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INTRODUCTION

Racial stereotypes have been proven to be strong predictors of Whites’ prejudice and racism toward Blacks for decades (Allport 1954, Dixon and Rosenbaum 2004, Farley et al. 1994, Gilliam, Valentino, and Beckmann 2002, Jackman and Crane 1986, Johnson, Farrell, and Guinn 1997, Kinder and Mendelberg 1995, Kleinpenning and Hagendoorn 1991, Sniderman and Piazza 1993, Tropp and Pettigrew 2005, Virtanen and Huddy 1998, Yancey 1999.) Recent studies that include Whites’ propensity to stereotype multiple subordinate groups show that Whites’ perceive various out-groups differently. Whites do not appear to stereotype Asians much differently than Whites, or rather in-group members, while Whites generally have the harshest and most persistent propensity to stereotype Blacks (Dixon and Rosenbaum 2004, Krysan 2002, Wilson 1996.) These same findings suggest that Whites’ propensity to stereotype Hispanics appears to fluctuate, sometimes perceived as similar to Blacks, sometimes similar to Asians. Theories based on Blumer’s group position and group threat theory (1958) suggest that the dominant group perceives that a subordinate group is either (or both) competition for scarce resources or a threat to the dominant group’s culture. As such, the dominant group will respond by restricting the subordinate group’s access to scarce resources or restrict the subordinate group’s influence on the dominant culture by creating ideologies, like racism, that may also be used to justify that unequal access to scarce resources.

There was a time when Americans believed that Europeans were of different races. Today, Americans perceive all European to be White (Warren and Twine 1997.) This resulted in Whites as a group expanding to include Europeans and today there
appears to be evidence that the dominant group is expanding again. Yancey (2003) predicts that Asians and Hispanics will assimilate into the dominant group. Bonilla-Silva (2004) makes predictions on the subgroups rather than the pan-ethnic groups. He believes that some Asian and Hispanic subgroups will assimilate into the dominant White group while some will create a middle minority, or buffer group, and yet a third will integrate into a *Collective Black* group. Portes and Zhou (1993) find that aside from some groups melting into both the dominant and some subordinate groups, a third set of groups will remain parallel, though not necessarily equal, to the dominant group. They will have better access to scarce resources while maintaining a separate culture (Portes and Zhou 1993.) According to Yancey, assimilation with the dominant group also means taking on the dominant group’s values and beliefs, including racism and prejudice. Comparing beliefs and values among Whites, Asians, Hispanics and Blacks there is evidence suggesting that Asians’ beliefs and values are closest to that of Whites; that Blacks share the least in common with Whites; and that Hispanics tend to be somewhere in-between. This tendency may also be true concerning the propensity of Whites to engage in racial stereotyping.

Previous research comparing the propensity to stereotype uses the group position and group threat perspective to compare subordinate group perceptions to that of the dominant group's (Bobo and Zubrinski 1996, Johnson, Farrell, and Guinn 1997.) Subordinate groups tend to have similar perceptions on which racial group is more likely to portray a particular racial characteristic. Using data from the Lilly Survey of American Friendships this will be the first time where research uses the propensity to stereotype
to test for possible evidence of racial assimilation, specifically the assimilation of Asians and Hispanics with Whites.

Purpose

A review of the research on racial stereotypes suggests that there appears to be a general order where Whites, and often Asians, are perceived more positively than Blacks, while Hispanics are perceived somewhere in-between Blacks and Whites. There also appears a pattern where Hispanic Americans have a tendency to give responses about in-group and out-group members that, for lack of a better word, appear exaggerated when compared to responses from other racial groups. Using a multiracial bivariate table similar to the one used by Bobo and Zubrinski (1996,) a racial group’s propensity to stereotype both in-group members and out-group members can be compared. With this method, Yancey’s (2003) premise that minority groups who are assimilating with Whites and are also taking on Whites’ values and beliefs, including Whites’ prejudice can be tested.
LITERATURE REVIEW

General Racial Stereotype Knowledge

All stereotypes are cognitive pictures and concepts that individuals use to subconsciously link physical features (like skin color, hair color, facial features) to physical actions. Individuals tend to string these stereotypic images together to form a vague representation of an out-group (Ford and Stangor, 1992.) In this manner racial stereotypes tend to take the place of direct experience and knowledge (Bobo and Hutchings, 1996.) Ford and Tonander (1998) described some basic functions of stereotypes. Individuals tend to simplify or reduce the amount of information needed to understand the world around him or her into categories in order to fill in the lack of information not gained from direct interaction or by researching for information about an out-group. By doing so they are forming stereotypes about that out-group.

Categorization into different groups occurs in a meaningful way. A group of individuals will tend to develop a variety of beliefs and stereotypes about another group. In doing so, most in-group members will use the same or similar racial stereotypes about that out-group. Additionally, Ford and Tonander found that stereotypes can develop to a stronger degree when in-group members perceive out-group members to be homogenous throughout the group or when in-group members perceive the out-group to be vastly different from in-group members. Likewise, when in-group members perceive an out-group to have a wide variety of features, or that the out-group’s members appear similar to in-group members, then in-group members tend to develop fewer stereotypes that are less widely believed in (Ford and Tonander, 1998.)

Gordon Allport (1954) defined a racial stereotype as “an exaggerated belief
associated with a category. Its function is to justify (rationalize) our conduct in relation to that category.” Individuals tend to use racial stereotypes without questioning their validity. By not verifying the validity of racial stereotype an individual is willing to accept it as true even though it may have no truth to it at all. An individual tends to use one or more racial stereotypes as a rationalization to explain information about an out-group. Accordingly, if one rationalization/stereotype does not fit, then the individual tends to refer to another rather than question the validity of the stereotype(s). To illustrate this last statement Allport referred to a study of Whites in a California county. The study first interviewed local White Americans on stereotypes about Armenian Americans. The study found that the stereotypes tended to portray Armenians as dishonest, lying, and deceitful compared to in-group members. Contrasting this result with the county’s criminal records and registered complaints failed to support these assumptions. Clearly there was no direct relationship between facts and the creation of those racial stereotypes. Additionally, Allport found that minor differences between groups can lead to exaggerations of the truth and thus to new stereotypes. To show how this works, Allport referred to studies on comparative education levels. Such studies found that Jews tended to score only slightly higher than Whites on college entrance exams and on IQ exams while Blacks tended to score only slightly lower than Whites. Despite this minor difference, many Whites believed stereotypes describing Jews as very intelligent and Blacks as very stupid.

According to Allport racial stereotypes are rationalizations of prejudice and therefore not equivalent to prejudice. Prejudice is an intense hatred, or dislike of, or aversion to, a particular out-group and its members. The prejudiced individual resorts to
false beliefs and racial stereotypes to rationalize his/her own feelings and actions toward the hated out-group. Prejudice can become deeply rooted within the individual. Racial stereotypes can change over time both in topic and in which group they are directed toward, however individuals still tend to perceive most racial stereotypes as fact. Using these negative beliefs and stereotypes to rationalize people’s place in the world tends to keep out-group members out of the in-group. If the in-group is the dominant group then the result is that out-group members tend to remain in subordinate positions.

Sources and Development of Racial Stereotypes

Racial stereotypes tend to develop within the social arenas (or social environments or social settings) where individuals interact with other individuals – at work, at school, in the media, in the neighborhood, in the home, etc. For example, Gilliam, Valentino, and Beckmann (2002) found that one influence of the mass media was to increase Whites’ propensity to stereotype Blacks among Whites who lived in all White, or mostly White, neighborhoods. Members of all White neighborhoods also tended to feel more distant from Blacks and to push for stronger policies against crime because crime was associated with Blacks in the media. In contrast, Whites from mixed neighborhoods were either indifferent to the media messages or tended to reject the images presented. This latter group tended to have a lower propensity to stereotype, tended to feel closer to Blacks, and tended to believe that anti-crime policies were too harsh. In a similar finding, Kinder and Mendelberg (1995) found that racial stereotypes were more prevalent in neighborhoods with larger percentages of Whites. The same
applied to increased prejudice toward Blacks. It was the lack of direct contact with Blacks and reliance on racial stereotypes through second hand information that increased prejudiced attitudes among Whites. Bobo and Hutchings (1996) provided further validation for this concept when they found that in-group members strongly influenced each other. It is from in-group members that an individual tends learns how to feel and what to think about members of an out-group.

Sniderman and Piazza (1993) sought to explain Whites’ general rejection of race related policies such as Affirmative Action and the Fair Housing Act. Part of that explanation was in describing how a social group (Whites) tend to develop and maintain racial stereotypes. They suggested three main sources. First, an individual views the mass media often portraying Blacks and violence together and begins to perceive that Blacks are generally violent. Second, when a White individual has a bad experience with one or more Black individuals then that experience could reinforce negative stereotypes about Blacks that he or she all ready uses to rationalize differences between Blacks and Whites. Third, objective social indicators like published statistics on crime can also reinforce stereotypic images of crime and violence among Blacks. According to Sniderman and Piazza, these sources do not necessarily breed negative feelings about Blacks even though individuals tend see one or more of these factors as verification of the racial stereotypes they all ready believe. Individuals might make judgments and decisions based on this imperfect understanding, and inaccurate information. Having a general dislike of Blacks also strengthens an individual’s propensity to stereotype Blacks. And finally, individuals with no prior dislike of Blacks
socializing with in-group members who have a dislike of Blacks can develop the propensity to stereotype Blacks.

Researchers find that individuals use racial stereotypes to link easily identifiable features or aspects among a selected out-group with negative behaviors (Hewstone and Brown 1986.) The individual then applies these stereotypes uniformly to any and all members of that out-group. Inevitably the individual will meet or learn about an out-group member who does not appear to fit one or more these racial stereotypes. The individual then tends to use whatever other rationalizations he/she knows of to justify the contradicting information as an exception or irregularity. He/she tends to so regardless of whether any of the rationalizations are erroneous or whether they contradict other stereotypes about that out-group. Thus the individual continues to ascribe to the out-group this stereotype, and all other racial stereotypes in his or her repertoire, despite the contradicting experience. To put it simply, rather than re-evaluate the accuracy of the stereotype the individual tends to seeks alternative explanations. Allport referred to an interviewee’s response when presented contradicting information about Jews to show how this worked. The interviewee’s first response to a question about Jews was that Jews tended to keep to themselves rather than getting to know people. The interviewer pointed out that Jews held prominent positions in the local community. The interviewee’s reply was that Jews were always butting in where they did not belong. According to this respondent Jews were doing things wrong regardless. Thus the prejudiced individual tends to perceive that a racial/ethnic stereotype is still valid despite contradicting information, however accurate. He or she might even offer resistance to attempts to disprove the stereotype (Bobo and Zubrinski 1996.) A
prejudiced individual has a variety of racial stereotypes at his disposal. If one does not
fit, then there is another that will.

