Exceptional Outgroup Stereotypes and White Racial Inequality Attitudes Toward Asian Americans

Abstract

Stereotypes of outgroups help create social identificational boundaries for ingroups. When the ingroup is dominant, members employ individualist sentiment to justify their status. In this study we build on advances in social psychological research that account for multiple outgroup stereotypes. We argue the Asian American Model Minority Stereotype is analogous to the "cold but competent" position of perceptions toward Asians in Fiske's Stereotype Content Model. Asian Americans are perceived to be exceptional to other minority groups, and we hypothesize that perceived competence is associated with individualist sentiment directed at Blacks and Latinos. Using data from the National Longitudinal Study of Freshmen, we find support for our hypotheses but find that perceived coldness has no relationship to individualist sentiment. We discuss the implications and directions for further research.

INTRODUCTION

Are stereotypes of different outgroups related to one another and if so, are these relationships connected to social attitudes regarding those outgroups? Sociologists have long asserted that the public discourse concerning Asian Americans has stereotyped them as a "model minority" over against other minorities, but little research has examined whether this stereotype is indeed one based on comparisons made between minority groups among members of the dominant group. Second, little research has considered whether this stereotype is associated with racial attitudes concerning social mobility. In this study we advance the known link between outgroup stereotypes and beliefs associated with ingroup identification, namely individualism. In light of the growth of non-white populations in the US over the last 50 years, and the persistent stereotype of Asian Americans as a model minority, we propose that this reflects an exceptional outgroup stereotype and may be associated with white beliefs regarding the low mobility of non-Asian minorities. We argue that accounting for the cognitive construct of an exceptional outgroup perceived to be more competent than other minorities clarifies contemporary dominant group attitudes toward multiple outgroups.

Ingroup and Outgroup Bias

One of the central questions addressed in the social psychological literature over the past several decades has been the relationship between social identity and intergroup relations (Tajfel and Turner 1986). Central to this research is the relationship between one's perception of belonging to a particular group (ingroup) and the perception of groups to which one does not perceive membership (outgroups). This dynamic gives rise to stereotype, prejudice and discrimination of the outgroup which further strengthens identification with the ingroup, (Hogg 2006). Ingroup identification includes beliefs about merit that help justify or legitimate the dominance of the

ingroup. In the US case, this is largely viewed as individual mobility or individualism; members of the ingroup experience upward social mobility as solely or primarily the result of individual effort. Individuals who perceive their group as lower in status for example, may opt for a strategy that dissociates themselves from the group with the expectation that personal effort alone will allow for individual upward mobility. "[This] ideology of mobility is very convenient for the dominant group," as Hogg notes since it serves as justification for their higher status (2006:123). By extension, outgroups do not experience similar social mobility due to lack of such effort, as opposed to structural barriers that may inhibit or prohibit mobility in systemic fashion (Hogg and Abrams 1988). Stereotypes of outgroups therefore are associated with beliefs about individual mobility.

Competent and Cold: Specifying the Model Minority Stereotype

One of the major advances in intergroup relations research in the past 13 years has focused primarily on the impact of stereotype for multiple outgroups. Social psychologist Susan Fiske and colleagues (2002) proposed a two-axis cognitive map termed the Stereotype Content Model (SCM). The two axes refer to perceived competence and perceived warmth of a given outgroup. By creating a two-dimensional map of stereotypes, we can better understand how the stereotypes of these groups relate to one another. The ingroup is viewed as both warm and competent, whereas outgroups are subordinate either by their relative coldness or incompetence.

Of particular note, the stereotypes of conventional racial categories (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, Native American (Hollinger 1995) appear in different clusters along the warmth and competence axes. Blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans are viewed as less competent than Whites and Asians. Asian Americans are viewed as more competent than whites but less warm. This suggests that Asian Americans reflect a different kind of racial outgroup that

contrasts with other racial outgroups, specifically with respect to perceived competence. Ho and Jackson (2001) proposed 2 scales that resemble the axes of the SCM but developed solely with a focus on Asian American stereotypes. One scale they described as "negative" (antisocial, cold, cunning, deceitful, narrow-minded, nerdy, pushy, selfish, shy) reflects perceived lack of warmth in the SCM, and the other "positive" (ambitious, hardworking, intelligent, mathematical, obedient, self-disciplined, serious, traditional) reflects perceived competence. Ho and Jackson specifically define the "positive" scale as the Asian American Model Minority Stereotype (AAMMS). Lin et al. (2005) further examined the SCM with respect to perceptions of Asian Americans and the attitudinal consequences of those perceptions, and drew similar results. This was negatively associated with befriending Asian Americans and learning less about their cultures. Similar to Ho and Jackson, Lin et al. focus their stereotype measures exclusively on Asian Americans.

