A Study of Stereotyping: Testing Three Models With a Sample of Blacks

Lerita M. Coleman
University of Colorado, Boulder
Lee Jussim
Rutgers University
Susan Hatter Kelley
University of Michigan

Two experiments tested the premise that the underlying stereotyping processes used by Blacks and Whites are similar. Experiment 1 examined the hypothesis that people have more complex views of members of their own in-group than of an out-group. Results showed that Blacks held more complex views of Blacks than of Whites. Experiment 2 examined the hypotheses underlying complexity-extremity theory, assumed-characteristics theory, and expectancy-violation theory. Black perceivers evaluated target job applicants who varied with respect to race, dialect style, and personal appearance. Contrary to the complexity-extremity model, Black judges evaluated Black targets more extremely than White targets. Somewhat consistent with assumed-characteristics theory, Blacks used background information more than race in their evaluations. Partial support for expectancy-violation theory was found. Black judges evaluated upper class Black and White targets differently than they evaluated lower class targets. These findings suggest that race of perceiver may moderate the predictions of these three models. Modification of stereotyping models by including less powerful or stigmatized in-groups in basic research is discussed.

AUTHORS' NOTE: *Paper presented at the Empirical Conference on Black Psychology XIII. We gratefully acknowledge advice provided by Patty Linville regarding procedures for assessing cognitive complexity, and Margaret Hudson, Debra Lederer, Tim Makris, Christine McMaster, and Lori Morgan for their help in collecting the data. Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Lerita M. Coleman at the Department of Psychology, CB345, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309.*

JOURNAL OF BLACK PSYCHOLOGY, Vol. 21 No. 4, November 1995 332-356

INTRODUCTION

The social psychological literature is filled with studies of stereotyping and the categorization of persons (Clark & Pearson, 1982; Dienstbier, 1970; Feldman, 1972; Smedley & Bayton, 1978). Most models and studies of stereotyping, however, are based primarily on how Whites stereotype People of Color (Blacks in particular) and on other social stimuli. Yet to fully understand the stereotyping process, it would appear equally important to know how Blacks stereotype themselves and members of other groups (Dovidio, Evans, & Tyler, 1986). Moreover, the similarities and differences in how Blacks and Whites stereotype may have important consequences for the assumptions underlying contemporary stereotyping models.

Previous research (Jussim, Coleman, & Lerch, 1987) compares and contrasts three primary theories of how stereotypes influence the evaluation of job applicants: complexity-extremity theory (Linville, 1982; Linville & Jones, 1980), assumed-characteristics theory (e.g., Feldman, 1972; Rokeach & Mezei, 1966; Smedley & Bayton, 1978), and expectancy-violation theory (Dienstbier, 1970; Kelley, 1971; McKirnan, Smith, & Hamayan, 1983). These three theoretical perspectives within social psychology address how stereotypes influence perceptions of individual members of in-groups and out-groups. Moreover, each theory proposes that different processes underlie the impact of background information on evaluations of in-group and out-group members. When considered separately, these theories generate conflicting predictions. In addition, it is not yet known whether Blacks when judging Black and White job applicants use these three stereotyping processes in the same ways as do Whites. Therefore, we sought to expand and extend these models by exploring the multiple processes influencing evaluations made by Blacks. To assess these processes, we manipulated the race, personal appearance, and dialect style of target job applicants. Black judges rated these applicants on a set of characteristics relevant to hiring decisions.

Complexity-extremity theory was assessed in two ways. Experiment 1 tested the hypothesis that Blacks hold more complex views of their own group than of an out-group (e.g., Whites) with a trait-sorting procedure developed by Linville and Jones (1980). Experiment 2 assessed the second part of complexity-extremity theory—extremity theory (i.e., whether Blacks evaluate in-group members [other Blacks] less extremely than they evaluate out-group members [Whites])—as well as the two remaining theories: assumed-characteristics theory and expectancy-violation theory. Black judges viewed slides and listened to tape recordings of Black and White job applicants. These "job applicants" spoke nonstandard English and Standard English and were dressed to appear upper class and working class (see Figure 1).

	Nonstandard English		*Standard English*	
	Lower Class	*Upper Class*	*Lower Class*	*Upper Class*
Black	2	1	1	2
White	1	2	2	1

Figure 1: Experimental Design
NOTE: Figure shows which targets were seen by each group of students in Experiment 2. Numbers refer to subject group. 1 = Subject Group 1, and 2 = Subject Group 2. (Subjects were randomly assigned to groups.)

Judges then rated each applicant on characteristics relevant to evaluations of occupational competence and to hiring decisions. This included a set of general occupational evaluations (e.g., likelihood of each applicant being hired, intelligence), ratings of typical occupational traits (e.g., hardworking, ambitious, organized), ratings of how much the judge would like to work with the applicant in various occupational relationships (e.g., employer, coworker, and employee).

COGNITIVE COMPLEXITY OF STEREOTYPES

How do stereotypes influence perceptions of individuals from the stereotyped groups? One approach that has addressed this issue is complexity-extremity theory (Linville, 1982; Linville & Jones, 1980). This theory argues that people have more contact with other in-group members than with out-group members. For example, Whites usually have more contact with other Whites than with Blacks, and Blacks usually have more contact with other Blacks. Consequently, "This rich background of experience with the in-group generates a larger number of dimensions along which individual members may be characterized" (Linville & Jones, 1980, p. 691).

When perceivers use more independent dimensions to judge a target person (or any stimulus), the theory suggests, evaluations should be less extreme. When perceivers use many independent dimensions, the target probably will be evaluated favorably on some dimensions and unfavorably on other dimensions. An overall evaluation that accounts for many dimensions is unlikely to be extremely favorable or unfavorable. When perceivers use few dimensions, however, they are more likely to see the target as all good or all bad.