Racial/Ethnic Stereotypes in the Social Environment

Jackman and Crane (1986) used racial stereotypes to measure racial attitudes. They wanted to test the contact hypothesis prediction that social contact with Blacks reduces Whites' prejudice toward Blacks and therefore reduces their propensity to stereotype Blacks. One perspective of the contact hypothesis is that we cannot maintain inaccurate beliefs and stereotypes about an out-group and maintain intimate contact with several members of that out-group. Jackman and Crane found that close intimacy with Blacks was important for White individuals to develop favorable attitudes toward Blacks and in turn to reduce or remove prejudice toward Blacks, including the propensity to stereotype. For this to work, Whites also need intimate contact with multiple Blacks else they may view their one friend as unique and continue to believe inaccurate information about Blacks in general.

Tropp and Pettigrew (2005) used meta-analysis on over 500 studies on Whites' prejudice toward Blacks to compare affective dimensions (stereotypes, beliefs, and judgments) and cognitive dimensions (feelings and emotions) of prejudice. The meta-analysis showed that having Black friends tended to reduce affective prejudice factors more than cognitive prejudice factors. That is, feelings and emotions about Blacks relate more to changes in prejudiced attitudes toward Blacks than racial stereotypes and beliefs do. The authors then conducted a new study to test this result. To measure the affective dimension they used 1) positive and negative emotions toward Blacks and 2)
favorability toward Blacks. To measure the cognitive dimension they used 1) anticipation of liking Blacks when encountered in different situations; 2) beliefs and judgments about Blacks; 3) racial stereotypes; and finally 5) a measure of internal and external motivations to control personal prejudice. Tropp and Pettigrew broke down categories of respondents to those who had one close Black friend, several Black friends, or several Black acquaintances. They found that racial stereotypes only significantly (and negatively) correlated with having several Black friends. The measurements of negative beliefs about Blacks did not correlate with any of the three categories when controlling for the above factors. The conclusion was that contact with Blacks is more likely to change feelings and emotions toward Blacks before (as compared to “instead of”) reducing or removing racial stereotypes or negative beliefs about Blacks.

Yancey (1999) examined interracial contact within interracial churches. An interracial church provides the key conditions that the contact hypothesis is based on equal status between groups; cooperation between groups (versus competition); formation of intimate relationships across group boundaries; and sanctioned contact by authority figures (clergy and church leaders.) According to Yancey this is in contrast to racially integrated neighborhoods because these environments often do not provide all of these ingredients, and sometimes none of them. The results add support to the supposition that attending an interracial church reduces racial attitudes attributed to modern racism and to overt racism, including the propensity to stereotype. In contrast, integrated neighborhoods did not have any comparable affect toward reducing racial attitudes. While this finding was favorable toward reducing prejudice, Yancey cautioned
that it may also be that the people who attend interracial churches are all ready inclined toward racial integration and have little prejudice, if any, compared to people attending all White churches. Overall, there was a general tendency for Whites attending multiracial churches to have more positive images of Blacks.

Finally, Levine, Carmines, and Sniderman (1999) wanted to know why prior research continued to find that there was no direct relationship between positive and negative racial stereotypes. Using a technique borrowed from a psychology study, the authors found that negative and positive stereotypes were indirectly, negatively related if not exact opposites. Where negative stereotypes strongly correlated with other negative stereotypes and where positive stereotypes strongly correlated with other positive stereotypes (both in a positive direction) negative and positive stereotypes correlated in a weak but negative direction when controlling for other factors. Thus, prejudiced individuals are not only more likely to have a higher propensity to stereotype Blacks but they are also less likely to link positive images and stereotypes with Blacks.

Racial/Ethnic Stereotypes and Prejudice

As seen above, racial stereotypes tend to be inaccurate or incomplete pieces of information taking the place of personal experience. They link physical features (like skin color) with actions and beliefs. Attempting to rationalize their feelings and beliefs, prejudiced individuals are likely to use more racial stereotypes, especially negative stereotypes. Yet it is in the environment that individuals live and socialize that racial stereotypes development and change over time. Finally, a motivation for the propensity
to stereotype might be an attempt to maintain superiority over an out-group. The following studies expand on these ideas.

On an individual level, Gaertner and McLaughlin (1983) used word associations to study racial stereotypes among White college students. This study visually recorded and examined how quickly students responded to questions after viewing a picture and a description of that picture. Participants viewed pictures and descriptions of those pictures developed using racially stereotypical images, names, and titles. Examples included White/Doctor; Black/Doctor; Whites/Lazy; Blacks/Lazy. Longer responses to viewing an image meant a lack of acceptance of image. The hypothesis was that participants would take longer to respond to positive images about Blacks and to negative images about Whites. The results suggested that White college students associated negative stereotypes to both Whites and Blacks equally. Participants hesitated only when connecting positive images to Blacks. Gaertner and McLaughlin found this was true even when controlling for prejudice. Prejudice and negative stereotypes seemed to have little direct effect on the response time of the college students. While this study came up much earlier than Levine, Carmines, and Sniderman’s it is congruent with their review of the literature on positive and negative racial stereotypes.

Sniderman and Piazza (1993) found that different racial stereotypes about Blacks related to opinions of some types of race-related public policies. How strongly Whites agreed with statements representing racial stereotypes about individual Blacks, like being lazy or needing to work harder, tended to related to Whites’ rejection of policies designed for social welfare and for assisting the poor. Racial stereotypes about Black
neighborhoods, like higher rates of violence or crime, tended to correlate with policies designed for more equality in the housing market. These variations in which racial stereotypes relate to which governmental policies are congruent with the perspective that prejudiced individuals tend to rationalize their beliefs.

Sniderman and Piazza further compared racial stereotyping and voting habits. Prior research found that current events in society has some influence on voting tendencies. With that in mind, they wanted to see if introducing new and contradicting information might cause individuals to rethink their position on a political topic. If so then when comparing pro and con positions on a political topic perhaps prejudiced individuals are less likely to change their negative positions than to change their positive positions. They hypothesized that many Whites today tend to keep their prejudiced feelings to themselves such that they will claim to be for policies about racial equality. If so then perhaps a prejudiced individual would be more likely to change their stated approval of a racial policy rather than their disapproval after hearing a counter-argument. The results, however, varied by policy agenda and were thus inconclusive. Rather, the results reinforced the perspective that Whites do not put much thought into politics, racial or otherwise while providing no ability to predict prejudice.

Davis and Silver (2002) followed up on Sniderman and Piazza’s hypothesis by examining only racial stereotypes. Like Sniderman and Piazza, they also believed that Whites learned to hide prejudiced feelings by keeping to themselves about what was not socially acceptable to say about Blacks. When asked about beliefs and attitudes toward Blacks, Whites tended to give responses that made them appear to be more positive in their beliefs about Blacks than they really were. Davis and Silver
hypothesized that prejudiced Whites would be more openly prejudiced when offered arguments supporting their prejudiced feelings and beliefs. Interviewers offered White participants counter-arguments when an interviewee’s response was positive as well as when it was negative. One result was that Whites were more likely to initially support a negative racial stereotype when interviewed by a White interviewer than a Black interviewer. That initial influence from interviewer race however had no significant influence on whether a respondent changed his/her support of negative or positive stereotypes. Some Whites changed their negative responses to positive ones but a significantly higher number of Whites changed their responses from positive to negative. This reinforces the perspective that Whites’ attitudes about Blacks influence their responses.

Blacks’ Perceptions of Whites

Most previous research on prejudice and racial stereotypes examined Whites’ prejudice toward Blacks. In contrast, Sigelman and Tuch (1997) examined Blacks' stereotypes about Whites. They described racial stereotypes as pictures in the head. These images are often negative, exaggerated beliefs that the mind links with perceived attributes or characteristics of members of various races. In addition, negative stereotypes have an ethnocentric bias. This bias allows in-group members to appear to have more positive characteristics compared to out-group members. Sigelman and Tuch referred to a previous study comparing Blacks’ perceptions of Whites in general with Blacks’ perceptions of Ku Klux Klan members. In that study, nine out of ten Blacks reported believing that the attitudes of most Whites toward Blacks were similar to those
of the Ku Klux Klan. Using this same approach, Sigelman and Tuch asked Black Americans to estimate Whites’ propensity to stereotype Blacks. The results were very similar to the earlier experiment. Blacks perceived Whites as harboring negative stereotypes of Blacks at a significantly higher rate than studies of Whites’ expressed attitudes usually showed.

Finally, Farley et al. believed that studying only Whites’ reluctance to live with Blacks told only one side of the story. They asked Blacks in Detroit why they would not move into an all-White neighborhood. Blacks’ responses did not include racial stereotypes about Whites. Rather Blacks said they preferred to live among other Blacks; they felt safer among other Blacks; they shared common values with other Blacks. Blacks also rationalized that Whites were prejudiced toward Blacks and that Whites did not want to live around Blacks.

White Prejudice toward Non-Black Out-Groups

In today’s multiracial society, it is vital to also study the propensity of Whites to stereotype non-black out-groups. Sniderman and Piazza included in The Scar of Race a comparison of Whites’ propensity to stereotype Blacks and Jews. The authors said that “consistency is the mark of prejudice.” Results found that Whites who tended to attribute derogatory stereotypes to Blacks also tended to attribute negative stereotypes to Jews. It is important to note that the specific stereotypes were different for each group. Sniderman and Piazza’s finding confirmed an earlier study by Ehrlich (1962). Ehrlich presented a sample of White college students in Ohio with a variety of positive and negative stereotypes. Students responded to survey questions as to whether Blacks or
Jews possessed these characteristics. Around 37.5% of students tended to have strong negative images of both Blacks and Jews. Another 37.5% tended to have strong positive images of both groups. The remaining 25% held strong beliefs about Blacks or about Jews or about neither. The correlation for the 75% that stereotyped both Blacks and Jews was almost 0.700. Both studies suggest that Whites who tended to use stereotypes also tended to stereotype multiple out-groups (possibly all.) While the findings were consistent, they only addressed the out-groups in the United States.

