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Racial prejudice toward African Americans has been largely measured and researched in terms of negative and hostile attitudes. However, there is considerable research to suggest the prevalence of evaluatively positive beliefs about Blacks (e.g., as athletic). A measure of Complimentary Stereotypes and Negative Prejudice (CSNP) is validated through exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses across 6 samples (N = 4,404). The 30-item CSNP consists of 2 subscales. The Complimentary Stereotypes (CS) scale measures evaluatively favorable stereotypes of Blacks in domains of athleticism, musical and rhythmic ability, and social/sexual competence. The Negative Prejudice (NP) scale corresponds with traditional hostile attitudes related to the inferiority of Blacks, opposition to race-related policies, and aversion to interracial contact. The CSNP subscales demonstrated appropriate convergent and discriminant validity with other measures of prejudice, and 2 additional studies supported the validity of CS and NP in evaluating positive and negative subgroups of African Americans.

Traditionally, stereotyping and prejudice research has focused on the prominence and prevalence of negative stereotypes and attitudes (see Fiske, 1998; Jones, 1997). Recently, however, social psychologists have come to acknowledge the emergence of more favorable beliefs about social groups (e.g., Madon et al., 2001) and the importance of measuring such positive stereotypes and studying their implications (e.g., Glick & Fiske, 1996; Lin, Kwan, Cheung, & Fiske, 2005). This focus on subjectively favorable category-based reactions is a refreshing revival of Gordon Allport’s (1954) often overlooked notion of positive prejudice, “People may be prejudiced in favor of others; they may think well of them without sufficient warrant” (p. 6, italics in original). Indeed, people often think well of a variety of social groups. For example, Asians are thought to excel in math ability and African Americans are perceived as athletically superior. Although such beliefs may seem justified and appropriate due to the ease with which people can provide confirming exemplars, they may nonetheless be characterized as unwarranted because the belief is based solely on group membership without appropriate individuating information.

The goal of this research is to measure complimentary stereotypes toward African Americans and examine their relation with traditional negative prejudice. Just as with other social groups (e.g., women, Asians), positive stereotypes about Blacks deserve greater empirical attention because (a) together with negative prejudice they may more accurately reflect the multidimensional nature of contemporary perceptions of Blacks, and (b) recent research suggests that despite their favorable tone, positive stereotypes may have unintended, but important negative consequences for the targets of such stereotypes.

PERCEPTIONS OF AFRICAN AMERICANS ARE MULTIDIMENSIONAL

When discussing issues related to interracial conflict, many people tend to assume that Whites’ perceptions of Blacks largely reflect hostility and antipathy. However, there is a good deal of research suggesting that Whites’ views of Blacks are not uniformly negative but represent a duality of positive and negative attributes. Myrdal (1944) focused on what he termed the “American dilemma” when he discussed the contradiction between universally accepted beliefs in
freedom and democracy in the United States and continuing racism and discrimination against Blacks. More recently, David Sears (1988) suggested that because the overt hostility of “old-fashioned” racism has been legally and normatively condemned, expressions of prejudice are manifested symbolically in the endorsement of traditional moral values (such as individualism, hard work, discipline). Racist individuals who wished to assert their anti-Black prejudice could do so under the guise of fervent patriotism. Similar to symbolic racism, modern racism (McConahay, 1986) involves the manifestation of negative prejudice in the context of abstract social and political opinions. Moreover, modern racists openly condemn old-fashioned hostile racism, and because they do not hold personally hold such beliefs, they do not perceive themselves as racist. Gaertner and Dovidio’s (1986) theory of aversive concerns the combination of non-prejudiced tendencies stemming from adherence to egalitarian values and prejudiced tendencies arising from socialization in a racist society and natural human inclinations to categorize and stereotype. They argue that White Americans’ often unacknowledged negative attitudes toward Blacks result in discriminatory responses in situations where the normative structures that typically encourage egalitarian responding are ambiguous.

In their theory of racial ambivalence, Katz and Hass (1988) more formally acknowledged (conceptually and empirically) the conflict between positive and negative attitudes toward Blacks. Katz and Hass argued that these attitudes stem from two core American value orientations: individualism (particularly, the Protestant work ethic) and humanitarianism-egalitarianism. Because the Protestant ethic (PE) value involves an emphasis on discipline and achievement, the failure of Blacks to succeed in society is perceived to be a reflection of the extent to which they are deviant from more successful Whites. In contrast, the more compassionate principles of the humanitarianism-egalitarianism (HE) value result in the perception of Blacks as disadvantaged “underdogs” struggling to overcome the very real obstacles of everyday prejudice and discrimination. Katz and Hass argued that because both PE and HE orientations are so closely tied to the self-concepts of most White Americans, the resultant simultaneous endorsement of pro- and anti-Black attitudes creates a conflicting state of racial ambivalence.

Thus, a number of prominent theories of intergroup relations suggest that Whites’ evaluations of Blacks contain both positive and negative components. However, the favorability toward Blacks described in these theories generally reflects a commitment to egalitarianism and the sympathetic recognition of continuing prejudice and discrimination. Although these principles are certainly positive in the sense that they may foster more open-minded thinking and behaviors, favorable perceptions of prejudice are considerably different from favorable perceptions of the targets of such prejudice. What about positive beliefs about Blacks that go beyond sympathy? What is the nature of subjectively favorable category-based perceptions of African Americans and how are such stereotypes related to negative prejudice? We can gain valuable insight to these issues by examining recent stereotyping research in the context of women and Asians.

FAVORABILITY BEYOND SYMPATHY

In creating the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory, Glick and Fiske (1996) identified a positive form of prejudice, Benevolent Sexism, based on favorable but paternalistic stereotypes of women (e.g., women are warm, gentle, and deserving of male chivalry). These beliefs are in contrast with traditional conceptualizations of prejudice as antipathy in that they are associated with positive affect and prosocial behaviors. Indeed, items from the Benevolent Sexism subscale appear genuinely complimentary toward women (e.g., “Women have a quality of purity that few men possess.; “Women should be cherished and protected by men”). Unlike Katz and Hass’s (1988) pro-Black scale, Benevolent Sexism measures genuinely positive attitudes toward the targets of prejudice rather than simply the sympathetic recognition that prejudice exists. However, Glick and Fiske (1996) are quick to point out that such benevolence should not necessarily be interpreted as favorable or constructive. “Even though benevolent sexism suggests a positive view of women, it shares common assumptions with hostile sexist beliefs: that women inhabit restricted domestic roles and are the ‘weaker’ sex” (p. 492). Thus, despite its superficial favorability, Benevolent Sexism represents attitudes that are role-restrictive in their prescriptions and devaluing in their assumptions. Women are perceived as and expected to remain complacently passive within traditional gender roles.

Asian Americans represent another social group often perceived favorably in stereotypic domains. Early social psychological research on racial stereotypes indicated that Whites often ascribed positive traits such as intelligence and industriousness to Asians (Karlin, Coffman, & Walters, 1969; Katz & Braly, 1933). More recent research confirms that contemporary stereotypes continue to portray Asians as intelligent (especially in mathematics), ambitious, self-disciplined and loyal to family ties (Jackson et al., 1996; Jackson, Lewandowski, Ingram, & Hodge, 1997; Madon et al., 2001). However, just as with perceptions of women, the complimentary nature of positive stereotypes of Asians belies an underlying negativity. Although perceived favorably as very competent and achievement-oriented, Asians are often simultaneously stereotyped as interpersonally cold and unsociable (Lin et al., 2005).

