Images of Black Women Among Anglo College Students[1]

Rose Weitz[2] and Leonard Gordon
Arizona State University

Previous research on popular images of women and of minority groups has looked almost solely at images of minority men and of white women. This article presents survey data on images of black women among 256 white non-Hispanic college undergraduates, using a modified Katz/Braly scale. The article explores the nature, distribution, correlates, and emotional evaluations of these images and the implications of these images for black women's lives. Images of black women differed substantially from those of American women in general. Most commonly, black women were characterized as loud, talkative, aggressive, intelligent, straightforward, and argumentative. In addition, students rated positive traits less positive and negative traits less negative when exhibited by black women than by American women in general, apparently because of their expectations for black women's behavior.

Since the 1930s, many studies have investigated the nature and distribution of images of blacks and other minorities. These studies have found widespread negative images, declining from the 1930s to the 1970s but rising slightly in the 1980s (Gordon, 1991; Stephan & Rosenfield, 1982). Studies conducted during the 1980s found that whites most commonly described blacks as aggressive, loyal to family ties, lazy, very religious, sly, and intelligent (Gordon, 1986; Clark & Pearson, 1982). Over the last two decades, the one trait that white respondents consistently have chosen to describe

[2]To whom correspondence should be addressed at Department of Sociology, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287-2101.

blacks is "aggressive" (Gordon, 1986; Clark and Pearson, 1982; Maykovich, 1972; Ogawa, 1971).

Despite this long and extensive history of research, however, few researchers have investigated how images of black women and women from other minority groups might differ from images of minority men. Yet cultural and historical analyses of literature, scholarship, and popular culture strongly suggest that these images differ substantially. This article will examine the nature, distribution, and attitudinal correlates of images of black women among an Anglo (white non-Hispanic) undergraduate sample and will test the hypothesis that images of black women differ substantially from images of women in general (with ethnicity unspecified). This study will also discuss the implications for black women's lives of these images.

Cultural and historical analyses have identified four recurrent images of black women in American society: "mammies," sexually loose women, matriarchs, and, more recently, welfare mothers (Collins, 1990; Staples, 1973; King, 1973; Wilkinson, 1987; Morton, 1991; Sims-Wood, 1988; Hooks, 1981).

The images of black women as mammies and as sexually loose stem directly from the centuries of slavery. Black women slaves often served as domestics and could not safely show their discontent with this position. The mammy or "Aunt Jemima" image reflects this history, and refers to a fat, African-looking woman who willingly and jovially serves a white family. Similarly, black women slaves could not protect themselves from the sexual assaults of white men. Consequently, white men projected their desires onto black women and concluded that black women were more animalistic and sexual than white women. From this emerged the image of black women as sexually loose.

The image of black women as matriarchs owes its existence largely to social science literature. Beginning most importantly with E. Franklin Frazier (1947) and Daniel P. Moynihan (1965), researchers have described black women as overbearing and emasculating. Moynihan, especially, argued that black women caused economic hardship in the black community and disrupted the black family by dominating their sons and driving their husbands and lovers away. Although other scholars [including most importantly, Gutman (1976) and Staples (1973)] have thoroughly discredited these arguments, the image of black women as overbearing matriarchs continues to appear in popular culture (cf., Baptiste, 1986).

The image of black women as welfare mothers is the most recent of these images. It portrays black women as "breeders" too lazy to work and too ignorant, stupid, lazy or greedy for welfare funds to control their reproduction. Thus, this image in part reflects whites' fears regarding the consequences of black women's purported sexual accessibility. This image

seems to have replaced the considerably more positive image of the hard-working mammy.