These important advances that draw on the model minority stereotype have been limited by their exclusive focus on perceptions of whites toward Asian Americans. In contemporary American life, Asian Americans are often encountered alongside other and more numerous minority groups. Racial stratification scholars have argued that the symbolic position of Asian Americans is one relative to other racial minorities. Simultaneous to the emergence of the SCM, political theorist Claire Jean Kim proposed a model of racial ordering that maps similarly to the aforementioned SCM axes of competence and warmth (what she terms relative valorization and civic ostracism respectively) (Kim 1999). In Kim's formulation, Asian Americans, regardless of ethnicity are generally valorized more highly than Blacks. However, unlike Blacks and Whites, Asian Americans are civically ostracized relative to the first two groups. This ostracizing process is summed by the phrase "forever foreigner" (Said 1979; Tuan 1998). While Asian Americans

are valorized more highly relative to Blacks, they remain subordinate to whites due to their perceived lack of assimilability. Kim's framing differs from Ho and Jackson and Lin et al. in that stereotypes rely on the relative positions of stereotypes of other groups. That is, racial minorities are compared against each other rather than viewed in isolation. Xu and Lee (2013) address this very issue and find, when comparing attitudes toward Asian Americans in terms of warmth and competence (what they term "civic ostracism" and "racial valorization") against attitudes toward Blacks and Whites, respondents tend to simultaneously valorize them above Blacks and Whites and ostracize albeit inconsistently below Blacks and Whites.[1] Rocco (2004) finds that Latinos are similarly viewed as foreigners despite their extensive history in the US. This might suggest that if perceived coldness directed at Asian Americans is akin to perceived foreignness, they should be accompanied by similar perceptions of Latinos. The SCM however does not identify a significant similarity in its model.

In social psychological terms the distinctive "cold but competent" position of Asian Americans in the field of stereotypes over against other racial minorities suggests that they are a conceptually different outgroup, what might be termed a perceived exceptional outgroup. The perceived exceptional outgroup appears as a comparison group to another outgroup (or outgroups) from which the ingroup draws *selective* distinctions. With regard to the AAMMS (Lee 1996; Osajima 1988), historical evidence shows its significance is most prominent when key White leaders *compare* Asian Americans against Blacks in the efforts to gain greater equity and to challenge structural discrimination (Wu 2014). Stereotyped as harder-working and more compliant than Blacks, the AAMMS served as a means to undercut arguments over racial inequity and supporting the narrative of individual mobility. While the AAMMS was construed by some as a positive stereotype, it implicated other racial minorities' lower socioeconomic

outcomes as the result of poor effort (sometimes referred to as individualist blame) rather than persistent structural discrimination (Chou and Feagin 2008). Further, the AAMMS decontextualizes the diverse pathways and notable dissimilarities in socioeconomic outcomes of different Asian ethnic groups. Most notable among these are southeast Asian Americans such as the Cambodians, Hmong, and Laotians who have lower educational attainment and higher rates of poverty compared to Asian Indians, Chinese and Filipinos (Taylor et al. 2013).

Put together, the AAMMS serves as a contemporary example of an exceptional outgroup stereotype through which members of the dominant group may justify their dominance in the racial hierarchy that now contains other non-Black minority groups. Historical, qualitative, and quantitative evidence suggests that this justification appears in beliefs about individualism, or personal merit. In colloquial terms the reasoning reads: Asian Americans, a minority group, are successful (competent), despite being less likable (cold); therefore discrimination does not affect other minorities' upward mobility. Regarding competence we hypothesize:

H1: Perceived greater competence among Asian Americans relative to other minorities will be associated with higher levels of individualist sentiment toward African American inequality.

H2: Perceived greater competence among Asian Americans relative to other minorities will be associated with higher levels of individualist sentiment toward Latino American inequality.

