A rose by any other name?
The consequences of subtyping "African-Americans" from "Blacks"

Erika V. Hall [a],*, Katherine W. Phillips [b], Sarah S.M. Townsend [c]

[a] Organization and Management Department, Goizueta Business School, Emory University, USA
[b] Management Division, Columbia Business School, Columbia University, USA
[c] Management and Organization Department, Marshall School of Business, University of Southern California, USA

HIGHLIGHTS

- We examine the consequences of ethnic labels that represent different SES subtypes.
- The ethnic label Black signals lower social class and status than African-American.
- Whites rated a Black employee to be lower status than an African-American employee.
- Articles that used Black (vs. African-American) had a more negative emotional tone.
- Whites perceived a Black suspect more negatively than an African-American suspect.

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Racial labels often define how social groups are perceived. The current research utilized both archival and experimental methods to explore the consequences of the "Black" vs. "African-American" racial labels on Whites' evaluations of racial minorities. We argue that the racial label Black evokes a mental representation of a person with lower socioeconomic status than the racial label African-American, and that Whites will react more negatively toward Blacks (vs. African-Americans). In Study 1, we show that the stereotype content for Blacks (vs. African-Americans) is lower in status, positivity, competence, and warmth. In Study 2, Whites view a target as lower status when he is identified as Black vs. African-American. In Study 3, we demonstrate that the use of the label Black vs. African-American in a US Newspaper crime report article is associated with a negative emotional tone in that respective article. Finally, in Study 4, we show that Whites view a criminal suspect more negatively when he is identified as Black vs. African-American. The results establish how racial labels can have material consequences for a group.

© 2014 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

---

*"What's in a name? That which we call a rose
By any other name, would smell as sweet"*

– Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet, 1600

In 2013, the U.S. Census Bureau decided to remove the racial label "Negro" from the "Black, African-American, or Negro" survey category for fear that the label was both offensive and outdated (Fama, 2013; U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). The removal sparked a spirited discussion among Americans of African descent (henceforth, AADs) over whether the remaining labels, "Black" and "African-American," also embodied

stigma (Collier, 2013; Lloyd, 2012; Washington, 2012). As AADs continue to debate which label they prefer, it remains unclear if and how Whites' affective responses toward AADs are affected by which label is used.

In the current research, we examine the differences in the traits that Whites attribute to each racial label,[1] and we investigate Whites' perceptions of AADs when they are labeled as Black as compared to African-American. First, we examine whether the content embedded in the stereotypes for Blacks is more negative than the content embedded in the stereotypes for African-Americans, and we investigate whether one cause of this discrepancy is that the African-American label refers to a subtype of AADs. Specifically, the African-American racial label may call forth a mental representation of AADs with relatively higher social class and

---

* Corresponding author at: Organization and Management Department, Goizueta Business School, Emory, University, Atlanta, GA 30322, USA.
E-mail address: Erika.hall@emory.edu (E.V. Hall).

[1] Both African-American and Black are classified as races, rather than ethnicities, by the United States Census Bureau (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012; http://www.census.gov/topics/population/race/about.html). Therefore, we refer to African-American and Black as racial labels throughout the body of the article.

status (e.g. AAD doctors or lawyers), whereas the racial label Black may evoke images of AADs with lower social class and status (e.g. AAD janitors or welfare recipients; Studies 1 and 2). Thus, the negativity attributed to AADs identified as Black may, in part, reflect peoples' negative feelings toward individuals with low social class and status (see Cozzarelli, Wilkinson, & Tagler, 2001; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002). We then explore the consequences of these different labels by examining Whites' affective reactions toward AADs that are labeled by each term. We predict that Whites will respond to AADs labeled as African-American with more positive and less negative emotions than those labeled as Black (Studies 3 and 4). Moreover, we focus primarily on criminal arenas because these are domains in which AADs have incurred a great deal of discrimination (see Banks, Eberhardt, & Ross, 2008; Duncan, 1976; Eberhardt, Davies, Purdie-Vaughns, & Johnson, 2006; Eberhardt, Goff, Purdie, & Davies, 2004).

Before presenting these studies, we review research on the general consequences that labeling has for how people perceive social groups. Then, we discuss whether the African-American racial label represents a higher social class and higher status subtype of the superordinate AAD category, whereas the Black racial label symbolizes the superordinate AAD category itself. We draw on the Stereotype Content Model (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2007; Fiske et al., 2002) to consider the potential differences in the stereotype content associated with each label and finally, we consider how these specific labels might affect Whites' perceptions of, and emotional reactions toward, AADs that are labeled by each term.

The consequences of labeling for perceptions of social groups

Contrary to Shakespeare's notion that "a rose, by any other name, would smell as sweet," studies have shown that the labels individuals apply to objects, ideas, or other people often affect their perceptions of and reactions toward those entities. For example, people are more likely to purchase a burger when it is labeled "75% lean" vs. "25% fat" (Levin & Gaeth, 1988), and declare more support for social spending when survey questions are phrased using the label "assistance to the underprivileged" vs. "welfare" (Smith, 1987). These studies indicate that seemingly equivalent labels may have disparate connotations, which may affect how people perceive the items or individuals that bear those labels.

The labels that AADs use, or the labels used by others to refer to AADs, may likewise have disparate connotations for AADs. In particular, given that White Americans are the dominant racial group, their perceptions toward the different labels used to identify AADs may be particularly consequential for AADs' economic, employment, and judicial outcomes. For example, AADs are often identified as either Black or African-American on employment applications, resumes (e.g. member of the African-American Lawyer's Association), and in judicial cases (e.g. a Black suspect allegedly stole from the store). Further, racial labels often title employee resource groups within organizations (e.g. National Black Employee's Caucus) and student groups on college and university campuses (e.g. African-American Student Union). Thus, Whites' responses to these racial labels may affect how they judge an African-American vs. Black person or group.

