Complicating Race: The Relationship between Prejudice, Race, and Social Class Categorizations

Matthew Weeks and Michael B. Lupfer

The online version of this article can be found at:

http://psp.sagepub.com/content/30/8/972

Published by:

$SAGE

http://www.sagepublications.com

On behalf of:

Society for Personality and Social Psychology

Additional services and information for *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://psp.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://psp.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations: http://psp.sagepub.com/content/30/8/972.refs.html

Complicating Race: The Relationship Between Prejudice, Race, and Social Class Categorizations

Matthew Weeks
Centenary College of Louisiana

Michael B. Lupfer
The University of Memphis

Although racial stereotyping and prejudice research have received considerable attention, the important element of social class has been largely excluded from social psychological research. Using the Statement Recognition Procedure, two experiments investigated social categorization along race and social class dimensions, the influence of racial and social class prejudice on these categorizations, and differences between White and Black perceivers. Analyses conducted at the subtype of race and social class memberships demonstrated differing patterns of categorization based on subtype membership. For example, lower-class Black targets were primarily categorized by race, whereas middle-class Black targets were primarily categorized by social class. The results demonstrate the importance of considering social class membership independent of and in conjunction with race. Theoretical and methodological implications regarding the study for race and social class categorizations are discussed.

Keywords: *stereotypes; social class; categorization; prejudice*

Social categorization lies at the foundation of social interactions and assists perceivers in effectively and efficiently dealing with information in their social environment (Bodenhausen & Macrae, 1998; Brewer, 1988; Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). A perceiver's spontaneous attending to a target's social category membership activates stereotypes that act as expectancies for the social situations and individuals encountered. However, individuals are members of multiple social categories and often the conjunction of these categories can occur more often than expected by chance. The relationship between an individual's race and social class is one example. Although it's true that Whites and Blacks alike are represented in lower, middle, and upper classes in society, the reality is that in the United States, more Blacks fall into the lower class than Whites. With Blacks over-represented among the lower social class, it can be difficult, when making social judgments of a Black individual, to separate those expectations due to a target's race from the expectations of their social class (Jones, 1972/1997; Pettigrew, 1981, 1985; Runciman, 1972; Triandis & Triandis, 1960). Indeed, in his popular text *Prejudice and Racism,* Jones (1972/1997) notes that a viable discussion of racial stereotypes must control for the influence of social class. Specifically, Jones states,

> One of the big difficulties we have is disentangling race from class, given that . . . Blacks, in particular, and ethnic minorities in general, are found disproportionately in the lower economic strata. To what extent are the examples of racism cited merely vestiges of racist disadvantage that now manifest themselves in class-related processes? (p. 441)

Although racial stereotyping and prejudice research have received considerable attention, the important element of social class has been largely excluded from this research (Hoyt, 1999).

Below, we review research pertaining to the relationship between race and social class and then raise several research questions concerning this relationship. After this review, we report research investigating (a) categorization along racial and social class dimensions as well as the conjunction of these categories, (b) differences between White and Black participants on these categorizations, and (c) the influence of racial and social class prejudice on these categorizations.

CATEGORIZATION BY RACE AND SOCIAL CLASS

The importance of the conjunction between race and social class is not a new consideration, having been cited in such classic texts as Allport's (1954) *The Nature of Prejudice* and Jones's (1972/1997) *Prejudice and Racism.* However, contemporary social psychological research has emphasized racial group memberships with little empirical attention given to social class memberships or social class' conjunction with race. Regarding the influence of target race and social class on interactions with, future outlooks for, and judgments of Blacks, three positions have been posited: one emphasizing race, another social class, and the third emphasizing the intersection of race and social class. Some theorists assert that race, and subsequently racial prejudice, is an influential factor in and of itself and emphasis on social class merely shrouds the important racial issue. Social psychological literature is replete with examples of racial prejudice and stereotyping influencing the judgments of and interactions with others, at both a conscious and unconscious level, and empirical research supports the importance of the racial dimension beyond the influence of the class dimension. For example, Herring's (1989) investigation of race and social class influences on Blacks' life chances found that although the influence of race slightly decreased between the 1960s and 1980s, race was still an influential factor in determining a Black's life chances and it has not been eclipsed by social class. Pettigrew (1980) showed that social class was increasingly influential on Blacks' lives in the mid-1900s but race continued to be an influential factor beyond the influence of social class. Also, Triandis and Triandis (1960) showed that both race and social class were influential in determining a perceiver's desired social distance from a target, with race having the stronger influence.

The second position, emphasizing social class, argues that racial issues and racial tensions often can be largely attributed to class effects, with one's race less important than one's social standing (e.g., Wilson, 1978). This view stipulates that the introduction of Blacks into American society as an underclass forged the dominant view that Blacks were an inferior race, and it is the inherent conception of lower status, rather than race per se, that af-fects judgments of Blacks. Therefore, class prejudice is more influential than racial prejudice. For example, in his provocatively titled book *The Declining Significance of Race*, Wilson (1978) posited that due to political and social changes in America, Black individuals' racial membership has become less relevant to their life circumstances and experiences than social class. Although Wilson's position should not be misinterpreted as the lack of influence of race, his argument centered on the increased significance of social class over race and its interaction with an individual's race.

Some empirical support can be mustered supporting class effects, accounting for what had previously seemed to be race effects, as well as the disjunction between race and class effects. For example, Bayton and his colleagues (Bayton, McAllister, & Hamer, 1976; Smedley & Bayton, 1978; see also Klonis & Devine, 2001) used the Katz and Braly (1933) technique to investigate the stereotypes associated with upper- and lower-class Blacks and Whites. For both Black and White respondents, the stereotypes varied more as a function of social class than race. Specifically, the stereotype typically associated with Whites (e.g., intelligent, ambitious, industrious) was indicative of upper-class targets, whether Black or White, rather than of Whites only. Similarly, the stereotype typically associated with Blacks (e.g., lazy, unreliable, ignorant) was most indicative of lower-class targets, whether Black or White. Indeed, the traditional positive White stereotype was more indicative of upper class than Whites, whereas the traditional negative Black stereotype was more indicative of lower class than Blacks. This leads to the conclusion that the traditional race stereotypes might be more a function of the underlying social class perceivers assume is correlated with a target's race. That is, when a person thinks White, they are also thinking middle class, and when they think Black, they are thinking lower class. Westie (1952) investigated desired social distance toward a Black target and found the target's social status, operationalized as occupational prestige, to be a significant factor. Specifically, as a Black target's occupational prestige increased, Whites' expressed prejudice decreased. Feldman and Hilterman (1974) found that target occupation, a prominent factor in social class, accounted for as much variance in racial stereotyping as target race. In a separate study, when Black and White job applicants of apparent middle or lower class were evaluated for a position (e.g., likelihood of success, intelligence, likability), target social class accounted for more variance in the ratings than target race (Jussim, Coleman, & Lerch, 1987). Finally, contrary to earlier work, Kirby (1999) showed that a class bias, but not a race bias, influenced evaluations of potential neighbors. Thus, this research suggests that much racial stereotyping could be explained in terms of social class stereotyping.

