition, motivation, and choice. Within the domain of studies of ethno-racial relations, each of these positions has modern advocates. From the sociologically deterministic vantage point Edna Bonacich trumpets the "'deeper' level of reality" exposed by class analytics (1980, p. 9), while Omi and Winant (1994, p. 59) focus on "racialized social structure." Others, while not so completely rejecting micro-level analyses, nonetheless call for primary attention to so-called "structural racism" (e.g., Bonilla-Silva (1997)). Within psychology we have seen an explosion of work on implicit attitudes or unconscious racism that more than ever centers attention on the internal psychological functioning of the individual. We argue here that, in general, a committed social psychological posture that examines both how societal level factors and processes shape individual experiences and outlooks and how the distribution of individual attitudes, beliefs, and values, in turn, influence others and the larger social environment provides the fullest leverage on understanding the dynamics of race. Specifically we argue in this chapter that ethno-racial attitudes, beliefs, and identities play a fundamental constitutive role in the experience, re-production, and process of change in larger societal patterns of ethno-racial inequality and relations.

Some basic conceptual anchoring of *attitude*, *race*, and *ethnicity* is necessary. By *attitude*, we refer to "a favorable or unfavorable evaluation of an object" (Schuman et al. 1997, p. 1). *Race* typically involves socially constructed perceptions of phenotypic differences, variation in skin color and tone, hair texture, eye shape and other facial features while *ethnicity* refers to variations in language, attire, aspects of self-presentation, and other cultural behaviors. Ethno-racial attitudes thus reflect a variety of race and ethnicity associated objects: racial and ethnic groups and their attributes, features and assessments of relations between such groups, intergroup contact, and public policies pertinent to either race or ethnicity. Ethno-racial attitudes are built up and constituted in environments structured to correspond to

Frank L. Samson was supported in part by funding from the National Science Foundation awarded to the University of Miami (Award No.: 0820128) during the writing of this chapter.

F. L. Samson (✉)
Department of Sociology, University of Miami
5202 University Drive, 120D Merrick Building
Coral Gables, FL, 33146, USA
e-mail: flsamson@miami.edu

L. D. Bobo
Department of Sociology, Harvard University
33 Kirkland Street, Cambridge, MA, 02138, USA

J. D. McLeod et al. (eds.), *Handbook of the Social Psychology of Inequality,* Handbooks of Sociology and Social Research, DOI 10.1007/978-94-017-9002-4_22, © Springer Sciences+Business Media Dordrecht 2014

socially constructed and recognized ethno-racial markers or designations (Omi and Winant 1994; See and Wilson 1988).

With only a limited amount of space to review a wide range of scholarship on the social psychology of racial inequality, this chapter focuses on just three key areas. First, we summarize trends reflecting important changes in ethno-racial attitudes. Next, we briefly review major contemporary theoretical approaches in the social psychology of racial prejudice, including a theory capturing the current tenor and behavioral implications of modern ethno-racial attitudes, labeled aversive racism. Lastly, we address how ethno-racial attitudes affect processes of labor market inequality, residential segregation, and politics and public policy.

Changing Ethno-Racial Attitudes

Sociologists have systematically studied change in ethno-racial attitudes since at least the 1950s (Hyman and Sheatsley 1956). Critical baseline surveys were conducted in the early 1940s and then replicated in subsequent national surveys. University of Chicago scholars famously reported these studies in a series of *Scientific American* articles (Garth et al. 1978; Greeley and Sheatsley 1971; Hyman and Sheatsley 1964,1956). A more expansive review and integration of available sources was undertaken by Howard Schuman and colleagues in the book, *Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations* (Schuman et al. 1985) and later broadened conceptually and extensively updated (Schuman et al. 1997).

Most of this work has focused on the attitudes of white Americans towards blacks. One recent extensive summary of the General Social Survey stressed the following key patterns (Bobo et al. 2012). First, surveys point to a large positive normative transformation in ethno-racial attitudes. Since the 1970s, white attitudes have shown a clear and steady decline in support for school segregation, the right to segregate neighborhoods, laws allowing homeowner discrimination in selling a house, and laws banning interracial marriage.

Second, whites prefer to maintain their social distance from non-white minorities. While white support for school segregation has assuredly declined, white respondents' objection to sending their children to a school with black children increases as the proportion of blacks increases. As will be discussed in greater depth later, white attitude towards residential segregation parallels these school segregation findings. As a third measure of social distance, while white opposition to interracial marriage has declined overall, whites still prefer Hispanic/Asian marriage partners for one of their family members and in 2008, about one-fourth of whites surveyed were still opposed or strongly opposed to a family member marrying a black person.

Third, white support for inequality ameliorating policies and government intervention is limited and has remained so for decades. White attitude regarding the denial of government's special obligation to improve blacks' living standard after such lengthy discrimination has hovered between 50 and 60 % from the mid-1970s through 2008. Forty percent of whites in 1990 felt it was somewhat likely that affirmative action would hurt whites' job or promotion prospects, a perspective that half of whites expressed in 2008. However, while income-targeted policy interventions are more popular than race-targeted ones, substantial percentages of whites still supported black-targeted programs such as early childhood education and college scholarships. Approximately 90 % of whites opposed preferential hiring or promotion for blacks, a percentage that has not budged since 1994 when the question was first asked.

Fourth, racial stereotypes have become less categorical and more gradational, departing from earlier assumptions of absolute biological differences towards more qualified, group-based comparisons on stereotypical traits. The belief that blacks are inherently less intelligent than whites has declined. While 40 % of whites in 2008 believed that blacks tend to be lazier than whites, this percentage has dropped from over 60 % in 1990. More whites express belief in blacks' relative lack of industriousness than the belief that blacks tend to be less intelligent. Relatedly, ex-

planations for black-white socioeconomic inequality have also shifted towards more culturally rooted attributions (i.e., need to work harder), rather than the belief that blacks have less inborn ability. Lack of motivation or willpower has been either the first or second preferred rationale for black-white socioeconomic inequality since 1977, compared to lack of education (which surpassed motivation in the early 1990s), inborn ability or discrimination.

We should note it is important not to infer from these results that biological thinking has disappeared from how white Americans think about race more broadly. Sociologist Ann Morning has rightly cautioned that processes of "racial conceptualization"—how people frame the very notion of race itself—continues to exhibit strong biological overtones. These overtones are reinforced by some trends in science, particularly the limited spread of the constructivist view of race endorsed in the social sciences and perhaps more importantly the growth of genomic science in biology and related fields (Morning 2011; Phelan et al. 2013).

Finally, the emotional aspects of whites' interracial attitudes are important to recognize. Whites continue to hold African Americans at an emotional distance. Less than 10 % of whites felt both admiration and sympathy for blacks in 1994, while over 70 % of whites felt closer to whites than blacks in 2008, up from just under 60 % in 1996. Moreover, whites view blacks as undeserving of "special treatment," reflecting a collective racial resentment towards African Americans (see section on Racial Resentment). Over 75 % of white Americans since 1994 through 2008 agree that blacks should work their way up without special favors.

African American attitudes have changed as well, as three patterns have emerged. First, black explanations for racial inequality are less likely to refer to structural or discrimination-based factors, declining from over three-quarters of blacks in the late 1980s to about 60 % by 2008. Second, such explanations increasingly reflect motivational and cultural justifications with 44 % of blacks offering lack of motivation as the reason for black-white socioeconomic inequality. Finally, black support for some types of government intervention has declined. Since 1994 when less than 40 % of blacks opposed preferential hiring and promotion for blacks, recent survey data indicates that a majority of blacks (~55 %) oppose such preferences.

Finally, racial apathy appears to be on the rise (Forman 2004). In 1976, one out of ten young whites expressed no concern that minorities may get unfair treatment, which almost doubles to 18 % by 2000. Surveys of white adults also appear to express racial apathy. Compared to either support or opposition, national survey data indicates an increase in the percentage of white respondents from 1964 to the mid-1990s and 2000 who expressed "no interest" in federal intervention for fair treatment in jobs, federal intervention for school desegregation, and government support for the right of black people to go to any restaurant or hotel they can afford. These changing attitudes, along with the tripling in percentage of respondents, from 5 % (1977) to 15 % (2004), who reject all four justifications (motivational, educational, in-born ability, discrimination) for black-white socioeconomic inequality (Hunt 2007), seem to suggest that a substantial proportion of the white population is indifferent to the challenges facing African Americans (see also Forman and Lewis (2006)).

A full accounting of ethno-racial attitudes across a range of topics, from general racial principles, feelings of social distance, perceptions about government, policy, and racial inequality, to perceived group traits and the emotions that groups trigger, gives sociologists traction for interpreting and predicting behaviors and social interactions. As social psychologists studying social inequality, these attitudes are of paramount importance, as they represent effects, indicators, and crucial components of a long-standing object of social psychological inquiry: racial prejudice. We describe some of the leading contemporary approaches to prejudice in the next section after first detailing conceptual foundations for *prejudice*, *stereotypes*, and *racism*.

Theories of Prejudice

Among social psychologists and other social scientists, Gordon Allport's definition of *prejudice* is perhaps best known: "Ethnic prejudice is an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization" (Allport 1954[1979], p. 9). There are two important components of this definition: an affective or feeling component and a cognitive component (Pettigrew 1980).

Emotional hostility is a central element of classical notions of prejudice. The negative affect can include aggression, disdain, fear, resentment, distrust, a lack of sympathy, and anger, as well as coldness typically measured by feeling thermometers in psychological studies. Historians of racial discrimination have noted the importance of this racial animus: "Prejudice can be defined as an attitude of generalized hostility or aggression against a group of human beings who are thought to have some undesirable characteristics in common. It manifests itself in such ethnic stereotypes as the lazy Negro, the drunken Indian, the unscrupulous Jew, or the unruly Irishman" (Fredrickson and Knobel 1980, pp. 30–31).

The cognitive component can involve stereotypes, or "cognitive structures that contain the perceiver's knowledge, beliefs, and expectations about a human group" (Hamilton and Trolier 1986, p. 133). Persons acquire, process, and selectively organize information into larger categories to help them anticipate, make sense of, and react to a world full of stimuli. This process often involves oversimplifications in light of limited cognitive resources. Stereotypes thus act as cognitive shortcuts, allowing individuals to expect likely characteristics or behaviors of a person categorized as a member of a larger group, based on average information associated with that group. Social scientists today consider stereotypes as basic features of human cognition, without necessarily carrying any negative connotations.

Prejudice scholars argue that stereotypes become problematic when such perceptions, particularly negative ones, are inaccurate due in part to overgeneralizations; if they become resistant to new information; or are applied in a categorical manner (Katz 1991). Thus, sociologists have stated: "Prejudice refers to the attitudinal dimension of intergroup relations, to the process of stereotyping and aversion that may persist even in the face of countervailing evidence" (See and Wilson 1988, p. 227).

Specifying the individual-level operations of prejudice allows us to arrive at a conceptual delineation between *prejudice* and *racism*. *Racism* involves supra-individual cultural and societal factors, as the following sociological view on racism stresses: "Racism is a more complex belief system [than prejudice] that prescribes and legitimates a minority group's or an out-groups subordination by claiming that the group is either biogenetically or culturally inferior… there are two components to racism that are not present in prejudice: an ideology that justifies social avoidance and domination by reference to the 'unalterable' characteristics of particular groups and a set of norms that prescribes differential treatment for these groups. Whereas prejudice is an attitude held by an individual, racism is an ideology of exploitation and is therefore equated with a society's culture" (See and Wilson 1988, p. 227). Such a definition allows sociologists to avoid hazardous, casual and stigmatizing applications of the term, as well as avoid using the term *racism* or *racist* solely to describe individual-level antipathies. This definition affords scholars greater conceptual clarity as it pertains to distinct levels of analysis. (See also Hunt, this volume.)

Having already catalogued changes in racial attitudes leading up to more recent times, including stereotypes and affect as key components of prejudice, we now turn to contemporary formulations of racial prejudice, beginning with sociocultural models.

Sociocultural Models

In many respects the core way of thinking about ethno-racial attitudes, the sociocultural approach to prejudice acquisition emphasizes social learning. It achieved its most influential elaboration in the work of Allport (Allport 1954[1979]) and later interpreters (Katz 1991; Pettigrew 1980). Individuals develop attitudes towards ethno-ra-

cial groups as they are socialized to adopt or conform to the values of a particular cultural context through family, peers, schools, religion, media, etc. They may also have direct contact with members of particular racial or ethnic groups, who then serve as an initial source of information. From the sociocultural perspective, if age (cohort), education, and region of origin affect prejudice it is because they indicate the particular historical (e.g., pre-Civil Rights) and cultural context within which an individual has been socialized. This sociocultural mechanism is an important distinction from, for instance, a social structural approach that might situate prejudice development in the arrangement of group statuses and perceived competition for resources (see section on Group Position Theory), or a personality model that focuses on either authoritarian proclivities, of either the earlier Freudian variety (Adorno et al. 1950) or more recent non-Freudian sort (Altemeyer 1998), or an individual orientation to group dominance (Sidanius and Pratto 1999). We review two sociocultural models here: racial resentment and aversive racism.