Although we often use African-American and Black interchangeably in modern times, the predominance of different racial labels has evolved throughout history. In the early 1900s, "Colored" was the predominant term for AADs, but the racial label Negro increased in favor as scholars like W.E.B. Du Bois argued that the term was more linguistically logical than its predecessor (Du Bois, 1928). In the late 1960s, the term Black became the predominant racial label for AADs and embodied Stokely Carmichael's "Black Power" movement (Martin, 1991). Importantly, many Black power advocates rejected "bourgeoisie" ideals, and insisted that middle and upper class AADs uniformly claim an identity of disadvantage and low socioeconomic status in order to attract a fair share of political resources for the AAD community (Kilson, 1989; Martin, 1991). Finally, in 1988, civil rights leaders publicly decided that the racial label African-American would represent the AAD community more positively than the racial label Black because the term bared important similarities with the terms that described other upward-bound and politically mobilized ethnic groups (e.g. Italian-Americans, Armenian-Americans; Martin, 1991). The term African-American was believed to symbolize a mutually shared African heritage and refer to a geographic land base — or, homeland (Martin, 1991). Further, the term connoted upward progression in society and originated from Jessie Jackson (Martin, 1991) — who is seen as a relatively more affluent, higher SES AAD (Jesse Jackson Net Worth, 2014a, 2014b).

The addition of the term African-American in 1988 suggests that each of these racial labels may be perceived to vary in the negativity they imbue and that, specifically, Black may have been perceived to carry a more negative connotation. To empirically investigate this proposition, Philogène (2001) used a derivation of the Princeton trilogy method for evaluating stereotype content (see Katz & Braly, 1933). The author examined the number of negative (vs. positive) attributes used to describe Blacks vs. African-Americans. Results showed that the stereotype for Blacks contained more negative content than the stereotype for African-Americans. Despite the importance of this work, it remains unclear what factors contributed to the differences in negativity attributed to Blacks vs. African-Americans, and what consequences these terms carried for individuals labeled as one or the other.

In the current research, we identify socioeconomic status as one important factor that is driving the differences in stereotype content between Blacks and African-Americans, as well as the divergent implications these labels have for how Whites perceive AADs. Defining socioeconomic status (SES) as "the social standing or class of an individual or group… often measured as a combination of education, income and occupation" (APA, 2013), we examine whether the racial label African-American refers to AADs with higher SES than the racial label Black. Because many Black power activists urged AADs to unite under the guise of a uniform, lower SES group in the late 1960s (Kilson, 1989), these connotations may have persisted with the label throughout time. Thus, the new differentiating label (African-American) may have progressed to label the exceptional subtype of AADs that did not fit the mold of the existing low SES stereotype.

Subtyping Americans of African descent

According to Maurer, Park, and Rothbart (1995), subtyping refers to "the process by which group members who disconfirm, or are at odds with, the group stereotype are mentally clustered together and essentially set aside as 'exceptions to the rule'" (p. 812). For subtyping to occur, a concentrated subset of individuals must have attributes that are inconsistent with the stereotype for their superordinate group. For example, in the early 1900s, Du Bois (1903) wrote about the existence of a concentrated subset of AADs, titled the "talented tenth," which were perceived to be intelligent and civil, and believed to be unlike the majority of AADs (e.g. incompetent, violent). Further, the discussion of a distinct group of successful middle and upper class AADs, titled the "Black Bourgeoisie," emerged again in the 1960s. In modern day media, there are many successful AADs such as Barack Obama, Colin Powell, and Oprah Winfrey who have attributes that are highly inconsistent with the stereotypes for the larger AAD population. Along with the counter-stereotypical traits of intelligence and civility, these exemplars also have atypical SES characteristics — namely, high levels of education, high status occupations, and affluence.

Several lines of research suggest that Whites will perceive these high SES, seemingly "atypical" AAD exemplars as an exceptional subtype rather than as examples of the general AAD population (Kunda & Oleson, 1995; Weber & Crocker, 1983). First, people are more likely to subtype group members when stereotype-inconsistent attributes are concentrated among a select few group members (Weber & Crocker, 1983). Second, people are more likely to subtype group members when they differ on a meaningful characteristic or dimension (Kunda & Oleson, 1995). In this sense, SES may have been the meaningful characteristic, concentrated among a few AADs, which allowed Whites to create an "exceptional" subtype. The announcement of a more favorable racial label (African-

American) may have provided Whites with a term for the exceptional AAD subtype they held, instead of increasing the positive perceptions of the entire race.

H1. The stereotypes associated with African-Americans will be more positive and less negative than the stereotypes associated with Blacks.

H2. The racial label African-American will be perceived to refer to an AAD of higher socioeconomic status than the racial label Black.

Supportive of the idea that African-American may represent a higher SES subtype of the AAD superordinate category, studies that use the Stereotype Content Model (SCM) have revealed that Whites group AADs into two types: "poor Black" and "Black professional" (Cuddy et al., 2007; Fiske, Bergsieker, Russell, & Williams, 2009; Fiske et al., 2002). We argue that these types may be evoked by the racial labels Black and African-American, respectively. According to SCM, all stereotypes are best described by two central dimensions — warmth and competence. Participants, who were predominantly White Americans, rated "poor Blacks" low in both warmth and competence and perceived them similarly to poor Whites and welfare recipients (Figure 1, p. 885, 887, Fiske et al., 2002). Conversely, participants rated "Black professionals" as having high competence and high warmth and perceived them similarly to Americans, the middle class, Christians, the Irish, and housewives (Figure 2, p. 638, Cuddy et al., 2007).

The SCM paradigm is useful for theorizing about how White Americans perceive otherwise equivalent AADs labeled as Black compared to African-American. First, consistent with our goals here, the SCM is derived from a White American middle-class perspective (Fiske et al., 2002), and our present interest is in Whites' perceptions of AADs that are labeled by the African-American vs. Black ethnic label. Second, if the Black racial label evokes the low SES "poor Black" stereotype, and the African-American racial label represents the high SES subtype of the "Black professional," we can use SCM to make predictions about the warmth and competence attributed to AADs who are labeled by these terms. Specifically, AADs with the African-American racial label should be seen as both warmer and more competent than those with the lower status racial label Black.

H3. The stereotypes associated with African-Americans will signal higher warmth than the stereotypes associated with Blacks.

H4. The stereotypes associated with African-Americans will signal higher competence than the stereotypes associated with Blacks.

