Putting Stereotype Content in Context: Image Theory and Interethnic Stereotypes

Michele G. Alexander
University of Maine

Marilynn B. Brewer
The Ohio State University

Robert W. Livingston
University of Wisconsin–Madison

Two studies apply intergroup image theory to better understand divergent interethnic images and to highlight the important role of intergroup context and perceived intergroup relations in shaping the content of social stereotypes. Image theory hypothesizes that specific interethnic stereotypes arise from specific patterns of perceived intergroup competition, relative power, and relative cultural status. Results from surveying Black, White, and Native Americans' appraisals of intergroup relations and reported outgroup stereotypes in various intergroup contexts suggest that the content of outgroup stereotypes varies systematically as a function of the perceived state of intergroup relations and the intergroup context in which these groups are situated. The data reported from both studies establish the importance of examining social stereotypes from a functional perspective in the context of intergroup relations.

Keywords: *intergroup relations; racial stereotypes; racial attitudes; image theory; intergroup power; intergroup status*

The study of ethnic stereotypes has a long history in the field of social psychology, as social psychologists have spent a good deal of research effort in assessing the content of intergroup stereotypes (Brigham, 1993; Judd, Park, Ryan, Brauer, & Kraus, 1995; Katz & Braly, 1935), changes in content over the course of time (Devine & Elliot, 1995; Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998), the social cognitive processes involved in stereotyping (Hamilton & Trolier, 1986; Moskowitz, 2001), and most recently, the functions that stereotypes serve for both individuals and groups (Alexander, Brewer, & Herrmann, 1999; Glick & Fiske, 2001; Jost & Major, 2001).

Although research on stereotyping in the past 20 years has been dominated by the study of the role of existing social stereotypes in processing information about individuals and groups, there has been renewed attention recently to questions related to the content of stereotypes themselves, specifically, the social and psychological factors that determine the substance of shared beliefs that individuals hold about specific social groups. Recent theories about stereotype content encompass both social structural and functional approaches (e.g., Eagly & Steffen, 1984; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002; Jost & Banaji, 1994; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). These different approaches to studying the origin of stereotype content converge on at least one point: that the content of social stereotypes is shaped by the nature of the intergroup context in which they are formed.

The model of stereotype content proposed by Fiske et al. (2002) provides one example of the hypothesized relationship between social structural variables and stereotype formation. This model postulates that stereotypes vary along two primary dimensions—warmth and competence—and that stereotype content arises from the four possible combinations of warmth (high vs. low)

and competence (high vs. low) judgments. The model specifies further that two structural variables—group status and competition—will predict competence and warmth assessments, respectively, leading to the particular pattern of stereotype content that will emerge for a given social group or category. These predicted relationships were tested and confirmed across a wide range of social group stereotypes, including housewives, the elderly, Black professionals, feminists, rich people, and welfare recipients.

Image Theory of Intergroup Perceptions

The idea that stereotype content may stem from features of the social structural relationships between groups is also the basic premise of the image theory of international relations in political science (Cottam, 1977; Herrmann, 1985). Unlike traditional representations of social stereotypes as lists of traits and attributes that are believed to be characteristic of individual members of a particular social group, images are patterns or configurations of coherent beliefs about the character, intentions, motives, and emotions attributed to or associated with the outgroup as a whole. Going beyond the structural factors implicated by Fiske et al. (2002), image theory specifies *three* dimensions of intergroup relations that are critical to stereotype formation—relative status, relative power, and goal compatibility (see Alexander et al., 1999). Each dimension represents an appraisal of the specific ingroup-outgroup relationship, from the ingroup's perspective (e.g., is the particular outgroup higher or lower or equal in status *relative to* the ingroup). The distinction between status and power as different dimensions of intergroup structure is important because each has distinct implications for how the ingroup may be affected by the outgroup and what feelings and attitudes might be generated. Status differences between groups reflect how the groups (or group culture) are regarded or valued in the intergroup context at large and might be expected to influence how the outgroup affects the collective self-esteem of the ingroup. Power differences, on the other hand, refer to inequalities in political, economic, and military resources that can affect relevant outcomes for the ingroup. Although social status and power resources of groups are often correlated, it is possible for an ingroup to perceive a particular outgroup as lower in social status but with high power to affect the ingroup.

Image theory is both structural and functional in that it explains both the origins of divergent outgroup stereotypes and the utilitarian purposes different outgroup stereotypes serve. According to intergroup image theory, the origin of outgroup stereotypes is located in the structure of intergroup relations and the emotional (e.g., threat or security) and behavioral orientations that evaluations of the ingroup's position relative to the outgroup engender. Appraisals of the nature of the relationship between the ingroup and outgroup give rise to specific outgroup images that justify treating outgroup members in a particular way. Thus, stereotypes both *reflect* the nature of the structural relationships between groups and serve to *justify* intergroup attitudes and behavior.

Image theorists have identified five generic images of the outgroup that are the ones most likely to arise from different configurations of the intergroup appraisals of relative status, power, and goal compatibility (Herrmann & Fischerkeller, 1995). Using terminology derived from the international arena, these are the ally, enemy, barbarian, dependent, and imperialist images. The theory also specifies the conditions under which these specific images are expected to emerge. An intergroup relationship characterized by goal compatibility, equal power or capability, and equal cultural status generates a nonthreatening appraisal and a behavioral inclination to cooperate with the outgroup. The resulting *ally image* includes perceiving the outgroup with primarily positive attributes such as cooperative, trustworthy, and democratic. This ally image serves to facilitate cooperative treatment of the outgroup.

The remaining images are negative and stem from intergroup relations with incompatible goals. The *enemy image* is the mirror image of the ally and arises when the intergroup relationship is characterized by intense competition between two groups that are similar in power or strength and in cultural status. This relationship appraisal pattern results in perceived threat and a behavioral inclination to deal with the threat by attacking or containing the outgroup. The enemy stereotype portrays the outgroup as hostile, manipulative, opportunistic, and untrustworthy and operates to resolve the tension between the desire to attack the outgroup and the ingroup's moral constraints against attack, ultimately serving to justify the attack response.

Both the ally and the enemy image arise from perceptions that the ingroup and outgroup are equal in status and power. Other images emerge from intergroup situations characterized by unequal status and power. When the ingroup perceives itself with superior cultural status than the outgroup but vastly weaker than the outgroup on the power dimension, the outgroup is a highly threatening potential invader. The appraisal of an outgroup as strong but culturally inferior gives rise to the *barbarian image*, which justifies insulating the ingroup from the outgroup by depicting the outgroup as violent, ruthless, irrational, and wantonly destructive.