Consistent with this perspective, research shows that men evaluate women more extremely than they evaluate men; women evaluate men more ex-

tremely than they evaluate women; Whites evaluate Blacks more extremely than they evaluate Whites; and young people evaluate old people more extremely than they evaluate younger people (Jussim et al., 1987; Linville, 1982; Linville & Jones, 1980). Further, Whites' stereotypes of Whites include more independent dimensions than their stereotypes of Blacks, and young people's stereotypes of the young incorporate more independent dimensions than their stereotypes of the old (Linville, 1982; Linville & Jones, 1980).

There is, however, one important limitation to previous research on complexity-extremity theory. All previous studies have focused exclusively on the stereotypes held by White perceivers. Therefore, whether the processes identified by previous research generalize to perceivers of different racial and cultural backgrounds remains an empirical question. The current research addresses this issue in several ways.

First, this research provides an additional test of the hypothesis that (a) people have a more complex structure of their group than of other groups; this is done by using Black, rather than White, subjects. Linville and Jones (1980), Linville (1982), and Linville, Salovey, and Fischer (1986) have provided support for this hypothesis but only using White subjects. Second, the hypotheses that (b) the more complex a person's cognitive representation of stimuli from a specific domain, the less extreme will be the person's evaluations of stimuli from that domain, and that (c) people will evaluate in-group members less extremely than they will out-group members will be tested using an "in vivo" interview simulation that is somewhat more realistic and complete than evaluative judgments based on resume information or cookie tasting, such as those used in the Linville studies. Linville (1982) has found support for these two hypotheses using race as well as gender as the in-group/out-group variable. Additionally, due to the relative lack of evidence for differential evaluations of job candidates as a function of race (Arvey, 1979), this research provides a stronger test of hypotheses b and c.

This paper is not meant, however, to propose differential predictions of the complexity-extremity effect for Blacks and Whites. Rather it is meant to test the limits of this approach and the generalizability of the basic hypotheses to other populations and situations.

THE IN-GROUP/OUT-GROUP COMPLEXITY HYPOTHESIS

This hypothesis assumes that individuals have more complex cognitive representations of in-group members than of out-group members. Greater

familiarity with and knowledge of stimuli within a domain leads to greater complexity within that domain. The complexity of cognitive schemas is thus a continuous factor rather than a dichotomous one. A cognitive schema is not either simple or complex but is rather more or less complex in regard to a particular domain. Thus, to the extent that individuals have more knowledge of and familiarity with members of their in-group than with members of their out-group, their cognitive representations regarding in-group members will be more complex than their representations of out-group members. Accordingly, Whites would generally be expected to have more complex cognitive schemas regarding Whites than regarding Latinos, Blacks, Asians, and other out-group members because they are exposed to and have more contact with Whites. Conversely, Blacks would be expected to have more complex cognitive schemas regarding Blacks than regarding Whites, Latinos, Asians, and other out-group members. However, the assumption that all Blacks have more contact with Blacks than with Whites may not always be valid in our society. With the increasing numbers of upwardly mobile Blacks in the country today, it is conceivable that some Blacks may well spend most, if not all, of their time, when not with family, in contact with Whites rather than with Blacks. Blacks at all socioeconomic status (SES) levels frequently have considerable contact with Whites in school, work, recreational situations, and through the media, thus it is not clear that all, or even most, Blacks will have more complex schemas regarding Blacks (their in-group) than regarding Whites (their out-group). Essentially, one expects that the complexity of one's cognitive schemas is determined primarily by the familiarity and knowledge one has of stimulus from a particular domain. Thus, although it is important to mention that there may be certain circumstances that influence the degree to which this hypothesis is valid, by definition, one would expect that individuals will have more complex schemas regarding in-group members than regarding out-group members.

EXTREMITY COMPONENT OF COMPLEXITY-EXTREMITY THEORY

There are certain characteristics (e.g., lower SES and nonstandard dialects) that are frequently viewed unfavorably by Whites (Bayton, McAllister, & Hamer, 1956; Feldman, 1972; McKirnan et al., 1983; Smedley & Bayton, 1978; Williams, 1970). Excluding other influences, complexity-extremity theory would predict that Blacks' evaluations of Whites should be polarized in comparison with Blacks' evaluations of Blacks. Thus, upper class,

Standard-English-speaking Whites should be evaluated extremely favorably—even more favorably than Blacks. On the contrary, lower class, nonstandard-English-speaking Whites should be evaluated extremely unfavorably—even less favorably than comparable Blacks.

RANGE, OR POLARIZED APPRAISALS, HYPOTHESIS

The range hypothesis, or polarized appraisals—a derivative of the complexity and extremity components of the complexity-extremity theory—posits that if there is no group (race main) effect, and if two stimuli are chosen such that one is favorable and the other unfavorable, evaluative extremity will result in a polarization effect. Hence the range, or the difference, between Blacks' evaluations of upper class, Standard-English-speaking Whites and of lower class, nonstandard-English-speaking Whites should be larger than the difference between their evaluations of upper class, Standard-English-speaking Blacks and of lower class, nonstandard-English-speaking Blacks. Hence support for the range, or polarized appraisals, hypothesis would be represented by a race by background characteristics interaction.

ASSUMED CHARACTERISTICS

Stereotypes are often associated with other background information about group members. Based on stereotypes about race, people also make assumptions about SES (Bayton et al., 1956; Feldman, 1972; Smedley & Bayton, 1978), personality traits (e.g., Grant & Holmes, 1981; Locksley, Borgida, Brekke, & Hepburn, 1980), and beliefs and values (e.g., Rokeach & Mezei, 1966). Normally, members of an in-group will believe their characteristics are more favorable than characteristics of members of an out-group.

If assumed characteristics were to operate in isolation from other influences, having information about relevant background characteristics should eliminate the effects of group membership. Thus, based on previous stereotyping research, many middle-class Whites show this *elimination of bias* effect if out-group members display behavior similar to that of Whites, express similar beliefs and values, have similar socioeconomic backgrounds, or speak similar dialect styles (Locksley et al., 1980; Locksley, Hepburn, & Ortiz, 1982b; McKirnan et al., 1983; Rokeach & Mezei, 1966; Smedley & Bayton, 1978).