Predicting reactions toward African-Americans vs. Blacks

Given that perceptions of a group's competence and warmth are associated with emotional reactions toward those groups (Cuddy et al., 2007), the SCM paradigm can also be useful in theorizing about Whites' affective reactions toward AADs that are identified as Black vs. African-American. First, people tend to express feelings of positive emotion toward groups that are perceived to be high in competence and warmth (Cuddy et al., 2007; Fiske et al., 2009). Therefore, we would expect Whites to have more positive affective reactions toward African-Americans relative to Blacks. Second, people tend to express feelings of negative emotion toward groups that are low in competence (Cuddy et al., 2007). Therefore, we would expect Whites to have more negative affective reactions toward Blacks as compared to African-Americans.

H5. Whites will express more positive emotion (less negative emotion) toward African-Americans as compared to Blacks.

Overview of studies

In the first two studies, we evaluate the content embedded in the Black and African-American stereotypes. In Study 1, we use the Princeton trilogy method to analyze the negative, status, warmth, and competence-based content embedded in the stereotypes for African-Americans and Blacks (as well as our control groups — Whites and Caucasians). In Study 2, we examine whether Whites perceive a target labeled as Black to be lower SES than a target labeled as African-American.

In the last two studies, we examine responses to AADs who are labeled by each term in criminal contexts. In Study 3, we conduct a content analysis of US newspaper crime reports, to investigate the presence of negative emotion (pity/sadness or anger) in crime reports that mention Blacks vs. African-Americans. Finally, in Study 4, we examine whether people feel more negatively toward a Black (vs. African-American) criminal.

Study 1

In our first study, we explored the negative, status, warmth, and competence-based stereotype content associated with the Black and African-American racial labels. This enabled us to test Hypotheses 1 through 4. In addition to replicating Philogène (2001) demonstration of the difference in negativity between the Black and African-American racial labels, we also extend this work in important ways by beginning to tease out other content differences between the two labels (i.e., status, warmth, and competence). Specifically, by examining status differences in the content associated with the two labels, we begin to identify a possible cause for the difference in negativity shown by Philogène (2001). In addition, by examining the warmth and competence-based content in each racial label, we can use the SCM model to predict Whites' affective reactions toward targets who bear each label (H5).

We also assessed the negative, status, warmth, and competence-based content associated with the White and Caucasian racial labels to test an alternative hypothesis. White Americans' different perceptions of Blacks vs. African-Americans could possibly be explained by the stereotype content embedded in color-based (Black and White) vs. non-color-based (African-American and Caucasian) labels. For example, referring to a racial group as a basic color may diminish the complexity, richness, and, therefore, positivity, associated with that group's culture. Thus, we also tested the hypothesis that color-based racial labels are perceived differently than non-color based racial labels.[2]

Free response task

Prior to the experiment, 79 participants (54 females; 57 White, 14 Asian, 5 Black, 14 Latino, 2 Other) engaged in a free response task, where they listed traits that described one of six groups: Blacks, African-Americans, Whites, Caucasians, the color black, or the color white. We used participants from various racial/demographic backgrounds to obtain a global list of terms for our White participants to choose from. This task resulted in a list of 456 terms, which we later condensed into a more tractable list of 75 traits (e.g. athletic, aggressive, bold).[3] We used these traits to determine the stereotypes associated with African-Americans and Blacks, as well as Whites and Caucasians.

Participants and procedure

One hundred and seventy-two White participants were recruited from a nationwide portal (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011) to complete an online survey (126 females).

Using the Princeton trilogy method (Gilbert, 1951; Karlins, Coffman, & Walters, 1969; Katz & Braly, 1933), participants were randomly assigned to one of 7 conditions. In the 4 stereotype attribution conditions, 106 participants were given the list of 75 traits and instructed to choose the 10 traits that were most descriptive of Blacks, African-Americans, Whites, or Caucasians depending on condition.

In the 3 remaining conditions, participants were employed to rate the valence, status, or warmth and competence-based associations of each of these 75 traits. In the valence assessment condition, 17 participants rated each trait on a scale from 1 (extremely positive) to 10 (extremely negative). In the status assessment condition, 24 participants provided two ratings. First, they indicated the degree to which they considered each of the attributes "to be a low or high status trait" on a 1 (extremely low status) to 10 (extremely high status) scale. Second, participants were given a definition of SES and, subsequently, indicated the degree to which they considered each of the attributes "to be a trait that is more typical of someone from a low SES (vs. high SES) background" on a 1 (extremely typical of a low SES person) to 10 (extremely typical of a high SES person) scale. We average the status and SES scales to create an overall status measure, $\alpha = .72$.

In the warmth and competence-based assessment condition, 25 participants first read, "When you meet people, you can often quickly determine whether they have a cold or warm personality." They then indicated the degree to which they considered each of the attributes "to be a cold or warm trait" on a 1 (extremely cold) to 10 (extremely warm) scale. Second, participants read, "When you meet people, you can often quickly determine whether they are incompetent or competent." Subsequently, they indicated the degree to which each of the attributed reflected "incompetence or competence" on a 1 (extremely incompetent) to 10 (extremely competent) scale.

We used participants' assessments to compute mean negativity, status, warmth, and competence scores for each of the traits. We then computed negative, status, warmth, and competence content scores for each racial label by averaging the mean assessment scores of the traits that participants attributed to the label.

Results and discussion

Negative content

As predicted in H1, LSD contrasts indicated that the stereotype content for Blacks was significantly more negative than for African-Americans, $p = .04$, $d = .49$. The stereotype content for Blacks was also perceived to be significantly more negative than the stereotype content for Whites, $p = .01$, $d = .71$. In contrast, the stereotype content for African-Americans did not significantly differ in perceived negativity from that of Whites, $p = .62$. See Table 1 for means, standard deviations, and significance tests.

We added the term Caucasian to our analysis and tested the alternative prediction that color-based racial labels (Black, White) are perceived more negatively than non-color-based labels (African-American, Caucasian). However, participants perceived no significant difference in the negative content embedded in color-based ($M = 4.39$, $SD = 1.40$) vs. non-color based ($M = 4.22$, $SD = 1.28$) racial labels,

$t(104) = 0.64$, $p = .53$. Although participants perceived the racial label Black more negatively than the racial label African-American, participants perceived no significant difference in the negative content embedded in the racial label White relative to the racial label Caucasian, $p = .29$.

