

Intergroup Relations in a Diverse Society:  
Data from the 2000 General Social Survey

Tom W. Smith

National Opinion Research Center  
University of Chicago

April, 2001

GSS Topical Report No. 32

This report was prepared for the American Jewish Committee.

## Introduction

As the results from the 2000 Census underscore, the United States is a diverse society. Nearly a third of the population is either Hispanic (13%) and/or non-White (19%) (Grieco and Cassidy, 2001). Religiously America is even more varied with hundreds of different denominations representing all of the world's faiths. Moreover, diversity is growing with the share of immigrants having doubled over the last generation and with ethnic and racial minorities making up even a larger proportion of children than they do among adults. This mosaic of groups and cultures makes intergroup relations very complex and challenging.

In assessing the complexity of contemporary intergroup relations, this report first examines how different groups are assessed. Specifically, the report considers 1) the perceived contributions of various groups to American society, 2) ethnic images about some major groups (Whites, Blacks, Asians, Hispanics, and Jews) on the dimensions of wealth, industriousness, violence-proneness, intelligence, commitment to strong families, and commitment to intergroup tolerance and equality, 3) desired social distance from various groups regarding neighborhood integration and inter-marriage, 4) preferred racial/ethnic composition of one's neighborhood, 5) ratings of groups that one has the most/least in common with, 6) estimated size of major groups in the United States and one's local community, 7) assessments of changes in the racial/ethnic composition of the population, and 8) contact with major groups in various venues (at school, in the local community, as a relative, at work) and whether any contacts involve close relationships.

Second, this report examines two major components of the increasing multiculturalism of the United States: 1) the use of foreign languages and attitudes towards language issues such as making English the official language of the United States and bilingualism in the schools and 2) attitudes towards the level and composition of immigration and the impact that immigrants have on American society.

Third, the report then looks at how the measures of intergroup relations and multiculturalism vary across socio-demographic groups. In addition, to the basic differences across the racial and ethnic groups themselves, differences are considered by gender, age, education, region, community type, and religion.

Finally, social changes in intergroup relations are followed over the last several decades. Trends tracked include the public's views on 1) intermarriage, 2) residential integration, 3) ethnic images, 4) perceived reasons for racial inequality, 5) relations between Blacks and Whites, 6) government policies to reduce racial inequality, and 7) immigration.

This report draws on the General Social Surveys (GSSs) of the National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago. The GSSs are in-person, full-probability samples of adults living in

households in the United States. They have been conducted 23 times between 1972 and 2000. Most analysis is based on the Multi-Ethnic United States (MEUS) module on the 2000 GSS. The 2000 GSS was fielded in February-May, 2000 and 1,397 people received the MEUS items. For full technical details on the GSS see Davis, Smith, and Marsden, 2001.

### Intergroup Comparisons

America is a large and complex society made up of people from many different races, nationalities, religions, and cultures. These myriad sub-groups relate to and interact with each other in many different ways. Some groups, like Blacks and Whites, have a long, shared history together. Others are new immigrant groups that became part of American society only in recent years. Sometimes intergroup conflicts have been long and violent as the struggle between the American Indians and the settlers. Other times groups have fought together such as in Black-White alliances during the civil rights movement in the 1960s. Part of story of intergroup relations is written in great historical events - the Emancipation Proclamation, Johnson-Reid Immigration Act, Montgomery bus boycott, LA riots. Most is told in the everyday attitudes and actions of all Americans as they go about their daily lives. It is from the perspective of individual Americans that the contemporary state of intergroup relations is perhaps best understood.

#### Perceived Contributions of Groups to American Society

The many religious, racial, and ethnic groups that make up American society are not seen as having made equal contributions to the country (Table 1). At the top 71% believe that the English have played an important role (% Very Important + Important). Next comes several other European groups - Jews (53% important), Italians (48%), and the Irish (48%) and Blacks (48%). They are followed by Asian groups - the Japanese (40%), the Chinese (39%), and the Vietnamese (18%). Then comes Hispanic groups - Mexicans (28%), Puerto Ricans (18%), and Cubans (16%). Near the bottom are the Muslims (17%). Clearly, people give more credit to groups that have been in America for a longer period. For example, European groups are rated above Asian and Hispanic groups and within the Asian groups the Japanese and Chinese are placed above the more recently arrived Vietnamese. It also appears that larger groups may sometimes be given an edge over smaller groups. This may explain why Mexicans, the largest Hispanic group, are rated above Puerto Ricans and Cubans.<sup>1</sup> Newer groups also score lower

---

<sup>1</sup>Research on social distance going back 70 years also suggests that nationalities identified with countries that are enemies of the United States are rated less favorably (Smith and Dempsey, 1984). This might explain the low scores for Cubans,

simply because people lack enough knowledge about them to assess their contributions (e.g. 19% Don't Know (DK) what role Muslims have played).

Members of each group rank the contributions of their own higher than non-group members do. For example, 88% of those of English ancestry rate the English contribution as important compared to only 70% of the non-English and 58% of Blacks vs. 47% of non-Blacks consider Black contributions as important. However, since each group is only a small share of the whole, looking at just out-group ratings only lowers ratings slightly and has virtually no impact on the relative ranking of groups.

### Ethnic Images

The public has decidedly different images of racial and ethnic groups in American society and generally has a much more negative view of many minorities than of the White majority.<sup>2</sup>

Overall, Blacks are viewed the most negatively (Table 2A). They are rated lower than Whites on all six dimensions and lower than other minority groups on four dimensions (industriousness, violence-proneness, commitment to strong families, and commitment to intergroup tolerance). For example, 10% rated Blacks as less violence-prone than Whites, 45% as tied with Whites, and 45% as more violence-prone for an overall score of -0.65.

Hispanics are seen more negatively than Whites on five of the six dimensions (all except for strong families) (Table 2A). They have the most negative ratings of all groups on wealth and intelligence and are second lowest to Blacks on the other four dimensions. For example, 22% see Hispanics as more hard working than Whites, 43% as the same as Whites, and 35% as less hard working for an overall score of -0.29.

Asians are rated more negatively than Whites on wealth, intelligence, and intergroup tolerance, but more positively on industriousness, violence-proneness, and strong families (Table 2A). On industriousness they are rated more positively than any other group and on the other dimensions they score above Blacks and Hispanics and below both Jews and Whites in general.

Jews are seen in more positive terms on all dimensions than Whites in general are (Table 2A). (However, on two dimensions - intelligence and intergroup tolerance they are essentially tied with Whites). On all dimensions except industriousness they have the most favorable rating overall. For example, 36% see Jews as less violence-prone than Whites, 55% as equal to Whites, and 10% as more violence-prone for an overall score of +0.49.

Minority groups often rate themselves more positively than

---

even though most Cubans in the United States do not support the Castro regime.

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix 1: Measuring Ethnic Images for a conceptual and technical discussion of these items.

out-group members do (Table 2B and Table 20). For example, while non-Hispanics consider Hispanics as less hard working than Whites (-0.14), Hispanics rate themselves as more harder working than Whites (+0.06). Hispanics evaluate themselves more favorably than non-Hispanics do on work and family, but the groups do not significantly differ on the other dimensions. Blacks rate themselves more positively on all dimensions except wealth where no difference appears across groups. Asians score themselves higher on work and family than either Blacks or Whites rate Asians. No differences appear on wealth, violence-proneness, intergroup tolerance, or intelligence. Jews consider themselves as better in terms of group tolerance and no other differences are statistically significant.<sup>3</sup>

In-groups and out-groups never show statistically significant differences on judgments about wealth, but always disagree on evaluations of intergroup tolerance. In particular, Asians, Hispanics, and Jews all rate themselves more positive than they rate Whites on being committed to the fair and equal treatment of all groups in society, while Whites see themselves as more tolerant. Furthermore Blacks see all minority groups as more for intergroup tolerance than Whites are, while Whites see each group as less dedicated than they are. Minorities tend to see Whites as dominating others while they themselves support civil rights, while Whites tend to see minorities as favoring their special, sub-group interests over the general well-being.

### Social Distance

Few non-Whites object to close contact with Whites, but objections to associating with some minorities is much higher (Table 3). Only 9% of non-Whites object to a close relative marrying a White and just 6% oppose living in a neighborhood with a White majority. Similarly, opposition among non-Jews to a relative marrying a Jew or living in a majority Jewish neighborhood is also low (respectively 13% and 9%). Objection is higher among non-Asians to an Asian marriage (20%) or to living in a majority Asian neighborhood (18%), higher still among non-Hispanics over a marriage with an Hispanic (21%) or living in a Hispanic neighborhood (27%), and highest among non-Blacks over a close relative marrying a Black (32%) or residing in a majority Black area (30%). Thus, while a majority does not oppose these two forms of close contact, many do wish to keep a social distance from other groups with objections greatest to Blacks, followed by towards Hispanics, Asians, Jews, and Whites.

### Preferred Neighbors

A more detailed measure of residential preferences showed

---

<sup>3</sup>Conclusions about the views of both Asians and Jews must be treated cautiously because of small sample sizes.

people a neighborhood with 15 houses in it (Table 4). Their home is shown in the middle and people are asked to indicate which of the 14 surrounding homes they would like to see occupied by Whites, Blacks, Asians, or Hispanics. These racial and ethnic preferences were then totaled to determine the desired composition of their nearest neighbors. Both people in general and members of each group on average opt for integrated neighborhoods with notable representation of all of the specified groups. Among everyone (excluding those who did not make selections), their desired neighborhood was 49% White, 19% Black, 14.5% Hispanic, 13% Asian, and 3.5% said it did not matter to them.

Each racial and ethnic group did lean towards having a plurality of neighbors from their own group. Thus Whites wanted their neighborhood to be 54% White, Blacks wanted neighbors 40% Black, Hispanics neighbors 33% Hispanic, and Asians neighbors 36% Asian.<sup>4</sup> Whites were the most frequent second choice for all minority groups, but all groups, including Whites themselves, chose fewer Whites than their actual share of the population. Blacks and Hispanics were then the next most frequently selected groups. Excluding self-selection both groups were chosen to be about 13-17% of neighbors, a little higher than their actual share of the population. Asians made up the smallest share of the neighbors of each non-Asian group (13% for Whites, 12.5% for Blacks, and 16% for Hispanics). However, this is about 3-4 times Asians actual share of the population so Asians are the most over selected compared to their actual numbers.

#### Most/Least in Common With

Another measure of closeness among groups asked people to identify the racial and ethnic group, other than their own, that they had the most and least in common with (Table 5). Many people found it hard to select a group with 28% not choosing a most in common group and 24% not coming up with a least in common group. In addition, others mentioned their own group despite the instructions to the contrary. Overall Blacks, Jews, and Hispanics were selected as the most compatible group by about the same proportion of non-group members, 16-17% (Table 5B) and as the least compatible group by a similar share, 13-16% (Table 5B). Whites are chosen least frequently as both the most compatible group (8%) and the least compatible group (2%). Asians as also rarely selected as the group one has the most in common with (8%), but are by far the group most often mentioned as having the

---

<sup>4</sup>This in-group preference shows up even more strongly in the current residential choices of people which tend to be segregated along racial and ethnic lines (Farley and Frey, 1994; Harris, 2001; Massey and Denton, 1994; Yinger, 1995). Preliminary analysis of metropolitan areas based on the 2000 Census indicate that this pattern persists (El Nasser, 2001).

least in common with (32%).

With self-nominations removed, Whites spread their selection for most compatible group pretty evenly between Jews (17%), Blacks (15%), and Hispanics (13%) with Asians trailing (6%) (Table 5C). Whites mention Asians as the group they have the least in common with by a wide margin (32%), followed by Blacks (17.5%), Hispanics (14%), and Jews (11%). Blacks consider Whites as their most compatible group (33%) with Hispanics second (19%) and few mention either Asians (3%) or Jews (3%). Blacks are most likely to name Asians as the least compatible group (39%), followed by Jews (15%), Hispanics (11%), and Whites (11%). Hispanics see Whites as the group they have the most in common with (33%) followed by Blacks (14%), Asians (8%), and then Jews (0.5%). Hispanics find the least in common with Asians (28%), Jews (25%), Blacks (21%), and then Whites (8%).

These cross group comparisons show that Jews are most favorably positioned among Whites (i.e. highest on most in common and lowest on least in common) and Asians are the least advantaged (i.e. lowest on most in common and highest among least in common). Among Blacks Whites are seen most favorably and Asians the least favorably. Among Hispanics Whites are also seen as most compatible and Jews and Asians are viewed the least favorably.

#### Estimated Population Size of Groups

Consistent with past studies (Highton and Wolfinger, 1992; Nadeau and Niemi, 1995; and Nadeau, Niemi, and Levine, 1993), people have a poor understanding of the actual demographic composition of American society. People underestimate the White share of the national population and greatly overestimate the size of all minority groups (Table 6A). According to the 2000 Census (Grieco and Cassidy, 2001) Whites make up 75% of the population vs. the mean public estimate of 59%, Blacks are 12.9% vs. an estimate of 31%, Hispanics are 12.5% versus an estimate of 25%, Asians are 4.2% vs. an estimate of 18%, and American Indians are 1.5% vs. an estimate of 14%. Likewise, the GSS puts the Jewish share at 2.0% vs. the public's estimate of 18%. Thus, minorities are overestimated by a factor of 2.0 for Hispanics, 2.4 for Blacks, 4.2 for Asians, 8.9 for Jews, and 9.5 for American Indians.<sup>5</sup> The smaller the minority group the larger the overestimate.

People also have a very high estimate of the proportion of the population that is racially mixed. The mean estimate is that 43% of the population has parents or ancestors from two or more

---

<sup>5</sup>These figures count multiple mentions for each racial group. Using a measure of ethnic origins rather than race, the GSS estimates the % of the adult US population with at least some American Indian ancestry as 6.5%. Using this figure reduces the overestimate factor to 2.2 (Smith, forthcoming).

of the major racial ethnic groups. This is in stark contrast to the only 2.4% of the population that identified themselves as mixed race on the 2000 Census (Grieco and Cassidy, 2001) or the 5.5% of adults who did so on the 2000 GSS. It may be that people were thinking of ethnically-blended ancestry (e.g. from two+ European or Asian nationalities), but the question did ask people to report on mixed-race backgrounds (Table 6A).

Hispanics and Blacks see even larger minority populations than non-Hispanics, Whites, or Asians do (Table 6B). For example, Hispanics believe Blacks make up 35% of the population, Blacks put the figure at 39%, and Whites estimated the Black share at 30%. Hispanics and Blacks also place the mixed-race share of the population somewhat higher than Whites do (49% and 47% vs. 42%).

Given the wide discrepancies between the popular estimates of the racial and ethnic composition of the national population and authoritative figures from the Census and GSS, it is surprising that in the aggregate that estimates of the profile of the local population of their community is much more accurate (Table 7).<sup>6</sup> Minorities are still overestimated, but the differences are much smaller. Whites are estimated as 68% (Census=75%), Blacks as 20% (13%), Hispanics as 14% (13%), Asians as 7% (4%), American Indians as 5% (1.5%), and Jews as 7% (GSS=2%).

Thus, people systematically overestimate the size of minority groups and the misestimates are much greater at the national level than at the local level. This indicates that the national estimates are not based on either a factual understanding of the demographic realities, nor merely upon projections from their direct observations of their local community, but based on impressions and perhaps anxieties that lead people to form greatly exaggerated ideas of the size of minority groups.

#### Assessments of Changes in Racial/Ethnic Composition

People realize that most minority populations have been and are likely to grow more rapidly than the White majority (Table 8A). Hispanics are seen as likely to experience the most growth over the next quarter century. Almost half (46%) believe the Hispanic share of the population will increase by a lot and fully 84% think it will grow at least some. A quarter see the Black proportion of the population as expanding a lot and 71% see at least some gain. Almost a fifth (19%) see the Asian share as growing a lot and 65% see at least some increase. Only 8% feel

---

<sup>6</sup>Each respondent's estimate of the composition of the population in their local community of course reflects the very varied distribution of groups across communities. But in the aggregate the community estimates should match the national figures since communities are representative of the country as a whole.



the White proportion will grow a lot and 37% see some gain. Just 4% see Jews gaining ground a lot and 28% believe there will be some increase. Except for underestimating the anticipated increase in the Asian population, this ranking of groups agrees with standard projections on the relative size of racial and ethnic groups.<sup>7</sup>

Expectations about the population gains of groups are fairly similar across racial and ethnic groups (Table 8B). Hispanics and non-Hispanics do not differ in these projections. Blacks do estimate somewhat more White and Jewish growth and less increases among minorities than Whites foresee. Asians are distinctive in seeing more gains for their own group than others do.

Overall, most people see the population changes they forecast as having a neutral impact on the country (Table 8C). 25% believe the changes are a good thing, 53% as neither good nor bad, 18% as a bad thing, and 3% Don't Know. Minorities (Hispanics, Blacks, and Asians) are however all more likely to think the changes are a good thing than Whites or non-Hispanics are (Table 8D).

Evaluations of the desirability of changes depends in large part on what group one belongs to and how much change one expects. For example, among non-Blacks who think that the Black share of the population will increase a lot, 34% think the expected population shifts are a bad thing, but among non-Blacks who think that the Black population share will decrease a lot 0.0% see future population changes as a bad thing. Among Blacks the pattern is reversed. Among Blacks seeing their share as increasing a lot, only 8% say future populations shifts are a bad thing. But among Blacks who think their population share will decrease a lot, 38% see future changes in general as a bad thing. Similarly, negative evaluations of future population growth increase among non-Hispanics and non-Asians when their expectations of Hispanic and Asian expansion is greater.

### Intergroup Contacts

The level of intergroup contact varies a great deal depending on the groups involved and the nature or venue of the contact (Table 9). Almost all (93%) non-Whites personally know a White person. Knowing minorities ranged considerably. 86% of non-Blacks know a Black person, 73% of non-Hispanics know a Hispanic, 60% of non-Asians know an Asian, and 58% of non-Jews know a Jew. Thus, contact with out-group members is largely a function of the size of a group in the general population. Contact in any particular venue is naturally smaller than overall contact.

Of the four areas asked about (school, community, family,

---

<sup>7</sup>People are unrealistic in believing that most groups can increase their share in the population. They instead to be thinking more in terms of increases in absolute size rather than in relative share.

and work), work is the most frequent point-of-contact between groups. Among the employed, 87% of non-Whites know a White from work, 62% of non-Blacks know a Black, 53% of non-Hispanics know a Hispanic, 36% of non-Asians know an Asian, and 30% of non-Jews know a Jew. Next, people tend to know members of other groups from their local community. 74% of non-Whites know a White, 52% of non-Blacks know a Black, 42% of non-Hispanics know a Hispanic, 29% of non-Asians know an Asian, and 27% of non-Jews know a Jew. Then, comes contact from school. 59% of non-Whites know a White from school, 42% of non-Blacks know a Black, 32% of non-Hispanics know a Hispanic, 27% of non-Jews know a Jew, and 23% of non-Asians know an Asian. Finally, the least frequent contact is as relatives. 44% of non-Whites have a White relative, 11% of non-Hispanics have a Hispanic relative, 9% of non-Jews have a Jewish relative, 9% of non-Blacks have a Black relative, and 7% of non-Asians have an Asian relative.

Of course knowing members of other groups is only the first step in establishing meaningful and harmonious relations between groups (Ellison and Powers, 1994; Pettigrew, 1998; Powers and Ellison, 1995; Sigelman, et al., 1996; Smith, 1999; Smith, 2000). Many people know people from other groups but do not feel close to them. Thus, 93% of non-Whites know a White person, but only 67% "feel close to" a White. Similarly, 86% of non-Blacks know a Black person, but only 46% feel close to a Black, 73% of non-Hispanics know a Hispanic, but only 35% feel close to one, 60% of non-Asians know an Asian, but only 25% feel close to one, and 58% know a Jew, but only 28% feel close to one. About half to three-fifths of people who know a minority-group member do not feel close to any of these acquaintances.

In sum, intergroup contact is first of all greater between minorities and the White majority than between others and specific racial and ethnic minorities. This pattern naturally arises out the differences in the size of the groups and their dispersion across the country. Second of all, intergroup contact involves a majority of people at the broadest and least intimate level (i.e. just knowing a member of another group), but only a minority in closer relationships. Only 25-46% of non-group members feel close to anyone from particular minorities and only 7-11% have a relative from a particular minority group.

### **Multiculturalism**

America is a world society with significant numbers from virtually all races, ethnicities, religions, and language groups. Moreover, it is an increasingly diversifying society with an expanding number of immigrants representing more nationalities, languages, and cultures than ever before. Thus, the need to deal with the challenges of pluralism is a present and growing necessity for society.

### **Language Use Policies**

Americans have complex views on the role of English and other languages in the United States. First, almost three-quarters of Americans endorse the idea that English should be the country's official language (73%) and that having English as our shared, national language "unites all Americans" (74%) (Table 10A). Second, most reject the idea that English should be used exclusively and that the use of other languages should be suppressed. Only 34% feel that ballots should only be in English, 31% think that English is threatened if other languages are used among immigrants, and 22% want to eliminate bilingual education (Table 10A). Third, people see knowledge of foreign languages as an educational plus. 74% believe that children should learn a second language before graduating from high school and 62% think that learning a second language is as valuable as learning math and science (Table 10C).