Assumed-characteristics theory, however, does acknowledge the fact that although race effects may not always be eliminated, background charac-

teristics should have more impact (Insko, Nacoste, & Moe, 1983; Locksley, Hepburn, & Ortiz, 1982a). Several studies have confirmed this lessening of racial bias effect (Feldman, 1972; Locksley et al., 1982a; Moe, Nacoste, & Insko, 1981; Rasinski, Crocker, & Hastie, 1985; for reviews, see also Cook, 1984; Insko et al., 1983). Yet it is unclear how this theory might apply to the evaluations of Whites by Blacks. Do Blacks have stereotype-based assumptions of Whites that lead to more unfavorable evaluations of them that are then moderated by SES and dialect style? Detailed research on Blacks' attitudes toward Whites is indeed complex and fairly unexplored. Would a secondary prediction of this theory be confirmed—that is, in the presence of other information, would background characteristics have larger effects than race with a sample of Black judges? We predicted that personal appearance and dialect style would have a greater impact on evaluations than would race.

EXPECTANCY VIOLATION

The final perspective, expectancy-violation theory, also suggests that stereotypes are linked to evaluations about personal characteristics. This theory, however, suggests that when a person's characteristics violate stereotyped-based expectations, the evaluations should be extreme in the direction of the expectancy violation. People who have qualities that are more positive than expected are rated more favorably than others with similar characteristics. Similarly, individuals who have characteristics that are more unfavorable than expected should be rated even more negatively than others with similar characteristics.

Kelley's (1971) theory about the attributional mechanisms of augmentation and discounting lend credence to the expectancy-violation effect. The augmentation principle indicates that the perceived role of a particular factor in producing an outcome is enhanced when factors leading to an opposite outcome are also present. Hence some Whites may perceive racial discrimination as creating more obstacles to the social and occupational mobility of Blacks. Therefore, successful Blacks may be perceived as possessing extremely favorable personal qualities—even more favorable than comparable Whites. Thus the presence of obstacles *augments* the perceived role of personal qualities in the success of Blacks. However, does the augmenting principle work similarly for Blacks when evaluating Blacks and Whites? Is the presence of successful Blacks as surprising to Blacks as it is to Whites? Will Blacks evaluate successful Blacks higher than successful Whites?

According to this model, Black judges should evaluate high SES Blacks higher than comparable Whites.

The discounting principle works in a similar fashion. These same obstacles might lead Whites to view lower SES Blacks as possessing fewer unfavorable personal qualities than lower SES Whites. Hence, according to this model, Blacks should evaluate lower SES Blacks more favorably than comparable Whites. Expectancy-violation theory then predicts that Blacks will evaluate Blacks more favorably than similar Whites if either (or both) of two conditions are met: (a) Blacks have an unexpected positive characteristic (high SES) or (b) Whites have an unexpected negative characteristic (low SES).

Although several studies have examined the expectations Whites hold of Blacks (Dienstbier, 1970; Feldman, 1972; Smedley & Bayton, 1978), no studies to our knowledge have examined the expectations that Blacks hold of other Blacks or Whites.

Previous research has also investigated Whites' expectations about the use of Standard English by Whites and Blacks (Back, 1968; McKirnan et al., 1983; Putnam & O'Hern, 1955), but only a few studies have included Blacks in their samples (Coleman, 1976; Tucker & Lambert, 1969; Williams, Whitehead, & Miller, 1971). Most of these studies point to the greater accuracy Blacks have for identifying social status from the voice, although often, Standard-English-speaking Blacks are mistaken for Whites by both Black and White listeners (Coleman, 1976). Usually both Black and White listeners respond to nonstandard-English-speaking Whites least favorably (Tucker & Lambert, 1969), so this category may violate the expectations of both Blacks and Whites. Therefore, we predict that Blacks will evaluate nonstandard-English-speaking Whites less favorably than comparable Blacks. Table 1 summarizes the predictions we have made for each theory.

EXPERIMENT 1

Overview

Subjects were asked to complete a trait-sorting task designed to assess the complexity of their knowledge structure regarding Blacks and Whites. This trait sort was similar to the one used by Linville (1982). Black subjects sorted personality traits into groups representing traits that seemed to belong together. Each subject performed this task twice. Half of the subjects were

TABLE 1

Nature of Stereotypes: Evaluations of Black and White Targets With Similar Characteristics as Predicted by Each Theory Separately

	Target			
Theory	*Lower Class, Nonstandard English*	*Upper Class, Nonstandard English*	*Lower Class, Standard English*	*Upper Class, Standard English*
Complexity-extremity	Blacks evaluated higher	No predicted difference	No predicted difference	Whites evaluated higher
Assumed-characteristics	No predicted difference	No predicted difference	No predicted difference	No predicted difference
Expectancy-violation	Blacks evaluated higher	Blacks evaluated higher	No prediction	Blacks evaluated higher

NOTE: Predictions were derived by assuming that each theory provides exhaustive and mutually exclusive descriptions of stereotyping.

asked to think about "adult Black males" and then about "adult White males" while performing the task. The other half of the subjects were asked to think about "adult Black male job applicants" and then "adult White male job applicants." Within each group, half of the subjects were asked to think about the White target first, while others were asked to think about the Black target first. Thus order effects could be controlled for. According to Hypothesis I, the Black subjects will use a larger number of independent conceptual traits when describing the Black group than when describing the White group.

METHOD

Subjects

The sample consisted of 42 Black students (33 female, 9 male) enrolled in a large midwestern university. All of the subjects were run in groups of 1 to 6. Each subject was paid $5 for participating in the experiment.

Trait Development

To develop the traits for the trait-sort task, another study was conducted. In this study, a sample of 74 Black and 80 White undergraduate students at a large midwestern university generated the personality traits used in Experiment 1.

Procedures

Complexity assessment. We assessed cognitive complexity using procedures adapted from those employed by Linville (1982; Linville & Jones, 1980). Through a series of pretests, we identified 30 traits that Blacks and Whites frequently use in describing Blacks and Whites. Subjects received a deck of 30 cards; a trait was printed on each card. These traits included personality characteristics, such as "ambitious" and "self-centered," and status characteristics, such as "college educated" and "upper class."