When an ingroup sees itself as having higher cultural status and more power or strength than the outgroup, the ingroup is left with an opportunity to eliminate the

goal incompatibility between the groups by exploiting the outgroup in its favor. Because exploitation is not morally correct, the tension between this behavioral preference and the moral constraint against it is balanced by developing a cognitive representation of the outgroup as lazy, lacking discipline, naïve, incompetent, and vulnerable. This *dependent image* justifies exploiting the outgroup in the guise of helping them or protecting them from themselves.

A complement to the dependent image is the *imperialist image*, generated when the ingroup perceives itself as weaker and lower in cultural status and sophistication than a threatening outgroup. Rather than directly attacking the outgroup to deal with the goal incompatibility (not a viable option given the outgroup's strength), the ingroup responds with indirect resistance, sabotage, and acts of revolt or rebellion. Here, the outgroup is seen as arrogant, paternalistic, controlling, and exploitative and includes the belief that some of one's own ingroup members have sold out to the outgroup and have allowed themselves to be used as pawns of the imperialists.

A summary of the structural and functional correspondents of specific outgroup images derived from image theory concepts is provided in Table 1.

Although image theory was originally developed to account for variations in national stereotypes in the context of international relations, Alexander et al. (1999) proposed that the basic elements of the theory provided the basis for a more general theory of intergroup perceptions. Support for the theory was obtained from a series of three laboratory experiments that examined the effects of intergroup relationship appraisals on outgroup images and behavioral preferences using a variety of intergroup scenarios (Alexander et al., 1999). Consistent with image theory predictions, systematically varying the structure of the intergroup relations (i.e., manipulating information about goal compatibility, power, and status) led participants in all three experiments to endorse action tendencies and outgroup images corresponding to the manipulated appraisal patterns. Importantly, the nature of the intergroup appraisals led to specific, distinct cognitive representations of the outgroup and clearly differentiated the negative images groups have of each other. The findings from these laboratory studies suggest that image theory is a general model of intergroup perceptions that can be applied to all intergroup contexts to better understand intergroup stereotypes.

Mutual Stereotypes

Image theory provides insights about the mutual images that two groups in a particular intergroup context are likely to hold of each other. Outside of interna-

TABLE 1: Image Theory Predictions of Behavioral Orientations and Outgroup Images Resulting From Perceived Intergroup Relations

Relationship Pattern	Behavioral Orientation	Outgroup Image

Goal compatibility
  Status equal
  Power equal
	Cooperation	Ally

Goal incompatibility
  Status equal
  Power equal
	Containment or attack	Enemy

Goal incompatibility
  Outgroup status lower
  Outgroup power higher
	Defensive protection	Barbarian

Goal incompatibility
 	
  Outgroup status lower
  Outgroup power lower
	Exploitation or paternalism	Dependent

Goal incompatibility
  Outgroup status higher
  Outgroup power higher
	Resistance or rebellion	Imperialist

tional perceptions, most social psychological research on stereotypes—and ethnic stereotypes in particular—has been largely one-sided. That is, stereotypes have been assessed primarily from the perspective of dominant, majority group members vis-à-vis minority groups (e.g., ethnic minorities, gays, welfare recipients). Recently, however, there has been a growing interest in the study of mutual perceptions of majority and minority groups, most specifically, of Whites and Blacks in the United States.

Investigations of the content of mutual interethnic stereotypes, particularly of stereotypic perceptions between White and African Americans, reveal a mixed pattern of findings regarding the mutual images the groups have of each other. For example, Judd et al. (1995) found a divergent pattern of stereotype endorsement and ethnocentric bias for African Americans and Caucasians such that African American college students from the University of Colorado and African American youth from the Cincinnati area endorsed more negative outgroup stereotypes and more ethnocentrism than did young White Americans from these areas (Studies 1, 2, and 3). Adult residents from Cincinnati, however, manifested the typical pattern of intergroup stereotyping and ethnocentrism, with both African American and White adults endorsing outgroup stereotypes and ethnocentrism to a similar extent (Study 3).

The findings from the Judd et al. (1995) studies have been interpreted as indicating that Whites' attitudes and stereotypes toward African Americans have grown more favorable across generations and that socialization differences between the two racial groups account for the

divergence in perspectives among younger respondents. However, subsequent studies of college students' stereotype content of Blacks and Whites suggest a very different pattern than that obtained by Judd et al.

Using open-ended essays to assess themes spontaneously expressed in reporting outgroup attitudes and stereotypes, Monteith and Spicer (2000) found mutual, negative stereotypes on the part of both Black and White college undergraduates. In contrast to Judd et al.'s (1995) findings, Monteith and Spicer indicate that both groups express similar positive attitudinal themes but diverge in the types of negative themes held about each group. For example, Whites are more likely to endorse Black stereotypes relevant to modern racism, such as violent and criminal, whereas Blacks are more likely to endorse discriminatory and distrustful stereotypes of Whites.

Variations in the intergroup context experiences of the different participant samples tested in these two studies (i.e., Judd et al., 1995; Monteith & Spicer, 2000) may account for the different patterns of outgroup stereotypes reported by Blacks and Whites. Highlighting the potentially important relationship between intergroup context variables and interethnic attitudes, Stephan and his colleagues (2002) recently demonstrated that perceptions of the intergroup context by Blacks and Whites, particularly threat perceptions, have a significant influence in predicting the groups' mutual negative, affective attitudes. As a test of integrated threat theory (Stephan & Stephan, 2000), Stephan et al. (2002) assessed the affective intergroup attitudes expressed by several samples of White and Black college students as a function of potential underlying intergroup context variables that were presumed to lead to such attitudes. For both Blacks and Whites, perceived intergroup threat and anxiety were shown to directly affect specific negative racial attitudes and to mediate the effects of participants' perceived intergroup conflict, history of negative contact between the two groups, and ingroup identification. Although their emphasis was on predicting affective intergroup attitudes and not intergroup stereotypes per se, the role of perceived intergroup relations studied by Stephan et al. is consistent with an image theory approach to the prediction of mutual stereotypes.

From an image theory perspective, the content of the mutual stereotypes any two groups will have of each other will depend on the structural features of the intergroup context within which they interact and the ingroup perspective from which those features are viewed. If both groups perceive the nature of the intergroup relations in the same way, then their mutual images of each other will be complementary, either symmetric (e.g., mutual enemy images) or asymmetric (e.g., imperialist and dependent images), depending on rela-

tive status and power. However, if the groups view the nature of their goals, relative status, and relative power differently, their images will be similarly divergent. Variations both within and between groups in the content of images of each other should be accounted for by variations in perceptions of the prevailing intergroup context.