Although cultural and historical studies can alert us to the existence of popular images of black women, they cannot tell us the extent to which the general public accepts these images. Nor can they tell us the distribution or correlates of believing in such images. For such information, we must turn to interview and survey research. Unfortunately, no interview research exists on this topic, while previous surveys have relied on methodologies that, for two reasons, cannot provide us with information about images of black women. First, virtually all previous surveys have asked respondents to describe the characteristics of blacks rather than those of black men or black women specifically. Yet research suggests that when asked questions about people in general (with gender unspecified), most individuals in fact will think only about men (Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972; Eagley & Kite, 1987). Second, the bias against analyzing images of women is built into the scales researchers commonly use. For example, according to Miller (1982), the most common single technique for investigating minority stereotyping is the Katz/Braly scale (Katz & Braly, 1933). This scale consists of 84 traits, from which respondents choose the 5 they feel best characterize various groups. The traits include stereotypically male traits (such as sportsmanlike or strong) but not stereotypically female traits (such as pretty or bitchy). Thus, the nature of both the questions and the possible responses encourages respondents to envision only minority men when using the scale. Using other scales has not eliminated this problem, for they, too, contain supposedly neutral questions that, for the same reasons, likely elicit images only of men.

The same problem haunts research on popular images of women. Beginning in the 1960s, many researchers have investigated this subject (Ruble & Ruble, 1982). Almost all these researchers, however, have asked respondents to characterize simply women in general, with race unspecified. We hypothesize that in such circumstances most individuals will think of women of their own race. Because most American survey respondents are white, therefore, most respondents in previous surveys would have envisioned only white women in answering supposedly race-neutral questions.

A study by Landrine (1985) provides the one exception to this pattern.[3] She surveyed 44 mostly middle-class, white, female undergraduates about popular images of black and white women. The students reported their belief that society regards black women as more dirty, hostile, and

[3]In addition, Bayton and Muldrow (1968) provide some minimal data about images of black women. Most of their article, however, focuses on how black respondents' skin color affects their assessment of light-skinned and dark-skinned blacks.

superstitious than white women and regards white women as more depend-
ent, emotional, intelligent, passive, suggestible, talkative, vain, and warm.
When asked to what extent they agreed with these images, most students
said they disagreed slightly (an average rating of 6 on a scale of 9). Inter-
preting these results is difficult, both because of the study's small and non-
representative sample and, more importantly, because respondents' beliefs
about cultural images may not accurately reflect either those images or
their own views about black women. In contrast, in this article, we will
report data that draw on a larger sample to address directly questions re-
garding the nature and distribution of images of black women.

METHODS

Subjects

The first and main sample for this study consisted of all students
($N=405$) enrolled in one section of Introductory Sociology at Arizona State
University (ASU) during spring 1991, 77% of whom returned usable ques-
tionnaires. ASU is an urban, largely commuter, public university, with more
than 30,500 undergraduates at its main campus. First-year students at ASU
do not differ significantly from first-year students nationally with respect
to age or race (Astin, Korn, & Berz, 1989); no other comparative statistics
are available. Because 42% of ASU freshmen are out-of-state residents (a
higher proportion than at most universities), data collected at ASU do not
reflect purely local attitudes.

Just over half (55%) of the respondents were male, compared to 51%
of ASU's undergraduate population. Twenty-seven percent were Protestant,
30% Catholic, 4% Mormon, and 5% Jewish. Five percent reported some
other religion and 30% reported that they practice no religion. No com-
parable data are available for the university. Compared to university stu-
dents overall, the sample contains 15% fewer Protestants and 15% more
with no religion (Astin et al., 1989). Three-fifths of the students were 18
or 19 years old, and 96% were under age 25. In contrast, only 73% of the
ASU undergraduate population as a whole is under age 25. However, this
age distribution is probably typical for students taking lower division
courses such as Introductory Sociology. No data on social class were col-
lected. The data on ethnicity revealed that 2% of respondents were black,
3% Asian, 8% Hispanic, and 1% Native American; these percentages
match almost exactly the racial distribution of ASU's population. Because
so few Hispanic and nonwhite students participated, we could not compare
minority students to nonminority students. Consequently, we removed all

Hispanics and nonwhites from the analysis. What follows, therefore, is based on responses from the 256 Anglo (i.e., white, non-Hispanic) students.