Subjects sorted traits into groups that they felt described particular types of Blacks, and they sorted traits into groups that they felt described particular types of Whites.

Experimental sessions. Each subject was seated at a table with 30 randomly ordered cards—each containing the name of one of the personality

traits—several blank cards, a pencil, and a recording sheet. The experimenter then read the following instructions:

> You may form as many groups as you desire. Each group may contain as many or as few traits as you wish. You *do not* have to use every trait. Also, each trait may be used in more than one group; so you may keep *reusing* traits as many times as you like. For example, you may find that you want to use the trait "independent" in several groups. If you wish to use a trait in more than one group, you may use one of the blank cards on your desk. Simply write the trait and its number on a blank card and then proceed to use it as you would the other cards.
>
> Continue forming groups until you feel that you have formed the important ones. We realize that this task could be endless, so form only those groups that make sense to you. Continue to form groups until you feel that it is impossible to form any that make sense.
>
> Use the recording sheet in front of you to indicate which traits you have put together. Each column will correspond to one of your groups. Write only the *number* that appears on the card in the column, not the name of the trait. A natural way to perform this task is to form several groups and then to record them, then form other groups and record them. Repeat this procedure until you feel that you have formed all the important groups. We have extra recording sheets if you need them. The order in which you record the groups is not important, nor is the order of the traits within a group. We are only interested in which traits you put together. Do not put your name on the recording sheet. Your responses are strictly anonymous and confidential, so be as honest as you can. There is no right or wrong answer here, only your opinion. Do you have any questions?
>
> Different people will finish at different times, so take as much time as you need, even if someone else is finished. Keep in mind that you are making groups of traits to describe Black (or White) males (or male job applicants) and *not* people in general.

RESULTS

Experiment 1: Cognitive Complexity

We computed a Scott's H^1 (Scott, 1962, 1966) to determine cognitive complexity. Next we determined if there were any differences in the Scott's H scores for the Black and White males and the Black and White male job applicants. In both sets of analyses, we found no differences: Black males/Black male job applicants, $F(10, 11) = 1.29$, *ns*; White males/White male job applicants, $F(9, 11) = 1.67$, *ns*. Thus we merged the data from these two trait sorts. Two analyses examined the hypothesis that in-group members have more complex cognitive representations of their own group than of out-groups. Table 2 presents the mean Scott's H scores and the mean number

TABLE 2
Complexity of Blacks' Racial Stereotypes

	Traits	
	Regarding Blacks	*Regarding Whites*
Scott's H	3.57	2.94
Number of groups	7.09	5.35

NOTE: H may range between 1.00 and $\log_2 n$, where n is the number of traits. A higher Scott's H reflects the use of more independent dimensions in perceiving the target group, that is, more cognitive complexity. A higher number of groups means that subjects created more piles of traits that "go together" (i.e., more subtypes) in describing either Blacks or Whites. For both measures, the scores for the Black target group were significantly higher than scores for the White target group.

of groups that subjects developed for Blacks and for Whites. Consistent with the complexity hypothesis, Blacks formed more groups when thinking about Blacks than when thinking about Whites ($t(40) = 1.99, p < .05$) and received higher Scott's H scores when thinking about Blacks or Whites ($t(40) = 2.32, p < .0001$).[2]

These results strongly support the first prediction of complexity-extremity theory—that in-groups (Blacks) hold more complex views of in-group members (Blacks) than of out-group members (Whites).

EXPERIMENT 2

EXTREMITY, ASSUMED-CHARACTERISTICS, AND EXPECTANCY-VIOLATION THEORIES

Overview

Experiment 1 indicated that Blacks' stereotypes of Blacks are more complex than their stereotypes of Whites. Consequently, complexity-extremity theory also predicts that Blacks' evaluations of Whites will be more extreme than their evaluations of Blacks. Experiment 2 tested this prediction.

Black judges evaluated target job applicants who varied on the basis of their race (Black, White), personal appearance (upper class, lower class), and dialect style (Standard English, nonstandard English). Subjects rated these applicants on a set of characteristics relevant to hiring decisions, such as intelligence, competence, warmth, and so on. According to complexity-

extremity theory, Blacks' evaluations of Whites should be more extreme than their evaluations of Blacks. Specifically, the difference between Blacks' evaluations of upper-class-appearing, Standard-English-speaking White applicants and lower-class-appearing, nonstandard-English-speaking White applicants should be larger (or more *extreme*) than the difference between their evaluations of upper-class-appearing, Standard-English-speaking Black applicants and lower-class-appearing, nonstandard-English-speaking Black applicants.

Subjects viewed slides and listened to tape recordings of Black and White job applicants who spoke either nonstandard English or Standard English and who were dressed to appear upper or lower class. Subjects then rated each applicant on 11 characteristics relevant to evaluations of occupational competence and to hiring decisions. This included a set of general occupational evaluations (e.g., hardworking, ambitious, organized) and ratings of how much the judge would like to work with the applicant in various occupational relationships (e.g., employer, coworker, and employee). The stimulus targets and materials used in this experiment are identical to those used by Jussim et al. (1987).

METHOD

Judges

Ninety-five Black (57 female and 38 male) undergraduate students enrolled in a large midwestern university served as judges in this experiment. These judges evaluated job applicants in groups of 3 to 12.

Stimulus Targets

The race (Black or White), personal appearance (lower class or upper class), and dialect style (nonstandard English or Standard English) of four male confederates were varied to create all eight possible stimulus combinations. Two target applicants were created from each confederate with the use of the matched-guide method (Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner, & Fillenbaum, 1960). Each confederate dressed in both upper class and lower class styles. Thus differences in ratings of upper- and lower class targets could only result from personal appearance differences and not from differences in the type of person appearing upper- or lower class.