Racial Resentment

The sociocultural model most familiar to sociologists is the theory of symbolic racism (Sears 1988), also referred to in the ethno-racial attitudes literature as modern racism (McConahay 1982) and racial resentment (Kinder and Sanders 1996), the last stated less provocatively and with greater theoretical and conceptual precision.[1] Racial resentment theory first arose as an attempt to understand seemingly paradoxical trends in white public opinion in the United States. White ethno-racial attitudes since the early 1960s had notably and extensively improved, indicating that whites were progressively embracing the principles of racial equality and integration across a variety of domains: education, neighborhoods, employment, and interracial marriage. Old-fashioned or Jim Crow racism, characterized by beliefs in blacks' biological inferiority, interracial social distance, and support for legal discrimination and segregation, was on the decline. Contemporaneously, white support for many programs and policies to address extant racial inequalities (e.g., affirmative action, school busing, etc.) stagnated or declined, indicating a gap between what whites supported in principle and the policies they endorsed to realize such egalitarian value commitments. Though some pockets of white America still espoused old-fashioned racist attitudes, scholars argued that a new, "symbolic" racism had arisen and become more politically influential than the older Jim Crow variety.

Racial resentment scholars argued that this new racism involved a blend of anti-black affect and the belief that blacks violate traditional American values such as hard work, individualism, self-reliance, obedience, discipline, punctuality, and delayed gratification (Kinder and Sears 1981; Sears 1988; Sears et al. 1979). Racial resentment was seen as independent of realistic threat or self-interest; one might be opposed to particular attitudinal objects (e.g., affirmative action, Harlem, a black political candidate, etc.) that symbolized the groups (e.g., blacks) who invoked negative emotions developed through preadult socialization, even if one was not in a situation where such attitudinal objects posed a risk. The "symbol" in symbolic racism also denoted its antagonistic basis in perceived violations of abstract moral values. In sum, individually located, socialized prejudice could intrude into political contests and contestations and produce real political outcomes.

Racial resentment scholars reinvigorated research on new forms of negative ethno-racial attitudes. Their work was critical in identifying key elements of contemporary discourse on race and politics: resentment to perceived special favors to minorities, resentment to demands being made by minorities, and the denial that racial discrimination remained influential well into the post-Civil Rights era. Recent studies have expanded the application of racial resentment theory to understand presidential candidate choice, voter

[1] "Racial resentment" as a concept/theory label is more concrete, closer to the face validity content of what the measures tap, and lack the intrinsic vagueness and controversy aroused by the "symbolic racism" label; see also discussion of collective racial resentments (Bobo et al. 2012, pp. 65–70).

turnout, health care policy, and crime-related attitudes (see review in Racialized Politics section below). Given the range of outcomes to which it is related, scholars expect it will likely continue to shed light on the social psychology of racial inequality for years to come (Tuch and Hughes 2011).

Aversive Racism

Aversive racism theory represents another sociocultural approach to the principle-implementation gap that situates whites within a conflict between open endorsements of racial egalitarianism on the one hand and black antipathy on the other, the latter existing often implicitly or at an unconscious level (see section on Implicit Attitudes and Bias below). Theorists of aversive racism argue that the affective component of these negative attitudes can be characterized as avoidance rather than open hostility, centered around "discomfort, anxiety, or fear" rather than "hotter" reactions (Pearson et al. 2009, p. 317). As with other sociocultural approaches, negative attitudes towards blacks are thought to be a product of socialization. According to the theory, despite antipathy toward blacks, aversive racists desire to uphold their non-prejudiced self-conception. Thus, in contrast to other racists, aversive racists may discriminate in some instances and may not do so in others because of their conflicting impulses. Specifically, they are more likely to engage in discriminatory behavior when racially egalitarian normative expectations are ambiguous or plausible non-racial justifications for behavior are readily available.

Researchers primarily employ experimental methods to more precisely specify and test the theoretical conditions necessary for discrimination to occur. Using samples of white college students, experimenters documented the influence of aversive racism on hypothetical selection decisions involving employment (Dovidio and Gaertner 2000) and college admissions (Hodson et al. 2002). In each scenario, participants did not discriminate against the black applicant with strong qualifications. However, when candidates possessed ambiguous qualifications, the white participants recommended the white candidate for employment significantly more often than the black candidate. Similarly, highly prejudiced white participants, as measured by Brigham's Attitudes Towards Blacks scale (Brigham 1993), recommended the white candidate for college admission more often than the black candidate. Moving beyond the black-white binary, aversive racists in Canada similarly discriminated against Asian candidates for employment compared to a white applicant, pointing to the generalizability of aversive racism beyond the U.S. national context (Son Hing et al. 2008).

Subsequent studies have also documented aversive racism's impact on jury decision-making in a legal context (Pearson et al. 2007). Aversive racism researchers in a laboratory setting found that explicit prejudice was linked to white participants' assessment of a black defendant's guilt in hypothetical robbery, assault, and murder cases (Dovidio et al. 1997). In a later study, Pearson et al. (2007) not only confirmed the influential role played by prejudice in white attitudes towards crime punishment, they also uncovered the subtle ways in which prejudice affected punitive attitudes under one context but not another. White endorsement for a more severe penalty was related to their levels of explicit prejudice towards blacks when given a non-racial justification for harsher punishment, consistent with aversive racism's predictions. Yet in the absence of a non-racial justification to draw upon, white participants' prescribed length of prison sentence was not directly related to anti-black prejudice. Racial prejudice did indeed matter for whites' support for punitive responses to crime, but some whites required recourse to a non-racial rationale for such attitudes to prove consequential. These findings may help us understand the high rates of black male incarceration in the United States—so high that some now argue that imprisonment represents a new stage in the life course of young low-skilled black males (Pettit and Western 2004; Western 2007). The punitive tenor of criminal justice policies, linked explicitly to racial prejudice (Bobo and Johnson 2004), has contributed to the black male prison boom.

One clear advantage of the aversive racism framework lies in its ability to propose interven-

tions. The largely experimental approach to specifying the psychological (cognitive and affective) and social (contextual) mechanisms through which aversive racism operates provides clues about how one might disrupt the attitude to behavior pathway. One proposed intervention lies in drawing upon the cognitive implications of in-group/out-group identification to propose a common, superordinate in-group identity that reduces bias between groups (Dovidio et al. 2004; Gaertner et al. 1993, 1996; West et al. 2009a). Activating a common in-group identity that linked white participants to “all citizens of the United States, regardless of race, religion or status” led to an increase in feelings of injustice after watching a video clip about anti-black racial bias (Dovidio et al. 2004). These feelings in turn mediated a decrease in prejudice towards blacks and other ethno-racial minorities (Latin Americans and Asian Americans). In a study conducted among college roommates, students who perceived a high level of commonality with their cross-race roommate experienced no significant decline in their friendship over time, compared to the significant declines in friendship expressed by cross-race roommates who perceived a low level of commonality between them (West et al. 2009a).

While the identification of possible interventions is a welcome development, are such interventions likely to have a strong and lasting impact on larger patterns of social inequality? From a sociological standpoint, the prospects look mixed. The lessons from aversive racism point to the possibility of positive change at the level of micro, social interactions. A decrease in racial bias in selection and other decision-making processes by egalitarian-minded individuals would no doubt represent some narrowing of the racial gap in the domains of employment, education, and criminal justice. They might also reduce biases in access to housing, credit, and some consumer goods.

Challenging social inequality in various institutional domains will also require significant macro-level responses, the likelihood of which still remains tied to the social psychological dynamics of ethno-racial attitudes and racialized politics (Sears et al. 2000). A crucial consideration in these dynamics is that prejudice is entrenched and developed *within* the competitive structure of U.S. politics itself, rooted in part in ethno-racial group competition and a sense of group position (Bobo and Tuan 2006). This theoretical distinction is an important one, as it departs from sociocultural perspectives that view prejudice as *exogenous* to politics and the social organization of group statuses, power, and interests. A clearer understanding of the operations of ethno-racial group threat is the topic to which we now turn.

Social Structure Model: Group Position Theory

In general, sociologists have favored accounts of group relations and ethno-racial attitudes that recognize how durable group inequalities also create group interests that then align with socially constructed groups and identities. This tradition received very influential articulation in the work of Herbert Blumer and subsequent interpreters (Wellman 1977; Bobo 1999; Bobo and Tuan 2006)

Taking direct aim at theories that located racial prejudice inside individuals by focusing on individuals’ feelings, Blumer proposed an alternative, sociologically-centered theory of racial prejudice in his now classic essay on “race prejudice as a sense of group position” (Blumer 1958). Blumer argued that racial prejudice was fundamentally about racial group relations, and must be understood in the collective process through which racial groups define themselves and other racial groups in relation to each other. The sense of group position involves an idea about the appropriate relative status between groups, but is not limited solely to such a vertical positioning, as it can entail boundaries of inclusion/exclusion.

Among members of the dominant group, race prejudice can be characterized by four feelings. First, there is a feeling of group superiority. Second, there is a feeling that a subordinate group is inherently different, which serves as the basis for attempts to exclude the subordinate other. Third, racial prejudice involves a feeling of entitlement,

or proprietary claim to resources, opportunities, authority, and prestige. Fourth, members of the dominant group feel threatened by the belief that a subordinate group wishes to encroach on those entitlements. This last makes group position theory, in part, a theory about perceived group interests and threat.

Crucially, against sociologists and others who might reduce the sense of group position to objective relations or positions between groups, Blumer highlights both the subjective and normative dimensions of the sense of group position: "it stands for "what ought to be" rather than for "what is." It is a sense of where the two racial groups *belong*" (1958, p. 5, emphasis original). As a collective sense, individual members of the dominant group will have to wrestle with the group's sense of dominant position if the individual wishes to behave contrary to that sense, facing possible sanction in the exercise of individual agency. That is because the sense of group position originates not within individuals but is collectively held.

Lastly, Blumer emphasizes that the sense of group position is a historical product. It is shaped by the structure of opportunities, the size of populations, the distribution of knowledge and skills, and the behaviors and communications between key figures and group leaders. As these and other social factors shift, so too does the sense of group position, again marking this sociological theory's distinctiveness from theoretical approaches that depict racial prejudice as an individual-level factor.

Blumer's sociological social psychological approach to racial prejudice provided a new lens to view questions about the paradox in white public opinion: rising commitment to racial equality and integration, stagnant or declining support for social programs and policies to redress inequality. Drawing on Blumer's insights, Bobo analyzed attitudes towards school busing and employed the same measures previously used by racial resentment researchers (Bobo 1983). However, Bobo recognized that the racial resentment measures involved collective dimensions of group conflict, which problematized racial resentment theory's assertion that such attitudes reflected simply individuals' socialized negative affect devoid of group interest-based concerns. Bobo discovered that the racial resentment measures loaded on multiple latent factors, one of which could easily be discerned as reflecting a "civil rights push" or "black political push," dimensions that evoked Blumer's perceived group interests and conflict. These perceived group conflict factors, previously aggregated along with other factors in a "racial intolerance" scale representing symbolic politics in earlier research (Sears et al. 1979), predicted white opposition to school busing. Resentments expressed and captured by racial resentment and symbolic politics researchers were not simply atomistic feelings of animosity; they were also political appraisals about which groups should have entitled claim and access to scarce and desired status, rewards, and opportunities as Blumer had claimed.

Bobo argued that Blumer's group position theory provided a more powerful and comprehensive framework for the study of racial prejudice (Bobo 1999). Blumer had articulated an expansive theory, one capable of explaining affect/emotions previously the province of individual-oriented prejudice approaches, while simultaneously remaining attuned to both social structure and identity-based processes. Furthermore, sociologists could now also draw on the importance of history to articulate a sense of group position that could account for not only the sense of group position among dominant group members but also a sense of racial alienation among subordinate group members (Bobo 1999; Bobo and Hutchings 1996). This attention to the historically variant experiences across dominant group and subordinate group members also allows space for the recognition that ethno-racial groups might explain racial inequality using different attributions (Hunt 2007), differences based on group-specific historical experiences with societal discrimination and institutional discrimination (Fox 2012; Fox and Guglielmo 2012).

Group position theory's emphasis on perceived group threat also helped identify important variations in both support for principles of racial equality/integration and opposition to social programs and policies. If perceived group

threats were important, one would expect greater support for compensatory programs/policies that promote opportunity over preferential policies perceived to impinge upon group interests, a hypothesis confirmed by public opinion data (Bobo 2001; Bobo and Kluegel 1993). Thus, the lackadaisical support previously found on the implementation side of white ethno-racial attitudes may actually hide greater openness to particular opportunity-enhancing policies and programs: both a more hopeful and empirically-verifiable conclusion.

With Blumer's group position theory, the social scientific attention to realistic group conflict, group numbers, and group threat also took on greater complexity (Bobo 1999). First, a fully elaborated group position theory recognized that not only did objective factors, such as the measured size of an out-group population, matter but subjective or perceived size and threat mattered as well. Second, the economic resources of a group mattered; subordinate groups with greater resources but lower numbers such as Asians may be perceived as more threatening. Third, social domain mattered; whites perceived lower levels of threat from blacks over housing. Finally, history and intensity of conflict mattered; blacks perceived Asians as greater threats than Latinos, despite larger numbers of Latinos in the population. More recent studies on group size and group threat incorporated insights about subjective perceptions of group size and ethno-racial group differences in a multiethnic social context, a literature we review next.