Thus, research suggests favorability toward women and Asians can be distinctly category-based and transcend mere sympathy or awareness of experiencing prejudice. Interestingly however, these complimentary stereotypes seem to be associated with concomitant negativity. Glick and Fiske (1996) found that the favorable sentiments of Benevolent
Sexism were positively correlated with their Hostile Sexism scale, which measures antagonism toward women. Likewise, Lin et al. (2005) demonstrated strong positive correlations between their measures of Asians’ competence and lack of sociability. Recent theorizing suggests that this combination of positive and negative beliefs may result in “mixed” perceptions of outgroups. Fiske and her colleagues (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick & Fiske, 2001; Glick & Xu, 2002; Lin et al., 2005) have proposed that stereotypes of outgroups are often ambivalent along dimensions of competence and warmth. That is, groups are often perceived as warm but incompetent (e.g., the paternalistic stereotypes of women associated with Benevolent Sexism) or competent but not very warm (e.g., stereotypes of Asians). The result may be a “double-edged sword” that ensures most outgroups will be targeted by some form of derogation (i.e., as incompetent or unsociable) that may serve to legitimize discrimination against members of such groups. Similarly, Jost and Kay (2005; Kay & Jost, 2003; Kay, Jost, & Young, 2005) have argued that such complementary stereotypes contribute to system-justifying beliefs that the status quo is fair. That is, stereotypes that depict groups as having both strengths and weaknesses create and reinforce beliefs that the system is just by counterbalancing differential advantages and disadvantages. For example, poor people make up for their lack of wealth by being perceived as happy and honest whereas the benefits rich people possess are tarnished by perceptions of them as miserable or dishonest (Kay & Jost, 2003). Thus, the combination of positive and negative stereotypes of social groups may perpetuate existing intergroup differences in power and status.

POSITIVE STEREOTYPES OF AFRICAN AMERICANS

Although the aforementioned research suggests that positive stereotypes play an important role in intergroup relations, there is a surprising dearth of similar research in the context of African Americans. Despite common positive stereotypes of Blacks as athletic, rhythmic, musical, and “cool,” there is very little research examining how such favorable beliefs may influence social judgments and interactions (although see Biernat & Manis, 1994; Stone, Perry, & Darley, 1997). The present research seeks to develop and validate a measure of evaluatively positive stereotypes toward Blacks and examine their relation to more traditional forms of negative prejudice.

Stereotype assessment research that has maintained the tradition of the classic Princeton Triglogy studies continues to identify positive stereotypic beliefs about African Americans (Devine & Elliot, 1995; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Gilbert, 1951; Karlins et al., 1969, Katz & Braly, 1933; Madon et al., 2001). Consistent across all these studies is the perception that Blacks are very musical and rhythmic. The historical roots of this stereotype can be traced from antebellum images of Black slaves singing in cotton fields, to minstrel shows and lively Black church choirs, to popular images of current Black rap artists. Indeed, in the two most recent studies, Devine and Elliot (1995) and Madon et al. (2001) found that traits related to music (e.g., musical, sing and dance well, rhythmic, listen to a lot of music) were consistently among the most endorsed stereotypes of Blacks.

These two stereotype assessment studies also represent important extensions of the Princeton Triglogy research because they highlight the emergence of athleticism as a recent and prominent stereotype. Although Blacks have long been considered to have superior physical capabilities (e.g., muscle strength), these traits have largely been in the context of negative stereotypes about Blacks as dangerously aggressive and intellectually primitive savages (Dines, 1998). Hoberman (1997) has suggested that these beliefs about the physical attributes of African Americans have evolved into more favorable and socially acceptable stereotypes about athletic ability. In Devine and Elliot’s (1995) sample, the trait athletic was most frequently rated as descriptive of the cultural stereotypes of African Americans (selected by 74% of participants). In Madon et al.’s (2001, Study 2, p. 1002) sample, athletic was the second most frequent trait selected “as much more characteristic of African Americans than other people” (behind listens to a lot of music).

In addition to positive stereotypes about musical ability and athleticism, a third domain in which Blacks seem to be perceived stereotypically is within the realm of social and sexual competence. Since the days of slavery, Black men and women have been described in sexualized terms (see Jones, 1997), and glorified remnants of such racism linger today (Cowan & Campbell, 1994; George & Martinez, 2002). Davis and Cross (1979) noted, “Black females are thought to have a near insatiable sexual appetite and black males are thought to have an oversized penis and to be more sexually potent than white males” (p. 269). In addition to sexual mystique, African Americans are perceived as socially savvy and possessing a unique sense of “coolness” (Connor, 1995; Cose, 2002; Majors & Billson, 1992). African Americans are often perceived as very attractive and stylish in their appearance and their physical and verbal mannerisms. For example, the popular appeal of stereotypically Black expressions (e.g., “You go girl!”) and handshakes has become so widespread that such sayings and gestures are often emulated by White Americans (Meikle, 2001; Padilla, 2002). Furthermore, research on stereotyping has often included positive traits such as “fashionable,” “hip,” “funny,” and “cool” as stimuli for positive stereotypes of Blacks (Kawakami, Dion, & Dovidio, 1998; Wittenbrink, Judd, & Park, 1997).

Thus, complimentary stereotypes of Blacks can be measured as evaluatively favorable yet distinctly race-based beliefs in the domains of musical and rhythmic ability, athleticism, and social/sexual prowess. As the goal of this research was to understand better the relation between such positive stereotypes and more commonly studied hostile
and negative prejudice, we also wanted to update the measurement of negative attitudes toward Blacks while also accounting for their own multidimensionality. Previous measures of negative racial prejudice may be outdated or too narrow in scope. For example, perhaps the most common of these measures, the 7-item Modern Racism Scale (MRS: McConahay, Hardee, & Batts, 1981) measures the manifestation of negative prejudice in abstract social and political opinions. However, this scale is over 25 years old and may refer to issues that are no longer particularly salient to contemporary students (e.g., desegregation). Brigham (1993) has suggested that because racial attitudes are likely to change over time, “measures will need to be revised as the salience of issues and content areas changes” (p. 1933). To this end, Brigham created the 20-item Attitudes Toward Blacks (ATB) scale to measure more accurately negative racial attitudes that revolved around the most salient social issues of the time (e.g., interracial dating, job opportunities, “White flight”). Although the ATB was intended to be a multifaceted measure of prejudice, the precise nature of its multidimensionality was not stringently tested (e.g., through confirmatory factor analyses).

Collectively, theory and research suggest three primary themes of negative prejudice toward Blacks, each of which has a history of theoretical and empirical research. First, although expressions of prejudice have generally become more subtle, relics of old-fashioned racism persist. Beliefs that Blacks are inherently inferior to Whites (i.e., they are unintelligent, lazy, and criminal) represent the most commonly recognized negative stereotypes about Blacks, and endorsement of such blatantly hostile stereotypes is associated with greater prejudice (Devine, 1989; Devine & Elliot, 1995; Katz & Hass, 1988). Several national and regional surveys have confirmed that most White individuals endorse the belief that Blacks are in some way deviant and inferior to Whites (Davis & Smith, 1994; Plous & Williams, 1995). Second, the theories of symbolic racism (Sears, 1988) and modern racism (McConahay, 1986) were based on the notion that overtly hostile prejudice is more subtly manifested in race-related issues of government policy (e.g., welfare and affirmative action). By disliking policies rather than people, an individual can safely express negative attitudes toward Blacks without directly appearing racist. Third, attitudes regarding close interracial contact have been the hallmark of measuring prejudice since the 1920s. Sociologist Emory Bogardus (1925) developed the first measure of social distance as a means of measuring intergroup attitudes by asking people the degree of intimacy with which they would accept a member of another group (i.e., as a citizen, neighbor, friend, etc.). Since then, measures of social distance have consistently related to negative attitudes toward outgroups, such that people higher in prejudice prefer less social contact with outgroup members (Green, 1972; Stangor, Sullivan, & Ford, 1991).

**COMPLIMENTARY STEREOTYPES AND NEGATIVE PREJUDICE**

Before considering the specific relation between complimentary stereotypes and negative prejudice we must acknowledge that the relation between stereotypes and prejudice in general remains a complex issue within social psychology (Dovidio, Brigham, Johnson, & Gaertner, 1996). Although some theorists argue that prejudice is an attitude with affective, cognitive, and behavioral components, others posit that prejudice is the affective component and stereotyping is the cognitive component of category-based reactions (see Fiske, 1998). Regardless of one’s precise definition, prejudice is generally understood to be evaluative (i.e., reflecting some like or dislike of others) whereas stereotypes are based on beliefs and expectancies. A great deal of research suggests that the two processes are theoretically and empirically related. Theoretically, stereotypes may be antecedents or consequences of prejudice. For example, as Brigham (1971) suggested, stereotypes may serve as the foundation for prejudice, “Obviously, in order to feel negatively toward a group, one must be able to perceive the different individuals of the given ethnic group as having certain constant characteristics” (p. 26). In addition, stereotypes may also serve as justifications for one’s existing prejudice (e.g., I don’t like Blacks because they are unintelligent). Indeed, we have argued that negative prejudice toward Blacks is partly reflected in the endorsement of stereotypes that Blacks are inferior to Whites. Empirically, a meta-analysis specifically comparing these processes in the context of race-based evaluations has found a significant and modest relation ($r = .25$) between stereotypes and prejudice (Dovidio et al., 1996).

