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SUMMARY

In the present study, I investigated how racially associated physical spaces influence person-perception in the criminal domain, along with the moderating effects of space-focused racial stereotypes on this relationship. In particular, with this study I investigated how a person’s race (Black or White) and/or the neighborhood context (inner-city, suburb, unspecified) influences the extent to which people perceive ambiguous actions as criminal, and the moderating roles of White and Black space stereotypes—space-focused racial stereotypes. I found some support for my hypothesis. Of note, results show that in the suburban neighborhood, as people’s awareness of White space stereotypes increase, so too do their ratings of the Black target’s criminality. Together, this study shows that context mattes in person perception. Further research should investigate how other contexts, especially those with stereotypes attached, are able to influence person-perception. Future work should also investigate these research questions among different, i.e., non-White, populations.
1. INTRODUCTION

A Black man is struggling to enter the front door of a home in suburban Cambridge, Massachusetts. A neighboring resident does not recognize the man, and notifies the police of a “breaking and entering” in progress. This man is esteemed Harvard professor Dr. Henry Louis Gates Jr., and he is having trouble entering his home because the front door is jammed. Eventually Gates enters, and soon after a police officer arrives. Questioned, Gates explains his forced entry and presents identification. Still, the officer arrests Gates, who is later charged with disorderly conduct.

Extensive social psychological research examines similar situations, showing how the “Black men are criminal” stereotype shapes perceptions and evaluative judgments of Black male targets (Eberhardt, Goff, Purdie, and Davies, 2004). Lacking, however, are insights into how a “suburban areas are White” stereotype might simultaneously shape these same perceptions and evaluative judgments. I contend that this stereotype could exacerbate perceptions of Black male targets as criminal, ultimately leading officers to overreact when facing an alleged Black male perpetrator. As social scientists, we already know that stereotypes about people bias perception, however, we do not know if stereotypes about physical spaces do the same. Gates’ experience is not unique; other examples include Renisha McBride, Trayvon Martin and Jonathan Ferrell—all Black individuals gunned downed in predominantly White suburban areas by an individual who felt threatened. I expect the proposed studies to help reveal why these examples are common, not only because of the target person’s race, but also due to the tight link between physical context race (e.g., White suburbs), target race, and how perceivers experience threat.

As such, I will investigate how a person’s race and physical context may individually and interactively bias person perception. I am interested in investigating the extent to which people criminalize Black and White people as a function of the context in which they are situated. Specifically,
in this paper, I will investigate how Black spaces and White spaces influence how people perceive the criminally ambiguous behaviors of Black and White men. In addition, in this paper, I will argue that stereotypes about the physical context in which a target is situated also influence person perception.

1.1 Black People as Criminal

Extensive work shows Black people are stereotyped as criminal, dangerous, hostile, and threatening (Bergsieker, Leslie, Constantine, & Fiske, 2012; Devine, 1989; Devine, & Elliot, 1995; Katz & Braly, 1933). Not only is the prototypic representation of a Black person a criminal (Correll, Park, Judd & Wittenbrink, 2002; Correll, Wittenbrink, Park, Judd & Goyle, 2007; Glaser, 2006; Johnson, 2008; Payne 2006; Ruby & Brigham, 1996; Russell, 1996); the prototypic representation of a criminal is a Black person, resulting in a tight cognitive link between crime and Black people (Eberhardt, et al., 2004). In particular, Eberhardt and colleagues (2004) found a bi-directional link between race and crime: People are faster to identify crime-relevant objects (e.g., gun or knife) compared to non-crime relevant objects (e.g., camera or book) when primed with Black (vs. White) faces; likewise people pay more attention to Black (vs. White) faces when primed with crime concepts (e.g. mugger, rapist).

This tight link between Black people and crime has significant negative outcomes. For example, in first-person shooter tasks, both Black and White people are quicker to shoot an unarmed Black suspect than an unarmed White suspect; a pattern that was magnified for participants with greater knowledge of cultural stereotypes associating Black people with aggression, violence, and danger (Correll, et al., 2002; Correll, et al., 2007). Further, Black defendants who look more prototypically Black are more likely to receive a death sentence than those who look less prototypically Black (Eberhardt, Davis, Purdie-Vaughns & Johnson, 2006). Additionally, Black perpetrators receive harsher punitive sentences and are found guilty of crimes more frequently than any other racial group in the U.S, especially when compared to Whites (Britt, 2000; Ruby & Brigham, 2006; Russell, 1996; Sargent &

Beyond examining behaviors that are either objectively criminal or not, racial biases in perception exist when examining criminally ambiguous behaviors as well. For example, students and law enforcement officials (majority White) rated an ambiguous dialogue as more criminal (i.e., said, “they were planning something illegal”) when the protagonists portrayed in a vignette were two Black males compared to when they were two White males (Ruby & Brigham, 2006). In another study, White participants rated a video recording of an ambiguous shoving by a Black protagonist as more violent than the same behavior done by a White protagonist, irrespective of the victim’s race (Duncan, 1976; Sagar & Schofield, 1980). Together, these studies suggest people see the criminally ambiguous behaviors of Black protagonists as more threatening and/or criminal than the ambiguous behaviors of White protagonists.

1.2 Contextual Cues and Racial Stereotyping

Not only does a person’s race drive perceptions of criminality, so too may the physical context in which the person is embedded. Generally, physical contexts act as cues for determining context-appropriate behavior and for predicting the behavior of others (Aarts & Dijksterhuis, 2003; Guinote & Fiske, 2003). Further, stereotype and attitude activation are dependent on situational contexts (Bodenhausen, Schwarz, Bess, & Wanke, 1995; Wittenbrink, Judd, & Park, 2001; for review see Blair, 2002). For example, Wittenbrink et al. (2001) demonstrated a dampening of implicit anti-Black bias after depicting Black people in stereotypically positive Black contexts (e.g., a family barbeque). There was no change in bias, however, after depicting Black people in stereotypically negative Black contexts (e.g., gang activity). Additionally, in a first-person-shooter task participants shot an unarmed Black man more frequently than an unarmed White man when in non-threatening, neutral contexts (i.e., with no markers of incivilities). However, shooter bias was not present when Black and White targets appeared
in threatening contexts (i.e., when the physical space featured dilapidated buildings, garbage, graffiti; Correll, Wittenbrink, Park, Judd, & Goyle, 2011). The authors reason that context influences stereotype application, which influences the decision to shoot. In this case, then, danger associated with target and danger associated with context shape racial bias. In sum, beliefs that criminal or threatening behaviors are normative for a given physical context can direct and therefore bias perception and behaviors toward targets in the context.