As this brief review shows, membership in both race and social class categories can influence social judgments, and each appears to exercise influence independent of the other. It has been argued, however, that the Race × Social Class interaction is the best conceptualization of race and class effects. That is, the subtype formed by the conjunction of race and social class is more meaningful than membership in the separate categories should dictate. So, there is more to being a lower-class Black than simply being Black and lower class. This conceptualization has garnered much support, positing that to focus solely on the race dimension or the class dimension is to miss the complexity of the issue.

Empirical research has supported the importance of the interactive conceptualization. For example, Kessler and Neighbors (1986) showed that the effects of race and social class on an individual's psychological distress were not additive but interactive. Earlier research had demonstrated a very reliable effect that Blacks in the United States have higher rates of psychological distress than Whites, attributed largely to racial discrimination (e.g., Warheit, Holzer, & Arey, 1975). The late 1970s and early 1980s saw this race effect largely explained in terms of social class, with Blacks' lower socioeconomic position being the real determinant of psychological distress. Kessler and Neighbors (1986) showed a strictly socioeconomic or racial explanation was in error, with race differences being much more pronounced among lower-class individuals. Specifically, lower-class Blacks experienced more distress than lower-class Whites, although there was little difference between middle-class White and Black respondents. Westie and Westie's (1957) interviews with residents of Indianapolis, Indiana, showed that desired social distance was influenced by race, social class, and their interaction, with the amount of desired social distance attributed to the target's race declining with an increase in the target's social class. In a study conducted on the subways of New York City, Black and White passengers helped a well-dressed (i.e., middle class), Black or White "victim" equally when he appeared to have a heart attack. However, a lower-class "victim," looking unkempt and smelling of alcohol, could only expect to be helped by members of his own race (Piliavin, Rodin, & Piliavin, 1969). Thus, theorists have argued and empiricists have demonstrated that a Race × Social Class interactive model is a useful and often appropriate conceptualization of these effects. That is, an individual's subtype membership could be more important than membership in either of the categories separately. Furthermore, it is possible that the Black prototype represents a lower-class individual, whereas the White prototype represents a middle-class individual (Posner & Keele, 1968; Reed, 1972). Indeed, research demonstrat-

ing the considerable overlap between Black and lower class as well as White and middle class support such a suggestion (Klonis & Devine, 2001; Smedley & Bayton, 1978). Thus, a crossing of race (White, Black) and social class (lower class, middle class) would result in expectancy-congruent targets (lower-class Black, middle-class White) and expectancy-incongruent targets (lower-class White, middle-class Black).

Investigation of this interaction, or a race/social class relationship in general, has been largely absent from social psychology's recent work on racial stereotyping and prejudice. If it is true that middle-class Whites and Blacks are perceived similarly, whereas lower-class Whites and Blacks are perceived differently, then this distinction adds an important caveat to racial stereotyping research. At the very least, class as a race-relevant construct should be considered.

SUMMARY AND OVERVIEW

A target's categorization along an applicable social dimension influences social judgments of that target, and race has proven to be a robust dimension for such categorizations. Categorization occurs because of informativeness (Stangor, Lynch, Duan, & Glass, 1992), and upon categorization, the application of a stereotype or prejudiced attitude frequently follows (see Gilbert & Hixon, 1991). However, some empirical work suggests that, at least in some cases, racial stereotyping and prejudice would be better conceptualized as class stereotyping and prejudice. This suggests the importance of investigating class categorization in conjunction with racial categorization. Racial prejudice and stereotyping has proven to be a complex concept and a better understanding of the influence of social class categorizations in addition to and in conjunction with racial categorization could provide a clearer conceptualization of this important phenomenon. The present research studies were designed to investigate categorization along the racial and social class dimensions.

THE STATEMENT RECOGNITION TASK

To investigate these categorizations, we employed the statement recognition task (SRT; aka, the "Who Said What?" paradigm). Developed by Taylor and her colleagues (Taylor & Falcone, 1982; Taylor, Fiske, Etcoff, & Ruderman, 1978), the SRT has previously been used to assess social categorization in a number of studies (e.g., Brewer, Weber, & Carini, 1995; Stangor et al., 1992; van Knippenberg, van Twuyver, & Pepels, 1994). In this procedure, participants observe eight individuals, usually identified by name and photo, making brief statements during a discussion, one target at a time, with each target

making multiple statements throughout the discussion. As they view the photograph-statement pairs, participants are instructed to form an impression of each target. Such an impression formation is presumed to activate participants' categorization of actors according to their group memberships; that is, those group memberships most informative to the perceiver should be most prominent. Spontaneous categorization of the targets is then assessed by examining the errors made during a target recognition task, in which participants are later presented a series of statements and asked, for each, "Who made this statement?" Examination of the confusions between targets sharing a given feature (e.g., race, class, sex, attire), as compared to those NOT sharing the feature, reveals categorization by that feature. That is, if more within-feature confusions are made than between-feature confusions, it can be inferred that the feature was attended to (at some level) and encoded during the impression formation phase. These are spontaneous categorizations to the extent that participants are given no explicit instructions to categorize the targets and are not given an indication that the task involves categorization or that they will later have to match statements with photos. Thus, if the eight target individuals were crossed on race (White or Black) and social class (lower or middle) and a statement initially made by a lower-class Black was misattributed during the recognition task, who was it misattributed to?: another lower-class, but White, target (i.e., categorization along the class dimension)? Another Black, but middle-class, target (i.e., categorization along the race dimension)? Or was it most likely misattributed to the other lower-class Black (i.e., categorization by the subtype)? The SRT has the advantage of being a popular measure and allowing us to address categorizations by the individual social categories (i.e., race and social class) and the conjunction of these categories simultaneously.

EXPERIMENT 1

To test the basic assumptions of the categorization process and the methodology used to assess it, the first experiment focused on the basic statement recognition procedure itself. We systematically varied race and social class to investigate categorization along these dimensions. Because the research reviewed earlier suggested that the Race × Social Class interaction can be influential—beyond the effects of either category alone—we assessed the prevalence of a third form of categorization, that is, the subtype created by the crossing of race and social class. This led us to predict that (a) perceivers would categorize targets independently by race and social class as well as (b) categorize along the subtype

formed by the intersection of race and social class, independent of either factor individually.

Method

PARTICIPANTS

Research participants were 69 (34 White, 35 Black) male and female undergraduates at a large, Midwestern university enrolled in introductory psychology courses who volunteered in exchange for course credit.