Dixon and Rosenbaum (2004) compared social contact between Whites and Blacks to that between Whites and Hispanics. The authors recognized that, like Sniderman and Piazza (1993) and Ehrlich (1962,) most people with a propensity to stereotype were likely to stereotype multiple out-groups rather than just one. Prior research suggested that Whites perceived some stereotypes as describing only Blacks or only Hispanics and other stereotypes as describing both Blacks and Hispanics. The stereotypes about Blacks were more widely accepted by Whites. Following up on these findings, Dixon and Rosenbaum surveyed White respondents on whether Blacks and/or Hispanics fit the racial stereotypes being unintelligent, lazy, and/or lacking in commitment to their families. They found that Whites attributed racial stereotypes to Blacks more than twice as often as they attributed them to Hispanics. Then they controlled for demographic variables (age, education, married, male, and being from the South), and they found that most of these variables had significant influences on Whites’ propensity to stereotype Blacks. In contrast, only age and education appeared to influence Whites’ propensity to stereotype Hispanics.

Krysan (2002) conducted a recent study on white flight and included Asians and
Latinos in the study. She used ratios of White families to Black families to study the reasons that Whites gave for moving out a neighborhood when Blacks were moving in. Krysan compared ethnocentrism, traditional racism, images of black neighborhoods, and racial stereotypes (in positive/negative opposites as in intelligent or unintelligent.) Like Sniderman and Piazza, Krysan separated images of black neighborhoods from stereotypes about individuals and work effort. She controlled for demographic variables and for the race of the interviewer. Krysan found that the propensity to stereotype individuals and to stereotype neighborhoods both related to Whites’ choice to move out of a neighborhood when Black families were moving in. She also assessed whether white flight occurs when Asians and Latinos are moving into a neighborhood. Krysan asked Whites whether they would feel comfortable in a neighborhood integrated with Asians, Latinos or Blacks. Results showed that Whites felt most comfortable living with Asians and that they liked Hispanics as neighbors only slightly better than they liked Blacks.

Wilson (1996) tried to determine whether White prejudice toward Blacks had lessened over the latter half of the 20th century as previous research suggested. Wilson wanted to know whether this held true for younger generations and whether the apparent lessening of White prejudice applied to all minority groups in the United States or to Blacks only. Data from the 1990 General Social Survey examined Whites’ perceptions of Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, Jews, and Whites on a social distance scale and a propensity to stereotype scale. The social-distance scale included two items – whether Whites accept members of that group to live in the same neighborhood or to marry a close relative. The stereotype scale included being intelligent, violent, lazy,
welfare dependent, and patriotic. Whites’ prejudice was consistent over all items except for patriotism. Jews ranked the most intelligent followed closely by Whites. The results ranked Jews as the least violent, lazy, and welfare dependent. Whites ranked as slightly more violent, lazier and more welfare dependent than Jews. Then came Asians followed by Hispanics. Blacks were at the bottom of the list – except that perceptions of Hispanics’ and Blacks’ intelligence were ranked about the same. On patriotism, Whites considered themselves the most patriotic group, followed by Jews, Blacks, Asians, and Hispanics as the least patriotic group.

Next, Wilson grouped the sample into regions (South and non-South) and into cohort age groups representing 4 time periods: Whites born prior to the year 1930, between the years 1931-1945, 1946-1960, and 1961-1972. There was a persistent pattern in both the social scale and the stereotype index suggesting that non-Southern Whites were less prejudiced toward all four racial/ethnic groups than Southern Whites. This pattern persisted for all cohort groups except for the youngest non-Southern Whites. The youngest cohorts of both Southern and non-Southern Whites both preferred the same social distance as the previous generation rather than following the pattern of less social distance. The youngest non-Southern Whites also showed a stronger belief in racial stereotypes toward all four groups, suggesting their prejudice was growing rather than lessening.

Multiple Racial/Ethnic Groups

Recently researchers examined racial stereotyping focusing on all racial/ethnic groups. Some examples include studies of whether Blacks perceive Asians as difficult
to get along with or not; whether Hispanics perceive Whites as welfare dependent; and whether Asians think of Blacks as patriotic. Latinos and Asians are currently the fastest growing racial groups in the U.S. Their growth is redefining how they fit into the multiethnic/multiracial puzzle of American society today (Yetman 1999.) This final section reviews various articles that studied multiple groups as both respondents and target groups where racial/ethnic stereotypes are at least one of the measures used for studying racial prejudice.

Bobo and Hutchings (1996) examined group competition for scarce resources in the United States – jobs, political power, housing and economic standing. Their findings suggested that Whites perceived Asians as presenting the most competition for these resources while Latinos were the next most competitive group, and Blacks were the least competition. Asians, Hispanics and Blacks also tended to perceive a similar ranking of competitiveness among the four groups as Whites did. From these results the authors developed a competition index. Bobo and Hutchings then compared the competition index with racial factors including a stereotype index. The stereotype index was only significantly correlated for Whites. It was significant for Whites’ perceptions about Blacks and Latinos as competition but not for Whites’ perceptions about Asians as competition.

A recent addition to the group position and group threat perspective was the study of social dominance orientation (SDO.) According to Pratto et al. (1994) racism is one of several ideologies, each of which can structure society into a hierarchal based system. Pratto et al. studied Whites, Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks in order to compare SDO with assimilation theories. The authors wanted a better understanding of the
relationship between an individual’s attachment to his/her ethnic group and to the nation they live in. The idea is that members of the dominant group will have a strong attachment to both the nation and to their ethnic group. Members of a subordinate group may or may not have a strong attachment to both the nation and their ethnic group.

Sidanius et al. (1997) compared the melting pot perspective, the pluralism perspective, and the group dominance perspective as possible explanations for this phenomenon. To compare these perspectives they used attachment to the nation and attachment to the ethnic group. The melting pot perspective suggests that all ethnic groups in society will not have an attachment to the nation that correlates with attachment to their ethnic group. The relationship either should be non-existent or should be negative such that a stronger attachment to the nation correlates with a weaker attachment to the ethnic group. The pluralism perspective suggests that national attachment and ethnic attachment will have a positive relationship. The group dominance perspective suggests that the dominant group maintains full rights and complete access to all of society’s resources. A subordinate group’s access to those resources depends on its relationship to the dominant group. Thus the correlation between attachment to nation and ethnic group will be positive for the dominate group and negative for all subordinate groups.

The dependent variables in Sidanius et al. (1997)’s study were patriotism and nationalism. Patriotism described love for one’s country while nationalism represented the belief that one’s nation should be dominant over other nations. The main independent variables were SDO, classical racism, and measures of in-group
attachment. Classical racism combined beliefs in group superiority with racial stereotypes that included both individuals and neighborhoods. On a side note, it is interesting that the measurement of classical racism included both derogatory stereotypes and beliefs that Blacks and Latinos, but not about Asians (or Whites for that matter,) were inferior. Results found that Whites tended to be both the most patriotic and the most nationalist. Blacks tended to be the least patriotic, Hispanics the least nationalistic. Asians were closest to Whites on nationalism and about the same as Hispanics on patriotism. Using multiple regressions models for each racial group, Sidanius et al. (1997) found positive relationships in the Whites model with all the control variables. This was true for both patriotism and nationalism. The Asians, Latinos, and Blacks models found a positive relationship linking nationalism with SDO and with classical racism but not with group attachment.

Wong et al. (1998) explored whether there was any truth to the stereotype that Asian Americans were the model minority in the United States. The study included White, Asian, Hispanic, Black, and Native American college students attending Washington State University. To test the model minority concept, interviewers asked respondents whether a given racial group, as compared to Whites, was more or less intelligent, industrious, or driven to succeed. The authors found that everyone, including Asians, believed Asians to be the most intelligent, best prepared, hardest working, and most likely racial group to succeed in American society. In contrast, Asians at the college generally did not perform better academically than anyone else.

and out-group perceptions to the propensity to stereotype, and perceived socioeconomic differences to an in-group’s preference for residential integration. They chose the stereotypes lacking intelligence and welfare dependency because researchers have been using these stereotypes in racial/ethnic studies for decades. Bobo and Zurbinski added the hard to get along with stereotype because of “widespread discussion that many recent Asian immigrant groups, especially but not exclusively Koreans, have brought cultural styles of interaction that are more brusque than is typical of U.S. culture.” Johnson, Farrell, and Guinn (1997) conducted a similar study from the same population with the same stereotype questions. Results compared percentages according to whether participants rated the in-group as equal to or better than the target group. For example, 63.4% of Asians, about 40% of Whites and 32% of Hispanics believed that Blacks were less intelligent than their own groups.

The tables on racial stereotypes in these two studies suggest some patterns. Throughout both studies Whites, Asians, and Hispanics tended to perceive Blacks as having the most negative characteristics. White Participants most often rejected Blacks as potential neighbors. Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks tended to perceive Whites, usually followed closely by Asians, the least negatively. Respondents preferred Whites and Asians as neighbors more than Hispanics or Blacks. Individuals tended to perceive some racial stereotypes as more accurate for some groups. Being welfare dependent was seen as the strongest characteristic of Blacks. Being hard to get along with was the strongest perception of Asians. None of these stereotypical perceptions were strongly associated with being White or Hispanic. Whites, Hispanics, and Asians tended to perceive Blacks as having the most negative characteristics on all three racial
stereotypes. One other pattern was a tendency for any two racial groups to stereotype the respective pair of out-groups differently. For example, Blacks rated Hispanics at an average of 4.55 on a scale of 1-7, with 1 being least difficult to get along with and seven being most difficult to get along with. The average Hispanic perception of Blacks as difficult to get along with was only 3.69. This phenomenon was apparent for most of the paired combinations with the only exception between Whites and Asians in respect to welfare dependency and to intelligence. The researchers speculated that these perceptions might come from mass media and published statistics about various racial groups, but it is not clear why the differences are more dramatic for some pairs of out-groups than for others.