Reflecting difference in language use, there are considerable differences across groups in their attitudes towards language issues. The major group of recent immigrants, Hispanics, is much less supportive of pro-English policies than others are (Table 10C). For example, 45% of Hispanics vs. 76% of non-Hispanics favor English being the official language of the United States, and 12% of Hispanics vs. 25% of non-Hispanics oppose children learning a second language in school. Whites generally are the most pro-English group. For example, 24% want to abolish bilingual education compared to 16% of Blacks, 10% of Hispanics, and 7% of Asians. Asians and Blacks typically take an intermediate position between Hispanics and Whites. They sometimes take relatively high pro-English positions (as on making English the official language of the US) and other times line-up with Hispanics (as on non-English ballots).

#### Language Use and Exposure

Foreign language use is fairly common in the United States. Over a quarter (27%) of Americans speak a foreign language, 10% speak it very well, and 12% use it on a daily basis (Table 11A). Spanish is the most widely spoken foreign language (15%). It is followed by other European languages (9%), Asian languages (4%), and all other languages (e.g. African and Middle Eastern - 2%). Most people (50%) acquired their foreign language as their mother tongue in their childhood home, a third (33%) learned it in school, and 16% otherwise picked up the language (e.g. from a spouse, while living overseas, from work).

Two thirds or more of Americans at least sometimes come across foreign languages being spoken at work (67%) and in their local community (74%) (Table 11B). A third hear a foreign language being used on a daily basis at work and a quarter hear it daily in their local community. Looking at exposure to foreign languages either at work or in ones local community, only 14% never hear them being used and almost half (47%) experience it daily.

Language use and exposure varies greatly across racial and

ethnic groups. Hispanics and Asians are much more likely to use and hear foreign languages than Whites or Blacks are and almost all Hispanics and Asians knowing a foreign language learned it at home while growing up (Table 11C). More Whites know a foreign language than Blacks do, but few of either race are fluent or use a foreign language often. Whites are more likely than Blacks to at least sometimes hear a foreign language in their local community (74% vs. 61%), but Blacks hear a foreign language at work more than Whites do (70% vs. 64%). Almost two-fifths of Whites (39%) and a quarter (26%) of Blacks learned their foreign language at home, but unlike Hispanics and Asians, most Blacks (52%) and a plurality of Whites (42%) learned it at school.

## Immigration

Americans are about evenly split between thinking that the overall level of immigration should be left at current levels (44%) and that it should be decreased (42%). Only 9% feel that it should be increased (Table 12A). Public support for immigration varies little by the type of immigrants. 42% want immigration from Latin America reduced, 40% want Asian immigration decreased, and 33% want less immigration from Europe. The two major immigrant groups, Hispanics and Asians, are notably more pro-immigration than other groups. For example, only 29% of Hispanics favor a decrease vs. 43% of non-Hispanics (Table 12B). Asians are even more for immigration with only 11% backing decreases. Whites are generally the most anti-immigration and Blacks favor immigration more than Whites, but much less than Asians and Hispanics.

While support for immigration did not vary notably by the origin of the immigrants overall, national origins does sometimes make a difference among racial and ethnic groups. Asians are less supportive of immigration from Latin America than from other areas. Whites are more for immigration from Europe than they are for new arrivals from other regions.

The public believes that immigrants have both positive and negative impacts on American society, but sees more downsides than upsides (Table 13A). On the plus side 73% feel that it is likely that immigrants will make the country "more open to new ideas and cultures." On the minus side 70% think that it is likely that there will be higher crime rates, 57% feel that it is likely that people born in the United States will lose jobs, and 53% consider it likely that immigrants will make it "harder to keep the country united." The public is nearly evenly split on whether it is likely or unlikely that immigrants will lead to more economic growth (48% likely, 47% unlikely, and 5% unsure).

Hispanics and Asians are considerably more sanguine about the impact of immigration than others are (Table 13B). Hispanics see more gains in economic growth and new ideas and less increases in crime, unemployment, and disunity. Asians share this optimistic outlook. Whites and Blacks are much less optimistic about the impacts of immigration and except for Blacks being more

positive about immigration promoting economic growth Whites and Blacks differ little in their views.

The public is also evenly divided on the matter of pluralism vs. assimilation (Table 14A). 30% lean towards racial and ethnic groups maintaining their own, distinct cultures, 34% favor them changing to blend into the larger society, 32% equally back both the pluralism and assimilation positions, and 4% have no opinion. Hispanics are notably less for assimilation than non-Hispanics are (21% vs. 35%) and Whites, Blacks, and Asians differ little in their preferences.

### Differences by Socio-Demographic Groups

#### Gender

Men and women differ little in their support for good intergroup relations or in contact with members of other groups (Table 15). On most topics there are few statistically significant differences and those reliable differences that appear are often offsetting. For example, 1) men and women differ on only 2 of 24 ethnic images and men hold more negative views towards the minority in one instance and women in the other, 2) no meaningful differences appear on immigration issues, 3) only 4 of 30 contact measures varied by gender, 4) men and women do not vary in their views on intermarriage, and 5) women are consistently, but modestly, more in favor of living in integrated neighborhoods than men are, but the genders agree on the preferred racial and ethnic composition of their neighborhoods.

But gender differences do show up on the demographic estimates. First, women think that each minority group, except Jews but including the mixed-race group, makes up a larger share of the national and local population than men do. Since even men overestimate the size of minorities, this means that women are even less accurate than men are. Second, women are more likely than men to see Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians increasing their population share and less likely than men to believe that Whites and Jew will gain ground. In this women are probably more accurate than men are.

#### Age-Cohort

Views about intergroup relations in general and of specific groups in particular differ considerably by age and cohort.<sup>8</sup> In most instances the youngest cohort, those less than 30 years old,

---

<sup>8</sup>From a single survey it is impossible to separate out age and cohort effects. We typically refer to the age-cohort differences are being due to cohort since over time studies indicate that the differences are due to cohort not aging (Firebaugh and Davis, 1988; Schuman, et al., 1997; Steeh and Schuman, 1992).

report the greatest acceptance of racial and ethnic minorities and the most contact with them, while the oldest cohort, those 65+ are the least tolerant and have the least contact (Table 16).

First, the youngest cohort usually gives the highest contributions scores to each non-European nationality or religion, while the oldest cohort typically gives the lowest ratings. For example, 59% of the young say that the contributions of Blacks have been important, while only 29% of those 65+ think so. For European groups the 50-64 and 65+ year old cohorts see the highest contributions, while the young usually see the lowest. For example, 55-56% of those 50+ think the Irish have made important contributions, but only 39% of the young share this evaluation. Thus, the young are more positively oriented towards newer groups and non-European minorities, while the old favor long-term, European groups.

Second, those 65+ have the most negative images on Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians regarding industriousness, proclivity to violence, intelligence, family, and intergroup equality. The most positive images are usually held by the youngest cohort, but in several instances those 40-49 years old have the most favorable view. Regarding Jews the age-cohort differences are less meaningful and consistent. No meaningful variation appears on intergroup equality or families, the old are the most likely to think that Jews are more intelligent and harder working than Whites and the young the least likely to believe this, and those under 50 are least likely to view Jews as violence-prone and those 65+ the most likely.

Third, in all but one case the oldest cohort objects most to intermarriage and living in integrated neighborhoods with any of the minorities - Blacks, Jews, Hispanics, or Asians. Either the under 30 cohort or those 30-39 object the least. For example, 57% of those 65+ oppose a close relative marrying a Black person vs. 16% of those under 30 and 26% of those 65+ are against living with Asians vs. 11% of those 30-39.

Fourth, the oldest cohort prefers the most White neighbors and the fewest minority group neighbors, while the youngest cohort is most accepting of minorities as neighbors.

Fifth, intergroup contact often varies by age and the oldest cohort usually reports the least cross-racial/ethnic contact and the youngest cohort typically the most. For example, 61% of non-Blacks under 30 know a Black person in their local community, but only 43% of those 65+ do so. Likewise, 31% of non-Asians under 30 are close to an Asian, but only 11% of those 65+ are. The differences are especially large on knowing people from school. Since schooling typically ends early in a person's adult life, asking about knowing people from school is essentially giving us a glimpse into the past, a view of the situation early in a person's adult years. Since several minorities (e.g. Asians and Hispanics) have greatly increased their share of the population in recent years and other groups used to be segregated by law in schools (e.g. Blacks and Whites), people in the older cohorts are much less likely to have come to know members of others groups

while in school than those in younger cohorts are. For example, only 11% of non-Blacks 65+ know a Black from school, while 69% of those under 30 do so. Likewise, while 45% of non-Asians under 30 know an Asian person from school only 6% of those 65+ do so.

There are two major exceptions to this general pattern. At work intergroup contact is highest among the middle-aged and often relatively low among the young (the old are excluded from the age-cohort comparisons since few 65+ are still working). This is probably because the middle-aged are more likely to be in management positions and have contact with more co-workers in general. Also, the old often have more contact with Jews than the young do. For example, 12% of non-Jews 65+ have a Jewish relative while only 5% of those under 30 do so.

Sixth, among Whites older cohorts see themselves as having more in common with Whites and Jews than younger cohorts do. The younger cohorts see stronger ties to Hispanics and Blacks, and views on Asians do not differ much across cohorts. For example, 24% of Whites under 30 say they have the most in common with Blacks compared to only 10% of those 65+ feeling the same. The middle cohort, ages 40-49, is distinctive in being most likely to volunteer that it relates to all groups equally. The older cohorts of Whites are also the most likely to say they have the least in common with Blacks and the least likely to report having little in common with Whites or Jews. The younger cohorts show the opposite pattern. An unanticipated result is that the youngest cohort had the highest level saying that they had the least in common with Hispanics, while those 65+ reported the lowest level having little in common with Hispanics. The oldest cohort also was the most likely to say they had nothing in common with any group and to say they did not know what group they had the least in common with.

Seventh, age groups differ little in their estimates of racial and ethnic distribution of the US population or of that of their local community. The youngest cohort does have the highest estimate of the % of the US population that is racially mixed (50%) compared to estimates of 36-40% among those 50+.

Eighth, age groups basically agree on the relative rank of the growth rates of racial and ethnic groups. Those under 30 see somewhat more growth among Whites and Asians than older groups do, while older groups project more growth among Blacks. The cohorts do differ in their assessment of future population changes. Almost a third (32%) of those 65+ think that the shifts are a bad thing, while less than a fifth of those under 65 and just 14% of those under 30 believe the changes are bad.

Ninth, the oldest cohort is the most pro-English and anti-bilingualism of all groups. Those under 40 are the most approving of non-English language use. For example, 87% of those 65+ want English made the official language, but only 65% of those under 30 concur. Likewise, 36% of the oldest cohort wants to abolish bilingual education vs. 13% of the youngest cohort.

Tenth, immigration is generally most accepted by the youngest cohort. Those under 30 are less likely to want the

number of immigrants reduced than all older cohorts are. For example, 34% want fewer immigrants from Latin America compared to from 42-47% of older cohorts wanting reductions in the number of Hispanic immigrants. Younger cohorts are also less likely to believe that negative consequences come from having immigrants, while those 65+ consistently have the most pessimistic view of immigrants. For example, 67% of those 65+ think it is likely that native-born Americans will lose jobs due to immigration vs. 51% of those under 30. Likewise, 64% think economic growth is unlikely to result from immigration compared to 36% among those under 30. However, all age groups agree that immigrants contribute to more crime. The youngest cohort is also the least in favor of groups assimilating into the main culture (29%), while the oldest cohort most favors this course (47%).

In sum, intergroup attitudes and behaviors are sharply differentiated by age-cohort. Across dimensions those 65+ generally have the least positive view of racial and ethnic minorities, the lowest level of intergroup contact, and the lowest acceptance of multiculturalism. Those under 65 are less sharply divided, but the youngest cohort tends to be the most accepting of diversity and has the most interactions across racial and ethnic lines.

#### Education

As other studies have shown (Bobo and Kluegel, 1997; Jackman, 1994; Schuman, et al., 1997; Smith, 2000), education promotes both intergroup contact and more positive relations among groups (Table 17).

First, those with college educations are the most likely to believe that all groups make important contributions to American society, while those without a high school degree are generally the least likely to acknowledge contributions. The differences are large and fairly consistent across groups. For example, 62% of those with college degrees vs. 34% of those who did not finish high school think Jews have made important contributions and 24% of the college educated vs. 11% of those not completing high school believe Muslims have made important contributions.

Second, with just one exception the college educated have the most positive images of all minority groups regarding industriousness, violence, intelligence, family, and intergroup relations.<sup>9</sup> Those without a high school education typically have the most negative images of all minority groups.<sup>10</sup> Often the

---

<sup>9</sup>Views on the violence proneness of Jews does not significant vary with education and those without a high school education have marginally the most positive image of Jews.

<sup>10</sup>The main exception is that those with a high school education have the most negative view of minorities on intergroup tolerance.



differences in ethnic images by education are quite notable. In particular, the better educated have much more positive views of Asians than the least educated do. Those with less than a high school degree view Asians as less intelligent, less hard work, and less committed to strong families than Whites are, but the college educated see them as more intelligent, harder working, and more committed to families than Whites are. For Hispanics and Blacks, all educational groups typically have negative images, but the better educated are more moderate in their negative assessments than the less educated are. In one case, evaluating Hispanics on commitment to families, the better educated have a overall positive image, while the less educated view them in a negative light.

Third, the college educated are generally the least likely to object to intermarriage or living with minorities. Those with a high school education or less are the most likely to oppose these forms of contact. For example, 22% of the college educated object to a close relative marrying a Black vs. 40-41% of those with a high school education or less. Similarly, 12% of those with a college education oppose living with Asians, while 24% of those without a high school degree object.

Fourth, among Whites the college educated prefer the smallest number of White neighbors and the greatest number of Asians, Blacks, and Hispanics. Those without a high school degree want the most White neighbors and the fewest from each minority group.

Fifth, intergroup contact generally increases notably with level of education. That is, contact with between out-group members rises with years of schooling. The college educated almost always report knowing more members of all minority groups, having the most contact with minorities at school, work, and in the local community, and feeling close to more members of other groups. For example, 83% of the college educated vs. 35% of those who did not finish high school know an Asian, 39% vs. 11% had contact at school, 52% vs. 16% at work, 43% vs. 14% from their local community, and 40% of the college educated feel close to an Asian compared to 9% of the least educated. A similar pattern emerges for Blacks, Hispanics, and Jews. The one partial exception is on knowing someone as a relative. Having contact with Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians relatives does not vary by educational level. However, consistent with the general pattern, better educated non-Whites are the most likely to know a White as a relative and the same is true for non-Jews having a Jewish relative.

Sixth, among Whites the college educated generally feel they have more in common with most minority groups than the less educated do. An exception is that the college educated are the least likely to see themselves as having the most in common with Blacks, while those without a high school education most frequently mention Blacks. It is possible that these ties appear because of the similar class position of the two groups. Educational differences in selecting the least common group are

rather scattered. The college educated are the most likely to say they are equally in common with all groups and the least likely to indicate that they have nothing in common with any group, and the most likely to mention Hispanics. Those with no high school degree are the most likely to say they have nothing in common with any group and the least likely to mention Hispanics or Asians.

Seventh, while still fairly far off-the-mark, the college educated have the most accurate estimates of the national racial and ethnic distribution of the US population. They think there are more Whites and fewer of each minority group than each of the less educated groups do. Conversely, those with less than a high school education are the most inaccurate, producing the highest overestimates of the size of each minority group. The college educated also give the lowest estimates of the share of the population racially mixed (40%) while the least educated have the highest figure (47%). The college educated report that their local communities have more Whites and Jews and fewer American Indians, Blacks, or Hispanics than the less educated indicate. The least educated generally report the highest share of American Indians, Blacks, and Hispanics. The share of Asians reported in local communities does not vary by educational level.

Eighth, the college educated believe that Whites, Blacks, and Jews will have the smallest population gains over the next 25 years, while those without a high school degree see the smallest increases for Hispanics and Asians. The college educated are the least worried about population shifts. Only 12% think these represent a bad thing compared to 28% of the least educated.

Ninth, education has a complex relationship toward language policies. The college educated see the most value in learning a second language and those with a high school education are the least convinced that students should learn another language. (Analysis suggest that opposition is not highest among the least educated because of the number immigrants in this educational level.) The college educated are also the least likely to believe that English unites all Americans and that English is threatened by the use of other languages. The most and least educated are less likely to favor English-only ballots (29%), while those with a high school degree and some college are more in favor of English-only ballots (37-38%). Those with no high school degree are the least likely to want English as the official language (64%), while those with high school degrees or some college most back this idea (75-76%).

Tenth, the college educated are without exception the least worried about immigration. They are less in favor of decreasing the level of immigration than the less educated are (29% vs. 43-49%) and find immigrants creating fewer social and economic problems. For example, 56% of the college educated think immigrants cause more crime vs. 76-77% of those with no college and 41% feel that national unity is harmed by immigrants vs. 61% of the least educated thinking this. However, support for assimilation vs. pluralism varies little by educational level

with 33-35% of all groups favoring assimilation.

In sum, intergroup contact and tolerance is greatest among those with college degrees. The least interaction and acceptance is usually found among those without a high school degree, but on some dimensions such as language and immigration, high school graduates are the least positive (because immigrants and most minorities are overrepresented among the least educated). Likewise, non-English use and immigration is most accepted by the college educated.

## Region

Regions vary greatly in the size and mixture of the various racial and ethnic groups living in them and in people's responses to these groups (Table 18).

First, except regarding Whites and Blacks, the South reports the lowest level of contributions from all ethno-racial and religious groups. The highest level of contributions are generally seen by people in regions where the groups are most concentrated. For example, the West rates the three Asian groups, Mexicans, and Muslims the highest, the Northeast gives more credit to Puerto Ricans, Italians, and (more surprisingly) Cubans. The Midwest places the contributions of the Irish, Blacks, and (more surprisingly) Jews higher than other regions do.

Second, most ethnic images do not notably vary across regions. When regional differences do occur, the West typically has the most positive images of minorities. The West is relatively more likely to believe that all minorities have strong families, that Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians are harder working, that Blacks are not violence-prone, and that Asians are intelligent. The most negative judgments on these dimensions and groups come from the South and Northeast.

Third, the West and the Northeast are most likely to accept intermarriage and residential integration with almost all minority groups and the South is least likely to accept such contact with each minority group. For example, 23% of those from the Northeast object to Hispanic neighbors and 11% frown on a close relative marrying a Hispanic, but opposition in the South to Hispanic residential integration and intermarriage is 30-31%.

Fourth, Whites in the West want the most diversified neighborhoods, while those from the South select the fewest from each minority group.

Fifth, there are no regional differences in level of contact with Whites, but knowing most minorities does differ by region. In general, the more members of a minority in an area, the more contact there is with that minority. Out-group members from the West have the more contact of almost every type with both Asians and Hispanics than those from other regions do. Those from the Northeast have the most contact with Jews. Except for as relatives where there are no regional variation and on school contacts, non-Blacks from the South have higher contact with

Blacks than do non-Blacks in other regions.

Sixth, Whites in the West are more likely than those in other regions to feel they have the most in common with Hispanics and less likely to think they have the least in common with Hispanics. Whites in the Northeast are more likely than those elsewhere to say they have the most in common with Jews and that they have equal ties to all and the least to indicate that they have the least in common with Jews and Asians. White Midwesterners are surprisingly both more likely to mention Asians as the group they have both the most and least in common with. White Southerners feel closer to Whites and Blacks and are also more likely to say they have the least in common with Jews and Blacks than those in other regions do.

Seventh, those from the West estimate the highest national share for Whites, Hispanics, Asians, and American Indians, have the lowest figure for Blacks, and are in the middle on figures regarding Jews. The Northeast has the highest national estimates for Jews and are in between for groups. The Midwest is intermediate on all population estimates. The South has the top estimate for Blacks, the lowest for Asians, Hispanics, and American Indians, and are in between on Whites. Estimates of the mixed-race population do not vary much by region, but the Northeast has the lowest and the Midwest the highest figure.

Eighth, the West is the region that predicts the top Asian growth and the bottom expansion for Whites and Blacks. The Northeast projects the least Hispanic increase and is intermediate for the other groups. The Midwest foresees the most rapid growth for Whites, Jews, and Hispanics and are in between for Blacks and Asians. The South has the highest growth expectations for Blacks among the regions and the lowest for Asians and Jews. The South most rates future population changes as a bad thing (25%) compared to the smallest complaint in Northeast (11%).

Ninth, attitudes towards language use do not change much across regions. The South is somewhat more for English being the official language, feeling that English unites the country, and disagreeing that learning a foreign language is as valuable as math and science. The West and Northeast lean more towards a pro-multilingual approach.

Tenth, immigration is uniformly most suspect in the South and most positively seen in the Northeast and West. For example, 47% of Southerners wants to decrease immigration vs. 38.5% of those in the Northeast and West. 67% of Southerners think native-born Americans lose jobs to immigrants compared to 48% in the West and 53% in the Northeast. The South also gives more support for minority groups assimilating into the majority culture than other regions do.

In sum, the South is consistently the least open to minority groups and pluralism. Usually the West is most accepting of ethnic and racial minorities and of changes associated with multiculturalism, but sometimes the Northeast leads in intergroup tolerance. The Midwest is almost always in the middle on these

matters.

### Community Type

People who reside in large central cities, suburbs, small towns, and rural areas live in substantially different Americas. This was illustrated by the sharp geographic divisions in the 2000 presidential election and also shows up clearly regarding attitudes and behaviors relating to intergroup relations (Table 19).