Historically, the status and power relationship between Whites and Blacks in the United States has been one in which there was general consensus that Whites held the advantaged position over Blacks on both dimensions. To the extent that Whites still perceive that Black Americans are lower in power, resources, and cultural status than White Americans, the primary tendency should be to exploit or paternalize Black Americans and to see Blacks as a dependent outgroup. From this appraisal, Blacks should be perceived as childlike and ineffective, but not threatening to Whites' interests. This dependent image of Blacks reflects the content of traditional or old-fashioned racism, or paternalistic racism. As time has passed, the traditional power and dominance hierarchy between Blacks and Whites in the United States and the relative positions of Blacks and Whites has been challenged, with concomitant changes in the structure of intergroup relations. If these changes have altered Whites' appraisals of their relative power, cultural status, or goal relations with respect to Blacks, there should be corresponding changes in stereotype content.

If Whites believe that greater equality in power and cultural status between Blacks and Whites represents cooperative efforts on the parts of both groups to achieve an egalitarian society, the dependent image of Blacks should be replaced with the ally image. However, if Whites believe that Blacks remain culturally inferior but are gaining in power, threat appraisals may result and the dependent image may be replaced by the barbarian image. A perception of increasing Black power may explain a shift from the old-fashioned stereotypes of Blacks to the current hostile images of Blacks (particularly militant Blacks) held by modern racists (McConahay, 1986). Across generations and contexts, Whites' images of Blacks may vary between the dependent and barbaric images, depending on perceived threat. Thus, if Whites perceive Blacks as highly threatening (i.e., having incompatible goals and growing power), the barbarian image should be generated, with an inclination toward self-protection and insulation from Blacks. If Whites perceive Blacks as nonthreatening (low in power and status with little goal incompatibility), the inclination to exploit or dominate Blacks will be evident and result in the dependent image.

Blacks' historical images of Whites, on the other hand, are based on perceived superiority in both social

status and power. If Blacks perceive the intergroup context in terms of White dominance and status advantage, the complement to the dependent image by Whites of Blacks should be reflected in an imperialist image of Whites by Blacks. If structural relationships are not perceived as complementary but rather in flux, perceived ingroup gains in the relative power and status of Blacks should move Blacks' perceptions of Whites toward the ally or the enemy image, depending on assessments of goal compatibility or incompatibility.

Thus, image theory provides a framework for predicting the nature of mutual stereotypes between two ethnic groups and changes in the content of those stereotypes across context and over time. Equally important, image theory provides a conceptual structure for designing measures of intergroup stereotypes that are comparable across groups and across contexts. Previous research attempting to compare the level of stereotyping between groups has suffered from noncomparability of the specific stereotype content being endorsed. For example, Judd et al. (1995, Study 1) were comparing the strength of Whites' endorsement of African American stereotypic traits such as "outgoing," "athletic," "hostile," and "intimidating" with Blacks' endorsement of White stereotypic traits such as "affluent," "intelligent," "partyers," and "self-centered." Although these different trait sets contain both positive and negative attributes, the specific trait content varies on many dimensions that may influence their base level of endorsement. With such different content, comparing the strength of stereotyping across groups is questionable. By contrast, image theory can be used to generate a set of generic images (stereotype beliefs), the level of endorsement of which can be directly compared across groups.

The goal of the present research was to extend image theory by applying the theory to understand the specific beliefs and stereotypes that majority and minority ethnic groups have of each other in the United States, in the context of perceived intergroup relations that are responsible for generating such beliefs. We were particularly interested in whether concepts drawn from image theory can shed light on findings from previous research indicating the divergent stereotypes between the two groups (Judd et al., 1995; Monteith & Spicer, 2000; Stephan et al., 2002). We also wanted to determine whether divergent perceptions reflect complementary images derived from the same perceptions of power and status asymmetries between minorities and majorities, or whether the various images that ethnic groups have of each other stem from different assessments of the structure of intergroup relationships. For this purpose, a survey questionnaire was developed to assess respondents' perceptions of interethnic relations and their images of the ingroup and outgroup. In the two studies reported here, the survey was conducted among high school and college-aged youth in three different intergroup settings.

STUDY 1

The first study focused on mutual images of Blacks and Whites among high school students in two different interracial settings. Three samples of juniors and seniors from Ohio public high schools were included in the survey study. The samples were (a) Whites from an all-White rural high school, (b) Whites from an urban, mixed-race high school where Whites are in the minority, and (c) Blacks from the same urban, mixed-race high school environment, where Blacks are in the majority. Including samples from these two very different high school settings provided an opportunity to assess whether appraisal of the nature of Black-White relationships on the part of White students varies as a function of the immediate intergroup context.

The rural public high school studied here is traditionally and currently composed of an all-White student population and is located in a very small town with a strong history of anti-Black attitudes, racial curfews, and an all-White country club. Given the high school's location, and the history of old-fashioned racist ideology expressed in the local town, students could be expected to perceive incompatible goals between Blacks and Whites, greater relative power on the part of Whites, and lower status on the part of Blacks, an appraisal pattern that would lead to the dependent image of Blacks. On the other hand, the absence of any direct threat from Blacks in the immediate environment, and the general educational climate promoting egalitarian values, could mitigate perceptions of incompatible goals or status and power differentials between groups and lead to more benign images of the outgroup, closer to the ally image than to any strong negative images (similar to the findings for White youth reported by Judd et al., 1995).

The racially mixed urban high school, located in an impoverished area in the downtown of a large city in Ohio, is predominantly African American (70%), with relatively few White American students (20%). Within this urban context, Whites are still generally perceived as having higher status than Blacks, but the fact that Blacks are in the majority could be expected to alter perceptions of relative power between the two groups and a general perception that the groups are in a competitive relationship. Given this competitive intergroup environment of the mixed-race urban high school, the image of Whites by Blacks should also be dependent on their perceptions of the relative status and power differentials between the two groups.

METHOD

Participants

As mentioned previously, three samples of participants were surveyed to assess intergroup perceptions in these two contexts. Sample 1 consisted of 122 Caucasian male and female junior and senior high school students attending a public, racially homogeneous, rural high school. Participants in this sample completed the race relations survey in the high school library during specified survey hours with a Caucasian researcher present at all times. Sample 2 consisted of 72 male and female Caucasian high school students attending a public, urban high school in Ohio, and Sample 3 consisted of 129 male and female African American students attending the same public high school. Students in Samples 2 and 3 completed the race relations survey in the school cafeteria in a single session with both a Caucasian and an African American researcher present. Participants ranged in age from 16 to 18, and all respondents received a $10 compensation for completing the survey.[1]

Materials

The survey instrument included items to assess students' appraisals of current relations between Blacks and Whites in the United States and the images they hold of each other. The identical survey was administered to all students and contained the same questions about both Blacks and Whites to allow for intergroup comparisons to be made within and between groups.