In addition, a second sample was used to help in understanding the data collected by our instrument. This sample consisted of students enrolled in another introductory sociology class with similar demographics. All 79 enrolled students participated.

Instruments

Data for the first sample were collected through a precoded questionnaire, which contained a revised version of the Katz/Braly trait list and questions on demographic background and on acceptance of racist and sexist ideas. To revise the trait list, we first deleted from the list 29 traits (such as cowardly, revengeful, and stolid) which few respondents had chosen in past surveys. To decide which traits to add so that the list would apply to women, we asked all students in several upper-division sociology classes which draw students from diverse majors to list all the traits generally associated with American, black, disabled, Japanese, Jewish, lesbian, Mexican, and Native American women.[4] (Because students cannot take upper division classes until after taking Introductory Sociology, none of these students were enrolled in the Introductory classes that we used for our samples.) In this way, we identified 28 frequently chosen traits (such as spoiled, jealous, and family-oriented) which we added to the end of the revised Katz/Braly trait list, for a final list of 83 traits. Table I gives the revised trait list and identifies the added and deleted traits.

The completed questionnaire asked respondents to select the five traits from the revised Katz/Braly scale which they believed best described each of eight groups—American women in general, black women, disabled women, Japanese women, Jewish women, lesbian women, Mexican women, and Native American women; this article reports only the data on black women. Negative and positive traits were randomly distributed on the list to avoid acquiescent response bias. Because respondents could easily tell that this scale measured images of ethnic group, the resulting data probably underestimate the existence of negative images, for some respondents probably dissembled to avoid giving answers they suspected might be socially undesirable.

[4]We used the term "black" rather than "African American" on this scale because it is the term most often used by Anglos. The term "African American" might have suggested to respondents that the researchers held "politically correct" or liberal views and, thus, might have decreased respondents' willingness to give "politically incorrect" answers. Because we used the term "black" in this survey, we use it in this paper to increase clarity and consistency.

Table I. Revisions to Katz/Braly Trait List

(A) Retained traits	(B) Added traits	(C) Deleted traits
Intelligent	Asexual (not sexual)	Brilliant
Scientifically-minded	Sinful	Witty
Sophisticated	Determined	Evasive
Alert	Bitchy	Treacherous
Shrewd	Tough	Cowardly
Sly	Competent	Cruel
Meditative	Fat	Revengeful
Imaginative	Weak	Gluttonous
Stupid	Dominating	Quarrelsome
Ignorant	Submissive	Pugnacious
Superstitious	Family-oriented	Boastful
Naive	Dependent	Rude
Industrious	Sexually "easy"	Conventional
Lazy	Independent	Slovenly
Honest	Career-oriented	Stolid
Deceitful	Masculine	Ponderous
Unreliable	Assertive	Suggestible
Faithful	Pushy	Sensual
Kind	Spoiled	Jovial
Generous	Emotional	Humorless
Grasping	Strong	Methodical
Mercenary	Rich	Neat
Materialistic	Too many children	Persistent
Aggressive	Jealous	Imitative
Conceited	Unattractive	Gregarious
Ambitious	Neat	Artistic
Ostentatious (showy)	Rude	Efficient
Talkative	Attractive	Suave
Loud		Courteous
Argumentative		
Suspicious		
Reserved		
Quiet		
Stubborn		
Impulsive		
Quick-tempered		
Passionate		
Pleasure-loving		
Happy-go-lucky		
Sensitive		
Frivolous		
Practical		
Progressive		
Conservative		
Musical		
Sportsmanlike		
Tradition-loving		
Very religious		
Extremely nationalistic		

<div align="center">Table I. Continued</div>

(A) Retained traits	(B) Added traits	(C) Delected traits
Physically dirty		
Loyal to family ties		
Arrogant		
Radical		