First, people living in suburbs of large cities on average see more contributions from more groups and people from rural areas find the least contributions overall. The only groups not ranked at or near the bottom by rural residents are two groups with long-term presence, the English and the Irish. Residents of the largest central cities have a very mixed view on the relative contributions of groups. They report higher contributions by Blacks, Cubans, Puerto Ricans, and Muslims than other places do, lower contributions by the English, Italians, and Irish (the longest-term European groups), and are intermediate on Asians groups, Mexicans, and Jews.

Second, ethnic images are almost always most negative in rural areas. The most sanguine views of minorities typically come those who live in large or medium central cities. In a few instances those in suburbs have the most favorable opinion of minorities (e.g. on Asian commitment to families and intelligence and on Jews not being violence prone).

Third, preferences towards living and intermarrying with out-groups do not vary greatly by community type. The largest and most consistent differences are that people in rural are much more likely to object to a relative marrying a Black (42%) or a Hispanic (29%) than are residents of large central cities (object to Black=17%; to Hispanic=12%).

Fourth, Whites in rural areas prefer fewer of all minority groups as neighbors compared to Whites from large central cities who back the most of all minority groups (except for Asians who are most favored by those in medium central cities. In addition, those in large central cities are the most likely to volunteer that ethnicity and race does not matter (7%), while no one from rural areas brought up this idea.

Fifth, intergroup contact is usually least in rural areas and highest in medium central cities and suburbs. This pattern is always true for contact with Jews, always leans in this direction for Hispanics (but sometimes is not statistically significant), and occurs in several instances for Asians and Blacks. But for Asians and Blacks the relationship sometimes flips and the lowest contact levels are found in large central cities. For example, non-Asians are least likely to work with an Asian in rural areas, but least likely to feel close to or have an Asian relative in large central cities. On the one hand the more diverse populations of large cities facilitates contact, but both ethnic and racial segregation within large cities and the anomia of

urban life discourages contact. The highest contact is often in medium central cities or suburbs of large cities. Contact with Jews is always highest in suburbs of large cities and for other groups it is mostly split between the medium central cities and the suburbs.

Sixth, feelings of having the most/least common with groups varies in complex ways by community type. Among Whites people in suburbs are more likely than those living elsewhere to say they have the most in common with Jews (32%) and rural residents are the least likely to feel this commonness (3%). Blacks are viewed as having the most in common by Whites in small cities and the least by Whites in large central cities. For Hispanics the most in common is seen by Whites in medium central cities and the least by those in the suburbs of large cities. Asians are mentioned most by Whites in other suburbs and least by those in large central cities.

Seventh, figures on population size do not vary greatly by community type and the estimates of the mixed-race population shows no statistically significant differences.

Eighth, those in rural areas believe that the White and Black populations will grow more than those in other areas do. Those in suburbs project the highest population expansion for Jews, Hispanics, and Asians. Those in large central cities see the lowest increases for Whites, Blacks, Jews, and Hispanics. In evaluating the projected changes in population, those in rural areas are more prone to see it as a bad thing (26%), while only 10% of those in large central cities consider the changes as bad.

Ninth, those in rural areas are consistently the most pro-English. The most support for the use of other languages usually appears in central cities, but sometimes approval is greater in the suburbs.

Tenth, rural residents are also the most opposed to immigration with the most support almost always being in central cities. These differences are often quite large. For example, 61% of rural residents want to decrease immigration from Latin America vs. only 32-33% of those in central cities. Likewise, 74% of rural residents believe the native born will lose jobs to immigrants compared to just 46% of those in large central cities. On assimilation the pattern is a little different with support for blending in greatest in large suburbs (41%) and rural areas (40%) and lowest in large central cities (23%).

In sum, rural residents are the least open to accepting racial and ethnic minorities and the hallmarks of multiculturalism - non-English language use, immigration, and cultural pluralism. Those in large central cities are generally most accepting, but in a number of cases the suburbs are the most open. In particular, intergroup contact is often greater in the suburbs with the lowest contact either in large central cities or rural areas.

Religion

America is even more diverse in its religions than it is on race and ethnicity. Unfortunately the faiths are so many and often so small that few can be individually examined. It is possible however to examine the intergroup views and behaviors of five major groups of religions: Protestants, Catholics, Jews, those with no religion, and Others (those in other religions - e.g. Islam, Eastern Orthodoxy, Hinduism) (Table 20).

First, except for two of the heavily Catholic ethnicities (Italians and Mexicans), Catholics are least likely to see important contributions from all groups. Jews and Others are the most likely to see groups as making contributions. Jews generally have the highest rating of older immigrant groups (Europeans and Blacks) and Others lead in the evaluations of newer groups (Asians and Hispanics). Protestants and those with no religion are in the middle.

Second, Jews uniformly have the most positive ethnic images of all groups on all dimensions except for Others rating Asians more positively on the violence measure. Catholics have the most negative images of Blacks. No religion has consistent negative views of Hispanics with Protestants, Catholics, and Others being least favorable on different dimensions. Evaluations of Jews vary little by religion. Protestants and Catholics have the lowest images of Asians.

Third, acceptance of intermarriage and residential integration is greatest among those with no religion, Jews, and Others and lowest among Protestants and Catholics. For example. 19% of Jews vs. 34% of Catholics object to living with Blacks. Likewise, 13% of Others compared to 41% of Protestants are against a close relative marrying a Black.

Fourth, among Whites those with no religion prefer the fewest White neighbors, the most of each minority race and ethnicity, and are virtually tied with Catholics in saying that the race and ethnicity of neighbors does not matter. However, most differences are small.

Fifth, intergroup contact does not vary much across religions. Those differences that do emerge form no general pattern across groups or venues. Among non-Whites, Protestants have more contact with Whites at work than other religions do. Among non-Blacks Jews know more Blacks than those in other faiths do and those in other religions and Jews are more likely to feel close to a Black person. Among non-Jews those with no religion are most likely to know a Jew from their local community and those with no religion and Others are most prone to feel close to a Jew. Among non-Hispanics Jews report the highest level of knowing and feeling close to an Hispanic. Among non-Asians Others and Jews report the most familiarity.

Sixth, Jews are the most likely to say they have much in common with all groups except with Hispanics. Of all religions Jews are the least likely to feel they have things in common with Hispanics. The Others are the most prone to see common bonds with Hispanics and the least with Blacks or Jews. Others and those with no religion see less in common with Asians than other

religions do. Protestants and Catholics are in the middle in evaluations of each group.

Seventh, Jews are the most accurate in estimating the size of all groups in the US and also have the lowest figure for those with mixed-race backgrounds. Protestants underestimate Whites the most and most overestimate the proportion Black. Catholics have the highest estimates for Jews, Hispanics, Asians, and American Indians. Those with no religion give the highest figure as mixed race.

Eighth, there are no statistically significant differences in future population growth of groups. Others are least likely to see changes as a bad thing (12%) and Jews the most likely to do so (25%). This in large part comes from concerns about Jewish population decline.

Ninth, the Others and, to a lesser extent, those with no religion are the least pro-English, while the Protestants are almost always the most for English. For example, 64% of Others and 76% of Protestants believe that English unites America. Likewise, 78% of Protestants and 60% of those with no religion are for making English the official language.

Tenth, Jews and Others are most for immigration and Protestants consistently the least in favor of it. Catholics and those without any religion are intermediate. For example, 74% of Protestants think that immigrants increase the crime rate vs. only 51-52% of Jews and Others. Likewise, 46% of Protestants want less immigration compared to 36% of Others favoring this. In addition, Protestants are more for assimilation (37%) than are Jews (26%) or Others (20%).

In sum, religion does not usually sharply differentiate people on ethnicity, race, and multiculturalism and the various faiths do not consistently line up on intergroup contact and attitudes. Jews and Others are typically more accepting of minority groups and of non-English use, immigration, and cultural pluralism, but the greatest opposition is scattered across Protestants, Catholics, and nones and varies dimension-by-dimension.

### Trends

Virtually across the board Americans have become more tolerant in their views on intergroup relations, more supportive of racial and ethnic equality, and more accepting of immigration (Bobo and Kluegel, 1997; Schuman, et al., 1997; Smith, 1993; 1994; 1996; Smith and Dempsey, 1984).

First, opposition to intermarriage across various racial and ethnic lines fell by about half during the 1990s (Table 21). For example, while 64% of non-Blacks objected to a close relative marrying a Black in 1990, opposition dropped to 32% in 2000. Likewise, support among Whites for anti-miscegenation laws declined from 36% in 1972 to just 11% in 2000 (Table 25).

Second, dislike of living in a neighborhood with majorities from various racial and ethnic minorities notably declined during



the 1990s (Table 22). While 46% of non-Blacks objected to living with Blacks in 1990s only 28% did in 2000. Objections to Hispanic neighbors fell from 43% to 27%, Asian neighbors from 35% to 18%, and Jewish neighbors from 14% to 9%.

Third, negative ethnic images about Hispanics, Blacks, and Asians declined over the last decade (Table 23). The proportion seeing these groups as lazier, more violence-prone, and less intelligent than Whites all substantially decreased. For example, in 1990 59% thought that Blacks were less hard working than Whites and this fell to 43% in 2000. Likewise, in 1990 50% believed that Hispanics were more violence-prone than Whites compared to 40% in 2000. Similarly, 39% considered Asians as less intelligent than Whites in 1990, but only 26% did so in 2000. There were also some modest declines in images of these groups as poorer than Whites.

Images of Jews changed relatively little during this period, but tended to become less positive. In at least one case, the decline in the idea that Jews are richer than Whites (from 46% in 1990 to 35% in 2000), actually represents an improvement since the this image contributes to resentment of the "overly successful" Jews (Smith, 1994; 1996).

Fourth, over time Whites have become less likely to give illiberal explanations for the socio-economic disadvantages that Blacks suffer (Table 24). While 25% of Whites mentioned less in-born ability as a reason for the disparities in 1977 only 9-12% did so in 1996-2000. Likewise, White mentions of Blacks having less will power or motivation declined from 61% in 1977 to 43-47% in 1998-2000. Whites also decreased their mentions of liberal explanations, but to a lesser degree than the drop in illiberal reasons (discrimination from 40% to 30-31% and less education from 50% to 41-42%). Blacks showed no clear trends in their mentions of illiberal explanations, but did mention both discrimination and lower education less frequently than they used to.

Fifth, Whites and Blacks have both increasingly rejected the idea that Blacks should not "push themselves where they're not wanted" (Table 25). Throughout the 1970s 70-72% agreed with that this sentiment, but in 1996-2000 only 38-40% felt this way. Likewise, Black agreement dropped from 48% in 1980 to 33-35% in 1990s.

Sixth, relatively few people want the government to take special steps like affirmative action or government spending targeting Blacks to address the problem of racial inequality. Three measures dealing with affirmative action policies currently show on 16-19% of the public backing such policies and support has either remained stable or declined slightly over time (Table 26). Likewise, two measures of government spending to help Blacks shows that presently 33-38% want to see an increase in these efforts and public opinion has been pretty stable over the last several decades. Out of 11 government spending areas asked from 1973 to 2000, "improving the conditions of Blacks" has almost always ranked 7th and out of 20 spending areas from 1984 to 2000

"assistance to Blacks" has consistently finished in 15th place (Smith, 2001).

Finally, opposition to immigrants has moderated over the last decade (Table 27). In 1994 62% wanted to decrease the number of immigrants and this fell to 42% in 2000. Likewise, those believing that immigrants undermine national unity dropped from 69% in 1994 to 53% in 2000 and support for the idea that immigrants undermine economic growth declined from 64% in 1994 to 47% in 2000. There has also been a small decline in the idea that racial and ethnic groups should blend into the dominant culture (from 38% in 1994 to 34% in 2000).

In sum, support for explicit programs of racial discrimination and segregation receded to small levels, negative images about group characteristics and the causes of intergroup disparities have diminished, and the desire to retain barriers between groups has declined. In addition, opposition to immigration and pessimistic judgments about the impact of immigrants on society have fallen sharply. However, not changed in support for policies to reduce socio-economic gaps between Blacks and Whites.

## Summary

### Intergroup Comparisons

Among the ethnic and racial groups that this study focused - Whites, Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and Jews, there is a clear social hierarchy. The White majority is naturally the advantaged group. Not only in their higher socio-economic status and numerical superiority, but also by their greater acceptance by non-members of their group. For example, White ethnic groups, especially the English, are rated as having made the most contributions to society; Whites in general and Jews are rated the most positively on most traits; few Non-Whites and non-Jews object to Whites and Jews as neighbors and relatives through marriage; and Whites are the most frequently mentioned by minorities as the group they share the most in common with.

While Jews are generally rated quite favorably along with other Whites, there are a few dimensions on which people do distinguish between the two groups. While Whites feel they have more in common with Jews than with other minorities, few Blacks or Hispanics believe they have much in common with Jews. Moreover less than a third of non-Jews report contact with Jews from school, the local community, or at work or feeling close to a Jew.

Blacks are on balance the least socially accepted group. On the positive side many acknowledge that Blacks have made important contributions to America and Blacks have more intergroup contact than other minorities have. But ethnic images about Blacks are generally more negative than towards other groups; fewer people want to accept Blacks as neighbors or as relatives; and intergroup contact as relatives is rare. In addition, Non-Blacks who see the Black share of the future

population as increasing a lot tend to view populations shifts as a "bad thing."

Hispanics are seen as having made modest contributions to American society. People have negative ethnic images about Hispanics on all dimensions except commitment to strong families. They are viewed in the most negative light regarding intelligence and are rated second to the bottom ahead of only Blacks in terms of industriousness, violence proneness, and commitment to strong families and fair and equal treatment of all groups. Likewise, objections to intermarriage and residential integration are second highest behind Blacks. Intergroup contact with Hispanics is limited with only 35% of non-Hispanics feeling close to an Hispanic and just 11% knowing an Hispanic as a relative.

Asians are seen as having made more contributions to American society than Hispanics (but less than Whites or Blacks). Images of Asians are positive in regards towards hard work, violence proneness, and committed to families and Asians are rated above Blacks and Hispanics on all dimensions. Likewise, there is less objection to residential integration or intermarriage with Asians than with Blacks or Hispanics. But Asians are relatively isolated from non-Asians. Only 22-36% of non-Asians know an Asian from school, the local community, or work; only 25% feel close to an Asian, and just 7% have an Asian relative. This low-level of interaction contributes to Asians being mentioned by Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics as the group they each have the least in common with.

### Multiculturalism

Americans have very mixed views on multiculturalism. In terms of language use, large majorities back English being made the official language of the US and see it as a unifying force, but only a third or less believe English is threatened by other languages or that non-English ballots and bilingual education should be prohibited. In addition, substantial majorities endorse the merit of foreign languages being taught in school. On immigration the public is evenly split between those who want the level of immigrants to remain at current levels vs. those favoring a reduction. People also tend to see more negative than positive consequences resulting from more immigration. On whether ethnic groups should maintain their own, distinct cultures or blend into the larger society, public is nearly evenly split into three groups with about a third favoring assimilation, pluralism, or equally endorse both courses.

### Socio-Demographics

Americans are not of one mind or one experience when it comes to intergroup relations and contact. While men and women differ little in their views, sharp differences appear on age-cohort, education, region, community type, and, to a lesser extent, religion. In general, acceptance of other groups and

unease over multiculturalism is most concentrated in segments of society that represent traditional America - those 65+, the less educated, rural residents, and Southerners, while acceptance is greatest among those oriented towards the emerging future, younger adults, the college educated, those in the West and Northeast, and residents of large metropolitan areas.

## Trends

America has been undergoing some notable population shifts in its ethno-racial and religious composition and has seen major increases in the level of immigrants and in the use of languages besides English. Even more massive than the demographic changes in diversity are the social changes in intergroup tolerance. Antipathy between groups is declining as ethnic images become less negative and preferred barriers to intergroup contact decline. Attitudes towards all minority groups have become more favorable in recent years.<sup>11</sup> Likewise, opposition to immigration and concerns over the consequences of more immigrants have moderated.

But these important changes do not mean that Americans have become committed to achieving intergroup equality. Support for policies such as affirmative action and for government spending that targets minorities is low and has not increased during the last generation. Policies that are based on the premise of group rights or which propose to compensate disadvantaged minorities are not popular and are not gaining ground.

Nor does the notable progress mean that intergroup intolerance has been eliminated. Negative ethnic images remain common, intergroup interaction is still limited, and concerns about multiculturalism in general and immigration in particular is still high. Moreover, minority groups are still quite disadvantaged compared to the White majority and frequently suffer from overt ethnic and racial discrimination (Feagin and Sikes, 1994; Sears and Jessor, 1996; Smith, 2000; St. Jean and Feagin, 1998; and St. Jean and Feagin, 1999).

## Conclusion

America was founded on certain noble ideals. As Lincoln noted the nation was "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." But Lincoln spoke these words in 1863 on the battlefield of Gettysburg just nine months after his Emancipation Proclamation went into effect but 87 years after Jefferson first penned the idea. And so down to the present America has struggled to live up to the ennobling principles on which the country was formed. It has been a long

---

<sup>11</sup>On trends towards Jews see Smith, 1990, 1993, 1994, 1996. On Blacks see Bobo, 1997; Bobo and Kluegel, 1997; Schuman, et al., 1997. On groups in general see Smith, 1998, 2000.

and slow process with periods of retrenchment and stagnation periodically broken by forward movement at "all deliberate speed." But despite the tardiness and incompleteness of the progress, there have been real gains and achievements towards turning our ideals into realities.

As America has become a more and more diverse society, the goals of intergroup tolerance and equality have not gotten any easier to reach, but the need to do so has become ever more necessary. As this report has revealed, there is still considerable ground to cover before our practices can catch up with our principles.

Table 1

## Perceived Contributions of Groups to America

	Most Important	Important	Some	Little	DK
English	29.5%	41.7	19.2	2.7	6.9
Jews	10.5%	42.1	31.9	5.3	10.2
Blacks	8.1%	40.1	34.9	10.5	6.4
Irish	7.7%	40.0	35.7	7.2	9.5
Japanese	7.4%	32.7	35.7	13.5	10.8
Italians	6.8%	41.5	37.8	5.4	8.6
Chinese	6.6%	32.0	39.7	12.1	9.6
Mexicans	3.7%	24.3	42.2	19.9	9.9
Puerto Ricans	2.6%	15.7	41.9	26.4	13.4
Vietnamese	2.3%	15.8	38.6	29.7	13.6
Muslims	2.3%	14.5	34.6	29.2	19.4
Cubans	2.2%	14.0	36.3	34.0	13.5

1384-1393

Source: 2000 GSS

Wording: Since the beginning of our country, people of many different races, nationalities, and religions have come here and settled. As I name some of these groups, please tell me if the group has made one of the most important positive contributions to this country, an important contribution, some contribution, or little positive contribution to this country.

Table 2A  
Ethnic Images<sup>a</sup>

Groups	Images					
	Rich/Poor	Hard Work/Lazy	Violent/Not	Intelligent/Not	Strong Families/Not	Fair & Equal/Not
Blacks						
Mean	-1.56	-0.82	-0.65	-0.69	-0.65	-0.47
+	4.8	8.9	10.3	2.9	15.3	18.4
0	18.0	44.9	44.6	59.0	41.0	43.2
-	77.3	46.3	45.1	38.1	43.7	38.4
DK	4.1	5.3	5.9	6.2	5.7	6.1
Jews						
Mean	+0.26	+0.22	+0.49	+0.03	+0.47	+0.01
+	40.4	31.2	35.9	18.7	39.1	24.6
0	40.6	52.4	54.6	67.4	49.2	52.2
-	19.0	16.4	9.6	13.9	11.7	23.2
DK	13.9	13.7	14.1	12.2	12.8	14.5
Asians						
Mean	-0.45	+0.23	+0.22	-0.07	+0.39	-0.16
+	22.0	34.4	26.8	21.6	37.3	22.1
0	33.2	46.6	54.9	56.9	44.3	49.4
-	44.9	19.0	18.2	21.5	18.4	28.4
DK	10.8	11.4	12.6	11.4	13.1	15.2
Hispanics						
Mean	-1.57	-0.29	-0.41	-0.74	+0.16	-0.30
+	6.6	22.3	14.6	3.3	33.8	22.1
0	14.8	43.0	47.1	54.4	40.7	43.9
-	78.5	34.7	38.3	42.3	25.5	34.0
DK	7.9	9.5	10.1	9.9	9.8	11.3

Source: 2000 GSS

Wordings: Now I have some questions about what different racial and ethnic groups are like. I'm going to show you a seven-point scale on which the characteristics of people can be rated. In the first statement a score of 1 means that you think almost of the

Table 2A (continued)

people in the group are "rich." A score of 7 means that you think almost everyone in the group is "poor." A score of 4 means that you think that the group is not towards one end or the other and of course you may choose any number in between that comes closest to where you think people in the group stand.

- a. Where would you rate Whites in general on this scale?
- b. Blacks?
- c. Jews?
- d. Hispanics or Latin Americans?
- e. Asian Americans?

In the second statement a score of 1 means that you think almost all of the people in the group are "hardworking." A score of 7 means that you think that almost everyone in the group is "lazy." A score of 4 means that you think the group is not towards one end or the other and of course you may choose any number in between that comes closest to where you think people in the group stand.

- a. Where would you rate Whites in general on this scale?
- b. Blacks?
- c. Jews?
- d. Hispanics or Latin Americans?
- e. Asian Americans?

In the next statement a score of 1 means that you think almost all of the people in the group are "intelligent." A score of 7 means that you think that almost everyone in the group is "unintelligent." A score of 4 means that you think the group is not towards one end or the other and of course you may choose any number in between that comes closest to where you think people in the group stand.