Group Size and Group Threat

While the last decade of the twentieth century produced important studies capturing the impact of group size and group threat on ethno-racial attitudes and inequality (Fossett and Kiecolt 1989; Quillian 1995, 1996; Taylor 1998), the first decade of the twenty first century generated additional studies that are critical for a number of reasons. First, we believe that despite signs of relatively slow black population growth in the years ahead, the "black image in the white mind," borrowing from the late historian George Fredrickson, still holds a special place in the social psychology of social inequality (Fredrickson 1971). US Census projections predict that the black population nationwide is unlikely to exceed 13 % by 2050, making earlier studies on group size focused almost exclusively on the black-white divide seem less relevant (Ortman and Guarneri 2009). However, while black population shares may remain stable at the national level, local black population shares are expected to fluctuate greatly. Demographers have identified substantial migration within the United States that is significantly altering black population percentages at the metropolitan level, with Atlanta, Dallas, and Houston undergoing the largest gains between 2000 and 2010 (Frey 2011). Second, the projected share of non-white groups is growing and will continue to grow considerably, serving as a new source of perceived and realistic group threat. By 2050, Hispanics are projected to comprise 30 % of the U.S. population, up from 16 % in 2010. The Asian population will approach 8 % in 2050 from less than 5 % in 2010. The infant population in the United States has already passed a demographic tipping point, with the majority of the U.S. population aged 1 or younger now hailing from non-white ethno-racial groups (U.S. Census Bureau 2012). In light of these significant demographic changes that will one day supplant the non-Hispanic white population as the numerical majority in the United States, it is worthwhile to reflect upon advances in the study of group size and threat produced over the last decade to anticipate how some might react to these demographic changes.

Over the last decade, research on group size and group threat have largely focused on two general themes. First, scholars have tried to tease out the relationship between perceptions of group size and objective group size. Various individual and structural factors were taken into account to explain discrepancies between the actual size of ethno-racial groups compared to their perceived size, with white population numbers typically under-estimated and non-white populations over-estimated. Relatedly, social scientists also sought to identify the reference points or boundaries (e.g., neighborhood, metropolitan area, county, nation, etc.) that informed perceptions about

group size. Second, investigators proposed and assessed alternative explanations for racialized group and policy attitudes that had previously been accounted for by a group threat framework. Among the approaches considered were additional contextual features besides group size, and contact theory.

A first thematic set of studies sought to clarify ambiguity in, and explain the disjuncture between, people's perceptions of the size of particular ethno-racial groups and the actual size of these populations. Glaser (2003) argued that prior studies on group threat did not clearly set the boundaries within which people were expected to consider: first, the size of group populations, and second, the rewards or opportunities affected by group size. To more clearly delineate these boundaries, Glaser employed survey-based experiments that measured white opposition to proportional apportionment of congressional representatives based on indicated state proportions of blacks, and proportional allotment of city government jobs and city minority set-aside contracts based on indicated black proportions at the city level. Gallagher (2003) used qualitative methods (focus groups, interviews, and open-ended surveys) to identify whites' explanations for their racial innumeracy, or the numerical misperception of ethno-racial group size relative to actual group size. Alba, Rumbaut, and Marotz (2005) argued for an analytical distinction between what they define as "innumeracy" (limitation in the ability to translate a perception into numerical terms) and the perception of group size itself. They circumvented challenges related to innumeracy by using a ratio of estimated black and Hispanic populations to the estimated white population as a better indicator of perceived ethno-racial group sizes and perceived threat, rather than estimations of absolute numerical group sizes alone. Finally, Wong (2007) explored the linkages between perceived and actual local ethno-racial group sizes on the one hand and perceived national group sizes on the other. Wong found that perceptions of local group size are better predictors of individuals' estimations of national group sizes than actual local group sizes.

Results from this first thematic set of studies have implications for the social psychology of group threat and its relationship to social inequality. Glaser (2003) found that setting boundaries and specifying group sizes confirm earlier research on the effects of group threat. Increases in the black share of a state's population decreased the percentage of non-black respondents supporting the redrawing of district lines to guarantee racially proportional apportionment of congressional seats. Similarly, experimentally increasing the black share of a city's population decreased the percentage of non-blacks supporting racially proportional apportionment of city government jobs. Glaser also found that white opposition is not entrenched solely in in-group/out-group distinctions, as the percentage of respondents supportive of proportional allotments in congressional seats was substantially smaller when proportions are based upon racial distinctions (i.e., black population) rather than geographic ones (i.e., rural population). Moreover, percentage of support did not vary significantly as a function of the percentage of the rural population specified on the survey ballots. Gallagher (2003) found that whites over-estimate the number of blacks because of perceived over-representation of blacks in the media (e.g., news coverage of crime, and sports broadcasts), perceived excessive black political demands, and Census reports about the decreasing proportion of whites in the U.S. population. Gallagher proposed that whites might equate larger nonwhite population sizes with unobstructed access to resources, obviating calls for the amelioration of racial inequality. Alba, Rumbaut, and Marotz (2005) found that their ratio-based measure of perceived threat was positively related to whites' restrictive positions on immigration, stereotypical views of blacks and Hispanics as violent, and beliefs that blacks shouldn't push too hard and that whites are hurt by affirmative action. Lastly, Wong (2007) suggested that because perceptions of local ethno-racial group sizes predict estimations of national ethno-racial group sizes more than actual local group sizes themselves, thereby foregrounding social psychological processes, the influence of perceptions of local group size may trump the in-

fluence of actual group size on outcomes such as racial or political attitudes as well.

A second set of studies sought to propose and test alternative explanations for ethno-racial attitudes that had previously been tied to group threat. Oliver and Mendelberg (2000) tested the group threat hypothesis using contextual measures such as objective group threat (measured as % black at zip code and metropolitan levels) against neighborhood socioeconomic status (measured as % college educated at the zip code level). They found support for the effect of objective contextual racial threat on white attitudes toward neighborhood integration and federal government intervention on behalf of black employment, but not university affirmative action. However, they found no support for the effect of objective contextual threat on white racial dispositions (racial resentment, negative stereotypes, anti-Semitism, and authoritarianism), while finding consistent effects of neighborhood educational status on these dispositions, qualifying the explanatory reach of objective threat. Dixon and Rosenbaum (2004) and Dixon (2006) tackled the problem of resolving the ambiguous effect of proximity to ethno-racial out-groups on negative group stereotypes, i.e., did proximity facilitate the positive influence of contact or the negative influence of group threat? Using multilevel models, they found that objective group threat (% black) was positively related to whites' anti-black stereotypes but % Hispanic had no relationship to anti-Hispanic stereotypes (Dixon and Rosenbaum 2004). They also found that contacts with blacks in schools and workplaces were related to decreases in whites' anti-black stereotypes, while similar decreases in anti-Hispanic stereotypes were associated with Hispanic contact in communities, and to a lesser extent, also in schools. In a similar study, Dixon (2006) confirmed the effects of % black on anti-black stereotypes, but found an opposite effect of % Asian on anti-Asian stereotypes. Dixon also discovered that knowing and feeling close to a black, Hispanic, or Asian was associated with decreases in negative stereotypes for each group respectively. Contrary to suggestions by Wong (2007), whites' estimations of black, Hispanic, or Asian group size at the local level were unrelated to their attendant group's stereotypes.

The social psychological implications of this second set of studies on group threat, ethno-racial attitudes and social inequality are mixed. While Oliver and Mendelberg (2000) reported that some of their findings contradict the "material" (or objective) threat hypothesis, their analysis did not evaluate perceived group threat. Their measure of "symbolic racism" contained items that could tap into a dimension of perceived group threat, including an item about attitudes towards "spokesmen for minorities who are complaining that blacks are being discriminated against." This item resembled an item used to operationalize perceived group threat in an earlier study assessing the relationship between racial resentment and white opposition to busing (Bobo 1983). Since their racism scale was consistently significant across models predicting white support for neighborhood integration and affirmative action, the threat hypothesis in one form, perceived group threat, might still retain some utility when measures other than objective group size are employed. Moreover, their use of OLS regression without apparent adjustments for clustering raises some concern about the non-independence of the error terms; a more recent study using hierarchical models did not confirm some of their key findings on neighborhood socioeconomic status (McDermott 2011).

The appraisals of contact theory versus group threat (actual group size) likely contributed the most among these studies to our understanding of the social contexts of inequality. Dixon and Rosenbaum (2004) proposed that desegregation and affirmative action policies at schools and the workplace could make meaningful inroads on decreasing whites' anti-black stereotypes. Likewise, similar policies targeted at neighborhoods and schools might attenuate whites' anti-Hispanic stereotypes. Beyond identifying the interactive settings in which beneficial interracial contact takes place, Dixon (2006) pointed to the possible upsides of interracial contact that promotes whites' feelings of closeness with non-whites, which can also temper whites' negative stereotypes about non-white groups.

Two studies involving ethno-racial group size within the last decade did not necessarily utilize group size to operationalize group threat. Fox (2004) took percent black and percent Hispanic at the state and county levels as indicators of diverse ethno-racial contexts, adopting OLS regression with robust standard errors to evaluate their effects on white support for welfare. Her results indicated that white support for welfare took into account not only whites' stereotypes about black work ethic, but also whites' stereotypes about Hispanics' work ethic. Surprisingly, the effect of beliefs about Hispanics' work ethic on white support for welfare differed immensely based upon the contextual effects of black group size and Hispanic group size. McDermott (2011) deployed multilevel modeling to examine the direct and indirect effects of race and socioeconomic status, measured at different levels, on a variety of ethno-racial attitudes expressed by whites, blacks, Hispanics, and Asians. McDermott found that the anti-black stereotypes of black respondents increased in conjunction with increases in the black percentage in a neighborhood, a finding McDermott also finds operating for the percentage of Asians living in a neighborhood and its effects on Asian respondents' anti-Asian stereotypes. In regards to attitudes about training programs for blacks, support across all respondents increased as the percentage of blacks at the neighborhood level increased. However, black support for affirmative action programs, which was already higher than white support for such programs, diminished as the share of blacks at the neighborhood level rose, a result Glaser (2003) also found when using experimentally varied survey ballots on black respondents. These results all point to the need for additional social psychological research on racial and policy attitudes in a multiracial social context to further clarify the precise mechanisms.

Several studies published over the first decade of the twenty first century improved our understanding of ethno-racial group size and group threat, and ultimately their effects on ethno-racial relations, attitudes, and social inequality. Measures involving the local black population size, be they objective or perceived, continue to largely uphold the theory that more blacks represents more threat and less egalitarian outlooks and politics. The black image still haunts the white mind of the twenty first century. Some research has also drawn our attention to the meaning of group size in a multiracial social context, where white attitudes may be influenced by the complex interaction between the population sizes of multiple groups. Other research has shown that respondents of different ethno-racial backgrounds react to variations in ethno-racial group contexts in different ways. This points to the importance of understanding a particular group's subjective sense of its own status, power, and resources and its relationship to other groups: all of which can vary in complex ways not easily captured by classifying such groups as dominant or subordinate. Recent studies on the lived experience of whiteness among working class whites (McDermott 2006), factors related to the strength of white identity (Croll 2007), on how high-achieving Asians can recast whiteness as lower status (Jiménez and Horowitz 2013), emphasize this complexity. In sum, sociological social psychological research indicates that the sweeping demographic changes currently occurring in the United States will continue to influence social inequality, despite projections that the share of the black population will remain stable for years to come.

Having outlined sociocultural and social structural models for the study of racial prejudice, we now turn our attention to another relatively recent entry. This account draws largely upon methodological innovations in cognitive psychology, creatively adapted to the study of implicit racial bias.

The Cognitive Turn: Implicit Attitudes and Bias

Developments in cognitive psychology and cognitive neuroscience point to significant ways in which attitudes influence perception below the level of conscious awareness, embedding patterns of association and bias that affect what we see and how we are likely to behave, but not without some real measure of controversy over

the meaning of and appropriate generalizations from these findings. Psychologists have proposed that implicit cognition, which involves an introspectively unidentified or inaccurately identified construct that nevertheless influences a range of individual responses, can illuminate research on ethno-racial attitudes and stereotypes (Greenwald and Banaji 1995). Unlike an explicit attitude or stereotype, which can be measured through introspective self-report, an implicit or unconscious attitude or stereotype requires indirect measures, often involving tasks that implicate categorization processes. While a wide variety of implicit measures and ways of measuring them exist (Fazio and Olson 2003), some complexities in the meaning and interpretation of many of the measures and results need to be borne in mind. We address these complexities by first describing one method of measuring implicit attitudes, the Implicit Association Test.

The Implicit Association Test (IAT), a popular method of measuring implicit attitudes often used in studies of aversive racism, represents a promising methodological innovation for researching the social psychology of racial inequality. The IAT captures response latencies (or time differentials in a timed task) reflecting the ease or difficulty of classifying items into category/attribute pairs, pairs hypothesized to converge or diverge in the minds of individuals. Individuals should find it easier to classify an item (e.g., rose, roach) under a category/attribute pairing that resonates with an individual's cultural perspective (e.g., flower/good or insect/bad) than one that does not (e.g., flower/bad or insect/good). Applied to the study of racial bias, the IAT measures the difficulty of classifying items when black/good and white/bad are paired, compared to when white/good and black/bad are paired. The absence of a time lag between category pairs that are theoretical matches versus theoretical mismatches would indicate the absence of cognitive bias. Since the response latency score only partially correlates with a handful of explicit racial attitude indicators and loads on separate constructs when factor analyzed (Lane et al. 2007), IAT proponents argue that the method captures an underlying construct unmeasured by explicit ethno-racial attitudes. However, along with the leading proponents of the IAT, we emphasize that the IAT and its measurement of an, as yet, un-described underlying racial construct do not signify a theoretical departure from the longstanding study of racial bias. Rather, the IAT may help us more precisely discern and better specify the nature of racial group stereotypes and attitudes.