We note the inclusion of Latinos in these hypotheses as they too form part of the complex racial hierarchy articulated earlier. Given that stereotypes of competence and warmth set Asian Americans apart from Latinos in similar ways to Blacks, our hypotheses directed toward relative stereotypes between Asians and Blacks will mirror those for Asians and Latinos.[2]

The relationship between perceived competence and beliefs about individual mobility are intuitive-but what about warmth? In our review of the literature no linkage has been suggested that perceptions of warmth or coldness are related to perceptions of individual mobility. We noted earlier that the SCM shows little difference in relative perceived warmth, while Lin et al's study finds that perceived coldness of Asian Americans was associated with a lower propensity to befriend Asian Americans. Xu and Lee's recent study found an inconsistent perceived difference in relative ostracization of Asian Americans. Recent research among white evangelical Protestants suggests that sometimes diverse racial friendships are preferred as a defense for denial of systemic racial inequality (e.g. Wadsworth 2014). Perhaps the perceived warmth dimension might be indirectly and negatively associated with perceptions of individual mobility. Or perhaps perceived coldness is indirectly associated with perceptions of mobility via perceived competence. In light of these mixed findings and speculations of indirect relationships we have no hypothesis for the potential relationship between perceived coldness and beliefs about individual mobility but include a measure to account for a possible direct effect on individual mobility attitudes.

In the following we provide a quantitative examination of the relationship between the AAMMS and attitudes about racial inequality by linking stereotypes of several minority groups to white attitudes about racialized individualism. This further nuances the traditional ingroup-outgroup dynamic by positioning an outgroup perceived as exceptional in some way relative to another outgroup. It links these relative stereotypes of multiple outgroups with justification asserted by the dominant group. We build further on the insights from the stereotype content model to explicate the impact of perceived competence. Our hypotheses imply too that the

competence dimension of the AAMMS impacts racial inequality beliefs toward non-Asian minorities in similar ways.

DATA AND RESULTS

Data used for this study comes from the National Longitudinal Survey of Freshmen (NLSF), a large panel survey of the entering class of 1999. Respondents were chosen from 27 prestigious colleges and universities. For the purposes of our study on dominant group attitudes we limit our use of the data to the white non-Hispanic subsample (N=998; N= 898 after listwise deletion of missing cases in all tables). Given that the social location of whites impinges on their understanding of whiteness and its subcomponents (Lewis 2004), we restrict our language to refer to these respondents as young white elite-college students. Since these respondents were new entrants into some of the most prestigious schools in the US, they may reflect what Marguia and Forman described as members of "old money families" (2003: 66). Arguably many of these respondents come largely from environments of privilege, and will likely have significant influence in many quarters of American society. Knowing their attitudes about race will illuminate our understanding of the attitudes of the future ruling class. Appendix A displays the schools from which the respondents were surveyed. This data set is uniquely useful for this investigation since it asks questions regarding racial attitudes for multiple minority groups from which we can derive a clearer understanding of relative group positions and stereotypes. See Massey et al. (2002) for further elaboration of the sample and survey.

Dependent Variables

Our study centers on white attitudes towards black and Latino inequality. In order to determine these attitudes we measure the respondents' level of agreement with the following two separate and identical statements: "Many Blacks [Hispanics] have only themselves to blame for not doing

better in life. If they tried harder they would do better." Respondents answered an eleven point scale ranging from 0 (Strongly Disagree) to 10 (Strongly Agree). The resulting responses have a mean of 3.81 for blacks and 3.57 for Latinos.[3] Given the range of the variable we note that the sample means suggest that respondents are somewhat less inclined toward individualist explanations. Thus our analyses reflect the associations with greater individualist sentiment rather than firm commitment to individualism.

Independent Variables: Asian American Model Minority Stereotype

Perceived relative competence. We test the central hypothesis of this paper by means of responses to perceptions of different racial minorities by young elite white non-Hispanics. Respondents were asked to rate on a scale from 1 to 7 their perception of several characteristics for each minority group. We include three that pertain to the *perceived competence* dimension of the Asian American model minority stereotype: work ethic (1= lazy, 7 = hard-working), perceived intelligence (1= unintelligent, 7 = intelligent), and perseverance (1= give up easily, 7 = sticks to tasks) for a scale ranging from 3 to 21 (Cronbach's = 0.68).

Since the model minority stereotype asserts a comparison between different groups, we replicated the coding strategy regarding perceptions of Asian Americans for perceptions of Blacks and Latinos. Given that the stereotype is aimed at pitting Asian Americans against other minorities, we took the difference of the scores for respondents' perceptions of Asian Americans from their perceptions of Blacks and Latinos to determine perceptions of Asian Americans relative to these other minorities. As suggested by the literature, white non-Hispanics tend to view Asian Americans more favorably on the three aforementioned characteristics that form the competence dimension of the stereotype. As seen in Table 1, the mean of the scale for perceptions of Asian Americans is 14.99 while the mean for Blacks is 12.51 and Hispanics is

12.37. The resulting scale for Asian competence relative to Black competence ranges from -8.0 to 13.0 with a mean of 2.48, while the scale for Asian competence relative to Latino competence ranges from -9.0 to 17.0 with a mean of 2.62. A score of 0 indicates that a person views Asians the same as they do Blacks and Hispanics. The positive mean values indicate that in this sample of white students, Asians are perceived as more competent than Blacks and Hispanics. This comports with Fiske et al (2002) and other studies suggesting whites perceive Asian Americans as more competent than they do Blacks and Latinos.