Perceptions of Black-White Relations

One section of the survey questionnaire contained questions about perceived goal compatibility, relative power, and relative societal status between Whites and Blacks in the United States. In completing this section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to report their perceptions of current relationships between the groups in the nation at large.

Perceptions of goal compatibility were assessed with three multiple-choice items. On one item, respondents were asked to indicate what they thought would be the consequence of improving the position of Blacks in our society, with three response options: (1) If Blacks get ahead it will hurt White people, (2) if Blacks get ahead it will not harm Whites, or (3) if Blacks get ahead, it will help both Blacks and Whites. The remaining two items asked about the effects of affirmative action policies and of civil rights, with similar response options ranging from incompatibility of outcomes to compatibility. Responses to these three items were averaged to create a single index of perceived goal compatibility, ranging from 1 (high incompatibility) to 3 (high compatibility).

Perceptions of differential power were assessed with two items on which participants indicated, on a 5-point scale, their evaluation of the degree of relative political and economic power held by Whites vis-à-vis Blacks. Specifically, relative political power was measured on a scale from (1) Blacks have much more political power than Whites, (2) Blacks have somewhat more political power than Whites, (3) Whites and Blacks are equal in political power, (4) Whites have somewhat more political power than Blacks, to (5) Whites have much more political power than Blacks. Relative wealth and economic power was measured on a similar scale from (1) Blacks have much more control over the wealth and economic system in this country than do Whites, to (5) Whites have much more control over the wealth and economic system in this country than do Blacks. Responses on these two items were averaged to form a perceived power score ranging from 1 (Blacks have much more power) to 5 (Whites have much more power).

Similar to power appraisals, perceived relative status was assessed with two items comparing Whites and Blacks in general social status (1 = Blacks have much higher status than Whites to 5 = Whites have much higher status than Blacks) and cultural superiority (1 = Black culture is regarded as far superior to the White culture to 5 = White culture is regarded as far superior to the Black culture). The average of these two items resulted in a scale ranging from 1 (Blacks have higher societal status) to 5 (Whites have higher societal status).

Images (Stereotypes)

Ingroup and outgroup images were assessed by endorsement of statements on 7-point Likert-type scales (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*), with statements written to reflect different component aspects specific to each of the five images (i.e., ally, enemy, barbarian, dependent, and imperialist). Image components were generated from theory based on the study of intergroup stereotypes in the international arena (Herrmann & Fischerkeller, 1995). Results from previous experiments conducted by Alexander et al. (1999) confirmed that specific beliefs associated with the ally, enemy, barbarian, and dependent images made up distinct clusters of intergroup perceptions. Items developed by Alexander et al. to tap these four images were adapted for use in the present survey. In addition, a further set of items was developed to reflect the imperialist image (Herrmann & Fischerkeller, 1995), which was expected to be relevant in the context of Black-White relations.

Five statements were generated for each of the five images, representing differences among the images in terms of perceived typical behaviors, motivations, intentions, decision-making strategies, and leadership characteristics of the target group (see the appendix for survey

items associated with each of the five images). Each of the 25 image statements (along with some filler items, for a total of 40 items) was included on the survey twice to assess respondents' images of both Black and White targets, respectively. The 80 items (intermixing Black and White target statements) were ordered randomly in the stereotype section of the questionnaire.

RESULTS

Perceptions of Black-White Relations

Responses to the questionnaire items regarding perceived goal compatibility, status, and power differentials are summarized for each of the three samples in Table 2. Main effects for sample were found for goals, $F(2, 319) = 5.19$, $p < .01$, and for relative power, $F(2, 320) = 14.93$, $p < .001$. There were no significant differences among samples in perception of relative status (overall mean = 3.53, indicating a general consensus that Whites have somewhat higher societal status than Blacks).

Responses on these context variables were further broken down into two orthogonal contrasts: ethnic group (combined Whites vs. Blacks) and Whites between the two high schools (rural vs. urban). Main effects for ethnic group revealed significant overall differences in perceptions between Whites and Blacks, with Blacks reporting greater perceived power differential ($M = 4.22$) than Whites ($M = 3.84$), $F(1, 321) = 29.96$, $p < .001$, and lower goal compatibility ($M = 2.10$ vs. 2.21), $F(1, 321) = 3.92$, $p = .05$.

Although Whites overall perceived more goal compatibility between races than the Black sample, the two White subgroups differed significantly on this variable. As can be seen in Table 2, White students attending the integrated urban high school reported lower goal compatibility (mean value equivalent to that of Blacks) than White students from the rural high school, $F(1, 194) = 5.65$, $p = .01$. Thus, immediate intergroup context made a difference in Whites' evaluations on this crucial dimension of perceived intergroup relations.

Images (Stereotypes)

Responses to the five statements for each of the five images for each target group were first averaged to create a mean image composite score ($\alpha = .75, .78, .79, .40, .63$, for ally, enemy, barbarian, dependent, and imperialist outgroup images, respectively). Intercorrelations among outgroup images (across all three samples) revealed that ratings of the outgroup on the enemy image and the barbarian image were highly correlated ($r = .72$). Although the distinction between the enemy and barbarian images had proved to be meaningful in international contexts (Hermann & Fischerkeller, 1995) and in our previous experimental situations (Alexander

TABLE 2: Mean Intergroup Perceptions by Sample, Study 1

Relationship Dimension	M	SD
Rural sample respondents: White ($n = 122$)		
Relative status[a]	3.62	0.49
Relative power[a]	3.83	0.50
Goal compatibility[b]	2.28	0.50
Urban sample respondents: White ($n = 72$)		
Relative status	3.42	0.83
Relative power	3.84	0.72
Goal compatibility	2.09	0.51
Urban sample respondents: Black ($n = 129$)		
Relative status	3.50	0.73
Relative power	4.22	0.65
Goal compatibility	2.10	0.43

a. Higher scores indicate higher status and power of Whites relative to Blacks (1-5 scale).
b. Higher scores indicate higher perceived compatibility (1-3 scale.)

et al., 1999), in the context of majority-minority relations within a society, these have proved to be operationally and empirically difficult to differentiate. For this reason, the items from these two image clusters were combined and averaged to form a single barbarian-enemy image for purposes of further analyses. Correlations among this and the other two negative images were low to moderate ($r = .47-.53$).

The means of each image score for Blacks and Whites within each of the three samples are presented in Table 3. The three-way ANOVA conducted on these image scores yielded a significant Sample × Image × Target interaction, $F(6, 960) = 22.27$, $p < .0001$. This interaction reflected general ingroup biases in image ratings, with each group rating the ingroup higher than the outgroup on the ally image and giving lower endorsements for the ingroup than the outgroup on most of the negative images.

