SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS IN THE LOCAL BLACK COMMUNITY AS AN INFLUENCE ON WHITE RESIDENTS' RACIAL VIEWS

Adriana M. Reyes
Department of Sociology
The Pennsylvania State University

Marylee C. Taylor
Department of Sociology
The Pennsylvania State University

ABSTRACT

This paper extends the study of contextual influences on racial attitudes by asking how the SES of the local black community shapes the racial attitudes of local whites. Using responses to the 1998-2002 General Social Surveys merged with year 2000 census data, we compare the influences on white residents' attitudes of black educational and economic composition, and we assess the independence of these effects from the impact of white contextual SES. For measures of traditional prejudice, perceptions related to "new" racism, and racial policy opinions, white residents' views are more positive in localities where the black population contains more college graduates. However, such localities tend also to have highly educated white populations, as well as higher income among black and white families, and the multiple influences are inseparable. In contrast, many dimensions of racial attitudes show an *independent* effect of black economic composition, white residents' reporting more negative racial views where the local African American community is poorer.

INTRODUCTION

<u>**Existing Assessments of Environmental Influences on Racial Attitudes**</u>

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

The roles of historical events, national culture, and regional norms in shaping racial attitudes have long been recognized (Pettigrew 1958; Schuman et al. 1997). Influences of changed legal requirements and the behaviors they prescribe on white Americans' racial views, sometimes dubbed "fait accompli" effects, have been documented (Allport 1954; Pettigrew 1971). Along with such macro-level environmental effects, the impact of the more immediate social environment is now receiving research attention, facilitated by the development of statistical tools for analyzing multi-level data.

The earliest and most numerous multi-level studies focused on the racial composition of localities, specifically on the proportion of the residents who are African American. In line with Pettigrew's (1959) claim that prejudice among white Southerners related directly to local black population share, Giles and Evans (1985, 1986) documented positive relationships between whites' racial attitudes and county-level black population concentration. Fossett and Kiecolt (1989) provided congruent information, as did Quillian (1996) from his comparison of U.S. regions.

Using 1990 survey data in conjunction with census information on metropolitan areas and non-metro counties, Taylor (1998) confirmed that many dimensions of white racial attitudes are more negative in communities where blacks are numerous. Her analyses also indicated that

residential segregation does not provide a buffer against the impact of large black population proportions; that the impact of black numbers on white attitudes is greater outside the South than within it; and that only modest curvilinearity exists in the relationships between black population share and white racial attitudes.

Theoretical discussions underpinning the research on black numbers often counterpose two perspectives. One is the "contact hypothesis" (Allport 1954; Pettigrew 1998) that under certain conditions intergroup contact can dispel ingroup favoritism and outgroup hostility. From this perspective, substantial representation of a minority group in the community may create conditions for *improved* racial attitudes among whites. The opposite prediction is implied in Blumer's (1958) argument that vehement racial prejudice arises in defense of "group position" by those at the top of the social pecking order; in Blalock's (1967) portrayal of economic, political, and status threat driving intergroup relations; in Levine and Campbell's (1972) "realistic group conflict theory" portraying intergroup conflict as competition for scarce resources; and in Giles and Evans' (1986) "power theory" depicting ethnic groups in pursuit of their own interest. These latter theoretical positions focus on the competition and threat that substantial minority presence may represent, predicting more negative white racial attitudes as the local black population share swells. Accumulated evidence is congruent with threat/competition notions rather than the more optimistic contact hypothesis predictions, although persuasive demonstrations that economic or political threat mediate the impact of black numbers have yet to be produced (see Taylor 1998).

Several challenges to existing contextual analyses of white racial attitudes were offered by Oliver and Mendelberg (2000). One claim, developed in subsequent work by Oliver and his collaborators (see Oliver and Wong 2003), is that the definition of local context is pivotal.

Oliver and Wong are joined by Ha (2010) in suggesting that the direction of the relationship between minority population size and white attitudes may actually reverse when the definition of locality shifts from larger areas such as metropolitan regions to smaller census units that more nearly approximate neighborhoods.

More important to the current project is Oliver and Mendelberg's (2000) insistence that local race composition has received undue emphasis in studies of white racial attitudes. Despite the evidence summarized above, Oliver and Mendelberg claim that only under certain conditions does local black population share influence white residents' racial attitudes. The more important contextual predictor, they claim, is the socioeconomic status (SES) of local white residents. The prevalence of college degrees among white residents was Oliver and Mendelberg's indicator of local white socioeconomic status, and indeed the data showed several dimensions of white residents' racial attitudes to become more negative as local white SES dropped.