Perceived relative warmth. Similarly to our measure of perceived competence, we operationalize perceived warmth by comparing perceptions of Asians Americans as "difficult to get along with" to Blacks and Latinos. Asians are perceived to be only slightly more difficult to get along with relative to Blacks and Latinos. As seen in Table 1, the mean score for perceived difficulty in getting along with Asians is 4.60 on a scale ranging from 1 to 7, whereas the mean of the perceptions toward Blacks' lack of relatability is 4.50 and Latinos' lack of relatability is 4.44.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

Neighborhood, High School, and Friendship Racial Composition

We control for the effects of contact with members of racial outgroups through three self-reported measures: respondents' neighborhood, high school and friendship racial composition The racial composition of both the respondents' neighborhood and high school are controlled for using log transformed percentages. Respondents' racial friendship composition is recorded with independent binary variables for African American, Hispanic American and Asian American friends (1= more than one friend of that race and 0= one or no friends of that race). This standard

helps identify the differential impact of having a network of different-race friends as opposed to having none or a mere symbolic or token friendship (Jackman and Crane 1986).

Other Control Variables

We include additional background demographic characteristics including commonly associated with racial attitudes. Following Massey et al. (2007) we used a dichotomous measure to control for household income ($75,000 or more= 1) and a series of binary variables to account for parental education levels (neither parent college graduate (contrast group in all models), one parent college graduate, both parents college graduates, one parent advanced degree, and both parents advanced degrees)). Additionally we controlled for gender (female= 1), church attendance (1= never attending, 5= more than once a week), and religious tradition (Protestant (contrast group), Catholic, Jewish, Other, and Nones). Table 2 shows the correlations of the variables used in this study.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

We conduct identical models predicting anti-Black and anti-Latino individualist attitudes including all of our controls and the two components of our AAMMS. Standard OLS regressions are not appropriate for the current study due to the clustered nature of the data. We did not employ multilevel models since our use of the sample, those surveyed in the first semester, reflects their experiences just prior to full participation in their higher education institution. Instead, the Huber/White sandwich estimator was used to correct all variance estimates for the clustering of multiple respondent observations within schools. This correction does not affect parameter estimates but tends to increase the size of estimated standard errors, which makes statistical tests more conservative than conventional tests. All analyses were performed using SAS 9.3.

Models 1 and 2 in Table 3 account for the main measures of the AAMMS. As we hypothesized, greater agreement with the combined attributes of perceived competence (work ethic, intelligence, and perseverance) ascribed to Asians relative to Blacks (Model 1) and Hispanics (Model 2) are associated with greater individualist sentiment toward Blacks (b = 0.194) and individualist sentiment toward Latinos (b = 0.153) among this sample of young elite-college white non-Hispanics. We have support for Hypotheses 1 and 2. In these same models, with respect to perceived relative warmth, we found no relationship between the perception that Asian Americans as more difficult to get along with than Blacks and Latinos in explaining young elite-college white attitudes about Black or Latino inequality.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

DISCUSSION

Our analyses find a strong correlation between the concept of the exceptional outgroup stereotype and justifications for ingroup dominance via beliefs about race and social mobility. We advance earlier studies considering the perceptions of whites about Asian Americans by incorporating insights from social psychology and critical race theory which argue this minority group is viewed more competently by whites compared to other minorities. In doing so we propose a more rigorous measure of determining the effect of stereotypes by pitting perceptions of Asian Americans against perceptions of Blacks and Latinos. We set out to determine whether young elite-college white Americans perceive Asian Americans as both competent and cold relative to Blacks and Latinos and if such perceptions are associated with their beliefs about Black and Latino social mobility. Our findings suggest perceived greater competence attributed to Asian Americans, holding constant the effects of neighborhood, high school composition, and friendship network and other demographic characteristics, is positively correlated with

individualist sentiment toward Blacks and Latinos. We emphasize "sentiment" in that the mean response on these survey questions was slightly below the midpoint indicating that the respondents generally do not place significant blame on Blacks and Latinos for unequal outcomes.