Looking at each sample's image ratings of the outgroup only, the Sample × Image interaction was also significant, $F(6, 960) = 18.95$, $p < .001$, indicating that groups differed in the pattern of images that they endorsed for the respective outgroup. This interaction was further analyzed by ethnicity and high school.

First, an ANOVA comparing the Black sample with the combined White samples revealed a significant Ethnicity × Image interaction, $F(3, 963) = 21.41$, $p < .001$. Breaking this down into simple effects revealed that Blacks rated Whites lower on the ally image than Whites rated Blacks, $F(1, 321) = 5.58$, $p = .01$. Furthermore, Blacks rated Whites higher on both the barbarian-enemy and the imperialist image than Whites rated Blacks, $F(1, 321) = 7.37$, $p < .01$, and $F(1, 321) = 82.73$, $p < .001$, respectively. There were no differences between groups in outgroup ratings on the dependent image.

Although (consistent with Judd et al., 1999) Whites overall showed less negative imagery of Blacks on aver-

TABLE 3:   Mean Image Scores by Sample, Study 1

Image Score	Black Target		White Target	
	M	SD	M	SD
Rural sample Whites (*n* = 122)				
Ally	4.09	0.95	4.19	0.84
Barbarian-enemy	3.33	1.22	3.24	0.93
Dependent	3.56	0.76	3.36	0.78
Imperialist	3.01	0.74	3.35	0.91
Urban sample Whites (*n* = 72)				
Ally	3.37	1.06	4.28	1.03
Barbarian-enemy	3.88	1.55	2.74	1.00
Dependent	3.51	1.01	2.96	0.95
Imperialist	3.30	1.01	3.02	1.16
Urban sample Blacks (*n* = 129)				
Ally	4.61	.97	3.55	0.87
Barbarian-enemy	3.37	1.07	3.92	1.06
Dependent	3.43	.85	3.76	0.84
Imperialist	2.98	0.92	4.05	0.97

NOTE: Responses are based on a 1-7 scale.

age than Blacks did of Whites, this picture changes when the two White samples are compared to each other (see Table 3). In general, the urban, mixed-race high school White students showed significantly more ingroup bias and negative outgroup imagery than did the students from the rural, segregated school (Sample × Image interaction, $F(3, 576) = 13.89, p < .001$). Whites from the urban high school rated Blacks significantly lower on the ally image than did Whites from the rural school, $F(1, 192) = 23.77, p < .001$. More important, urban Whites reported significantly higher outgroup barbarian-enemy image than did rural Whites, $F(1, 192) = 7.25, p < .01$. (There were no significant differences between the two subgroups in outgroup ratings on the dependent or imperialist image.)

In sum, the mutual images of Blacks and Whites within the integrated high school setting differed in content, with the imperialist image dominating Black students' images of Whites and the barbarian-enemy image dominating White students' images of Blacks in this setting. Furthermore, White students from the different high schools endorsed very different images of Blacks, with Whites in the rural, segregated setting endorsing the more benign (ally) image of Blacks and significantly less negative imagery.

Relationship Between Intergroup Perceptions and Outgroup Image Scores

At the group level, the nature of differences in outgroup images across the three samples corresponds to differences in mean perceptions of the prevailing intergroup situation. For the Black student sample, the strongest image of the White outgroup was the imperialist image, which is consistent with their overall percep-

tion of Whites as much higher in power, somewhat higher in status, and with incompatible goals. Our Black sample also rated the White outgroup as relatively high on the barbarian-enemy image, which is not consistent with the perceived power differential (according to image theory) but may reflect the strong sense of intergroup competition that prevails in the high school environment. Although both urban and rural Whites similarly perceived Blacks as having somewhat lower status and power than Whites, the urban sample reported significantly lower goal compatibility, which is consistent with their greater endorsement of the barbarian-enemy outgroup imagery.

To test the predictive validity of the image model at the individual level, the dominant negative outgroup image for each racial group was regressed on perceived goals, relative status, and relative power. For Whites, the multiple regression predicting the barbarian-enemy image of Blacks from these three variables was significant, $R = .36, p < .001$. Furthermore, the direction of contribution of each of the predictors to the image rating was consistent with the model (goal compatibility: β = –.28, $p < .001$; status: β = .22, $p < .01$; power: β = .05, $p < .50$), although the residual contribution of perceived relative power was not significant. Thus, it appears that for our White samples, high ratings on the barbarian-enemy image of Blacks were driven primarily by perceptions of higher ingroup status combined with low goal compatibility.

For our Black sample, the regression of the White imperialist image on individual differences in perceptions of goal compatibility, relative status, and relative power was also statistically significant, but only perceived goal incompatibility contributed significantly to the prediction (β = –.27, $p < .01$).[2] Neither perceived power differential nor status differential was significantly correlated with ratings on the imperialist image of the outgroup at the individual level of analysis. This could reflect the fact that perceptions of high relative power and status of Whites was so consensual in this sample of Black students[3] that only variations between respondents in their perceptions of intergroup competition drove variations in degree of endorsement of the imperialist image.

DISCUSSION OF STUDY 1

Altogether, the self-reports of White and Black respondents in this study reveal patterns of intergroup stereotypes partially consistent with image theory of intergroup perceptions. This was particularly true for endorsement of the barbarian-enemy image of Blacks by White respondents. Among Whites, the barbarian-enemy image of Blacks was associated with beliefs in low outgroup status and low goal compatibility, and this rela-

tionship was replicated at both the group and the individual level of analysis. However, the absence of any clear effect of power appraisals on the barbarian-enemy image is not entirely consistent with image theory predictions, particularly because White respondents generally perceived Whites as slightly higher in power than Blacks, rather than equal or lower. Among Blacks, the imperialist image of Whites was associated with perceptions of intergroup competition in a context in which there was general agreement that Whites have greater status, power, and resources than the ingroup.

Further evidence for the importance of considering the intergroup context when examining interethnic stereotypes became apparent when the two samples of White students were compared separately from the Black respondents. For Whites, the negative imagery held of Blacks varied as a function of the school context. Whites in the urban sample, who are a minority group in a racially mixed school, showed greater ingroup bias (in endorsement of the ally image) than Whites in the rural school and were also more likely to hold the barbarian-enemy image of Blacks. This difference in image of the outgroup was consistent with differences between the schools in perceptions of intergroup goal compatibility. In the rural context, the reported image of Blacks was closer to the positive ally image than to any of the more negative images postulated by the theory. This is consistent with the general educational climate promoting racial equality, given a context in which the outgroup does not pose any immediate threat.