Oliver and Mendelberg (2000) interpreted the SES effect demonstrated in their research with what some scholars would call "scapegoating" theory. They say: "Low-status settings, defined by low rates of education and employment, expose residents to a daily dose of petty crime, concentrated physical decay, and social disorder… This exposure in turn leads to a constellation of negative psychological states… In settings characterized by general anxiety and fear, anti-black affect may arise because African Americans are a salient target in a racially divided society" (2000:576).

Taylor and Mateyka (2011) questioned Oliver and Mendelberg's (2000) conclusions, noting that the Oliver and Mendelberg depiction of the white SES findings as a function of *economic* hardship in the white community is incongruent with their use of *educational* level as the contextual SES measure. Taylor and Mateyka pit the two strands of contextual white SES

against each, asking whether the prevalence of college education in the white community or the economic status of whites was the more powerful predictor of white racial attitudes. The clear winner was the contextual education measure. White contextual economic status has modest effects when examined alone, and after controlling for education level in the white community the contextual effect of white economic status is not significant for any dimension of racial attitudes. However, after controlling for the economic status of the white community, there are noteworthy contextual education effects on many dimensions of racial attitudes: Whites report more progressive racial attitudes when they live in communities where college education is common.

At first blush, the predominance of contextual education effects may seem like old news, given the well-established role of individual-level education in shaping many racial attitudes (see, for example, Schuman et al. 1997). However, the influence of educational composition in the white community is quite distinct from the tendency for better educated whites to hold more progressive racial attitudes. Contextual education effects exist above and beyond any influence on whites' attitudes of their own educational achievement. The tendency for whites living in highly educated localities to hold more progressive racial attitudes is seen among well-educated and poorly-educated whites alike.

To explain this contextual education effect, Taylor and Mateyka (2011) relied on the interpretation offered in Moore and Ovadia's (2006) discussion of support for civil liberties. Focusing on high SES rather than the bottom of the SES ladder implicated in scapegoating notions, Moore and Ovadia (2006) suggested that where white college graduates are numerically dominant, "institutional and macrosocial means" not dependent on face-to-face interaction promote progressive attitudes. The "strong norms of cultural acceptance" manifest in highly

educated white localities influence "local governments, schools, cultural centers and businesses," for example encouraging the passage of anti-discrimination legislation. "And even though these public activities may be set up in response to the demands of the intellectual elite, their effects are likely to be felt throughout the community" (Moore and Ovadia 2006:2215).

The Present Study

The present project takes off from questions about how whites' racial attitudes are affected by the socioeconomic status of the local *white* community to ask how the socioeconomic status of the local *black* community may influence white residents' racial views. On the face of it, we might expect the SES of the local black population to have at least as much impact on whites' attitudes as does white contextual SES, yet we know little about the potential impact of contextual black SES.

As noted earlier, where the impact of *black population share* on white racial attitudes has been assessed, competing predictions about the direction of the relationship were offered by "contact theory" and competition/threat notions. When locality-level *white SES* was dissected into its economic and educational dimensions, psychological scapegoating processes were pitted against sociological portrayals of normative influence on the operation of community institutions.

Opposing predictions about the impact of *black SES* on white racial attitudes are provided not by two but by *four* streams of scholarship:

1)   Competition/threat notions (Blumer 1958, Blalock 1967, Levine and Campbell 1972, Giles and Evans 1986) imply that whites' racial attitudes may be more negative in localities

where black residents have the higher educational and/or economic status that would make them more threatening.

2)   The contact hypothesis (Allport 1954; Pettigrew 1998) does not state that all intergroup contact brings improved attitudes, but specifies that equal status of the groups involved is a facilitating if not necessary condition for contact that promotes improves intergroup attitudes. Given the realities of racial stratification in the United States, black and white communities will more nearly approximate equal status in localities where black SES is high. Thus, contact theory propositions imply that high SES in the local black community will be associated with more positive racial attitudes among local whites—the opposite of the competition/threat prediction.

3)   A line of scholarship pursued by Gay (2004), in line with Huckfeldt and Kohfeld's (1989) description of environmental influences on attitude formation, implies a qualified prediction congruent with that of contact theory. Lower quality neighborhoods were found to foster black residents' race-consciousness and perception that they are targets of discrimination (Gay 2004). Neighborhoods with more resources and fewer obstacles to mobility encourage more optimistic attitudes among black residents. White prejudice and the black cynicism that arises in struggling neighborhoods may form a vicious cycle: White prejudice may be accompanied by discrimination that limits black opportunity, resulting in troubled black neighborhoods where distrust of whites is the norm; but also, the distrust characterizing low quality black neighborhoods may have a polarizing effect, generating more negative racial views among whites. Insofar as poor neighborhood quality exists where family income is low, these notions imply that white residents' racial attitudes may be especially negative where local black family incomes are low, in part as a reaction to black attitudes prevalent in those settings.