We were not able to identify a difference in perceptions of likability among the main minority target groups and, not surprisingly, it had no association with greater individualist sentiment toward Blacks and Latinos. This may be the result of the measure used for perceived coldness, and future studies should identify other perceptions that measure trust or likability toward different minority groups. If this lack of distinction is valid, it may suggest that dominant group members' boundaries between themselves and multiple outgroups need no further justification: all outgroups are equally not favored. Alternatively, perhaps perceived differences in warmth are associated with other justifications employed by the dominant group unrelated to individualist sentiment. Our findings also mirror the mixed findings for perceived competence and lack of support for perceived coldness in Xu and Lee's (2013) study. To the extent that the "cold but competent" position of Asian Americans in the SCM exemplifies the main dimensions of the AAMMS, we have quantitative empirical evidence that one of those dimensions is linked to justifications of white dominance which play a part in white identity construction.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

More work is needed to further understand the significance of intergroup attitudes as the diversifying racial composition of American society continues apace. Mentioned earlier, we recommend alternative measures of perceived relative warmth and justifications of group dominance associated with perceived warmth. In addition the measures here asked respondents to consider minority target groups as racialized homogeneous groups. With respect to Asian

Americans, such homogenization might mask potential differences in stereotype content if we specify certain ethnic-Asian target groups such as South Asian Indians, Koreans, and Vietnamese. In addition, US-born Asian Americans might be perceived differently relative to immigrant Asian Americans. As Kim (2007) points out the US presence in various Asian countries varies considerably, which in turn can affect stereotypes of specific Asian groups over against others. These groups might trigger different positions of competence and warmth and may have different effects on individualist sentiment.[4] Further, future research should consider employing the strategy demonstrated above to more diverse samples of adult whites. Since parental education was significant for these elite-college white students, perhaps socioeconomic position may play a larger role in how minority groups are compared with one another (Lewis 2004). Surveys with significant oversamples of Blacks and Latinos might also reveal how beliefs about Asian Americans affect their own attitudes about black and Hispanic inequality. Forman, Goar and Lewis (2002) for example found that Latinos of different national origins and skin tones reported different levels of agreement on perceptions of discrimination against Blacks. Further, scholars should consider the perspective of Asian Americans themselves – as members of a group stereotyped as exceptional, how does assent to this stereotype affect their understanding of Asian American inequality as well as the inequality explanations of blacks and Latinos?

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics (N=898)

	Mean	S. D.		Mean	S.D.
Dependent Variable			Demographic Controls		
Blacks Need to Try Harder	3.81	2.69	Gender (Female)	0.52	0.49
Hisp. Need to Try Harder	3.57	2.60	Parental Educ. Attainment		
			No College Graduate	0.09	0.29
Independent Variables			One Parent College Grad	0.09	0.30
Perceived Competence			Both Parents Coll. Grad	0.15	0.36
Asians			One Parent Adv. Degree	0.35	0.48
Work Ethic	5.07	1.26	Parents Adv. Degrees	0.29	0.46
Intelligence	4.89	1.20	Household Income	0.67	0.47
Perseverance	5.03	1.16			
(A) AsAm scale	14.99	2.83	Religiosity		
			Religious Attendance	2.41	1.06
Blacks			Religious Affiliation		
Work Ethic	4.11	0.81	Protestant	0.39	0.49
Intelligence	4.14	0.78	Catholic	0.30	0.46
Perseverance	4.26	0.92	Jewish	0.16	0.37
(B) Black scale	12.51	1.89	Other	0.06	0.29
			None	0.09	0.24
Latinos					
Work Ethic	4.16	0.96	H.S. Racial Composition		
Intelligence	4.04	0.82	Percent Black	11.97	12.99
Perseverance	4.17	0.93	Logged Black	1.91	1.14
(C) Latino scale	12.37	2.01	Percent Latino	8.09	9.87
			Logged Latino	1.57	1.05
Perceived Relative Competence			Percent Asian	9.51	9.13
Asian-Black (A-B)[a]	2.48	2.91	Logged Asian	1.79	1.05
Asian-Latino (A-C)[a]	2.62	3.13			
			Neigh. Racial Composition		
Perceived Warmth			Percent Black	5.21	10.63
Asian Ease of Relatability	4.60	1.24	Logged Black	0.93	1.11
Blk Ease of Relatability	4.49	1.15	Percent Latino	3.52	7.51
Latino Ease of Relatability	4.44	1.14	Logged Latino	0.72	1.00
			Percent Asian	5.29	8.81
Perceived Relative Warmth			Logged Asian	1.04	1.12
Asian-Black[a]	0.11	1.05			
Asian-Latino[a]	0.16	1.01	Racial Friendship Comp.		
			Percent Black	0.12	0.32
			Percent Latino	0.09	0.29
			Percent Asian	0.24	0.43