A similar procedure was followed for dialect style. Each speaker conversed in both nonstandard English and Standard English. Thus differences

in the ratings of speakers of nonstandard English and Standard English could only be due to differences in dialect style and not to actual differences in the type of person who spoke a particular dialect.

Materials

A detailed description of the stimulus materials (slides and tape-recordings) we used can be found in Jussim et al. (1987). These materials are briefly described below.

Slides of targets. Job applicants were presented through a series of slides. The upper-class-appearing targets were dressed in a conservative and formal style. This consisted of a traditional dark suit with a light colored shirt, dark polished shoes, and a conservative tie. The lower-class-appearing targets wore less expensive clothing that included an older sports coat, a light colored shirt, a wide tie, older pants, and scuffed dress shoes. Each target was photographed walking into the office, sitting in the waiting room, filling out a job application, and waiting for the interviewer to enter the room.

Scripts. Scripts containing responses to four job interview questions were developed. The questions included the following: "How did you hear about this job?" "Why do you want this job?" "Do you have a car?" and "What are your job strengths?" There were four answers to each of these questions. Each answer was written in both Standard English and nonstandard English. For example, the following are Standard English and nonstandard English versions of the same response to the question. "Why do you want this job?"

> *Standard English:* This is the kind of job I have been trained to do. At my old job, I wasn't able to use all of my skills. This job would allow me to use more of my skills, while learning some new ones at the same time.
>
> *Nonstandard English:* Dis is da kinda job I been trainin ta do. At my ole job, I wasn able ta use all a ma skills. Dis job'd llow me ta use maw of ma skills while learnin some new ones at da same time.

The nonstandard English scripts were not written in Black English vernacular. The confederates also did not use southern accents when speaking nonstandard English. Both Blacks and Whites speak nonstandard forms of English other than Black English (Labov, 1972; Tucker & Lambert, 1969). Thus our use of a form of nonstandard English that is not uniquely Black was intended to enhance the credibility of our White nonstandard English speakers without detracting from the credibility of our Black nonstandard English speakers.

Speakers. Tape recordings of the responses to chosen job interview questions were prepared by speakers who were capable of speaking both Standard English and nonstandard English. Two White men and two Black men approximately 30 years of age were recorded while answering two of the interview questions twice—once using nonstandard English and once using Standard English. Although different speakers sometimes answered the same question, no two speakers provided the same response to any question.

Questionnaires

Questionnaires assessed judges' evaluations of the job candidates. One set of questions addressed general evaluations, including judgments of (a) the likelihood of each applicant being hired, (b) intelligence, (c) overall occupational competence, and (d) the status level of the job for which the applicant was most suited (job suitability). Another set of questions referred to personal characteristics or traits often relevant to occupational success, including assessments of how hardworking, ambitious, organized, and interpersonally warm the applicants were. The third set of questions assessed judges' preferences for working with each applicant in different types of occupational relationships. Specifically, judges indicated how much they would like to have each applicant as an employer, coworker, and employee.

All questions except job suitability were answered on a semantic differential scale ranging from 1 to 10, with higher scores indicating more favorable ratings. For the job suitability questions, judges selected from one of five occupational classifications of jobs, which ranged from unskilled labor to professional.

Experimental Design

Two sets of four stimulus targets were created from the slides and recordings of confederates. One stimulus set consisted of a lower class, nonstandard-English-speaking Black; an upper class, Standard-English-speaking Black; a lower class, Standard-English-speaking White; and an upper class, nonstandard-English-speaking White. The other set consisted of a lower class, nonstandard-English-speaking White; an upper class, Standard-English-speaking White; a lower class, Standard-English-speaking Black; and an upper class, nonstandard-English-speaking Black (see Figure 1).

Slides and recordings were combined as follows: (a) the same confederate did not appear twice in the same set, (b) the same speaker was not heard twice

in the same set, (c) if a confederate appeared upper class in one set, he appeared lower class in the other set (and vice versa), (d) if a speaker used Standard English in one set, he used nonstandard English in the other set (and vice versa), (e) all four confederates appeared in each stimulus set, (f) all four speakers were used in each stimulus set, and (g) none of the speakers within a set used the same script in response to interview questions. We presented the first stimulus set to one group of judges and the second stimulus set to a secondary group of judges. Within each stimulus set, presentation of targets was counterbalanced to eliminate order effects.

This methodology has several advantages over previous research on racial stereotyping. After reviewing the literature on discrimination in employment interviews, Arvey (1979) called for several methodological improvements: (a) presentation of fuller stimulus persons through "in vivo interview simulations," (b) presentation of multiple stimulus persons so that effects are not due to the unique characteristics of any single stimulus person, and (c) use of within-subjects designs, because such designs have more statistical power and allow judges to compare and contrast applicants. Our design met all of those needs by presenting multiple job applicants (i.e., two Whites, two Blacks, two upper class applicants, two lower class applicants, two Standard-English speakers, and two nonstandard English speakers) and by using a primarily within-subjects design.

Procedures

The slides and tapes were presented to subjects who were told that a hidden camera and microphone had been used to obtain pictures and tapes of actual job interviews. The four slides of each candidate (i.e., walking into the office, sitting in the waiting room, filling out an application, and sitting by the interviewer's desk) were shown, and a recording of the applicant answering two interview questions was played along with the fourth slide. The judges viewed one target and answered 11 questions about him. This procedure was then repeated for the other three targets.

RESULTS

We performed an initial set of 2 (race) × 2 (appearance) × 2 (dialect style) × 2 (gender) repeated measures ANOVAS for each of the 11 dependent variables. This analysis yielded significant differences in only three of the 88 possible main effects and interactions involving gender. Therefore, for the remaining analyses, we collapsed across gender. Cell means (see Table 4)

TABLE 3
Analysis of Variance for Evaluation of Black and White Targets

Source	df	F
Race (R)	1	.85
Class (C)	1	103.09*
Dialect style (DS)	1	131.94*
R × C	1	20.66*
R × C within-group error	64	(1.64)
R × DS	1	1.47
R × C within-group error	64	(1.76)
C × DS	1	3.37
C × DS within-group error	64	(3.43)
R × C × DS	1	.26
R × C × DS within-group error	64	(2.98)

NOTE: Values enclosed in parentheses represent within-square errors.
*$p < .001$.

also illustrate that the pattern of effects was similar on most of the 11 variables. Consequently, the clearest way to examine the predictions of the three theories is to analyze the data summing over all 11 variables. Reliabilities (Cronbach's alpha) computed for this 11-item scale for ratings of each of the eight applicants ranged from .87 to .95.