(It is important to note that Gay (2004) found quite a different pattern for contextual black education effects: Where block groups contained large proportions of highly educated blacks engaged with black community groups, African Americans' perceptions of anti-black discrimination were heightened. By implication, if local black educational composition is implicated in the polarization of white and black attitudes, the direction of its effect would be opposite to that of black economic composition, white residents' racial attitudes becoming more negative where college education is prevalent among local blacks.)

4)   Importantly, research on stereotyping also suggests that white prejudice may be greatest where low SES predominates in the black community. Whites' overall racial views may be linked to stereotypes of blacks that reflect actual local social patterns. Although some descriptions of stereotyping decree stereotypes to be false by definition, there is evidence that generalizations about out-groups often carry a "grain of truth." In the absence of full information, people will make judgments based on statistics for the group, judgments that will not be accurate for every individual but that do reflect prevailing patterns (McCauley 1995). Research on stereotype accuracy has found that observers' comparisons of groups generally identify the direction of differences accurately, and are more likely to underestimate than exaggerate the magnitude of those differences (Kaplowitz, Fish, and Broman 2003). Insofar as whites' stereotypes of blacks are based on interaction, observation, or local media portrayals, they may well reflect dominant local realities. Stereotypes held by whites and the related racial views they spawn would then predictably be most negative in localities where low SES predominates in the black community.

In sum, threat/conflict perspectives imply that local whites will react negatively when higher SES blacks predominate in the locality. The opposite hypothesis—that whites' racial

views are most negative where the SES of local blacks is low—is derived from contact theory notions that equal status promotes positive outcomes after intergroup contact; from evidence that poor quality neighborhoods foster a sense of collective grievance among blacks that may be reciprocated with more negative white racial attitudes; and from evidence that racial stereotyping has enough basis in reality that whites' views will be skewed in the negative direction when circumstances in the local black community are dire.

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

Importantly, this research will conclude by asking to what extent any influences of local black educational and economic composition are independent of contextual white SES effects, and in what measure the correlated dimensions of black and white contextual SES work in concert.

METHODOLOGY

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

1998-2002 General Social Survey Samples.

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

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

In each survey year, NORC randomly selected respondents from 100 Primary Sampling Units (PSUs), 70 metropolitan areas and 30 non-metropolitan counties.[1] Details of the sampling plan are available in the General Social Surveys 1972-2002: Cumulative Codebook. The PSUs are the contextual units representing localities in our analyses.

For twelve of these PSUs, census information represented fewer than 100 black residents, and (because the information came from the decennial census long form) values on key measures were obtained from only one-sixth of that number. Under the circumstances, we judged that black locality-level data to be inadequate and excluded these twelve PSUs from our analyses. The 88 remaining contextual units contained 5577 non-Hispanic whites. The GSS practice of administering selected questions to random sub-samples of respondents, inclusion of some

---

[1] A single exception should be noted: One non-metro Primary Sampling Unit encompasses two counties.

measures in only one or two survey years, and item-specific refusals leave us with smaller samples for any given analysis. Ns range from 2558 to 4631.

<u>Dependent Variables</u>.

Responses to twenty-three questions were used individually or in scales to yield eight measures of race-related views and feelings. Included in this set are measures of "traditional prejudice," perspectives related to "new" forms of racism (Kinder and Sanders 1996), and race-policy opinions.

Three scales represent traditional prejudice: *Stereotyping* is the unweighted mean of three quantities, the differences in white respondents' ratings of whites and blacks on seven-point scales representing trait dimensions of intelligence, industriousness, and propensity to violence. *Emotion* is the mean of two quantities, differences in reported warmth or coldness felt toward whites and blacks, and differences in respondents' feelings of closeness toward whites and blacks. *Social Distance* is the mean of reported reactions to living in a half-black neighborhood and to having a close family member marry a black person.

Three measures assess perceptions associated with "new" forms of racism. *Attributions for Racial Inequality* is a four-item scale registering respondents' assignment of responsibility for racial inequality to "victim" factors -- blacks' inborn ability and lack of effort – as opposed to "system" factors -- inadequate schools, and discrimination. *Belief in Reverse Discrimination* records respondents' assessments of how often white job seekers lose out to less qualified blacks. *Racial Resentment* is a two item scale registering sentiment that blacks should work their own way up and should not push where they are not wanted.