[a] t-test of mean difference significant at p<.001 level, two-tailed

Table 2. Correlation Matrix (N=898)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
(1) Blacks Need to Try Harder															
(2) Hispanics Need to Try Harder	.86*														
(3) Relative Asian Competence scale	.21*	.21*													
(4) Asian Relative Warmth	.07*	.07*	.16*												
(5) Female	-.15*	-.17*	-.12*	.01											
(6) No parents with college degree	.07*	.06	-.05	.02	.08*										
(7) One Parent B.A. degree	.01	-.01	-.01	-.01	-.02	-.10*									
(8) Two Parents B.A. degree	.09*	.09*	.03	-.05	.01	-.12*	-.11*								
(9) One Parent Advanced degree	-.00	-.01	.03	-.04	-.04	-.23*	-.22*	-.27*							
(10) Two Parents Advanced degree	-.08*	-.08*	-.01	.07*	.02	-.24*	-.23*	-.28*	-.54*						
(11) Household Income	.01	.03	.07*	.08*	-.08*	-.32*	-.05	-.01	.10*	.14*					
(12) Religious Service Attendance	.05	.07*	.03	-.03	.04	.06*	.04	.00	-.02	-.05	-.02				
(13) Protestant	.03	.02	.02	-.09*	.03	.05	.06	.05	-.03	-.07*	-.02	.20*			
(14) Catholic	.08*	.09*	.01	.03	-.04	.04	.04	-.00	.00	-.04	.06	.16*	-.51*		
(15) Jewish	-.03	-.02	.00	.06	-.04	-.11*	-.08*	.01	-.02	.13*	.11*	-.05	-.34*	-.28*	
(16) Other	-.11*	-.10*	.02	.02	.06*	-.02	-.04	-.04	.01	.04	-.09*	-.12*	-.19*	-.16*	-.11*
(17) None	-.03	-.06	-.06	.01	.02	.01	-.03	-.05	.07*	-.02	-.09*	-.42*	-.25*	-.20*	-.14*
(18) High School Logged Prop. Black	.04	.02	.04	-.03	.01	-.02	-.03	.01	-.01	.03	-.02	.01	.04	-.02	.00
(19) High School Logged Prop. Hispanic	.08*	.08*	.05	-.03	-.08*	-.05	-.02	.05	.01	.00	-.02	-.05	-.01	-.06	.04
(20) High School Logged Prop. Asian	-.06	-.05	.06	.03	-.08*	-.17*	-.08*	.01	.02	.12*	.09*	-.12*	-.10*	-.03	.12*
(21) Neighborhood Logged Prop. Black	.00	.00	-.02	-.05	.03	-.01	-.01	.01	-.04	.05	-.05	.05	-.03	.01	.04
(22) Neighborhood Logged Prop. Hispanic	.02	.01	-.04	-.03	.05	.01	-.03	.08*	-.03	-.01	-.07*	.02	-.04	-.05	.05
(23) Neighborhood Logged Prop. Asian	-.07*	-.08*	.02	.03	.10*	-.14*	-.06	-.01	.05	.08*	.05	-.06	-.15*	-.02	.17*
(24) % Black friends	-.03	-.04	-.03	.05	-.05	.02	-.02	-.04	-.03	.06	-.04	.00	.01	-.01	-.02
(25) % Hispanic friends	.00	.00	-.04	.02	-.02	.01	.03	-.02	-.01	.00	.00	-.04	.00	.01	-.04
(26) % Asian friends	-.02	-.02	.00	.05	.01	-.08*	-.08*	.02	.00	.08*	.06	-.13*	-.06*	-.07*	.08*

*$p < .05$, two-tailed tests

Table 2. Correlation Matrix (continued)