However, as noted earlier, most research has focused on comparisons of negative stereotypes and negative prejudice. With the emergence of greater focus on positive stereotypes, new comparisons can be made between complimentary stereotypes and negative prejudice. On the one hand, one might expect evaluatively favorable stereotypes (similar to positive affect) to be inversely related to prejudice (Stangor et al., 1991). After all, if one holds favorable beliefs about a particular group (albeit in stereotypic domains), they may generalize to overall favorable evaluations of the group as a whole. Alternatively, there may be no relation between the two processes. For example, Devine and Elliott (1995) demonstrated that whereas low-prejudice and high-prejudice participants differentially endorsed negative stereotypes of Blacks (with high-prejudice people more likely to endorse negative stereotypes than low-prejudice people), they did not differ in their endorsement of positive stereotypes of Blacks. Finally, there may be a positive relation between endorsement of complimentary stereotypes and negative prejudice. This correspondence may reflect a general tendency to make category-based generalizations whether negative or positive (see Fiske, Lin, & Neuberg, 1999). Alternatively, as noted before, many posi-
tive stereotypes have a corresponding and complementary negativity to them (e.g., Fiske et al., 2002; Jost & Kay, 2005). Indeed, Lin et al. (2005) found that the more participants stereotyped Asians as highly competent, the less willing they were to be roommates with an Asian American student. Furthermore, Glick and Fiske (1996; Glick et al., 2000) consistently found positive correlations between the favorability of Benevolent Sexism and the antipathy of Hostile Sexism. In the context of positive stereotypes and negative prejudice toward African Americans, we expected a similar positive relation to emerge.

**SUMMARY AND OVERVIEW OF RESEARCH**

Contemporary perceptions of Blacks, like those of women and Asians, clearly have positive and negative components. We believe that evaluatively positive stereotypes of Blacks reflect favorable beliefs in domains of musical and rhythmic ability, athleticism, and social/sexual prowess. Furthermore, negative prejudice toward Blacks can be measured in domains of inferiority of Blacks compared to Whites, opposition to race-related government policy, and aversion to interracial contact. A conceptual model of these multidimensional attributes is depicted in Figure 1. The purpose of Study 1 was to develop and validate reliable measures of Complimentary Stereotypes (CS) and Negative Prejudice (NP) toward African Americans and assess their relation with each other as well as other measures of prejudice. We expected CS and NP to be positively related as we hypothesized that they are complementary aspects of perceptions of Blacks (Fiske et al., 2002; Jost & Kay, 2005). CS likewise should be positively related to other measures of antipathy toward Blacks, although not after controlling for NP attitudes. Importantly, CS should not be related to Katz and Hass’ (1988) Pro-Black scale, as we are positing that CS is fundamentally different from sympathetic attitudes toward Blacks. Finally, NP should be strongly related to lack of sympathy for Blacks and to other measures of antipathy. In Studies 2 and 3, we tested whether evidence of CS and NP emerged in participants’ generation of positive and negative subgroups of Blacks, and we examined the relation between our measures of CS and NP and participants’ evaluations of these subgroups.

**STUDY 1 METHOD**

**Participants and Procedure**

The creation and validation of a measure of Complimentary Stereotypes and Negative Prejudice (CSNP) is described across six samples totaling 4,404 individuals. In addition to these measures, participants within each sample completed various other measures of prejudice. With the exception of Sample 2, all participants were recruited via the University of Kentucky’s introductory psychology subject pool and received credit toward a course requirement in exchange for their participation. All participants were assured that their responses would be confidential. The racial composition of each sample was predominantly White, but because the psychometric properties of the CSNP were similar among Blacks and Whites (discussed later), the small percentage of Blacks within each sample were included in analyses. Results are identical when Blacks are removed from each sample.

**Sample 1.** The first sample of participants initially included 463 undergraduates enrolled in introductory psychology courses who responded to a 78-item questionnaire that served as the basis for the CSNP. The data from 388 of these participants (148 men, 227 women, 13 not reported) were retained because they completed the entire questionnaire. The sample was predominantly White (84%) and included 28 Blacks, 10 Asians, 15 individuals who indicated “other,” and 9 not reporting race. Participants also completed the ATB (Brigham, 1993).

**Sample 2.** The second sample included 85 students (20 men, 65 women) enrolled in an experimental psychology course at the University of Kentucky who received extra credit in exchange for participation. The sample included 70
Whites, 8 Blacks, 3 Hispanics, 3 Asians, and 2 individuals who indicated “other.” In addition to the finalized 30-item version of the CSNP, participants completed the Pro-Black and Anti-Black scales (Katz & Hass, 1988), and the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI: Glick & Fiske, 1996). To examine potential social desirability biases of the CSNP, participants also completed the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR: Paulhus, 1998).

**Sample 3.** The third sample included 1269 undergraduates (402 men, 278 women, 13 not reporting) enrolled in introductory psychology courses. The sample was predominantly White (88%), and included 42 Blacks, 57 individuals who indicated “other,” and 50 people not reporting race. In addition to the 30-item CSNP, participants completed the ATB.

**Sample 4.** The fourth sample included 461 undergraduates (170 men, 278 women, 13 not reporting) enrolled in introductory psychology courses. Again, the sample was predominantly White (90%), and included 18 Blacks, 11 Hispanics, 2 Asians, 3 individuals who indicated “other,” and 13 people not reporting race. All participants completed the CSNP and the ATB, and 154 participants of this sample also completed the ASI.

**Sample 5.** The fifth sample included 1102 undergraduates (355 men, 689 women, 58 not reporting) enrolled in introductory psychology courses. Again, the sample was predominantly White (88%), and included 49 Blacks, 29 individuals who indicated they were Asian, Hispanic, or “other,” and 58 individuals who did not report their race. All participants completed the CSNP and the ATB.

**Sample 6.** The sixth sample included 1099 undergraduates (395 men, 701 women, 3 not reporting) enrolled in introductory psychology courses. Again, the sample was predominantly White (96%), and included 26 Blacks, 16 individuals who indicated they were Asian, Hispanic, or “other.” All participants completed the CSNP and the ATB.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Exploratory Factor Analysis With Sample 1**

Our initial goal was to develop a questionnaire that measured the distinct subfactors of complimentary stereotypes and negative prejudice toward African Americans (see Figure 1) with a user-friendly amount of items. To this end, an initial pool of 240 possible items (40 items per subfactor) was generated and subsequently reduced to 78 items (13 items per subfactor). Items were retained based on their clarity and the extent to which they were similar to but not redundant with other same-factor items. This 78-item questionnaire was administered to Sample 1, and participants indicated their agreement with each statement using a 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) scale.

We conducted a principal components factor analysis using varimax rotation. The strongest factor (Factor 1, eigenvalue = 18.16) accounted for 23% of the variance and corresponded to positive stereotypes related to African American athletic ability. The next strongest factor (Factor 2, eigenvalue = 8.71) accounted for 11% of the variance and corresponded to negative attitudes toward interracial contact. The next four factors all had eigenvalues greater than 2 and corresponded to the remaining four subfactors of NP and CS: Factor 3 (eigenvalue = 3.00) accounted for 3.8% of the variance and corresponded to negative attitudes toward race-related policies. Factor 4 (eigenvalue = 2.51) accounted for 3.2% of the variance and corresponded to negative attitudes about the inferiority of Blacks. Factor 5 (eigenvalue = 2.19) accounted for 2.8% of the variance and corresponded to positive stereotypes related to Blacks’ coolness and sexuality. Finally, Factor 6 (eigenvalue = 2.01) accounted for 2.6% of the variance and corresponded to positive stereotypes related to Blacks’ rhythm ability. There were 11 additional factors with eigenvalues greater than 1, all of which accounted for less than 2% of the overall variance. These factors are not reported because they were of little theoretical interest or consisted of too few items.