- a. Where would you rate Whites in general on this scale?
- b. Blacks?
- c. Jews?
- d. Hispanics or Latin Americans?
- e. Asian Americans?

In the next statement a score of 1 means that you think almost all of the people in the group are "prone to violence." A score of 7 means that you think that almost everyone in the group is "not violence prone." A score of 4 means that you think the group is not towards one end or the other and of course you may choose any number in between that comes closest to where you think people in the group stand.

- a. Where would you rate Whites in general on this scale?
- b. Blacks?
- c. Jews?



Table 2A (continued)

- d. Hispanics or Latin Americans?
- e. Asian Americans?

In the next statement a score of 1 means that you think almost all of the people in the group have a "commitment to strong families." A score of 7 means that you think that almost everyone in the group "lacks a commitment to strong families." A score of 4 means that you think the group is not towards one end or the other and of course you may choose any number in between that comes closest to where you think people in the group stand.

- a. Where would you rate Whites in general on this scale?
- b. Blacks?
- c. Jews?
- d. Hispanics or Latin Americans?
- e. Asian Americans?

In the next statement a score of 1 means that you think almost all of the people in the group have a "commitment to the fair and equal treatment of all groups in society." A score of 7 means that you think that almost everyone in the group "lacks a commitment to the fair and equal treatment of all groups in society." A score of 4 means that you think the group is not towards one end or the other and of course you may choose any number in between that comes closest to where you think people in the group stand.

- a. Where would you rate Whites in general on this scale?
- b. Blacks?
- c. Jews?
- d. Hispanics or Latin Americans?
- e. Asian Americans?

<sup>a</sup>The scores are based on subtracting the rate assigned to Blacks, Jews, Hispanics, and Asians from the White rate. All scales are scored so that the negative means that the minority group is rated as closed to the unfavorable characterization (poor, lazy, violence-prone, unintelligent, not committed to strong families, and not committed to fair and equal treatment). Thus, if Whites were scored 4 on Rich/Poor and Blacks 5 the score on the wealth scale for Blacks would be -1.0. The +, 0, and - distributions collapse the full range of possible scores which range from -6 to +6. DKs are excluded from the scale means and these collapsed distributions. The DK levels are reported separately in the table.

Table 2B  
Ethnic Images by Race and Ethnicity<sup>a</sup>  
(Mean Difference Scores)

	Not Hisp. Hisp		White	Black	Asian
<b>Rich - Poor</b>					
Blacks	-0.72	-0.74	-0.74	-0.64	-0.73
Jews	0.24	-0.12*	0.26	0.14	0.13*
Hispanics	-0.72	-0.71	-0.72	-0.67	-0.78
Asians	-0.24	-0.11	-0.21	-0.29	-0.27
<b>Hard Working Lazy</b>					
Blacks	-0.36	-0.50*	-0.42	-0.08	-0.45*
Jews	0.16	0.01*	0.16	0.14	0.20
Hispanics	-0.14	0.06*	-0.16	0.07	-0.29*
Asians	0.15	0.17	0.15	0.20	0.43*
<b>Violence-Prone/Not</b>					
Blacks	-0.34	-0.43	-0.39	-0.03	-0.61*
Jews	0.28	0.08*	0.27	0.31	0.05*
Hispanics	-0.23	-0.30	-0.28	0.06	-0.30*
Asians	0.09	0.05	0.07	0.22	0.11
<b>Intelligent/Not</b>					
Blacks	-0.34	-0.52*	-0.38	-0.09	-0.56*
Jews	0.06	-0.06	0.05	0.10	-0.15
Hispanics	-0.39	-0.36	-0.40	-0.27	-0.56*
Asians	0.01	-0.04	0.01	0.03	-0.08
<b>Committed to Strong Families/Not</b>					
Blacks	-0.28	-0.34	-0.31	-0.09	-0.25*
Jews	0.27	0.35	0.27	0.26	0.47
Hispanics	0.07	0.23*	0.07	0.11	0.53*
Asians	0.19	0.23	0.19	0.12	0.59*
<b>Committed to Fair &amp; Equal Treatment/Not</b>					
Blacks	-0.18	-0.36*	-0.26	0.24	-0.40*
Jews	0.02	-0.03	-0.01	0.22	-0.15*
Hispanics	-0.13	-0.02	-0.16	0.18	-0.31*
Asians	-0.07	0.03	-0.09	0.14	-0.15*

Source: 2000 GSS

<sup>a</sup>Not Hispanic/Hispanic is one variable in which all respondents are classified into one of these two categories. Race is a second

Table 2B (continued)

variable that includes the three races listed here as well as other races (e.g. American Indian and Pacific Islander) that are not shown because of small sample sizes. On the race variables Hispanics can appear amongst any of the racial categories.

\*=statistically significant at the .05 level or greater.

Table 3

Social Distance to Groups

(Based on non-group Members Only)

Reference Group	% Objecting to Close Relative Marrying	% Objecting to Living in Neighborhood With
Whites	8.6	6.0
Blacks	32.0	29.7
Jews	12.6	9.1
Hispanics	20.9	26.5
Asians	20.4	18.1

Source: 2000 GSS

Wordings: Now I'm going to ask you about different types of contact with various groups of people. In each situation would you please tell me whether you would be very much in favor of it happening, somewhat in favor, neither in favor nor opposed to it happening, somewhat opposed, or very much opposed to it happening?

- a. Living in a neighborhood where half of your neighbors were Whites?
- b. What about in a neighborhood where half of your neighbors are Blacks?
- c. Jews?
- d. Hispanics or Latin Americans?
- e. Asian Americans?

Now I'm going to ask you about another type of contact with various groups of people. What about having a close relative marry a white person? Would you be very much in favor of it happening, somewhat in favor, neither in favor nor opposed to it happening, somewhat opposed, or very much opposed to it happening?

- b. What about having a close relative marry a Blacks person?
- c. A Jewish person?
- d. A Hispanic or Latin American person?
- e. An Asian American person?

Table 4

## Preferred Racial/Ethnic Composition of Neighborhood

(% of neighbors selected from each group)

Neighbors	All	All (Missing Whites Omitted)	Whites Only	Asns. Only	Blks. Only	Hsps. Only
Asian	11.6	13.4	12.7	35.6	12.5	15.8
Black	16.7	19.2	16.2	13.4	39.7	16.5
Hispanic	12.6	14.5	13.5	14.7	14.0	33.0
White	43.1	49.4	54.4	36.3	28.1	32.4
Doesn't Matter (VOL.)	3.1	3.5	3.2	0.00	5.8	2.3
Other (VOL.) <sup>a</sup>	0.9	----	----	----	----	----
Missing	12.0	----	----	----	----	----
	1398	1239	986	33	161	96

Source: 2000 GSS

Wording: Now I'd like you to imagine a neighborhood that had an ethnic and racial mix you personally would feel most comfortable in. Here is a blank neighborhood card, which depicts some houses that surround your own. Using the letters A for Asian, B for Black, H for Hispanic or Latin American, and W for White, please put a letter in each of these houses to represent your preferred neighborhood where you would most like to live. Please be sure to fill in all of the houses.

Note: Respondents were given a card showing their home (X) in the center and 14 neighboring homes as indicated below:

1	2	3	4	5
6	7	X	8	9
10	11	12	13	14

<sup>a</sup>Includes various miscellaneous mentions such as preferring no neighbors and mentions of other groups.

Table 5

Group Most/Least in Common With<sup>a</sup>

## A. Everyone

	Most	Least
Whites	20.3%	2.7%
Blacks	15.6	16.0
Jews	13.9	12.6
Hispanics	14.6	13.3
Asians	7.4	31.9
EQUAL IN COMMON WITH ALL	16.3	11.2
NOTHING IN COMMON WITH ANY	6.5	5.0
DK	5.4	7.3
	1371	1363

## B. Everyone, Self Mentions Removed

	Most	Least
Whites	7.8%	1.8%
Blacks	16.4	15.9
Jews	16.7	12.8
Hispanics	15.5	13.3
Asians	8.3	32.4
EQUAL IN COMMON WITH ALL	20.4	11.4
NOTHING IN COMMON WITH ANY	8.2	5.1
DK	6.7	7.4
	1098	1340

## C. By Race and Ethnicity

	Whites		Blacks		Hispanics	
	Most	Least	Most	Least	Most	Least
Whites	----	----	33.1	10.8	32.9	7.6
Blacks	15.4	17.5	----	----	15.9	21.3
Jews	17.0	10.8	3.1	15.1	0.5	25.1
Hispanics	13.4	14.3	19.0	11.0	----	----
Asians	7.4	32.3	3.1	38.5	7.5	27.9
EQUAL IN COMMON WITH ALL	16.2	10.9	13.8	10.8	13.6	10.9
NOTHING IN COMMON WITH ANY	6.4	4.7	8.3	7.4	2.3	0.9
DK, Named Own	24.3	9.4	19.6	6.5	27.2	6.2
	1081	1074	179	178	117	116

Table 5 (continued)

Source: 2000 GSS

Wordings: Of these groups - Whites, blacks, Jews, Hispanic and Latin Americans, Asian Americans, if you had to say, which one (other than your own) do you feel you have the most in common with?

Of these groups - Whites, blacks, Jews, Hispanic and Latin Americans, Asian Americans, if you had to say, which one (other than your own) do you feel you have the least in common with?

<sup>a</sup>Some people named their own group despite the instructions.

Table 6

Estimated Composition of US Population

	Mean % Estimated as ... <sup>a</sup>	% DK
A. Everyone		
Whites	60.0	3.6
Blacks/African Americans	31.3	3.9
Hispanics/Latin Americans	24.6	5.9
Jews	17.7	11.0
Asian Americans	17.7	7.3
American Indians	14.2	8.1
Racially Mixed	43.3	5.0

B. By Race and Ethnicity

	Mean % Estimated as... <sup>a</sup>				
	Not Hisp.	Hisp.	White	Black	Asian
White	59.1	58.2	59.1	57.7	65.7
Black	31.0	35.3*	30.1	39.1	29.8*
Hispanic	17.3	21.8*	16.8	24.0	13.8*
Jewish	17.3	21.8*	16.8	24.0	13.8*
Asian	16.8	27.5*	16.6	22.0	19.2*
American Indian	13.6	20.7*	13.4	17.9	16.4*
Mixed	42.7	49.3*	42.2	46.8	35.2*

Source: 2000 GSS

Wordings: Just your best guess, what percentage of the United States population is each group?  
 PERCENTAGES DO NOT HAVE TO ADD TO 100% AND THE LISTED GROUPS MAY OVERLAP. ENCOURAGE ESTIMATES FOR ALL GROUPS, BUT DISCOURAGE RESPONDENTS REVISING THEIR ESTIMATES.

- a. Whites
- b. Blacks/African Americans
- c. Jews
- d. Hispanics or Latin Americans
- e. Asian Americans
- f. American Indians

People may come from one racial group such as being White, Black/African American/Hispanic, Asian, or American Indian or



Table 6 (continued)

people may come from two or more of these groups. What percent of the people in the United States today do you think have parents or their ancestors from two or more racial groups?

<sup>a</sup>With DKs excluded.

Table 7

Estimated Composition of Local Population

	Mean % Estimated as ... <sup>a</sup>	% DK
Whites	67.5	2.4
Blacks/African Americans	19.5	3.0
Hispanics/Latin Americans	14.2	4.6
Jews	7.1	10.4
Asian Americans	7.3	5.5
American Indians	4.8	6.7

Source: 2000 GSS

Wording: Just your best guess, what percentage of the people who live in your local community is in each group?

- a. Whites
- b. Blacks/African Americans
- c. Jews
- d. Hispanics or Latin Americans
- e. Asian Americans
- f. American Indians

Table 8

## Perceptions about Changes in Population Composition

## A. Expected Future Changes

	Increase a Lot	Increase a Little	Stay the Same	Decrease a Little	Decrease a Lot	DK
Hispanics	45.7%	38.5	8.4	2.0	0.9	4.5
Blacks	24.8%	45.8	21.8	4.1	0.8	2.6
Asians	19.4%	45.3	24.3	2.6	1.0	7.4
Whites	7.8%	29.1	33.7	21.6	5.5	2.3
Jews	3.6%	24.7	49.8	11.4	1.7	8.7

## B. Expected Future Changes by Race and Ethnicity, % Increasing

	Not Hisp.	Hisp.	White	Black	Asian
Hispanics	83.8	88.5	85.6	72.8	88.6*
Blacks	70.8	68.5	72.3	67.4	65.7*
Asians	64.7	65.8	65.0	58.7	85.7*
Whites	37.1	35.2	36.3	42.3	34.3*
Jews	28.3	27.8	27.3	38.1	20.0*

## C. Assessment of Desirability of Future Changes

Very Good	3.4%
Good	21.8
Neither Good Nor Bad	53.0
Bad	14.6
Very Bad	3.8
DK	3.4

## D. Desirability of Changes by Race and Ethnicity

	Not Hisp.	Hisp.	White	Black	Asian
% Good+	23.0	44.5	21.7	32.7	40.0
% Neutral	54.4	42.5 *	54.4	51.5	50.0 *
% Bad+	18.6	9.3	20.4	9.6	1.4
% DK	4.0	3.7	3.5	6.2	8.6

Source: 2000 GSS

Wordings: In the next 25 years, which of these groups do you think will increase their share of the population by a lot, which will increase by a little, which will stay the same, which will

Table 8 (continued)

decrease by a little, and which will decrease by a lot?

- a. Whites
- b. Blacks
- c. Jews
- d. Hispanics or Latin Americans
- e. Asian Americans

When you think of these changes in the racial and ethnic make-up of the country in the next 25 years, do you think they will be a very good thing for the country, a good thing, neither good nor bad, a bad thing, or a very bad thing?

Table 9

Knowing and Contact with Various Groups

(Ask of Non-group Members)

	% Knowing Personally	From School	%Knowing... From Commun.	As Relative	From Work <sup>a</sup>	%Feel Close to
Whites	93.0	58.6	73.8	43.8	86.8	67.0
Blacks	86.3	41.7	52.0	9.1	62.2	46.0
Jews	58.3	27.0	26.7	9.4	29.8	27.7
Hispanics	73.0	31.9	41.5	11.3	52.7	35.3
Asians	59.7	22.9	29.0	7.0	36.0	24.6

Source: 2000 GSS

Wording: Do you personally know any ...

- a. Whites
- b. Blacks
- c. Jews
- d. Hispanics or Latin Americans
- e. Asian Americans

Note: Whites were asked parts b-e, Blacks were asked parts a, c-e, Jews were asked parts a,b,d,e, Hispanics were asked parts a-c, e, and Asians were asked parts a-d.

Now I'm going to ask some questions about these people you personally know.

- a. Do you know any of these Whites/Blacks/Jews/Hispanics/Asians from when you went to school or college?
- b. Do you know any of these Whites/Blacks/Jews/Hispanics/Asians from the community where you now live?
- c. Do you know any of these Whites/Blacks/Jews/Hispanics/Asians as a relative?
- d. IF EMPLOYED: Do you know any of these Whites/Blacks/Jews/Hispanics/Asians from the place where you work?
- e. Are any of these Whites/Blacks/Jews/Hispanics/Asians people you feel close to?

Note: People asked about groups they did not belong to as in screening question on knowing group members.

<sup>a</sup>Based on employed people only.

Table 10

Attitudes towards Language Use and Bilingualism

(% Supporting Pro-English or Anti-Bilingual Position)

A. Language Use Policies

English Unites Americans	73.6%
For English as Official Language	73.2%
Ballots Should Not be in Other Languages	34.1%
English Threatened if Immigrants Use Other Languages	31.2%
Abolish Bilingual Education	21.8%

B. Value of Knowing Second Language

Children Should Learn Second Language in School	73.7%
Learning Foreign Language as Valuable as Math or Science	62.4%

1389-1394

C. Language Issues by Race and Ethnicity

	Not Hisp.	Hisp	White	Black	Asian
English Unites Americans	74.8	60.2*	73.6	77.3	91.6*
For English as Official Language	75.8	44.8*	75.1	70.7	74.6*
Ballots Should Not be in Other Languages	35.3	21.3*	36.6	23.3	21.1*
English Threatened if Immigrants Use Other Langs.	32.1	21.8*	32.9	30.9	8.4*
Abolish Bilingual Education	22.9	10.2*	24.0	15.5	7.0*

Value of Knowing Second Language

Children Should Learn Second Language in School (Dis.)	25.4	12.0*	26.1	20.0	18.3*
Learning Foreign Lang. as Valuable as Math or Sci. (Disagree)	36.7	17.8*	38.1	28.7	18.3*
	1271	117	1092	184	39

Source: 2000 GSS

Wordings: Do you favor or oppose making English the official language of the United States?  
Now please tell us whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with each of the following:

Table 10 (continued)

- a. Children in the US should learn a second language fluently before they finish high school.
- B. Bilingual education programs should be eliminated in American schools.
- C. Speaking English as the common national language is what unites all Americans.
- D. Learning a foreign language is as valuable as learning math and science in school.
- E. English will be threatened if other languages are frequently used in large immigrant communities in the US.
- F. Election ballots should be printed in other languages in areas where lots of people don't speak English.

Table 11

Foreign Language Use and Exposure

A. Use

Speaks No Foreign Language 73.3%

Foreign Languages Spoken<sup>a</sup>

Spanish	14.9
Other European Languages	9.4
Asian Languages	3.7
Middle Eastern Languages	1.2
Other Languages	1.1
Not Specified	0.6

Fluency in Foreign Language

Doesn't Speak Foreign Language	73.3%
Poor/Hardly at All	3.0
Not Well	6.4
Well	6.3
Very Well	10.0
Missing	1.1

Use of Foreign Language

Doesn't Speak Foreign Language	73.3%
Never	5.4
Less than Weekly	5.0
Once a Week	1.7
Several Times a Week	2.4
Once a Day	1.6
Several Times a Day	9.9
Missing	0.7

Source of Foreign Language (Speakers Only)

Childhood Home	50.4%
School	32.6
Elsewhere	15.7
Missing	1.3

367



Table 11 (continued)

B. Exposure to Foreign Language

	Local Community	At Work
Never	26.5%	33.1%
Less than Once a Week	18.3	9.9
Once a Week	10.5	8.6
Several Times a Week	18.8	13.4
Once a Day	6.4	11.6
Several Times a Day	18.7	22.6
DK	0.8	0.8
	1383	936

Workers Only:

Community/Work Combined

Both Never	13.6
Less than Once a Week	12.2
Once a Week	10.4
Several Times a Week	16.8
Once a Day	13.0
Several Times a Day	33.9
	940

C. Language Use by Race and Ethnicity

	Not Hispanic		White Black Asian		
Speaks No Foreign Language	78.7	14.4*	77.1	87.5	9.9*
Foreign Languages Spoken <sup>a</sup>					
Spanish	7.3	75.9	10.7	6.3	2.8
Other European Languages	9.1	2.8	9.5	4.7	1.4
Asian Languages	2.5	7.0*	0.5	0.0	83.1*
Middle Eastern Languages	0.8	0.0	0.5	0.6	0.0
Other Languages	0.6	0.0	0.3	0.9	1.4
Not Specified	0.6	0.0	0.7	0.0	1.4

Fluency in Foreign Language

Doesn't Speak Foreign Language	78.7	14.4	77.1	87.5	9.9
Poor/Hardly at All	3.1	2.3	3.5	0.9	0.0
Not Well	6.7	3.2*	6.9	2.7	0.0*
Well	5.2	18.5	5.8	4.8	15.5
Very Well	5.5	59.3	5.5	3.2	71.8
Missing	0.9	2.3	1.1	0.9	2.8

Table 11 (continued)

Use of Foreign Language	Not		White	Black	Asian
	Hisp.	Hisp			
Doesn't Speak Foreign Language	78.7	14.4	77.1	87.5	9.9
Never	5.6	3.2	5.9	3.3	1.4
Less than Weekly	5.1	3.6	5.5	2.7	0.0
Once a Week	1.5	3.7*	1.8	0.9	0.0
Several Times a Week	1.8	8.8	1.7	2.4	23.9
Once a Day	1.3	4.6	1.8	0.0	0.0
Several Times a Day	5.1	61.6	5.1	3.2	64.8
Missing	0.8	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0
Source of Foreign Language (Speakers Only)					
Childhood Home	36.0	89.7	39.3	26.3	90.6
School	44.4	3.8*	41.7	52.2	9.4
Elsewhere	19.6	6.5	19.0	21.5	0.0
Exposure to Foreign Language					
Local Community:					
Never	28.2	8.3	26.3	39.4	12.7
Less than Once a Week	19.3	7.4	20.9	10.2	8.5
Once a Week	10.7	8.3	11.2	7.5	11.3
Several Times a Week	19.1	16.2*	19.1	17.4	29.6*
Once a Day	6.6	4.6	6.5	5.4	12.7
Several Times a Day	15.3	55.1	15.4	17.7	25.4
DK	0.9	0.0	0.6	2.4	0.0
At Work:					
Never	35.3	12.7	36.3	29.6	3.3
Less than Once a Week	10.4	5.2	11.2	4.9	8.2
Once a Week	9.0	5.2	8.1	11.2	16.4
Several Times a Week	12.9	17.9*	12.0	14.1	16.4*
Once a Day	11.8	9.8	12.0	13.5	4.9
Several Times a Day	19.6	49.1	19.5	26.2	50.8
DK	0.9	0.0	0.9	0.5	0.0

Source: 2000 GSS

Wordings: Can you speak a language other than English?