Still unclear is whether the race associated with a physical context could be one factor causing these contextual shifts in stereotype activation and application. Consistent with this proposed relationship, sociologists have demonstrated correlations between neighborhood racial demographics and perceptions of crime. For example, people perceive higher crime levels in neighborhoods with more racial minority residents, even when controlling for actual crime rates (Quillan & Pager, 2001). Similarly, Sampson and Raudenbush (2004) found a positive relationship between perceptions of neighborhood crime and racial minority concentration, even after controlling for objective measures of social (e.g., public intoxication, drug sales) and physical (e.g., graffiti, abandoned cars) disorder.

While these prior studies examine an implicit race-context-crime link for specific neighborhoods (e.g., neighborhoods in Baltimore, Chicago, and Seattle), emerging work in social psychology shows this link is also explicitly present for Black and White physical spaces more generally. For example, when asked to list characteristics of Black and White areas in general (i.e., areas that most people in the United States would associate with Black or White Americans), “crime-ridden” was a frequently listed theme for Black areas, compared to “safe” for White areas (Bonam, Eberhardt, & Bergsieker, under revision; Yantis & Bonam, in prep). In addition to mapping these generalized space-focused stereotypes, Bonam and colleagues have shown that people associate a wide range of different kinds of physical spaces with both Black people (e.g., Detroit, basketball court, inner city) and White people (Kansas,
hockey rink, suburbs). Further, people perceive Black space exemplars more negatively (e.g. dangerous, criminal) than White space exemplars (Bonam & Bergsieker, in prep).

The consequences of space-focused stereotyping are profound. The racial composition of a space—and the extent to which people apply space-focused racial stereotypes to that space—shape space-relevant evaluations and judgments. For example, people feel less connected to Black neighborhoods and assume they are of lower quality than White neighborhoods. In turn, these negative evaluations of Black neighborhoods lead people to devalue houses in said neighborhood as well as provide these areas with less environmental protection (Bonam, Eberhardt & Bergsieker, under revision). Still unclear, however, is how space-focused racial stereotypes, activated by racialized space exemplars, are applied to people—potentially shaping perceptions, evaluations, and judgments of people in these spaces.

1.3 A Context-Person Interaction

With the proposed research, I will examine how target race, racialized physical context, and space-focused stereotyping individually and interactively shape person perception in the criminal domain. Though most work has independently examined the perception of racialized spaces and people, some have already begun to investigate how racialized physical spaces shift person perception in the criminal domain. For example, police officers use more physically coercive force when apprehending both Black and White suspects in Black neighborhoods (Terrill & Reisig, 2003; cf. Smith (1986) who shows that police officers use less coercive force when apprehending (Black) suspects in White neighborhoods compared to when apprehending Black suspects in Black neighborhoods). Further, Correll et al. (2011) found that participants were more likely to shoot unarmed Black targets than unarmed White targets in a “safe context”; however, in a “threatening context” the rate at which
participants shot unarmed White targets increased, leading to no difference between the rate of shooting unarmed Black targets and unarmed White targets.

The “threatening” context used in Correll et al. (2011) could also represent a stereotypical Black space in the U.S. This manipulation featured images with litter, graffiti, and dilapidated buildings; similar characteristics used to describe Black areas in a study mapping Black space-focused stereotype content (see Study 1 of Bonam, Eberhardt, & Bergsieker, under revision). Thus, in addition to manipulating the physical features of the context and its perceived threat level, the researchers likely also manipulated the race of the space. Though Correll et al. (2011) argue that the boost in shooting the White target in the threatening context was driven solely by perceived threat, I argue that the physical context itself was imbued with racial meaning, and that this Black-rundown-dangerous link might have exacerbated the perceived threat-level of the physical space depicted in the “threatening” condition. Thus, reinterpreting the results from Correll et al., (2011), I argue that their rundown context plausibly cued both threat and Blackness, which is the lens through which both the White and Black targets were perceived. Together, then, work in criminology and in social psychology suggests that both White and Black targets are likely to be criminalized more in Black than White] spaces. These findings are consistent with my theory that relevant space-focused stereotypes play a role in person perception.

In contrast to the idea that stereotypes about a physical space influence person-perception, some work suggests that White spaces do not de-criminalize Black and White targets. For example, in demographically White contexts, people still perceive Black people as criminal. Work on racial profiling shows that police officers are more likely to stop Black (vs. White) motorists who drive “farther from ‘black’ communities and into whiter areas” (Meehan & Ponder, 2002, p. 422). Additional work documenting the prevalence of anti-Black hate crimes has shown a positive relationship between the percentage of White people in a neighborhood and anti-Black hate crimes (Green, Strolovitch, & Wong,
Here, the authors argue that in predominantly White neighborhoods, Black people are criminalized, which in turn leads to an increase in criminal, forceful, and life-threatening behaviors towards them.

Together, work on racial profiling and racial hate crimes suggest that people do not de-criminalize Black people in White spaces, and that space-focused stereotypes about White areas (i.e., safe) might not reduce crime perceptions of Black targets in White spaces. Instead, evidence suggests that people still criminalize Black people in White spaces. I posit that this apparent inconsistency between the way space-focused stereotypes are likely applied to White people in Black spaces but not to Black people in White spaces can be reconciled by considering the historical construction of exclusively White suburbs and by drawing from the defended community theory (Suttles, 1972).

**1.4 Why are Black people not de-criminalized in Suburban settings?**

I argue that the likely criminalization of Black bodies in White spaces is not merely a product of anti-Black stereotypes, but also the implicit manifestations of beliefs about ownership of suburban spaces, physically, structurally, and symbolically (Kushner, 1979; Turner, Struyk, & Yinger, 1991). The existence of exclusive White suburban neighborhoods is a product of the active exclusion of ethnic and racial minorities from these spaces (Dreier, Mollenkopf & Swanstrom, 2001). The initial growth of suburbs in the U.S was a direct consequence of the post World War II economic boon, along with the need to create housing for returning war veterans (Jackson 1985). In an attempt to stimulate the housing market, the U.S federal government tasked the Federal Housing authority to approve affordable mortgages to lenders (Patterson, 1996). However, due to racial discrimination, Black people, and other racial minorities, did not benefit from the federal mortgage program. When Black people successfully received government-backed mortgages, contractors and real estate owners did not sell suburban properties to them. Still, if Black people were able to secure a loan and purchase suburban property, they
frequently fell victim to death threats, physical attacks, and attacks to their property (Jackson, 1985). The barriers that Black people faced when trying to get access to suburban spaces has resulted, to this day, in the notion and representation of suburban spaces as White spaces; spaces supported by a legacy of racial minority exclusion (Bonam & James, in progress; Dreier, Mollenkopf & Swanstrom, 2001; Yantis & Bonam, in prep).