The final version of the CSNP consisted of items selected from these six factors based on the following criteria: mean values for each item were close to the midpoint with large standard deviations, the item had high correlations with other items measuring the same first-order and second-order factors, and the item maintained the multidimensionality of the various factors of the CSNP. This yielded a 30-item scale comprised of 15 items measuring the three components of Complimentary Stereotypes (CS) with five items each for athleticism, musical/rhythmic ability, and social/sexual prowess and 15 items measuring three components of Negative Prejudice (NP) with five items each for inherent inferiority, government policy, and interracial contact (see Appendix). Participants indicated their agreement with each statement using a 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) scale. Participants in Samples 2–5 were given an initial version of the CSNP that contained four items requiring reverse-scoring (all within the NP scale). Participants in Sample 6 were given a slightly modified version of the CSNP that contained 11 items required reverse-scoring (five within CS and six within NP). For these items, although the wording was changed to reflect opposite level of agreement, the conceptual meaning of the items remained the same (e.g., “Black people have a natural instinct for athletics” was changed to “Black people do not have a natural instinct for athletics”).

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

To assess the extent to which the observed data conformed to the model implied by our exploratory analyses, confirmatory
factor analysis (CFA) was conducted using EQS software (Bentler & Wu, 1995) within all samples except Sample 2, which was too small to permit CFA (see Kaplan, 1995). The complete measurement model was highly restrictive. The six sets of five indicators (i.e., five questionnaire items per factor) were estimated on their corresponding first order factor only, with each indicator assigned a loading of 0 on all other subfactors. Additionally, the three first order factors of NP were assigned a loading of 0 on CS and vice versa. This full model (see Figure 1) with higher-order factors was tested against a two-factor model (in which the three subscales of CS and NP were subsumed within their respective factors), and a one-factor general model. Using maximum likelihood estimation, fit between the data and the hypothesized model was assessed using a standardized version of Joreskog and Sorbom’s (1981) root mean squared residual (SRMR: Bentler, 1990), and Steiger’s (1990) root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). To the extent that complimentary stereotypes and negative prejudice represent distinct (yet related) structures, the two-factor model should fit the data significantly better than the one-factor model. Similarly, the hypothesized full measurement model with subfactors depicted in Figure 1 should account for the data significantly better than the two-factor model.

Table 1 presents model comparison information using the two fit indexes and decreases in $\chi^2$ among all three samples tested. Consistently, the two-factor model (positive stereotypes and negative prejudice) demonstrated a substantial increase in fit over a single factor, and the full model likewise provided a considerable increase in model fit compared to the two-factor model. Furthermore, to assess absolute fit between the observed data and the hypothesized model, Hu and Bentler (1998) advocate a two-index presentation strategy that includes the SRMR supplemented by the RMSEA (or any of several other recommended fit indexes). When both indexes are used to assess model fit, Hu and Bentler (1999) recommend cutoff values close to .09 or .10 for SRMR and values close to .06 for RMSEA. As shown in Table 1, across the three samples (and especially in larger samples where CFA is more reliable) the obtained values for these indexes conform very closely to the recommended cutoff scores when assessing the fit of the full model. Thus, given the degree of complexity of the model tested, these results should be considered as supporting the validity of the proposed measurement model.

### Reliability and Mean Values

Across all six samples, the CSNP demonstrated acceptable reliability scores as measured by alpha coefficients (see Table 2). As might be expected, total CSNP scores yielded the highest reliability coefficients, with the CS and NP factors only slightly lower and roughly equivalent to each other. Despite consisting of only five items, each of the six subfactors (three for CS, three for NP) consistently demonstrated satisfactory reliability. Mean values for CS and NP and each of their subfactors are presented in Table 3. Means for CS were consistently higher than means for NP supporting previous research suggesting that people are more likely to endorse stereotypically positive than negative beliefs about Blacks (e.g., Devine & Elliot, 1995). In addition, the mean values for the subscales are quite consistent across all samples. Taken together, these results provide further support that the CSNP reliably measures two distinct constructs.

### Relation Between CS and NP

We hypothesized that complimentary stereotypes and negative prejudice would be positively correlated. Supporting this prediction, across all samples CS and NP were consistently and positively correlated (with moderate effect sizes) such that people high in NP also tended to be high in CS, $r(386) = .32, p < .001; r(83) = .34, p = .001; r(1267) = .31, p < .001; r(459) = .25, p < .001; r(1100) = .25, p < .001, r(1097) = .14, p < .001$, for Samples 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, respectively. This positive correla-

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit Index</th>
<th>Sample 1 (N = 388)</th>
<th>Sample 2 (N = 1269)</th>
<th>Sample 3 (N = 461)</th>
<th>Sample 4 (N = 1102)</th>
<th>Sample 5 (N = 1102)</th>
<th>Sample 6 (N = 1099)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One factor model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% RMSEA CI</td>
<td>(.102, .110)</td>
<td>(.104, .109)</td>
<td>(.106, .114)</td>
<td>(.107, .112)</td>
<td>(.091, .096)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$ (405)</td>
<td>2681.62*</td>
<td>7408.83*</td>
<td>3303.59*</td>
<td>5786.29*</td>
<td>4557.77*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two factor model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% RMSEA CI</td>
<td>(.078, .087)</td>
<td>(.079, .084)</td>
<td>(.082, .090)</td>
<td>(.082, .087)</td>
<td>(.081, .086)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta \chi^2$</td>
<td>912.19*</td>
<td>2904.07*</td>
<td>1153.02*</td>
<td>2218.61*</td>
<td>847.71*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% RMSEA CI</td>
<td>(.064, .068)</td>
<td>(.056, .061)</td>
<td>(.057, .066)</td>
<td>(.057, .062)</td>
<td>(.064, .069)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta \chi^2$</td>
<td>539.58*</td>
<td>1980.97*</td>
<td>830.97*</td>
<td>1605.77*</td>
<td>1258.19*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SRMR = Standardized root mean squared residual; RMSEA = Root mean square error of approximation; CI = Confidence interval.

*Decrease compared to one factor model, distributed as $\chi^2$ with 1 df. *Decrease compared to two factor model, distributed as $\chi^2$ with 6 df.

*p < .001.
tion suggests that complimentary stereotypes of African Americans are not altogether positive or harmless but share features associated with traditionally negative and hostile racial attitudes. Additional analyses examining the quadratic effect of NP on CS yielded significant relations in Samples 1, 2 (marginally), 3, 5, and 6, $\beta = -0.81, p < .001; \beta = -1.10, p = .075; \beta = -0.50, p < .001; \beta = -1.04, p < .001; \beta = -0.41, p < .05$ respectively. When a fit line to the regression equation was plotted, graphs consistently indicated that the nature of the curvilinear trends were such that CS scores increased as NP scores increased up to a certain point, at which point CS scores began to decrease as NP scores further increased. This is sensible because individuals with extremely negative attitudes are unlikely to find any “redeeming” positive qualities about Blacks and consequently evaluate them quite unfavorably even within stereotypically positive domains. From a system justifying perspective (e.g., Jost, Kivetz, Rubini, Guermandi, & Mosso, 2005), people with extremely negative attitudes may feel little need to simultaneously hold complementary, positive stereotypes to perceive the existing social system as just.

**Convergent and Discriminant Validity**

**Racism.** According to Katz and Hass (1988), anti-Black attitudes are the result of perceptions of deviance and inferiority compared to Whites (e.g., “On the whole, Black people don’t stress education and training”). Similarly, Brigham’s (1993) multidimensional ATB measures several facets of negative racial attitudes (e.g., “It is likely that Blacks will bring violence to neighborhoods when they move in”). Given that these measures of racism tend to focus on hostile attitudes toward Blacks, we expected that the NP subscale would correlate highly with such measures and that CS would also show some correlation but not after controlling for the correlation between NP and CS. As can be seen in Table 4 and supporting our hypothesis, NP was consistently significantly related to Anti-Black attitudes and ATB scores when controlling for CS. Although CS likewise showed positive relations with these measures at the zero order level, it generally did not after controlling for NP.