Bobo and Zubrinski included in-group perceptions for each racial group. The propensity to stereotype in-group members refers to Whites’ mean rating of Whites or Blacks’ mean rating of Blacks. There is a clear tendency for each group to rate in-group members in the best light when compared to perceptions from comparable respondent groups. For example, the mean for Blacks’ perception of welfare dependency among in-group members was 3.98 compared to Hispanics’ perception of Blacks at 5.22, meaning that Hispanics believed Blacks more likely to be welfare dependent than Blacks believed themselves to be welfare dependent. This pattern was stronger for Blacks’ and Hispanics’ in-group perceptions than it was for Whites or Asians. There is also less difference between Whites’ in-group perceptions and Asians’ in-group perceptions than between any other combinations of in-group perceptions. Lastly, Whites’ propensity to stereotype appears to be lower than that of Asians, Hispanics, or Blacks. Yet, as was the main focus of the article, Whites’ propensity to stereotype relates stronger with other
Finally, Bobo and Zubrinski referred to a topical report conducted by Smith (1990) that used the General Social Survey to research multiple ethnic groups and the propensity to stereotype. Like Dixon and Rosenbaum (2004,) Smith believed that the definitions for stereotypes and prejudice were too indistinct due to the irrationality associated with them. Instead he used stereotypic images presented as bipolar opposites (rich/poor or hard-working/lazy.) Smith did not provide any sample sizes. For most of the study Smith did not control for respondent’s race. Respondents were asked to rate their impressions of Whites, Jews, Asians, Hispanics, Blacks, and Southern Whites. The result was a persistent ranking of all racial/ethnic groups on the stereotypes rich/poor; hard-working/lazy; violent/nonviolent; intelligent/unintelligent; self-supporting/welfare. These results were remarkably similar to Wilson’s (1996.) Americans perceived Jews with the most positive images, usually slightly better than those of Whites. Participants perceived Blacks with the worst images. Hispanics closely followed Blacks. Asians were in the middle with Southern Whites. For patriotic/unpatriotic, the order was also much like Wilson’s results – Whites; Southern Whites; Jews; Blacks; Asians; and Hispanics. Like Sniderman and Piazza, Smith concluded that different racial stereotypes relate to different political policies on race. Smith’s interpretation of the results appeared to confirm that individuals tend to perceive in-group members more positively than members of out-groups.

Summary of Racial Stereotypes and Multiracial Groups

Previous research into the propensity to stereotype among multiple racial/ethnic
groups suggests a few patterns. First, the combined perceptions of all racial/ethnic
groups tends to rank Whites and Jews as the most preferred or best liked group.
Likewise all racial groups tend to perceive Blacks as the least the least liked group. All
racial groups attribute the most negative images to Blacks and the least negative
images to Whites. Perceptions of Asians and Latinos tend to vary. Sometimes both
groups appear to be somewhere in between perceptions of Whites and Blacks.
Sometimes perceptions of Asians appear to be the same as those for Whites.
Sometimes perceptions of Latinos appear to be the same as for those for Blacks. The
general order appears to be Whites and Jews, then Asians, followed by Hispanics, and
finally Blacks. Perceptions of Whites and Asians appear to differ less than perceptions
of Whites and Hispanics or of Whites and Blacks. Second, results from Bobo and
Zubrinski (1996), Johnson, Farrell, and Guinn (1997), and Smith (1990) suggest that
Asians have a propensity to stereotype that is closer to Whites’ propensity to stereotype
than either Hispanics’ or Blacks’ propensity to stereotype. Third, there is a tendency for
racial groups to perceive in-group members more positively than members of out-group
members. There is further evidence in the above multiracial studies that images and
information from the mass media and published statistics influence the propensity to
stereotype various groups. This is often seen in the tendency to connect Blacks with
welfare dependency. Interestingly, this phenomenon may also exist within the in-group
perceptions as the results found by Bobo and Zubrinski suggest. Fourth, no particular
group appears to have a stronger general propensity to stereotype. Finally, Whites’
propensity to stereotype tends to correlate well with other factors of prejudice. Asians
appear to be developing a similar tendency to stereotype. In contrast, Blacks do not
tend to share this tendency and Hispanics are somewhere in between the two groups.

What’s Missing?

Research including the propensity to stereotype multiple racial groups from the perspectives of multiple racial groups is fairly recent. Further research needs to include a wide range of racial stereotypes. In-group perceptions of multiple racial/ethnic groups and racial stereotypes do not appear to relate as well to racial beliefs or racial integration preference. Part of Bobo and Zubrinski’s goal was to test Clark’s finding that in-group perceptions strongly relate to racial prejudice and discrimination. They found that in-group perceptions do not have as direct a relationship with prejudice as the propensity to stereotype does. While the tendency to stereotype in-group members may not directly relate to the tendency to stereotype out-group members, it may be that they can offer more information. Each of the multi-group studies above includes a theory that is part of the group position and group threat perspective. Group position and group threat theory suggests that a subordinate group’s ability to prosper in society depends on its relationship to the dominant group. Asians appear to have a closer relationship with Whites than Hispanics or Blacks. Recent assimilation theories suggest that Asians are assimilating into the dominant White culture and that Hispanics may be following. Research in assimilation has not included multiple racial groups’ propensities to stereotype in a multiracial society. It may be that a comparison between tendencies to stereotype in-group members and out-groups members can provide another method to test racial assimilation.
THEORETICAL CONSTRUCTION

Racism, Prejudice, and Racial Stereotypes

Racial stereotypes are strong indicators of racism and prejudice among Whites. Recent research suggests that there is a similar, if weaker, phenomenon among both Asians and Hispanics (Bobo and Hutchings 1996, Bobo and Zubrinski 1996, Johnson, Farrell, and Guinn 1997). There also appears to be a general pattern where Whites, Asians, and Hispanics tend to perceive Blacks with the most negative racial characteristics and Whites with the most positive. Whites, Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks tended to perceive Asians more positively than Hispanics (Bobo and Zubrinski 1996, Krysan 2002, Smith 1990, Wilson 1996.) Bobo and Zubrinski (1996) suggest that the group position and group perspective is an alternative to racial/ethnic assimilation theories. Assimilation theory suggests that as a subordinate group integrates into the dominant group it takes on the dominant group’s beliefs, values, and prejudices (Alba and Nee 1997, Yancey 2003). Recent theories on assimilation suggest that this process occurred with European Whites in the early part of the 20th century (Lieberson 1980, Lieberson and Waters 1988, Waters 1990). More recent assimilation theory attempts to predict how or if racial assimilation will occur between Whites and Asians and between Whites and Hispanics. One explanation suggests that Asians and Hispanics are becoming a new middle group between Blacks and Whites (Bonilla-Silva 2004). Another that Asians and Hispanics are integrating with Whites (Yancey 2003.) And a third suggests that some Asian, Hispanic, and Black subgroups are forming an alternate set of groups more on par with Whites as the dominant group (Portes and Zhou 1993). All three assimilation theories agree that Blacks and Whites will continue to remain,
separate groups. The following theoretical construction examines predictions of the
group position/group threat perspective and then assimilation theory on the propensity
to stereotype in a multi-racial society.

Group Position and Group Threat Theories

Group position and group threat theories have been around since Blalock (1956, 1957) and Blumer (1958.) Blalock believed that when there was a large number of a
subordinate group in a neighborhood, or when a large number were moving into the
neighborhood, then that group provides more competition for scarce resources like jobs
and housing. Where this phenomenon occurred then the dominant group in that
neighborhood tended to feel threatened by increased competition and responds with
increased prejudice and discrimination. Blumer on the other hand believed that the
dominant group, Whites, had a sense of social position. Whites had a tendency to treat
subordinate groups according to group norms and values that grew from the
relationship that developed between them and the subordinate group. Blumer identified
four factors that defined the dominant group’s sense of social position: 1) superiority; 2)
intrinsic differences; 3) proprietary claims to scarce resources; and 4) fear and suspicion
over the subordinate groups goals within society. The social processes that shape and
organize individuals according the norms of society in general also develop and
maintain racial prejudice. This does not mean that racial prejudice should be normal, but
that it is a constructed set of social norms and values. Many individuals tend to question
one or more factors in their relationship with the subordinate group yet fail to question
all of them. In a deeply-rooted prejudicial environment, attempting to reject all norms
that support the social structure can result in strong alienation from one’s peers.

Bobo and Hutchings (1996) refer to four models of the group position and group perspective. The self-interest model applies to minorities perhaps as much as to the dominant group. Here changes in the racial make-up of a neighborhood or workplace can develop into new competition for scarce resources. The racial prejudice model suggests that individuals who adhere to racial prejudice and racial stereotypes are more likely to perceive an out-group as competition for scarce resources. The stratified beliefs model suggests that belief in opportunity in the United States comes primarily from hard work. This model suggests that members of subordinate groups remain in the subordinate position in society because they do not work hard enough to rise through the ranks. Lastly, Bobo and Hutchings refer to Blumer’s sense of group position theory. Here the subordinate group believes it is superior and at the same time alienates out-groups, allowing in-group members to believe that they deserve more access to scarce resources.

Social dominance orientation (SDO) is a more recent theory on group position. SDO postulates that racism is merely one type of hierarchical social structure within society and society can have several hierarchal structures operating at the same time (Pratto et al., 1994; Sidanius, Pratto, and Bobo, 1996; Sidanius and Ekehammar, 1979). Other hierarchal ideologies are patriarchy, political-economic conservatism, class stratification. Specifically, SDO is a method used to determine what hierarchal ideologies are prominent at the time a measurement is taken (Pratto et al. 1994). It does not consider how the current form of an ideology (like racism) operates within society. Individuals who adhere to one of these ideologies tend to share some of the beliefs
found in other hierarchal ideologies.