If "YES":

What other languages do you speak?

How well do you speak that language? Very well, Well, Not Well, Poorly, Hardly at All.

Table 11 (continued)

IF SPEAKS 2 OR MORE, ASK ONLY OF THE MOST FLUENT LANGUAGE.  
How often do you use that language in everyday life? Never,  
Less than Once a Week, Once a Week, Several Times a Week,  
Once a Day, Several Times a Day

Is that a Language that you first learned as a child at  
home, in school, or is it one you learned elsewhere?

How often do you hear languages other than English spoken in the  
local community where you live? Never, Less Than Once a Week,  
Once a Week, Several Times a Week, Once a Day, Several Times a  
Day

IF WORKING:

How often do you hear languages other than English spoken in the  
place you work? Never, Less Than Once a Week, Once a Week,  
Several Times a Week, Once a Day, Several Times a Day

<sup>a</sup>Totals more than 26.7% because some people speak more than one  
foreign language.

Table 12

Support for Level of Immigration

	Increased a Lot	Increased a Little	Left Same as Now	Decreased a Little	Decreased a Lot	DK
A. Level of Immigration						
Total Level of Immigration	3.8	5.3	43.8	20.8	21.3	5.0
Level from...						
Latin America	3.0	5.6	44.3	20.7	21.1	5.3
Asia	2.5	5.6	45.4	19.4	20.7	6.4
Europe	2.9	6.4	51.4	17.1	16.1	6.1
			1393			

B. Level by Race and Ethnicity

	Not Hispanic	Hispanic	White	Black	Asian
Total Level of Immigration (Decrease)	43.4	29.2*	44.6	37.0	11.3*
Level from...					
Latin America	43.3	26.4*	44.2	37.0	29.6*
Asia	41.3	26.9*	42.3	38.5	11.2*
Europe	34.4	20.8*	34.7	34.3	5.6*

Source: 2000 GSS

Table 12 (continued)

Wordings: Do you think the number of immigrants from foreign countries who get permitted to come to the United States to live should be increased a lot, increased a little, left the same as now, decreased a little, or decreased a lot?

What about the number of immigrants from Latin America (that is Spanish-speaking countries in the Americas) -- should it be increased a lot, increased a little, left the same as now, decreased a little, or decreased a lot?

What about the number of immigrants from Asia (should it be increased a lot, increased a little, left the same as now, decreased a little, or decreased a lot?)

What about the number of immigrants from Europe (should it be increased a lot, increased a little, left the same as now, decreased a little, or decreased a lot?)

Table 13

Perceived Impact of Immigrants on Country

	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not too Likely	Not Likely at All	DK
A. Overall Perceived Impact					
Making the country more open to new ideas and cultures	26.2%	47.2	17.7	5.5	3.3
Higher crime rates	23.8%	46.3	21.8	3.6	4.5
People born in the US losing their jobs	24.7%	32.5	29.8	10.0	3.0
Making it harder to keep the country united	18.4%	34.9	33.4	9.6	3.6
Higher economic growth	11.1%	36.8	36.4	10.3	5.4

1389-1391

B. Perceived Impact by Race and Ethnicity

	Not Hisp.	Hisp	White	Black	Asian
Making the country more open to new ideas and cultures (Not Likely)	23.7	17.0*	23.9	20.4	12.7*
Higher crime rates (Likely)	71.2	58.5*	71.7	68.1	82.4*
People born in the US losing their jobs (Likely)	58.9	39.6*	59.0	59.5	29.5*
Making it harder to keep the country united (Likely)	54.5	40.0*	54.7	54.7	18.3*
Higher economic growth (Not Likely)	49.3	18.6*	50.2	41.1	15.5*

Source: 2000 GSS

Wording: What do you think will happen as a result of more immigrants coming to this country? Is each of the following possible results very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely, or not likely at all?

- a. Higher economic growth
- b. higher crime rates
- c. making the country more open to new ideas and cultures
- d. making it harder to keep the country united
- e. people born in the US losing their jobs

Table 14

Support for Pluralism vs. Assimilation

A. Overall Support for Pluralism vs. Assimilation

1 - Groups Maintain Distinct Cultures	8.2%
2 -	9.3
3 -	12.7
4 -	31.8
5 -	13.8
6 -	10.7
7 - Blend into Larger Society	9.5
DK	4.1
	1387

B. Support by Race and Ethnicity

	Not Hispanic	Hispanic	White	Black	Asian
Groups Should Blend In	35.2	21.2*	35.1	32.7	30.9*

Source: 2000 GSS

Wording: Some people say that it is better for America if different racial and ethnic groups maintain their distinct cultures. Others say that it is better if groups change so that they blend into the larger society as in the idea of a melting pot. Here is a card with a scale from 1 to 7. Think of a score of 1 as meaning that racial and ethnic groups should maintain their distinct cultures and a score of 7 as meaning that groups should change so that they blend into the larger society. What score between 1 and 7 comes closest to the way you feel?

Table 15

## Intergroup Attitudes and Contact by Gender

	Men	Women
A. Made Important Contributions		
English	74.4	68.7*
Italians	51.7	45.6*
Chinese	37.8	39.2*
Jews	55.2	50.6*
Blacks	49.3	47.3*
Mexicans	27.9	28.1*
Vietnamese	16.7	19.3*
Cubans	14.6	17.5*
Irish	51.7	44.3*
Puerto Ricans	15.8	20.4*
Japanese	44.1	36.9*
Muslims	16.0	17.4*
B. Language Use Policies		
English Unites Americans	73.7	73.5
For English as Official Language	73.0	73.4
Ballots Should Not be in Other Languages	36.1	32.4
English Threatened if Immigrants Use		
Other Languages	34.6	28.5*
Abolish Bilingual Education	25.7	18.6*
Value of Knowing Second Language		
Children Should Learn Second Language		
in School (Disagree)	27.6	21.7*
Learning Foreign Language as Valuable		
as Math or Science (Disagree)	36.4	34.3
C. Immigration and Assimilation		
Total Level of Immigration (Decrease)	43.0	41.4
Level from...		
Latin America	42.8	41.0
Asia	40.1	40.2
Europe	33.2	33.2
Making the country more		
open to new ideas and		
cultures (Not Likely)	23.8	22.8
Higher crime rates (Likely)	70.9	69.4
People born in the US		
losing their jobs (Likely)	56.0	58.1
Making it harder to keep		
the country united (Likely)	52.1	54.3



Table 15 (continued)

	Men	Women
Higher economic growth (Not Likely)	45.8	47.4
Groups Should Blend In	35.7	32.5
D. Changes in Population		
Group's Population Share Will Increase		
Whites	35.0	38.4*
Blacks	74.2	67.8*
Jews	30.1	26.9*
Hispanics	88.0	81.1*
Asians	69.6	60.9*
Population Change is Bad Thing	20.8	16.7*
E. Population Share Estimates		
United States		
White	59.2	58.8
Black	27.3	34.7*
Hispanic	19.5	28.8*
Jewish	13.9	21.0*
Asian	13.3	21.5*
American Indian	10.5	17.4*
Mixed	39.6	46.3*
Local Community		
White	69.4	65.9*
Black	17.1	21.4*
Hispanic	12.7	15.4*
Jewish	6.2	7.8*
Asian	5.6	8.6*
American Indian	3.5	6.0*
F. Ethnic Images		
Rich - Poor		
Blacks	-1.60	-1.53
Jews	0.34	0.20
Hispanics	-1.57	-1.57
Asians	-0.48	-0.42
Hard Working Lazy		
Blacks	-0.85	-0.80
Jews	0.20	0.23
Hispanics	-0.15	-0.40*
Asians	0.29	0.19

Table 15 (continued)

	Men	Women
Violence-Prone/Not		
Blacks	-0.72	-0.59
Jews	0.54	0.45
Hispanics	-0.45	-0.37
Asians	0.20	0.23
Intelligent/Not		
Blacks	-0.71	-0.68
Jews	0.04	0.03
Hispanics	-0.75	-0.72
Asians	-0.07	-0.07
Committed to Strong Families/Not		
Blacks	-0.86	-0.49*
Jews	0.43	0.50
Hispanics	0.07	0.23
Asians	0.37	0.41
Committed to Fair & Equal Treatment/Not		
Blacks	-0.42	-0.52
Jews	0.05	-0.02
Hispanics	-0.25	-0.33
Asians	-0.15	-0.17
G. Social Distance		
Whites		
Object to Neighbors	6.8	5.4*
Object to Rel. Marrying	10.8	7.1
Blacks		
Object to Neighbors	30.8	28.7*
Object to Rel. Marrying	32.7	31.4
Jews		
Object to Neighbors	12.2	7.5*
Object to Rel. Marrying	9.0	9.5
Hispanics		
Object to Neighbors	29.5	24.1*
Object to Rel. Marrying	22.3	19.8
Asians		
Object to Neighbors	20.5	16.3*
Object to Rel. Marrying	21.1	19.9

Table 15 (continued)

	Men	Women
H. Preferred Neighborhood		
All:		
Whites	51.0	48.2
Blacks	18.4	19.9
Hispanics	14.2	14.7
Asians	13.0	13.8
Doesn't Matter	3.4	3.5
Whites Only:		
Whites	55.6	53.4
Blacks	15.8	16.5
Hispanics	13.3	13.7
Asians	12.2	13.1
Doesn't Matter	3.1	3.3
I. Most/Least in Common With (Whites Only)		
Most in Common:		
Whites	15.9	19.5
Blacks	16.2	14.7
Jews	17.7	16.4
Hispanics	13.3	13.4
Asians	9.6	5.6
EQUAL IN COMMON WITH ALL	13.0	18.8
NOTHING IN COMMON WITH ANY	7.2	5.8
DK	7.2	5.9
		*
Least in Common:		
Whites	0.7	1.8
Blacks	19.6	15.8
Jews	11.2	10.5
Hispanics	15.4	13.3
Asians	32.9	31.8
EQUAL IN COMMON WITH ALL	9.1	12.5
NOTHING IN COMMON WITH ANY	4.3	5.0
DK	6.8	9.2
J. Intergroup Contact		
Out Group Members Knowing...		
Whites	94.3	92.1
Blacks	89.9	83.4*
Jews	61.1	56.1
Hispanics	78.8	68.3*
Asians	62.5	57.4

Table 15 (continued)

	Men	Women
Out Group Members Knowing from School		
Whites	54.9	61.2
Blacks	43.7	39.9
Jews	29.2	25.3
Hispanics	31.8	31.9
Asians	25.8	20.6
Out Group Members Knowing from Local Community		
Whites	78.2	70.8
Blacks	57.0	47.8*
Jews	28.8	25.1
Hispanics	44.9	38.7
Asians	29.3	28.8
Out group Members Knowing as Relative		
Whites	44.4	43.4
Blacks	6.4	11.4*
Jews	9.1	9.7
Hispanics	11.4	11.2
Asians	7.6	6.4
Out Group Members Knowing from Work		
Whites	83.0	90.0
Blacks	62.2	62.2
Jews	28.3	31.3
Hispanics	54.1	51.2
Asians	35.6	36.4
Out group Members Close to...		
Whites	71.5	63.9
Blacks	46.6	45.5
Jews	27.2	28.1
Hispanics	36.2	34.5
Asians	25.4	24.0

Table 16

## Intergroup Attitudes and Contact by Age

	LT	30	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+
<b>A. Made Important Contributions</b>						
English	71.5	72.7	69.3	73.2	69.1	
Italians	40.4	45.0	50.6	56.2	50.9*	
Chinese	41.6	40.6	38.1	42.5	25.3*	
Jews	40.4	50.1	56.1	60.6	59.5*	
Blacks	59.4	50.5	47.4	47.1	28.8*	
Mexicans	37.1	29.9	28.0	27.2	11.8*	
Vietnamese	20.9	19.3	18.8	18.1	10.5*	
Cubans	17.3	16.5	17.6	18.4	8.9*	
Irish	38.6	44.3	48.5	55.6	54.2*	
Puerto Ricans	20.7	19.2	19.5	19.3	9.8*	
Japanese	47.3	43.9	41.4	36.5	25.3*	
Muslims	21.6	18.9	17.1	15.2	7.5*	
<b>B. Language Use Policies</b>						
English Unites Americans	66.2	71.5	73.7	76.3	85.0*	
For English as Official Language	65.1	69.7	76.9	72.3	86.8*	
Ballots Should Not be in						
Other Languages	32.5	27.0	36.9	32.2	44.7*	
English Threatened if Immigrants Use						
Other Languages	27.6	26.1	29.8	30.9	47.7*	
Abolish Bilingual Education	12.5	20.1	23.5	22.6	35.9*	
<b>Value of Knowing Second Language</b>						
Children Should Learn Second Language						
in School (Disagree)	27.4	23.0	23.6	22.3	25.0	
Learning Foreign Language as Valuable						
as Math or Science (Disagree)	32.7	34.9	32.7	36.6	42.1*	
<b>C. Immigration and Assimilation</b>						
Total Level of						
Immigration (Decrease)	35.0	46.6	42.6	42.1	45.5*	
Level from...						
Latin America	34.1	44.8	42.2	43.1	47.3*	
Asia	31.2	43.5	41.0	41.8	45.6*	
Europe	26.6	36.4	33.3	36.3	34.7	
Making the country more						
open to new ideas and						
cultures (Not Likely)	21.2	24.2	18.2	25.2	30.7*	
Higher crime rates (Likely)	72.3	73.1	65.6	66.3	73.8	

Table 16 (continued)

	LT 30	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+
People born in the US					
losing their jobs (Likely)	51.1	56.7	56.4	58.4	66.6*
Making it harder to keep					
the country united (Likely)	49.8	53.5	52.5	52.1	61.3*
Higher economic growth (Not Likely)	35.7	42.1	48.5	49.4	64.4*
Groups Should Blend In	28.6	33.4	31.7	34.6	46.6*
D. Changes in Population					
Group's Population Share					
Will Increase					
Whites	40.5	37.9	35.3	39.7	28.5*
Blacks	67.4	66.4	69.7	76.9	75.2*
Jews	29.6	27.7	27.0	30.4	26.8
Hispanics	85.3	84.4	86.1	85.4	77.0*
Asians	63.3	64.3	69.4	68.3	54.7*
Population Change is Bad Thing	14.3	17.0	16.2	19.4	32.2*
E. Population Share Estimates					
United States					
White	56.1	58.8	60.0	59.5	61.9*
Black	31.6	33.1	30.8	29.4	31.2
Hispanic	24.7	26.1	24.3	22.9	24.3
Jewish	16.2	18.2	17.6	17.3	20.1
Asian	18.1	19.0	16.8	16.3	18.3
American Indian	14.4	14.5	14.4	13.1	14.8
Mixed	49.6	45.4	42.9	35.7	39.9*
Local Community					
White	63.9	64.0	68.7	69.2	74.5*
Black	21.6	21.1	18.7	18.4	16.1
Hispanic	17.0	16.1	13.7	11.6	10.3*
Jewish	8.0	6.6	6.6	7.3	6.8
Asian	8.5	8.6	6.7	6.1	5.6*
American Indian	7.6	4.6	4.9	2.8	3.2*
F. Ethnic Images					
Rich - Poor					
Blacks	-1.44	-1.51	-1.76	-1.58	-1.46
Jews	-0.13	0.25	0.24	0.48	0.67*
Hispanics	-1.62	-1.52	-1.71	-1.54	-1.31
Asians	-0.38	-0.36	-0.47	-0.48	-0.63

Table 16 (continued)

	LT	30	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+
Hard Working Lazy						
Blacks	-0.54	-0.79	-0.83	-0.77	-1.39*	
Jews	0.12	0.13	0.19	0.31	0.45*	
Hispanics	0.04	-0.25	-0.28	-0.31	-0.95*	
Asians	0.27	0.19	0.30	0.37	-0.13*	
Violence-Prone/Not						
Blacks	-0.76	-0.51	-0.46	-0.67	-0.96*	
Jews	0.52	0.58	0.59	0.44	0.19*	
Hispanics	-0.49	-0.34	-0.27	-0.41	-0.65*	
Asians	0.34	0.30	0.22	0.24	-0.26*	
Intelligent/Not						
Blacks	-0.50	-0.68	-0.54	-0.76	-1.22*	
Jews	-0.11	-0.03	0.00	0.18	0.20*	
Hispanics	-0.73	-0.75	-0.55	-0.75	-1.04*	
Asians	0.03	-0.06	0.06	-0.12	-0.46*	
Committed to Strong Families/Not						
Blacks	-0.29	-0.47	-0.66	-0.83	-1.27*	
Jews	0.45	0.47	0.50	0.51	0.38	
Hispanics	0.47	0.29	0.17	0.02	-0.50*	
Asians	0.51	0.35	0.51	0.36	0.04*	
Committed to Fair & Equal Treatment/Not						
Blacks	-0.26	-0.38	-0.49	-0.56	-0.83*	
Jews	0.08	-0.02	0.00	0.02	-0.02	
Hispanics	-0.13	-0.21	-0.30	-0.36	-0.65*	
Asians	-0.03	-0.06	-0.18	-0.24	-0.43	
G. Social Distance						
Whites						
Object to Neighbors	7.9	4.0	5.3	7.4	4.4	
Object to Rel. Marrying	6.6	7.2	8.7	12.7	8.8	
Blacks						
Object to Neighbors	23.2	24.3	26.5	35.3	44.1*	
Object to Rel. Marrying	15.9	23.7	27.6	46.3	57.1*	
Jews						
Object to Neighbors	10.3	6.5	7.5	13.1	11.0	
Object to Rel. Marrying	8.8	11.0	12.3	15.6	17.6*	
Hispanics						
Object to Neighbors	26.4	23.1	23.5	30.6	30.7*	
Object to Rel. Marrying	13.6	15.1	16.3	31.7	32.8*	
Asians						
Object to Neighbors	17.7	11.1	17.0	21.8	26.1*	
Object to Rel. Marrying	14.0	15.3	16.8	28.9	33.3*	

Table 16 (continued)

	LT 30	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+
H. Preferred Neighborhood					
All:					
Whites	43.7	47.0	47.4	51.3	63.6*
Blacks	22.9	19.8	19.2	18.1	14.1*
Hispanics	17.2	16.1	15.4	12.4	8.6*
Asians	14.6	14.6	14.1	13.3	8.9*
Doesn't Matter	1.5	2.5	4.0	5.0	4.9
Whites Only:					
Whites	48.0	51.5	52.1	56.5	69.2*
Blacks	20.1	16.9	16.6	15.0	10.3*
Hispanics	15.5	14.8	14.8	11.6	9.0*
Asians	14.4	13.6	13.6	12.2	8.2*
Doesn't Matter	2.1	3.1	2.8	4.8	3.4
I. Most/Least in Common With (White Only)					
Most in Common:					
Whites	15.6	20.1	14.7	17.5	23.4
Blacks	24.4	14.7	13.7	13.3	9.5
Jews	11.0	16.2	17.9	21.5	18.6
Hispanics	15.2	17.4	13.7	12.2	6.1
Asians	9.3	6.3	6.8	6.9	8.1
EQUAL IN COMMON WITH ALL	16.6	13.1	20.9	15.4	12.9
NOTHING IN COMMON WITH ANY	3.2	5.3	6.8	5.3	13.2
DK	4.6	6.8	5.3	8.0	8.1
			*		
Least in Common:					
Whites	2.0	2.0	0.6	1.2	0.3
Blacks	15.5	11.7	17.1	21.1	25.3
Jews	16.0	13.2	11.5	4.8	7.3
Hispanics	18.2	14.7	13.6	17.1	5.2
Asians	32.7	31.5	34.3	34.9	26.6
EQUAL IN COMMON WITH ALL	8.6	12.2	14.3	9.9	7.6
NOTHING IN COMMON WITH ANY	1.7	5.6	2.8	4.5	10.7
DK	5.4	9.1	5.8	6.4	17.0
			*		
J. Intergroup Contact					
Out Group Members Knowing					
Whites	93.0	94.0	96.7	90.6	86.4
Blacks	91.8	89.7	93.0	83.5	65.7*
Jews	51.9	49.8	66.1	65.6	59.1*
Hispanics	78.5	79.7	77.7	71.5	50.4*
Asians	66.4	59.4	65.0	60.9	37.7*



Table 16 (continued)

	LT	30	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+
Out Group Members Knowing from School						
Whites	73.8	61.0	56.6	45.0	26.8*	
Blacks	68.9	49.4	43.7	22.1	10.6*	
Jews	35.2	25.6	27.7	21.1	22.4*	
Hispanics	55.9	40.4	32.1	14.8	8.2*	
Asians	44.5	22.5	22.4	11.5	5.7*	
Out Group Members Knowing from Local Community						
Whites	71.9	78.4	77.9	68.0	68.3	
Blacks	60.8	51.4	54.1	46.8	42.9*	
Jews	20.3	22.7	29.3	32.5	31.2*	
Hispanics	48.3	42.0	45.1	38.5	28.7*	
Asians	33.5	26.8	33.5	28.5	18.1*	
Out group Members Knowing as Relative						
Whites	49.1	44.4	38.5	48.0	26.8	
Blacks	11.2	10.8	7.3	10.5	4.8	
Jews	5.4	7.9	11.3	11.7	12.2	
Hispanics	9.5	16.2	12.4	11.1	6.0*	
Asians	6.1	9.4	6.3	7.8	3.9	
Out Group Members Knowing from Work						
Whites	82.0	85.2	96.7	90.5	45.5*	
Blacks	61.0	67.0	64.8	57.7	38.9	
Jews	23.6	21.1	36.9	40.6	11.1*	
Hispanics	49.9	56.8	52.8	55.8	23.6*	
Asians	32.4	32.3	40.9	39.6	16.7	
Out group Members Close to...						
Whites	56.5	70.4	74.1	72.3	63.4	
Blacks	52.2	47.4	49.3	47.9	25.5*	
Jews	23.6	20.9	35.7	33.1	23.4*	
Hispanics	37.5	43.5	39.3	36.1	12.4*	
Asians	31.0	25.4	28.9	19.7	11.0*	