Status-based content

In support of H2, LSD contrasts indicate that the stereotype content for Blacks signaled significantly lower status than the stereotype content for African-Americans, $p = .03$, $d = .50$. The stereotype content for Blacks also signaled significantly lower status than the stereotype content for Whites, $p < .001$, $d = 1.12$. In contrast, the stereotype content for African-Americans did not significantly differ in status from that of Whites, $p = .09$.

We also tested whether color-based racial labels (Black, White) were perceived to signal lower status than non-color-based labels (African-American, Caucasian). However, participants perceived no significant difference in the status-based content embedded in color-based ($M = 5.98$, $SD = 0.68$) vs. non-color based ($M = 6.07$, $SD = 0.60$) racial labels, $t(104) = 0.71$, $p = .48$. Specifically, although participants perceived the label Black to signal lower status than the label African-American, participants perceived no significant difference in the status-based content embedded in the label White as compared to the label Caucasian, $p = .33$.

Warmth-based content

In support of H3, LSD contrasts indicated that the stereotype content for African-Americans was significantly more warm than the stereotype content for Blacks, $p = .03$, $d = .51$. The stereotype content for Whites was also significantly more warm than the stereotype content for Blacks, $p = .04$, $d = .57$. In contrast, the stereotype content for African-Americans did not significantly differ in warmth from that of Whites, $p = .96$.

As before, participants perceived no significant difference in the warmth-based content embedded in color-based ($M = 6.13$, $SD = 1.01$) vs. non-color based ($M = 6.28$, $SD = 0.95$) racial labels, $t(104) = 0.82$, $p = .42$. Specifically, although participants perceived the label Black to signal lower warmth than the label African-American, participants perceived no significant difference in the warmth-based content embedded in the label White as compared to the label Caucasian, $p = .26$.

Competence-based content

In support of H4, LSD contrasts indicated that the stereotype content for African-Americans signaled higher competence than the stereotype content for Blacks, $p = .04$, $d = .48$. The stereotype content for Whites also signaled higher competence than the stereotype content for Blacks, $p = .01$, $d = .63$. In contrast, the stereotype content for African-Americans did not significantly differ in competence from that of Whites, $p = .31$.

As before there were no significant differences in the competence-based content embedded in color-based ($M = 6.12$, $SD = 0.82$) vs. non-color based ($M = 6.22$, $SD = 0.75$) racial labels, $t(104) = 0.66$, $p = .51$. Specifically, although participants perceived that the label Black signaled lower competence than the label African-American, participants perceived no significant difference in the competence-based content embedded in the label White compared to the label Caucasian, $p = .27$.

Through a content analysis of the stereotypes attributed to the Black, African-American, White, and Caucasian racial groups we found that the stereotype content for Blacks signals less positivity, status, warmth, and competence than the stereotype for African-Americans. Further, we ruled out an alternative hypothesis. We did not find support for the notion that color-based labels were perceived differently than non-color-based labels, which suggests that the difference we found between the

Table 1
Mean negative, status, warmth, and competence-based stereotype content for the "Black," "African-American," "White," and "Caucasian" Racial Labels (Study 1).

Racial label	Negative	Status	Warmth	Competence
Black	4.88 (1.73)$_a$	5.65 (0.81)$_a$	5.84 (1.22)$_a$	5.79 (1.00)$_a$
African-American	4.13 (1.32)$_b$	6.01 (0.62)$_b$	6.40 (0.97)$_b$	6.21 (0.76)$_b$
White	3.96 (0.85)$_b$	6.29 (0.33)$_b$	6.39 (0.71)$_b$	6.41 (0.98)$_b$
Caucasian	4.35 (1.24)$_{a,b}$	6.16 (0.59)$_b$	6.13 (0.91)$_{a,b}$	6.23 (0.75)$_b$

Note: Means in each column that have different subscripts differ significantly at $p < .05$, and means in each column that share the same subscripts do not differ significantly.

African-American and Black labels does not extend to the White and Caucasian labels.[4]

Study 2

In Study 2, we seek to replicate our status subtype findings from Study 1, and therefore increase the robustness of our analysis, by examining whether an otherwise identically presented AAD target would be perceived as low status if he were labeled Black and higher status if he were labeled African-American. Further, we seek to improve the status measures we used in Study 1 by using measures of status that are more applicable to real-world outcomes (e.g. education level, occupational attainment). We provided participants with profiles that identified a target as either Black or African-American. After reading the profile, we asked participants to indicate the salary, occupational position level, educational level, and overall status of the target.

Participants and procedure

One hundred and ten White participants were recruited from the nationwide portal to complete an online survey (Buhrmester et al., 2011). Fifty-five participants were retained for the current analysis (21 females).[5]

Participants were randomly assigned to view a profile of a target that was identified as a Black or African-American male. Aside from the racial label, participants were given information about the target's last name (Williams), address (Chicago, Illinois), and gender (male). We asked participants to fill in information about the target using the information in the profile. Participants were told that they would not be provided with enough information to answer all of the questions, but that it was crucial that each participant provide his or her best guesses/estimates.

As a manipulation check, participants were first asked to indicate the target's gender, race, and last name. Participants were then asked to indicate: (a) their best estimate of the target's annual salary on an interactive sliding scale ranging from $0 to $100,000, (b) the target's position in the company (1 — custodial/Maintenance, 2— support staff, 3 — lower-level manager, 4 — manager, 5 — mid-level manager, and 6 — senior executive), (c) the target's level of educational attainment (1 — less than high school, 2 — high school/GED, 3 — some college, 4 — 2-year college degree, 5 — 4-year college degree, 6 — master's degree, 7 — doctoral degree, 8 — professional degree), and (d) the target's level of status (1 — no status, 2 — a little status, 3 — some status, 4 — a lot of status).

Results and discussion

Six participants were removed from the analysis for failing to pass the manipulation check (i.e. for incorrectly identifying the target's last name, gender, or race as they was presented in the profile).