The different approaches in group position and group threat theories help to explain some of the interaction between any two given racial groups. Members of the dominant group enjoy complete access to society’s scarce resources. A subordinate group’s relative position to the dominant group influences the success and the life chances of individual group members. A stronger interaction between the dominant and a subordinate group should provide the subordinate group with greater access to scarce resources along with a reduction in differences in perceived group position. Subordinate groups with greater access to scarce resources or with a higher group position should tend to show prejudice and discrimination toward groups with less access to resources and/or in lower positions within society. This provides a brief explanation suggesting two things. First, that Asians higher relative position to Whites translates into a stronger propensity to stereotype Hispanics and Blacks (Bobo and Hutchings 1996, Bobo and Zubrinski 1996, Johnson, Farrell, and Guinn 1997.) Second, that White Americans as the dominant have fewer derogatory stereotypes about Asians than they do about Hispanics or Blacks. Together these factors suggest that the closer a subordinate group is to the dominant group the more likely they are to share the same propensity to stereotype.

Assimilation Theory

Basic assimilation theory suggests that over time a subordinate group is eventually absorbed into the dominant group. The subordinate group usually enters society with its own culture and identity. As the subordinate group assimilates with the
dominant group the subordinate’s culture and identity fades away (Alba and Nee 1997.) The dominant group in comparison remains relatively unchanged. There is some alteration culturally but the general social structure of the dominant group remains intact. As it loses its previous values and beliefs the subordinate group takes on the beliefs and values of the dominant group, including the dominant group’s ideologies – such as racism toward a second subordinate group. Identity with an individual’s ancestry may not be completely lost or may take longer to fade. Immigrant grandparents and great-grandparents (of many White adults in the mid-20th century) often struggled with their cultural identity as first and second generation Americans (Lieberson 1980, Lieberson and Waters 1988, Waters 1990.) Third and fourth generation immigrants tended to either forget their ancestral heritage or identify themselves as American first then as Italian, Irish, German, Greek and so on. Children from mixed ancestry did so as well but not as often and sometimes without including all ethnicities from their ancestry (Waters 1990.) These later generations also shared the same beliefs and stereotypes as Whites did about Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks. At the same time majority group members also began to perceive all Europeans as Americans first then by their ethnic heritage. This new perception also lacked the previous prejudice associated with first and second generation European immigrants. On the other hand, the new dominant group continued to perceive Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks as separate groups. Three recent racial assimilation theories suggest that this is not a unique phenomenon but will occur again. All three theories agree that Whites and Blacks will continue to be relatively separate groups but disagree on what will occur between Whites and Asians/Hispanics.
The Changing Definition of Whiteness

Warren and Twine (1997) explore the prediction that Whites would soon be a minority in the United States. Latino and Asian populations were growing (and continue to grow) very fast related to Whites. The authors refer to works like Lieberson’s and Waters’ to show that this is not a new phenomenon. By the early 1900s, the then non-White Europeans were immigrating in mass numbers into the United States from Italy, Germany, Ireland, Poland and a few other southern and eastern Europeans nations. Population experts at the beginning of the 20th century predicted that Whites would soon become a numerical minority in the United States. Yet by the latter half of the century non-White Europeans no longer existed and Whites were still the majority group. Non-White Europeans had fully integrated into the dominant White culture and the definition of Whiteness had expanded. From this event Warren and Twine pointed out that the prediction “Whites will become a minority group” is not a guaranteed outcome.

Yancey (2003) predicts a similar process will occur in respect to Asians and Hispanics. The definition of Whiteness will expand so that Whites remain the majority group. History is repeating itself even now as Whites appear to becoming a numerical minority group in the U.S. Yancey shows evidence that the dominant group will expand again to include non-Black minority groups, this time Asians and Hispanics. On the other hand there will remain a White and a Black group whether or not Blacks remain a subordinate group. Referring to demographic variables and political beliefs, Yancey found that Asians are currently more similar to Whites than Hispanics or Blacks are suggesting Asians are assimilating with Whites. Eventually Asians Americans will follow the path European Americans took. They will think of themselves as White and be
perceived as White. Just like Immigrants from Europe, immigrant Asians will themselves taken for White as soon as they set foot on American soil. At that point the majority group population becomes larger. Yancey found that Hispanics are not as far along as Asians in the assimilation process but are following the same pattern. Part of Yancey’s argument refers to Warren and Twine’s finding that Blacks were the ruler, or measure, that non-White Europeans used to become White. That by using statements about not being Black, Whites and European immigrants redefined Whiteness. Not being Black was the back-door for non-White Europeans. Yancey argues that it is still the back door to Whiteness and Asians and Hispanics are going through it. He goes a step further to predict that eventually there will only be two racial groups left in U.S. society - Blacks and non-Blacks. Thus Asians and Hispanics should take on Whites’ propensity to stereotype.

Segmented Assimilation

Portes and Zhou (1993) suggested that full assimilation into the dominant culture is not necessary in order for a group to prosper in the United States. While many immigrant cultures did successfully integrate with Whites, some have not – such as the Cuban enclave in Miami. The authors contend that there are three paths immigrants follow when assimilating into American culture. The first path has immigrants assimilating directly into the dominant group. This was the case for immigrants from European nations like Britain, Germany, France and most, if not all, of Europe. New European immigrants today quickly find themselves part of the dominant group. The second path has immigrants pushed into the underclass of American society. They do
not choose to take this path yet they find they have little choice. The third path leads immigrants to maintain their home culture within tightly knit communities. They are able to prosper by helping each other rather than depending on the dominant group. Portes and Zhou found that the Haitian experience in the U.S. provided a good example of the latter two paths as they attempt to maintain a tightly-knit community while acculturating to the dominant group and prospering in American society. Black Haitians face similar prejudice and discrimination from the dominant group as native-born Blacks do and Haitians also face rejection from native-born Blacks due to attempting to acculturate to the dominant White culture. Both groups appear to be pushing Haitians toward the underclass. Haitians could accept this outcome and seek a community experience within the native Black community. Instead Haitians have created an enclave where group members help each other out. Instead of following the second path into the underclass new Haitian immigrants follow the third path. They prosper in American society while not fully integrating into the dominant culture. Thus, by not integrating into the dominant group they are less likely to take on the dominant group’s propensity to stereotype.

Triracial Stratification: Creation of a Third, Middle Racial Group

Bonilla-Silva (2004) examined the various Asian and Hispanic subgroups. He found that among both Asians and Hispanics some subgroups appear to integrate well with the dominant group (Whites); others tend to end up in the underclass (Collective Blacks); and a third group is developing an in-between or middle-group status (Honorary Whites.) Bonilla-Silva suggests that this pattern will lead to a tri-racial
stratification system. The Whites group will include (European) Whites and a few Asian and Latino subgroups assimilated into the dominant culture. The Collective Blacks group will include Blacks and dark-skinned Asians and Latinos. The middle, Honorary Whites group will include light-skinned people – too dark to be in the Whites group and too light to be Collective Blacks group. In the triracial system Honorary Whites form a racial buffer between the dominant group and the underclass. Bonilla-Silva predicts that Honorary Whites will take on some of the dominant group's prejudice and will prefer to be around Whites more than collective Blacks.

Racial Stereotypes and Assimilation

Bonilla-Silva (2004), Portes and Zhou (1993), and Yancey (2003) each link acculturation of dominant values with assimilation into the dominant group. Each assimilation theory bases its predictions on recent findings that Asians were intermarrying with Whites at a high rate; Hispanics were also assimilating but at a slower rate; and the intermarriage rate between Whites and Blacks was too low to represent assimilation. The group position and group threat theories perspective is an alternative explanation to assimilation theories that focuses on how racial/ethnic groups interact rather than whether they are assimilating or not (Blalock 1956, 1957, Blumer 1958, Pratto et al. 1994.) Yancey links acculturating racial prejudice and racial stereotypes with the assimilation process. Group position and group threat theories links racial stereotypes with the dominant group as part of the hierarchal ideology of racism. Group position and group threat theories also posits that the more a subordinate group integrates with the dominant group the more likely it is to share the dominant group’s
beliefs and norms. Pratto et al. (1994) found that Asians and Hispanics were more likely to share the same racial beliefs and values with Whites than with Blacks. In this study it can be argued that Asians and Hispanics are assimilating with Whites and Blacks are not. With that assumption, does the propensity to stereotype reflect racial assimilation as well as group position dynamics?
HYPOTHESES

Assimilation theories, particularly recent theories by Bonilla-Silva (2004), Portes and Zhou (1993), and Yancey (2003,) predict that racial/ethnic groups assimilating into the dominant group take on the values, beliefs, and prejudices of the dominant group, including the propensity to stereotype racial/ethnic groups. According to Yancey’s biracial assimilation prediction Asians and Hispanics are assimilating with Whites while Blacks are not. As such Asians and Hispanics should be taking on Whites’ propensity to stereotype and Blacks should not. Bonilla-Silva’s (2004) tri-racial assimilation breaks down the pan-ethnic Asian and Hispanic groups into subgroups where they will assimilate into one of three racial groups. Some Asian ethnic groups and some Hispanic ethnic groups will assimilate with Whites while some will intermix with Blacks and some will form a third, buffer group in-between Whites and Blacks. Like Yancey’s prediction those groups that assimilate with Whites will take on Whites’ propensity to stereotype. Those that intermix with Blacks should not be taking on Whites’ propensity to stereotype. Those that enter the middle group, Honorary Whites, should have mixed feelings about racial stereotypes and many will try to exaggerate the stereotypes in order to integrate better with Whites. Portes and Zhou’s (1993) segmented assimilation focus on non-assimilating groups. Like tri-racial assimilation, segmented assimilation focuses on subgroups and not on the pan-ethnic groups. Here some subgroups are maintaining their ethnicity and succeeding in society. In so doing they are less likely to take on Whites’ propensity to stereotype. Examining sub-groups however is beyond the scope of this study and thus only Yancey’s predictions can be tested in respect to racial stereotypes.
Where Yancey’s predictions focused on groups that are in the process of assimilating, Waters (1990) studied subordinate groups that were ready fully assimilated into the dominant group, i.e., European Whites. Waters found that fully assimilated Europeans perceived themselves and other European immigrants as Whites while also maintaining vague references to their European heritage(s.) There were inconsistent ethnic descriptions both across and within ethnicities and they tended to be more indistinct the more generations an ethnic group had been in the U.S. The one characteristic that was consistent across all groups was that they were all White Americans first.