Table 17

## Intergroup Attitudes and Contact by Education

	Not High School Grad	High School Grad	Some Col.	Col. Grad
<b>A. Made Important Contributions</b>				
English	58.3	65.3	73.5	83.1*
Italians	32.0	42.3	50.9	61.7*
Chinese	24.0	33.4	41.1	50.0*
Jews	33.8	47.5	52.9	69.8*
Blacks	30.8	41.2	53.9	59.8*
Mexicans	18.0	21.9	30.5	37.9*
Vietnamese	13.2	13.7	18.1	26.2*
Cubans	11.7	11.4	15.2	26.0*
Irish	36.5	41.0	48.9	60.5*
Puerto Ricans	16.3	14.8	17.5	24.3*
Japanese	28.0	33.1	43.8	50.7*
Muslims	11.3	13.7	16.5	23.7*
<b>B. Language Use Policies</b>				
English Unites Americans For English as Official Language Ballots Should Not be in Other Languages	73.6	79.2	73.9	65.8*
English Threatened if Immigrants Use Other Languages	64.3	75.4	75.6	72.9*
Abolish Bilingual Education	29.2	36.6	37.7	29.3*
Other Languages	33.2	39.8	29.7	21.5*
Other Languages	26.5	20.6	20.2	22.1*
<b>Value of Knowing Second Language</b>				
Children Should Learn Second Language in School (Disagree)	23.9	28.7	25.2	17.9*
Learning Foreign Language as Valuable as Math or Science (Disagree)	36.3	41.0	33.9	28.3*
<b>C. Immigration and Assimilation</b>				
Total Level of Immigration (Decrease) Level from...	47.2	49.2	42.7	29.3*
Latin America	47.2	48.7	41.7	29.9*
Asia	45.4	49.7	38.8	26.2*
Europe	36.0	40.4	32.7	22.9*

Table 17 (continued)

	Not High School Grad	High School Grad	Some Col.	Col. Grad
Making the country more open to new ideas and cultures (Not Likely)	28.2	25.9	26.3	12.9*
Higher crime rates (Likely)	75.7	77.3	71.5	56.4*
People born in the US losing their jobs (Likely)	66.0	69.2	55.5	39.8*
Making it harder to keep the country united (Likely)	60.5	59.0	53.9	41.4*
Higher economic growth (Not Likely)	49.0	51.6	47.1	39.5*
Groups Should Blend In	34.4	33.4	35.3	32.8*
D. Changes in Population				
Group's Population Share Will Increase				
Whites	39.1	45.2	39.4	22.8*
Blacks	70.1	73.8	72.0	65.4*
Jews	27.4	34.4	30.0	19.8*
Hispanics	71.8	83.5	84.8	92.0*
Asians	46.5	64.4	66.2	74.6*
Population Change is Bad Thing	27.8	21.3	16.8	12.0*
E. Population Share Estimates				
United States				
White	58.3	58.6	58.0	61.1*
Black	37.9	34.0	31.0	24.7*
Hispanic	30.7	25.2	24.2	20.8*
Jewish	22.2	19.8	17.3	13.6*
Asian	22.0	19.8	17.5	13.3*
American Indian	22.1	16.0	13.1	9.5*
Mixed	47.3	43.5	44.3	39.8*
Local Community				
White	60.5	67.5	66.4	73.0*
Black	28.4	19.5	19.5	14.2*
Hispanic	16.5	13.9	15.2	12.0*
Jewish	6.1	6.1	6.6	9.3*
Asian	6.6	7.2	7.5	7.4
American Indian	6.1	5.2	4.9	3.7

Table 17 (continued)

	Not High School Grad	High School Grad	Some Col.	Col. Grad
F. Ethnic Images				
Rich - Poor				
Blacks	-1.37	-1.50	-1.66	-1.62
Jews	0.10	0.33	0.22	0.31
Hispanics	-1.22	-1.51	-1.74	-1.61*
Asians	-0.47	-0.39	-0.59	-0.32
Hard Working Lazy				
Blacks	-1.23	-0.91	-0.72	-0.57*
Jews	0.01	0.09	0.21	0.47*
Hispanics	-0.42	-0.43	-0.25	-0.10*
Asians	-0.10	0.05	0.22	0.63*
Violence-Prone/Not				
Blacks	-0.91	-0.55	-0.77	-0.46*
Jews	0.56	0.45	0.54	0.45
Hispanics	-0.55	-0.38	-0.52	-0.24*
Asians	0.16	0.17	0.22	0.29
Intelligent/Not				
Blacks	-1.06	-0.75	-0.61	-0.50*
Jews	-0.08	-0.01	0.02	0.15*
Hispanics	-0.85	-0.88	-0.77	-0.46*
Asians	-0.52	-0.22	0.02	0.22*
Committed to Strong Families/Not				
Blacks	-1.01	-0.68	-0.61	-0.47*
Jews	0.15	0.39	0.48	0.71*
Hispanics	-0.33	-0.08	0.30	0.50*
Asians	-0.13	0.16	0.51	0.77*
Committed to Fair & Equal Treatment/Not				
Blacks	-0.48	-0.67	-0.38	-0.32
Jews	0.08	-0.17	0.05	0.15*
Hispanics	-0.49	-0.52	-0.17	-0.06*
Asians	-0.14	-0.35	-0.13	+0.04*
G. Social Distance				
Whites				
Object to Neighbors	7.5	6.3	7.6	10.8
Object to Rel. Marrying	9.1	9.0	7.1	11.8

Table 17 (continued)

	Not High School Grad	High School Grad	Some Col.	Col. Grad
Blacks				
Object to Neighbors	30.9	35.9	28.0	23.8*
Object to Rel. Marrying	39.9	40.9	28.3	22.0*
Jews				
Object to Neighbors	15.5	14.4	7.5	3.9*
Object to Rel. Marrying	16.1	14.6	9.8	11.1*
Hispanics				
Object to Neighbors	27.4	31.4	26.8	19.6*
Object to Rel. Marrying	29.6	26.8	18.1	12.2*
Asians				
Object to Neighbors	23.9	22.2	16.1	11.9*
Object to Rel. Marrying	24.5	27.4	17.5	12.6*
H. Preferred Neighborhood				
All:				
Whites	50.5	53.5	48.3	45.3*
Blacks	20.7	18.8	20.1	18.0
Hispanics	12.7	13.9	15.0	15.8
Asians	10.3	11.6	14.4	16.7*
Doesn't Matter	5.8	2.3	2.2	4.2
Whites Only:				
Whites	59.9	58.9	53.3	47.3*
Blacks	13.6	15.0	17.3	17.6*
Hispanics	11.3	12.6	13.9	15.3*
Asians	8.5	11.3	13.6	15.6*
Doesn't Matter	6.8	2.2	1.9	4.2*
I. Most/Least in Common With (Whites Only)				
Most in Common:				
Whites	21.3	17.5	17.2	16.7
Blacks	20.6	16.7	14.4	12.5
Jews	6.7	15.5	17.5	23.3
Hispanics	9.9	15.2	15.1	11.0
Asians	3.6	7.2	6.6	10.8
EQUAL IN COMMON WITH ALL	15.0	12.9	18.3	17.9
NOTHING IN COMMON WITH ANY	12.6	8.3	5.5	2.2
DK	10.3	6.6	5.5	5.6

\*

Table 17 (continued)

	Not High School Grad	High School Grad	Some Col.	Col. Grad
Least in Common:				
Whites	2.4	1.5	1.0	0.8
Blacks	18.8	19.4	14.8	18.3
Jews	10.8	12.9	8.2	11.8
Hispanics	8.4	12.0	15.5	18.5
Asians	24.0	33.3	39.4	26.7
EQUAL IN COMMON WITH ALL	11.2	8.2	10.8	14.3
NOTHING IN COMMON WITH ANY	10.0	5.7	3.7	1.4
DK	14.4	7.0	6.6	8.2
			*	
J: Intergroup Contact				
Out Group Members Knowing				
Whites	85.8	91.3	96.2	100.0*
Blacks	78.6	79.7	89.9	93.9*
Jews	36.6	49.1	64.0	78.6*
Hispanics	54.9	65.5	77.6	86.8*
Asians	34.9	46.3	67.4	83.1*
Out Group Members Knowing from School				
Whites	48.9	53.6	60.2	80.6*
Blacks	33.8	30.7	50.7	46.7*
Jews	11.3	18.0	30.1	45.9*
Hispanics	19.5	27.2	39.4	34.6*
Asians	10.5	10.5	29.0	38.8*
Out Group Members Knowing from Local Community				
Whites	66.7	70.2	76.1	85.8
Blacks	46.0	45.9	54.9	58.5*
Jews	8.3	21.0	28.9	44.2*
Hispanics	27.8	38.7	44.7	49.0*
Asians	14.4	21.3	33.5	42.7*
Out group Members Knowing as Relative				
Whites	35.6	36.9	50.5	56.8*
Blacks	11.7	7.0	9.1	10.1
Jews	4.2	9.4	8.4	14.5*
Hispanics	14.1	12.0	8.9	12.2
Asians	4.2	6.9	6.7	9.3

Table 17 (continued)

	Not High School Grad	High School Grad	Some Col.	Col. Grad
Out Group Members Knowing from Work				
Whites	82.0	87.7	85.8	90.2
Blacks	53.1	54.5	67.2	66.7*
Jews	15.0	21.0	34.1	40.2*
Hispanics	28.6	47.8	57.2	59.6*
Asians	16.3	27.7	36.8	51.6*
Out group Members Close to...				
Whites	59.3	64.4	68.9	80.4
Blacks	32.2	39.7	51.3	53.5*
Jews	9.7	22.4	31.3	42.4*
Hispanics	24.2	28.6	37.0	48.1*
Asians	8.8	18.7	27.0	39.8*

Table 18

## Intergroup Attitudes and Contact by Region

	North- East	Mid- West	South	West
<b>A. Made Important Contributions</b>				
English	64.5	72.8	72.8	72.9
Italians	51.2	51.2	43.3	50.6*
Chinese	40.0	38.2	34.9	43.9
Jews	53.8	58.1	47.5	54.2*
Blacks	46.0	50.8	46.5	50.1
Mexicans	25.6	31.1	21.7	37.4*
Vietnamese	19.1	18.5	14.8	22.4*
Cubans	19.3	16.5	13.3	17.9
Irish	45.8	54.8	43.4	48.3*
Puerto Ricans	23.6	18.0	13.1	22.4*
Japanese	39.7	39.3	36.8	46.7
Muslims	19.7	19.5	10.9	21.0*
<b>B. Language Use Policies</b>				
English Unites Americans	70.9	72.8	76.9	71.2*
For English as Official Language	73.5	72.6	76.1	69.1*
Ballots Should Not be in				
Other Languages	29.5	36.0	33.4	37.2
English Threatened if Immigrants Use				
Other Languages	30.5	29.2	34.3	28.9
Abolish Bilingual Education	19.2	20.9	21.1	26.2
<b>Value of Knowing Second Language</b>				
Children Should Learn Second Language				
in School (Disagree)	20.2	28.4	24.3	24.0
Learning Foreign Language as Valuable				
as Math or Science (Disagree)	31.6	38.3	39.2	28.6*
<b>C. Immigration and Assimilation</b>				
Total Level of				
Immigration (Decrease)	38.5	40.9	47.2	38.5*
Level from...				
Latin America	35.2	38.8	49.5	38.6*
Asia	35.4	38.3	46.1	36.6*
Europe	30.4	30.3	39.4	28.9*
Making the country more				
open to new ideas and				
cultures (Not Likely)	25.8	23.3	25.0	18.1*
Higher crime rates (Likely)	60.0	69.7	76.5	69.2*



Table 18 (continued)

	North- East	Mid- West	South	West
People born in the US losing their jobs (Likely)	53.0	54.7	66.6	48.1*
Making it harder to keep the country united (Likely)	48.8	51.8	57.9	51.3
Higher economic growth (Not Likely)	49.0	47.8	49.5	38.8*
Groups Should Blend In	27.6	35.2	37.0	33.6*
D. Changes in Population				
Group's Population Share Will Increase				
Whites	36.4	44.3	34.1	34.2*
Blacks	67.9	75.4	75.9	59.2*
Jews	29.8	33.4	24.1	28.7*
Hispanics	81.7	85.5	84.3	85.0*
Asians	67.6	66.5	60.0	68.0*
Population Change is Bad Thing	10.8	14.4	25.1	19.6*
E. Population Share Estimate				
United States				
White	58.5	58.2	58.4	61.3*
Black	31.3	31.4	33.0	28.7*
Hispanic	25.0	23.7	23.3	27.1*
Jewish	20.4	17.4	16.4	17.6*
Asian	18.9	17.5	15.6	20.1*
American Indian	13.4	15.1	13.1	15.7
Mixed	40.4	47.2	41.2	45.0*
Local Community				
White	67.9	76.8	63.0	64.2*
Black	20.6	16.9	25.5	11.4*
Hispanic	13.3	8.9	13.1	22.0*
Jewish	9.5	6.7	5.3	8.2*
Asian	6.7	5.8	4.6	13.5*
American Indian	4.5	4.3	3.3	8.0*
F. Ethnic Images				
Rich - Poor				
Blacks	-1.69	-1.48	-1.48	-1.66
Jews	0.46	0.23	0.20	0.21
Hispanics	-1.72	-1.52	-1.54	-1.54
Asians	-0.48	-0.52	-0.47	-0.30

Table 18 (continued)

	North- East	Mid- West	South	West
Hard Working Lazy				
Blacks	-0.96	-0.75	-0.84	-0.75
Jews	0.19	0.13	0.20	0.36
Hispanics	-0.77	-0.26	-0.16	-0.10*
Asians	0.05	0.18	0.23	0.45*
Violence-Prone/Not				
Blacks	-0.50	-0.64	-0.81	-0.50*
Jews	0.63	0.54	0.44	0.40
Hispanics	-0.26	-0.40	-0.52	-0.38
Asians	0.37	0.24	0.12	0.21
Intelligent/Not				
Blacks	-0.76	-0.57	-0.73	-0.72
Jews	0.10	0.02	0.01	0.01
Hispanics	-0.82	-0.61	-0.79	-0.72
Asians	-0.19	-0.05	-0.11	0.08*
Committed to Strong Families/Not				
Blacks	-0.69	-0.46	-0.88	-0.46*
Jews	0.36	0.55	0.34	0.66*
Hispanics	-0.06	0.30	-0.12	0.60*
Asians	0.25	0.44	0.12	0.84*
Committed to Fair & Equal Treatment/Not				
Blacks	-0.39	-0.45	-0.54	-0.46
Jews	-0.05	0.11	0.04	-0.08
Hispanics	-0.44	-0.19	-0.33	-0.24
Asians	-0.19	-0.05	-0.23	-0.15
G. Social Distance				
Whites				
Object to Neighbors	12.3	12.2	3.8	0.9*
Object to Rel. Marrying	11.3	4.9	10.1	6.1
Blacks				
Object to Neighbors	23.2	26.8	34.6	31.5
Object to Rel. Marrying	24.6	32.6	42.6	23.0*
Jews				
Object to Neighbors	9.6	8.0	12.2	7.4
Object to Rel. Marrying	7.7	13.9	16.6	8.7*
Hispanics				
Object to Neighbors	22.8	23.9	30.2	27.0*
Object to Rel. Marrying	14.5	20.0	30.6	10.8*

Table 18 (continued)

	North- East	Mid- West	South	West
Asians				
Object to Neighbors	18.5	14.8	19.7	19.0*
Object to Rel. Marrying	17.8	18.6	27.6	12.4*
H. Preferred Neighborhood				
All:				
Whites	49.8	50.5	52.2	43.3*
Blacks	17.4	19.1	21.4	17.4*
Hispanics	13.7	13.8	12.8	18.7*
Asians	11.6	14.0	11.7	17.3*
Doesn't Matter	7.5	2.6	2.1	3.4*
Whites Only:				
Whites	55.0	53.8	59.9	46.3*
Blacks	14.7	16.8	16.1	16.8
Hispanics	12.3	13.5	11.4	17.7*
Asians	11.4	13.7	11.0	15.1*
Doesn't Matter	6.7	2.1	1.7	4.1*
I. Most/Least in Common with (Whites Only)				
Most in Common:				
Whites	17.9	12.9	22.2	16.9
Blacks	13.6	18.0	19.5	7.5
Jews	25.4	17.8	10.3	18.4
Hispanics	6.0	14.9	9.4	24.9
Asians	5.3	9.9	6.9	7.2
EQUAL IN COMMON WITH ALL	18.4	12.9	16.6	17.4
NOTHING IN COMMON WITH ANY	4.3	6.5	9.1	4.1
DK	9.1	7.1	6.1	3.6
*				
Least in Common:				
Whites	2.0	0.0	2.0	1.0
Blacks	20.9	15.2	14.3	22.3
Jews	6.9	11.8	10.8	13.6
Hispanics	13.0	15.4	17.3	9.4
Asians	27.0	39.9	28.2	34.6
EQUAL IN COMMON WITH ALL	14.0	6.6	13.9	8.7
NOTHING IN COMMON WITH ANY	3.6	4.2	7.1	2.4
DK	12.5	7.0	6.5	8.0
*				

Table 18 (continued)

	North- East	Mid- West	South	West
J. Intergroup Contact				
Out Group Members Knowing				
Whites	90.6	89.4	93.7	95.8
Blacks	81.8	85.1	91.2	84.8*
Jews	70.6	58.6	50.4	60.7*
Hispanics	67.9	69.7	67.1	92.4*
Asians	57.5	62.0	49.6	76.8*
Out Group Members Knowing from School				
Whites	50.9	60.7	59.6	61.3
Blacks	39.2	48.3	43.8	33.9*
Jews	33.5	29.8	21.0	28.7*
Hispanics	28.3	37.0	26.3	39.4*
Asians	20.2	25.7	16.8	33.1*
Out Group Members Knowing from Local Community				
Whites	69.6	64.0	77.1	77.4
Blacks	47.5	42.9	60.5	53.4*
Jews	34.9	23.8	22.4	30.3*
Hispanics	32.6	37.8	34.5	67.7*
Asians	27.2	28.4	20.3	46.9*
Out group Members Knowing as Relative				
Whites	42.2	50.6	37.3	52.6
Blacks	9.6	9.5	9.1	8.2
Jews	11.7	10.1	6.8	11.2
Hispanics	9.3	9.8	10.4	16.9*
Asians	5.5	6.4	6.1	10.5
Out Group Members Knowing from Work				
Whites	79.9	78.1	89.1	93.3
Blacks	56.7	54.1	74.8	58.2*
Jews	37.7	28.1	24.4	33.9*
Hispanics	45.3	46.5	53.2	66.3*
Asians	36.4	34.9	28.4	50.1*
Out group Members Close to...				
Whites	57.8	57.9	68.5	76.6
Blacks	39.6	44.2	53.3	43.1*
Jews	37.4	25.7	23.2	29.1*
Hispanics	28.7	30.7	32.0	54.7*
Asians	19.7	27.8	20.2	33.5*

Table 19

## Intergroup Attitudes and Contact by Community Type

	Large Cent. City	Oth. Cent. City	Large Sub- burb	Oth. Sub- Burb	Oth. Ur- Ban	Rural
<b>A. Made Important Contributions</b>						
English	58.6	70.9	76.3	65.7	74.1	69.4*
Italians	44.2	46.3	57.7	46.2	48.3	44.8*
Chinese	37.0	42.2	47.6	38.0	37.0	31.3*
Jews	51.4	50.1	60.1	57.4	53.0	40.9*
Blacks	53.6	53.3	50.4	45.6	48.5	37.4*
Mexicans	32.6	33.7	25.1	26.3	29.2	18.5*
Vietnamese	19.4	19.1	20.0	17.9	19.1	10.3*
Cubans	22.6	18.0	16.3	17.7	16.4	7.2*
Irish	40.3	45.0	52.1	45.3	50.2	43.5*
Puerto Ricans	27.9	19.1	20.6	16.4	18.2	11.4*
Japanese	42.6	40.4	52.1	39.5	38.5	30.6*
Muslims	22.1	19.6	15.4	15.9	17.1	11.4*
<b>B. Language Use Policies</b>						
English Unites Americans For English as Official Language	76.1	68.4	76.7	68.0	74.2	79.3
Ballots Should Not be in Other Languages	72.6	66.0	76.2	75.2	73.2	77.3
English Threatened if Immigrants Use Languages	25.2	29.7	31.8	37.4	36.0	59.7*
Abolish Bilingual Education	33.1	25.9	21.9	31.1	31.5	35.2
	14.4	18.8	23.7	23.3	22.1	24.9*
<b>Value of Knowing Second Language</b>						
Children Should Learn 2nd Language in School (Dis)	16.7	16.6	22.0	20.2	28.3	32.0*
Learning Foreign Language as Valuable as Math... (Dis)	25.8	31.4	32.3	29.0	37.1	49.8*
<b>C. Immigration and Assimilation</b>						
Total Level of Immigration (Decrease) Level from...	31.0	30.5	47.7	46.5	40.8	57.6*
Latin America	32.6	31.9	45.9	43.8	39.9	61.3*
Asia	29.8	27.3	38.4	47.2	40.9	54.4*
Europe	24.3	23.4	34.3	36.5	32.9	47.7*