	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)	(24)	(25)
(1) Blacks Need to Try Harder										
(2) Hispanics Need to Try Harder										
(3) Relative Asian Competence scale										
(4) Asian Relative Warmth										
(5) Female switch										
(6) No parents with college degree										
(7) One Parent B.A. degree										
(8) Two Parents B.A. degree										
(9) One Parent Advanced degree.										
(10) Two Parents Advanced degree										
(11) Household Income										
(12) Religious Service Attendance										
(13) Protestant										
(14) Catholic										
(15) Jewish										
(16) Other										
(17) None	-.08*									
(18) High School Logged Prop. Black	.00	-.05								
(19) High School Logged Prop. Hispanic	-.01	.06	.40*							
(20) High School Logged Prop. Asian	.03	.04	.27*	.40*						
(21) Neighborhood Logged Prop. Black	-.01	-.03	.41*	.18*	.17*					
(22) Neighborhood Logged Prop. Hispanic	.05	.03	.13*	.46*	.26*	.43*				
(23) Neighborhood Logged Prop. Asian	.00	.05	.11*	.28*	.55*	.28*	.34*			
(24) % Black friends	.01	.00	.30*	.05	.03	.26*	.06*	.02		
(25) % Hispanic friends	.02	.02	.08*	.28*	.09*	.15*	.28*	.08*	.10*	
(26) % Asian friends	.04	.07*	.08*	.18*	.42*	.05	.17*	.36*	-.03	.02

*p <.05 two-tailed tests

Table 3: Coefficient Estimates for Predicting Black/ Hispanic Individualist Sentiment

	Black Individualist Sentiment Model 1	Latino Individualist Sentiment Model 2
AsAm Competency Scale[a]	0.194***	0.153***
AsAm Warmth Scale[a]	0.036	0.095
Control Variables		
Female	-0.789***	-0.782***
Household Income	0.075	0.125
Parent's Education		
One Parent College Graduate	-0.679	-0.702
Both Parents College Graduates	-0.175	-0.191
One Parent Advanced Degree	-0.803*	-0.664
Both Parents Advanced Degrees	-1.172**	-1.017**
Congregational Attendance	0.052	0.093
Religious Affiliation[b]		
Catholic	0.239	0.320
Jewish	0.020	0.001
None	-0.172	-0.342
Other	-1.010*	-0.829*
High School Racial Composition		
Percent Black in H.S.	0.209*	---
Percent Latino in H.S.	---	0.307**
Percent Asian in H.S.	-0.134	-0.163
Neighborhood Racial Composition		
Percent Black in Neighborhood	-0.007	---
Percent Latino in Neighborhood	---	-0.003
Percent Asian in Neighborhood	-0.030	-0.022
Racial Friendship Composition		
Two or more Black Friends	-0.156	---
Two or more Latino Friends	---	-0.088
Two or more Asian Friends	0.321	0.170
Intercept	3.903***	3.491***
R-squared	0.1029	0.1010
N	898	895

***p≤001 **p≤01 *p≤05, two-tailed tests

[a] Asian American Warmth/Competence is in contrast to African-Americans for Model 1 and in contrast to Latinos for Model 2.

[b] Contrast group is Protestant

[c] In ancillary models we tested whether the relationship between the AAMMS and individualist sentiment varied by gender. We found no significant effects. Thus, while males are more likely to ascribe individualist sentiment to Black and Latino inequality than females, the positive correlation between AAMMS and individualist sentiment is not gendered.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1 Important exceptions appear in areas dominated by the new highly-skilled class of Asian immigrants. As Jimenez and Horowitz (2013) show, these contexts reveal a reconfiguration of the "white on top" racial ordering argued previously. In these specific locales, Asian competence trumps white competence as the standard for comparison.

2 We acknowledge that important exceptions emerge in specific contexts regarding Latino and Black stereotypes. Smith's (2014) ethnography of Mexican Americans in New York in the late 1990s-early 2000s shows that certain high school settings produce stereotypes that run counter to stereotypes found in larger aggregate studies like Fiske et al.'s SCM research. There he found that young Mexican students who sought upward mobility identified as closely to Blacks as possible since they were contrasted against Latinos who were stereotyped in their part of the city as oppositional. We are grateful to an anonymous reviewer who directed us to this study.

3 We acknowledge the limits based on the use of a single item indicator such as the one described above. While other studies have similarly relied on this approach, future research in this area should consider multiple indicators of racial inequality attitudes in order to increase the reliability of this measure as an indicator of the underlying concept.

4 We are grateful to an anonymous reviewer for this observation.

REFERENCES

Chou, Rosalind S. and Joe R. Feagin. 2008. *The Myth of the Model Minority: Asian Americans Facing Racism*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Fiske, Susan T., Amy J. C. Cuddy, Peter Blick, and Jun Xu. 2002. "A Model of (Often Mixed) Stereotype Content: Competence and Warmth Respectively Follow from Perceived Status and Competition." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 82(6):878–902.