To explore how other attitudes correlated with images of black women, we constructed a racism and a sexism scale. The sexism scale combined answers from three Likert-style questions: whether American women in general have too much power, whether men are better leaders than women, and whether women should have equal employment opportunity. These items were deemed appropriate for combining into a scale because they were significantly correlated and appeared, at the level of face validity, to measure different dimensions of sexism. The racism scale combined answers from parallel, significantly correlated, questions phrased in terms of nonwhites in general. We used these items rather than the more commonly used scales because they gave us truly parallel measures of racism and sexism.[5] The sexism scale had an alpha of .8134 and the racism scale an alpha of .7410, both suggesting strong reliability. Scores on the sexism scale were significantly higher than those on the racism scale; on a scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high), the average sexism score was 2.314, while the average racism score was 1.890 ($t = 10.84$, $df = 385$, $p < .001$).

Our second sample was used to quantify the emotional evaluations of the traits on the revised trait list. For this purpose, we distributed to the second sample a questionnaire which explained that students in another class had been asked to decide which of a list of 83 traits characterize a given target group. The questionnaire further explained that to understand the answers from the other class, we needed to know whether these traits are positive, negative, or neutral. Students were then asked, "If someone told you that the following traits characterize (target group), would you consider that a positive, negative, or neutral statement?" Fifty-four students received questionnaires that used "American women in general" as the target group and 25 received questionnaires with black women as the target group. (More students were given questionnaires regarding American women in general than regarding black women to ensure that we would

---

[5]Although a scale based on more items might have been a stronger measure, scales based on only three items are common in sociological research and provide stronger measures of a given concept than do individual items.

have sufficient data for our basic comparison group.) We then assigned a score of 1 to positive ratings, 2 to neutral ratings, and 3 to negative ratings, and computed average ratings for each trait. These average ratings were then used in analyzing the emotional evaluation of the traits on the revised trait list.

Procedures

Questionnaires and a cover letter describing the study were distributed at the beginning and collected at the end of a class session. All questionnaires were coded and computer-analyzed.

RESULTS

Table II presents the 10 traits that students in the main survey most commonly selected when asked to characterize black women and the 12 traits they most commonly selected to characterize American women in general. (Three traits tied for tenth place.) As can be seen, the traits selected for American women in general are overwhelmingly positive, while the picture drawn of black women is far more negative. For example, 45% characterize women in general as intelligent but only 22% characterize black women this way. Similarly, American women in general, but not black women, are characterized as (among other things) sensitive, attractive, so-

Table II. Percentages Selecting Most Commonly Selected Traits

American women in general (n = 256)	%	Black women (n = 236)	%
Intelligent	45	Loud	38
Materialistic	37	Talkative	23
Sensitive	20	Aggressive	22
Attractive	20	Intelligent	22
Sophisticated	18	Straightforward	18
Emotional	18	Argumentative	14
Ambitious	17	Stubborn	14
Career-oriented	16	Quick-tempered	12
Independent	15	Bitchy	11
Talkative	13	Too many children	11
Imaginative	13		
Kind	13		

phisticated, career-oriented, and independent, while black women are characterized as loud, aggressive, argumentative, stubborn, and bitchy.

The substantial difference between these two lists of traits supports the hypothesis that asking respondents solely about women in general generates images that do not hold for minority women. In addition, the traits selected to describe black women suggest that Anglo students primarily view black women as threats: loud, aggressive, argumentative, stubborn, and so on. This image, it should be noted, strongly resembles the image of "black matriarchs," although without specifying black men as the victims of these threats.