STIMULUS MATERIALS

Photographs for statement recognition procedure. Eight male volunteers, four Black and four White, of approximately 30 to 50 years of age were photographed and used as targets for the SRT. Each volunteer was photographed with both lower-class and middle-class appearance.

Operationalization of social class was accomplished with two pieces of information: appearance and occupation (Argyle, 1994; Jussim et al., 1987). Middle-class targets wore a dress shirt and conservative tie or sport coat with a clean appearance, whereas lower-class targets wore older attire or a work shirt, with unkempt hair and unshaven face. These head and upper body photographs clearly depicted the men's attire. Middle-class occupations were bank manager, accountant, high school principal, and real estate agent. Lower-class occupations were garbage collector, gas station attendant, delivery driver, and short-order cook. Pretesting was used to ensure each target's social class was clearly associated with his appearance and results confirmed the social class distinction between the lower-class and middle-class appearance of each target.

Foil statements for manipulation check. To demonstrate the validity of the manipulation of target social class, a manipulation check was included in the experimental procedure. Eight social-class-indicative statements not presented during the learning phase of the SRT were presented to participants during the recognition phase. Twenty-four undergraduates not completing the rest of the experimental procedure rated each foil statement on a scale from 1 (*statement much more likely to be made by a working-class than a middle-/upper-class person*) to 7 (*statement much more likely to be made by a middle-/upper-class than a working-class person*), with 4 as the neutral point (*statement no more likely to be made by either a lower-class or middle-/upper-class person*). Four of the statements were indicative of a lower-class target ($M = 2.833$; e.g., "I could never afford to send my kid to school here") and 4 were indicative of a middle-class target ($M = 4.854$; e.g., "I like it they're incorporating new technologies"). Both sets of statements significantly differed from the neutral point ($ps < .001$).

PROCEDURE

Participants were seated at individual computers to observe a mock discussion between eight people discussing the significance of the university to the local community. These discussants were supposedly gathered from a random sampling of local residents who agreed to participate in exchange for free basketball tickets.

Participants were told that they would be viewing a series of statements (i.e., excerpts from the discussion) made by the eight discussants and as they viewed the discussion, they should try to form an impression of what each person is like, because they would be asked questions about them later. The photograph of each target, along with his name, occupation, and the statement presented beneath, was displayed for 5 s, with a 1-s blank screen between each display and presentation time controlled by the computer. Each target made three statements and, although the order of these 24 statements was fixed to provide a coherent sense of dialog, three random orderings of photographs were constructed. Each target made one statement during each third of the discussion.

After viewing all 24 photograph-statement pairs, participants completed a 2-min distracter task to eliminate recency effects. For this distracter task, a series of short arithmetic problems (e.g., $8 \times 6 = 44$) appeared on the screen and the participant had 4 s to determine if the answer was correct by circling "YES" or "NO" on a response sheet.

After the distracter task, participants completed the recognition phase of the procedure. The photograph, name, and occupation of all eight targets appeared on the computer screen simultaneously, with a number (1-8) corresponding to each photograph. The statements used during the discussion appeared in random order and participants indicated which of the eight targets made the statement by pressing the number on the keyboard corresponding with their choice. Participants had as long as needed to complete this task. If unable to recall who made a given statement, participants were instructed to give their "best guess."

As the final task, participants completed the manipulation check to assess the effectiveness of the social class manipulation. Participants were presented the eight previously unseen foil statements in a random order and were told, "These were statements made during the original discussion, but which you were not shown earlier." Based on the impressions of the targets formed during the earlier task, participants indicated which discussant was believed to have made each statement.

After completing the task, participants were debriefed and thanked for their participation.

TABLE 1:   Mean Number of Assignments of Social Class Foil Statements to Social Class Targets

	Target Social Class	
	Lower Class	*Middle Class*
Experiment 1 foils		
Lower class	3.302	0.698
Middle class	0.873	3.127
Experiment 2 foils		
Lower class	3.149	0.851
Middle class	0.837	3.163

NOTE: Possible values range from 0 to 4. All values significantly differ from chance value of 2 ($ps < .001$).

Results and Discussion

ASSESSMENT OF TARGET SOCIAL CLASS MANIPULATION

Analysis of the responses to the eight foil statements determined that the class manipulation was effective. If class was not recognized, participants should assign lower- and middle-class foils approximately equally to the lower- and middle-class discussants. Thus, approximately two targets of each social class should be assigned to each foil type. However, t tests indicated that participants were much more likely to attribute a lower-class foil to a lower-class discussant and a middle-class foil to a middle-class discussant ($ps < .001$; see Table 1).

ASSESSING CATEGORIZATION

Examining the errors made during the recognition phase of the study revealed the categorizations used. On each recognition trial, eight options (pictures) were presented, only one of which was correct. Selection of any of the other seven options represented an error. For example, if a statement originally made by a lower-class Black was misattributed to a lower-class White, this was classified as a within-class/between-race error. Four types of errors could occur on any trial: either a within-race/within-class error (one opportunity), within-race/between-class error (two opportunities), between-race/within-class error (two opportunities), or between-race/between-class error (two opportunities). The number of errors of each type were computed for each participant. Because there were twice as many opportunities to make the latter three types of errors as the first type, the number of errors in the latter three categories were multiplied by 0.5, following an adjustment recommended by Stangor et al. (1992). Recall that more within-category errors than between-category errors is evidence for categorization by a given social category, indicating statement misattribution was more likely to another member of the same category. Similarly, categorization by the sub-

TABLE 2:   Mean Within-Class and Between-Class Recognition Errors by Participant Race (Experiment 1)

	Participant Race	
Class Error Type	White	Black
Within	2.548	2.314
Between	1.709	2.039

type is evidenced by more within-race/within-class errors than the other three categories (above the influence of the main effects), indicating statement misattribution was most likely to the other member of the subtype.

The mean number of recognition errors was 8.701 and there was no significant difference between White and Black participants ($p > .3$). The mean recognition errors were submitted to a 2 (race error type: within, between) $\times$ 2 (class error type: within, between) $\times$ 2 (participant race) $\times$ 3 (photograph order) $\times$ 2 (photograph set) mixed-factors analysis of variance with the first two factors being within-subjects.[1] Demonstrating categorization by race, there was a significant main effect for race error type, with within-race errors ($M = 2.464$) exceeding between-race errors ($M = 1.841$), $F(1, 57) = 10.234$, $p < .003$. Similarly, there was a significant main effect for class error type, with within-class errors ($M = 2.431$) exceeding between-class errors ($M = 1.874$), $F(1, 57) = 12.893$, $p < .002$. However, this class categorization effect was qualified by a marginally significant Class Error Type $\times$ Participant Race interaction, $F(1, 57) = 3.296$, $p < .08$. As the mean categorization errors presented in Table 2 show, both White and Black participants made more within-class than between-class errors, although this difference was more pronounced for White participants, $F(1, 67) = 16.94$, $p < .001$, than Black participants, $F(1, 67) = 5.86$, $p < .02$. Thus, there was ample support for Hypotheses 1 and 2. The subtyping-indicative Race Error Type $\times$ Class Error Type interaction was not significant ($F < .3$).