While an important and innovative approach, we argue as sociologists that such measures cannot replace careful study of the terms of explicit social discourse and interaction, nor fully answer more basic questions about how attitudes and beliefs interact with larger socio-political processes and institutions to shape the broader social patterning of group inequality. Ambiguity surrounding the explicit-implicit divide has drawn questions from a number of quarters. Arkes and Tetlock (2004) proposed alternative interpretations of reaction time scores as either reflections of cultural rather than personal bias, indicative of different types of negative affect besides antipathy (guilt, shame, embarrassment, etc. as opposed to bigotry or hostility), or simply outcomes predicted by the probabilistic cognitive exercise of rationality. The higher predictive validity observed for the IAT relative to explicit attitudinal measures, and for that matter, the occasionally low levels of correlation between IAT scores and explicit attitudinal scores, may reflect the use of a truncated set of explicit ethno-racial attitudes rather than an absolute distinction between observable and unobservable constructs (see also Blanton and Jaccard (2008)). To be sure, we do not argue that there cannot be some measure of an underlying, unidentified construct or constructs that relates to a variety of racial inequality outcomes.

While IAT proponents do not recommend prioritizing implicit measures or replacing explicit measures with implicit ones, it is important to warn against critics of explicit measures who might go too far in overemphasizing a core argument marshaled on behalf of implicit attitudes: concerns about self presentation (Nosek 2005). This line of reasoning concerns us for two reasons. First, survey respondents continue to give what many people believe to be socially undesirable responses including manifestly racially

prejudiced opinions (Bobo and Tuan 2006; Wilson 1997). These responses in turn continue to co-vary with a range of race-related outcomes such as policy attitudes, ethno-racial neighborhood composition preferences, hiring preferences, etc. Second, concern about social desirability casts a pall over the authenticity of individuals' responses, which, taken to an extreme, may cause some researchers to disregard whether individuals may actually want to be less racially biased. As IAT proponent Nosek (2005, p. 566) noted, self-presentation "can be genuine" and can emerge in other socially consequential behaviors and outcomes.

The authenticity of unbiased self-presentation is critical for social interaction, particularly because unconscious expressions of negative attitudes can hinder congenial interracial relations. Researchers hypothesized and confirmed a link between white participants' implicit attitudes and their nonverbal behaviors signifying distance, disrespect, and tension (less visual contact and increased rates of blinking) towards a black interviewer (Dovidio et al. 1997). A subsequent study confirmed the relationship between white participants' implicit attitudes and white observers' ratings of the participants' nonverbal friendliness; moreover, the same study revealed that black confederate evaluation of the friendliness of the white participant was associated with these nonverbal cues rather than verbal behavior (Dovidio et al. 2002). Goff, Steele and Davies (2008) warned that racial distancing need not derive from racial prejudice, but might reflect white participant anxiety about appearing racist, thereby confirming an undesirable white group stereotype as stereotype threat can affect IAT scores as well (Frantz et al. 2004). Assessments of the friendliness of interracial others is important given different attributions, expectations, and goals that individuals bring to explain inaction and anxiety pertaining to interracial interactions (Bergsieker et al. 2010; Richeson and Shelton 2007; Shelton and Richeson 2005, 2006; Shelton et al. 2005a; Trawalter et al. 2009; West et al. 2009b).

While individuals may be initially unaware of their biases, overt acknowledgment that unconscious bias may lead to discriminatory behavior can serve as an intervention against such biases. A study testing the link between physicians' implicit attitudes and their recommendations for blood clot treatment to a black or white patient presenting heart attack symptoms found that physicians aware of the study's purpose were more likely to recommend the treatment for black patients as their implicit bias increased (Green et al. 2007). This unanticipated finding reversed the black disadvantage in treatment found among physicians scoring high on implicit bias that were unaware of the study's purpose. This finding that a beneficial outcome positively correlates with implicit bias also corresponds with research on the irony of more engaged interracial interaction among high IAT scoring whites (Shelton et al. 2005b), and high IAT scoring whites' behavioral overcorrection towards stigmatized outgroups under challenging conditions (Mendes and Koslov 2013).

To this point, we have charted changes in racial attitudes, mapped out four of the most prominent contemporary approaches to understanding contemporary racial prejudice and bias, and reviewed recent studies related to these various research agendas. We now turn our attention to specific domains of ethno-racial inequality that are in part produced or constrained by the social psychology of racial prejudice. We do not attempt a comprehensive summary of all relevant social domains or studies, but instead focus on a few key research questions, topics, and methodologies, including recent innovations.

Domains of Ethno-Racial Inequality

While larger patterns of ethno-racial inequality, particularly those embedded in institutions, will likely require a forceful political and policy-based approach to significantly alter ethno-racial inequalities in labor markets (Wilson 1997), housing markets (Massey and Denton 1993), wealth distribution (Oliver and Shapiro 1997), educational settings (Darling-Hammond 2004), mass incarceration (Western 2007), and health care (Williams and Rucker 2000), social scientists must nevertheless continue to track the

micro-level dynamics that produce these macro configurations of inequality. These inequalities have been exacerbated even further by monumental debt, job loss, and home foreclosures from the "Great Recession" (Grusky et al. 2011), possibly requiring comprehensive anti-poverty policy and serious re-investments in education, health care, and factors impacting neighborhood cohesion (Sampson 2012; Wilson 2010). We focus our attention now on the labor market and the housing market, two major domains of social life where evidence of substantial structural racial inequality remains, and end with a brief look at possible social psychological factors impacting the domain from which the most effective macro-level interventions are likely to arise, that is, the political arena.

Labor Market Inequality

Consider first the labor market. We know that African Americans in particular face significantly higher rates of unemployment, longer spells of unemployment and job search, as well as a greater likelihood of falling into persistent joblessness than their white counterparts (Bobo 2011; Harris 2010; Katz et al. 2005).

There is also growing evidence that negative racial stereotypes still play a powerful role in shaping labor market experiences and outcomes. Evidence for this claim takes several forms. For example, Kirschenman and Neckerman (1991) in their now classic qualitative interview study of Chicago employers found that employers described their black and Hispanic employees using negative stereotypes, despite what would seem to be social desirability pressures to appear race neutral. Employers questioned their black workers' work ethic, education level, and leadership skills. Some employers in sales and customer service mentioned their customers' racial prejudices as justification for bias in hiring that favored white employees. Other employers for clerical jobs referenced blacks' appearance (e.g., hairstyle) and speech patterns ("street talk") as detracting from a professional image. A few employers for low-skilled blue collar or service jobs recited stereotypes of blacks as unreliable and lazy, and therefore ill suited for a job sector where dependability and work ethic were seen as paramount. Employers did appreciate heterogeneity within the black community and recognized "good" black employees who did not conform to negative stereotypes. In such situations, however, employers screened for markers they attributed to inner-city culture.

While still retaining analytical focus on structural changes in the U.S. urban economy and many poor blacks' rootedness in social networks, households, and neighborhood contexts that are not conducive to employability, William Julius Wilson recognized that employers nevertheless took into account racial considerations in their hiring practices (Wilson 1997). Drawing on the same employer survey as Kirschenman and Neckerman, Wilson found that 74 % of surveyed employers related negative views of blacks, including assumptions about their dishonesty, welfare dependency, poor family values, tardiness, etc. Such views cut across racial lines as both black and white employers expressed these negative evaluations of inner-city blacks. Wilson also found a gendered component, with black males more than females bearing the brunt of the negative attitudes. However, black women did not escape questions about their childcare and family responsibilities, including the assumption that black women desired too many children to sustain employment. A few employers openly disclosed that racial prejudice affected the hiring process, while most engaged in selective recruitment. The latter chose to search for their ideal high quality candidates by avoiding placing job ads in metropolitan or particular ethnic and urban neighborhood newspapers and purposefully shunning recruitment at inner-city schools or government-run programs. In the ethnographic portion of the study, Wilson summarized findings among a smaller sample of inner-city residents, documenting blacks' feelings of having experienced discrimination and exploitation. Such feelings underlie some inner-city black men's hostility to jobs they characterized as being less remunerative relative to the wages earned by non-blacks, and entailing the most arduous tasks, a finding

confirmed in more recent research on job channeling (see Pager et al. (2009) below).

In addition to in-depth interviews, multivariate analyses of large sample surveys indicate that employers' perceptions of the ethno-racial makeup of their customers relate to the likelihood of hiring blacks (Holzer and Ihlanfeldt 1998). Utilizing employer surveys from Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, and Los Angeles, the researchers found that employers' perceptions of the proportion of their customers of a particular ethno-racial background (and by implication those customers' preferences for employees of a particular ethno-racial background) was linked to the hiring of a black worker as the most recently hired worker. The perceived ethno-racial proportion of their customers had the strongest negative effect on the hiring of blacks into jobs with direct customer contact versus jobs without customer contact, and hiring blacks into sales jobs compared to blue collar jobs and other white-collar and service jobs, even though skill requirements may have been higher for the latter. As the researchers note, these effects are linked not to the actual ethno-racial makeup of a firm's clientele, but rather employers' *perceived* ethno-racial makeup of their customer base.

Employer surveys are important not only because of the critical role that hiring authority confers to employers in regards to nonwhites' job prospects, but also because of survey data's ability to address social scientific predictions about labor market and workplace competition as the fundamental cause of ethno-racial antagonism. A structural, sociological perspective on racial and ethnic conflict that privileges class location (Bonacich 1972, 1980) might predict that business owners and supervisors would be less likely to report negative stereotypes than non-managerial workers, given the relative lack of workplace power that places the latter in economic competition with job-seeking blacks. Bobo, Johnson, and Suh (2000) found that negative stereotyping of blacks did not differ significantly by workplace power; business owners, supervisors, and non-managerial workers alike tended to rate blacks more negatively than whites on stereotype measures. Bipolar trait rating items for intelligence, preference for welfare, ease of getting along with, and English speaking proficiency were used to measure stereotypes, including a scale averaging all four items. Like the stereotypes held by workers without workplace power, owners and supervisors' black stereotypes were related to political ideology, after controlling for socio-demographic factors, region, and religious factors. That a political orientation which cuts across differences in workplace authority significantly relates to stereotyping further supports the idea that racial stereotypes are not reducible solely to class location.

More recent studies have drawn upon experimental methods to identify racial bias in employers' actual hiring decision-making, corroborating the negative stereotypes that employers self reported during in-depth interviews and large sample surveys. A study of the low wage labor market in New York City utilized a field experiment, or audit study, to document employer bias in the hiring process (Pager et al. 2009). Researchers sent trained white, black and Latino testers matched on a range of characteristics (e.g., verbal ability, eye contact, talkativeness, physical attractiveness) to apply for 340 entry-level jobs. White and Latino applicants received more second interview call-backs or job offers than black applicants, despite possessing equivalent qualifications (education, job experience, and neighborhood residence) and applying for the exact same job opening. A second team of testers revealed that black and Latino applicants without a criminal record fared about as well as a white applicant recently released from prison after a drug felony conviction, confirming findings from an earlier audit study in Milwaukee, Wisconsin on race and criminal stigma (Pager 2003). Being black or Latino (with a clean record) held the same level of social psychological stigma to employers as a white felon's criminal record.

Qualitative analysis of testers' field notes also revealed that minority applicants were more likely to be excluded from the applicant pool outright, with very little, if any, chance to communicate their job suitability. When given a chance to convey their qualifications, the minority testers—sometimes only the black tester, sometimes both

black and Latino testers—faced higher standards of resume evaluation than the white tester despite equivalent experience and credentials (see also Biernat and Kobrynowicz (1997)). What proved to be job-denying resume deficiencies for the black and/or Latino applicant did not hinder their white confederate. Lastly, the study revealed that black and Latino applicants were more likely to be "channeled" or steered toward jobs that employed greater manual labor, less customer contact, or less authority than the job initially sought by the applicant. A few white testers experienced channeling in the opposite or "upward" direction: greater customer contact, less manual labor, or entailing supervisory or managerial skills. Social psychology underlies multiple factors that influence labor market prospects: from employers' beliefs about applicants identified with particular racial groups, the types of jobs into which applicants were channeled, the shifting standard of evaluation faced by differently racialized testers, to the stigma equivalence between being a minority on the one hand and being a convicted and recently imprisoned felon on the other.

The race associated with an applicant's name on a resume can influence the applicant's job prospects (Bertrand and Mullainathan 2004). Again utilizing a field experiment, researchers sent almost 5000 resumes responding to over 1300 job postings in the Chicago and Boston region, primarily changing the name on the resume from a typically white-sounding name, e.g., "Emily Walsh or Greg Baker," to a typically black-sounding name, e.g., "Lakisha Washington or Jamal Jones." Resumes with white-sounding names were 50 % more likely to receive a callback response than resumes bearing black-sounding names. The researchers also looked at the effects of resume quality, subjectively classifying resumes into low and high quality resumes based on features such as skills, gaps in employment, job experience, etc. To ensure that high-quality resumes could be differentiated from low-quality ones, researchers also added some subset of a number of additional characteristics: summer or in-school employment, additional computer skills, volunteer experience, certifications, foreign languages, honors, and military experience. Resumes with white-sounding names received a higher call back percentage in response to high-quality resumes (10.79 %) than low-quality resumes (8.5 %), a statistically significant difference. On the other hand, resumes with black-sounding names received statistically equivalent percentages of callbacks: 6.7 % for high-quality resumes and 6.2 % for low-quality resumes. Increasing the subjective quality of one's resume did not produce the same reward across racial categories.