Specific to understanding the treatment of Black people in exclusively White neighborhood spaces, defended community theory (Suttles, 1972) posits that the presence of Black people in predominantly White spaces symbolizes a threat to their ownership of and entitlement to these spaces. The defended community theory has historically focused on how White people in predominantly White communities respond to Black people in, and Black people who want to enter, these spaces. The theory, coupled with empirical evidence, suggests that White people in predominantly White spaces attempt to protect the identity of these spaces by increasing the prevalence of crime control and also perceive greater economic and social threat (Jackson, 1989; Liska, 1992). The defended community perspective is consistent with racial threat theory (Blalock, 1967; Blumer, 1985): the assertion that White people perceive more threat and show greater support for rigorous and racialized practices to protect their power and privileges as the Black population increases. For example, Green et al., (1998) documented that anti-Black hate crimes occur most frequently in predominately White communities.

Green et al.’s (1998) defended community model contends that the expression of anti-minority attitudes matters most in traditionally White communities constructed with a legacy of racial exclusion. Thus, the historical construction of suburban spaces as White, private, and exclusive—coupled with fears of racial minority invasion—might be one reason for the criminalization of Black people in predominantly White/suburban contexts.
2. CURRENT STUDY

To test my overarching argument that racially imbued physical space shifts person perception, I developed a new paradigm describing a person engaging in criminally ambiguous behavior. Manipulating both this person’s race (Black or White) and the neighborhood context (inner-city, suburb, unspecified) in which the behavior occurred allowed me to test the following, more specific questions: 1) How, and to what extent, do racialized spaces, i.e., inner-city and suburb, influence how people perceive the criminally ambiguous behaviors of Black and White targets? 2) How do space-focused racial stereotypes moderate the aforementioned relationships? Several hypotheses guided my analyses.

First, I expected criminality ratings to be higher for the Black than White target (H1) and to be higher in the inner city context, compared to the suburban (H2a) and unspecified (H2b) contexts. I expected these main effects to be qualified by their two-way interaction, where people perceive Black and White targets equally criminally in the inner city (H3a) but the Black (vs. White) target as more criminal in the suburban context (H3b). Second, I expected space stereotypes to moderate perceptions of target criminality. I predicted that in the suburban neighborhood, but not the inner-city and unspecified neighborhoods, as participants’ awareness of White space-focused stereotypes (WSS) increased, so would their ratings of the Black target’s criminality (H4a). I expected no relationship between WSS and participants’ ratings of the White target’s criminality in all three neighborhoods (H4b). I also expected that in the inner-city neighborhood, but not the suburban and unspecified neighborhoods, as participants’ awareness of Black space-focused stereotypes (BSS) increased, so would their ratings of the White target’s criminality (H5a). Finally, I expected no relationship between BSS and participants’ ratings of the Black target’s criminality in all three neighborhoods (H5b).
2.1 Method

2.1.1 Participants

Analyses exclude 256 people failing the race and/or the context informational manipulation check questions\(^1\), leaving 349 White participants (222 women, 127 men, \(M_{\text{age}} = 36.70, SD_{\text{age}} = 12.81,\ Mdn_{\text{age}} = 33.00\)) who completed an online survey through Mechanical Turk. Individuals with a U.S. IP address who had completed at least 95 percent of their previous tasks satisfactorily were eligible.

2.1.2 Design and Procedure

After providing consent, participants read that the study will gather data on information processing to help writers “show without telling” more effectively. To bolster the cover story, participants were told they would read one of fifteen short stories, each using a combination of two writing approaches: Literary Language Emphasis, Contextual Emphasis, Sensation Emphasis, and Character Emphasis. In actuality, the vignette did not employ any special literary emphasis and all participants were told they were assigned to the Contextual and Character emphasis vignette. The story was set in a neighborhood where a target was potentially acting suspiciously. Participants were randomly assigned to condition in a 2 (target race: White or Black) by 3 (neighborhood context: inner city, suburb, unspecified control) between-subjects design. After reading the vignette, participants rated the criminality of target’s actions. Finally, participants completed attention and conceptual manipulation

---

\(^1\) To investigate the number of people who incorrectly remembered the name of the target and the neighborhood presented in the vignette, I conducted two Chi-square analyses. See Appendix A for wording of the informational manipulation check questions. One-hundred and thirteen participants (19\%) did not remember the type of neighborhood presented in the vignette, which did not differ in the Black (\(n = 56, 19\%)\) or White (\(n = 57, 19\%)\) target conditions, \(X^2(1, N = 604) < .01, p > .250\), or among the unspecified (\(n = 33, 16\%)\), inner-city (\(n = 39, 19\%)\), and suburb (\(n = 41, 21\%)\) neighborhood conditions, \(X^2(2, N = 604) = 1.81, p > .250\). One-hundred and eighty participants (30\%) did not remember the target’s name. More participants did not remember the target’s name in the White (\(n = 113, 37\%)\) compared to the Black (\(n = 67, 22\%)\) target condition, \(X^2(1, N = 604) = 15.06, p < .001\). Additionally, more participants did not remember the target’s name in the inner-city (\(n = 69, 34\%)\) and suburb neighborhood conditions (\(n = 66, 34\%)\) than in the unspecified neighborhood condition (\(n = 45, 22\%)\), \(X^2(2, N = 604) = 9.47, p = .009\). No participants guessed the purpose of the study.
check items, space-focused stereotyping measures, and a demographic survey. See Appendix B for detailed instructions.

### 2.1.3 Materials and Measures

#### 2.1.3.1 Vignette
Participants read a vignette in which a man with a White (Tom or Andrew) or Black (Dwayne, or Jamal) name struggles to unlock a door to a house using a screwdriver, in either an inner-city, suburban, or unspecified neighborhood context, while pacing up and down the side of the house on a phone. (See Appendix C for the full vignette.) I conducted four pilot tests to develop this vignette and the manipulations. Pilot 1 identified race and context neutral crimes. Pilots 2a and 2b identified criminally ambiguous target behaviors. Pilots 3a and 3b identified Black and White names. Pilot 4 assessed memory for the experimental manipulations. (See Appendix D for a full description of each pilot test and results.)