Katz and Hass (1988) also posit that Pro-Black attitudes stem from the sympathetic recognition that Blacks are disadvantaged because they face continued discrimination. Our conceptualization of favorability as assessed by the CS scale is quite different, however, and represents a subjectively positive evaluation of Blacks in stereotypic domains. Consequently, there should be little relation between the sympathy of Katz & Hass’s Pro-Black scale and the race-based favorability of our CS scale. Importantly, this theoretical difference was reflected empirically as shown

**TABLE 2**

Study 1: Internal Consistency of CSNP Subfactors (Cronbach’s $\alpha$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample 1 ($N = 388$)</th>
<th>Sample 2 ($N = 85$)</th>
<th>Sample 3 ($N = 1269$)</th>
<th>Sample 4 ($N = 461$)</th>
<th>Sample 5 ($N = 1102$)</th>
<th>Sample 6 ($N = 1099$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary Stereotypes</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athleticism</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cool/sexual</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Prejudice</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSNP</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** CSNP = Complimentary Stereotypes and Negative Prejudice.

**TABLE 3**

Study 1: Mean Values (and Standard Deviations) of CSNP Subfactors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample 1 ($N = 388$)</th>
<th>Sample 2 ($N = 85$)</th>
<th>Sample 3 ($N = 1269$)</th>
<th>Sample 4 ($N = 461$)</th>
<th>Sample 5 ($N = 1102$)</th>
<th>Sample 6 ($N = 1099$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary Stereotypes</td>
<td>3.42 (1.11)</td>
<td>3.51 (0.84)</td>
<td>3.61 (0.98)</td>
<td>3.59 (0.98)</td>
<td>3.60 (0.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athleticism</td>
<td>3.37 (1.38)</td>
<td>3.57 (1.08)</td>
<td>3.63 (1.26)</td>
<td>3.71 (1.23)</td>
<td>3.68 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic</td>
<td>3.69 (1.35)</td>
<td>3.94 (1.08)</td>
<td>4.05 (1.25)</td>
<td>3.95 (1.26)</td>
<td>4.02 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cool/sexual</td>
<td>3.16 (1.18)</td>
<td>3.04 (1.00)</td>
<td>3.14 (1.06)</td>
<td>3.10 (1.08)</td>
<td>3.12 (1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Prejudice</td>
<td>2.98 (1.09)</td>
<td>3.00 (0.86)</td>
<td>2.95 (1.05)</td>
<td>3.08 (1.06)</td>
<td>3.03 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior</td>
<td>2.88 (1.29)</td>
<td>2.94 (1.07)</td>
<td>2.81 (1.21)</td>
<td>2.98 (1.26)</td>
<td>2.80 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>3.26 (1.29)</td>
<td>3.18 (1.12)</td>
<td>3.20 (1.21)</td>
<td>3.40 (1.25)</td>
<td>3.38 (1.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>2.82 (1.39)</td>
<td>2.69 (1.14)</td>
<td>2.83 (1.34)</td>
<td>2.85 (1.36)</td>
<td>2.90 (1.39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** CSNP = Complimentary Stereotypes and Negative Prejudice, Response range = 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) scale.
by the lack of significant correlation between CS and Pro-Black attitudes (see Table 4). Pro-Black attitudes were, however, negatively related to NP, suggesting that the lack of sympathy toward Blacks corresponds to greater levels of hostility.

**Sexism.** To examine the extent to which negative prejudice and complimentary stereotypes toward Blacks corresponded to similar constructs of hostile and benevolent sexism, participants in Samples 2 and 4 completed the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Because hostile prejudice toward one outgroup often generalizes to others (e.g., Altemeyer, 1994), we expected NP should correlate more with hostile sexism (HS) than benevolent sexism (BS) (see Glick & Fiske, 1996). Of greater interest were correlations involving CS. We expected CS to correlate with BS because both constructs involve subjectively favorable role-restrictive beliefs about low-status group members. The findings presented in Table 5 generally support our hypotheses. Across both samples, NP was positively correlated to HS and CS was positively correlated with BS.

**Social desirability.** Issues related to race are often surrounded by heightened sensitivity due to contemporary social norms, and measuring racial beliefs and attitudes may be especially susceptible to social desirability response biases. Participants in Sample 2 completed the BIDR (Paulhus, 1998) which has two subfactors. Self-deception ($\alpha = .71$) measures tendencies to provide favorably biased but honestly held self-descriptions, and impression management ($\alpha = .77$) measures tendencies to provide favorable self-descriptions to others. The self-deception factor was unrelated to CS, $r(84) = -.10$, ns, but weakly correlated with NP, $r(84) = -.26$, $p < .05$. More importantly, the impression management factor was not correlated with CS, $r(84) = -.02$ or NP, $r(84) = .01$.

**Black Participants**

Separate analyses were performed using Black respondents only to examine the appropriateness of using the CSNP among a Black sample. Black participants from the six samples were pooled together ($N = 171$) and compared to an aggregate sample of White participants from Samples 1–6 ($N = 3,951$). Comparing means of the subscales, Blacks’ scores for NP were somewhat lower and less variable than scores from Whites (Black $M = 2.36$, $SD = 0.73$; White $M = 3.12$, $SD = 1.07$). In contrast, means for CS were slightly higher and more variable among Blacks than Whites (Black $M = 3.96$, $SD = 1.27$; White $M = 3.75$, $SD = 0.96$).

As with White samples, there was a significant positive correlation between CS and NP, $r(169) = .37$, $p < .001$, and the quadratic effect of NP on CS was also significant, $F(1, 168) = 10.62$, $p < .01$, $\beta = -.96$. When the quadratic effect was plotted, the graph indicated that the curvilinear pattern observed among predominantly White samples was also obtained among an exclusively Black sample: CS scores increased as NP scores increased up to a point when further increases in NP were associated with decreases in CS. These findings are consistent with previous work by Cokley (2002) on “internalized racialism,” which revealed a positive correlation between Blacks’ beliefs about their own mental and genetic deficiencies and their beliefs about their natural ability and sexual prowess. These findings are also consistent with system justification theory (Jost & Banaji, 1994), which maintains that members of lower status groups often will hold the same prejudiced attitudes and beliefs as members of higher status groups. More generally, these findings suggest that the CSNP can be used to assess attitudes toward Blacks among Black samples.

**STUDY 2**

The data from Study 1 largely support the CSNP as a reliable measure of positive stereotypes and negative prejudice to-
ward Blacks. The purpose of Study 2 was relevant to examining the validity of the CSNP. Participants in Study 2 generated positive and negative subgroups\(^1\) of Blacks and then evaluated these subgroups. We expected that participants would possess and use both negative and positive subgroups of Blacks as part of their social categorization process (Hamilton & Mackie, 1990). Furthermore, these subgroups should conform closely to the positive and negative themes in the CSNP items (e.g., Black athletes, Black musicians, unintelligent Blacks, criminal Blacks). Speaking to the validity of the CSNP, we expected that participants with higher CS scores would evaluate positive subgroups of Blacks more favorably than people with lower CS scores, and people with higher NP scores would evaluate negative subgroups more negatively than people with lower NP scores. That is, participants high in NP should generate subgroups and evaluations that are especially unfavorable, and participants high in CS should generate subgroups and evaluations that are especially favorable.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The CSNP (\(\alpha = .88\)) and its subscales (CS \(\alpha = .85\), NP \(\alpha = .88\)) were reliable. Consistent with Study 1, there was a positive correlation between CS and NP, \(r(65) = .24, p < .06\). The quadratic effect of NP on CS was not significant.