Table 19 (continued)

	Large Cent. City	Oth. Cent. City	Large Sub- burb	Oth. Sub- Burb	Oth. Ur- Ban	Rural
Making the country more open to new ideas and cultures (Not Likely)	24.5	18.3	17.7	26.3	23.0	32.8*
Higher crime rates (Likely)	49.1	64.7	64.8	68.0	73.8	85.0*
People born in the US losing their jobs (Likely)	45.8	52.1	52.7	48.9	60.4	74.1*
Making it harder to keep the country united (Likely)	47.4	49.6	49.3	54.0	54.5	61.3*
Higher economic growth (Not Likely)	40.7	37.1	51.6	42.0	47.2	60.8*
Groups Should Blend In	22.8	29.7	40.8	32.3	34.1	40.2*
D. Changes in Population						
Group's Population Share Will Increase						
Whites	28.1	35.8	34.8	34.5	38.5	43.4
Blacks	60.1	67.4	70.8	69.2	72.6	75.6*
Jews	25.3	27.1	32.4	29.3	28.0	27.6*
Hispanics	76.4	81.5	89.2	86.6	84.4	84.1*
Asians	65.2	63.4	69.4	69.8	64.3	56.3*
Population Change is Bad Thing	10.4	15.6	16.0	20.1	19.3	26.1*
E. Population Share Estimates						
United States						
White	56.2	60.9	61.2	59.5	57.9	59.0*
Black	33.9	33.7	31.1	28.6	30.4	34.1*
Hispanic	27.3	25.1	27.6	22.8	23.5	24.5
Jewish	20.5	18.3	21.7	16.6	16.1	17.6*
Asian	19.0	19.3	20.4	17.4	16.1	17.9*
American Indian	13.9	15.9	15.2	12.4	13.3	16.6
Mixed	42.6	42.1	44.0	40.9	44.1	44.4
Local Community						
White	38.6	51.2	64.7	67.4	74.3	83.8*
Black	38.7	33.0	21.4	16.3	14.4	10.6*
Hispanic	17.2	18.1	14.7	14.3	13.4	8.9*
Jewish	10.5	7.5	11.8	9.6	5.6	0.9*
Asian	7.5	10.5	9.4	10.1	5.9	1.9*
American Indian	2.9	5.1	3.0	3.0	6.2	5.2*

Table 19 (continued)

	Large Cent. City	Oth. Cent. City	Large Sub- burb	Oth. Sub- burb	Oth. Ur- Ban	Rural
F. Ethnic Images						
Rich - Poor						
Blacks	-1.94	-1.50	-1.74	-1.71	-1.48	-1.33*
Jews	0.51	0.22	0.42	0.34	0.20	0.06
Hispanics	-2.00	-1.40	-1.65	-1.58	-1.54	-1.56
Asians	-0.56	-0.46	-0.26	-0.27	-0.52	-0.57
Hard Working Lazy						
Blacks	-0.70	-0.56	-0.94	-1.13	-0.74	-1.02*
Jews	0.61	0.25	0.29	0.24	0.19	-0.12*
Hispanics	-0.15	-0.08	-0.24	-0.56	-0.23	-0.56*
Asians	0.83	0.37	0.29	0.41	0.10	-0.14*
Violence-Prone/Not						
Blacks	-0.26	-0.57	-0.68	-0.73	-0.71	-0.60
Jews	0.50	0.45	0.72	0.63	0.39	0.44*
Hispanics	-0.08	-0.30	-0.41	-0.54	-0.41	-0.61
Asians	0.65	0.18	0.39	0.33	0.11	0.04*
Intelligent/Not						
Blacks	-0.60	-0.54	-0.73	-0.77	-0.70	-0.80
Jews	0.22	0.03	0.14	0.08	-0.01	-0.12*
Hispanics	-0.96	-0.50	-0.75	-0.77	-0.72	-0.97*
Asians	-0.01	0.05	0.14	0.04	-0.17	-0.29*
Committed to Strong Families/Not						
Blacks	-0.33	-0.43	-0.91	-0.69	-0.66	-0.76*
Jews	0.76	0.49	0.61	0.58	0.38	0.26*
Hispanics	0.33	0.16	0.17	0.33	0.16	-0.23
Asians	0.50	0.46	0.53	0.69	0.28	0.09*
Committed to Fair & Equal Treatment/Not						
Blacks	0.52	-0.31	-0.52	-0.68	-0.53	-0.80*
Jews	0.40	0.06	-0.02	-0.14	0.05	-0.18
Hispanics	0.28	-0.17	-0.29	-0.43	-0.31	-0.61*
Asians	0.34	-0.02	-0.18	-0.28	-0.20	-0.35*

Table 19 (continued)

	Large Cent. City	Oth. Cent. City	Large Sub- burb	Oth. Sub- burb	Oth. Ur- Ban	Rural
G. Social Distance						
Whites						
Object to Neighbors	12.9	3.0	4.2	10.1	2.1	12.1*
Object to Rel. Marrying	8.2	7.4	13.9	4.3	8.6	12.1
Blacks						
Object to Neighbors	26.0	28.2	28.6	38.5	28.4	28.7*
Object to Rel. Marrying	16.8	32.7	25.9	24.9	35.0	41.7*
Jews						
Object to Neighbors	13.0	8.2	6.0	10.5	10.5	8.9*
Object to Rel. Marrying	8.4	11.7	9.9	12.4	13.8	15.1
Hispanics						
Object to Neighbors	23.9	16.9	29.4	28.7	28.0	28.7
Object to Rel. Marrying	11.9	19.2	13.5	13.8	24.9	29.4*
Asians						
Object to Neighbors	25.2	13.5	14.2	20.6	19.1	17.5
Object to Rel. Marrying	18.3	21.6	11.3	16.9	22.6	26.2
H. Preferred Neighborhood						
All:						
Whites	34.8	39.6	50.1	47.0	52.2	60.6*
Blacks	29.5	22.3	15.8	17.6	18.9	17.0*
Hispanics	18.4	16.2	13.6	15.1	14.3	11.3*
Asians	13.6	16.1	14.0	14.9	12.6	11.2*
Doesn't Matter	3.7	5.9	6.5	5.5	2.1	0.0*
Whites Only:						
Whites	44.3	46.6	54.2	52.3	55.0	64.5*
Blacks	18.3	18.4	14.4	15.8	16.7	13.8*
Hispanics	16.8	15.5	12.3	14.2	13.5	11.1*
Asians	14.0	15.2	13.3	11.8	12.7	10.7*
Doesn't Matter	6.7	4.4	5.8	5.8	2.2	0.0*



Table 19 (continued)

	Large Cent. City	Oth. Cent. City	Large Sub- burb	Oth. Sub- burb	Oth. Ur- Ban	Rural
I. Most/Least in Common with (Whites Only)						
Most in Common:						
Whites	31.9	20.1	16.2	29.5	13.1	17.4
Blacks	4.3	14.7	14.6	8.8	19.4	13.0
Jews	8.5	21.9	32.4	16.7	16.1	3.2
Hispanics	12.8	16.1	8.7	14.3	13.2	15.4
Asians	2.1	4.9	8.7	11.6	6.8	8.5
EQUAL IN COMMON WITH ALL	18.1	12.1	12.6	12.4	17.2	22.7
NOTHING IN COMMON WITH ANY	8.5	4.9	2.4	1.6	7.6	11.7
DK	13.8	5.4	4.3	5.2	6.5	8.1
				*		
Least in Common:						
Whites	3.2	0.9	3.5	1.6	0.2	2.1
Blacks	16.0	15.7	16.5	28.1	14.1	22.6
Jews	6.4	9.4	5.5	4.7	14.4	13.0
Hispanics	10.6	15.2	16.9	14.2	14.7	10.5
Asians	28.7	30.0	40.6	34.0	31.4	28.9
EQUAL IN COMMON WITH ALL	14.9	11.7	9.4	11.5	11.4	7.9
NOTHING IN COMMON WITH ANY	2.1	6.3	2.8	0.4	4.9	9.6
DK	18.1	10.8	4.7	5.5	8.9	5.4
				*		
J. Intergroup Contact						
Out Group Members Knowing						
Whites	85.2	94.4	97.5	92.7	95.3	84.4
Blacks	75.2	90.5	88.6	90.8	86.0	80.4*
Jews	58.3	62.6	80.5	63.3	54.0	39.2*
Hispanics	80.0	78.3	80.5	79.1	68.7	63.8*
Asians	59.8	64.6	68.9	70.4	55.3	47.7*
Out Group Members Knowing from School						
Whites	49.4	62.7	53.7	59.2	61.9	59.4
Blacks	34.8	47.4	45.1	34.5	43.5	36.0
Jews	24.5	28.3	39.3	23.8	27.7	14.8*
Hispanics	31.8	37.4	35.3	30.8	30.0	29.7
Asians	20.7	31.3	19.6	30.2	21.4	15.4*

Table 19 (continued)

	Large Cent. City	Oth. Cent. City	Large Sub- burb	Oth. Sub- burb	Oth. Ur- Ban	Rural
Out Group Members Knowing from Local Community						
Whites	49.4	76.1	82.0	63.2	85.2	78.1*
Blacks	52.2	58.8	50.2	47.8	55.5	38.0*
Jews	23.3	30.7	42.4	27.5	26.3	8.0*
Hispanics	46.4	38.7	42.3	42.2	43.7	33.0
Asians	20.9	30.4	31.4	30.8	30.1	23.6
Out group Members Knowing as Relative						
Whites	37.6	39.4	39.8	55.3	49.9	31.3
Blacks	13.0	9.2	8.4	7.6	9.6	8.0
Jews	10.3	9.0	16.6	12.1	8.0	4.4*
Hispanics	10.6	15.2	11.5	12.9	10.2	9.3
Asians	3.1	8.6	8.5	11.1	6.3	3.6*
Out Group Members Knowing from Work						
Whites	81.8	92.0	88.7	84.6	91.4	47.4*
Blacks	56.9	74.1	71.9	72.4	54.7	51.7*
Jews	37.2	31.6	54.1	37.4	22.0	12.3*
Hispanics	62.5	52.6	59.6	57.1	50.0	42.3*
Asians	38.8	44.9	46.2	49.2	29.9	14.0*
Out group Members Close to...						
Whites	36.0	70.1	68.1	81.7	76.8	46.9*
Blacks	29.7	54.5	55.3	49.0	44.7	35.3*
Jews	21.8	29.4	50.4	31.2	24.6	12.4*
Hispanics	37.6	38.6	45.8	34.4	33.0	28.3*
Asians	14.7	31.2	31.1	30.0	22.4	17.2*

Table 20

## Intergroup Attitudes and Contact by Religion

	Prot	Cath	Jew	None	Oth.
A. Made Important Contributions					
English	73.0	64.4	80.0	75.7	68.6*
Italians	46.5	47.4	69.2	52.7	46.9
Chinese	36.1	34.7	50.7	45.6	54.6*
Jews	52.2	49.3	83.1	53.9	55.3*
Blacks	47.9	40.0	60.0	57.7	57.4*
Mexicans	25.4	25.9	30.8	34.8	40.6
Vietnamese	16.0	15.1	20.0	23.5	35.7*
Cubans	14.8	11.5	23.1	22.0	31.5*
Irish	46.0	45.5	63.1	53.9	47.6
Puerto Ricans	16.7	14.8	20.0	23.5	34.3*
Japanese	37.8	37.4	53.8	43.1	58.8*
Muslims	14.7	12.8	21.5	24.2	31.5*
B. Language Use Policies					
English Unites Americans	76.2	71.4	74.6	72.2	63.7*
For English as Official Language	78.1	72.5	75.4	60.2	67.6*
Ballots Should Not be in					
Other Languages	36.3	33.2	31.7	27.3	38.5*
English Threatened if Immigrants Use					
Other Languages	34.7	31.0	30.1	23.8	21.7*
Abolish Bilingual Education	23.8	19.5	20.6	20.8	16.8
Value of Knowing Second Language					
Children Should Learn Second Language					
in School (Disagree)	27.3	22.3	10.8	22.3	20.3*
Learning Foreign Language as Valuable					
as Math or Science (Disagree)	39.6	30.0	41.3	30.9	28.7*
C. Immigration and Assimilation					
Total Level of					
Immigration (Decrease)	45.5	39.2	41.5	39.1	35.7*
Level from...					
Latin America	46.4	36.4	35.4	38.9	37.1*
Asia	43.6	38.0	32.3	36.8	32.2*
Europe	37.6	29.0	20.0	30.2	28.0*
Making the country more					
open to new ideas and					
cultures (Not Likely)	24.2	21.7	29.2	23.4	19.6*
Higher crime rates (Likely)	73.7	71.1	50.8	66.7	51.8*

Table 20 (continued)

	Prot	Cath	Jew	None	Oth.
People born in the US					
losing their jobs (Likely)	60.8	56.1	47.7	53.8	45.1
Making it harder to keep					
the country united (Likely)	56.2	52.8	43.1	49.1	46.2*
Higher econ. growth (Not Likely)	50.5	44.1	40.0	44.7	32.2
Groups Should Blend In	36.6	33.3	26.2	33.2	20.4
D. Changes in Population					
Group's Population Share					
Will Increase					
Whites	39.1	39.9	29.3	28.5	30.8
Blacks	73.8	69.8	69.3	61.1	74.2
Jews	29.4	31.6	15.3	25.5	17.5
Hispanics	83.9	82.9	89.2	84.5	90.3
Asians	62.9	66.8	75.4	63.9	69.3
Population Change is Bad Thing	21.5	14.5	24.6	17.1	12.3*
E. Population Share Estimates					
United States					
White	58.0	60.4	62.5	59.0	60.1
Black	32.6	30.8	25.2	29.4	30.9*
Hispanic	23.1	27.4	23.3	24.4	25.9*
Jewish	17.9	19.6	10.1	16.1	14.9*
Asian	17.5	19.4	16.1	16.1	16.8
American Indian	14.3	16.2	8.2	12.6	11.9*
Mixed	43.7	41.6	37.3	46.3	41.8
Local Community					
White	68.4	67.1	70.8	65.0	65.9
Black	21.1	16.9	14.1	20.1	17.9*
Hispanic	12.3	16.9	12.8	15.7	15.1*
Jewish	6.0	8.4	18.9	6.6	6.7*
Asian	6.3	8.5	8.6	6.8	10.8*
American Indian	4.3	5.1	1.5	5.7	8.0*
F. Ethnic Images					
Rich - Poor					
Blacks	-1.45	-1.81	-1.53	-1.47	-1.69*
Jews	0.28	0.29	0.47	0.10	0.33
Hispanics	-1.49	-1.75	-1.55	-1.51	-1.71
Asians	-0.46	-0.49	-0.26	-0.39	-0.38

Table 20 (continued)

	Prot	Cath	Jew	None	Oth.
Hard Working Lazy					
Blacks	-0.82	-1.02	-0.33	-0.56	-0.94*
Jews	0.17	0.28	0.62	0.16	0.32
Hispanics	-0.32	-0.28	0.12	-0.25	-0.34
Asians	0.16	0.18	0.74	0.41	0.39*
Violence-Prone/Not					
Blacks	-0.64	-0.76	-0.37	-0.50	-0.73
Jews	0.43	0.51	0.74	0.63	0.48
Hispanics	-0.42	-0.49	-0.23	-0.25	-0.49
Asians	0.13	0.26	0.45	0.30	0.47
Intelligent/Not					
Blacks	-0.68	-0.96	-0.10	-0.47	-0.55*
Jews	0.03	0.02	0.32	0.02	0.02
Hispanics	-0.74	-0.87	-0.17	-0.61	-0.81*
Asians	-0.14	-0.10	0.42	0.02	0.19*
Committed to Strong Families/Not					
Blacks	-0.64	-0.84	-0.21	-0.49	-0.56
Jews	0.45	0.38	0.73	0.56	0.66
Hispanics	-0.01	0.20	0.70	0.43	0.40*
Asians	0.30	0.29	0.78	0.66	0.73*
Committed to Fair & Equal Treatment/Not					
Blacks	-0.50	-0.76	0.15	-0.18	0.01*
Jews	0.05	-0.23	0.60	0.19	-0.01*
Hispanics	-0.37	-0.44	0.25	-0.04	0.07*
Asians	-0.21	-0.25	0.18	0.02	0.09
G. Social Distance					
Whites					
Object to Neighbors	5.8	4.9	----	9.5	4.3
Object to Rel. Marrying	8.6	5.0	----	16.3	4.3*
Blacks					
Object to Neighbors	31.5	33.7	19.0	23.1	20.5
Object to Rel. Marrying	40.5	29.0	20.3	21.8	12.6*
Jews					
Object to Neighbors	9.1	11.5	----	9.8	5.0
Object to Rel. Marrying	15.7	11.3	----	6.1	9.2*
Hispanics					
Object to Neighbors	28.3	25.9	16.9	22.8	28.2
Object to Rel. Marrying	25.0	18.7	15.3	14.1	13.0*
Asians					
Object to Neighbors	19.3	17.3	18.4	16.7	16.5*
Object to Rel. Marrying	24.1	19.3	20.0	12.2	13.4*

Table 20 (continued)

	Prot	Cath	Jew	None	Oth.
H. Preferred Neighborhood					
All:					
Whites	51.9	46.8	54.4	45.5	46.4*
Blacks	20.8	16.2	18.3	18.7	19.9*
Hispanics	12.5	17.2	14.0	16.6	14.5*
Asians	12.7	14.1	13.3	13.9	16.5
Doesn't Matter	2.1	5.6	0.0	5.4	2.6*
Whites Only:					
Whites	58.5	50.5	55.5	48.3	52.2*
Blacks	16.1	15.6	16.7	16.9	17.7
Hispanics	12.1	15.1	14.3	15.0	13.6*
Asians	12.5	12.4	13.6	13.6	12.6
Doesn't Matter	0.9	6.4	0.0	6.3	3.9*
I. Most/Least in Common With (Whites Only)					
Most in Common:					
Whites	16.1	17.7	25.4	20.3	24.2
Blacks	17.0	14.2	19.0	13.6	8.8
Jews	15.8	21.0	23.8	14.9	9.9
Hispanics	13.1	16.2	0.0	11.1	16.5
Asians	9.3	6.8	11.1	3.2	3.3
EQUAL IN COMMON WITH ALL	15.1	14.6	17.5	20.3	19.8
NOTHING IN COMMON WITH ANY	8.4	2.5	3.2	8.5	2.2
DK	5.2	7.0	0.0	8.2	15.4
			*		
Least in Common:					
Whites	0.6	2.7	0.0	1.0	2.2
Blacks	17.2	18.9	17.5	15.8	19.8
Jews	11.1	11.5	0.0	12.3	7.7
Hispanics	15.6	10.7	28.6	13.5	13.2
Asians	32.0	35.3	34.9	29.0	29.7
EQUAL IN COMMON WITH ALL	10.5	8.6	17.5	13.9	13.2
NOTHING IN COMMON WITH ANY	5.4	3.9	0.0	4.2	5.5
DK	7.6	8.4	1.6	10.3	8.8
			*		
J. Intergroup Contact					
Out Group Members Knowing					
Whites	93.7	92.5	----	92.2	91.1
Blacks	88.1	80.8	98.4	90.5	81.9*
Jews	55.2	62.4	----	59.7	65.0
Hispanics	69.9	70.1	86.2	82.0	82.4*
Asians	56.3	60.1	75.4	62.7	75.6*

Table 20 (continued)

	Prot	Cath	Jew	None	Oth.
Out Group Members Knowing from School					
Whites	60.9	57.4	----	56.2	51.1
Blacks	41.4	37.6	44.3	45.9	51.2
Jews	22.5	30.2	----	32.8	38.0
Hispanics	28.6	34.7	35.4	35.6	41.5
Asians	20.3	22.5	20.3	29.2	33.6*
Out Group Members Knowing from Local Community					
Whites	74.1	69.7	----	77.8	80.0
Blacks	54.0	49.6	50.8	53.3	46.0
Jews	24.6	29.1	----	31.2	24.1*
Hispanics	39.8	40.1	38.5	48.6	45.1
Asians	28.5	27.6	32.8	30.5	35.5*
Out group Members Knowing as Relative					
Whites	42.7	46.2	----	44.4	42.2
Blacks	9.3	8.5	6.6	10.5	7.9
Jews	9.3	9.5	----	8.9	11.7
Hispanics	10.9	12.1	6.2	12.9	9.8
Asians	6.8	7.9	12.5	5.3	6.5
Out Group Members Knowing from Work					
Whites	92.2	86.5	----	65.9	84.4*
Blacks	63.5	60.7	68.2	61.7	59.1
Jews	26.8	34.6	----	31.1	31.0
Hispanics	52.7	49.5	56.3	53.8	58.2
Asians	33.9	38.1	39.6	38.6	35.4
Out group Members Close to...					
Whites	66.7	74.0	----	54.0	64.1
Blacks	46.6	41.1	53.4	54.3	36.3*
Jews	24.8	30.4	----	31.2	32.3*
Hispanics	34.6	29.9	61.3	40.9	33.3*
Asians	24.3	24.7	21.3	23.8	32.0

Table 21  
Trends in Acceptance of Intermarriage  
(Non-group members only)