Estimated annual salary

Participants estimated a lower annual salary for the Black target than the African-American target, $t(47) = 2.33, p = .02, d = .66$ (see Table 2 for means and standard deviations).

Estimated occupational position

Because of the categorical, rather than continuous, nature of the occupational position variable (e.g. the difference between the 1 — custodial/maintenance and 2 — support staff positions is not equivalent to the difference between the 2 — support staff and 3 — lower-level manager positions), we created a dichotomous variable to indicate whether the target was believed to be in a managerial (lower-level manager, manager, mid-level manager, and senior executive) or non-managerial (custodial/maintenance and support staff) position. Then, we submitted the data to chi-square analysis. Only 38.46% of the participants in the Black racial label condition estimated that the target was in a managerial position, while 73% of the participants in the African-American racial label condition estimated that the target was in a managerial position, $\chi2(1, N = 49) = 6.20, p = .01$.

Estimated education level

Participants estimated a lower education attainment level for the Black target than for the African-American target, $t(47) = 2.92, p = .01, d = .83$.

Estimated status

Participants attributed less status to the Black target than to the African-American target, $t(47) = 2.54, p = .01, d = .73$.

Across our dependent measures, White participants attributed lower SES to a Black (vs. African-American) target. These results further support H2, that Whites perceive Blacks to have lower SES than African-Americans.

Study 3

In Studies 1 and 2, we showed that the racial label African-American represents a higher SES AAD and is associated with less negative, and more warmth and competence content that the racial label Black. In Studies 3 and 4, we evaluate the consequences of identifying AADs with each label for Whites' emotional reactions toward Blacks vs. African-Americans.

Specifically, we have established that Whites perceive that the label African-American (vs. Black) represents a relatively higher SES and more warm and competent AAD. The SCM paradigm predicts that warmth and competence connotations can elicit different reactions. Specifically, people feel more positive emotion toward groups that are perceived to be high in competence and warmth and more negative emotion (e.g. anger or pity) toward groups that are low in competence (Cuddy et al., 2007). Thus, in H5, we predicted that Blacks would elicit negative emotions from Whites (anger or sadness/pity), whereas African-Americans would elicit positive emotions from Whites. We conducted a content analysis of US newspaper articles to determine whether articles that referred to Blacks were associated with more negative and less positive emotional content than those where the label African-Americans was used. Although we were unable to determine the racial background of the journalists for each article, research has suggested that American journalists who determine the negative/positive content embedded in an article are predominantly White (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013; Gertz, 2013).

Procedure

We used LexisNexis to search for all articles under the heading "US major news and business publications" from the years 2000–2012 that had "violent crime" in the title or headlines and at least 5 occurrences of Black(s), African American(s), or African-American(s) within the article (690 articles). We established these parameters for a variety of reasons. First, even though the term African-American was first announced in 1988 (Martin, 1991), we were confident that its usage would have been common by the year 2000. Indeed, the term was first introduced to the US Census form in the year 2000 (Cohn, 2010).

---

[4] Although we found that the stereotype content embedded in the White label was less negative and warmer than the stereotype content in the Black label, the Caucasian and Black racial labels did not significantly differ on these dimensions. We reasoned that Caucasian is a less commonly used term than White, and therefore, may be more negatively perceived due to its rarity.

[5] For exploratory reasons we originally included conditions with a photo of the target. We were interested in seeing if providing a richer representation of the target would be necessary given the online medium of data collection. Although these data veered from the focus of the paper and were, therefore, not included in the final article, the first author can make these data available upon request. The full materials used in Study 2 are shown in Table S2 in the supplemental material available online.

Table 2
Participants' SES estimations for the "Black" vs. "African-American" target: means (or percentages) and standard deviations (Study 2).

Racial label	Estimated annual salary	% Participants estimated managerial position	Estimated education level	Estimated status
Black	$29,420 ($9,369)$_a$	38.5$_a$	3.04 (1.25)$_a$	2.04 (0.72)$_a$
African-American	$37,040 ($13,384)$_b$	73.0$_b$	4.04 (1.15)$_b$	2.52 (0.59)$_b$

Note: Means (or percentages) in each column that have different subscripts differ significantly at $p < .05$, and means in each column that share the same subscripts do not differ significantly.

Second, we investigated crime reports to examine how racial labels affect perceptions of an important societal outcome (criminal punishment). Finally, we limited our scope to articles that had at least 5 occurrences of our core terms to ensure that AADs were a central theme of the article, rather than a cursory mention. After filtering out duplicate articles, 666 articles remained. A coder blind to hypotheses read through each article and indicated that 205 articles (30.78%) referred to the color black, rather than to Black people. After filtering out articles pertaining to the color black, 461 articles remained.

Using Linguistic Inquiry Word Count software (LIWC), we analyzed the 461 articles by paragraph. We used the standard LIWC dictionary to measure positive/negative emotion, including the sub-components of negative emotion: anxiety, anger, and sadness,[6] and we created a custom dictionary to measure the frequency of the terms Black(s), African American(s), and African-American(s).[7] To confirm that we were measuring full paragraph content in our statistical analysis (as opposed to titles or headings), we selected paragraph segments that were at least 50 words in length and included the terms Black or African-American (we excluded paragraph segments that had both Black and African-American). This resulted in 1065 relevant paragraphs.

Results and discussion

Consistent with H5, we found a significant negative correlation between the use of the term Black and the number of positive emotion words ($r = -.09$, $p = .01$), and a non-significant correlation between the use of the term African-American and the number of positive emotion words ($r = -.01$, $p = .89$). However, the difference between these correlations did not reach significance, $z = -.73$, $p = .23$. Paragraphs that used the racial label Black were associated with more negative emotions than those that used the racial label African-American. Specifically, we found a significant positive correlation between the use of the term Black and the number of negative emotion words ($r = .15$, $p < .001$), and a non-significant correlation between the use of the term African-American and the number of negative emotion words ($r = -.02$, $p = .85$). Importantly, the difference between these correlations was statistically significant, $z = 1.67$, $p = .048$.