### Subgroup Descriptions

Participants listed an average of 8.40 subgroups (range 3–10). The number of subgroups listed was not related to CS or NP. To analyze the content of participants’ subgroup listing, we first created an exhaustive list of all subgroup categories provided (\(N = 553\)). Then, based on an iterative procedure of identifying similarities between subgroup categories, several higher-order categories were created (see Table 6). For each subject, one coder tallied the number of subgroups listed for each category. Afterward, a second coder tallied the number

---

\(^1\)In their distinction between subtyping and subgrouping, Richards and Hewstone (2001) described subtypes as a cluster of individuals who disconfirm a group stereotype and are categorized as atypical members of the superordinate social category. Subgroups however involve individuals who confirm the group’s stereotype or whose shared traits help define the group stereotype. Subgroups are not perceived as atypical, but rather are included within the superordinate social category. Thus, “Black intellectuals” would represent an atypical subtype of the overall category Blacks, but because athleticism is a stereotypic trait, “Black intellectuals” would represent a subgroup. Although participants are likely to include a combination of subtypes and subgroups, for the purpose of this study, all will be referred to as subgroups.
of subgroups listed for 18 randomly selected participants (accounting for 24% of the total number of subgroups). Agreement between the two raters was 95%. Three categories conformed to our theoretical model of complimentary stereotypes: Athletic included subgroups such as good athletes, basketball player, and football player. Musical/rhythmic included subgroups such as good dancers, singers, and rappers. Cool/sexual included subgroups such as funny, stylish, and sexual. In addition, we created an Other Positive category to include other favorable subgroups (e.g., smart Blacks, religious Blacks). Of the variety of subgroups included in the Other Positive category, no separate category could be created that had a frequency greater than any of the three categories previously reported.

Three negative categories also emerged from the content analysis: Underclass included subgroups such as poor, lazy, and unintelligent. Deviant included subgroups such as criminals, gangsters, and drug users. Annoying included subgroups such as loud, complaining, and racist. The subgroups listed in these categories share overlap with items on the NP scale concerning various negative stereotypes of Blacks as captured in the inferiority subscale. There was less overlap with the policy and contact items, which concern aspects of negative attitudes that are not likely to translate directly into particular subgroups. In addition, we created an Other Negative category to include other infrequently mentioned unfavorable subgroups (e.g., niggers, Oreos, fat women). Finally, a Miscellaneous category was created to include any subgroups that did not fit into the above categories (e.g., minority group, fraternity members).

Subgroup Evaluations

Our main goal in this study was to evaluate the validity of the CSNP by examining the relation between CS and NP scores and overall evaluations of Blacks. Toward this end, responses were averaged across all subgroup evaluations for each of the evaluation domains (i.e., positive/negative traits, positive/negative emotions, overall evaluation). Although there was a great deal of variability in the evaluations of subgroups, because these indexes represent a combination of all subgroups, CS should be positively correlated with positive evaluations and NP should be positively correlated with negative evaluations. Because the positive correlation between CS and NP, analyses with CS and NP were conducted while controlling for the other measure.

Correlations between CS, NP, and the averages of the various positive and negative evaluations made for each subgroup are presented in Table 7. As expected and supporting the predictive validity of the CS and NP subscales, participants who scored higher on NP were also more likely to report that Black subgroups have negative traits and elicit negative emotions from them. In contrast, participants higher in CS were more likely to report that Black subgroups have pos-

### Table 6

**Study 2: Frequencies of Subgroup Listings by Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup Category</th>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Subgroups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td>Black athletes (45), basketball players (8), good at sports (5), football players (3), muscular Blacks (3), big Black boys (2), balers (2), professional athletes (2), can jump high, physical Blacks, athletic scholarship Rappers (25), good dancers (19), singers (10), musically talented (7), R&amp;B musicians (5), gospel singers (4), rhythm (4), like rap music (3), jazz/blues man (2), choir (2), full of soul (2), hip hoppers, entertainers</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscular/rhythmic</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cool/sexual</td>
<td>Funny (9), good looking (3), players (3), sexual (2), cool hair, preppy, womanizer, pimp, trendy, fashionable</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other positive</td>
<td>Smart/educated Blacks (18), religious (10), successful (7), civil rights activists (7), friendly (6), family-oriented (5), confident (5), proud (4), wise old man (4), respectable (4), ambitious (4), nice old ladies (3), open-minded (3), rare smart ones, good speakers, future president, underappreciated, artistic, good cooks</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Subgroups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underclass</td>
<td>Ghetto Blacks (13), unintelligent (11), welfare abusers (10), poor (6), lazy (5), can’t talk properly (5), homeless (3), no morals (3), unemployed (2), bad fathers (2), sloppy (2), Black trash (2)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviant</td>
<td>Gangsters (31), thugs (17), criminals (10), drug users (7), intimidating Blacks (5), drug dealers (5), violent (3), delinquent (3)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoying</td>
<td>Racist (17), loud Blacks (14), Blacks who dwell on the past (8), easily offended (5), pushy (4), have attitudes (3)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other negative</td>
<td>Niggers (6), janitors (4), Oreos (3), big fat Blacks (3), fake Blacks (3), possessive women (2), nappy hair, dirty skank, don’t forgive easily, negative, can’t swim, rowdy kids</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Preacher (7), mistreated (5), students (4), opinionated (4), slaves (3), colored (3), lots of kids (3), minority (2), doctor (2), lawyer (2), housewives (2), Blacks (2), actors (2), old Blacks (2), cooks, masons, politicians, roofers, single mother, Baptists, grandparents, arguers, protective, half-Blacks, eat fried chicken, dress different, drive Cadillacs, teacher, soldier, wear curlers, Aunt Jemima, cultural, average, immigrants</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>553</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
itive traits and elicit positive emotions. Finally, when examining perceptions of Blacks using the overall evaluation thermometer, there was a negative correlation with NP and a positive correlation with CS. Thus the extremity of evaluations of these subgroups was associated with endorsement of complimentary stereotypes and negative prejudice as measured by the CSNP.

STUDY 3

The purpose of Study 3 was to provide a conceptual replication of the findings of Study 2 using specific subgroups of Blacks and more detailed evaluation criteria. In Study 2, the various evaluation measures were averaged across all subgroups listed because these naturally varied across participants. This precluded us from examining how the CSNP subscales predict evaluations of specific subgroups of Blacks. In Study 3, four subgroups among the most frequently listed by Study 2 participants were selected for evaluation (Black athletes, musical Blacks, Black criminals, lazy Blacks). Participants provided trait and affect descriptions for each subgroup (see Esses et al., 1993; Glick et al., 1997), and these evaluations were expected to correspond to participants’ CSNP scores. Specifically, CS should be positively correlated with positive evaluations and NP should be positively correlated with negative evaluations.

METHOD

Participants

One-hundred twelve undergraduate students (24 men, 78 women, 10 not reporting) enrolled in introductory psychology courses participated in exchange for credit toward a course requirement. The sample was 94% White with five Asian students and two students indicating “other.”

Procedure

Participants completed the study in groups of six or less while seated in individual cubicles that shared a common room from which a White female experimenter provided instructions. Participants were under the impression that they would be randomly assigned to evaluate subgroups of one of several possible overall social groups (e.g., men, women, students). All participants received a questionnaire packet that listed Blacks/African Americans as the social group they would be evaluating and included separate evaluations for Black criminals, lazy Blacks, Black athletes, and musical Blacks. When finished with the evaluations, participants completed the CSNP.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The CSNP (α = .88) and its subscales (CS α = .88, NP α = .89) were reliable, and there was a marginally significant positive correlation between CS and NP, r(110) = .17, p < .08. The quadratic effect of NP on CS was also significant, β = -.96, p < .05.
Subgroup Evaluation Ratings

As expected, the mean values of the trait ratings were rather low for the negative subgroups (Black criminals $M = -96.4$, lazy Blacks $M = -83.3$) and correlated well with each other, $r(110) = .48, p < .001$. Scores for the two groups were combined to form a stereotypic trait index for the negative subgroups. Conversely, the means for the positive subgroups were quite high (Black athletes $M = 86.6$, musical Blacks $M = 92.2$). These scores were also highly correlated, $r(110) = .45, p < .001$, and were combined to form a stereotypic trait index for the positive subgroups. A similar procedure of separately combining the negative and positive subgroups was followed for forming indexes for the emotional reactions (negative subgroups $r = .38$, positive subgroups $r = .59$), evaluation thermometer (negative subgroups $r = .66$, positive subgroups $r = .50$), and feeling thermometer (negative subgroups $r = .45$, positive subgroups $r = .60$).