These results demonstrate the usefulness of the SRT as the measure of target categorization and also demonstrate categorization along both racial and social class dimensions. Because these results demonstrate target categorization along an applicable social dimension rather than stereotype activation or application, this is an important first step in demonstrating the importance of class categorizations. An interesting finding of this initial study is the difference between social class categorizations made by White and Black participants. Specifically, Whites categorized by class more than did Blacks, indicating Whites find an individual's social class membership—regardless of the individual's race—more

informative than do Blacks (Stangor et al., 1992). This finding underscores the importance of examining differences in categorizations made by Whites and Blacks because this distinction has been largely overlooked in previous research. Further discussion of these differences is reserved for a later section. Having established categorization along both racial and social class dimensions, investigation of moderating factors and the relationship between these categorizations proceeded.

EXPERIMENT 2

Racial Prejudice

The effects of individual prejudice level on stereotyping and categorization has been a topic of intense interest (see Dovidio, Brigham, Johnson, & Gaertner, 1996, for a review). Generally, with greater levels of prejudice comes greater categorization and stereotyping along that dimension, or as Feldman (1972) put it, extreme affect causes race to become a "central trait" for that target. Stangor and his colleagues (1992) demonstrated the importance of prejudice in categorization along the race dimension. They hypothesized and showed that if a particular category or category conjunction is not informative, respondents do not categorize along that dimension. Their participants performed the SRT with targets crossed on sex and race dimensions and completed the Modern Racism Scale (MRS; McConahay, 1986) as a measure of racial prejudice. They found that only high-prejudiced respondents categorized targets along the race dimension, concluding that race was an informative category only for high-prejudiced perceivers. Fazio and Dunton (1997) assessed implicit racial prejudice (Fazio, Jackson, Dunton, & Williams, 1995) and found that automatically accessible prejudiced attitudes, whether positive or negative, resulted in greater categorization by race.

Although there are numerous measures of Whites' prejudice toward Blacks, there is no standard psychometric measure for assessing Blacks' prejudice toward Whites (Biernet & Crandell, 1999; Monteith & Spicer, 2000; Shelton, 2000). Not only has little research assessed Blacks' attitudes toward Whites, even less has investigated the influence of these attitudes on the categorization and stereotyping process. Consequently, there is little known about whether such attitudes influence Blacks' categorization processes differently than Whites'.

Social Class Prejudice

Social class prejudice can be described as a negative attitude toward one's social class outgroups. Empirically, this has been primarily represented as a middle- or

upper-class individual's disdain for the poor and working class (Giles, Gatlin, & Cataldo, 1976; Laumann, 1966). This conceptualization is based on the notion that individuals prefer to interact with others of equal or higher social status. Although social class is an important level of categorization with an influential stereotype (e.g., Madon et al., 1998; Russell, 1996; Westie, 1953), the assessment of class prejudice as a personal attitude, and its relationship with stereotyping, has received little attention. Recently, Hoyt, Doyon, and Dietz-Uhler (1998) developed a general attitude measure of class prejudice covering the areas of attribution, stereotypes, and modern class prejudice. Hoyt (1999) used this "classism" measure to investigate the prejudice-discrimination link in terms of social class prejudice, demonstrating results similar to those found for racial prejudice (e.g., Devine, 1989; Devine & Elliot, 1995). Specifically, she showed that individuals with a low degree of class prejudice were familiar with the lower-class stereotype, although they were more reluctant to apply that stereotype than those with a high degree of class prejudice. However, due to the relationship between racial and social class attitudes, it is important to control for race when assessing class-relevant attitudes (Giles et al., 1976). The Hoyt scale makes no attempt to control for these issues and, consequently, it is difficult to separate race from class issues for this measure. The preceding review demonstrated the importance of class categorization, and subsequently class prejudice, in social distance judgments and personality assessment, in addition to the influence of racial effects. Accordingly, higher levels of class prejudice would be expected to increase categorization by class, just as higher levels of racial prejudice increase categorization by race.

Overview

The second experiment again used the SRT to assess categorization and investigated the moderating effects of racial and social class prejudice. The reviewed research shows the significance of racial prejudice in categorizations by race. In the present study, this was extended to relate to social class prejudice and categorization along the class dimension; that is, as affect toward lower-class individuals becomes more negative (i.e., greater social class prejudice), a target's social class should increasingly become a "central trait" for that perceiver. As in Experiment 1, differences in categorizations made by Whites and Blacks also were investigated.

Method

PARTICIPANTS

Research participants were 202 (117 White, 85 Black) male and female undergraduates enrolled in introductory psychology courses who volunteered in exchange for course credit.

PROCEDURE

Experiment 2 was conducted in two separate phases. Phase 1 consisted of distributing several individual differences measures during a mass screening of the psychology department's subject pool population. Later in the semester, participants attended the experimental session for Phase 2, which contained the SRT and a version of the Bogardus (1933, 1959) social distance scale (SDS).

Phase 1. Phase 1 consisted of the participant population completing several prejudice measures and answering demographic questions. During a mass screening of the subject pool population, students in general psychology courses completed the MRS, the Attitudes Toward Whites scale (ATW; Brigham, 1993), Hoyt's class prejudice scale, and filler items. Participants also provided three pieces of identifying information for use in the later research project: the last four digits of their social security number, their mother's maiden name, and their pet's name.

Phase 2. Later in the semester, participants arrived at the experimental sessions that were seemingly independent of the questionnaires completed at the beginning of the semester. After arriving for the experiment, participants were told several unrelated experiments were being conducted in the same session for the sake of convenience. The tasks had intentionally different formats (e.g., font styles, wording, presentation styles, and so forth) to substantiate this claim.

Participants completed the SRT, with all procedures and stimuli identical to those in Experiment 1. The final procedure involved the completion of several additional questionnaires with different questionnaire packets prepared for Black and non-Black participants. These packets included a version of Bogardus's (1933, 1959) SDS and additional demographic questions. For non-Black respondents, the SDS included measures of desired social distance from a "Black male" and a "working-class, White male." For Black respondents, social distance was measured from a "Caucasian male" and a "working-class, Black male."