Although Table II provides useful data regarding the proportion of Anglo students who believe that various individual traits characterize black women, it cannot tell us how students mentally combine these traits into more complex images of black women. For this purpose, we ran a factor analysis to determine which combinations of traits respondents most often selected as characteristic of black women. Using maximum-likelihood extraction and orthogonal rotation and seeking the most parsimonious solution, three factors emerged: a threatening factor (consisting of loud, dishonest, and argumentative), a "good mother/wife/daughter" factor (intelligent, family-oriented, and loyal to family ties), and a "welfare mother" factor (too many children, fat, and lazy). Virtually all respondents (95%) selected one or more of the traits which comprise the threatening factor, 28% selected one or more of the good mother/wife/daughter traits, and 19% selected one or more of the welfare mother traits.

Neither sex, age, religion of origin, current religion, being a born-again Christian, nor self-described political orientation was significantly associated with any of these three factors. The racism and sexism scales, however, were significantly correlated with the three factors. Both racism and sexism were negatively correlated with the good mother/wife/daughter factor (for racism, $r = -.2158$, $p < .001$; for sexism, $r = -.2647$, $p < .001$) and positively correlated with the welfare mother factor (for racism, $r = .3229$, $p < .001$; for sexism, $r = .2020$, $p < .001$). The threatening factor, however, was not significantly associated with either sexism or racism.

Both sexism and racism are highly correlated with each other ($r = .6334$, $p < .001$). To determine whether sexism had an impact independent of racism, we used multiple regression analysis. When both variables were entered into the equation, only racism significantly correlated with characterizing black women as welfare mothers and only sexism significantly (and negatively) correlated with characterizing black women as good mothers/wives/daughters (Table III).[6] Racism and sexism in combination, as

[6]Because our purpose was to investigate whether racism and sexism each affect the dependent

Table III. Multiple Regression of Images (Factors) by
Racism and Sexism

Variable	B	Beta
(A) Dependent variable: Welfare mother factor		
Racism	.2062	.3019**
Sexism	.0266	.0389
$R^2 > = .1053$		
(B) Dependent variable: Good mother/wife/daughter factor		
Racism	−.0819	−.1028
Sexism	−.1673	−.2092*
$R^2 = .0776$		

$^*p < .05.$
$^{**}p < .001.$

when investigated separately, were not correlated with characterizing black women as threatening. For all three factors, adding the interaction between racism and sexism as a third independent variable did not significantly affect the results.

Up to this point, our analysis relied solely on the revised Katz/Braly scale and on our first survey for dependent variables. A major limitation of this scale, however, is its implicit assumption that a given trait has the same meaning when used to describe different groups. Data from the second survey enabled us to test this assumption. We calculated the mean rating for each trait among the 25 respondents whose target group was black women and among the 54 whose target group was American women in general (with "positive" given a score of 1, "neutral" a score of 2, and "negative" a score of 3). We then used t tests for differences of means to compare the average rating of each trait for black women with the average rating of that trait for American women in general.

The differences in average ratings were significant for 10 traits (Table IV). A striking pattern emerged: of these 10 traits, the 5 rated most positively for women in general—determined, attractive, assertive, independent, and meditative—were all considered less positive for black women. At the

variables and are worth studying in future analyses, our focus was on the betas rather than the explained variance. We recognize, however, that the explained variance is small and that the final word on this awaits a better specified model.

same time, the 5 considered most negative for women in general—very religious, loud, asexual, having too many children, and weak—were all considered less negative for black women. Because these data are based on a small sample, their reliability is limited. However, the consistency of the results adds to their credibility, as does the fact that data we collected on attitudes towards Mexican and Jewish women yielded identical patterns (Weitz, 1992).

Further analysis suggested that the same people who rate black women less negatively on negative traits rate them less positively on positive traits. Scores on the negative traits are negatively correlated with scores on the positive traits, i.e., as individuals' scores on the negative traits go down or become less negative, their scores on the positive traits go up or become less positive ($r = -.1690$, $p < .05$). Perhaps because of the small size of this second survey, however, these results are not statistically significant and these findings have to be considered tentative.

CONCLUSIONS

Our findings suggest two conclusions: that Anglo students assign different emotional evaluations to the same trait depending on whether they are characterizing women in general or black women and that Anglo students believe that black women are generally characterized by a different and substantially more negative set of traits than women in general.