King et al. (2006) replicated and extended Bertrand and Mullainathan's results for white and black associated resumes by using a multiethnic collection of resumes, adding resumes with Asian and Hispanic sounding names. They recruited 160 participants at a downtown metropolitan pedestrian area and an airport to evaluate the resumes. Results indicated that Asian Americans' resumes were more highly rated than resumes with either black or Hispanic-sounding names. The data also revealed that occupational stereotypes, or the perceived suitability of applicants for either high status (e.g., physician, chemist, engineer, judge) or low status jobs (custodian, construction worker, repairman, etc.) mediated the relationship between race and resume evaluations.

This brief review of the literature pertaining to the social psychology of labor market racial inequality make clear three key points. First, employers express awareness of a variety of racial considerations that impact employee search, screening, and suitability for specific jobs. Second, contrary to social desirability expectations, employers willingly and openly express negative racial stereotypes about both workers and prospective applicants during face-to-face interviews. Such negative attitudes spanned multiple locations across the United States. Third, methodological innovations in the study of race-based labor market inequality, in particular the use of experimental manipulations, reveal exact points in the hiring process at which employers or hiring managers' beliefs about racial groups can lead to racial inequality in labor market outcomes. Race affected initial acknowledgement about job availability, actual hiring decisions, and subse-

quent job placement. Even fielding a better resume yielded racially differentiated returns. As our main argument asserts, the social psychology of ethno-racial attitudes and identities is a fundamental component of larger structural patterns of race-based inequalities in the labor market.

Racial Residential Segregation

Racial residential segregation has been referred to as the "linchpin" of modern racial inequality (Pettigrew 1979). Where individuals and groups reside has consequences for broad neighborhood quality. This includes such considerations as the quality of schools, safety and likelihood of exposure to violence and criminal victimization, level and quality of public services, and even proximity to serious environmental risks and hazardous conditions. Patterns of racial residential segregation intensified over much of the early part of the twentieth century (Massey and Denton 1993). Most major metropolitan areas and a very large fraction of the black population could be classified as living in "hypersegregated" circumstances where black and white places of residence were highly separated along at least four of five major indicators of residential dispersal. Despite some modest decline in recent decades, especially in smaller and newer metropolitan areas of the southwest and west, the black-white dissimilarity index remains high and has yet to approach the lower but still sizable dissimilarity index for whites-Hispanics. Black isolation has substantially decreased, though largely due to the influx of Hispanics and Asians into black neighborhoods, and black exposure to whites has remained fairly static over the last three decades (Logan 2013; Rugh and Massey 2013). Declarations of "the end of the segregated century" (Glaeser and Vigdor 2012) may be premature.

An extensive body of research has tried to assess the degree to which ethno-racial attitudes play a part in the maintenance (or break-down) of racial residential segregation. Four general themes of inquiry have primarily occupied this line of social psychological research. First, do neighborhood racial composition preferences vary by race and how are these compositional preferences related to attitudes about willingness to join or exit a particular neighborhood? Second, what is the association between neighborhood racial preferences and indicators of racial prejudice (e.g., negative stereotypes, out-group aversion and social distance, perceived group competition, etc.), particularly in a multiethnic society? Third, how heavily do other race-related social psychological factors (e.g., ethnocentrism) weigh vis-à-vis racial prejudice? Finally, is race primarily a proxy for a variety of socioeconomic or neighborhood considerations (e.g., perceptions of property value changes, neighborhood disorder) or are there important social psychological dimensions of race-based evaluation that also pertain? Work in this domain has also grown in complexity and methodological sophistication.

With data from the 1976 Detroit Area Study, Farley and Schuman introduced a major innovative showcard methodology for assessing neighborhood racial composition preferences (Farley et al. 1978). Prior studies often used general or imprecise survey items querying, for instance, whether it would make a difference for whites if a Negro moved into your block, or if blacks preferred segregated or mixed neighborhoods (Pettigrew 1973). The researchers used five showcards depicting the neighborhood composition based on three rows of five houses, with the respondent's house situated in the middle. For black respondents, the five showcards ranged across the following compositions: an all black neighborhood, four houses occupied by whites, seven white houses (or just under half white), twelve houses, and an all white neighborhood. For white respondents, the five showcards depicted: an all white neighborhood, one black family moving into the neighborhood, three black families in the neighborhood, five black houses (one-third), and eight black houses (just over half the houses occupied by blacks). Showcard pre-tests indicated almost no whites preferred neighborhoods with higher black concentrations. The Detroit Area Study data revealed that as the number of black homes depicted in a hypothetical neighborhood rose white respondents expressed growing discomfort, rated the neighborhood as one they

would not move into, and if already there, would consider moving out. On the other hand, 82% of blacks preferred mixed (~50% white) neighborhoods as their first or second choices, contradicting the hypothesis that blacks preferred to live amongst themselves and not with whites. The least desirable neighborhood among whites approximated the racial composition of the most desirable neighborhood among blacks.

That neighborhood racial composition affected neighborhood discomfort and willingness to enter and exit a neighborhood does not mean such attitudes are static. Farley et al. (1994) revisited the 1976 Detroit study using data collected in 1992, which showed that whites' neighborhood racial composition preferences reflected an increased tolerance for integration. Among blacks, neighborhood attractiveness varied little over the corresponding time period, with the most notable changes reflecting a declining desire among blacks to live in neighborhoods where almost all or all the neighbors were white. Black respondents still held racially mixed neighborhoods in the highest regard, with levels of racial integration that white respondents in 1976 and 1992 found to be the least attractive. Open-ended follow up questions, in particular regarding blacks' desire to live in an all-black neighborhood, divulged a possible explanation for blacks' reluctance to live in mostly white or all white neighborhoods: fear of white prejudice.

Farley et al. (1994) also tested two other possible factors linked to neighborhood attractiveness among whites: a perceived gap in socioeconomic status (difference scores between whites and blacks on perceptions as rich or poor) and group stereotypes (black/white difference scores on bipolar trait measures tapping perceived intelligence, preference for welfare dependency, difficulty of getting along with a particular group, and English speaking proficiency). The perceived gap in socioeconomic status between groups is another frequently cited source of opposition to residential segregation, with decline in property maintenance, unstable employment, and crime attributed to relatively poorer status. They found no effect of perceived socioeconomic gap on the three dependent outcomes: whites' discomfort with black neighbors, an index of willingness to exit a neighborhood based on the neighborhood's black composition, and reluctance to move into a mixed neighborhood. The data did reveal that negative black stereotypes were related to these three residential attitudes, with white discomfort, inclination towards white flight, and white reluctance to enter integrated neighborhoods all increasing as the black-white difference score indicated greater endorsement of negative black stereotypes.

Some research suggests that own-race preferences are an important factor producing racially segregated neighborhoods (Clark 1992). According to this perspective, multiple groups' preference for living among members of their same race can jointly determine observed patterns of residential segregation. Some claim that blacks' desire to self-segregate is a main factor in contemporary racial residential segregation (Thernstrom and Thernstrom 1997). Bobo and Zubrinsky (1996) directly test the in-group preference hypothesis by using feeling thermometer scores to operationalize ethnocentrism or positive in-group affect. For the most part, in-group affect was linked to residential integration attitudes primarily for white respondents, and only in reference to black and Asian neighbors; higher levels of white in-group affect related to lower support for living in neighborhoods where half the residents were black or Asian. In-group affect related to integration attitudes for only one other group: black respondents in relation to half Hispanic neighborhoods. However in that case, the relationship contradicted the in-group preference hypothesis; higher in-group affect among blacks decreased opposition to residential integration with Hispanics. Additional studies employing quantitative analysis of open-ended survey responses did not provide strong, if any, support for a relationship between ethnocentrism and neighborhood racial composition, in part because of the relative absence of ethnocentric justifications relative to other concerns (Krysan 2002; Krysan and Farley 2002).

Out-group affect predicted residential integration attitudes more consistently than in-group affect. Bobo and Zubrinsky's multiethnic data

revealed that two indicators of racial prejudice (out-group affective hostility and the in-group/out-group affective difference scores) explained more variation in the willingness to live in a neighborhood composed of 50 % of an ethno-racial out-group (whites, blacks, Latinos or Asians) than in-group affect. Models containing out-group affect generally explained as much or more of the variation in blacks, Hispanics, and Asians' attitudes than the affective difference score. However, the difference score models explained the most variation for whites, leading Bobo and Zubrinsky to surmise that the maintenance of social status difference for whites is a more powerful predictor of residential integration attitudes than either ethnocentrism or out-group animus alone. The multiethnic data also confirmed earlier findings on the almost statistical irrelevance of perceived group differences in socioeconomic status across all groups, as well as the robust relevance of negative group stereotypes, particularly for white respondents (Farley et al. 1994). In sum, racial prejudice was more often directly linked to residential racial integration attitudes than in-group affective preference, and only among whites was both out-group animus and in-group preference broadly related to opposition to living in substantially integrated neighborhoods.

Prior investigations provided limited footing on preferences for living among multiple out-groups simultaneously, typically due to the use of forced-choice measures. To provide additional information and decrease pressure for respondents reacting to pre-specified questions, the show card methodology underwent two important modifications with the Los Angeles subsample of the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality project (Charles 2000). First, respondents were presented with blank showcards and were asked to construct their own "ideal" neighborhoods by filling in their own ethno-racial neighbor preferences. Second, respondents were allowed to also indicate Latino and Asian neighbors, in addition to white and black neighbors. This moved the showcard methodology beyond both two-group comparisons and research focused on the black-white dichotomy, as a multiethnic society increasingly characterizes many major metropolitan areas.

Results from the multiethnic neighborhood showcards yielded news both sanguine and somber. Optimistically, most people created integrated neighborhoods, indicating extensive openness to residential integration. However, blacks were universally the most stigmatized out-group. Almost one in five white respondents constructed ideal neighborhoods with no black neighbors. Almost one-third of Latinos respondents and two out of five Asian respondents constructed ideal neighborhoods that excluded black neighbors, with important variations by nativity; foreign-born Latinos and Asians expressed greater distaste for living among blacks. Whites also expressed the greatest preference for exclusively same-race neighbors. Eleven percent of whites constructed ideal neighborhoods that contained only same-race neighbors, compared to 2.8 % of blacks, 6.6 % of Latinos, and 7 % of Asians. Ideal neighborhoods also indicated that all groups preferred substantial in-group representation, with whites as the most desirable out-group neighbor among minority respondents.

Multiethnic neighborhood showcards also allowed explorations of factors influencing the extent of same-race preferences as well as the influence on neighbor preferences of an additional racial prejudice factor: perceived racial group competition. The data revealed that a composite scale of perceived out-group job and political competition inversely predicted white preference for out-group neighbors and positively predicted same-race neighbor preferences. These results were net of racial stereotypes (intelligence, welfare dependency, English proficiency, drug and gang involvement) and social distance (assessments of difficulty of groups to get along with) that were again found to be significant for whites' neighborhood attitudes (Charles 2006). The data thus revealed that a third psychological indicator of racial prejudice (perceived group threat) independently predicted whites' neighbor preferences (see also Timberlake (2000)).

Furthermore, the multiethnic neighborhood showcards expanded our understanding of non-whites' neighborhood preferences. Racial stereo-

types and social distancing, and group threat to a lesser extent, proved significant for blacks' out-group and same-race neighbor preferences. Also, in-group attachment (a sense of common fate with same-race others) did have a moderate influence on blacks' same-race preferences (Thernstrom and Thernstrom 1997). Latinos' negative stereotypes of Whites and Asians decreased their preference for either group as neighbors, while black stereotypes had no relationship to black neighbor preference. Social distance was an important factor across all out-group and same-group neighbor preferences for Latinos. The various out-group attitudes did not affect Asians' same-race neighbor preferences. On the other hand, social distancing predicted Asians' out-group neighbor preferences, and stereotyping was associated with only black and Latino neighbor preferences. Racial group threat had no effect on either Latino or Asians' neighbor preferences. All minority groups were less likely to prefer white neighbors if they believed whites tended to discriminate against other racial-ethnic groups. In sum, across all groups, whites and non-white minorities, racial prejudice factors were linked to neighbor preferences.

There are those who argue, however, that racial prejudice is not as prominent a factor in the maintenance of racial residential segregation as earlier studies might suggest. Harris (1999, 2001) proposed that race acts as a proxy for non-race-related factors: property values, poverty, crime, etc. Certainly, open-ended responses indicate that perceptions of declining property values and crime are among the most cited reasons whites give for their willingness to move from a neighborhood as the number of black neighbors increases (Farley et al. 1994). However, critics of the showcard methodology maintained that when respondents reacted to showcards indicating a neighborhood's racial composition, race served as a proxy for these other race-neutral apprehensions. Using data from the 1990–1993 Chicago Area Study, Harris (2001) found that perceptions about three neighborhood characteristics—crime, deterioration, and quality of public school education—predict white and black respondents' neighborhood satisfaction, reducing the initial significant effect of percent black in the respondents' zip code to statistical non-significance. Because controlling for these non-racial neighborhood evaluations wiped out the negative relationship between neighborhood satisfaction and objective indicators of percent black in the larger zip code area, Harris argued that respondents' negative reaction to racial composition at the zip code level is primarily a negative reaction to underlying non-racial considerations manifested through the proxy of race. However, Harris did not control for either ethno-racial group stereotypes or affective ratings to assess whether these social psychological factors played a role as well, nor was there discussion about the extent to which the relevant neighborhood characteristics themselves were related to racial factors.