After the completion of the questionnaire packet, participants were told the study related to one of the questionnaires completed at the beginning of the semester. Participants were asked for the same three pieces of identifying information to match their scores from the previous prejudice measures (but were not asked for their names). If a participant had not completed the first questionnaire packet during the mass screening (e.g., was absent from class, opted not to participate), they

were asked to complete the packet at that time (23% of the participants).[2] Participants were then debriefed and thanked for their participation.[3]

Results

We began the analyses with an assessment of the social class manipulation and a replication of the analyses from Experiment 1 to assess any main effect and subtyping categorizations. We then investigated the influences of racial and social class prejudice on any main effect and subtyping categorizations.

ASSESSMENT OF TARGET SOCIAL CLASS MANIPULATION

As with Experiment 1, examination of the responses to the foil statements revealed participants were much more likely to attribute a lower-class foil to a lower-class discussant and a middle-class foil to a middle-class discussant (see Table 1). Thus, congruent with the manipulation check from Experiment 1, appearance and occupation effectively conveyed targets' social class membership.

INITIAL ANALYSIS

We classified each statement recognition error into the appropriate Race Error Type × Class Error Type category. The mean error rate was 7.952 errors, with no significant difference in error rates between White and Black participants ($p > .1$). We began with the same Participant Race × Race Error Type × Class Error Type mixed-factors ANOVA performed for Experiment 1. As with Experiment 1, the main effect for race error type was statistically significant, with within-race errors ($M = 2.355$) exceeding between-race errors ($M = 1.783$), $F(1, 184) = 44.423$, $p < .001$. Also, the main effect for class error type was statistically significant, with within-class errors ($M = 2.326$) exceeding between-class errors ($M = 1.811$), $F(1, 184) = 32.110$, $p < .001$. However, unlike Experiment 1, these effects were qualified by a statistically significant Race Error Type × Class Error Type interaction, $F(1, 184) = 10.923$, $p < .005$. Planned comparisons revealed within-race–within-class errors were significantly greater than any other error category ($ps < .05$), indicating categorization occurred at the subtype (i.e., recognition errors were most likely made to the other member of the subtype). Simple main effects tests (see Table 3) revealed the ordinal nature of the interaction, substantiating the main effects for both race and social class categorization.

ANALYSIS OF SUBTYPING EFFECTS

Given the evidence for target subtyping, we investigated the patterns of categorization across the different types of targets. Were middle-class targets primarily categorized by social class? Were Black targets primarily categorized by race? Was subtyping equally prominent for all

TABLE 3:   Mean Recognition Errors With Tests of the Simple Main Effects

	Race Error Type		
Class Error Type	Within	Between	F
Within	2.757	1.952	37.54**
Between	1.895	1.671	7.63*
F	30.67**	4.67*	

NOTE: Two-tailed; $df = 1, 184$.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

four target types? We performed the Race Error Type × Class Error Type analysis for each of the four types of target to assess the racial, social class, and subtype categorization of each target type. The mean recognition errors and analysis of variance results regarding each target type are reported in Table 4.

The analysis of target categorizations presented in Table 4 revealed differing categorizations between the four target types. Several items are worth noting. First, for three of the four subtypes, there was a stronger social class categorization effect than racial categorization effect. The exception seems to be lower-class Black targets, for whom racial categorization did indeed dominate. Second, for middle-class Black targets, categorization by social class was the only significant categorization effect, indicating social class membership was particularly informative of this group. Third, three of the four target types were significantly categorized by the subtype membership. Again, the exception was middle-class Black targets, for whom the social class categorization dominated. Notably, there were no statistically significant differences between the categorizations made by White and Black participants. This point is important given the relative lack of research regarding Blacks' social judgments and categorizations as compared to Whites'.

This initial analysis substantiates the independent categorization along both race and social class dimensions, although unlike Experiment 1, there was also strong evidence of subtyping at the interaction of race and social class; that is, targets were categorized by their membership at the conjunction of race and social class as well as by race and social class alone.[4]

CATEGORIZATION AND PREJUDICE

We also examined the moderating influence of racial and social class prejudices on these categorizations. Previous research has demonstrated that the chronic accessibility of category-related attitudes leads to increased categorization of targets along the relevant dimension (e.g., Lepore & Brown, 1997; Stangor et al., 1992). Thus, we predicted individual differences in prejudice would

TABLE 4: Categorization Effects Broken Down by Race and Social Class of Target

| | Race Error Type | | | | | | |
| | Within | | Between | | F-Ratios From ANOVA | | |
Target Type	Within Class	Between Class	Within Class	Between Class	Race	Social Class	Subtype
White							
Lower class	0.76	0.41	0.46	0.47	7.73**	15.82***	16.27***
Middle class	0.66	0.40	0.44	0.34	11.40**	21.47***	4.65*
Black							
Lower class	0.68	0.58	0.38	0.47	18.67***	0.05	4.38*
Middle class	0.68	0.46	0.62	0.41	1.81	22.70***	0.04

NOTE: Mean recognition errors and results from corresponding categorization tests are presented.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

influence categorization, with increased prejudice resulting in greater categorization along the related social dimension. Given the evidence for subtyping, we examined the influence of racial and social class prejudice on categorizations at the level of the subtyped groups. Based on the prevalence of its use, the MRS served as the measure of racial prejudice for White participants. Scores on the MRS were calculated ($\alpha = .863$) and participants were dichotomized into high- and low-prejudice groups based on a median split. The ATW served as the measure of racial prejudice for Black participants. As with the MRS, ATW scores were calculated ($\alpha = .724$) and dichotomized into high- and low-prejudice groups based on a median split. For all participants, desired social distance from a same-race, working-class target served as the measure of class prejudice with greater desired distance indicating greater prejudice.[5] Scores on the class prejudice measure were uncorrelated with both the MRS ($r = -.043$, White participants only) and the ATW ($r = -.060$, Black participants only). As with the measures of racial prejudice, participants were dichotomized into high- and low-prejudice groups.[6] A 2 (participant race) × 2 (level of racial prejudice) × 2 (level of class prejudice) × 2 (race error type) × 2 (class error type) mixed-factors ANOVA, with the first three factors being between-subjects, was performed for each of the four target types.

An examination of the results revealed a statistically significant Class Prejudice × Class Error Type interaction for middle-class, White targets, $F(1, 167) = 5.31$, $p < .03$, and lower-class, Black targets, $F(1, 167) = 4.03$, $p < .05$. There was a consistent finding for both of these target types: Participants high in class prejudice categorized by social class ($ps < .05$), whereas participants low in class prejudice did not ($ps > .4$). Thus, class prejudice increased social class categorization only for targets congruent in regard to the race/social class expectation. Unlike the findings of Stangor et al. (1992), racial prejudice did not significantly interact with racial categoriza-

tion. However, for middle-class Black targets, racial prejudice did significantly interact with class categorization, $F(1, 167) = 12.58$, $p < .002$. Specifically, participants high in racial prejudice categorized middle-class Black targets by social class, whereas those low in racial prejudice did not. There were no further significant interactions between prejudice level and categorization effects.