Table IV. Mean Ratings of Traits for Black Women and Women in General[a]

Trait	Mean for women ($n = 54$)	Mean for black women ($n = 24$)	t	df
Determined	1.0370	1.2800	−2.18*	27
Attractive	1.1296	1.52	−2.82**	30
Assertive	1.1887	1.4800	−2.06*	33
Independent	1.2037	1.4400	−1.97*	76
Meditative	1.8462	2.1667	−2.19*	74
Very religious	1.9815	1.5200	2.90**	77
Loud	2.4815	2.12	2.24*	77
Too many children	2.5926	2.2500	2.51**	76
Asexual	2.6481	2.3450	1.98*	76
Weak	2.7778	2.5200	2.15*	43

[a]Traits were rated positive (1), neutral (2), or negative (3).
*$p < .05$.
**$p < .01$.

The first of these two conclusions is the more unexpected and requires the most explanation. We would suggest that Anglo students consider positive traits less positive for black women and negative traits less negative because of their expectations regarding how black women should and would behave. Those who have low expectations for black women's behavior—expecting them to be weak or to have too many children, for example—will not be surprised when black women meet those expectations. Consequently, they will not judge these traits less harshly when exhibited by black women, perhaps believing at some level that black women cannot help acting in these ways. Conversely, such respondents will be not only surprised but disturbed when black women act independently, assertively, or even thoughtfully (one possible interpretation of meditative).

An alternative explanation would hold that Anglo students rate black women less harshly when characterized by negative traits because these students want to "given them the benefit of the doubt." Anglo students may believe that social factors make it more likely that black women will, for example, have many children, be loud, or be weak. They thus may not blame black women who exhibit such traits and, thus, may rate them less harshly than other women who exhibit the same traits. Logically, however, such respondents should also view black women more positively than others when they exhibit positive traits, in the belief that black women would have had to overcome substantial odds to do so. As the data show, however, the reverse is true. Thus, the first explanation for the discrepancy in trait ratings seems the more parsimonious and hence more likely explanation.

The particular image that emerged most strongly in this study, in both the analysis of frequencies and the factor analysis, is the image of black women as threatening. This image was so common that even those who otherwise appeared nonracist and nonsexist on our measures still subscribed to it.

Although the image of black women as threatening does not have deep historic roots, the image of black men as threatening is an old and familiar one in American iconography. For decades, whites used this image to justify lynchings of black men (Hall, 1979; Zangrando, 1980). More recently, George Bush masterfully manipulated this image, in the form of Willie Horton, to bolster his 1988 presidential campaign. The image of black women as threatening, which appears in our students' responses, probably draws in part on ideas about the threatening nature of black men. Anglo students who have never encountered a clear, specific, and widely held stereotype of black women may have extrapolated beliefs about black women from popular ideas about black men.

The image of black women as threatening also may reflect our respondents' status as recent high-school graduates. Adolescence is probably

the age during which whites and blacks are most likely to harm each other. Given the absence of true integration in this country, most of these students will have graduated either from high schools with virtually no blacks (and hence assumed, in the absence of a popular image of black women, that the image of black men also applied to black women) or from high schools which were racially torn. The latter schools are often segregated enough so that one has few if any classmates or friends of other races but integrated enough so that one does encounter members of other races in public areas. In these situations, both blacks and whites may fear and sometimes encounter physical harm from the other.

Finally, the image of black women as threatening may derive in part from the myth of the black matriarchy. The entertainment industry has often portrayed black women as domineering, beginning at least as early as the *Amos and Andy* radio show, with its "Sapphire" character (Sims-Wood, 1988; Ely, 1991). The news media, meanwhile have reinforced this idea by publicizing social scientific research on the black matriarchy and the supposed death of the black family. Students' ideas about black women may thus stem in part from these sources.