In the urban, mixed-race high school setting, the dominant image of Whites by Black respondents was the imperialist image, whereas the dominant image of Blacks by White respondents was that of the barbarian-enemy. Thus, the predominant mutual images of Blacks and Whites in this context are not only different but discrepant, in the sense that they do not reflect complementary images. This difference stems from discrepancies in the way in which the two groups view the relative power position of the outgroup in the current intergroup environment. On average, Black respondents reported a high level of power differential in favor of Whites in the society, whereas White respondents reported perceived power as closer to equal. Thus, the data from this first study suggest that groups view the prevailing power and status structure from quite different perspectives, depending on the location of the ingroup in that structure. And this difference in perspective generates noncomplementary mutual images.

Interestingly, there was little evidence of endorsement of the dependent image of Blacks by White respondents in either of our high school samples. Overall, endorsement of the dependent items for the outgroup did not differ significantly from the level of endorse-

ment for the ingroup. In fact, the component items of the dependent image did not even conform to an internally reliable scale ($\alpha = .40$). Despite the historic power and status differentials between Blacks and Whites in the United States, the current generation of young Whites does not appear to hold corresponding images of Blacks as lazy, childlike, or ineffective.

Although the failure to find evidence for dependent imagery is consistent with the fact that our White respondents' perceptions of relative power and status differentials were not extreme, it could also be that our measure of the dependent image was inadequate to tap this particular stereotype pattern. To rule out this possibility, we sought to replicate the present survey in another majority-minority intergroup context in which the dependent image was still expected to prevail.

STUDY 2

To test image theory in a different interethnic context, we examined the mutual images of Whites and Native Americans in a survey designed to parallel our initial data collection with White and African American adolescents. Image theory would predict different perceived relationships and different intergroup images to emerge in an intergroup context between groups with a different history of relations from that of Blacks and Whites.

Historically, Whites at one time perceived Native Americans as bloodthirsty, uncultured savages who were culturally inferior and highly threatening to Whites, as represented in traditional cinematic portrayals of Natives (Merskin, 1998). As Natives lost their power in society and are no longer a strong threat to Whites, the stereotype of Natives as barbarians has been replaced with a modern-day image of Natives as uneducated, lazy, dependents (Mihesuah, 1996). Thus, we expect that the nature of current intergroup relations would foster the dependent image of the minority group (Natives) on the part of Whites, rather than the barbarian or enemy image. In this particular group context, we also expected Natives to hold the complementary image of Whites, that of the imperialist.

A slightly adapted version of the questionnaire developed for Study 1 was designed to assess Native and White Americans' perceptions of their intergroup relationship and mutual stereotypes. To ensure a knowledgeable sample with a good understanding of the history of relations between Native and Whites, we chose to study college-aged Native adults from a Native American nation in the state of Maine and college-aged White adults who attended an integrated Native-White high school in Maine, with students from this specific Native American nation. Although the sample available for this survey was relatively small in size, this setting provided a unique

opportunity to replicate and extend some of the findings from our initial study.

METHOD

Participants

Thirty-five male and female Native American young adults from a tribe located in Maine, and 24 male and female White American adults of the same age (19-23) from a town neighboring the Native American tribe completed the ethnic relations survey for a $10 compensation.

Materials

The survey instrument was a similar yet modified version of that used in Study 1 to fit the Native-White intergroup context. The instrument tapped participants' appraisals of the current relations between Natives and Whites in the United States and the images they hold of each other. All participants answered the identical survey that contained the same questions about both Natives and Whites to allow for intergroup comparisons to be made.

Perceptions of Native-White Relations

The survey contained questions about perceived goal compatibility, relative power, and relative cultural status between Whites and Natives. Items tapping goal compatibility were similar to those used in Study 1, adapted to the local context. Respondents indicated on 3-point scales the extent to which improving the position of Native Americans, affirmative action policies, and hate crime legislation (1) benefits Native Americans at the expense of Whites, (2) benefits Native Americans without harming Whites, or (3) benefits both Native Americans and Whites. Responses to these three items were averaged to generate a scale ranging from 1 (high goal incompatibility) to 3 (high goal compatibility).

Perceptions of differential power were assessed with three multiple-choice items on which participants indicated their perception of the degree of relative political power, wealth and economic power, and control over land resources held by Whites compared with Natives. By averaging responses on these three items, a power index was computed, ranging from 1 (Natives have more power) to 5 (Whites have more power).

Similar to power appraisals, perceived relative status was assessed with two 5-point scale items comparing Whites and Natives in general social status and cultural superiority. The average of these two items resulted in a scale ranging from 1(Natives have higher status) to 5 (Whites have higher status).

Images

Ingroup and outgroup images were assessed with a total of 25 statements, rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*), written to reflect component aspects specific to each of the five images (i.e., ally, enemy, barbarian, dependent, and imperialist). These questions were essentially identical to those used in the first study (see the appendix), with the target labels changed from *Black* to *Native*. Each image statement was included on the survey twice to assess respondents' images of both Native and White targets.

RESULTS

Perceptions of Native-White Relations

Intergroup relation perceptions are reported in Table 4. Natives perceived greater goal compatibility than did Whites, $F(1, 57) = 8.32$, $p < .01$, and less status difference between the groups, $F(1, 57) = 8.73$, $p < .01$, but somewhat greater power differential in favor of Whites, $F(1, 57) = 2.86$, $p < .10$.

Images

Image composite scores were calculated for each image (α = .84 ally, .66 enemy, .83 barbarian, .80 dependent, and .81 for imperialist images) for each target group. Again, the barbarian and enemy images for both groups were highly correlated and combined into a single index (α = .86). Mean image scores for Natives and Whites are presented in Table 5. The three-way Ethnicity × Image × Target repeated-measures ANOVA revealed a significant overall interaction, $F(3, 174) = 27.14$, $p < .001$. As in Study 1, both groups showed ingroup bias in rating their own ethnicity higher on the ally image.

Analyses of outgroup images indicated distinctly different patterns for the two respondent groups. Natives rated Whites significantly lower on the ally image than Whites did for Natives, $F(1, 57) = 27.38$, $p < .001$, as well as significantly higher on the imperialist, $F(1, 57) = 69.04$, $p < .001$, and the barbarian-enemy image, $F(1, 57) = 41.17$, $p < .001$. Whites, on the other hand, rated Natives significantly higher on the dependent image, $F(1, 57) = 5.61$, $p < .05$, but showed little evidence of the barbarian-enemy or imperialist image of the outgroup.