Discussion

In the above analyses, we examined participants' categorizations by race and social class separately and in conjunction with one another. We then examined the influence of racial and social class prejudice on these categorizations for White and Black participants. The results provided evidence of categorization at the conjunction of race and social class as well as each categorization separately; that is, although there was evidence for categorization by race alone and social class alone, subtype categorization also was evident. Decomposition of these subtype categorizations revealed categorization of Black targets differed markedly depending on social class membership. Specifically, lower-class Blacks were categorized predominantly by race (although categorization by the subtype was evident), whereas middle-class Blacks were categorized predominantly by social class membership. This assessment of spontaneous categorization suggests a dominance of social class categorization for middle-class Black targets. Also, there was evidence that middle-class targets of both races were predominantly categorized by social class. For middle-class Black targets, social class categorization clearly dominated, and for middle-class White targets, the class categorization effect ($F = 21.47$, $\eta^2 = .107$) was stronger than the race categorization effect ($F = 11.40$, $\eta^2 = .057$) or the subtype categorization effect ($F = 4.65$, $\eta^2 = 0.023$). Regarding lower-class targets, White targets were categorized along all three dimensions, including a significant subtyping effect (i.e., specifically categorized as a

White, lower-class target). However, lower-class Blacks were not categorized by social class and seemed predominately categorized by race. Taken in conjunction with the research reviewed above, these findings point to an important relationship between racial and social class categorizations that has largely been overlooked in contemporary social psychological research on racial stereotyping. Below, we discuss several aspects of these findings and the implications for an understanding of racial prejudice and stereotyping effects.

THE MODERATING INFLUENCE OF RACIAL AND SOCIAL CLASS PREJUDICES

Further analyses revealed the moderating influence of racial and social class prejudice on these categorization effects. For the present studies, social class prejudice was conceptualized as a negative attitude toward lower-class persons. Predictions stated higher levels of class prejudice should result in social class membership being a more informative, and thus more prominent, categorization. Class prejudice did moderate social class categorization, although this was only evident for two of the four target types. Of interest, the Race × Social Class subtype memberships for these two target types were congruent to perceiver expectations suggested in the literature (i.e., White/middle class and Black/lower class). Perhaps, for these expectancy-congruent targets, the confound between race and social class is being demonstrated, with the visually salient racial category dominating, allowing the confounded class membership to be obscured; that is, beyond race, the social class standing of these targets is not particularly informative because it matches the prototype of Black and White. However, as research on chronically accessible attitudes demonstrates, individuals with a stronger negative attitude toward lower-class individuals focus more on the informative class membership (Stangor et al., 1992). For expectancy-incongruent targets, social class is informative enough that class prejudice is not needed to draw attention to the social class membership. The incongruence between the class expectation elicited by the target's race and the target's characteristics causes social class to be salient.

It is prudent to note that the present definition of social class prejudice limits the findings and a more complex conceptualization, one including attitudes toward the middle class and upper class, would give a clearer understanding of the influences on social categorizations. With Blacks overrepresented in lower socioeconomic classes, their attitudes toward the middle class and upper class might be particularly informative in explaining Black perceivers' social categorizations. Future research should expand the conceptualization of social class prejudice and account for attitudes toward middle- and upper-class targets.

Surprisingly, racial prejudice did not influence racial categorization in the present studies. A failure to replicate this previous finding could have occurred for several reasons. One possibility is the dichotomized variable resulted in insufficient power to detect any differences. To assess this possibility with a more powerful regression-based approach, we calculated a difference score for each participant by subtracting the between-race errors from the within-race errors. Thus, higher values on the difference score represent greater racial categorization. However, regressing racial prejudice on these difference scores produced nonsignificant results for both White ($p > .08$) and Black ($p > .5$) participants. These findings, however, seem contrary to Stangor et al. (1992), who crossed sex and race of discussants, finding all participants categorized by sex and the subtype but only high racially prejudiced participants (as measured by the MRS) categorized by race. One possibility for this discrepancy concerns the social categories used. The present study's use of only male discussants meant target sex was not particularly informative because it could not be used to distinguish between discussants (see Taylor et al., 1978; Zarate & Smith, 1990). However, a target's racial group membership was both visually distinctive and informative for differentiating between targets, resulting in race becoming a more prevalent categorization.

But why did racial prejudice influence class categorization, with participants high in racial prejudice engaging in class categorization of middle-class Black targets? Perhaps these individuals were particularly attuned to the Black target's social class membership because it was incongruent with the race/social class expectation; that is, the middle-class standing of such a target was particularly informative and salient due to its contrast to the expectation and this contrast was sharpest for those with a negative attitude toward Blacks. This conclusion is consistent with research demonstrating increased scrutiny of expectancy-incongruent information relative to expectancy-congruent information (Stangor & McMillan, 1992).

Admittedly, the present conceptualization of Blacks' attitudes toward Whites might have been too limiting to demonstrate any reliable or valid categorization differences due to racial prejudice. Limited research has investigated Blacks' racial attitudes toward Whites, particularly in comparison to the body of research investigating White's attitudes toward Blacks (Biernet & Crandell, 1999; Monteith & Spicer, 2000; Pettigrew, 1985; Shelton, 2000). Thus, the lack of differences between high and low racially prejudiced Blacks could potentially be due to inadequate conceptualization and/or

measurement of Blacks' prejudice toward Whites rather than a general lack of influence of such attitudes. The present study does present an important comparison between the categorization processes of Black and White perceivers. A lack of consistent significant differences suggests a similarity in the category memberships White and Black perceivers find informative.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The Importance of Social Class

The present studies resulted in several interesting findings about the relationship between racial and social class categorizations. First, categorization by subtype was prominent, demonstrating the informativeness of membership at the conjunction of race and social class. Indeed, examination of the categorization of targets crossed on race and social class demonstrated the importance of considering this subtyping. For example, race dominated the categorization of lower-class Black targets but social class dominated for middle-class Black targets. Also, three of the four targets were categorized specifically at the conjunction of race and social class, beyond either category independently.

Second, these results clearly illustrate the informativeness of social class membership as a social category, independent of and in conjunction with race. Despite the visual salience and social significance of race, social class categorization effects exceeded race categorization effects for three of the four target types. For lower-class Black targets, however, racial categorization did dominate, with only high-class-prejudice participants categorizing by social class. Thus, racial stereotypes and attitudes could dominate social judgments of lower-class Black targets. For middle-class Black targets, social class categorization clearly dominated, suggesting the importance of social class membership in social judgments of these targets. Although individuals can be categorized along a variety of social categories (e.g., ethnicity, gender, occupation, and so forth), one factor influencing which categorization dominates is the salience of a category (Macrae & Bodenhausen, 2000). Given the salience of race and racial discrimination in American society, and the plethora of research investigating racial stereotype activation and application, the relationship with social class is an important caveat warranting further investigation.