For instance, we know that perceptions of neighborhood crime and disorder are in fact linked to racial factors, net of the actual, objectively measured crime, disorder, and social class of a neighborhood. Quillian and Pager (2001) found that a census tract's percentage of young, black men (age 12–29) in Chicago and Seattle and percent black in Baltimore predicted perceptions of neighborhood crime, controlling for official reported crime rates, victimization rates, and percent poor at the neighborhood level. Likewise, Sampson and Raudenbush (2004) utilized systematic social observation to collect data on objective neighborhood disorder. Researchers sent a sports utility vehicle moving three to five miles an hour into almost 500 block groups, from which both trained observers and video cameras recorded physical disorder (e.g., cigarettes, garbage, empty beer bottles, graffiti, condoms, abandoned cars, etc.), social disorder (i.e., loitering, alcohol consumption, intoxication, fighting, prostitution, drug sales), and physical decay (e.g., boarded up houses, abandoned commercial buildings, etc.). They found that not only did objective indicators of physical disorder, social disorder, and physical decay predict perceptions of neighborhood disorder, but controlling for percent of families living in poverty, percent black, and percent Latino eliminated the association between perceived disorder and observed physical disorder, and substantially reduced perceived disorder's association with objective social disor-

der and physical decay, the former by a half. As with perceptions of neighborhood crime, perceptions of neighborhood disorder involve crucial race-related dimensions. Though perceptions of neighborhood crime and deterioration matter for whites' evaluations of neighborhood desirability (Harris 2001), both Quillian and Pager (2001) and Sampson and Raudenbush (2004) concluded that racial stereotypes are central to understanding both of these prima facie race-neutral attitudes. Racial stereotypes therefore cannot be summarily ruled out.

Another methodological innovation embedded videos in a self-administered computer-assisted survey, allowing researchers to revisit the race vs. class debate while controlling for class-related neighborhood characteristics (Krysan et al. 2009). Respondents viewed four to five short videos of neighborhoods, 27–44 seconds in length, which depicted one of five social class levels (lower working class, upper working class, unblemished middle class, blemished middle class, and upper middle class), based on factors such as property size, house maintenance, and neighborhood upkeep. Furthermore three of the five videos depicted different racial compositions (all white, all black, mixed white/black) based on the race of actors hired to engage in the same, routine activities for a given neighborhood social class level. Researchers randomly assigned respondents to view different neighborhood racial compositions, and utilized a within-subjects hierarchical linear model to estimate the effects on neighborhood desirability of a neighborhood's racial composition net of neighborhood social class, with both entered as level one predictors. Results revealed that whites rated the all white neighborhood as more desirable than the mixed neighborhood and the all black neighborhood as least desirable, effects independent of the influence of perceived neighborhood social class on neighborhood desirability.

Also, Krysan et al. (2009) found that the effect of racial composition on whites' assessments of neighborhood desirability varied based on a range of social psychological indicators. Both negative stereotypes about blacks (black/white difference scores on intelligence, welfare preference, crime/gang involvement, and quality of children supervision) and stereotypes about blacks' negative impact on property values further reduced whites' desire for living in a black neighborhood. Positive in-group affect increased whites' desirability for the all-white neighborhood, as earlier studies found, but also exacerbated aversion to black and racially mixed neighborhoods. Neighborhood racial composition also affected black respondents' neighborhood assessments, with mixed race neighborhoods perceived as most desirable and all white neighborhoods as least desirable. However, none of the social psychological factors—perceptions of racial discrimination (job, police, neighborhood, and housing market), in-group identity (sense of linked fate and closeness in feelings and thoughts to other in-group members), and in-group affect (black/white difference score on warmth towards group)—interacted with the effect that racial composition had on blacks' assessments of neighborhood desirability. In short, social psychological factors relate to how the racial composition of a neighborhood affects a neighborhood's desirability for whites, net of the perceived social class of the neighborhood, while the same cannot be said for blacks.

While most of the foregoing research addressed the connection between group attitudes and neighborhood preferences, social psychology has been implicated in housing discrimination via the sound of a voice. One study on language and social psychology indicated that among 421 listeners to speakers of Standard American English, African American Vernacular English, and Chicano English, listeners correctly associated multiple speakers of Standard American English with European American identity between 81 and 92 % of the time, different speakers of African American Vernacular English with African American identity between 77 and 97 % of the time, and different speakers of Chicano English with Hispanic American identity between 79 and 91 % of the time (Purnell et al. 1999). On the basis of such high accuracy in associating dialect to ethnic identity, sociologists conducted a phone audit study of Philadelphia's rental housing market exploring whether variations in black-sounding versus white-sounding phone inquiries

would relate to various housing access outcomes (Fischer and Massey 2004; Massey and Lundy 2001). The data revealed that speakers of a black-associated linguistic style were less likely than speakers of a white-associated linguistic style to speak to a rental agent (as opposed to leaving a voice mail), less likely to be informed that a unit was available, less likely to be given access to a unit, more likely to have fees requested, and more likely to receive a credit record inquiry. Another study found that racially identifiable voices also led to differential treatment during home insurance policy inquiries (Squires and Chadwick 2006). Just as the name on a resume triggered perceptions of the racial identity of a job applicant and led to discriminatory labor market outcomes, so too did the voice heard on a telephone suggest the perceived ethnic identity of a rental housing seeker that led to housing discrimination.

Rigorous, complex, and innovative studies on social psychology and neighborhood-related attitudes very clearly confirm that ethno-racial attitudes are implicated in the dynamics of racial residential segregation. While concerns about social class level of a neighborhood and declining property value are indeed important factors in evaluations of neighborhood desirability, race operates as more than a proxy for such considerations. Study after study reveals the independent effects that negative racial stereotypes and indicators of racial animus have on whites' neighborhood preferences, net of social class factors, while the effect of same-group preference on neighborhood attitudes, across all racial groups, is modest at best. Multiple studies attuned to the multiethnic landscape also point to a clear racial hierarchy in race-of-neighbor preferences, with blacks universally viewed as the least desirable neighbor and whites the most desirable. Finally, research exploring how social psychological mechanisms affect neighborhood attitudes across ethno-racial groups indicates that such processes differ between groups; social psychological processes that explain residential attitudes for one group may not apply to other groups (Hunt et al. 2000)

Racialized Politics

To round out our brief survey of the social psychology of ethno-racial attitudes and social inequality, we now turn to a critical domain of social life that weighs directly and quite heavily on many of the issues we've discussed so far: the domain of politics. A sizeable inter-disciplinary literature now exists on the debate about whether racial prejudice, in some form, influences U.S. politics (Hutchings and Valentino 2004; Krysan 2000). This review will assess what we know about the influence of ethno-racial identities and attitudes on partisanship, voting, explicitly ethno-racial policy issues (i.e., school busing, affirmative action, immigration, bilingualism), and implicitly racial policy issues (e.g., welfare, crime and criminal justice).

In this section, we will attempt to address three questions. Do negative ethno-racial attitudes and outlooks heavily influence politics? If so, what is the nature of such negative outlooks, how should we measure them, and what sorts of outcomes do they affect? If not, how should we understand what appears and is often interpreted as racialized political controversy? Given the vast amount of literature that can be classified under the general heading "ethno-racial attitudes and politics," and the extensive treatment already done in the book, *Racialized Politics: The Debate about Racism in America* (Sears et al. 2000), we focus our attention on one of the theoretical frameworks introduced earlier: racial resentment.

Racial resentment has successfully predicted a number of electoral and other political outcomes over the course of over three decades of research. In one of the earliest tests of racial resentment, researchers asked if direct personal racial threat or racial resentment would better predict preference for a white mayoral candidate over a black mayoral candidate. Researchers found that racial resentment was a better predictor of white preference for voting against the black candidate than direct racial threat. The influence of racial resentment on voter preference did not wane even for those less vulnerable to direct racial threat (Kinder and Sears 1981). Racial resentment was also a better predictor than self-interest for whites'

opposition to busing for school desegregation (Sears and Allen 1984), and opposition to affirmative action (Jacobson 1985). In a more recent test, Matsueda and Drakulich (2009) found that controlling for both racial resentment and negative black stereotypes accounted for the negative influence of both Republican identification and conservative ideology on support for affirmative action, though the relationship between conservative ideology and racial resentment has long been a point of contention (Sniderman and Tetlock 1986; Tarman and Sears 2005). Racial resentment also predicted 2008 presidential support for McCain over Obama (Ford et al. 2010; Pasek et al. 2009), and either choosing not to vote or voting for a nonmajor party candidate in 2008 versus voting for Obama (Pasek et al. 2009).

Racial resentment has also been tested on political attitudes beyond the black/white divide. Huddy and Sears (1995) found that an indicator of new prejudice against Hispanics (disagreeing that Hispanics' financial situation would improve with a chance at a good education) predicted opposition to bilingual education. They found that negative averaged ratings towards Mexican-Americans, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans on an affect thermometer scale also predicted opposition to bilingual education. Finally, endorsement of racial resentment targeted towards immigrants (e.g. immigrants are too demanding in push for equal rights, immigrants should work their way up without special favors) predicted opposition to a number of pro-immigration policies: allowing increased legal immigration, granting immigrants eligibility for government assistance as soon as they arrive, and illegal immigrant entitlement to work permits, citizenship for their American-born children, and same costs for public university attendance as other students (Berg 2013).

Finally, racial resentment is also related to a number of attitudes that are not explicitly race-related. Individualism, economic self-interest, and three racial resentment items predicted support for food stamps spending, an attitude towards welfare (Gilens 1995). Racial resentment also predicted opposition to health care policy (Henderson and Hillygus 2011; Tesler 2012), and crime-related concepts such as support for the death penalty and other punitive sanctions (Bobo and Johnson 2004; Buckler et al. 2009; Matsueda and Drakulich 2009), crime spending (Matsueda and Drakulich 2009) and progressive punishment policies (Buckler et al. 2009). Racial resentment also predicted a racially-tinged, criminal justice-associated behavior, the likelihood that Louisiana registered voters closely followed news about protests regarding a racially-charged court case (Goidel et al. 2011).

Racial resentment has undergone a number of operationalized incarnations over the years. While Henry and Sears (2002) endorse the eight item Symbolic Racism 2000 (SR2K) scale, we list instead the six item set Kinder and Sanders (1996) offered to measure racial resentment, some of which are identical to SR2K items.

- Irish, Italian, Jewish and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without any special favors.
- Over the past few years, Blacks have gotten less than they deserve.
- Government officials usually pay less attention to a request or complaint from a Black person than from a white person.
- Most Blacks who receive money from welfare programs could get along without it if they tried.
- It's really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if Blacks would only try harder, they could be just as well off as Whites.
- Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for Blacks to work their way out of the lower class.

These items taken together reflect the two core dimensions of racial resentment: anti-black animus and blacks' perceived violations of traditional American values. Scholars have also argued for updated items that more explicitly measure racial resentment (Wilson and Davis 2011).

One of the biggest challenges to racial resentment theory has come from those who argue that commitment to race-neutral values and principles provides an alternative interpretational lens for understanding what would appear to be racially prejudiced political attitudes (Sniderman and

Carmines 1997; Sniderman and Piazza 1993). Such values include political conservatism (Feldman and Huddy 2005; Sniderman and Tetlock 1986), individualism (Feldman 1988; Sniderman and Hagen 1985), and fairness and egalitarianism (Peterson 1994; Sniderman and Carmines 1997). Some have found that principled objections not only reflect race-neutral values but are also manifestations of group dominance (Federico and Sidanius 2002). While some analysts engage in contentious arguments about theoretical primacy, a multi-causal framework that acknowledges the important role played by both race-neutral values and group-related factors is warranted (Bobo and Tuan 2006).

Space limitations do not permit us to review other social psychological frameworks relevant to the domain of race and politics. These include the aforementioned model of group position theory, and other theoretical approaches such as social dominance (Pratto et al. 1994; Sidanius 1993; Sidanius and Pratto 1999), paternalism theory (Jackman 1994), stratification beliefs (Kluegel and Smith 1983,1986; Tuch and Hughes 1996), linked fate (Dawson 1994) and racialization (Gilens 1999; Tesler 2012; see Hunt, this volume). Ethno-racial attitudes and identities also play a major role in the political sociology of collective action, from the "cognitive liberation" of ethno-racial identities (McAdam 1982) to the emotional pull and "frame lifting" exhortations of African American church leaders involved in civil rights struggle (Morris 2000; see Snow and Owens, this volume). All these approaches testify to the enduring connection between ethno-racial attitudes, politics, and social inequality.

Conclusion

The social psychological study of ethno-racial attitudes constitutes one of *the* quintessential illustrations of sociological processes, insofar as ethno-racial attitudes are deeply implicated in the operation, reproduction, and transformation of society at every level of analysis. From the micro-level processes of cognitive categorization and affective and behavioral aversion, to macro-level patterns of labor market sorting and residential segregation, to either the unfettering or shackling of possibilities via the election of political leaders and the policy constraints and opportunities placed upon them, ethno-racial attitudes structure and are in turn structured by the complex and ofttimes contradictory impulses expressed through historical and contemporary forces and the practice of individual and collective agency. Despite our predilection for sociological analyses, we believe most of the studies we reviewed indicate that the social psychological investigation of ethno-racial attitudes and social inequality is a truly interdisciplinary affair, spanning sociology, psychology, political science, economics, anthropology, linguistics, and health-related disciplines as well (Krieger 1999; Major et al. 2013; Schnittker and McLeod 2005; Williams et al. 2003). These social psychological processes are too complex, too variegated, too profoundly entwined in the fabric of social life to be the province of any disciplinary silo. The goal of a United States where ethno-racial factors no longer limit any individuals' life chances is indeed a distant one, but the malleability and change observed in ethno-racial attitudes over the last half-century suggest that at the very least, it is not an impossible one.