The last two measures assess views on racial policy questions. *Opposition to Affirmative Action* records opinions about racial preferences in hiring and promotion. *Opposition to*

Government Help is a scale registering respondents' preferred level of government spending to assist blacks and their opinions about whether the government is obliged to help blacks.

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

<div align="center">TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE.</div>

Individual-level controls.

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

Locality-level controls.

Population Size, the natural log of the 2000 population count for the locality, was included in all analyses, as was *Metro Status*, coded 1 for metropolitan localities and 0 for non-metropolitan counties. Region was represented by a variable *South*, coded 1 for Southern localities, 0 otherwise. Also included was a contextual variable described earlier as a well-documented influence on many dimensions of white racial attitudes: *Race Composition*, a straightforward measure of proportion of the population that is African American.

Focal Locality-Level Predictors.

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

In order to interpret these two focal predictors appropriately, we also employ two measures of contextual SES for local whites: *White Educational Composition* is the proportion of white residents who have <u>not</u> attained a college degree; *White Economic Composition* is the proportion of local whites having family income lower than $50,000.

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

The two black contextual SES measures are substantially positive correlated with each other (r = .688), as are the two white contextual SES measures (r = .794). The black contextual SES measures are also highly correlated with the corresponding measures for whites (r = .769 for black and white educational composition; r = .729 for black and white economic composition). These relationships will figure in our subsequent discussion.

Descriptive statistics.

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

<u>TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE.</u>

Analyses.

The multi-stage samples from which our GSS data come, with survey respondents clustered in eighty-eight geographical areas, call for specialized data analysis. Co-residents of localities are presumably more similar to each other than to individuals randomly-picked from across the country on a whole range of unmeasured as well as measured characteristics. More technically, there is a lack of independence among errors within clusters. For our central measures of community characteristics, all residents from the same locality have identical values.

This project employs the multi-level modeling program HLM that adjusts for the structure of these data (Raudenbush and Bryk 2002).

Our strategy is to begin examination of each dependent measure with an analysis that includes the individual-level control variables, the four locality-level controls, and our first focal predictor, Black Educational Composition. In Model 2 we remove Black Educational Composition and introduce the other focal contextual predictor, Black Economic Composition. Model 3 incorporates both Black Educational Composition and Black Economic Composition. Finally, Model 4 adds the two parallel white contextual SES measures, White Educational Composition and White Economic Composition.

RESULTS

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

respondents, presumably reflecting "cohort effects," growing from the racial norms prevalent when the various cohorts came of age.

<div align="center">TABLES 3 AND 4 ABOUT HERE</div>

Coefficients for the contextual variables are presented in Table 4 for each of the eight racial attitude measures. Looking first at the locality-level control variables, in the four cases where region made a significant difference, the positive coefficients indicate that Southerners held more negative attitudes than non-Southerners, as earlier findings lead us to expect (see e.g. Tuch and Martin 1997). In the few instances where population size showed a significant effect, views of whites from larger localities were less negative. Metropolitan status of the locality never made a significant difference. As demonstrated in Taylor and Mateyka (2011), black population share had a significant effect for five of the eight racial attitude measures—all except the Emotion, Social Distance, and Opposition to Affirmative Action measures. The observed effects always work in the same direction: White residents of localities where African Americans make up a large share of the population hold more negative racial views.

With these observations as a backdrop, our attention can turn to the contextual black SES measures that are the focus of this paper. In the Model 1 coefficients, we see that Black Educational Composition has a significant effect on seven dimensions of racial attitudes, and a nearly significant effect on the eighth. Given the coding of this SES indicator – high values representing with low rates of college completion -- the positive coefficients for Model 1 indicate that white residents' racial views are more negative where smaller proportions of African Americans in the community are college educated.

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

Model 3 allows us to assess the independent effect of each black contextual SES indicator, controlling for the other. It will be recalled that Black Educational Composition and Black Economic Composition are correlated with each other at the level of $r = .663$, which means that each accounts for about 44% of the variance in the other. Yet each dimension of black contextual SES has an independent effect on some racial attitudes, the impact of <u>black economic composition</u> being the most consistent and pronounced. On the seven dimensions of racial attitudes where Model 2 estimates indicate a significant effect of Black Economic Composition, Model 3 coefficients reveal similarly significant estimates even when Black Educational composition is also in the model.

Black Educational Composition effects, in contrast, fall below the statistical significance threshold for five of the eight dimensions of racial attitudes when Black Economic Composition is included in the analysis. Only on Attributions for Racial Inequality, Racial Resentment, and Opposition to Government help are white residents' views more negative when smaller proportions of local blacks are college educated.