These findings have important theoretical and methodological implications for our understanding of race-related social phenomena. The present studies assessed spontaneous categorizations in that participants had no explicit instructions to attend to the targets' social cate-

gory memberships. Although factors such as motivation and interest can influence the level of categorization (e.g., Pendry & Macrae, 1996), subtyping was prominent in the absence of motivation to do so. The prevalence of target subtyping suggests that there could be discord between the category level typically researched (e.g., Black, White) and the perceiver's actual level of categorization (e.g., middle-class Black, lower-class Black). To the extent that the subtype category (e.g., lower-class Black) matches the superordinate category (e.g., Black; i.e., expectancy congruence), similar stereotypes and attitudes apply. However, if the subtype (e.g., middle-class Black) differs markedly from the superordinate category (e.g., Black; expectancy incongruence), research findings regarding the superordinate category may not apply (Ramsey, Lord, Wallace, & Pugh, 1994).

From a methodological standpoint, the present results suggest that class-relevant features could influence the attitudinal and stereotype priming effects of photographs of Black targets. Does the target have a well-groomed appearance with a nice shirt/blouse or is the target less clean-cut, with a more modest appearance and attire? What if no class-relevant inform in discernable? Priming studies using facial stimuli have been used to demonstrate the automatic activation of attitudes (e.g., Dovidio, Kawakami, Johnson, Johnson, & Howard, 1997; Fazio et al., 1995) and stereotypes (e.g., Stewart, Weeks, & Lupfer, 2003; Wittenbrink, Judd, & Park, 1997). Further research should investigate the priming effects of such visual stimuli, varying the class-relevant status of Black and White targets. These findings support the importance of the recent shift in empirical research toward using visual/pictorial stimuli to investigate stereotyping and prejudice phenomena rather than the traditional verbal labels (Macrae & Bodenhausen, 2000). The use of verbal labels as stereotype activation stimuli would most likely result in the activation of the prototypic category expectation, whereas pictorial stimuli allows for more realistic category activation. If the verbal label "Black" is used to activate stereotypes of African American targets, then these findings might not generalize to a highly relevant subtype (i.e., middle-class Blacks). Thus, if the verbal label "Black" activates the stereotype for the prototypic, lower-class, Black target, then the same stereotype might not be applied to a non-prototypic, middle-class, Black target. Further research should assess this possible explanation for the complex findings among studies investigating racial prejudice and stereotyping.

Conclusion

Social science research has shown racial stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination phenomenon are quite

complex and the present research suggests the influential social class component needs further investigation. The present findings substantiate the claim that race and social class memberships are intertwined in a complex relationship that needs to be teased apart. A recent film (Rich, 2000) illustrates the phenomenon explored in the present research. In the film, Jamal, an exceptionally bright Black teenager from the Bronx, is enrolled in an elite Manhattan prep school. When an attraction forms between Jamal and a White classmate, her father clearly disapproves of the relationship. The question raised by this research is simple: Is the father's disapproval based on Jamal's race or his socioeconomic class? Or, perhaps being a lower-class Black puts Jamal at a particular disadvantage. As Pettigrew (1985) notes, "race and class studies appear to converge on an interactional position— one that emphasizes the importance of both race and class factors as well as their interaction" (p. 329). The present investigation has produced findings consistent with Pettigrew's statement and demonstrated the importance of its embrace. Future models of race-relevant attitudes and stereotyping should account for the complexity introduced by social class membership and provide a better understanding of the use of race and social class in social judgments.

NOTES

1. For the remainder of the article, photograph order and photograph set were included in all relevant analyses, although they will not be explicitly stated. To the extent any interactions with these factors represent disordinal, unpredicted effects, they will be discussed.

2. Analysis revealed scores on the individual differences measures did not significantly differ by time of completion. Consequently, this factor will not be discussed further.

3. An analysis of participants' self-reported social class membership revealed approximately 35% of Blacks classified themselves as lower class or working class versus only 16% of Whites. Conversely, 34% of Whites indicated that they were from the upper-middle-class or upper-class category versus only 19% of Blacks (with none indicating membership in the upper-class category).

4. Given that the procedures and stimuli for the statement recognition task (SRT) were identical to those of Experiment 1, a likely explanation for this additional finding is the increased power of Experiment 2, with approximately 4 times as many research participants in the latter study. An additional analysis merged the data from Experiments 1 and 2 and included Experiment Number as a between-subjects factor. Substantiating the claim of insufficient power, the analysis revealed no significant interactions with the Experiment Number factor.

5. Although we collected participants' responses to Hoyt's classism scale during the screening week assessment, two factors prevented us from using it as our primary measure of social class prejudice. First, the measure does not control for racial effects; that is, the participant responds to "working-class" and "middle-class" targets but it is likely these targets are Black and White, respectively. The social distance measure allowed us to control for target race, providing a less racially confounded assessment of social class prejudice. Second, the Hoyt classism scale was significantly correlated with Modern Racism Scale (MRS) scores ($r = .444$), whereas the social-distance-based class prejudice measure was not.

6. Although the construct being measured is assumed to be the same, it should be noted that the White and Black respondents were responding to different targets; that is, White respondents rated desired social distance from a "working-class White" target, whereas Blacks rated desired social distance from a "working-class Black" target.

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Argyle, M. (1994). *The psychology of social class.* London: Routledge.

Bayton, J. A., McAllister, L. B., & Hamer, J. (1976). Race-class stereotypes. *Journal of Negro Education, 25,* 75-78.

Biernat, M., & Crandell, C. S. (1999). Racial attitudes. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of political attitudes* (pp. 297-411). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Bodenhausen, G. V., & Macrae, C. N. (1998). Stereotype activation and inhibition. In R. S. Wyer, Jr. (Ed.), *Advances in social cognition* (Vol. 11, pp. 1-52). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bogardus, E. S. (1933). A social distance scale. *Sociology and Social Research, 17,* 265-271.

Bogardus, E. S. (1959). *Social distance.* Yellow Springs, OH: Antioch.

Brewer, M. B. (1988). A dual process model of impression formation. In T. K. Srull & R. S. Wyer, Jr. (Eds.), *Advances in social cognition* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-36). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Brewer, M. B., Weber, J. G., & Carini, B. (1995). Person memory in intergroup contexts: Categorization versus individuation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69,* 29-40.

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

Devine, P. G. (1989). Automatic and controlled processes in stereotype priming. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70,* 1142-1163.