References

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper.

Alba, R., Rumbaut, R. G., & Marotz, K. (2005). A distorted nation: Perceptions of racial/ethnic group sizes and attitudes toward immigrants and other minorities. *Social Forces, 84*(2), 901–919.

Allport, G. W. (1954[1979]). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge: Perseus Books.

Altemeyer, B. (1998). The other "authoritarian personality." *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 30*, 47–92.

Arkes, H. R., & Tetlock, P. E. (2004). Attributions of implicit prejudice, or "would Jesse Jackson 'fail' the Implicit Association Test?". *Psychological Inquiry, 15*(4), 257–278.

Berg, J. A. (2013). Opposition to pro-immigrant public policy: Symbolic racism and group threat. *Sociological Inquiry, 83*(1), 1–31.

Bergsieker, H. B., Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2010). To be liked versus respected: Divergent goals in inter-

racial interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99*(2), 248–264.

Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *American Economic Review, 94*(4), 991–1013.

Biernat, M., & Kobrynowicz, D. (1997). Gender- and race-based standards of competence: Lower minimum standards but higher ability standards for devalued groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(3), 544–557.

Blanton, H., & Jaccard, J. (2008). Unconscious racism: A concept in pursuit of a measure. *Annual Review of Sociology, 34,* 277–297.

Blumer, H. (1958). Race prejudice as a sense of group position. *The Pacific Sociological Review, 1*(1), 3–7.

Bobo, L. (1983). Whites' opposition to busing: Symbolic racism or realistic group conflict? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*(6), 1196–1210.

Bobo, L. D. (1999). Prejudice as group position: Microfoundations of a sociological approach to racism and race relations. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*(3), 445–472.

Bobo, L. D. (2001). Racial attitudes and relations at the close of the twentieth century. In N. J. Smelser, W. J. Wilson, & F. Mitchell (Eds.), *America becoming: Racial trends and their consequences* (Vol. 1, pp. 264–301). Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Bobo, L. D. (2011). Somewhere between Jim Crow & post-racialism: Reflections on the racial divide in America today. *Daedalus, 140*(2), 11–36.

Bobo, L. D., & Hutchings, V. L. (1996). Perceptions of racial group competition: Extending Blumer's theory of group position to a multiracial social context. *American Sociological Review, 61*(6), 951–972.

Bobo, L. D., & Johnson, D. (2004). A taste for punishment: Black and white Americans' views on the death penalty and the war on drugs. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race, 1*(1), 151–180.

Bobo, L. D., & Kluegel, J. (1993). Opposition to race-targeting: Self-interest, stratification ideology, or racial attitudes? *American Sociological Review, 58*(4), 443–464.

Bobo, L. D., & Tuan, M. (2006). *Prejudice in politics: Group position, public opinion, and the Wisconsin treaty rights dispute*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bobo, L., & Zubrinsky, C. L. (1996). Attitudes on residential integration: Perceived status differences, mere in-group preference, or racial prejudice? *Social Forces, 74*(3), 883–909.

Bobo, L. D., Johnson, D., & Suh, S. (2000). Racial attitudes and power in the workplace: Do the haves differ from the have-nots? In L. D. Bobo, M. L. Oliver, J. H. Johnson Jr., & A. Valenzuela Jr. (Eds.), *Prismatic metropolis: Inequality in Los Angeles* (pp. 491–522). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bobo, L. D., Charles, C. Z., Krysan, M., & Simmons, A. D. (2012). The real record on racial attitudes. In P. V. Marsden (Ed.), *Social trends in the United States: Evidence from the general social survey since 1972* (pp. 38–83). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bonacich, E. (1972). A theory of ethnic antagonism: The split labor market. *American Sociological Review, 37*(5), 547–559.

Bonacich, E. (1980). Class approaches to ethnicity and race. *Critical Sociology, 10*(2), 9–23.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (1997). Rethinking racism: Toward a structural interpretation. *American Sociological Review, 62*(3), 465–480.

Brigham, J. C. (1993). College students' racial attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 23*(23), 1933–1967.

Buckler, K., Wilson, S., & Salinas, P. R. (2009). Public support for punishment and progressive criminal justice policy preferences: The role of symbolic racism and negative racial stereotype. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 34*(3-4), 238–252.

Charles, C. Z. (2000). Neighborhood racial-composition preferences: Evidence from a multiethnic metropolis. *Social Problems, 47*(3), 379–407.

Charles, C. Z. (2006). *Won't you be my neighbor? Class, race, and residence in a prismatic metropolis*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Clark, W. A. V. (1992). Residential preferences and residential choices in a multiethnic context. *Demography, 29*(3), 451–466.

Croll, P. R. (2007). Modeling determinants of white racial identity: Results from a new national survey. *Social Forces, 86*(2), 613–642.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). The color line in American education: Race, resources, and student achievement. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race, 1*(2), 213–246.

Dawson, M. C. (1994). *Behind the mule: Race and class in African-American politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Dixon, J. C. (2006). The ties that bind and those that don't: Toward reconciling group threat and contact theories of prejudice. *Social Forces, 84*(4), 2179–2204.

Dixon, J. C., & Rosenbaum, M. S. (2004). Nice to know you? Testing contact, cultural, and group threat theories of anti-black and anti-Hispanic stereotypes. *Social Science Quarterly, 85*(2), 257–280.

Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2000). Aversive racism and selection decisions: 1989 and 1999. *Psychological Science, 11*(4), 315–319.

Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., Johnson, C., Johnson, B., & Howard, A. (1997). On the nature of prejudice: Automatic and controlled processes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 33*(5), 510–540.

Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S. L. (2002). Implicit and explicit prejudice and interracial interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(1), 62–68.

Dovidio, J. F., ten Vergert, M., Stewart, T. L., Gaertner, S. L., Johnson, J. D., Esses, V. M., Riek, B. M., & Pearson, A. R. (2004). Perspective and prejudice:

Antecedents and mediating mechanisms. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*(12), 1537–1549.

Farley, R., Schuman, H., Bianchi, S., Colasanto, D., & Hatchett, S. (1978). "Chocolate city, vanilla suburbs": Will the trend toward racially separate communities continue? *Social Science Research, 7*(4), 319–344.

Farley, R., Steeh, C., Krysan, M., Jackson, T., & Reeves, K. (1994). Stereotypes and segregation: Neighborhoods in the Detroit area. *American Journal of Sociology, 100*(3), 750–780.

Fazio, R. H., & Olson, M. A. (2003). Implicit measures in social cognition research: Their meaning and use. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54,* 297–327.

Federico, C. M., & Sidanius, J. (2002). Racism, ideology, and affirmative action revisited: The antecedents and consequences of "principled objections" to affirmative action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(4), 488–502.

Feldman, S. (1988). Structure and consistency in public opinion: The role of core beliefs and values. *American Journal of Political Science, 32*(2), 416–440.

Feldman, S., & Huddy, L. (2005). Racial resentment and white opposition to race-conscious programs: Principles or prejudice? *American Journal of Political Science, 49*(1), 168–183.

Fischer, M. J., & Massey, D. S. (2004). The ecology of racial discrimination. *City & Community, 3*(3), 221–241.

Ford, P. K., Maxwell, A., & Shields, T. (2010). What's the matter with Arkansas? Symbolic racism and 2008 presidential candidate support. *Presidential Studies Quarterly, 40*(2), 286–302.

Forman, T. A. (2004). Color-blind racism and racial indifference: The role of racial apathy in facilitating enduring inequalities. In M. Krysan & A. E. Lewis (Eds.), *The changing terrain of race and ethnicity* (pp. 67–119). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Forman, T. A., & Lewis, A. E. (2006). Racial apathy and Hurricane Katrina: The social anatomy of prejudice in the post-civil rights era. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race, 3*(1), 175–202.

Fossett, M., & Kiecolt, J. (1989). The relative size of minority populations and white racial attitudes. *Social Science Quarterly, 70*(4), 820–835.

Fox, C. (2004). The changing color of welfare? How whites' attitudes toward Latinos influence support for welfare. *American Journal of Sociology, 110*(3), 580–625.

Fox, C. (2012). *Three worlds of relief: Race, immigration, and the American welfare state from the progressive era to the new deal*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Fox, C., & Guglielmo, T. A. (2012). Defining America's racial boundaries: Blacks, Mexicans, and European immigrants, 1890–1945. *American Journal of Sociology, 118*(2), 327–379.

Frantz, C. M., Cuddy, A. J. C., Burnett, M., Ray, H., & Hart, A. (2004). A threat in the computer: The race implicit association test as a stereotype threat experience. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*(12), 1611–1624.

Fredrickson, G. M. (1971). *The black image in the white mind: The debate on Afro-American character and destiny, 1817–1914*. New York: Harper & Row.

Fredrickson, G. M., & Knobel, D. T. (1980). A history of discrimination. In T. F. Pettigrew, G. M. Frederickson, D. T. Knobel, N. Glazer, & R. Ueda (Eds.), *Prejudice: Dimensions of ethnicity* (pp. 30–86). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Frey, W. H. (2011). *The new metro minority map: Regional shifts in Hispanics, Asians, and blacks from Census 2010*. Metropolitan Policy Program at Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Anastasio, P. A., Bachman, B. A., & Rust, M. C. (1993). The common ingroup identity model: Recategorization and the reduction of intergroup bias. *European Review of Social Psychology, 4*(1), 1–26.

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., & Bachman, B. A. (1996). Revisiting the contact hypothesis: The induction of a common ingroup identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 20*(3), 271–290.

Gallagher, C. A. (2003). Miscounting race: Explaining whites' misperceptions of racial group size. *Sociological Perspectives, 46*(3), 381–396.

Garth, D., Sheatsley, P. B., & Greeley, A. M. (1978). Attitudes toward racial integration. *Scientific American, 238*(6), 42–49.

Gilens, M. (1995). Racial attitudes and opposition to welfare. *The Journal of Politics, 57*(4), 994–1014.

Gilens, M. (1999). *Why Americans hate welfare: Race, media, and the politics of antipoverty policy (studies in communication, media, and public opinion)*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.

Glaeser, E., & Vigdor, J. (2012). *The end of the segregated century: Racial separation in America's neighborhoods, 1890–2010*. New York: Manhattan Institute for Policy Research.

Glaser, J. M. (2003). Social context and inter-group political attitudes: Experiments in group conflict theory. *British Journal of Political Science, 33*(4), 607–620.

Goff, P. A., Steele, C. M., & Davies, P. G. (2008). The space between us: Stereotype threat and distance in interracial contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*(1), 91–107.

Goidel, K., Parent, W., & Mann, B. (2011). Race, racial resentment, attentiveness to the news media, and public opinion toward the Jena Six. *Social Science Quarterly, 92*(1), 20–34.

Greeley, A. M., & Sheatsley, P. B. (1971). Attitudes toward racial integration. *Scientific American, 225*(6), 13–19.

Green, A., Carney, D., Pallin, D., Ngo, L., Raymond, K., Iezzoni, L., & Banaji, M. (2007). Implicit bias among physicians and its prediction of thrombolysis decisions for black and white patients. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 22*(9), 1231–1238.

Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review, 102*(1), 4–27.

Grusky, D. B., Western, B., & Wimer, C. (2011). *The great recession*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Hamilton, D. L., & Trolier, T. K. (1986). Stereotypes and stereotyping: An overview of the cognitive approach. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 127–163). Orlando: Academic Press.

Harris, D. R. (1999). "Property values drop when blacks move in, because…": Racial and socioeconomic determinants of neighborhood desirability. *American Sociological Review, 64*(3), 461–479.

Harris, D. R. (2001). Why are whites and blacks averse to black neighbors? *Social Science Research, 30*(1), 100–116.

Harris, A. L. (2010). The economic and educational state of black Americans in the 21st century: Should we be optimistic or concerned? *The Review of Black Political Economy, 37*(3–4), 241–252.

Henderson, M., & Hillygus, D. S. (2011). The dynamics of health care opinion, 2008-2010: Partisanship, self-interest, and racial resentment. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law, 36*(6), 945–960.

Henry, P. J., & Sears, D. O. (2002). The symbolic racism 2000 scale. *Political Psychology, 23*(2), 253–283.

Hodson, G., Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2002). Processes in racial discrimination: Differential weighting of conflicting information. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*(4), 460–471.

Holzer, H. J., & Ihlanfeldt, K. R. (1998). Customer discrimination and employment outcomes for minority workers. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 113*(3), 835–867.

Huddy, L., & Sears, D. O. (1995). Opposition to bilingual education: Prejudice or the defense of realistic interests? *Social Psychology Quarterly, 58*(2), 133–143.

Hunt, M. O. (2007). African-American, Hispanic, and white beliefs about black/white inequality, 1977–2004. *American Sociological Review, 72*(3), 390–415.

Hunt, M. O., Jackson, P. B., Powell, B., & Steelman, L. C. (2000). Color-blind: The treatment of race and ethnicity in social psychology. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 63*(4), 352–364.

Hutchings, V. L., & Valentino, N. A. (2004). The centrality of race in American politics. *Annual Review of Political Science, 7,* 383–408.

Hyman, H. H., & Sheatsley, P. B. (1956). Attitudes toward desegregation. *Scientific American, 195*(6), 35–39.