#### 2.1.3.2 Criminality
After reading the vignette, participants rated the target’s actions along four dimensions: (1) law-abiding/criminal (1 = very law-abiding and 7 = very criminal), (2) legal/illegal (1 = very legal and 7 = very illegal), (3) justifiable/unwarranted (1 = very justifiable and 7 = very unwarranted), and (4) right/wrong (1 = very right and 7 = very wrong). I constructed a crime perception measure by averaging the four items. Higher values reflect greater beliefs of the target’s criminality ($\alpha = .95$)

#### 2.1.3.3 Conceptual Manipulation Checks
Participants rated the extent to which they associate (1) the “neighborhood in the short story with White or Black Americans” and (2) the “individual in the short story with White or Black Americans,” from 1 (very strongly associate with White Americans) to 7 (very strongly associate with Black Americans), with 4 (associated equally with White and Black Americans) being the race-neutral midpoint.
2.1.3.4 White and Black Space-focused Stereotypes

Adapted from Yantis (2015), these measures assessed participants’ awareness of White and Black space-focused stereotypes. Participants rated the extent to which most Americans think a series of traits (e.g. clean, dirty, safe) are representative of (1) Black neighborhoods and (2) White neighborhoods, from 1 = very unrepresentative to 7 = very representative (race order and item order randomized; see Appendix D for complete item list indicating reverse coded items). Higher scores represent a stronger awareness of U.S. American stereotypes of Black neighborhoods (α = .97) and White neighborhoods (α = .97).

2.2 Results

2.2.1 Preliminary Analyses

Overall, participants paid close attention to the information presented in the vignette\(^2\). Table I presents bivariate correlations and Table II presents means and SDs, for all measures by condition.

2.2.2 Conceptual Manipulation Check

One-sample \(t\)-tests (comparing participants’ responses to a “race-neutral midpoint”) confirm that the target and neighborhood manipulations were successful. Participants associated Dwayne (\(M = 4.43, SD = .91\), \(t(83) = 4.32, p < .001\) and Jamal (\(M = 5.22, SD = 1.03\), \(t(108) = 12.36, p < .001\), significantly more strongly with Black Americans, whereas participants associated Tom (\(M = 3.60, SD = .97\), \(t(86) = -3.87, p < .001\), and Andrew (\(M = 3.72, SD = 1.22\), \(t(67) = -1.89, p = .063\), though marginally, more strongly with White Americans. Primary analyses are therefore reported with Tom and Andrew collapsed into the White condition, and Jamal and Dwayne collapsed into the Black condition.

\(^2\) See Appendix A for memory-check item wording. Lower numbers represent fewer incorrect responses. Participants scored well, on average getting less than one of three questions incorrect (\(M = .08, SD = .15\)). Two-way ANOVA results revealed that this number did not differ as a function of neighborhood, \(F(2, 343) = .74, p = .476\), target race, \(F(1, 343) = 1.57, p = .211\) or the interaction between neighborhood and race, \(F(2, 343) = 1.71, p = .183\).
Participants associated the inner-city neighborhood more strongly with Black Americans ($M = 4.63$, $SD = 1.12$), $t(107) = 5.87$, $p < .001$, the suburban neighborhood more strongly with White Americans ($M = 3.51$, $SD = 1.02$), $t(104) = -4.88$, $p < .001$, and the unspecified neighborhood to Black and White Americans equally ($M = 3.98$, $SD = .87$), $t(135) = -30$, $p = .769$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Inner City</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Unspecified</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Criminality</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>-25*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. White Space Stereotypes</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.66***</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Black Space Stereotypes</td>
<td>-25*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.66***</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>-23*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Target Race Association</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.74***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. N’hood Race Association</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Correlations within the Black and White conditions are reported above and below the diagonal, respectively.

$p < .10$, $*p < .05$, $**p < .01$, $***p < .001$

**TABLE 1. BIVARIATE CORRELATIONS BY CONDITION**
2.2.3 Criminality

To investigate study hypotheses, I conducted three multiple linear regressions, with criminality fitted as the dependent variable. First, Model 1 estimated the main effects of the manipulated variables (i.e., race and neighborhood context) and their interaction. Second, to examine effect modification by space-focused stereotypes, Models 2 and 3 incorporated the White space-focused stereotypes (WSS) and Black space-focused stereotypes (BSS) x target race interactions, respectively. To test for three-way interactions, I also included the cross-product terms for target race x neighborhood context x space-focused stereotypes (WSS in Model 2 and BSS in Model 3). See Table 3 for the details of the effects tested in all three models.
**TABLE III.** MULTIPLE LINEAR REGRESSIONS OF TARGET RACE, NEIGHBORHOOD, AND SPACE-FOCUSED STEREOTYPES PREDICTING TARGET CRIMINACITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Race (Ref: White)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Context (Ref: Control)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Stereotype</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSS</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race X Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race X</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood X WSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood X</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race X WSS</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3-Way Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race X Neighborhood X WSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race X</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** CI = Confidence Interval; Ref = Reference group. WSS = White space stereotype. BSS = Black space stereotype.
Neighborhood context: 0 = Unspecified, 1 = Inner-city, 2 = Suburb
Race: 0 = White, 1 = Black
$+p = .53$, $*p < .05$, **$p < .01$
2.2.3.1 Model 1

To test for the main effects of target race and neighborhood context, as well as moderating effects of race by neighborhood context, I regressed target race, neighborhood context, and their two-way interaction on criminality.

Consistent with hypotheses, results revealed a significant main effect of neighborhood context, $b = -.28, SE = .14, p = .041, 95\%CI [-.55, -.01]$. However, contrary to hypotheses, results revealed no main effect for target race, $b = .03, SE = .23, p = .882, 95\%CI [-.42, .48]$, and no target race by neighborhood context interaction, $b = -.01, SE = .19, p = .978, 95\%CI [-.37, .36]^{3}$.

2.2.3.1 Planned Contrasts

I performed two planned contrasts to further examine the significant neighborhood context effect. Inconsistent with predictions, participants rated the target’s actions as more criminal in the unspecified ($M = 4.89, SD = 1.19$) compared to the inner-city ($M = 4.39, SD = 1.46$) neighborhood, $b = .50, SE = .18, p = .006, 95\%CI [.14, .86]$. Also contrary to predictions, participants’ ratings of the target’s criminality did not differ between the inner-city ($M = 4.39, SD = 1.46$) and suburban ($M = 4.34, SD = 1.61$) neighborhoods, $b = .05, SE = .19, p = .780, 95\%CI [-.33, .44]$.