Bobo and Zubrinski (1996) did not compare the propensity to stereotype in-groups with the propensity to stereotype out-groups because the theories used suggested that the results would not be interpretable to the comparisons being made. However Waters’ findings suggest that the lack of distinction between the dominant group and its assimilated groups should mean that the tendency for European ethnic groups to stereotype European ethnic groups should fail to find any significant distinctions. This means that the dominant group and the assimilated group will have the same tendency to stereotype all racial groups, including the dominant group and the assimilated group. Furthermore, Waters’ findings suggest that subjective measures like racial stereotypes can be turned around such that the dominant group and the assimilated group should share the same racial characteristics so that unassimilated subordinate groups will also fail to see a distinction.

Finally, recent research also suggests that Asians are assimilating at a faster rate than Hispanics are. Considering the varying rates of racial assimilation and the
development of sharing Whites’ propensity to stereotype all racial/ethnic groups then I make the following predictions based on Yancey’s changing definition of whiteness theory.

Hypothesis 1: The difference between Whites and Hispanics on the propensity to stereotype all racial/ethnic groups will be greater than the difference between Whites and Asians on the propensity to stereotype.

Hypothesis 2: The difference between Whites and Blacks on the propensity to stereotype all racial/ethnic groups will be greater than the difference between Whites and Hispanics on the propensity to stereotype.

Hypothesis 3: The difference between Whites and Blacks on the propensity to stereotype all racial/ethnic groups will be greater than the difference between Whites and Asians on the propensity to stereotype.¹

However stereotypes are not demographical data but individual perceptions about racial/ethnic groups. To compare Whites’ propensity to stereotype Asians to their propensity to stereotype Hispanics means comparing whether Whites perceive a significant difference based on the stereotype tested. If Asians are assimilating with Whites then logically Whites, Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks should fail to see a significant difference between the two racial groups.

Hypothesis 4: The differences in racial/ethnic characteristics between Whites and Hispanics will be greater than the difference in racial/ethnic characteristics between Whites and Asians.

Hypothesis 5: The differences in racial/ethnic characteristics between Whites and Blacks will be greater than the difference in racial/ethnic characteristics between Whites and Asians.

Hypothesis 6: The differences in racial/ethnic characteristics between Whites and Blacks will be greater than the difference in racial/ethnic characteristics between Whites and Hispanics.

¹ Logically if Hypotheses 1 and 2 are true then Hypothesis 3 will also be true. However, if either Hypotheses 1 fails or Hypothesis 2 fails (or both) then it is questionable whether Hypothesis 3 will also fail. The same goes for Hypothesis 6.
DATA

The 1999-2000 Lilly Survey of American Attitudes and Friendships (LSAF) used a random digit dialing method to sample Americans aged 18 and over.\(^2\) The LSAF reached 2561 respondents; 1662 Whites, 296 Blacks, 307 Hispanics and 210 Asians as well as 86 respondents who identified themselves as either part of another group (as in Native American or being from the Middle East) or mixed race. These 86 cases were excluded from this study due to limitations in how the data was distributed. Interviewers over-sampled African, Hispanic, and Asian Americans to ensure reaching an adequate sample of each of these groups. Interviewers asked respondents three questions on racial stereotypes. 1) “Compared to other racial groups, [rotate racial group] on average tend to prefer to live on welfare.” 2) “Compared to other racial groups, [rotate racial group] on average tend to be patriotic to the United States. And 3) “Compared to other racial groups, [rotate racial group] on average tend to be arrogant.” Each respondent gave their opinion of the target group based on a scale of 1: *Strongly agree*, 2: *Moderately agree*, 3: *Slightly agree*, 4: *Neither agree nor disagree* (in between,) 5: *Slightly disagree*, 6: *Moderately disagree*, 7: *Strongly disagree*.

Interviewers used a random selection method to select one racial group per question, per respondent. The result was five separate sample groups per stereotype question. The randomization allowed for five separate sample groups of more or less equal size. During the interview, interviewers used the random selection method to obtain a new racial group for each of the three stereotype questions. For example, interviewers asked one fifth of respondents: “Compared to other racial groups ‘American

\(^2\) For a more complete description of the LSAF survey see *Who is White* (2003.)
Indians’ tend to be patriotic to the United States.” The next question received a new, randomly selected racial group. Thus only about one-fifth of respondents answered the stereotype question about American Indian’s tendency to be patriotic. The purpose of the rotation method was to avoid asking each respondent the same question about each of the five target groups thereby avoiding any bias that a respondent had toward one racial group influencing his/her response about another racial group.
METHODS

The 1999 Lily Survey of American Friendships (LSAF) has data on three racial stereotypes – tendency to prefer to live off welfare, to be patriotic, and to be arrogant. The LSAF appears to be the first time a national survey used the arrogant stereotype. The stereotypes prefer to live off welfare, patriotic, and arrogant have no direct theoretical relationship and so it is not useful to combine them into a scale or index.

Recent research finds Americans have different perceptions about which groups are more patriotic (Sidanius et al., 1997; Smith, 1990; Wilson, 1996) versus more welfare dependent (Bobo and Zubrinski, 1996; Smith, 1990; Wilson, 1996.) Thus each racial stereotype must be evaluated separately. Due to the randomization approach to each question the result is that no two participants answered the same question more than once. It is not possible to use correlations or regressions to compare the propensity to stereotype Whites to the propensity to stereotype Blacks. That leaves $t$-tests or chi-square tests as an appropriate test of significance. There were 7 values for each stereotype question making a table from a chi-square test cumbersome without reducing the variables to fewer values. The LSAF worded the stereotype questions such that a higher means represents a higher tendency to prefer to live off welfare, to be patriotic, and to be arrogant. The welfare and arrogant stereotypes are negative stereotypes while patriotic is a positive stereotype. Reversing the coding of the patriotic stereotype so that higher means represent the tendency to be unpatriotic will make interpreting the results simpler. This is the same procedure Bobo and Zubrinski (1996) used to set up a stereotype index.

Two-tailed $t$-tests will work better here than one-tailed $t$-tests. The hypotheses
were developed based the expectation that in-group stereotype ratings will not vary from out-group stereotype ratings whether the $t$-tests compare the propensity to stereotype or racial characteristics. For example, if Whites’ propensity to stereotype should be less than Blacks’ then a one-tailed test would be appropriate. But Blacks’ propensity to stereotype Blacks and Whites’ propensity to stereotype are also included in these tests. Bobo and Zubrinski (1996) found that the propensity to stereotype in-groups tended to be lower than the propensity to stereotype out-groups. At a later date it might be more useful to use one-tailed $t$-tests while keeping track of whether in-groups stereotype ratings were included in the tests but for this study two-tailed tests are used.

The first set of hypotheses compares the propensity to stereotype for all three stereotype questions. Running a $t$-test on the propensity to stereotype without breaking down the variable by racial categories would fail to show whether Whites and Asians might differ on all, some, or none of the racial groups. Whites and Asians may have vastly different propensities to stereotype that balance out in the general $t$-test. Individual $t$-tests would not provide sufficient cause to reject or accept the null hypothesis. Plus, the randomized approach to the questionnaire means that breaking down the sample by the racial categories within the stereotype variable creates 5 smaller, independent samples. This study uses $t$-tests on three stereotypes to compare the propensity to stereotype each of the five target groups separately then adds the number of significant results. If the hypotheses are correct then, for example, there should be fewer significant results for Whites and Asians compared to Whites and Hispanics.

Because there are several $t$-tests involved, the chance that one of the results will
be significant increases over that of a single \( t \)-test. This would normally require using a Bonferroni or similar adjustment on the alphas to compensate. In this case, such an adjustment will increase the chance that the research hypotheses will be supported. The result would that Whites and Asians; Whites and Hispanics; and / or Whites and Blacks do not have significantly different propensities to stereotype as theory suggests and would lead to the conclusion that these groups are assimilating even when they may not. Therefore this study did not adjust the \( t \)-test alphas.
RESULTS

Table 1 shows that the only time Asians and Whites differed significantly on welfare dependency was over American Indians (Whites 2.13, Asians 3.11.) None of the t-tests for patriotism or arrogance were significant.

Table 1

Comparing t-Tests between Whites and Asians by the Tendency to Stereotype Target Racial Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Welfare Dependent</th>
<th>Not-Patriotic</th>
<th>Arrogant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>Asians</td>
<td>t Whites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHa</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(294)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(312)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(254)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(219)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS</td>
<td>-1.95</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(254)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(247)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(312)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(264)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. I.</td>
<td>-2.81</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(247)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>(233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total n</td>
<td>(1361)</td>
<td>(168)</td>
<td>(1275)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001

Note: Higher means indicate a higher propensity to stereotype.

In Table 2 Whites and Hispanics had a significantly different propensity to stereotype in 10 categories. On welfare dependent it was Whites 2.22 and Hispanics 2.69 on WHITES; 1.88 and 2.68 on ASIANS; 2.54 and 3.48 on BLACKS; 2.13 and 2.87 on AMERICAN INDIANS. For not patriotic it was Whites 3.68 and Hispanics 3.06 on ASIANS; 3.68 and 2.96 on HISPANICS. For arrogant it was Whites 3.48 and Hispanics 3.89 on BLACKS. To reduce confusion response categories are in all uppercase while sample categories remain in lower-case with first letter capitalized.

3 In Tables 1-3 sample participants are compared while in Tables 4-6 the participants’ responses are compared. This means the labels representing the sample groups and the response categories are the same: Whites, Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks. To reduce confusion response categories are in all uppercase while sample categories remain in lower-case with first letter capitalized.
3.83 on ASIANS; 2.26 and 3.05 on HISPANICS; 2.44 and 3.00 on BLACKS; 1.95 and 3.00 on AMERICAN INDIANS.

Table 2

Comparing t-Tests between Whites and Hispanics by the Tendency to Stereotype Target Racial Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Welfare Dependent</th>
<th>Not-Patriotic</th>
<th>Arrogant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whites t</td>
<td>Hisps t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>-2.02 (294)</td>
<td>2.22 (54)</td>
<td>0.64 (312)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>-2.55 (254)</td>
<td>1.88 (40)</td>
<td>2.02 (219)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS</td>
<td>-0.92 (254)</td>
<td>2.37 (61)</td>
<td>2.47 (247)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>-3.10 (312)</td>
<td>3.48 (48)</td>
<td>-1.22 (264)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. I.</td>
<td>-3.06 (247)</td>
<td>2.13 (63)</td>
<td>0.66 (233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.69 *</td>
<td>3.60 (320)</td>
<td>3.40 (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.68 *</td>
<td>3.68 (252)</td>
<td>3.06 (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.59 *</td>
<td>3.68 (293)</td>
<td>2.96 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.48 **</td>
<td>3.37 (254)</td>
<td>3.80 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.48 **</td>
<td>3.57 (254)</td>
<td>3.35 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.87 **</td>
<td>3.57 (247)</td>
<td>-3.79 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total n</td>
<td>(1361) (255)</td>
<td>(1275) (255)</td>
<td>(145 0) (264)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05,  ** p<.01  *** p<.001

Note: Higher means indicate a higher propensity to stereotype.