Looking across the spectrum of racial attitudes represented here, we see a pattern for the contextual black SES measures that is, in some respects, the reverse of the pattern seen for white contextual SES measures. Between the white contextual SES indicators, educational composition is clearly dominant. In the case of black contextual SES, economic composition has the more sweeping influence on white residents' racial views.

With this reference to the white contextual SES indicators, it is time to ask another question about independent effects: To what extent should the confounding of locality-level black SES with contextual white SES condition our interpretation of these results? The correlation of r = .769 between the black and white educational composition measures means that approximately 59% of the variance in each indicator is accounted for by the other. For the economic composition measures, the situation is similar: The correlation of r = .729 implies that about 53% of the variance in each indicator can be attributed to the other. Considering the black and white, educational and economic contextual SES indicators as a set, where should we speak of shared impact, and where do we find independent effects? Addressing this question is the job of Model 4.

In the Model 4 results, for no racial attitude dimension does Black Educational Composition have a significant effect independent of the other contextual SES indicators. Furthermore, of the six significant White Educational Composition effects reported in Taylor and Mateyka (2011) for these 1998-2002 GSS data, only those for Belief in Reverse Discrimination and Racial Resentment remain significant when the black contextual SES indictors are in the model. (The coefficient for Attributions for Racial Inequality approaches significance.)

In contrast to the pattern for Black Educational Composition, Black Economic Composition does have an effect on many dimensions of racial attitudes even when the influence

of Black Educational Composition and the contextual white SES measures are factored out. White residents' attitudes tend to be more negative in localities with high proportions of lower-income black families. This independent effect of Black Economic Composition is significant for the measures of Stereotyping, Emotion, Attributions for Racial Inequality, and Racial Resentment, and it is nearly significant for the measure of Opposition to Government Help.

CONCLUSIONS

We have assessed the influence of educational and economic composition in the local black community on eight dimensions of white residents' racial attitudes. Insofar as educational and economic composition effects were evidenced, they were all in the same direction: Lower SES in the local black community was associated with more negative racial views among white residents.

This pattern runs contrary to predictions derived from the competition/threat notion that a preponderance of higher-status blacks, representing a greater threat to white "group position" (Blumer 1958), will evoke more negative racial views among local whites.

As noted in our introductory discussion, multiple themes in the race literature converge to predict relationships in the direction we actually found. Black/white contact in the community may have more positive outcomes where the SES of black residents is relatively high, placing them on more equal footing with whites. Insofar as low black economic composition signals lower quality neighborhoods, as is probable, African Americans in low-economic-composition localities may manifest greater in-group racial identification and sense of grievance about societal discrimination, thereby provoking more negative attitudinal reactions from local whites. Finally, low-SES black communities may reinforce white residents' stereotypes and other

negative racial views derived from them. The present data do not allow us to distinguish among these dynamics. We must look to future research for guidance in assessing the potential importance of these three processes.

Looking just at the two dimensions of black contextual SES, in coefficients for Model 3 we do not see educational composition effects overshadowing economic composition, as was true when these two dimensions of white contextual SES were compared by Taylor and Mateyka (2011). If anything, the opposite is true for black contextual SES. The focal Model 3 coefficients were both non-significant as regards Belief in Reverse Discrimination, and they were both significant when looking at Attributions for Racial Inequality, Racial Resentment, and Opposition to Government Help. For the other four dimensions of whites' racial attitudes, black economic composition showed a significant effect; black educational composition did not.

Our inclusion of multiple measures, representing three domains of racial perspective, leaves us confident that we are not over-generalizing from patterns that exist only for certain racial attitudes. The results are not different in any clear and systematic way for traditional prejudice, perceptions associated with "new" forms of racism, and racial policy views.

The findings for black educational composition call for further discussion. The ubiquitous significant effects of black educational composition seen for Model 1 were most often not independent of black economic composition: Model 3 educational composition coefficients are significant for only three racial attitude measures. And when the white contextual SES measures are introduced in Model 4, even those three black educational composition effects become non-significant. Insofar as black educational composition plays a role in influencing white racial attitudes, it is as part of a package that includes black economic composition and

contextual white SES, for which white educational composition was shown in Taylor and Mateyka (2011) to play the dominant role.

Also, the Model 4 results here show that most of the <u>white</u> educational composition effects reported in Taylor and Mateyka (2011) are reduced to non-significance when contextual black SES dimensions are in the analysis.[2] We have learned that to a substantial extent, black and white educational composition work in concert.