2.2.3.2 Model 2

To test for the three-way interaction between target race, neighborhood context, and WSS, I regressed the main effects of target race and neighborhood context, all two-way interactions, and the three-way interaction on criminality.

As with Model 1, results revealed a non-significant race effect. The neighborhood context effect was also non-significant, as were the two-way interactions involving WSS (See Table 3). A significant main effect of WSS, $b = .33, SE = .16, p = .034, 95\%CI [.03, .64]$, was qualified by a significant two-

---

3 Neighborhood effect becomes marginal when participants who incorrectly remembered the race and/or the neighborhood informational manipulation check questions are included in the analysis, $b = -.17, SE = .10, p = .095, 95\%CI [-.37, .03]$. 
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way interaction between target race and neighborhood context, \( b = -2.00, SE = 1.01, p = .049, 95\% CI [ -4.00, -0.01 ] \), which—consistent with hypotheses—was further qualified by a significant three-way interaction of target race x neighborhood context x WSS, \( b = .38, SE = .19, p = .045, 95\% CI [ .01, .74 ] \) (see Figures 1, 2, and 3).

![Graph showing relationship between target and White space-focused stereotype in the suburbs.](image)

**White Space-focused Stereotype**

Figure 1. Relationship between target and White space-focused stereotype in the suburbs.

---

4 There is no WSS, \( b = .16, SE = .12, p = .162, 95\% CI [ -.07, .39 ] \), race by neighborhood effect, \( b = -.23, SE = .78, p = .773, 95\% CI [-1.75, 1.30] \), and race by neighborhood by WSS effect, \( b = .05, SE = .14, p = .738, 95\% CI [-.24, .33] \), when participants who incorrectly remembered the race and/or the context informational manipulation check questions are included in the analysis.
Figure 2. Relationship between target and White space-focused stereotype in the inner-city.

Figure 3. Relationship between target and White space-focused stereotype in unspecified neighborhood.
2.2.3.2.1 Planned Contrasts

Further examining this three-way interaction, I found that, in the inner-city and unspecified neighborhoods, results revealed no race by WSS interactions, \( b = -.21, SE = .22, p = .361, 95\%CI [-.65, .24] \) and \( b = -.08, SE = .24, p = .729, 95\%CI [-.57, .40] \), respectively. However, in the suburban neighborhood, results revealed a race by WSS interaction, \( b = .73, SE = .28, p = .010, 95\%CI [.18, 1.29] \). More specifically, and consistent with hypotheses, as WSS increased so too did participants’ ratings of the Black target’s criminality, \( b = -1.42, SE = .38, p < .001, 95\%CI [-2.16, -.67] \). However, WSS did not predict participants’ ratings of the White target’s criminality, \( b = -.59, SE = .35, p = .087, 95\%CI [-1.27, .09] \) (see Figure 1).

2.2.3.3 Model 3

To test for the three-way interaction between target race, neighborhood context, and BSS, I regressed the main effects of target race and neighborhood context, all two-way interactions, and the three-way interaction on criminality. Results for this model revealed no significant main effects or two-way interactions. Finally, inconsistent with hypotheses, I did not find a significant race x neighborhood x BSS interaction (see Table 3).\(^5\)

---

\(^5\) Results remain the same when participants who incorrectly remembered the race and/or the neighborhood informational manipulation check questions are included in the analysis.
3. DISCUSSION

With this study, I investigated how racially associated physical spaces influence person-perception in the criminal domain, along with the moderating effects of space-focused racial stereotypes on this relationship. I found support for some of my hypotheses.

Inconsistent with previous work (e.g., Duncan, 1976; Ruby & Brigham, 2006; Sagar & Schofield, 1980), participants did not rate the ambiguous actions of the Black target as more criminal than the actions of the White target. Also inconsistent with previous work (e.g., Correll et al., 2002, 2007, 2011; Quillan & Pager, 2001), participants did not rate the target as more criminal in the inner-city compared to the suburban and unspecified neighborhoods, or the Black target as more criminal than the White target in the suburban neighborhood. Motivation to control prejudice (MCP) might account for the above hypothesis-disconfirming results.

First, it is conceivable that participants were motivated to respond without prejudice. Previous work has demonstrated that people high in MCP, who also hold negative implicit attitudes about Black people, are more likely to generate positive explicit evaluations of a Black target than those low in MCP (Dunton & Fazio, 1997; Olson & Fazio, 2004). Dunton and Fazio (1997) argue that these people—high in MCP and negative implicit attitudes—generate positive explicit evaluation as an attempt, arguably, to “eliminate the presumed biasing effect of their automatically activated negativity towards Blacks” (p.324). This is especially the case when participants are aware that they are being evaluated. For example, White participants high in MCP are more likely to endorse stereotypes about Black people in an anonymous compared to a non-anonymous (i.e., presence of the experimenter) setting (Plant & Devine, 1998). Given the anonymity of online studies, it is possible that MCP could be an active moderator of the relationships investigated in this study.
It is also possible that people high in MCP and high in implicit bias towards Black areas are also motivated to eliminate the presumed biasing effect of their automatically activated negativity towards Black spaces. Past work demonstrates that physical and social contexts can act as cues for determining context-appropriate behavior (Aarts & Dijksterhuis, 2003; Guinote & Fiske, 2003) and can affect stereotype and attitude activation (Bodenhausen, Schwarz, Bess, & Wanke, 1995; Wittenbrink, Judd, & Park, 2001; for review see Blair, 2002). Given that people stereotype Black areas negatively, and associate the inner-city most strongly with Black people (Bonam et al., under revision), it is possible that people can also be motivated to respond without prejudice when Black spaces are made salient. Ongoing work is investigating the role of MCP, and attitudes toward Black people and spaces and White people and spaces, as moderators of the above relationships.