The results yielded significant main effects for class, $F(1, 64) = 103.09$, $p < .001$, and dialect style, $F(1, 64) = 131.94$, $p < .001$, but not for race, $F(1, 64) = .85$, *ns*. Overall, upper-class-appearing targets were rated more favorably than lower-class-appearing targets, and targets who spoke Standard English were rated higher than targets who spoke nonstandard English. There was also one two-way (Race × Class) interaction, $F(1, 64) = 20.66$, $p < .001$. Lower-class-appearing White targets were judged more positively than lower-class-appearing Black targets, but upper-class-appearing Black targets were judged more positively than lower-class-appearing White targets. The Race × Dialect Style two-way interaction, $F(1, 64) = 1.47$; Class × Dialect Style two-way interaction, $F(1, 64) = 3.37$; and the Race × Class × Dialect Style three-way interaction, $F(1, 64) = .26$, were not significant.

Complexity-Extremity (the Range Hypothesis)

In sharp contrast to predictions generated from complexity-extremity theory, the cell means show that the judges rated the Black, upper-class-appearing, Standard-English-speaking applicant more favorably than the

TABLE 4
Cell Means for the Overall Evaluative Index

	Nonstandard English Speech		*Standard English Speech*	
	Lower Class	*Upper Class*	*Lower Class*	*Upper Class*
Black	36.15	65.32	56.93	84.08
White	37.86	51.53	63.24	70.66

Main Effect Means

Black = 60.62	White = 55.82
Lower class = 48.45	Upper class = 67.90
Nonstandard English = 47.71	Standard English = 68.72
Grand mean = 58.22	

NOTE: Higher means indicate more favorable ratings.

comparable White applicant (see Table 4), and the lower-class-appearing, nonstandard-English-speaking, White applicants were not rated significantly lower than the similar Black applicants ($t = 5.65$, $p < .001$). The evaluations of Whites by Blacks were not more extreme than the evaluations of Blacks by Blacks, as this model would predict.

Also inconsistent with the theory, judges rated the Black, lower-class, nonstandard-English-speaking applicant less favorably than the comparable White applicant (see Table 4). Further, an interaction contrast (based on the Race × Class interaction) showed that the judges' evaluations of the most and least favorable Black applicants were significantly more extreme than their evaluations of the most and least favorable White applicants: $F(1, 55) = 6.08$, $p < .02$; range for Blacks = 47.93, range for Whites = 32.80. These analyses are inconsistent with the hypothesis that in-group members evaluate out-group members more extremely.

Assumed Characteristics (Elimination of Bias Hypothesis)

A main prediction of assumed-characteristics theory is that Blacks' bias against Whites should be eliminated through direct access to relevant background information. Although there exists information that Blacks hold no real negative biases toward Whites (in a manner similar to how Whites stigmatize Blacks), we did not assess evaluations of Blacks and Whites about whom no background information was provided. Therefore, we cannot clearly demonstrate that Blacks' bias against Whites is eliminated through access to background information.

We can assess the secondary prediction that background characteristics (i.e., class and dialect style) should have larger effects than race in the evaluation of targets. Indeed, our analysis indicated the race main effect was not significant. Moreover, personal appearance and dialect style accounted for 17% and 20% of the variance, respectively. Hence our results are somewhat consistent with assumed-characteristics theory. On the one hand, Blacks did show a bias in their ratings of Blacks and Whites with similar characteristics. Evaluations of race were tempered by class but not by dialect style. As indicated by the significant Race × Class two-way interaction, lower-class-appearing Whites were rated higher than comparable Blacks, but upper-class-appearing Blacks were rated higher than comparable Whites.

Expectancy-Violation Theory

Pairwise comparisons of Blacks and Whites with similar characteristics only partially supported the expectancy-violation hypotheses. Because we were uncertain about the specific expectations Blacks hold about Blacks and Whites, we were not surprised by the results. However, given the predictions expectancy-violation theory makes about the evaluation of out-groups, these findings are unusual. Hence the upper-class-appearing, Standard-English-speaking Blacks were rated significantly more favorably than the similar Whites ($t = 5.65$, $p < .001$), but lower-class-appearing, Standard-English-speaking Blacks and Whites were not rated significantly differently ($t = 1.16$, *ns*). Lower-class-appearing, nonstandard-English-speaking Whites were not evaluated less favorably than similar Blacks ($t < 1$, *ns*).

GENERAL DISCUSSION

These two experiments examined hypotheses derived from complexity-extremity theory, assumed-characteristics theory, and expectancy-violation theory. Clear support was obtained for the hypothesis that Blacks would have more complex representations of Blacks than of Whites. These results suggest that at an abstract level, a general in-group/out-group phenomenon exists. Whites have more cognitively complex stereotypes of Whites (in-group) than of Blacks (out-group) (Linville & Jones, 1980); Blacks have more cognitively complex stereotypes regarding Blacks (in-group) than regarding Whites (out-group) (the current study); and the young have more complex stereotypes of the young than of the old (Linville, 1982).

In contrast, however, the hypothesis that Blacks would evaluate White targets more *extremely* than Black targets was resoundingly disconfirmed. The predicted interaction was significant, but the pattern of means was in

exactly the opposite direction: Blacks evaluated Black job applicants more extremely than they evaluated White job applicants. Linville (1982) claimed that "the polarization effect for out-group members occurs across a range of social groups defined by age, race, and gender, and across a range of intellectual as well as personality-related dependent measures" (p. 206). However, previous research supporting complexity-extremity has focused exclusively on White subjects (Jussim et al., 1987; Linville, 1982; Linville & Jones, 1980). Our results suggest that cognitive complexity may not lead to evaluative extremity among Black perceivers.