In contrast, the good mother/wife/daughter image seems the descendant of the "Mammy" or "Aunt Jemima" stereotype. Whereas white culture in the past, however, had depicted Mammy and Aunt Jemima as always and willingly taking care of others' families, the good mother/wife/daughter image depicts them taking care of their own families.

The third image that emerged in this study, of black women as welfare mothers, has more obvious roots in contemporary American culture. Stories of poor black mothers, often unmarried and on welfare, appear frequently in newspapers—probably more often than any other images of black women. Whether or not reporters intend it, white readers often seem to conclude from these stories that most black women not only live in poverty, but also deserve their poverty. To many white American readers, the problems of poor black women seem to stem from their uncontrolled sexuality, which leads them to give birth often and early, and to their laziness, which leads them to rely on welfare rather than to better themselves through education or a job.

The problems that black women face when they are viewed as threats or as welfare mothers are obvious. In contrast, the image of black women as good mothers, wives, and daughters, at first glance, seems benign. Yet this image, too, may handicap black women in white society, for it stands in striking contrast to Anglo students' image of American women in general. That latter image places American women not within the family but within the broader world—career-oriented, ambitious, independent, and intelligent (the latter trait chosen by these Anglo students almost twice as

often for American women in general as for black women). Although in some ways positive, therefore, the image of black women as good wives, mothers, and daughters will not help black women who aspire to success in the public sphere.

The emotional evaluations of traits taken from the second survey also suggest some pessimistic conclusions. Several decades ago, Robert K. Merton (1957) described how ethnic groups can be "damned if they do and damned if they don't": condemned as pushy or sly when they succeed despite discrimination and as lazy or stupid when they do not. Thus an Englishman gets labeled "thrifty," while a Jew who behaves identically gets labeled "stingy." Similarly, various cognitive psychologists have suggested that majority-group members often attribute minority successes to luck or other situational factors, while attributing minority failures to laziness, stupidity, or other internal factors (Greenberg & Rosenfield, 1979; Hamilton, 1979; Pettigrew, 1979).

These theories suggest that whites will view black women who succeed (or, in our terms, exhibit positive traits) less positively than they would equally successful whites, since white observers would attribute black women's successes to forces outside the women's control rather than to hard work, intelligence, and so on. The theories leave open whether those who fail will be judged more harshly (because they are presumed to have had only themselves to blame for their failures) or less harshly (because those failures were caused by purported insurmountable, inborn weaknesses). Our data support the latter interpretation.

These data have significant implications for black women's ability to succeed. Our data come only from college students. It is from the ranks of these students, however, that future teachers, employers, and others who hold positions of authority will be drawn. Extrapolating from this study, therefore, we would hypothesize that white teachers and supervisors, for example, will less often reward young black women for their successes than reward young white women and will less often chastise black women for their failures. As a result, black women's incentive to achieve may decline. Moreover, those black women who do achieve, whether in school or the marketplace, will likely find that their achievements either are not rewarded or are even held against them by whites as signs that these black women are stepping out of their "places" or benefiting undeservedly due to good luck.

Previous research has provided us with considerable data regarding the nature and sources of cultural images of minority groups and of women. No longer, however, can we assume that ethnic images hold across gender lines or that gender images hold across ethnic lines. We are currently conducting qualitative interviews to obtain more detailed data on image of

minority women. Our future plans call for conducting parallel survey research with broader samples on other groups of minority women and investigating images of minority women within various minority communities. We hope, for example, to study stereotypes of black women among both black men and black women. Such research will enable us to investigate the extent to which gender and ethnic groups reject or internalize oppressive cultural images.

REFERENCES

Astin, A. W., Korn, W. S., & Berz, E. R. (1989). *American freshman: National norms for fall 1989*. Los Angeles: American Council on Education, Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California.

Baptiste, D. A. (1986). The image of the black family portrayed by television: A critical comment. *Marriage and Family Review, 10*, 41-63.