Further, we broke down the negative emotion words using its subcomponents of anger, sadness, and anxiety. The association between negative emotion and the use of the term Black was predominately driven by the sub-component anger. We found a significant positive correlation between the use of the term Black and the number of anger words ($r = .19$, $p = 001$), and no significant relationship between the use of the term Black and the number of sadness words ($r = .02$, $p = .50$), or anxiety words ($r = .01$, $p = .72$). Additionally, there were no significant associations between the use of the term African-American and these subcomponents, all $ps > .34$.

In a content analysis of US newspapers, we demonstrate that the racial label Black was associated with more negative emotion content (specifically, angry emotional content) than the racial label African-American. Contrary to our predictions, African-American was not associated with more positive emotions, suggesting that the differences in

[6] Although we had no a priori hypotheses dealing with anxiety emotions, we included these results because anxiety is a sub-component of our larger negative emotion measure.
[7] A full list of the negative and positive emotion words used in Study 3 is shown in Tables S3 and S4 in the supplemental material available online.

affective reactions that we see between the two terms may be driven by negative emotions toward AADs identified as Black rather than positive emotions toward AADs identified as African-American.

Study 4

In Study 4, we used an experimental design to examine whether White American participants would express more negative emotion toward a criminal suspect when he was identified as African-American than when he was identified as Black. In addition, we simultaneously tested an alternative explanation. White participants may identify with an African-American vs. Black target because the "American" designation emphasizes that they have a common identity with the racial minority. Therefore, participants' positive evaluation of an African-American vs. Black target could be due to feeling more identified with an African-American target. Thus, we measured the degree to which participants identified with the African-American vs. Black targets.

Participants and procedure

Ninety White participants were recruited from a nationwide portal (Buhrmester et al., 2011) to complete an online survey (66 females). Participants were randomly assigned to view a petty theft crime report incriminating a suspect that was identified as a Black or African-American male:

At 4:33 PM on Sunday, March 3rd, the victim spotted a Black (African-American) male suspect running east on Lake Street. The suspect forcibly approached the victim with a gun, and demanded the victim's wallet. The victim later identified the suspect as a Black (African-American) male in his late 20's.

The crime report then revealed the identity of the leading suspect:

A 29 year old Black (African-American) male named Michael *{last name removed for identification purposes}* fit the description of the suspect. In developing a case, the police department deposed character witnesses to see if Mike's temperament aligned with the hostile nature of the crime.

Participants were then instructed to read a character witness testimony from a friend of the suspect. We employed the "Donald paradigm" (Srull & Wyer, 1979), which describes a day of events in which Donald participates in ambiguously hostile activities. We changed Donald's name to Mike to ensure that the suspect would be believable as an AAD target. The testimony described Mike engaging in a few actions that could be interpreted as either hostile or commonplace. For example, "a salesman knocked at the door, but Mike refused to let him enter." Moreover, when asked by the Red Cross for a blood donation, "Mike lied by saying he had diabetes and therefore could not give blood" (Srull & Wyer, 1979).

After reading the crime report and the character witness testimony, participants indicated how warm or cold they felt toward Mike using an interactive thermometer (0 – extremely cold to 10 – extremely warm). Importantly, participants were instructed to indicate the warmth that they personally felt for the suspect (as opposed to how "warm" they perceived the suspect to be). Scores above the 5 midpoint indicated positive emotion toward the suspect, whereas scores below the 5 midpoint

indicated negative emotion toward the suspect (H5). We also tested identification using six Venn-like diagrams that indicated the degree of overlap the participant perceived between him or herself and Mike (1 − least overlap to 7 − most overlap; Aron, Aron, Tudor, & Nelson, 1991).

Results and discussion

In support of H5, participants expressed more negative emotion toward the suspect when he was described as Black ($M = 1.86$, SD = 1.43) than when he was described as African-American ($M = 2.81$, SD = 1.91), $t(58) = 2.16$, $p = .04$, $d = .56$. Because both means were significantly lower than the midpoint of the scale, $t(28) = 13.68$, $p < .001$ and $t(31) = 7.88$, $p < .001$, respectively, we cannot substantiate our claim that the term African-American elicits more positive emotion than the term Black (H5). This finding is consistent with the results of Study 3, which suggested that the label Black elicits more negative emotion than the label African-American, but African-American does not elicit positive emotion.

Contrary to the alternative identification explanation, participants felt no more identified with the suspect when he was described as Black ($M = 1.83$, SD = 1.08) than when he was described as African-American ($M = 1.84$, SD = 1.33), $t(88) = .06$, $p = .95$.

Discussion

In four studies, we explored the differences between the Black and African-American racial labels. Our results show that the content embedded in the Black stereotype is generally more negative, and less warm and competent, than that in the African-American stereotype (Study 1) and that the Black racial label refers to a lower SES AAD than the African-American racial label (Studies 1 and 2). Importantly, we also demonstrated that these different associations carry the consequences for how Whites perceive AADs who are labeled with either term. We analyzed US newspaper reports and found that the racial label Black is associated with more negative emotion, specifically, anger emotions, than the racial label African-American (Study 3). Further, we found that White Americans feel more negatively toward a Black vs. African-American criminal suspect (Study 4). We ruled out two alternative explanations. Color-based labels were not associated with more negative connotations than racial-based labels and the African-American label did not make participants feel more identified with AADs than the Black label.

Implications

If people view African-Americans as an exceptional minority, distinct from the majority of AADs, the term African-American may serve to disassociate high SES AADs from the negative stereotypes that surround lower SES AADs. Thus, instead of serving as an example that disproves negative stereotypes for all AADs, this exceptional minority and the term used to identify them may only help to crystallize Whites' negative stereotypes of AADs. Richeson and Trawalter (2005) showed that likeable, but atypical, Black exemplars are less likely to be categorized as Black, which suggests that the positivity associated with the exemplars would have no impact on increasing favorable perceptions of the community as a whole. In line with this idea, Fiske et al. (2009) poses the question: "Have non-Blacks come to see Obama as an 'American, like us, who happens to be Black' or an 'American, unlike other Blacks'" (p.11)? This concern, too, mirrors Du Bois's (1903) observation that as soon as the talented tenth emerges, people "cry out in alarm: 'These are exceptions, look here at death, disease, and crime—these are the… rule'" (p. 43). Future research should empirically investigate whether the presence of an African-American subtype helps to crystallize the negative stereotypes against Blacks.