Further, contemporary race-based discussions in the U.S might be magnifying the effects of MCP. Following the acquittal of George Zimmerman in the shooting death of Trayvon Martin in a predominantly White neighborhood, the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement has been vocal in U.S news and social media with discussion on how Black people are treated and criminalized in predominantly White spaces (Day, 2015). Pope, Price, and Wolters (2014) have shown that public awareness of racial bias via the media can lead to a reduction in future racial biases in evaluation. Other work has also shown that media representation of racial minorities can shift racial bias (e.g., Gorham, 2006; Peffley, Shields, & Williams, 1996; Valentino, 1999). Arguably, the now omnipresent discussions of the BLM movement in the U.S media could have increased participants’ awareness of racial biases in criminalization, especially Black men in White spaces, thus cuing them to respond with less bias. Still, studies are needed to investigate this claim. Future studies should investigate how knowledge of cases like those of Trayvon Martin and Dr. Henry Louis Gates Jr.—described in the introduction—might shift bias in racial criminal evaluation.
Results of this study also show that participants rated the actions of the Black and White target as equally criminal in the inner-city context. This finding is consistent with work done by Correll and colleagues (2002; 2007; 2011) showing that in a dangerous context, participants perceive Black and White targets as equally criminal. Nonetheless, the underlying mechanisms might differ for two reasons. First, Correll et al. (2002; 2007; 2011) used a shooting task that implicitly captured participants’ racial biases. Second, though I argue that the “dangerous contexts” referenced in Correll et al. (2002; 2007; 2011) are cultural depictions of inner-city neighborhood contexts, they did not label the contexts as *inner-city*. Here, it is possible that the *inner-city* label in this study cued participants to reduce their evaluative biases. Other work should investigate how the implicit associations of physical spaces to racial groups (e.g., *broken windows theory*; Sampson & Raudenbush, 2004), influence participants explicit and implicit responses to criminally ambiguous behaviors.

In addition, although the predicted WSS by context by race interaction did not reach significance, key planned contrasts suggest that space-focused racial stereotypes may operate differently as a function of context and target race. In particular, in the suburban neighborhood, but not in the unspecified or inner-city contexts, as WSS increased, so too did participants’ ratings of the Black target’s criminality. The effect of WSS for Black targets in the suburban condition is consistent with the *defended community* theory (Green et al., 1998; Suttles, 1972) and racial threat theory (Blalock, 1967; Blumer, 1985). This finding is also consistent with the historical documentation of Black criminalization in predominantly White spaces—generally, White people perceive more threat when Black people encroach into predominantly White spaces (see Dreier, Mollenkopf & Swanstrom, 2001; Jackson 1985).

Further, these results also follow work documenting the *race-out-of-place* phenomenon: the idea that racial profiling is a product of conceptions about persons of a particular racial/ethnic background and conceptions about spaces, i.e. who “belongs” to an area (Smith, 1986; Meehan & Ponder, 2002). It
is plausible that those with a high awareness of WSS are more likely to believe that Black people are “out-of-place” in suburban areas, and hence are more likely to criminalize them. The effect of WSS on participants’ rating of the White target’s criminality in the suburb also supports this theory. Results revealed that, in the suburb, as WSS increased, participants’ criminal rating of the White target decreased. Perhaps the more people believe that White people belong to, and are “race-in-place” in, the suburb, the less vigilant they are in response to their presence, resulting in a lesser degree of criminalization.

I did not expect the race-out-of-place narrative to explain participants’ criminality ratings of the White target in the inner city. Unlike the legacy of racial minority exclusion in suburban areas, inner-cities have no history of actively excluding Whites (Jackson, 1987). White people may therefore not seem out of place in the inner city, perhaps making people less suspicious of their actions there. I instead expected that the Black space stereotype would be the lens through which the White target would be perceived in the inner city. However, the present findings were inconsistent with this prediction: the White target’s criminality decreased with increases in BSS. Perhaps a contrast effect can explain this unpredicted relationship. On the other hand, the null effect of BSS on participants’ ratings of the Black target’s criminality in the inner-city is consistent with previous work. Wittenbrink et al. (2001) have shown that depicting Black people in stereotypically negative Black contexts (e.g., gang activity) does not increase anti-black bias compared to a control condition. Ergo, it is conceivable that even as people’s Black space stereotypes increase, their perceptions of a Black target’s criminality do not change, conceivably, because of a ceiling effect.

Interestingly, while not the focus of the present research, these results suggest that stereotypes about a particular type of space might influence person perception in multiple contexts. In this study, results revealed that BSS predicted participants’ ratings of the White target in the suburban
neighborhood. Future studies should investigate how and why stereotypes about Black spaces, for example, influence person perception in spaces associated with different racial groups.

Finally, though I found support for some of my hypotheses, the number of participants who failed the manipulation check is a major concern. The percentage of participants who did not remember the target’s name and/or the neighborhood in which the vignette was situated was higher in this study than in the piloting phase (See Appendix C, Pilot 4). In the pilot study, participants read vignettes with either the target’s name or a neighborhood context. Presenting participants with both the target name and neighborhood might have depressed their retention of information. Future studies could present participants with the vignette twice: once so that they can get acquainted to the information in the vignette and again before they respond to the main dependent measures. Alternately, it is possible that the combination of race and neighborhood cues heightened participants’ motivation to respond without prejudice, and as such they actively selected the wrong answer choice. To address this issue, future studies could replicate this paradigm using more subtle manipulations.
4. CONCLUSION

Though limited and requiring replication, this study provides some evidence suggesting that racially imbued physical contexts, along with their associated stereotypes, can influence person-perception. Further, this study highlights the need for continued social psychological exploration of physical context, particularly as it shapes person-perception, which can provide a fuller understanding of social perception processes. Future work should investigate other moderators of these relationships (e.g., MCP, media consumptions, stereotype content) that affect the relationships investigated in this study.
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APPENDIX A

ATTENTION-CHECK ITEMS

Vignette memory checks.

1. How long did the individual stay on his phone while pacing the block?
   a. about 1 minute
   b. about 10 minutes
   c. about 5 minutes

2. What hand tool was mentioned in the scenario?
   a. Hammer
   b. Screwdriver
   c. Wrench

3. What was the sex of the individual in the vignette?
   a. Male
   b. Female

Informational manipulation checks.

1. In what type of neighborhood context did the story take place?
   a. Suburb
   b. inner-city
   c. a specific neighborhood context was mentioned, but I don't remember which one specifically; a specific neighborhood context was not presented
   d. I don't remember.

Participants who selected “a specific neighborhood context was mentioned, but I don't remember which one specifically” were re-routed to the question:

   I. What was the specific neighborhood mentioned in the vignette?”
      a. Suburb
      b. inner-city

2. What was the name of the individual in the short story?
   a. Jamal
   b. Dwayne
   c. Tom
   d. Andrew
   e. a name was presented, but I do not remember which one specifically
   f. a name was not presented

Participants who selected “a name was presented, but I do not remember which one specifically” were re-routed to the question:

II. If you had to guess the individual’s name, what would it be?
   a. Jamal
   b. Dwayne
   c. Tom
   d. Andrew
APPENDIX B

DETAILED INSTRUCTIONS

Study Outline

This study has three sections:

1) First you will be randomly assigned to read one of fifteen possible short stories. Your job is to read this story and pay close attention to the information provided.