Bayton, J. A., & Muldrow, T. R. (1968). Interacting variables in the perception of racial personality traits. *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 3*, 39-44.

Broverman, I., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. (1972). Sex role stereotypes: A current appraisal. *Journal of Social Issues, 32*, 119-133.

Clark, M. L., & Pearson, W. (1982). Racial stereotypes revisited. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 6*, 381-393.

Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Eagley, A. H., & Kite, M. (1987). Are stereotypes of nationalities applied to both men and women? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 451-62.

Ely, M. P. (1991). *The adventures of Amos and Andy*. New York: Free Press.

Frazier, E. F. (1947). *The Negro family in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gordon, L. (1986). College student stereotypes of blacks and Jews on two campuses: Four studies spanning 50 years. *Sociology and Social Research, 70*, 200-201.

Gordon, L. (1991). Race relations and attitudes at Arizona State University. In P. G. Altbach & K. Lomotey (eds.)., *The Racial Crisis in American Higher Education* (pp. 233-248). New York: State University of New York Press.

Greenberg, J., & Rosenfield, D. (1979). Whites' ethnocentrism and their attributions for the behavior of blacks: A motivational bias. *Journal of Personality, 47*, 643-657.

Gutman, H. (1976). *Black family in slavery and freedom*. New York: Pantheon.

Hall, J. D. (1979). *Revolt against chivalry: Jessie Daniel Ames and the women's campaign against lynching*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hamilton, D. L. (1979). A cognitive-attributional analysis of stereotyping. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 12*, 53-84.

Hooks, B. (1981). *Ain't I a woman: Black women and feminism*. Boston: South End Press.

Katz, D., & Braly, K. (1933). Racial prejudice and racial stereotypes. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 30*, 175-193.

King, M. C. (1973). The politics of sexual stereotypes. *Black Scholar, 4*, 12-23.

Landrine, H. (1985). Race × class stereotypes of women. *Sex Roles, 13*, 65-75.

Maykovich, M. K. (1972). Stereotypes and racial images—white, black, and yellow. *Human Relations, 25*, 101-120.

Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure*. New York: Free Press.

Miller, A. G. (1982). Historical and contemporary perspectives on stereotyping. In A. G. Miller (ed.), *In the eye of the beholder: Contemporary issues in stereotyping* (pp. 1-40). New York: Praeger.

Morton, P. (1991). *Disfigured images: The historical assault on Afro-American women*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Moynihan, D. P. (1965). *The Negro family: The case for national action*. Washington, DC: GPO.

Ogawa, D. M. (1971). Small group communication: Stereotypes of black Americans. *Journal of Black Studies, 2*, 273-281.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1979). The ultimate attribution error: Extending Allport's cognitive analysis of prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 5*, 461-476.

Ruble, D. N., & Ruble, T. L. (1982). Sex stereotypes. In A. G. Miller (ed.), *In the eye of the beholder: Contemporary issues in stereotyping* (pp. 188-252). New York: Praeger.

Sims-Wood, J. (1988). The black female: Mammy, Jemima, Sapphire, and other images. In J. Smith (ed.), *Images of blacks in American culture* (pp. 235-256). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Staples, R. (1973). *Black women in America: Sex, marriage, and family*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Stephan, W. G., & Rosenfield, D. (1982). Racial and ethnic stereotypes. In A. G. Miller (ed.), *In the eye of the beholder: Contemporary issues in stereotyping* (pp. 92-136). New York: Praeger.

Weitz, R. (1992, August). *College students' stereotypes of black American, Mexican American, and Jewish American women*. Paper presented at the meetings of the American Sociological Association, Pittsburgh, PA.

Wilkinson, D. (1987). The doll exhibit: A psycho-cultural analysis of black female role stereotypes. *Journal of Popular Culture, 21*, 19-29.

Zangrando, R. L. (1980). *The NAACP crusade against lynching, 1909-1950*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.