	1990	1996	1998	2000
Close Relative Marrying Person who is ...				
Black				
Oppose/Strongly Oppose	63.6	40.6	38.4	31.9
Hispanic				
Oppose/Strongly Oppose	41.2	----	----	20.9
Asian				
Oppose/Strongly Oppose	41.2	----	----	20.4
Jewish				
Oppose/Strongly Oppose	16.0	----	----	12.6

Source: 1990-2000 GSS



Table 22

Trends in Acceptance of Neighborhood Integration

(Non-group members only)

	1990	1996	1998	2000
Living in a Neighborhood That is Half ...				
Black				
Oppose/Strongly Oppose	46.3	29.2	30.5	27.8
Hispanic				
Oppose/Strongly Oppose	42.9	----	----	26.5
Asian				
Oppose/Strongly Oppose	35.0	----	----	18.1
Jewish				
Oppose/Strongly Oppose	13.6	----	----	9.1

Source: 1990-2000 GSS

Table 23

## Trends in Ethnic Images

(Position of Groups Compared to Whites)

	1990	1994	1996	1998	2000
Rich/Poor					
Blacks					
+	3.4	4.2	9.6	8.1	6.9
0	14.9	14.8	17.7	19.6	20.2
-	81.6	80.8	72.6	72.3	72.9
Hispanics					
+	5.1	4.7	-----	-----	6.3
0	12.3	13.8	-----	-----	16.3
-	82.5	81.5	-----	-----	77.4
Asians					
+	14.8	16.4	-----	-----	20.1
0	31.8	30.0	-----	-----	32.1
-	53.4	53.6	-----	-----	47.8
Jews					
+	45.6	-----	-----	-----	35.4
0	37.0	-----	-----	-----	37.6
-	17.4	-----	-----	-----	26.9
Hard Working/Lazy					
Blacks					
+	6.3	7.9	12.2	10.5	9.4
0	34.2	37.1	47.8	49.9	47.2
-	59.4	54.9	39.9	39.5	43.4
Hispanics					
+	7.7	13.4	-----	-----	20.6
0	38.2	32.6	-----	-----	42.2
-	54.1	54.1	-----	-----	37.2
Asians					
+	27.7	39.2	-----	-----	31.0
0	35.3	30.0	-----	-----	44.6
-	36.9	30.8	-----	-----	24.3
Jews					
+	37.0	-----	-----	-----	27.3
0	47.3	-----	-----	-----	48.7
-	15.7	-----	-----	-----	24.0

Table 23 (continued)

	1990	1994	1996	1998	2000
Violence Prone/Not					
Blacks					
+	13.4	----	----	----	10.1
0	32.1	----	----	----	46.2
-	54.5	----	----	----	43.7
Hispanics					
+	15.4	----	----	----	13.4
0	34.3	----	----	----	46.7
-	50.3	----	----	----	39.8
Asians					
+	22.9	----	----	----	23.9
0	44.0	----	----	----	52.3
-	33.1	----	----	----	23.7
Jews					
+	30.3	----	----	----	31.4
0	54.5	----	----	----	51.2
-	15.1	----	----	----	17.4
Intelligent/Not					
Blacks					
+	5.9	----	9.1	8.6	5.1
0	42.5	----	61.2	65.9	61.0
-	51.8	----	29.8	25.5	34.0
Hispanics					
+	5.9	----	----	----	3.1
0	39.9	----	----	----	53.5
-	54.2	----	----	----	43.5
Asians					
+	17.0	----	----	----	19.3
0	43.6	----	----	----	55.0
-	39.4	----	----	----	25.7
Jews					
+	21.7	----	----	----	16.6
0	64.0	----	----	----	63.8
-	14.3	----	----	----	19.6

Source: 1990-2000 GSS

Table 24

Trends in Perceived Reasons for Racial Inequality

(% Mention Reason as a Cause for Disparities)

	Whites				Blacks			
	Discrim- ination	Less Ability	Less Educ.	Less Motiv.	Discrim- ination	Less Ability	Less Educ.	Less Motiv.
1977	39.5	24.5	49.5	61.3	----	----	----	----
1985	40.1	20.1	51.1	57.1	73.5	16.2	72.0	31.3
1986	39.1	19.2	49.0	61.8	69.5	17.5	60.0	35.9
1988	37.1	19.2	50.5	58.8	76.4	9.2	69.9	34.9
1989	36.3	15.9	52.0	57.6	75.4	16.6	66.8	30.3
1990	36.0	18.0	50.4	60.5	65.8	13.4	69.0	37.2
1991	33.2	15.5	50.6	57.1	79.9	9.8	57.0	46.3
1993	34.7	10.6	50.1	49.4	81.1	18.6	70.9	39.8
1994	33.4	12.6	46.3	52.5	77.4	9.3	58.2	27.8
1996	32.0	8.6	41.4	49.3	60.2	8.3	52.3	38.3
1998	29.6	9.4	40.7	43.4	55.2	8.4	53.9	34.1
2000	30.8	11.5	42.0	46.9	60.0	12.9	55.9	38.8

Source: 1977-2000 GSS

Wording: On average Blacks have worse jobs, income, and housing than white people. Do you think these differences are...

- a. Mainly due to discrimination?
- b. Because Blacks have less in-born ability to lean?
- c. Because most Blacks don't have the chance for education that it takes to rise out of poverty?
- d. Because most Blacks just don't have the motivation or will power to pull themselves up out of poverty?

Table 25

## Trends in Various Racial Attitudes

	For Anti- Miscegena- tion Laws	Blacks Shouldn't Push	Not Close to Blacks	Not Close to Whites
Whites				
1972	35.8	69.7	----	----
1973	37.0	72.4	----	----
1974	32.7	----	----	----
1975	37.6	72.1	----	----
1976	31.9	69.8	----	----
1977	26.8	70.9	----	----
1978	----	----	----	----
1980	29.5	66.7	----	----
1982	31.9	59.9	----	----
1983	----	----	----	----
1984	25.4	57.5	----	----
1985	27.5	60.9	----	----
1986	----	----	----	----
1987	25.4	----	----	----
1988	24.9	----	----	----
1989	21.5	----	----	----
1990	19.1	----	----	----
1991	18.5	----	----	----
1993	17.2	----	----	----
1994	14.8	44.0	----	----
1996	11.7	39.2	20.5	3.5
1998	12.1	40.3	22.1	3.3
2000	10.7	38.4	20.9	2.7

Table 25 (continued)

	For Anti- Miscegena- tion Laws	Blacks Shouldn't Push	Not Close to Blacks	Not Close to Whites
Blacks				
1972	----	----	----	----
1973	----	----	----	----
1974	----	----	----	----
1975	----	----	----	----
1976	----	----	----	----
1977	----	----	----	----
1978	----	----	----	----
1980	18.0	48.3	----	----
1982	7.4	24.9	----	----
1983	----	----	----	----
1984	5.5	37.5	----	----
1985	8.6	44.3	----	----
1986	----	----	----	----
1987	4.7	----	----	----
1988	4.2	----	----	----
1989	5.7	----	----	----
1990	7.2	----	----	----
1991	6.3	----	----	----
1993	4.3	----	----	----
1994	3.1	32.2	----	----
1996	3.9	34.9	6.7	16.8
1998	3.3	32.8	8.1	15.6
2000	3.8	35.4	3.2	15.7

Source: 1972-2000 GSS

Wordings: Do you think there should be laws against marriages between Blacks and Whites?

Here are some opinions other people have expressed in connection with Black-White relations. Which statement on the card comes closest to how you, yourself feel? (Agree Strongly; Agree; Disagree Slightly, Disagree)

Blacks shouldn't push themselves where they're not wanted.

In general how close to you feel to Blacks/Whites? Nine point scale going from 1 - Not at All Close to 5 - Neither one Feeling Nor the Other to 9 - Very Close.

Table 26

## Trends in Support for Government Policies to Help Blacks

	% Govt Help Blacks	% for Affirmative Action	% Against Blacks Working Way Up W/O Spec. Favors	% for More Govt Spending for Blacks Living Condit.	Assis- tance
1973	--	--	--	35.3	--
1974	--	--	--	33.4	--
1975	24.7	--	--	29.4	--
1976	--	--	--	29.6	--
1977	--	--	--	27.5	--
1978	--	--	--	26.3	--
1980	--	--	--	26.7	--
1982	--	--	--	30.2	--
1983	16.6	--	--	31.7	--
1984	18.4	--	--	37.3	26.5
1985	--	--	--	32.1	28.8
1986	17.7	--	--	37.2	23.5
1987	20.5	--	--	37.4	28.2
1988	16.7	--	--	38.0	29.0
1989	19.2	--	--	37.3	31.3
1990	20.5	--	--	41.1	31.1
1991	21.7	--	--	39.0	34.5
1993	17.0	--	--	39.4	27.2
1994	15.6	16.3	14.7	34.0	26.5
1996	15.8	15.8	14.4	35.4	25.4
1998	15.8	13.8	13.8	36.9	29.3
2000	18.8	18.0	16.0	38.1	33.4

Source: 1973-2000 GSS

Wordings: Some people think that Blacks have been discriminated against for so long that the government has a special obligation to help improve their living standards. Others believe that the government should not be giving special treatment to Blacks. Where do you place your self on this scale, or haven't you made up your mind on this?

Some people say that because of past discrimination, blacks should be given preferences in hiring and promotion. Others say that such preference in hiring and promotion of blacks is wrong because it discriminates against whites. What about your opinion -- are you for or against preferential hiring and promotion of blacks?

Table 26 (continued)

Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with the following statement:

Irish, Italians, Jewish, and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without special favors.

We are faced with many problems in this country, none of which can be solved easily or inexpensively. I'm going to name some of these problems, and for each one I'd like you to tell me whether you think we're spending too much money on it, too little money, or the right amount.

- a. Improving the Conditions of Blacks
- b. Assistance for Blacks



Table 27

## Trends in Attitudes on Immigration/Multiculturalism

	1994	2000
% for Decreasing Number of Immigrants	62.0	42.1
% Immigrants Somewhat or Very Likely to Hurt National Unity	69.1	53.3
% Immigrants Not Too Likely or Not at All Likely to Lead to High Economic Growth	63.5	46.7
Different Racial/Ethnic Groups Should		
% Maintain Own Cultures (1-3)	31.6	30.2
% In Between (4)	28.8	31.8
% Blend into Main Culture (5-7)	37.8	34.0
% DK	1.9	4.1

Source: 1994-2000 GSS

## References

- Allport, Gordon, The Nature of Prejudice. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1954.
- Apostle, Richard A.; Glock, Charles Y.; Piazza, Thomas; and Suelzle, Marijean, The Anatomy of Racial Attitudes. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- Bettelheim, Bruno and Janowitz, Morris, Social Change and Prejudice. New York: The Free Press, 1964.
- Bobo, Lawrence D., "The Color Line, the Dilemma, and the Dream - Race Relations in America at the Close of the 20th Century," Civil Rights and Social Wrongs: Black-White Relations Since World War II, edited by John Higham. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997.
- Bobo, Lawrence and Kluegel, James R., "Status, Ideology, and Dimensions of Whites' Racial Beliefs and Attitudes: Progress and Stagnation," in Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change, edited by Steven A. Tuch and Jack R. Martin. Westport, CT: Praeger Press, 1997.
- Davis, James A.; Smith, Tom W.; and Marsden, Peter V., General Social Survey, 1972-2000: Cumulative Codebook. Chicago: NORC, 2001.
- Ellison, Christopher G. and Powers, Daniel A., "The Contact Hypothesis and Racial Attitudes among Black Americans," Social Science Quarterly, 75 (1994), 385-400.
- El Nasser, Haya, "Segregation Still Touches Minorities Where They Live," USA Today, April 4, 2001, 2A.
- Farley, Reynolds and Frey, William H., "Changes in the Segregation of Whites from Blacks during the 1980s: Small Steps towards a More Integrated Society," American Sociological Review, 59 (Feb., 1994), 23-45.
- Feagin, Joe R. and Sikes, Melvin P., Living with Racism: The Black Middle-Class Experience. Boston: Beacon Press, 1994.
- Firebaugh, Glenn and Davis, Kenneth E., "Trends in Antiblack Prejudice, 1972-1984: Region and Cohort Effects," American Journal of Sociology, 94 (Sept., 1988), 251-272.
- Grieco, Elizabeth M. and Cassidy, Rachel C., "Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin," Census 2000 Brief, US Bureau of the Census, March, 2001.
- Harris, David R., "Why Are Whites and Blacks Averse to Black

- Neighbors?" Social Science Research, 30 (March, 2001), 100-116.
- Highton, Benjamin and Wolfinger, Raymond E., "Estimating the Size of Minority Groups," Report to National Election Studies Board of Overseers, January 23, 1992.
- Jackman, Mary R., "Education and Prejudice or Education and Response-Set," American Sociological Review, 38 (June, 1973), 327-339.
- Jackman, Mary R. and Crane, Marie, "'Some of My Best Friends are Black...': Interracial Friendships and Whites' Racial Attitudes," Public Opinion Quarterly, 50 (Winter, 1986), 459-486.
- Jackman, Mary R., The Velvet Glove: Paternalism and Conflict in Gender, Class, and Race Relations. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Massey, Douglas and Denton, Nancy A., American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994.
- Matthews, Donald R. and Prothro, James W., Negroes and the New Southern Politics. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1966.
- Nadeau, Richard and Niemi, Richard G., "Educated Guesses: The Processing of Answering Factual Knowledge Questions in Surveys," Public Opinion Quarterly, 59 (Fall, 1995), 323-346.
- Nadeau, Richard; Niemi, Richard G.; and Levine, Jeffrey, "Immunity about Minority Populations," Public Opinion Quarterly, 57 (Fall, 1993), 332-347.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F., "Intergroup Contact Theory," Annual Review of Psychology, 49 (1998), 65-85.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F., Racially Separated or Together? New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Powers, Daniel A. and Ellison, Christopher G., "Interracial Contact and Black Racial Attitudes: The Contact Hypothesis and Selectivity Bias," Social Forces, 74 (1995), 205-226.
- Schuman, Howard and Harding, John, "Prejudice and the Norm of Rationality," Sociometry, 27 (Sept., 1964), 353-371.
- Schuman, Howard; Steeh, Charlotte; Bobo, Lawrence; and Krysan, Maria, Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and

- Interpretations. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Sears, David O. and Jessor, Tom, "Whites' Racial Policy Attitudes: The Role of White Racism," Social Science Quarterly, 77 (1996), 751-759.
- Selznick, Gertrude J. and Steinberg, Stephen, The Tenacity of Prejudice: Anti-Semitism in Contemporary America. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- Sigelman, Lee; Bledsoe, Timothy; Welch, Susan; and Combs, Michael W., "Making Contact? Black-White Social Interaction in an Urban Setting," American Journal of Sociology, 101 (1996), 1306-1332.
- Smith, Tom W., "Actual Trends or Measurement Artifacts? A Review of Three Studies of Anti-Semitism," Public Opinion Quarterly, 57 (1993), 380-393.
- Smith, Tom W., "Anti-Semitism in Contemporary America: A Review," Research in Micropolitics, 5 (1996), 125-178.
- Smith, Tom W., "Aspects of Measuring Race: Race by Observation vs. Self-Reports and Multiple Mentions of Ethnicity and Race," GSS Methodological Report No. 93. Chicago: NORC, forthcoming.
- Smith, Tom W., "Ethnic Images," GSS Topical Report No. 19 Chicago: NORC, 1991a.
- Smith, Tom W., "Intergroup Relations in Contemporary America: An Overview of Survey Research," in Intergroup Relations in the United States: Research Perspectives, edited by Wayne Winborne and Renae Cohen. New York: The National Conference for Community and Justice, 1998.
- Smith, Tom W., "Measuring Inter-racial Friendships: Experimental Comparisons," GSS Methodological Report No. 91. Chicago: NORC, 1999.
- Smith, Tom W., Taking America's Pulse: NCCJ's 2000 Survey of Intergroup Relations in the United States. New York: National Conference for Community and Justice, 2000.
- Smith, Tom W., Trends in Anti-Semitism in Contemporary America. New York: American Jewish Committee, 1994.
- Smith, Tom W., "Trends in National Spending Priorities, 1973-2000," Unpublished NORC report, 2001.
- Smith, Tom W., What Do Americans Think about Jews. New York:

- American Jewish Committee, 1991b.
- Smith, Tom W. and Dempsey, Glen, "Ethnic Social Distance and Prejudice," Public Opinion Quarterly, 47 (1984), 584-600.
- Steeh, Charlotte and Schuman, Howard, "Young White Adults: Did Racial Attitudes Change in the 1980s?" American Journal of Sociology, 98 (Sept., 1992), 340-367.
- St. Jean, Yanick and Feagin, Joe R., Double Burden: Black Women and Everyday Racism. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1999.
- St. Jean, Yanick and Feagin, Joe R., "The Family Cost of White Racism: The Case of African American Families," Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 29 (1998), 297-312.
- Yinger, John, Closed Doors, Opportunities Lost: The Continuing Cost of Housing Discrimination. New York: Russell Sage, 1995.

## Appendix 1: Measuring Ethnic Images

In our examination of ethnic images, we use "ethnic" as a general term to cover the five groups under examination (Whites, Jews, Blacks, Asian Americans, and Hispanic Americans) which are defined partly by race, religion, and nationality. We utilize "images" rather than stereotypes or prejudices since we wish to avoid some of the baggage that is frequently associated with one or both of these terms. For example, stereotypes and prejudice are often assumed to contain a component of irrationality, including such fallacies as causal misattribution, improper generalization, excessive categorization, and rejecting or ignoring counter-evidence (Allport, 1953; Schuman and Harding, 1964; Jackman, 1973). These traits may well be part of the images we measure here, but we have no direct tests of that and therefore can not assume that irrationality is a notable element in our measures. Furthermore, stereotypes are also sometimes seen as projections of psychological states (e.g. as either Id or Super-ego based) and we do not wish to adopt this formulation (Bettelheim and Janowitz, 1950; Pettigrew, 1971). Thus, ethnic images are beliefs that people have about cultural groups (and their members) in general and in particular beliefs about group characteristics and attributes.

To measure ethnic images we developed a question that 1) reduced the likelihood of giving offense, 2) facilitated the reporting of group characterizations, 3) permitted the expression of both positive and negative attributions, 4) allowed comparisons across various groups, and 5) included both in- and out-group evaluations of the reference groups. Both the general survey literature on social desirability and self-presentation effects and the specific literature on prejudice and stereotypes suggested that special care had to be taken in devising questions on ethnic images.

First, we avoided declarative statements of negative attributions as had often been used in the past (e.g. "The trouble with Jewish businessmen is that they are so shrewd and tricky that other people don't have a fair chance in competition" and "Generally speaking, Negroes are lazy and don't like to work hard." Selznick and Steinberg, 1969; Smith, 1990). The problem with using such statements is partly that their offensive nature may lead to a loss of rapport or even a break-off. In addition, because of offensiveness such statements were frequently not asked of the in-group members themselves, thus losing the ability to compare in- and out-group images.

Second, declarative statements discourage the reporting of groups differences because of their violation of norms of politeness and their often absolutist phrasing. Third, we wanted to allow the comparison of several groups on various image dimensions. Some formulations have avoided the problems of offensive declarations by asking whether Blacks or Whites were more likely to have some attribute (Apostle, Glock, Piazza, and Suelzle, 1983; Matthews and Prothro, 1966), but this approach

does not readily facilitate multi-group comparisons. Fourth, we wanted to allow people to express positive as well as negative feelings towards a group. Because of their apparent repercussions (discrimination, minority persecution, etc.), negative stereotypes have been given more attention than more general group depictions covering negative, neutral, and positive evaluations. This focus is clearly unbalanced and ignores that fact that many groups are rated positively on at least some dimensions.

To achieve these goals, we developed an instrument that asked people to rate whether people in the designated group were mostly closer to one or the other of two polar statements (e.g. Rich/Poor). (See Table 2 for the complete wordings.) The opposing images were fixed at points 1 and 7 with intermediate points of 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Point 4 is defined as meaning "you think that the group is not towards one end or another." This allowed people to place a group at any point along the continuum. It also allowed the study of the comparative positioning of groups by studying where people rated one group vs. other groups.

In our analysis of ethnic images, we took the ratings that people gave Whites and subtracted from it the score they gave each of the other four groups. For example, if a person rated Whites as 3 on wealth and rated Jews as 2 and Blacks as 5, we calculated a Jewish wealth difference score of +1 and a Black score of -2. Scores could range from +6 to -6 (although because Whites were usually rated near the middle, few maximum difference scores actually occurred). For each characteristic, we coded the dimension so that a positive score meant that a group was rated closer to the positive image (Rich, Hard-working, Not Violence-Prone; Intelligent, Committed to Strong Families, Committed to Intergroup Tolerance) than Whites were and a negative score meant that a group was rated more towards the negative images than Whites were.

We chose to use difference scores between the ratings of Whites and the various other ethnic groups primarily because we were interested in the comparative positioning and advantages that groups were seen as having. In addition, while the difference scores and absolute ratings were substantially correlated, with correlations usually in the .5-.8 range, the difference scores seemed to perform somewhat better as predictors (Smith, 1990). When we correlated the absolute and difference scores with measures of racial interactions, racial attitudes, and national images, we found that the difference scores generally had slightly higher correlations than the absolute scores (higher in 63 of 95 correlations). For a similar use of a difference scale see Jackman and Crane, 1986. For more information on the ethnic images scale see Smith, 1990.