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., Brigham, J. C., Johnson, B. T., & Gaertner, S. L. (1996). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination: Another look. In C. N. Macrae, C. Stangor, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Stereotypes and stereotyping.* New York: Guilford.

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

Fazio, R. H., & Dunton, B. C. (1997). Categorization by race: The impact of automatic and controlled components of racial prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 33,* 451-470.

Fazio, R. H., Jackson, J. R., Dunton, B. C., & Williams, C. J. (1995). Variability in automatic activation as an unobtrusive measure of racial attitudes: A bona fide pipeline? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69,* 1013-1027.

Feldman, J. M. (1972). Stimulus characteristics and subject prejudice as determinants of stereotype attribution. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 21,* 333-340.

Feldman, J. M., & Hilterman, R. J. (1974). Stereotype attribution revisited: The role of stimulus characteristics, racial attitude, and cognitive differentiation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1,* 62-65.

Fiske, S. T., & Neuberg, S. L. (1990). A continuum model of impression formation from category-based to individuating processes: Influences of information and motivation on attention and interpretation. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 1-74). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Gilbert, D. T., & Hixon, J. G. (1991). The trouble of thinking: Activation and application of stereotypic beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60,* 509-517.

Giles, M. W., Gatlin, D. S., & Cataldo, E. F. (1976). Racial and class prejudice: Their relative effects on protest against school desegregation. *American Sociological Review, 41,* 280-288.

Herring, C. (1989). Convergence, polarization, or what? Racially based changes in attitudes and outlooks, 1964-1984. *The Sociological Quarterly, 30,* 267-281.

Hoyt, S. K. (1999). *Beyond prejudiced thoughts: Conceptual links between classism and discrimination.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Miami University.

Hoyt, S. K., Doyon, T. A., & Dietz-Uhler, B. (1998). *The classism scale.* Poster presented at the 70th annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago.

Jones, J. M. (1997). *Prejudice and racism.* New York: McGraw-Hill. (Original work published 1972)

Jussim, L., Coleman, L. M., & Lerch, L. (1987). The nature of stereotypes: A comparison and integration of three theories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 536-546.

Katz, D., & Braly, K. (1933). Racial stereotypes in one hundred college students. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 28*, 280-290.

Kessler, R. C., & Neighbors, H. W. (1986). A new perspective on the relationships among race, social class, and psychological distress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 27*, 107-115.

Kirby, B. J. (1999). Income source and race effects on new-neighbor evaluations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 29*, 1497-1511.

Klonis, S. C., & Devine, P. G. (2001). *Measurement of racial and socioeconomic subgroups.* Paper presented at the 3rd annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Savannah, GA.

Laumann, E. O. (1966). *Prestige and association in an urban community.* New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

Lepore, L., & Brown, R. (1997). Category and stereotype activation: Is prejudice inevitable? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 275-287.

Macrae, C. N., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2000). Social cognition: Thinking categorically about others. *Annual Review of Psychology, 51*, 93-120.

Madon, S., Jussim, L., Keiper, S., Eccles, J., Smith, A., & Palumbo, P. (1998). The accuracy and power of sex, social class, and ethnic stereotypes: A naturalistic study in person perception. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24*, 1304-1318.

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.

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

Pendry, L. F., & Macrae, C. N. (1996). What the disinterested perceiver overlooks: Goal-directed social categorization. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 3*, 250-257.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1980). The changing—not declining—significance of race. *Contemporary Sociology, 9*, 19-21.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1981). Race and class in the 1980s: An interactive view. *Daedalus, 110*, 233-255.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1985). New Black-White patterns: How best to conceptualize them? *Annual Review of Sociology, 11*, 329-346.

Piliavin, I. M., Rodin, J., & Piliavin, J. A. (1969). Good Samaritanism: An underground phenomenon? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 13*, 289-299.

Posner, M. I., & Keele, S. W. (1968). On the genesis of abstract ideas. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 77*, 353-363.

Ramsey, S. L., Lord, C. G., Wallace, D. S., & Pugh, M. A. (1994). The role of subtypes in attitudes towards superordinate social categories. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 387-403.

Reed, S. K. I. (1972). Pattern recognition and categorization. *Cognitive Psychology, 3*, 382-407.

Rich, M. (2000). *Finding Forrester* [Screenplay]. Los Angeles: Twentieth Century Fox.

Runciman, W. G. (1972). Race and social stratification. *Race, 13*, 497-509.

Russell, G. M. (1996). Internalized classism: The role of class in the development of self. *Women and Therapy, 18*, 59-71.

Shelton, J. N. (2000). A reconceptualization of how we study issues of racial prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4*, 374-390.

Smedley, J. W., & Bayton, J. A. (1978). Evaluative race-class stereotypes by race and perceived class of subjects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36*, 530-535.

Stangor, C., Lynch, L., Duan, C., & Glass, B. (1992). Categorization of individuals on the basis of multiple social features. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*, 207-218.

Stangor, C., & McMillan, D. (1992). Memory for expectancy-congruent and expectancy-incongruent information: A review of the social and social developmental literatures. *Psychological Bulletin, 111*, 42-61.

Stewart, T. L., Weeks, M., & Lupfer, M. B. (2003). Spontaneous stereotyping: A matter of prejudice? *Social Cognition, 21*, 263-298.

Taylor, S. E., & Falcone, H. (1982). Cognitive bases of stereotyping: The relationship between categorization and prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8*, 426-432.

Taylor, S. E., Fiske, S. T., Etcoff, N. L., & Ruderman, A. J. (1978). Categorical and contextual bases of person memory and stereotyping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36*, 778-793.

Triandis, H. C., & Triandis, L. M. (1960). Race, social class, religion, and nationality as determinants of social distance. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 61*, 110-118.

van Knippenberg, A., van Twuyver, M., & Pepels, J. (1994). Factors affecting social categorization processes in memory. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 419-431.

Warheit, G., Holzer, C. E., & Arey, S. S. (1975). Race and mental illness: An epidemiologic update. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 16*, 243-256.

Westie, F. R. (1952). Negro-White differentials in social distance. *American Sociological Review, 17*, 550-558.

Westie, F. R. (1953). A technique for the measurement of race attitudes. *American Sociological Review, 18*, 73-78.

Westie, F. R., & Westie, M. L. (1957). The social distance pyramid: Relations between caste and class. *American Journal of Sociology, 63*, 190-196.

Wilson, W. J. (1978). *The declining significance of race: Blacks and changing American institutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wittenbrink, B., Judd, C. M., & Park, B. (1997). Evidence for racial prejudice at the implicit level and its relationship with questionnaire measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 262-274.

Zarate, M. A., & Smith, E. R. (1990). Person categorization and stereotyping. *Social Cognition, 8*, 161-185.