Hyman, H. H., & Sheatsley, P. B. (1964). Attitudes toward desegregation. *Scientific American, 211*(1), 16–23.

Jackman, M. R. (1994). *The velvet glove: Paternalism and conflict in gender, class, and race relations*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jacobson, C. K. (1985). Resistance to affirmative action: Self-interest or racism? *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 29*(2), 306–329.

Jiménez, T. R., & Horowitz, A. L. (2013). When white is just alright: How immigrants redefine achievement and reconfigure the ethnoracial hierarchy. *American Sociological Review, 78*(5), 849–871.

Katz, I. (1991). Gordon Allport's "The Nature of Prejudice." *Political Psychology, 12*(1), 125–157.

Katz, M. B., Stern, M. J., & Fader, J. J. (2005). The new African American inequality. *The Journal of American History, 92*(1), 75–108.

Kinder, D. R., & Sanders, L. M. (1996). *Divided by color: Racial politics and democratic ideals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kinder, D. R., & Sears, D. O. (1981). Prejudice and politics: Symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40*(3), 414–431.

King, E. B., Mendoza, S. A., Madera, J. M., Hebl, M. R., & Knight, J. L. (2006). What's in a name? A multiracial investigation of the role of occupational stereotypes in selection decisions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*(5), 1145–1159.

Kirschenman, J., & Neckerman, K. M. (1991). "We'd love to hire them, but…": The meaning of race for employers. In C. Jencks & P. E. Peterson (Eds.), *The urban underclass* (pp. 203–232). Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Kluegel, J. R., & Smith, E. R. (1983). Affirmative action attitudes: Effects of self-interest, racial affect, and stratification beliefs on whites' views. *Social Forces, 61*(3), 797–824.

Kluegel, J. R., & Smith, E. R. (1986). *Beliefs about inequality: Americans' views of what is and what ought to be*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Krieger, N. (1999). Embodying inequality: A review of concepts, measures, and methods for studying health consequences of discrimination. *International Journal of Health Services, 29*(2), 295–352.

Krysan, M. (2000). Prejudice, politics, and public opinion: Understanding the sources of racial policy attitudes. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26,* 135–168.

Krysan, M. (2002). Whites who say they'd flee: Who are they, and why would they leave? *Demography, 39*(4), 675–696.

Krysan, M., & Farley, R. (2002). The residential preferences of blacks: Do they explain persistent segregation? *Social Forces, 80*(3), 937–980.

Krysan, M., Couper, M. P., Farley, R., & Forman, T. A. (2009). Does race matter in neighborhood preferences? Results from a video experiment. *American Journal of Sociology, 115*(2), 527–559.

Lane, K. A., Banaji, M. R., Nosek, B. A., & Greenwald, A. G. (2007). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: IV. What we know (so far) about the method. In B. Wittenbrink & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Implicit measures of attitudes* (pp. 59–102). New York: Guilford Press.

Logan, J. R. (2013). The persistence of segregation in the 21st century metropolis. *City & Community, 12*(2), 160–168.

Major, B., Mendes, W. B., & Dovidio, J. F. (2013). Intergroup relations and health disparities: A social psy-

chological perspective. *Health Psychology, 32*(5), 514–524.
Massey, D. S., & Denton, N. A. (1993). *American spartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Massey, D. S., & Lundy, G. (2001). Use of black English and racial discrimination in urban housing markets: New methods and findings. *Urban Affairs Review, 36*(4), 452–469.
Matsueda, R. L., & Drakulich, K. (2009). Perceptions of criminal injustice, symbolic racism, and racial politics. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 623*(1), 163–178.
McAdam, D. (1982). *Political process and the development of black insurgency (1930–1970)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
McConahay, J. B. (1982). Self-interest versus racial attitudes as correlates of anti-busing attitudes in Louisville: Is it the buses or the blacks? *The Journal of Politics, 44*(3), 692–720.
McDermott, M. (2006). *Working class white: The making and unmaking of race relations*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
McDermott, M. (2011). Racial attitudes in city, neighborhood, and situational contexts. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 634*(1), 153–173.
Mendes, W. B., & Koslov, K. (2013). Brittle smiles: Positive biases toward stigmatized and outgroup targets. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 142*(3), 923–933.
Morning, A. (2011). *The nature of race: How scientists think and teach about human difference*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Morris, A. (2000). Reflections on social movement theory: Criticisms and proposals. *Contemporary Sociology, 29*(3), 445–454.
Nosek, B. A. (2005). Moderators of the relationship between implicit and explicit evaluation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 134*(4), 565–584.
Oliver, J. E., & Mendelberg, T. (2000). Reconsidering the environmental determinants of white racial attitudes. *American Journal of Political Science, 44*(3), 574–589.
Oliver, M. L., & Shapiro, T. M. (1997). *Black wealth/white wealth: A new perspective on racial inequality*. New York: Routledge.
Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York: Routledge.
Ortman, J. M., & Guarneri, C. E. (2009). *United States population projections: 2000 to 2050*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.
Pager, D. (2003). The mark of a criminal record. *American Journal of Sociology, 108*(5), 937–975.
Pager, D., Western, B., & Bonikowski, B. (2009). Discrimination in a low-wage labor market: A field experiment. *American Sociological Review, 74*(5), 777–799.
Pasek, J., Tahk, A., Lelkes, Y., Krosnick, J. A., Payne, B. K., Akhtar, O., & Tompson, T. (2009). Determinants of turnout and candidate choice in the 2008 U.S. presidential election: Illuminating the impact of racial prejudice and other considerations. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 73*(5), 943–994.
Pearson, A. R., Dovidio, J. F., & Pratto, F. (2007). Racial prejudice, intergroup hate, and blatant and subtle bias of whites toward blacks in legal decision making in the United States. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy, 7*(2), 145–158.
Pearson, A. R., Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2009). The nature of contemporary prejudice: Insights from aversive racism. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 3*(3), 314–338.
Peterson, R. S. (1994). The role of values in predicting fairness judgments and support of affirmative action. *Journal of Social Issues, 50*(4), 95–115.
Pettigrew, T. F. (1973). Attitudes on race and housing: A social-psychological view. In A. H. Hawley & V. P. Rock. (Eds.), *Segregation in residential areas: Papers on racial and socioeconomic factors in choice of housing* (pp. 21–84). Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences.
Pettigrew, T. F. (1979). Racial change and social policy. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 441*(1), 114–131.
Pettigrew, T. F. (1980). Prejudice. In T. F. Pettigrew, G. M. Frederickson, D. T. Knobel, N. Glazer, & R. Ueda (Eds.), *Prejudice: Dimensions of ethnicity* (pp. 1–29). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Pettit, B., & Western, B. (2004). Mass imprisonment and the life course: Race and class inequality in U.S. incarceration. *American Sociological Review, 69*(2), 151–169.
Phelan, J. C., Link, B. G., & Feldman, N. M. (2013). The genomic revolution and beliefs about essential racial differences: A backdoor to eugenics? *American Sociological Review, 78*(2), 167–191.
Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(4), 741–763.
Purnell, T., Idsardi, W., & Baugh, J. (1999). Perceptual and phonetic experiments on American English dialect identification. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 18*(1), 10–30.
Quillian, L. (1995). Prejudice as a response to perceived group threat: Population composition and anti-immigrant and racial prejudice in Europe. *American Sociological Review, 60*(4), 586–611.
Quillian, L. (1996). Group threat and regional change in attitudes toward African-Americans. *American Journal of Sociology, 102*(3), 816–860.
Quillian, L., & Pager, D. (2001). Black neighbors, higher crime? The role of racial stereotypes in evaluations of neighborhood crime. *American Journal of Sociology, 107*(3), 717–767.
Richeson, J. A., & Shelton, J. N. (2007). Negotiating interracial interactions: Costs, consequences, and pos-

sibilities. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 16*(6), 316–320.

Rugh, J. S., & Massey, D. S. (2013). Segregation in post-civil rights America: Stalled integration or end of the segregated century? *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race, 10*(2), 1–28.

Sampson, R. J. (2012). *Great American city: Chicago and the enduring neighborhood effect*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sampson, R. J., & Raudenbush, S. W. (2004). Seeing disorder: Neighborhood stigma and the social construction of "broken windows". *Social Psychology Quarterly, 67*(4), 319–342.

Schnittker, J., & McLeod, J. D. (2005). The social psychology of health disparities. *Annual Review of Sociology, 31,* 75–103.

Schuman, H., Steeh, C., & Bobo, L. (1985). *Racial attitudes in America: Trends and interpretations*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Schuman, H., Steeh, C., Bobo, L. D., & Krysan, M. (1997). *Racial attitudes in America: Trends and interpretations, revised edition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sears, D. (1988). Symbolic racism. In P. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 53–84). New York: Plenum.

Sears, D. O., & Allen, H. M. Jr. (1984). The trajectory of local desegregation controversies and whites' opposition to busing. In N. Miller & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 123–151). New York: Academic Press.

Sears, D. O., Hensler, C. P., & Speer, L. K. (1979). Whites' opposition to "busing": Self-interest or symbolic politics? *The American Political Science Review, 73*(2), 369–384.

Sears, D., Sidanius, J., & Bobo, L. (2000). *Racialized politics: The debate about racism in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

See, K. O., & Wilson, W. J. (1988). Race and ethnicity. In N. J. Smelser (Ed.), *Handbook of sociology* (pp. 223–242). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2005). Intergroup contact and pluralistic ignorance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*(1), 91–107.

Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2006). Interracial interactions: A relational approach. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 38, pp. 121–181). San Diego: Academic Press.

Shelton, J. N., Richeson, J. A., & Salvatore, J. (2005a). Expecting to be the target of prejudice: Implications for interethnic interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31,* 1189–1202.

Shelton, J. N., Richeson, J. A., Salvatore, J., & Trawalter, S. (2005b). Ironic effects of racial bias during interracial interactions. *Psychological Science, 16*(5), 397–402.

Sidanius, J. (1993). The psychology of group conflict and the dynamics of oppression: A social dominance perspective. In S. Iyengar & W. J. McGuire (Eds.), *Explorations in political psychology* (pp. 183–219). Durham: Duke University Press.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sniderman, P. M., & Carmines, E. G. (1997). *Reaching beyond race*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sniderman, P. M., & Hagen, M. G. (1985). *Race and inequality: A study in American values*. Chatham: Chatham House.

Sniderman, P., & Piazza, T. (1993). *The scar of race*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sniderman, P. M., & Tetlock, P. E. (1986). Reflections on American racism. *Journal of Social Issues, 42*(2), 173–187.

Son Hing, L. S., Chung-Yan, G. A., Hamilton, L. K., & Zanna, M. P. (2008). A two-dimensional model that employs explicit and implicit attitudes to characterize prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*(6), 971–987.

Squires, G. D., & Chadwick, J. (2006). Linguistic profiling: A continuing tradition of discrimination in the home insurance industry? *Urban Affairs Review, 41*(3), 400–415.

Tarman, C., & Sears, D. O. (2005). The conceptualization and measurement of symbolic racism. *Journal of Politics, 67*(3), 731–761.

Taylor, M. C. (1998). How white attitudes vary with the racial composition of local populations: Numbers count. *American Sociological Review, 63*(4), 512–535.

Tesler, M. (2012). The spillover of racialization into health care: How President Obama polarized public opinion by racial attitudes and race. *American Journal of Political Science, 56*(3), 690–704.

Thernstrom, S., & Thernstrom, A. (1997). *America in black and white: One nation, indivisible*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Timberlake, J. M. (2000). Still life in black and white: Effects of racial and class attitudes on prospects for residential integration in Atlanta. *Sociological Inquiry, 70*(4), 420–425.

Trawalter, S., Richeson, J. A., & Shelton, J. N. (2009). Predicting behavior during interracial interactions: A stress and coping approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 13*(4), 243–268.

Tuch, S. A., & Hughes, M. (1996). Whites' racial policy attitudes. *Social Science Quarterly, 77*(4), 723–745.

Tuch, S. A., & Hughes, M. (2011). Whites' racial policy attitudes in the twenty-first century: The continuing significance of racial resentment. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 634*(1), 134–152.

U. S. Census Bureau. (2012). *Most children younger than age 1 are minorities, Census Bureau reports*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.

Wellman, D. T. (1977). *Portraits of white racism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

West, T. V., Pearson, A. R., Dovidio, J. F., J Shelton, J. N., & Trail, T. E. (2009a). Superordinate identity and

intergroup roommate friendship development. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*(6), 1266–1272.

West, T. V., Shelton, J. N., & Trail, T. E. (2009b). Relational anxiety in interracial interactions. *Psychological Science, 20*(3), 289–292.

Western, B. (2007). *Punishment and inequality in America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Williams, D. R., & Rucker, T. D. (2000). Understanding and addressing racial disparities in health care. *Health Care Financing Review, 21*(4), 75–90.

Williams, D. R., Neighbors, H. W., & Jackson, J. S. (2003). Racial/ethnic discrimination and health: Findings from community studies. *American Journal of Public Health, 93*(2), 200–208.

Wilson, W. J. (1997). *When work disappears: The world of the new urban poor*. New York: Vintage.

Wilson, W. J. (2010). *More than just race: Being black and poor in the inner city*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Wilson, D. C., & Davis, D. W. (2011). Reexamining racial resentment: Conceptualization and content. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 634*(1), 117–133.

Wong, C. J. (2007). "Little" and "big" pictures in our heads race, local context, and innumeracy about racial groups in the United States. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 71*(3), 392–412.