This conclusion calls not only for thoughtful interpretation of the patterns presented here, but also for some recasting of discussion presented in the earlier paper. White residents' racial views may be more positive in response to the coinciding prevalence of college-educated whites and blacks for many reasons. The processes underpinning this relationship may include the operation of local institutions influenced by progressive norms that college graduate promote, in line with Moore and Ovadia's (2006) ideas discussed in Taylor and Mateyka (2011). They also may include the dynamics outlined in the introduction of this paper – positive contact effects, reciprocal relationships between black and white inter-group attitudes, and stereotyping that takes off from "kernels of truth" evident in local communities.

What about the impact of black economic composition? When the substantially inter-correlated white contextual SES measures were brought into the analyses in Model 4, and many partial effects fell below the significance threshold, the independent effects of black economic composition stood out. Net of the white contextual SES dimensions as well as black educational composition, black economic composition was shown to have a significant influence on

---

[2] The samples for this study and the earlier one differ slightly, owing to the necessity of our excluding twelve localities with black populations too small to yield reliable black SES data. However, the overlap is substantial enough for our discussion to combine the information about prevalent white educational composition effects from Taylor and Mateyka (2011) with evidence in Model 4 coefficients presented here that the influence of white educational composition on white residents' attitudes is intertwined with the influence of black contextual SES.

Stereotyping, Emotion, Attributions for Racial Inequality, and Racial Resentment, as well as a nearly significant influence on Opposition to Government Help.

Most analysts believe that where black communities experience particularly severe economic disadvantage, discrimination associated with white residents' negative racial views play a role. The results presented here suggest that vicious cycles may exist, with economic hardship among local African American families driving white racial attitudes to become more negative. This possibility provides additional reason for public policy initiatives aimed at improving economic outcomes in black communities. In the first instance, the lives of black residents would be improved. But also, that improvement could be echoed in more positive attitudes of white residents, diminishing the forces that may perpetuate or recreate black disadvantage.

REFERENCES

Allport, Gordon W. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice.* Garden City, NJ: Doubleday Anchor
　　Books.

Blalock, Hubert M. 1967. *Toward a Theory of Minority-Group Relations*. New York: Wiley.

Blumer, Herbert. 1958. "Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position." *Pacific Sociological
　　Review* 23:3-7.

Burstein, Paul. 2003. "The Impact of Public Opinion on Public Policy: A Review and an
　　Agenda." *Political Research Quarterly* 56:29-40.

Fossett, Mark A. and K. Jill Kiecolt. 1989. "The Relative Size of Minority Populations and
　　White Racial Attitudes. *Social Science Quarterly* 70:820-835.

Giles, Micheal and Arthur S. Evans. 1985. "External Threat, Perceived Threat, and Group
　　Identity." *Social Science Quarterly* 66:50-66.

Giles, Micheal and Kaenan Hertz. 1994. "Racial Threat and Partisan Identification." *American
　　Political Science Review* 88:317-326.

Ha, Shang E. 2010. "The Consequences of Multiracial Contexts on Public Attitudes Toward
　　Immigration." *Political Research Quarterly* 63:29-42.

Hughes, Michael and Steven A. Tuch. 2003. "Gender Differences in Whites' Racial Attitudes:
　　Are Women's Attitudes Really More Favorable?" *Social Psychology Quarterly* 66:384-
　　401.

LeVine, Robert A. and Donald T. Campbell. 1972. *Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic
　　Attitudes, and Group Behavior.* New York: Wiley.

Moore, Laura M. and Seth Ovadia. 2006. "Accounting for Spatial Variation in Tolerance: The
　　Effects of Education and Religion." *Social Forces* 84:2205-2219.

Oliver, J. Eric and Tali Mendelberg. 2000. "Reconsidering the Environmental Determinants of White Racial Attitudes." *American Journal of Political Science* 44:574-589.

Oliver, J. Eric and Janelle Wong. 2003. "Intergroup Prejudice in Multiethnic Settings." *American Journal of Political Science* 47:567-582.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. 1958. "Personality and sociocultural factors in intergroup attitudes: A cross-national comparison." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 2:29-42.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. 1971. *Racially Separate or Together?* McGraw-Hill.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. 1998. "Intergroup contact theory." *Annual Review of Psychology* 49:65-85.

Quillian, Lincoln. 1996. "Group Threat and Regional Change in Attitudes Toward African Americans." *American Journal of Sociology* 102:816-860.

Schuman, Howard, Charlotte Steeh, Lawrence Bobo, and Maria Krysan. 1997. *Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Taylor, Marylee C. 1998. "How White Attitudes Vary with the Racial Composition of Local Populations: Numbers Count." *American Sociological Review* 63:512-535.

Table 1. Dependent Variables -- Measures of Racial Attitudes.