In each short story, the writer "shows without telling" in different ways (i.e. the writer describes a situation through action, words, thoughts, senses or feelings instead of through summarization and description).

2) Next, you will answer a series of memory questions about this story.

3) Finally, you will provide your opinions of the writer's ability to "show without telling".

**Next Page

You are now being randomly assigned to view a short story where the author "shows without telling" using two of the following approaches:

**Literary Language Emphasis**

A. personification
B. puns
C. metaphor
D. alliteration
E. hyperbole

**Sensation Emphasis**

A. taste
B. emotion
C. touch
D. sight
E. smell

**Contextual Emphasis**

A. airport
B. post office
C. inner city
D. suburb
E. neighborhood

**Character Emphasis**

A. personal attributes
B. physical characteristics
C. personality attributes
D. use of language
E. style of dress
APPENDIX C

Pilot 1: Crimes

I ran this pilot to identify race- and place-neutral crime to use as a theme to construct the stimulus materials for my main Studies.

**Participants:** In total, I recruited 20 participants (11 women, 8 men, 7 “White/European American, 5 “East Asian/East Asian American, 1 South Asian/South Asian American, 4 Latino/Hispanic American, 1 Middle Eastern/Arab American, 1 “Other”, \( M_{age} = 20.63 \) years, age range: 18-27 years) from the University of Illinois at Chicago subject pool.

**Measures and Procedure:** After providing informed consent, participants responded to all of the following questions in random order: “What crimes would most Americans say that **Black** (**White**) Americans are most likely to commit?” “What crimes would most Americans say are most likely to be committed in an **inner-city** (**suburban**) area?”, and “What crimes would most Americans say are most likely crimes to occur in **America**”. Blind to the purpose of the experiment and condition, two trained research assistants (RAs) then coded the data into 34 distinct categories, Cohen’s kappa = .94.

**Results and Discussion:** In total, participants made 446 data entries across the five experimental conditions. I examined the top five most frequently listed crimes across all conditions: **homicide** \( (N=53) \), **sex crimes** \( (N=48) \), **robbery** \( (N=41) \), **theft** \( (N=39) \), **breaking and entering** \( (N=26) \). I decided to use **robbery** or **breaking and entering** as potential crime themes, because a **homicide**, **sex crime**, or **robbery** theme, they do not require the presence of a victim, which, in my judgment, might complicate the design of the main studies.
Pilot 2: Vignette and Crime Measure

In the following studies (Pilot 2a and Pilot 2b), I investigated the criminal ambiguity of a House and a Bike vignette devoid of race and context information. In Pilot 2a, I evaluated both the House and Bike vignettes. In Pilot 2b, I evaluated only the House vignette.

Pilot 2a

Participants and Design: In total, I recruited 38 participants (12 women, 25 men, 1 unspecified, 11 “White/European American, 5 Black/African-American”, 4 “East Asian/East Asian American, 9 South Asian/South Asian American, 5 Latino/Hispanic American, 1 Middle Eastern/Arab American, 2 “Other”, $M_{age}$ = 19.59 years, age range: 18-23 years) from the University of Illinois at Chicago subject pool.

Procedure and measures: After providing informed consent, I randomly assigned participants to read either a House or a Bike vignette (See Appendix B). Then, participants responded to the following questions, randomly presented: “The man was doing something illegal”, “The man was doing something good”, “The man was doing something suspicious”, “The man was doing something wrong”, and “The man is a law-abiding citizen”, on a 7-point likert scale (1= strongly disagree and 7= strongly agree). Finally, per each vignette condition, participants made a force choice between two options. In the Bike vignette condition, participants made a choice between: (1) “I think it most likely that this person broke the bike free because he was stealing it”, and (2) “I think it most likely that this person broke the bike free because he lost the key to his bike-lock”. In the House vignette condition, participants made a choice between: (1) “I think it most likely that this person was trying to enter the house through the window because he does not live in this house and was trying to break into the house”, and (2) “I think it most likely that this person was trying to enter the house through the window because he lives in this house and lost his house-keys”. After each choice, participants rated the degree
to which they were certain of their decision on a 7-point likert scale (1 = *very uncertain* and 7 = *very certain*).

For purposes of analyses, I reverse coded “The man was doing something *good*” and “The man is a *law-abiding citizen*” to keep the language used consistent—higher values reflect higher criminality perceptions. I then constructed a composite measure by averaging the five Crime Perception individual items, per vignette condition. Higher values on the scale (closer to 7) signify higher perceptions of criminality.

**Results and Discussion:** The composite measure reliability was high in both the Bike vignette condition, $\alpha = .91$, and the House vignette condition, $\alpha = .92$. One-sample $t$-test revealed that the composite measure differed from the scale midpoint in the Bike vignette condition ($M = 5.51$, $SD = 1.21$), $t(18) = 5.42$, $p < .001$, but not in the House vignette condition ($M = 4.44$, $SD = 1.11$), $t(18) = 1.72$, $p = .102$. **House vignette:** the number of participants who thought the target’s actions were illegal ($N = 8$) and lawful ($N = 10$) did not differ, $X^2 (18) = .22$, $p = .637$. Participants who thought the vignette portrayed an illegal act ($M = 4.90$, $SD = 1.00$) were more certain of their decision than those who thought the vignette portrayed a lawful act ($M = 3.81$, $SD = .56$), $t(16) = 2.94$, $p = .010$. **Bike vignette condition:** the number of participants who thought the target’s actions were illegal ($N = 13$) and lawful ($N = 6$) did not differ, $X^2 (19) = 2.58$, $p = .108$. Participants who thought vignette portrayed an illegal act ($M = 6.15$, $SD = .82$) were more certain of their decision than those who thought the vignette portrayed a lawful act ($M = 4.10$, $SD = .47$), $t(17) = 5.68$, $p < .001$.

Together, these results suggest that participants perceived the House vignette as less criminal, more ambiguous, than the Bike vignette.
Pilot 2b

Participants: In total, I recruited 26 participants (12 women, 14 men, 6 “White/European American, 4 Black/African-American”, 1 “East Asian/East Asian American, 2 South Asian/South Asian American, 11 Latino/Hispanic American, 2 “Other”, $M_{age} = 19.23$ years, age range: 18-21 years) from the University of Illinois at Chicago subject pool.