We hypothesized that participants’ endorsement of complimentary stereotypes would predict favorable evaluations of positive subgroups and participants’ negative prejudice would predict unfavorable evaluations of the negative subgroups. Relations between CS and NP scores and the various evaluation measures are provided in Table 8 and generally support our predictions. When examining evaluations of the positive subgroups Black athletes and musical Blacks, CS (controlling for NP) was significantly related to favorable evaluations among three of the four measures: emotional reactions, evaluation thermometer, and feeling thermometer. As expected, CS scores (controlling for NP) were not associated with any of the evaluation measures for the negative subgroups. Participants’ NP (controlling for CS) was significantly related to negative evaluations of Black criminals and lazy Blacks in three of the four dependent measures: trait ratings, emotional reactions, and feeling thermometer.

Unexpectedly, NP scores (controlling for CS) were negatively correlated with all four evaluations measures such that participants with more negative racist attitudes rated the positive subgroups unfavorably. These significant correlations may be due to the fact that many participants high in NP provided evaluations that, although negative, nonetheless recognized the stereotypic superiority of the Black subgroups. For example, when describing Black athletes or musicians, many participants reported feeling jealous, envious, or depressed, perhaps in comparison to their own aptitude. Overall, these findings support our hypotheses and replicate the results of Study 2. People’s perceptions African Americans seem to reflect a duality of traditionally hostile attitudes aimed at subgroups such as lazy Blacks and criminals yet favorable evaluations of more positive subgroups such as Black athletes and musicians.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Across three studies, we have provided empirical support for our measure of complimentary stereotypes and negative prejudice, the CSNP. Confirmatory factor analyses consistently indicated that the complete measurement model (see Figure 1) provided a significantly better fit to the data than a two-factor (NP and CS, no subfactors) or one-factor (general racism) model. These results support the CSNP as a measure of two distinct, yet positively correlated, measures of perceptions of African Americans. The consistent positive correlations between CS and NP suggest that the superficial admiration associated with CS may not be as harmless as one might think. People who are likely to praise Blacks for their supposed athletic and music ability are also likely to denigrate Blacks for their laziness and criminality. Furthermore, two studies demonstrated that participants use subgroups to organize information cognitively about Blacks that share a good deal of overlap with the CSNP. Most importantly, Studies 2 and 3 demonstrated that participants’ scores on CS consistently predicted positive evaluations of these subgroups, and scores on NP predicted negative evaluations.

The CSNP and Other Measures of Prejudice

The CSNP is distinct from other measures in its ability to capture a wide range of positive and negative perceptions of African Americans. For example, according to modern racism theory, negative attitudes toward Blacks are subtly manifested in opposition to race-related political issues measured by the Modern Racism Scale (McConahay et al., 1981). However, such anti-policy beliefs represent only one component of NP, and some researchers have suggested that the Modern Racism Scale may more related to conservatism than to prejudice (Fazio, Jackson, Dunton, & Williams, 1995). By measuring negative attitudes toward Blacks in additional domains of inferiority and interracial contact, the NP scale provides a more complete assessment of hostile prejudice toward Blacks. Although Brigham’s (1993) ATB scale is also a multifaceted measure of negative racial attitudes, its factor structure is less clear than the CSNP. With clear second-order subscales related to racial inferiority, race-based policy, and interracial contact, researchers can use the entire NP or only a specific subscale as predictor variables.
Perhaps the CSNP bears greatest resemblance to Katz and Hass’s (1988) notion of racial ambivalence and their measures of pro-Black and anti-Black attitudes, though there are important differences. Katz and Hass posit that anti-Black attitudes stem from beliefs that Blacks are deviant from Whites. Such negative attitudes are consistent with NP and their similarity is reflected by their substantial positive correlation. Pro-Black attitudes, however, are said to be the result of a sympathetic recognition that Blacks are disadvantaged because of continuing discrimination. Such beliefs are quite different from the favorability captured by CS, which is based on perceptions of the targets of prejudice rather than perceptions of the prejudice itself. Importantly, this difference was reflected by a lack of correlation between the two measures. Furthermore, Katz and Hass (1988) argued that because of core American values such as individualism and humanitarianism, many Whites come to adopt both anti-Black and pro-Black attitudes. The result is a conflicted state of ambivalence that is resolved only when one set of attitudes is situationally amplified (Katz, Wackenhut, & Hass, 1986). In contrast, we believe that the consistent positive correlations between CS and NP suggest the two dimensions may be complementary sets of beliefs that can coexist without any state of conflict (see Fiske et al., 2002).

Our conceptualization of complimentary stereotypes and negative prejudice also shares some similarities with Glick and Fiske’s (1996) concept of ambivalent sexism. In both models, there is a set of antagonistic attitudes that correspond to traditional definitions of prejudice (negative racism and hostile sexism) and a set of subjectively favorable beliefs (complimentary stereotypes and benevolent sexism). Indeed, our analyses indicated that NP was correlated with HS and that CS was correlated with BS. The correlation between NP and HS suggests that people with negative attitudes toward Blacks are also likely to have negative attitudes toward women and is consistent with previous research on the generalizability of outgroup prejudice (see Duckitt, 2001; Saucier, 2000). The positive correlation between CS and BS, however, is more novel and suggests that favorable evaluations of targets in stereotypic domains may generalize somewhat between women and Blacks. That is, people who believe that Blacks are gifted athletically and musically are also likely to believe that women should be cherished and protected by men. What can account for this covariation? One possibility could be the general tendency for people to make category-based evaluations (Fiske et al., 1999). A good deal of research suggests that in social perception, people tend to give priority to categorization over individuation, and this tendency is especially strong when the category is visually prominent (e.g., race or gender) or when motivation and ability to individuate are low.

Another explanation for the covariation of CS and BS may be related to the content and underlying function of mixed outgroup stereotypes. Fiske et al. (2002) proposed a stereotype content model in which stereotypes are said to be a product of two primary dimensions: competence and warmth. When outgroups are perceived as high in competence but low in warmth, the result is envious stereotypes and prejudice. For example, Asians are often perceived as financially and educationally successful but also as interpersonally cold and distant (Lin et al., 2005). In contrast, when outgroups are viewed as low in competence but high in warmth, the result is paternalistic stereotypes and prejudice. For example, disabled and elderly people are thought to be relatively powerless but simultaneously kind and friendly. Fiske and colleagues (2002; Glick & Fiske, 2001) suggest that the favorableness but inherent restrictiveness of benevolent sexism corresponds with paternalistic prejudice. Women (especially traditional subgroups such as housewives) are simultaneously praised for their warmth and tenderness but devalued because these traits are associated with weakness.

Complimentary stereotypes of African Americans may have a particularly interesting fit within the stereotype content model because they may foster either paternalistic or envious prejudice. Individuals who compete with Blacks in domains relevant to complimentary stereotypes (e.g., athletes, singers, dancers) may perceive Blacks as highly competent but interpersonally cold (i.e., envious prejudice). Indeed, as mentioned earlier, some participants in Study 3 rated Black athletes negatively and reported feelings of jealousy and envy. However, among those who do not compete with Blacks or do not perceive these stereotypic domains as important or influential (i.e., low-status), they may perceive members of these subgroups rather fondly. Indeed, many popular Black athletes and entertainers (e.g., Michael Jordan, Oprah Winfrey) are often perceived to have pleasant and good-natured personalities (i.e., high in warmth). The result may be a form of paternalistic prejudice where people admire Blacks who occupy these stereotypic roles, but don’t perceive them as very competent in terms of their intelligence or authority (which is largely how Fiske et al. [2002] measured competence). This would be consistent with recent work by Kay et al. (2005) who suggested that attributing causally irrelevant traits to disadvantaged groups (e.g., poor people are happy) may represent a “victim enhancement” strategy that serves as a powerful form of system justification.

Possible Concerns About the Conceptualization of Complimentary Stereotypes

Although the present research provides support for the CSNP as a measure of positive and negative perceptions of Blacks, there are some empirical and theoretical issues that warrant attention. First, we have argued that the CSNP measures (positive) stereotypes and (negative) prejudice toward Blacks, and some readers may question why we focused on stereotypes in one case and prejudice in the other (although note that the “inferiority” subscale of NP largely corresponds to negative stereotypes). We do not wish to make too much of this distinction as many researchers believe that stereotypes
can have an affectively driven evaluative component that closely resembles traditional conceptualizations of prejudice (Dovidio et al., 1996; Esses et al., 1993). Indeed, our measurement of complimentary stereotypes goes beyond other descriptive measures that merely assess the extent to which people believe stereotypes are accurate descriptions of target group members. Rather, the prescriptive nature of these stereotypes (and our items measuring them) can evoke clearly evaluative responses (e.g., “A Black person is wasting an opportunity by not getting involved in athletics”). That is, not only do people believe that Blacks are superior athletes, but they may expect them to be and may be confused or disappointed if they are not.