Forman, Tyrone A., Carla Goar, and Amanda E. Lewis. 2002. "Neither Black nor White? An Empirical Test of the Latin Americanization Thesis." *Race and Society* 5:65–84.

Ho, Colin and Jay W. Jackson. 2001. "Attitudes Towards Asian Americans: Theory and
Measurement." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 31(8):1553–81.

Hogg, Michael A. 2006. "Social Identity Theory." Pp. 111–36 in *Contemporary Social
Psychological Theories*, edited by P. J. Burke. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hogg, Michael A. and Dominic Abrams. 1988. *Social Identifications: A Social Psychology of
Intergroup Relations and Group Processes*. London and New York: Routledge.

Hollinger, David A. 1995. *Postethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism*. New York: Basic
Books.

Jackman, Mary R. and Marie Crane. 1986. "'Some of My Best Friends Are Black...': Interracial
Friendship and Whites' Racial Attitudes." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 50:459–86.

Jimenez, Tomas R. and Adam L. Horowitz. 2013. "When White Is Just Alright How Immigrants
Redefine Achievement and Reconfigure the Ethnoracial Hierarchy." *American
Sociological Review* 0003122413497012.

Kim, Claire Jean. 1999. "The Racial Triangulation of Asian Americans." *Politics and Society*
27(1):105–38.

Kim, Nadia Y. 2007. "Critical Thoughts on Asian American Assimilation in the Whitening
Literature." *Social Forces* 86:561–74.

Lee, Stacey J. 1996. *Unraveling the "Model Minority" Stereotype: Listening to Asian American
Youth*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lewis, Amanda E. 2004. "What Group?" Studying Whites and Whiteness in the Era of "Color-Blindness." *Sociological Theory* 22(4):623–46.

Lin, Monica H., Virginia S. Y. Kwan, Anna Cheung, and Susan T. Fiske. 2005. "Stereotype Content Model Explains Prejudice for an Envied Outgroup: Scale of Anti-Asian American Stereotypes." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 31(1):34–47.

Massey, Douglas S., Camille Z. Charles, Garvey Lundy, and Mary J. Fischer. 2002. *The Source of the River: The Social Origins of Freshmen at America's Selective Colleges and Universities*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Massey, Douglas S., Margarita Mooney, Kimberly C. Torres, and Camille Z. Charles. 2007. "Black Immigrants and Black Natives Attending Selective Colleges and Universities in the United States." *American Journal of Education* 113(2):243–71.

Murguia, Edward and Tyrone A. Forman. 2003. "Shades of Whiteness: The Mexican American Experience in Relation to Anglos and Blacks." Pp. 63–80 in *White Out: The Continuing Significance of Racism*. New York: Routledge.

Osajima, Keith. 1988. "Asian Americans as the Model Minority: An Analysis of the Popular Press Image in the 1960s and 1980s." Pp. 165–74 in, *Reflections on Shattered Windows: Promises and Prospects for Asian American Studies*, edited by G. Y. Okihiro, S. Hune, A. A. Hansen, and J. M. Liu. Pullman: Washington State University Press.

Rocco, Raymond. 2004. "Transforming Citizenship: Membership, Strategies of Containment, and the Public Sphere in Latino Communities." *Latino Studies* 2(1):4–25.

Said, Edward. 1979. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Smith, Robert Courtney. 2014. "Black Mexicans, Conjunctural Ethnicity, and Operating Identities: Long-Term Ethnographic Analysis." *American Sociological Review* 79:517–48.

Tajfel, Henri and John Turner. 1986. "The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior." Pp. 7–24 in *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Taylor, Paul et al. 2013. *The Rise of Asian Americans*. Washington DC: Pew Research Center.

Tuan, Mia H. 1998. *Forever Foreigners or Honorary Whites? The Asian Ethnic Experience Today*. New Brunswick,NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Wadsworth, Nancy D. 2014. *Amibvalent Miracles: Evangelicals and the Politics of Racial Healing*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.

Wang, L. Ling-chi. 2008. "Myths and Realities of Asian American Success: Reassessing and Redefining the 'Model Minority' Stereotype." Pp. 21–42 in *Model Minority Myth Revisited: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Demystifying Asian American Educational Experiences*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Wu, Ellen D. 2014. *The Color of Success: Asian Americans and the Origins of the Model Minority*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Xu, Jun and Jennifer C. Lee. 2013. "The Marginalized 'Model' Minority: An Empirical Examination of the Racial Triangulation of Asian Americans." *Social Forces* 91:1363–97.