Traditional Prejudice

Stereotyping (alpha = .740)
>   Where would you rate whites in general/Blacks [on this 7-point scale that runs from Hard-Working to Lazy]?
>
>   Where would you rate whites in general/Blacks [on this 7-point scale that runs from Intelligent to Unintelligent]?
>
>   Where would you rate whites in general/Blacks [on this 7-point scale that runs from Violence-Prone to Not Violence-Prone]?

*Emotion (*alpha = .681)
>   In general, how warm or cool do you feel towards African Americans/white or Caucasian Americans? [9-point scale]
>
>   In general, how close do you feel to Blacks/Whites? [9-point scale]

Social Distance (alpha = .695)
>   Now I'm going to ask you about different types of contact with various groups of people. In each situation would you please tell me whether you would be very much in favor of it happening, somewhat in favor, neither in favor nor opposed to it happening, somewhat opposed, or very much opposed to it happening? …
>
>   Living in a neighborhood where half of your neighbors were blacks?
>
>   What about having a close relative or family member marry a black person? (Would you be very in favor it it happening, somewhat in favor, neither in favor nor opposed to it happening, somewhat opposed, or very opposed to it happening?)

Table 1.   Dependent Variables -- Measures of Racial Attitudes (continued).

_____

Perceptions Associated with "New" Forms of Racism.

Attributions for Racial Inequality (alpha = .512)

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

Mainly due to discrimination? (coding reversed)

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

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

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

Belief in Reverse Discrimination

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

Racial Resentment (alpha = .522)

Here are some opinions other people have expressed in connection with black-white relations. Which statement on the card comes closest to how you, yourself, feel? [Card contains responses Agree strongly, Agree slightly, Disagree slightly, Disagree strongly] The first one is…
Blacks/African-Americans shouldn't push themselves where they're not wanted.

Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with the following statement [statement appears on card]:
Irish, Italians, Jewish and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without special favors.

Table 1.   Dependent Variables -- Measures of Racial Attitudes (continued).

_____

Racial Policy Opinions

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

Opposition to Government Help (alpha = .562)

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

> We are faced with many problems in this country, none of which can be solved easily or inexpensively. I'm going to name some of these problems, and for each one I'd like you to tell me whether you think we're spending too much money on it, too little money, or about the right amount…
> [Data were combined for the two split-ballot versions of this question.]
> > Version A: Improving the conditions of Blacks
> > Version B: Assistance to Blacks

Table 2.   Descriptive Statistics

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 3. **HLM Estimates – Fixed Effects of Individual-Level Controls on Racial Attitudes (continued).[a]**

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

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

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

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

Table 4.   HLM Estimates – Contextual Effects on Racial Attitudes. [a]

Stereotyping
(N=2841)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
Population Size	-.033	(-.044)	-.021	(-.028)	-.021	(-.028)	-.048	(-.064)
Metro Status	.085	(.029)	.080	(.027)	.085	(.029)	.099	(.034)
South	.025	(.010)	-.018	(-.007)	-.016	(-.006)	-.011	(-.005)
Proportion Black	1.111***	(.110)	1.078***	(.107)	1.066***	(.106)	.937**	(.093)
Black Ed. Composition	**1.083***	**(.063)**			**.233**	**(.013)**	**.143**	**(.008)**
Black Econ. Composition			**1.279***	**(.095)**	**1.160****	**(.086)**	**1.695****	**(.126)**
White Ed. Composition							**.160**	**(.012)**
White Econ Composition							**-.917**	**(-.076)**

Emotion
(N=3698)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
Population Size	-.008	(-.013)	.001	(.001)	.001	(.001)	.001	(.002)
Metro Status	.049	(.020)	.047	(.019)	.047	(.019)	.049	(.020)
South	-.019	(-.009)	-.043	(-.022)	-.043	(-.021)	-.038	(-.019)
Proportion Black	.185	(.022)	.159	(.019)	.159	(.019)	.140	(.017)
Black Ed. Composition	**.548+**	**(.038)**			**.014**	**(.001)**	**-.379**	**(-.027)**
Black Econ. Composition			**.742****	**(.067)**	**.735***	**(.066)**	**.863***	**(.078)**
White Ed. Composition							**.476**	**(.043)**
White Econ Composition							**-.284**	**(-.028)**

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

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

Table 4. **HLM Estimates – Contextual Effects on Racial Attitudes (continued).** [a]