It is possible, however, that our results do not reflect a failure of complexity-extremity theory. Cognitive complexity may be only one of many psychological factors that influence evaluations. Perhaps other, more powerful factors influenced evaluations in ways opposing cognitive complexity.

Alternatively, our results may represent an important limitation to complexity-extremity theory. Perhaps among Blacks, cognitive complexity leads to evaluative extremity, not to evaluative moderation as indicated by Linville (1982; Linville & Jones, 1980). Some research has shown that the use of more dimensions does lead to evaluative extremity *if* those dimensions are highly correlated with one another (Judd & Lusk, 1984). Perhaps the dimensions Blacks use when judging other Blacks are correlated, rather than independent as assumed in the complexity-extremity model. In addition, Blacks may have much more contact with Whites than Whites have with Blacks. Through the predominance of Whites in the media, through an educational curriculum that focuses on Whites, and because most occupational settings are White owned or White supervised, Blacks are exposed to many kinds of Whites. As a "majority and powerful" out-group, Whites may not "all look alike" to Blacks, because to exist in the society, Blacks are compelled to attend to and know about different kinds of Whites. With a more real-life task (slides of actual people instead of adjectives in a card sort), the in-group/out-group effects may operate differently.

If complexity-extremity does not provide an adequate explanation for the present findings, what other factors provide better explanations? Perhaps assumed-characteristics or expectancy-violation theories can account for our results. In particular, the augmentation principle underlying expectancy-violation theory might help to explain these results (see discussion below).

Assumed Characteristics

Our findings suggest that background characteristics do make a difference in racial stereotyping among Blacks. These results are consistent with earlier work (Locksley et al., 1980; Locksley et al., 1982b) demonstrating that

background characteristics help to attenuate most stereotypes whether they are gender, age, or racial stereotypes. Background information seems to initiate the individuating process, that is, the process by which we look beyond social category membership to a specific individual. It is not clear, however, from this research and previous research (Jussim et al., 1987) whether stereotyping is attenuated or there is a switch to another stereotype. Hence, although our Black judges may respond less to race (there are not race main effects), they are responding to social class cues as manifested by personal appearance and dialect style.

Expectancy Violation

Expectancy-violation theory may help to explain the evaluative extremity in ratings of the Black applicants by Blacks. The evaluations of the upper class Blacks shows some support for the augmenting principle (evaluators assume Blacks have more obstacles, and upper class Blacks should be rated higher than comparable Whites). However, the discounting principle (evaluators assume Whites have less obstacles than Blacks so lower class Whites should be rated lower than lower class Blacks) underlying expectancy-violation theory is not supported. Lower-class-appearing, nonstandard-English-speaking Whites and Blacks are rated similarly. Thus the expectancy-violation for Black judges may be the presence of upper class Blacks rather than the presence of lower class or nonstandard-English-speaking Whites. Again, the prevalence of so many different kinds of Whites in the media and the absence of Blacks, especially upper class Blacks, in the media may account for this finding. One would think, however, that a Black sample such as this may be exposed through family relationships to many upper- or middle-class Blacks; that exposure, however, may not override the sense that most Blacks are lower class.

In some ways, our findings suggest that Blacks are evaluating Blacks and Whites as Whites would. Why might this be the case? Again, stigmatization is a probable explanation. Blacks may have internalized the same kinds of stereotypes of Blacks and Whites that Whites have. Having been exposed to a media and a social world where Whites control the positive and negative images of both groups, use of similar stereotyping processes by Blacks is not surprising.

CONCLUSION

For each theory, our results confirm predictions that allow for multiple influences on evaluations. Our results both confirm and disconfirm the

research on stereotypes conducted on White samples. The results are not completely consistent with complexity-extremity theory because the range of Blacks' evaluations of Whites are not always larger than the range of their evaluation of Black applicants. Complexity-extremity theory needs to be modified to take into account power differentials between in-groups and out-groups. Whites, being in the majority and having White-skin privileges (or a nonstigmatized status) may view out-groups very differently than Blacks, who hold a more stigmatized role in society. In fact, feeling stigmatized for being Black may determine the extent to which one has internalized the stereotypes associated with being Black (Coleman, Armstead, & Chambliss, 1990; Coleman & Veneciano, in press; Steele, 1992) and therefore may predict how Blacks evaluate themselves and out-group members. Moreover, racial identification or the degree to which one has constructed a positive racial identity (Cross, 1991; Helms & Parham, 1990) may also influence the stereotyping process in Blacks and in other visible racial and ethnic group (VREG) members (Cook & Helms, 1988). This empirical question can be tested in future research. It might also be important to replicate this study with a "noncollege" sample who may evaluate lower- and upper class individuals very differently.

Results consistent with some of the predictions of assumed-characteristics theory showed that background attributes had more impact than race. However, because social class and race are frequently presented as being equivalent in the larger society, the advantages of additional social class information may not completely attenuate the effects of race. More research is needed to disentangle these effects. The results showing that upper class Blacks received more favorable ratings than comparable Whites but lower class Blacks did not receive more favorable ratings than comparable Whites is not completely consistent with expectancy-violation theory, but it may show some increased favoritism toward upper class Blacks over upper class Whites.

Studies assessing basic expectations of Blacks about themselves and out-group members (e.g., Latinos, Asians, Whites) is sorely needed. It is clear from the current study and from other studies that stereotypes may have multiple, and somewhat conflicting influences on evaluations. The results also suggest that we must reconsider and perhaps redesign the predictions of these three models of stereotyping to make them reflect the many kinds of evaluations of in-groups and out-groups and the many kinds of in-groups and out-groups. Depending upon the combination of attributes (particularly which attributes are chosen to differentiate the "in-group" from the "out-group"), evaluations may vary. In addition, the salience of "background" characteristics like personal appearance and dialect style may increase or decrease and expectations may or may not be violated.