These results indicate that the mutual images of Natives and Whites are largely complementary. Whites hold a relatively strong dependent image of Natives, consistent with their perception of relatively low goal compatibility and higher ingroup status and power. On the other hand, Natives hold a strong imperialist image of Whites, as predicted, but also a relatively strong barbarian-enemy image. The latter may reflect the fact

TABLE 4:   Mean Intergroup Perceptions by Ethnicity, Study 2

Relationship Dimension	M	SD
Whites (*n* = 24)		
Relative status[a]	3.46	0.51
Relative power[a]	4.57	0.40
Goal compatibility[b]	1.76	0.33
Natives (*n* = 35)		
Relative status	3.01	0.61
Relative power	4.73	0.34
Goal compatibility	2.00	0.29

a. Higher scores indicate higher status and power of Whites relative to Natives (1-5 scale).
b. Higher scores indicate higher perceived compatibility (1-3 scale).

TABLE 5:   Mean Image Scores by Ethnicity, Study 2

	Native Target		White Target	
Image Score	M	SD	M	SD
Whites (*n* = 24)				
Ally	4.24	0.95	4.26	0.66
Barbarian-enemy	2.65	1.13	2.71	0.94
Dependent	4.17	1.23	2.37	0.73
Imperialist	2.43	0.63	3.14	0.79
Native Americans (*n* = 35)				
Ally	5.10	0.82	2.98	0.88
Barbarian-enemy	2.11	0.81	4.35	1.15
Dependent	2.68	0.86	3.16	0.73
Imperialist	2.45	0.63	4.67	1.21

that Native respondents rejected higher status of Whites but did perceive Whites to have higher power and resources.

At the individual level of analysis, our White sample showed a clear relationship between their perceptions of intergroup relations and the strength of their dependent image of the outgroup. The regression of outgroup dependent image scores on goal compatibility, relative status, and power was significant, $R = .66$, $p < .01$, with relationships in the expected direction (goal compatibility: $\beta = -.26$, $p < .10$; status: $\beta = .45$, $p < .05$; power: $\beta = .13$, $p < .50$). For Natives, however, individual differences in perceived intergroup relations did not significantly predict differences in either the imperialist or the barbarian-enemy image of Whites ($R = .22$ and $.28$, respectively). As with the African American data from Study 1, the aggregate level of group perceptions was consistent with the dominant images of the outgroup, but at the individual level these did not covary. It may be that for minority groups in particular, consensual evaluations of outgroup status and power do not necessarily reflect personal assessments or attitudes about the state of intergroup relations. How the respondent personally evaluates the size and meaning of power and status differentials may determine whether the barbarian or the imperialist image of the White outgroup is generated.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Image theory's emphasis on the specific relationships that underlie the content of these beliefs helps us better understand the origin of the divergent stereotypes that dominant and minority groups in a particular society hold of one other. By examining ethnic intergroup images across different groups and in different intergroup contexts, the data from both studies highlight the important role of the intergroup context and the specific intergroup relationship perceptions that underlie the content of group beliefs. In a context in which Blacks perceived Whites as powerful and threatening (incompatible goals), as was the case in the Black urban sample in Study 1, Blacks held the imperialist image of Whites, stereotypically perceiving Whites as exploitative, intentionally oppressive, and dominating. To the extent that Whites perceived Blacks as having incompatible goals but with relatively low cultural status, as was more the case with the White urban sample, Whites held the barbarian-enemy image of Blacks, characterizing them as irrational, hostile, destructive, and out of control.

As image theory would predict, intergroup images and perceptions differ between the Black-White and Native-White American contexts. In contrast to their image of Blacks, Whites clearly held the dependent image of Natives. In fact, the dependent image items did not form a coherent index in the case of Black-White perceptions but did cohere as an internally consistent index in the Native-White context. On the other hand, Blacks and Natives were relatively similar in their images of Whites, reflecting similar perceptions of the nature of intergroup relations with Whites dominant in status and/or power. In the case of Natives and Whites, however, the dominant images that each group held of the other were complementary (i.e., dependent-imperialist), which was not the case for Whites and Blacks. Although there is evidence across both sets of studies that structural variables determine the images that ethnic groups hold of one another, the structural variables alone were not as successful in predicting attitudes at the individual level, particularly for minority respondents. We propose several possible explanations for this pattern.

First, it is possible that structural variables are more useful in predicting images in international or laboratory contexts than in an interethnic context, where individual differences within the group are likely to be more prevalent. The fact that intergroup contact occurs much more frequently between racial groups within a society than it does in most international or laboratory contexts may add a layer of complexity to determining the nature of interethnic images. Moreover, the quality of cross-group contact may vary more within racial groups than

within national or laboratory groups. Consequently, it may not be surprising that Blacks may hold either an enemy, barbaric, or imperialist image of Whites, depending on their personal experience with the outgroup. Indeed, Livingston (2002) found that individual differences in both contact and metaperceptions were important determinants of Blacks' racial attitudes toward Whites. Thus, given the diversity of individual experiences within ethnic groups, it may be important for image theory to integrate constructs such as metaperception and contact, in addition to appraisals of structural factors in predicting outgroup images.

Differences between international and intranational contexts for intergroup relations may also account for the finding that the enemy and barbarian images were conflated in the present studies, whereas previous research found these to be distinct images. Because both images derive from perceived threat and goal incompatibility, the distinction is somewhat subtle and lies in structural characteristics of the intergroup situation that may be clearer in international relations than between subgroups within a nation.

The data from the present studies also failed to support the predicted role of perceived intergroup power differences on respective images. Although we had expected the two White groups to differ with respect to perceived relative power, it turned out that perceptions of political and economic power of Whites relative to Blacks in the society as a whole were very similar across the two contexts. Subsequent research has shown that the element of power most relevant to the barbarian image is perceived physical power. Research by Livingston (2004) found that although Blacks and Whites agree that Whites are higher in political and economic power compared to Blacks, Whites rated Blacks as being higher in *physical* power relative to the ingroup. Particularly in the context of a racially mixed school, it may be that perceptions of physical power are the most relevant determinant of intergroup images, rather then the more remote forms of power represented by political and economic resources.

Nevertheless, the patterns of images found in both studies indicate how the complexity and diversity of intergroup stereotypes may be represented in coherent schemas, or images, containing meaningful components, rather than mere trait characteristics that may appear to be unrelated. Descriptive studies of interethnic stereotypes that assess separate, seemingly unrelated trait descriptors to capture interethnic stereotypes do not take into account the composite images that may unify the different descriptors, thereby making it difficult to make sense of the divergent stereotyped traits

reported about outgroups. Image theory offers an explanation for how traits are related and how they arise from intergroup perceptions of threat, power, and cultural status. Within the image theory framework, our findings indicate that groups do not necessarily hold complementary, negative mutual images but rather may endorse divergent images of each other, consistent with their different perspectives on the prevailing intergroup context.