Table 3 shows Whites and Blacks differed significantly on the propensity to stereotype only twice. Once on welfare dependent on WH (Whites 2.22, Blacks 2.71) and the second was arrogant on AS (Whites 2.47, Blacks 3.09.)

To sum up Tables 1-3, the difference in the propensity to stereotype between Whites and Asians was 1; between Whites and Hispanics was 10, and between Whites and Blacks was 2. These results strongly support Hypothesis 1: The difference between Hispanics and Whites on the propensity to stereotype all racial/ethnic groups will be greater than the difference between Asians and Whites on the propensity to stereotype.

Hypothesis 3: The difference between Whites and Blacks on the propensity to
stereotype all racial/ethnic groups will be greater than the difference between Whites and Asians on the propensity to stereotype is partially supported. However Hypothesis 2: The difference between Whites and Blacks on the propensity to stereotype all racial/ethnic groups will be greater than the difference between Whites and Hispanics on the propensity to stereotype, fails. Hypothesis 1 is supported while Hypotheses 2 and 3 are not.

Table 3

Comparing t-Tests between Whites and Blacks by the Tendency to Stereotype Target Racial Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Welfare</th>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Not-Patriotic</th>
<th>Arrogant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH -2.04</td>
<td>-2.04</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>* 0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(294)</td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>(312) (59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS -1.01</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(254)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(219) (51)</td>
<td>-2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS -0.26</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(254)</td>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>(247) (40)</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL 0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(312)</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>(264) (53)</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. I. 0.63</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(247)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(233) (50)</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>(255)</td>
<td>1275 (253)</td>
<td>1450 (263)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* p&lt;.05,</td>
<td>** p&lt;.01</td>
<td>*** p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Higher means indicate a higher propensity to stereotype.

Table 4 t-tests found five significant results in the stereotype characteristics that Whites, Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks perceive WHITES and ASIANS to have. Only Whites and Asians perceived ASIANS to be less welfare dependent than WHITES (Whites 2.22, 1.88 and Asians 2.38, 1.60) and agreed ASIANS were less welfare dependent. None of the patriotism t-tests were significant. The t-tests were more
consistent on arrogance with only Asians failing to perceive ASIANS as less arrogant than WHITES (Whites 3.48, 2.47; Hispanics 3.83, 3.13; Blacks 3.95, 3.09.)

Table 4

Comparing t-Tests between Perceived Racial Characteristics of WHITES and ASIANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grp.</th>
<th>Welfare Dependent</th>
<th>Not-Patriotic</th>
<th>Arrogant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WH    AS</td>
<td>t WH   AS</td>
<td>t WH   AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites 3.06</td>
<td>2.22  1.88 **</td>
<td>-0.39  3.60 3.68</td>
<td>7.15 3.48 2.47 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(294) (254)</td>
<td>(312) (219)</td>
<td>(320) (252)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asians 2.49</td>
<td>2.38  1.60</td>
<td>0.27  3.51 4.20</td>
<td>1.81 3.95 3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34) (30)</td>
<td>(39) (21)</td>
<td>(59) (51)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics 0.03</td>
<td>2.69  2.68</td>
<td>0.82  3.40 3.06</td>
<td>2.00 3.83 3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54) (40)</td>
<td>(58) (49)</td>
<td>(61) (45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks 1.65</td>
<td>2.71  2.15</td>
<td>-1.52  3.37 3.23</td>
<td>2.38 3.13 2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(63) (47)</td>
<td>(41) (30)</td>
<td>(40) (43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total n</td>
<td>(445) (371)</td>
<td>(470) (349)</td>
<td>(473) (400)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001

Note: Higher means indicate a higher stereotype rating.

The t-tests in Table 5 also found three significant differences on the racial characteristics of WHITES and HISPANICS. None of the four respondent groups had a significant difference on welfare dependent or not-patriotic. Like with Table 4, Asians were the only group that did not have a significant tendency to stereotype WHITES as more arrogant than HISPANICS (Whites 3.48, 2.26; Hispanics 3.83, 3.05; Blacks 3.95, 2.62.)

Finally, Table 6 compares the racial characteristics for WHITES and BLACKS. These t-tests found that both Whites (2.22, 2.54) and Hispanics (2.69, 3.48) had significantly different propensities to stereotype WHITES and BLACKS as welfare dependent. No group stereotyped WHITES and BLACKS more or less not-patriotic. On the arrogance stereotype the pattern is the same as with the previous two tables where
Whites (3.48, 2.26,) Hispanics (3.83, 3.05,) and Blacks (3.95, 2.62) tended to stereotype BLACKS as less arrogant than WHITES.

Table 5

*Comparing t-Tests between Perceived Racial Characteristics of WHITES and HISPANICS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resp.</th>
<th>Welfare Dependent</th>
<th>Not-Pat</th>
<th>Arrog</th>
<th>ant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grp. t</td>
<td>WH HIS</td>
<td>t WH HIS</td>
<td>t WH HIS</td>
<td>t WH HIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites -1.13</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asians -1.56</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics 0.30</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks 0.87</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total n</td>
<td>(445)</td>
<td>(397)</td>
<td>(470)</td>
<td>(365)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05,  ** p<.01,  *** p<.001

Note: Higher means indicate a higher stereotype rating.

Table 6

*Comparing t-Tests between Perceived Racial Characteristics of WHITES and BLACKS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resp.</th>
<th>Welfare Dependent</th>
<th>Not-Pat</th>
<th>Arrog</th>
<th>ant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grp. t</td>
<td>WH BL</td>
<td>t WH BL</td>
<td>t WH BL</td>
<td>t WH BL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites -2.61</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.54 **</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asians -1.80</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics -2.20</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.48 *</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks 0.61</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total n</td>
<td>(445)</td>
<td>(452)</td>
<td>(470)</td>
<td>(402)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05,  ** p<.01,  *** p<.001

Note: Higher means indicate a higher stereotype rating.
To sum up Tables 4-6, there were five significant differences in racial characteristics between WHITES and ASIANS, three between WHITES and HISPANICS, and 5 between WHITES and BLACKS. The results for arrogant and not-patriotic were very consistent. Non-patriotic suggests Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks are assimilating with Whites while Arrogant suggests none of these groups are assimilating with Whites. The welfare dependent characteristic suggests Hispanics are assimilating more than Blacks and more than Asians but Asians are not assimilating more than Blacks. There is very little support for Hypothesis 5: (The difference between Whites and Blacks on the propensity to stereotype all racial/ethnic groups will be greater than the difference between Whites and Hispanics on the propensity to stereotype) and no support for Hypothesis 4: The difference between Whites and Hispanics on the propensity to stereotype all racial/ethnic groups will be greater than the difference between Whites and Asians on the propensity to stereotype or Hypothesis 6: The difference between Whites and Blacks on the propensity to stereotype all racial/ethnic groups will be greater than the difference between Whites and Asians on the propensity to stereotype. Hypotheses 4-6 are all rejected.
DISCUSSION

Based strictly on counting the number of significant t-test results, Hypotheses 1, 2, and 5 were supported by the t-tests. These are Hypothesis 1: The difference between Whites and Hispanics on the propensity to stereotype all racial/ethnic groups will be greater than the difference between Whites and Asians on the propensity to stereotype; Hypothesis 2: The difference between Whites and Blacks on the propensity to stereotype all racial/ethnic groups will be greater than the difference between Whites and Hispanics on the propensity to stereotype; and Hypothesis 5: The differences in racial/ethnic characteristics between Whites and Blacks will be greater than the difference in racial/ethnic characteristics between Whites and Asians.

The hypotheses tested Yancey’s (2003) assimilation theory which states that as a subordinate group assimilates with the dominant group they take on the dominant group’s beliefs and values, including the propensity to stereotype. Results here support Asians taking on Whites propensity to stereotype. Yet Hispanics are also supposed to be assimilating with Whites and clearly they are not taking on Whites' propensity to stereotype. In contrast, the comparisons on racial characteristics suggest that White, Asian, Hispanic, and Black respondents think that Hispanics have less variation from Whites in racial characteristics than Asians or Blacks do. This result is further complicated by the consistent results for the non-patriotic and arrogant stereotypes. Comparing the variation for the propensity to stereotype in Tables 1-3 to the consistency of racial characteristics in Tables 4-6 supports Allport’s theory on racism which included that racial stereotypes do not reflect reality.

Looking closer at Tables 4-6 it can be seen that the significant findings per
respondent group add up like so: Whites 5, Asians 1, Hispanics 4, Blacks 3. The only significant finding for Asian respondents was where Asians were less welfare dependent than Whites. It seems strange that Asians appear to lack any variation from Whites in Tables 1-3 (suggesting they share Whites’ propensity to stereotype) and also lack any variation in their propensity to stereotype the racial groups Whites, Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks where as White respondents had the most significant differences.