NOTES

1. Scott's H is a measure of the independent dimensions used in the trait sort that incorporates the number of groups formed, the number of traits used, and the redundancy of traits used in different groups. A higher Scott's H indicates the use of more independent dimensions.

2. In this analysis, we did not test for gender differences due to the small number of males in the sample (n = 10).

REFERENCES

Arvey, R. D. (1979). Unfair discrimination in the employment interview: Legal and psychological aspects. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*, 736-765.

Back, J. (1968). The effects of Negro and White dialectal variations upon attitudes of college students. *Speech Monographs, 35*, 168-173.

Bayton, J., McAllister, L., & Hamer, J. (1956). Race-class stereotypes. *The Journal of Negro Education, 25*, 75-78.

Clark, M. L., & Pearson, W., Jr. (1982). Racial stereotypes revisited. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 6*, 181-191.

Coleman, L. M. (1976). Racial decoding and status differentiation: Who hears what? *Journal of Black Psychology, 3*, 31-37.

Coleman, L. M., Armstead, C., Chambliss, L. (1990, August). *Developing a scale to assess self-stigmatization in African-Americans*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Association of Black Psychologists, Ocho Rios, Jamaica.

Coleman, L. M., & Veneciano, C. (in press). On destigmatization: A pathway to competence in a multicultural world. In G. K. Brookins & M. B. Spencer (Eds.), *Ethnicity and diversity: Minorities no more*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cook, D. A., & Helms, J. E. (1988). Relationship dimensions as predictors of visible racial/ethnic group students' perceptions of cross-racial supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35*, 268-274.

Cook, S. (1984). Cooperative interaction in multiethnic contexts. In N. Miller & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact* (pp. 155-185). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Cross, W., Jr. (1991). *Shades of Black: Diversity in African-American identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Dienstbier, R. A. (1970). Positive and negative prejudice: Interaction of prejudice with race and social desirability. *Journal of Personality, 38*, 198-215.

Dovidio, J. F., Evans, N. E., & Tyler, R. B. (1986). Racial stereotypes: The contents of their cognitive representations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 22*, 22-37.

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

Grant, P. R., & Holmes, J. G. (1981). The integration of implicit personality theory schemas and stereotype images. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 44*, 107-115.

Helms, J., & Parham, T. (1990). The relationship between Black racial identity attitudes and cognitive styles. In J. E. Helms (Ed.), *Black and white racial identity: Theory, research and practice*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Insko, C. A., Nacoste, R. W., & Moe, J. L. (1983). Belief congruence and racial discrimination: Review of the evidence and critical evaluation. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 13*, 153-174.

Judd, C. M., & Lusk, C. M. (1984). Knowledge structures on evaluative judgments: Effects of structural variables on judgmental extremity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 1193-1207.

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.

Kelley, H. H. (1971). Attribution in social interaction. In E. E. Jones, D. E. Kanouse, H. H. Kelley, R. S. Nisbett, S. Balins, & B. Weiner (Eds.), *Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior* (pp. 1-26). Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lambert, W., Hodgson, R., Gardner, R., & Fillenbaum, S. (1960). Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 60*, 44-51.

Linville, P. W. (1982). The complexity-extremity effect and age-based stereotyping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42*, 193-211.

Linville, P. W., & Jones, E. E. (1980). Polarized appraisals of out-group members. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*, 689-703.

Linville, P. W., Salovey, P., & Fischer, G. W. (1986). Stereotyping and perceived distributions of social characteristics: An application to ingroup-outgroup perception. In J. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp 165-208). New York: Academic Press.

Locksley, A., Borgida, E., Brekke, N., & Hepburn, C. (1980). Sex stereotypes and social judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*, 821-831.

Locksley, A., Hepburn, C., & Ortiz, V. (1982a). On the effects of social stereotypes on judgments of individuals: A comment on Grant and Holmes's "The integration of implicit personality theory schemas and stereotypic images." *Social Psychology Quarterly, 45*, 270-273.

Locksley, A., Hepburn, C., & Ortiz, V. (1982b). Social stereotypes and judgments of individuals: An instance of the base-rate fallacy. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 18*, 23-42.

McKirnan, D. J., Smith, C. E., & Hamayan, E. V. (1983). A sociolinguistic approach to the belief-similarity model of racial attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 19*, 434-447.

Moe, J. L., Nacoste, R. W., & Insko, C. A. (1981). Belief versus race as determinants of discrimination: A study of southern adolescents in 1966 and 1979. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41*, 1031-1050.

Putnam, G. N., & O'Hern, E. M. (1955). The status significance of an isolated urban dialect. *Language, 32*, 1-32.

Rasinski, K. A., Crocker, J., & Hastie, R. (1985). Another look at sex stereotypes and social judgments: An analysis of the social perceiver's use of subjective probabilities. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*, 317-326.

Rokeach, M., & Mezei, L. (1966). Race and shared belief as factors in social choice. *Science, 151*, 167-172.

Scott, W. A. (1962). Cognitive complexity and cognitive flexibility. *Sociometry, 25*, 405-414.

Scott, W. A. (1966). Flexibility, rigidity, and adaptation: Toward clarification of concepts. In O. J. Harvey (Ed.), *Experience, structure and adaptability* (pp. 369-400). New York: Springer.

Smedley, J., & Bayton, J. (1978). Evaluative race-class stereotypes by race and perceived class of subjects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30*, 530-535.

Steele, C. (1992, April). Race and the schooling of Black Americans. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 68-78.

Tucker, G. R., & Lambert, W. E. (1969). White and Negro listeners' reactions to various American English dialects. *Social Forces, 47*, 463-468.

Williams, F. (1970). Psychological effects of speech characteristics: On sounding disadvantaged. *Journal of Speech and Hearing, 13*, 472-488.

Williams, F., Whitehead, J. L., & Miller, L. M. (1971). Ethnic stereotypes and judgments of children's speech. *Speech Monographs, 38*, 166-170.