Our work demonstrating that commonplace intergroup labels can affect how groups are perceived also has important theoretical, methodological, and practical implications. First, our results carry implications for psychologists who study the nature of race and prejudice. The current American Psychological Association Manual suggests that both the African-American and Black racial labels are acceptable and interchangeable in academic publications (see American Psychological Association, 2009). Researchers that identify experimental targets using the label African-American could be underestimating the prejudice that a Black person would receive. Thus, even the interpretation of our own science and the studies we conduct may be unexpectedly affected by the label we use.

Finally, our work also has severe implications for the justice system. The choice of racial labels used in courtroom proceedings could affect how jurors interpret the facts of a case and make judicial decisions. Specifically, Black defendants may be more easily convicted in a court of law than African-American defendants.

Limitations

Although we present evidence that SES may be partially driving the divergent associations connected to Black vs. African-American racial labels, additional mechanisms may be contributing to our effects. First, the racial label African-American could be a political correctness prime. For example, research shows that when participants are given a social pressure prime, they refer to Blacks as "passionate" and "musical," whereas without a social pressure prime, they refer to Blacks as "lazy" and "ignorant" (Fiske et al., 2009).

Further, in Study 1, we found no stereotype content differences between color-based (Black and White) and non-color-based labels (African-American and Caucasian). However, this does not rule out the possibility that color-based associations are creating differences in negativity within color-based labels (Black vs. White). People often perceive the color black to be bad and immoral, while the color white is perceived to be good and moral (Adams & Osgood, 1973; Sherman & Clore, 2009). Thus, the color black could be lending negative connotations to AADs who are labeled by the term. Indeed, people are quicker and more accurate when evaluating a negative word in black, instead of white, font (Meier, Robinson, & Clore, 2004). The automatic association between the color black and negativity can also have material consequences for those who wear black. For example, NFL and NHL teams who wear black uniforms receive more penalties than teams who wear non-black uniforms (Frank & Gilovich, 1988). Consequently, labeling a person with the term Black could have negative implications for the labeled person. This possibility should be explored in future studies.

Further, the current research focuses on Whites' perceptions of racial labels; however, future research should investigate whether AADs and other non-Whites similarly perceive that the term Black signals lower SES than the term African-American. Among the AAD community, there is a nearly equally divided preference for the terms Black and African-American (Sigelman, Tuch, & Martin, 2005). As Black is also perceived to embody notions of "power" (Martin, 1991) and "strength" (Adams & Osgood, 1973), AADs who embrace the term may have reappropriated its connotations to represent self-determination, advancement, and pride (Galinsky et al., 2013). Thus, it is possible that AADs perceive that the term Black has high status (vs. low status) connotations.

Moreover, we focus on AAD male, rather than AAD female, targets in 3 of our 4 studies. The "out-group male target hypothesis" would suggest that certain prejudices are committed more extensively toward out-group males, rather than females (Navarrete, McDonald, Molina, & Sidanius, 2010; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). In line with this hypothesis, recent intersectionality research has revealed that certain biases against AAD men do not extend to AAD women (Biernat & Sesko, 2013; Hall et al., 2014; Livingston, Rosette, & Washington, 2012). Future research should test whether the effects of using the Black and African-American terms are attenuated when applied to AAD female targets.

Finally, although the terms African-American and Black are used relatively synonymously within the United States to refer to AADs, the terms actually describe overlapping, but not identical, groups. The term African-American refers to Americans of African descent, whereas the term Black refers to all people with African ancestry, regardless of their nationality. For example, Black would refer to Caribbean people in the US who directly descended from the West Indies, but still have African ancestral roots. Although we do not believe that this difference has implications for our sub-typing hypothesis, we believe that this distinction should be noted.

Conclusion

The choice of commonplace racial labels can have profound effects on the expression of prejudice in the United States. Although the terms African-American and Black are used synonymously, our work indicates that the label used to identify an AAD can have material consequences for that person. The same individual is perceived differently if he is labeled African-American instead of Black, and this may lead to bias in criminal, educational, and employment spheres. Thus, counter to Shakespeare's statement, a rose, by any other name, does not smell as sweet.

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2014.10.004.

References

Adams, F.M., & Osgood, C.E. (1973). A cross-cultural study of the affective meanings of color. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *4*, 135–156.

American Psychological Association (2009). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author, 12.

American Psychological Association (2013). Psychology topics: Socioeconomic status. Retrieved from. http://www.apa.org/topics/socioeconomic-status/

Aron, A., Aron, E.N., Tudor, M., & Nelson, G. (1991). Close relationships as including other in the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*(2), 241.

Banks, R.R., Eberhardt, J.L., & Ross, L. (2008). Race, crime, and antidiscrimination. *Beyond common sense: Psychological science in the courtroom* (pp. 3–22). London: Blackwell.

Biernat, M., & Sesko, A.K. (2013). Evaluating the contributions of members of mixed-sex work teams: Race and gender matter. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *49*(3), 471–476.

Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S.D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk a new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *6*(1), 3–5.

Bureau of Labor Statistics (2013). Household data averages: 11. Employed persons by detailed occupation, sex, race, and Hispanic or Latino raciality. Retrieved from. http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat11.pdf

Cohn, D. (2010, January 21). *Race and the census: The "Negro" controversy.* Pew research social & demographic trends (Retrieved from http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2010/01/21/race-and-the-census-the-%E2%80%9Cnegro%E2%80%9D-controversy/).

Collier, T. (2013, March 2). *Neither 'Negro' nor 'African-Americans'.* The Washington Post (Retrieved from http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-03-02/opinions/37386706_1_descent-african-american-latin-american).

Cozzarelli, C., Wilkinson, A., & Tagler, M.J. (2001). Attitudes toward the poor and attributions for poverty. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*(2), 207–227.

Cuddy, A.J., Fiske, S.T., & Glick, P. (2007). The BIAS map: Behaviors from intergroup affect and stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*(4), 631.

Du Bois, W.E.B. (1903). *The talented tenth.* James Pott and Company, 102–104.

Du Bois, W.E.B. (1928). The name Negro. *The Crisis*, *35*, 96–97.