Furthermore, the evaluative nature of the CS scale is reflected in its consistent positive relations with reactions to positive subgroups of Blacks. In Studies 2 and 3, CS scores were correlated with emotional reactions to Blacks (e.g., “How do Black athletes/musicians make you feel?”) and general evaluation indexes (e.g., “How favorably/unfavorably do you consider Black athletes/musicians?”). Thus, it appears that CS does capture an evaluative component. Among participants who score high in CS, Blacks are considered to have favorable stereotypic traits, Blacks who embody these traits evoke positive emotions, and the subordinate category of Blacks are evaluated favorably because of these favorable traits and emotional reactions.

A second issue that deserves comment concerns the absence of any scale items related to Blacks being “religious” or “spiritual” in our measure of complimentary stereotypes. Close examination of available research suggests that stereotypes of Blacks as religious may be somewhat fading. In their examination of contemporary racial stereotypes, Devine and Elliot (1995) reported that only 11% of 147 participants selected the trait “very religious” as applying to Blacks (compared to 74% who selected “athletic” and 57% who selected “rhythmic”). Moreover, participants in Study 2 were specifically instructed to describe any positive subgroups of African Americans. Subgroups pertaining to religiousness (e.g., religious, spiritual, preachers) comprised only 3.2% of all subgroups listed. Thus, the omission of traits related to religiousness may be the result of the stereotype fading from contemporary perceptions of African Americans, at least among college samples.

Implications and Future Research

We have argued that people’s perceptions of Blacks can be a combination of traditional hostility and stereotypic praise. This combination may have some disturbing implications that require future research on intrapersonal, interpersonal, and systemic levels of analysis. First, on an intrapersonal level, endorsing complimentary stereotypes may serve to legitimize a person’s own negative racial prejudice. Whites with negative attitudes toward Blacks may perceive such hostility as more acceptable because they simultaneously endorse considerable favorability toward certain subgroups. Consequently, they present this favorability as evidence against any possible bias against Blacks. That is, to the extent that people feel praising Blacks in stereotypic domains is complimentary (and thus nonprejudiced), such beliefs may provide them with “moral credentials” that allow them to subsequently express more hostile sentiments related to NP (Monin & Miller, 2001). A person may claim, “I can’t be racist, I think Blacks are incredible athletes and wonderful entertainers!”

Interpersonally, complimentary stereotypes may impede progress in race relations. Whites who strongly endorse such stereotypes may openly demonstrate their favorability under the assumption that such beliefs are nonprejudiced and complimentary. To the extent that Blacks disagree and find expressions of such positive stereotypes offensive, they are likely to voice their displeasure (Feagin, 1991). Whites simultaneously high in NP may respond rather unfavorably to such a rebuff (Czopp & Monteith, 2003) and such an interaction may reinforce their negative attitudes (e.g., “Blacks complain even when we’re trying to be nice”).

Finally, the implications of complimentary stereotypes extend beyond intrapersonal and interpersonal levels of analysis and can be examined in terms of their impact on large-scale interracial differences in social power. Specifically, the praise and admiration associated with CS is relegated to domains in which occupational and financial success are relatively unlikely (e.g., athletics, music). Whites who endorse positive beliefs about Blacks and are in positions of influence over Blacks (e.g., as teachers, counselors) may encourage them to pursue stereotype-consistent careers. Unfortunately, success in such domains (i.e., professional athletics, music careers) is considerably improbable. Furthermore, by encouraging stereotypic career goals, Blacks may be implicitly or explicitly dissuaded from academic-related pursuits that are likely to yield more meaningful and financially fruitful outcomes. Thus, some Blacks may be pushed into vocations consistent with positive and restricted racial stereotypes rather than academic alternatives more likely to yield success.

CONCLUSION

We believe that the intergroup perceptions we have investigated are not a fundamentally new form of prejudice, but rather have historical roots found in the evolution of racism in America. Negative prejudice toward Blacks has a long and troubling history, and although expressions of such hostility have recently become more subtle among many people, the underlying antagonism associated with these negative attitudes and consequent acts of discrimination has persisted (Duckitt, 1992; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; McConahay, 1986). Complimentary stereotypes toward Blacks have their own historical context as well. Just as in slavery times, Blacks continue to be perceived as rhythmic and musical
people. In addition, contemporary admiration of Blacks’ athletic ability and coolness may be modern revisions of older beliefs about Blacks as primitive and happy-go-lucky children (Hoberman, 1997). Perhaps most disturbing is that the combination of hostility and favorability toward Blacks may be part of what continues to maintain existing interracial disparities in power and status. That is, the hostility of negative prejudice and its corresponding forms of discrimination may continue to prevent Blacks from achieving high-status positions within society, but the praise and admiration associated with complimentary stereotypes may simply represent “symbolic concessions” (Jackman, 1994). Consequently, stereotypical favorability toward Blacks may convey a deceptive impression of equality.
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1. There are so many Black criminals because Black people are naturally more aggressive.

2. Black people do not have a natural “instinct” for athletics.

3. Housing laws should be passed that encourage greater racial integration of neighborhoods.

APPENDIX

The Multidimensional Racial Attitudes (CSNP) Scale

Please indicate your level of agreement with the items below using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N(Inf)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>P(Ath)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N(Pol)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **N(Inf)**: 1. There are so many Black criminals because Black people are naturally more aggressive.

2. **P(Ath)**: 2. Black people do not have a natural “instinct” for athletics.

3. **N(Pol)**: 3. Housing laws should be passed that encourage greater racial integration of neighborhoods.
P(Ath) 4. A Black person is wasting an opportunity by not getting involved in athletics.
P(Sex) 5. I think the way Black people talk and the expressions they use are cool.
P(Ath) 6. The success of Black athletes has nothing to do with their natural ability.
P(Mus) 7. Black people often have a difficult time picking up the beat to music.
P(Sex) 8. Black people have a unique quality of sexuality that most White people don’t have.
N(Inf) 9. There will always be racial differences in intelligence.
N(Con) 10. I think it would be fun to have a Black roommate.
P(Ath) 11. There are so many Black athletes in professional sports because of their innate ability.
N(Inf) 12. Black people should learn to work hard rather than look for “freebies” and “handouts.”
P(Sex) 13. Black people usually aren’t very stylish in their appearance.
N(Pol) 15. Affirmative Action is not just reverse discrimination against White people.
N(Inf) 16. As a whole, White people aren’t smarter than Black people.
N(Pol) 17. The welfare system really just allows Black people to “mooch” money from the government.
N(Con) 18. It’s just not natural to see a Black person and a White person holding hands and kissing.
P(Ath) 19. It’s true that White men really can’t jump as well as Black men.
N(Inf) 20. Black people could be as successful as White people if they only worked harder.
P(Sex) 21. Most Black people have a sense of coolness that White people don’t have.
N(Pol) 22. White people lose a lot of jobs to Black people because of racial quotas in hiring processes.
P(Sex) 23. Black men and women give off an aura of sensuality.
N(Con) 24. I can’t understand why a White person would want to date a Black person.
P(Mus) 25. When music starts playing, I expect Black people to start moving to the beat.
P(Mus) 26. White choirs put on a much better performance than Black choirs.
N(Con) 27. I would have no problems with dating a Black person.
P(Mus) 28. Black people should take advantage of their natural abilities to sing and dance.
N(Pol) 29. The government is already spending too much time catering to the wishes of Black people.
N(Con) 30. I enjoy groups that are racially diverse.

Note: N = Negative Attitudes, P = Positive Attitudes, (Inf) = Inferiority, (Pol) = Policy, (Con) = Contact, (Ath) = Athleticism, (Mus) = Musical/Rhythmic, (Sex) = Cool/Sexual
Reverse score the following items: 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 13, 15, 16, 26, 27, 30