Finally, understanding the conditions that foster such intergroup images and stereotypes may help us determine the conditions under which they may be changed. Relevant to the contact hypothesis literature, perceptions of power differentials and threat may determine the effectiveness of intergroup contact for reducing stereotypes and prejudiced attitudes. Given that contact under positive conditions can increase positive intergroup attitudes (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000), intergroup perceptions of low threat or compatible group goals, relatively equal power, and equal status during contact may attenuate negative outgroup images (e.g., barbarian, enemy, imperialist, dependent) and foster positive stereotypes (e.g., ally).

Contact under negative conditions, on the other hand, may perpetuate and strengthen negative stereotypes if it fosters perceived threat and unequal power and status. Under such circumstances, Whites who experience a high level of negative contact with Blacks may be more likely to perceive Blacks as threatening (as in the urban White sample reported here) and to hold more negative stereotypes about Blacks than Whites who have little or no contact with Blacks. Blacks' images of Whites can also be negatively affected by contact in competitive, status-differentiated contexts. Livingston (2002), for instance, found a strong correlation between amount of past (e.g., high school) contact with Whites reported by his Black respondents and their perceptions that Whites hold negative attitudes toward Blacks. This is consistent with our finding of a strong imperialist image of Whites by the Black students in our contact setting.

Taken together, results from the two studies based on intergroup image theory reported here underscore the importance of examining interethnic stereotypes in terms of the perceived intergroup relationships that contribute to specific stereotypes. Appraisals of the intergroup context generate corresponding outgroup stereotypes that function to justify behavioral orientations toward outgroups. This contextual and functional approach to understanding intergroup stereotypes is theoretically, methodologically, and practically valuable and illustrates the importance of putting the study of social stereotypes in its intergroup context.

APPENDIX
Survey Items for Each Outgroup Image

Ally:

White/Black people value cooperative solutions to race relation problems.

Whites/Blacks have good leaders who have the best intentions of the country at heart.

Most Whites/Blacks are working hard for peaceful race relations.

All White/Black people want is an equal shot, which they deserve.

Whites'/Blacks' concerns about racism in this country are legitimate and reasonable.

Enemy:

Whites/Blacks cannot be trusted because they know how to trick you.

White/Black people say they want to better race relations, but they don't really mean it.

White/Black people take as much as they can get away with until they are challenged.

Whites/Blacks are at an advantage because they have organized leaders.

White/Black people have hostile intentions toward Blacks/Whites.

Barbarian:

The majority of young Whites/Blacks are out of control.

Whites/Blacks in general take whatever they want and enjoy intimidating others.

White/Black people have been trying to get ahead economically in illegal, crooked ways rather than by earning it.

White/Black people would rather rough someone up than talk sense when solving a conflict.

Whites/Blacks will take advantage of any social program available to get more than they deserve.

Dependent:

It is difficult to supervise Black/White employees on the job because they're always trying to avoid working.

Whites/Blacks as a group want to do better, but lack discipline and don't know how to work hard.

Most Whites/Blacks are okay, but a few bad apples make the whole group look bad.

Black/White civil rights leaders meant well, but they were too simple minded to be very effective.

The White/Black population needs to be protected from militant White/Black activists.

Imperialist:

Whites/Blacks discriminate on purpose to prevent Black/White people from taking their jobs.

To be successful in this country you have to be White/Black.

White/Black people are arrogant and are convinced they are superior to other groups.

Whites/Blacks use Blacks/Whites for cheap labor and keep all the profits for themselves.

Some Blacks/Whites have "sold out" to Whites/Blacks and have allowed themselves to be used for furthering the White/Black race.

NOTES

1. Only students who provided personal written consent and signed parental consent for their participation in the study were permitted to take the survey.

2. This was also the case for the outgroup barbarian-enemy image.

3. In fact, the mean rating of White power for this sample was close to the ceiling of our 5-point scale (see Table 2).

REFERENCES

Alexander, M. G., Brewer, M. B., & Herrmann, R. K. (1999). Images and affect: A functional analysis of out-group stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 78-93.

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

Cottam, R. (1977). *Foreign policy decision making: A general theory and a case study*, Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Devine, P. G., & Elliot, A. J. (1995). Are racial stereotypes really fading? The Princeton trilogy revisited. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*, 1139-1150.

Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1998). On the nature of contemporary prejudice: The causes, consequences, and challenges of aversive racism. In J. L. Eberhardt & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), *Confronting racism: The problem and the response* (pp. 3-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Eagly, A. H., & Steffan, V. J. (1984). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men into social roles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 735-754.

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 878-902.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). Ambivalent stereotypes as legitimizing ideologies: Differentiating paternalistic and envious prejudice. In J. Jost & B. Major (Eds.), *The psychology of legitimacy: Emerging perspective on ideology, justice, and intergroup relations* (pp. 278-306). New York: Cambridge University Press.

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

Herrmann, R. K. (1985). *Perceptions and behavior in Soviet foreign policy.* Pittsburgh, PA: Pittsburgh University Press.

Herrmann, R. K., & Fischerkeller, M. (1995). Beyond the enemy image and spiral model: Cognitive-strategic research after the cold war. *International Organization, 49*, 415-450.

Jost, J., & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 1-27.

Jost, J. T., & Major, B. (2001). *The psychology of legitimacy: Emerging perspective on ideology, justice, and intergroup relations.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Judd, C. M., Park, B., Ryan, C. S., Brauer, M., & Kraus, S. (1995). Stereotypes and ethnocentrism: Diverging interethnic perceptions of African American and White American youth. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 460-481.

Katz, D., & Braly, K. W. (1935). Racial prejudice and racial stereotypes. *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 30*, 175-193.

Livingston, R. W. (2002). The role of perceived negativity in the moderation of African Americans' implicit and explicit racial attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 38*, 405-413.

Livingston, R. W. (2004). *Contingencies of prejudice: A proactive-reactive typology of White and Black racial attitudes.* Unpublished manuscript.

McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence and the Modern Racism Scale. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination and racism* (pp. 91-125). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Merskin, D. (1998). Sending up signals: A survey of American Indian media use and representation in the mass media. *The Howard Journal of Communications, 9*, 333-345.

Mihesuah, D. A. (1996). *American Indians: Stereotypes and realities.* Atlanta, GA: Clarity Press.

Monteith, M. J., & Spicer, C. B. (2000). Contents and correlates of Whites' and Blacks' racial attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36*, 125-154.

Moskowitz, G. B. (2001). *Cognitive social psychology: The Princeton symposium on the legacy and future of social cognition.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Recent meta-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 93-114). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

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

Stephan, W. G., Boniecki, K. A., Ybarra, O., Bettencourt, A., Ervin, K. A., Jackson, L. A., et al. (2002). The role of threats in the racial attitudes of Blacks and Whites. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 1242-1254.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 23-46). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.