Duncan, B.L. (1976). Differential social perception and attribution of intergroup violence: Testing the lower limits of stereotyping of Blacks. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *34*(4), 590–598.

Eberhardt, J.L., Davies, P.G., Purdie-Vaughns, V.J., & Johnson, S.L. (2006). Looking deathworthy perceived stereotypicality of black defendants predicts capital-sentencing outcomes. *Psychological Science*, *17*(5), 383–386.

Eberhardt, J.L., Goff, P.A., Purdie, V.J., & Davies, P.G. (2004). Seeing Black: Race, crime, and visual processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *87*, 876–893.

Fama, J. (2013, February). *US Census Bureau drops 'Negro' from surveys.* ABC News (Retrieved from http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/OTUS/us-census-bureau-drops-negro-surveys/story?id=18591761#.UZAJLcpCodo).

Fiske, S.T., Bergsieker, H.B., Russell, A.M., & Williams, L. (2009). Images of black Americans. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race*, *6*(01), 83–101.

Fiske, S.T., Cuddy, A.J., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*(6), 878.

Frank, M.G., & Gilovich, T. (1988). The dark side of self-and social perception: Black uniforms and aggression in professional sports. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*(1), 74–85.

Galinsky, A.D., Wang, C.S., Whitson, J.A., Anicich, E.M., Hugenberg, K., & Bodenhausen, G.V. (2013). The reappropriation of stigmatizing labels the reciprocal relationship between power and self-labeling. *Psychological Science*, *24*(10), 2020–2029.

Gertz, M. (2013, June 25). *Stagnant American newsroom diversity in charts.* Media Matters for America (Retrieved from http://mediamatters.org/blog/2013/06/25/stagnant-american-newsroom-diversity-in-charts/194597).

Gilbert, G.M. (1951). Stereotype persistence and change among college students. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *46*(2), 245.

Hall, E.V., Phillips, K.W., Glick, P., Livingston, R.W., Rudman, L., & Washington, E. (2014). Laying the groundwork for future research in intersectionality: Descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes for Black and White women and men. *Working paper*.

Jesse Jackson Net Worth (2014a). CelebrityNetworth.com. Retrieved from. http://www.celebritynetworth.com/richest-politicians/democrats/jesse-jackson-net-worth/

Jesse Jackson Net Worth (2014b). TheRichest.com. Retrieved from. http://www.therichest.com/celebnetworth/celeb/televangelists/jesse-jackson-net-worth/

Karlins, M., Coffman, T.L., & Walters, G. (1969). On the fading of social stereotypes: Studies in three generations of college students. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *13*(1), 1.

Katz, D., & Braly, K. (1933). Racial stereotypes of one hundred college students. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *28*(3), 280.

Kilson, M. (1989). Problems of Black politics: Some progress, many difficulties. *Dissent*, *36*, 526–534.

Kunda, Z., & Oleson, K.C. (1995). Maintaining stereotypes in the face of disconfirmation: Constructing grounds for subtyping deviants. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *68*(4), 565.

Larkey, L.K., Hecht, M.L., & Martin, J. (1993). What's in a name? African American ethnic identity terms and self-determination. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *12*(4), 302–317.

Levin, I.P., & Gaeth, G.J. (1988). How consumers are affected by the framing of attribute information before and after consuming the product. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 374–378.

Livingston, R.W., Rosette, A.S., & Washington, E.F. (2012). Can an agentic Black woman get ahead? The impact of race and interpersonal dominance on perceptions of female leaders. *Psychological Science*, *23*(4), 354–358.

Lloyd, M. (2012). Identity crisis in the black community: Are you African-Americans, Black, or American of African Descent? YourBlackWorld.com. Retrieved from. http://www.yourblackworld.net/2013/03/black-news/identity-crisis-in-the-black-community-are-you-african-american-black-or-american-of-african-descent/

Martin, B.L. (1991). From Negro to Black to African-Americans: The power of names and naming. *Political Science Quarterly*, *106*(1), 83–107.

Martin, J. N., Krizek, R. L., Nakayama, T. K., & Bradford, L. (1996). Exploring whiteness: A study of self labels for white Americans. *Communication Quarterly*, *44*(2), 125–144.

Maurer, K.L., Park, B., & Rothbart, M. (1995). Subtyping versus subgrouping processes in stereotype representation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*(5), 812.

Meier, B.P., Robinson, M.D., & Clore, G.L. (2004). Why good guys wear white: Automatic inferences about stimulus valence based on brightness. *Psychological Science*, *15*(2), 82–87.

Navarrete, C.D., McDonald, M., Molina, L., & Sidanius, J. (2010). Prejudice at the nexus of race and gender: An out-group male target hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *98*, 933–945.

Philogène, G. (2001). Stereotype fissure: Katz and Braly revisited. *Social Science Information*, *40*(3), 411–432.

Richeson, J.A., & Trawalter, S. (2005). On the categorization of admired and disliked exemplars of admired and disliked racial groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *89*(4), 517.

Sherman, G.D., & Clore, G.L. (2009). The color of sin: White and black are perceptual symbols of moral purity and pollution. *Psychological Science*, *20*(8), 1019–1025.

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

Sigelman, L., Tuch, S.A., & Martin, J.K. (2005). What's in a name? Preference for "Black" versus "African-Americans" among Americans of African descent. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *69*(3), 429–438.

Smith, T.W. (1987). That which we call welfare by any other name would smell sweeter: An analysis of the impact of question wording on response patterns. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *51*(1), 75–83.

Srull, T.K., & Wyer, R.S. (1979). The role of category accessibility in the interpretation of information about persons: Some determinants and implications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *37*, 1660–1672.

U.S. Census Bureau (2012, August 8). Results from the 2010 census race and Hispanic origin alternative questionnaire experiment. *Press Conference* (Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/pdf/20120808_aqe_10am.pdf).

Washington, J. (2012, February 4). Some blacks insist: 'I'm not African-Americans'. Retrieved from. http://news.yahoo.com/blacks-insist-im-not-african-american-181257715.html

Weber, R., & Crocker, J. (1983). Cognitive processes in the revision of stereotypic beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *45*(5), 961.