Social Distance
(N=2933)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
Population Size	-.044**	(-.086)	-.037*	(-.072)	-.037*	(-.071)	-.019	(-.037)
Metro Status	.065	(.032)	.056	(.028)	.064	(.032)	.058	(.029)
South	.188***	(.113)	.157**	(.095)	.161**	(.097)	.166***	(.100)
Proportion Black	.183	(.026)	.181	(.026)	.156	(.023)	.217	(.031)
Black Ed. Composition	**1.015****	**(.086)**			.452	(.038)	**.091**	**(.008)**
Black Econ. Composition			**.995*****	**(.108)**	.764*	(.083)	**.533**	**(.058)**
White Ed. Composition							**.425**	**(.046)**
White Econ Composition							**.283**	**(.034)**

Attributions for Racial Inequality
(N=2669)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
Population Size	-.015	(-.029)	-.009	(-.016)	-.009	(-.017)	-.015	(-.030)
Metro Status	.020	(.010)	.000	(.000)	.019	(.009)	.029	(.014)
South	.119**	(.071)	.086*	(.051)	.098*	(.058)	.107**	(.064)
Proportion Black	.670***	(.096)	.701***	(.100)	.647**	(.092)	.589**	(.084)
Black Ed. Composition	**1.470*****	**(.122)**			1.008**	(.084)	**.469**	**(.039)**
Black Econ. Composition			**1.154*****	**(.124)**	.633*	(.068)	**.921***	**(.099)**
White Ed. Composition							**.686+**	**(.074)**
White Econ Composition							**-.608**	**(-.072)**

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

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

Table 4.   **HLM Estimates – Contextual Effects on Racial Attitudes (continued).** [a]

Belief in Reverse Discrimination
(N=2662)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
Population Size	-.019	(-.045)	-.017	(-.041)	-.017	(-.041)	-.015	(-.037)
Metro Status	-.018	(-.011)	-.026	(-.016)	-.018	(-.011)	-.009	(-.005)
South	-.016	(-.012)	-.024	(-.018)	-.020	(-.015)	-.008	(-.006)
Proportion Black	.492**	(.088)	.508**	(.091)	.488**	(.087)	.462**	(.083)
Black Ed. Composition	**.496***	**(.052)**			**.407**	**(.042)**	**-.477**	**(-.050)**
Black Econ. Composition			**.326**	**(.044)**	**.121**	**(.016)**	**.347**	**(.047)**
White Ed. Composition							**1.089****	**(.146)**
White Econ Composition							**-.576**	**(-.086)**

Racial Resentment
(N=3985)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
Population Size	-.027+	(-.056)	-.019	(-.039)	-.018	(-.037)	-.001	(-.002)
Metro Status	.087	(.046)	.059	(.031)	.085	(.045)	.086	(.045)
South	.111*	(.071)	.072	(.046)	.084+	(.054)	.102*	(.065)
Proportion Black	.501*	(.077)	.549*	(.084)	.475*	(.073)	.491*	(.076)
Black Ed. Composition	**1.971****	**(.227)**			**1.394****	**(.161)**	**.238**	**(.021)**
Black Econ. Composition			**1.496****	**(.173)**	**.799***	**(.092)**	**.846***	**(.098)**
White Ed. Composition							**1.435****	**(.166)**
White Econ Composition							**-.362**	**(-.046)**

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

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

Table 4.   HLM Estimates – Contextual Effects on Racial Attitudes (continued). [a]

Opposition to Affirmative Action
(N=2558)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
Population Size	-.022	(-.045)	-.016	(-.031)	-.016	(-.032)	-.012	(-.008)
Metro Status	.067	(.034)	.056	(.029)	.066	(.034)	.064	(.022)
South	.049	(.030)	.022	(.014)	.026	(.016)	.026	(.018)
Proportion Black	-.012	(-.002)	-.016	(-.002)	-.039	(-.006)	-.022	(-.025)
Black Ed. Composition	.918**	(.080)			.438	(.038)	.429	(.217)
Black Econ. Composition			.876**	(.099)	.650*	(.073)	.583	(.103)
White Ed. Composition							.008	(.010)
White Econ Composition							.106	(.106)

Opposition to Government Help
(N=4631)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
Population Size	-.031*	(-.053)	-.024+	(-.042)	-.025+	(-.043)	-.025	(-.043)
Metro Status	-.016	(-.007)	-.033	(-.015)	-.016	(-.007)	-.016	(-.007)
South	.102*	(.055)	.077+	(.041)	.083*	(.045)	.084+	(.045)
Proportion Black	.564**	(.073)	.582**	(.075)	.544**	(.070)	.541**	(.070)
Black Ed. Composition	1.124***	(.085)			.724*	(.054)	.688	(.052)
Black Econ. Composition			.923***	(.089)	.554*	(.054)	.570+	(.055)
White Ed. Composition							.045	(.004)
White Econ Composition							-.034	(.004)

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

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