If Asians really are taking on Whites’ propensity to stereotype then why isn’t this reflected in Tables 4-6 as well as in Tables 1-3? Perhaps this was due to the small samples in the Asian categories. Referring back to the welfare dependent stereotype means in Bobo and Zubrinski (1996,) the welfare dependent stereotype means for Asians were Whites – 2.72, Asians – 2.89, Hispanics – 4.47, and Blacks – 4.84, which varied more than the LSAF\(^4\) findings: Whites – 2.38, Asians – 1.60, Hispanics – 3.00, and Blacks – 3.03. That’s a range of more than 2 points compared to less than 1.5 points on the 1-7 point scale used in both surveys. It’s not clear that such a variation is meaningful to explaining the strange contrast in Asians’ propensity to stereotype. Bobo and Zubrinski used the 1992 Los Angeles County Social Survey, which had a similar sample size of Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks. This survey was localized to Los Angeles County and was a very diverse county making it useful for this type of study. Perhaps the difference in variation is due to the LSAF being a national survey. Perhaps the LSAF reached Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks in areas where racial stereotypes were less important. Another difference was in the survey questionnaire. The LSAF used a random approach where one racial group was picked at random per question and each

\(^4\) The 1999 Lily Survey of American Friendship.
participant was asked each racial question only once. The 1992 Los Angeles County Social Survey asked each respondent each racial question about each target racial group. That’s four questions per stereotype compared to LSAF’s one question per stereotype. Perhaps the random racial approach removed some of the racial bias from the survey and the results reflect that. However it may also be that the 1992 Los Angeles County Social Survey had larger samples per racial category to work with than the LSAF was able to provide. The sample size difference helps explain the lack of significant findings for Asians but I think the different questionnaire designs explain the difference in means for Asians between the two surveys. Perhaps the only way to know for certain will be conduct a larger survey with the random racial approach.

Yancey’s (2003) prediction of a Black/non-Black United States also suggests that Blacks’ propensity to stereotype should vary more from Whites’ than either Asians’ or Hispanics’. Yet the results show that Blacks’ propensity to stereotype did not vary from Whites’ much more than Asians’ propensity to stereotype. According to Warren and Twine (1997) and Yancey, early European immigrant groups tended to express a stronger belief in racial stereotypes about Blacks in order to differentiate themselves from Blacks and to make it easier for them to integrate with Whites. This would be an exaggeration of the stereotypes expressed by Whites. Yancey says a similar process is occurring today. In this case, It is Asians and Hispanics who are differentiating themselves from Blacks so as to integrate better with Whites. Perhaps this explains why Hispanics’ propensity to stereotype varies so much from that of Whites.

But does the phenomenon of differentiating one’s racial group from Blacks help describe the lack of variation between Whites’ and Blacks’ propensity to stereotype?
Only if we can say that Blacks have no reason to exaggerate racial stereotypes about Asians or Hispanics in order to integrate better with Whites. If Blacks are the group that Asians and Hispanics are attempting to distance themselves from, that Whites desire the most social distance from (Bobo and Zubrinski 1996, Yancey 2003) what would it accomplish for Blacks to distance themselves from Asians or Hispanics? This logic suggests that if Asians are well along the assimilation process then they have little need to exaggerate racial stereotypes. At the same time, Hispanics may be in the assimilation process but are not as far along and so may be exaggerating racial stereotypes to help the process along. This is not to say that Blacks have no reason to stereotype or that Blacks lack prejudice toward out-groups. If that were the case then results would show Blacks with very low means and this was not the case with the LSAF or in Bobo and Zubrinski. This logic still fails to explain the lack of significant findings in Asian participants propensity to stereotype Whites, Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks. Perhaps the lack of significant findings in Table 1 comparing Whites’ and Asians’ propensity stereotype is only because Asians have little tendency to exaggerate stereotypes. Thus it may be that the results in Table 1 do not reflect assimilation directly but their group position (as per Blumer’s 1958 sense of group position theory.) This concept is supported by the results in Table 4 showing Whites and Asians believe Asians are less welfare dependent than Whites, reflecting a high group position in United States society. These results may also reflect Portes and Zhou’s (1993) segmented assimilation theory. However that would mean that most of the Asian respondents came from tightly-knit support groups where they would have little need to take on Whites’ values and beliefs and their propensity to stereotype. Segmented assimilation suggests that children of
immigrant families tend to either acculturate American perceptions – either assimilating with Whites or with a disadvantaged subordinate group, or they take a third option where they either create their own support group or a fortunate enough to find such a group that accepts them as one of their own. Perhaps Asians benefit from a similar experience in this third option and in so avoid acculturating racial stereotypes. This concept might also be supported by Table 4 where Asian and White respondents believed that Asians were less welfare dependent than Whites.

The consistent findings among racial characteristics in Tables 4-6 for the arrogant and patriotic stereotypes might suggest that racial perceptions remain strong despite assimilation patterns. Yet while Asian participants’ results on the arrogant stereotype were consistent they were also not significant while the ones for White, Hispanic, and Black respondents were. While the results suggest that Hypothesis 5 was not rejected it should be questioned as to whether it supports racial assimilation. Rather the number of significant findings for Hispanic respondents’ propensity to stereotype Whites, Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks was more like those of Whites that either Asians or Blacks were. This observation supports the concept above that Hispanics may be exaggerating racial stereotypes.
LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The 1999 Lilly Survey of American Friendships (LSAF) was a national sample and is representative of the U. S. population. The individual t-tests broke down the sample into categories that were often too small to make generalizations. The 4-5 t-tests per hypothesis would normally require a Bonferroni adjustment to account for an increased chance of a Type I error. Since the hypotheses were looking for similarities and not differences, a Bonferroni adjustment would increase the chance of a Type II error. Thus I did not use the Bonferroni adjustment. This choice may also be an error. The propensity to stereotype may be more thoroughly acculturated throughout American society than this study assumed. If so then a difference in the propensity to stereotype should fail to find major similarities by racial or ethnic groups. The study that inspired this research (Bobo and Zubrinski 1996) linked racial stereotypes with other factors relating to racism and prejudice rather than comparing the stereotypes directly. The small category sizes in the LSAF have the same limitation for future studies using the LSAF when categorizing the variables as done here.

Using only three racial stereotypes might also be a limit to this study. The stereotypes were unique and therefore would not work well in an index or scale. An index provides a more valid and reliable comparison. It is unclear whether the uniqueness of the stereotypes added to the chance of finding significant differences or took away from it. Individuals in American society definitely link some racial stereotypes with specific groups. Here, arrogance strongly describes Whites. In Bobo and Zubrinski (1996) and in Johnson, Farrell, and Guinn (1997,) individuals tended to relate the racial stereotype hard to get along to Asians. In both studies, individuals linked welfare
dependency consistently to Blacks. There was a similar pattern linking welfare
dependency to Hispanics. The results from the LSAF\textsuperscript{5} were mixed with White and
Hispanic respondents believing Blacks were more welfare dependent than Whites while
Asian and Black respondents did not share this belief. The consistency with the racial
characteristics on the patriotic and arrogant stereotypes in Tables 4-6 made it difficult to
see any support for racial assimilation or support for Asians, Hispanic, or Blacks to be
taking on Whites' propensity to stereotype.

The randomized approach used in the LSAF means that each participant in the
survey answered the stereotype question about only racial/ethnic group. There is no
variable with a second target racial group to run correlations on (as in a correlation
between Whites propensity to stereotype Asians and Blacks). It is still possible to run
correlations with other variables. While correlations used as such would add to this
approach, correlations between respondents by race would still run into the same
problem because the cases studied are in the same variable. The racial stereotypes in
the LSAF were designed to account for biases. That is, when an individual answers the
first question about a racial group, their response may influence answers for the same
question about a second or third racial group. Thus the randomized approach means
that the stereotype questions have more validity.

Assimilation is an on-going process. Studying assimilation means repeated
research to confirm predictions or discover processes that don't fit prior theory. The
same goes for the group position and group threat perspective. While the group position
and group threat perspective provides an alternative explanation to standard

\textsuperscript{5} 1999 Lilly Survey of American Friendships.
assimilation, the fact that some groups are assimilating into the dominant group means that group dynamics change as well (Bonilla-Silva 2004, Portes and Zhou 1993, and Yancey 2003).\(^6\) Finally, this study did not account for immigration. It may be that a large portion of the Asian or Hispanic sample was foreign-born rather than native-born, something that a future study can look into. Perhaps accounting for foreign-born Americans may help to explain Hispanics' higher tendency to stereotype. This too is questionable because the same phenomenon did not occur with Asians. Perhaps it is better explained by the acculturation effect found by Warren and Twine (1997). They refer to Irish Americans and a group of Chinese Americans in Mississippi to show that race is not a fixed concept. Both immigrant groups tended to exaggerate Black stereotypes in order to distance themselves from Blacks and ingratitude themselves with Whites. Perhaps the results of this study show this phenomenon in two different stages. Since Asians are rapidly assimilating with Whites they may not feel as much pressure to exaggerate racial stereotypes. Hispanics are also assimilating but not as quickly. Perhaps they feel more pressure to distance themselves from Blacks and therefore exaggerate racial stereotypes much like the Irish and the Mississippi Chinese did.

Finally, there is the lack of significant findings for Asians in Tables 4-6. If Asians are assimilating with Whites and taking on Whites propensity to stereotype, as Tables 1-3 appear to suggest, then logically Asians would have a similar tendency to stereotype Hispanics and Blacks in the same way that Whites do. At the same time I expected Asian and White participants to perceive Asians and Whites with the same racial

\(^6\) See Alba and Nee 1997 for a thorough review on assimilation theory. See Pratto et al. 1994 on comparing the group position and group threat perspective with racial assimilation.
stereotype ratings yet this was not true for welfare dependence in Table 4. Perhaps foreign-born Americans can account for the odd lack of variation here as well.

For future research I recommend a more in-depth study of Asian and Hispanic subgroups on how they perceive racial groups in the United States. I also recommend a follow-up to Waters (1990) study on European Whites such that today it includes Asian and Hispanic Whites. Such a study should also include Asian and Hispanic Blacks. Perhaps such a study should also attempt to capture White Hispanics (as in individuals who often feel they are mistaken for White when they consider themselves Hispanics or Latino.) This logic comes from the fact that the census did include Hispanic or Latino in the race category but in the ethnic category, suggesting that this phenomenon is more prevalent among Hispanics than among Asians or Blacks. Future research comparing both the propensity to stereotype out-groups, and the racial characteristics that Americans perceive represent an out-group, will need either a larger sample size or it will need to use the older questionnaire style where each racial question is repeated for each racial group studied. As an alternative to the bias-free approach used in the LSAF the researcher might try a random arrangement of 2-3 racial groups. Thus fewer questions are asked. This approach may also show a contrast in the bias effect. Perhaps bias would be less evident when respondents are asked about Whites and Asians or about Hispanics and Blacks or about Asians and Blacks as compared to when they are asked about Whites and Blacks.