Procedure and measures: In this pilot study, participants evaluated only the House vignette. The methods and procedures followed that of Pilot 2a. In addition, for the criminality perception items, I dropped three items and replaced them with two new items. Firstly, I dropped the item, “This man is a law-abiding citizen” because it does not focus on the action of the protagonist. Secondly, I dropped the item “The man was doing something suspicious” because of its ambiguity: one can do something suspicious and legal, and one can do something suspicious and illegal. Lastly, I dropped the item “The man was doing something good”. I replaced the items with “The man was doing something justifiable” and “The man was doing something criminal”. To create the composite measure, I reverse coded “The man was doing something justifiable” and then I averaged the four individual crime perception items—higher values reflect higher perceptions of criminality.

Results and Discussion: The reliability of the composite measure was high, Cronbach’s alpha = .860. A one sample t-test revealed no difference between the composite measure and the midpoint, neither agree/disagree (4), ($M = 4.08, SD = .44$), $t(25) = .983, p = .335$. The number of participants who thought the target’s actions were illegal ($N = 11$) and lawful ($N = 15$) did not differ, $X^2 (26) = .62, p = .433$. Participants who thought vignette portrayed an illegal act ($M = 4.33, SD = .39$) were more certain of their decision than those who thought the vignette portrayed a lawful act ($M = 3.91, SD = .39$), $t(24) = 2.70, p = .012$. 
Pilot 3a: Names

The main goal of this pilot study was to generate Black/African American and White/Caucasian American names.

Participants: In total, I recruited 24 participants (13 women, 11 men, 18 “White/European American, 3 Black/African-American”, 1 “East Asian/East Asian American, 1 Latino/Hispanic American, 1 “Other”, $M_{age}=41.71$ years, age range: 21-67 years) from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk).

Measures and Procedure: After providing informed consent, I instructed participants to list names that most Americans would associate with Black/African Americans and White/Caucasian Americans, in random order (within-subjects design).

Results and Discussion: In total, participants made 423 entries across both conditions (189 entries in Black/African-American condition, 234 in White/Caucasian American condition). To select 10 Black/African American names and 10 White/Caucasian names for further evaluation in Pilot 3b, I made a series of judgments\(^1\). The Black/African-American names I selected are: Willie ($N=2$), Marcus ($N=3$), Rufus ($N=3$), Andre ($N=6$), Dwayne ($N=2$), Terrance ($N=2$), Demetrius ($N=2$), Trevon ($N=3$), Lebron ($N=6$), and Jamal ($N=6$). The White/Caucasian American names I selected: Tom ($N=5$), Tim ($N=4$), Andrew ($N=4$), Bob ($N=6$), Mark ($N=4$), John ($N=12$), Joe, ($N=5$), Robert ($N=4$), Mike ($N=6$), and James ($N=4$).

Pilot 3b: Name Evaluations

I designed this study with the end goal of selecting two Black/African American names and two White/Caucasian American names to use as a race proxy in my main studies.

---

\(^1\) Firstly, I selected the top ten most frequently listed names per condition. I excluded names that were present in both conditions. If the names in the top 10 were names of “famous” individuals, e.g. Denzel Washington, I excluded them. Secondly, though, the name Tyrone appeared most frequently in the Black/African American condition, I excluded it from the selection process because of its abundance in Psychology studies. Finally, when the frequency of two or more names was equal, I selected the names I thought would maximize the success of the race manipulation in the main studies.
**Participants:** In total, I recruited 26 participants (15 women, 11 men, 23 “White/European American, 1 Black/African-American”, 1 “East Asian/East Asian American, 1 Native American/American Indian, \(M_{age} = 39.54 \) years, age range: 18-60 years) from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk).

**Measures and Procedure:** After providing informed consent, participants rated the degree to which most Americans associate the names selected in Pilot 3a to the White, Black, Latino, Asian racial groups on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *very weak* and 7 = *very strong*).

**Black-White index.** I calculated the Black-White Index (BWI) by subtracting the mean Whiteness ratings from the mean Blackness ratings of each name. A higher BWI suggests that participants perceived the name as “more Black than White”, whereas a lower BWI suggests that participants perceived the name as “more White than Black”.

**Results and Discussion:** Participants associated all the Black/African American names, with the exception of the name *Willie*, greatest with the Black/African American racial group than the White/Caucasian American racial group: *Willie* (BWI = 0.12), *Marcus* (BWI = 0.96), *Rufus* (BWI = 1.12), *Andre* (BWI = 1.61), *Dwayne* (BWI = 1.92), *Terrance* (BWI = 1.92), *Demetrius* (BWI = 1.93), *Trevon* (BWI = 3.96), *Lebron* (BWI = 4.40), and *Jamal* (BWI = 4.43). Participants associated all White/Caucasian American names greatest with the White racial group than Black, Latino, or Asian racial groups: *Tom* (BWI = -2.96), *Tim* (BWI = -2.58), *Andrew* (BWI = -2.57), *Bob* (BWI = -2.28), *Mark* (BWI = -1.84), *John* (BWI = -1.65), *Joe* (BWI = -1.56), *Robert* (BWI = -1.50), *Mike* (BWI = -1.38), and *James* (BWI = -1.12). Using various criteria, I selected the names *Jamal* and *Lebron* to represent the
Black/African-American race proxies, and Tom and Andrew to represent the White/Caucasian-American race proxies.²

**Pilot 4: Manipulation-Check**

With this study, I investigated the full study paradigm. In particular, I investigated how participants’ interaction with the study and stimuli, and the race and context manipulations.

**Participants:** In total, I recruited 128 participants (80 women, 40 men, 8 unidentified, 92 “White/European American, 13 “Black/African American”, 5 “East Asian/East Asian American, 3 South Asian/South Asian American, 3 Latino/Hispanic American, 1 Native American/American Indian”, 3 “Other”, $M_{age}=35.63$ years, age range: 22 – 67 years) from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Eight participants did not complete the demographics.

**Design and Procedures:** The study design followed that of Study 1 except the questions asking participants to identify the target name and context presented in the vignette did not come after the main dependent items.

**Data analysis:** I analyzed the results for each condition separately then combined the results for Jamal and Lebron, to represent the “Black condition” and the results for Tom and Andrew, to represent the “White condition”. Across all conditions, I categorized a 90% or above “correct” response rate as a success³.

---

² For the Black/African-American names, I selected names with a high BWI. For the White/Caucasian-American names, I selected names with a low BWI. Initially, for the White/Caucasian names I decided on Tom and Tim. However, given the close similarities between the two names (only a vowel difference), I decided to forgo the name Tim and selected the name Andrew as it too met selection criteria.

³ In the inner-city and suburban conditions, I considered selection “no name was presented” correct when participants had to recall the name of the target portrayed in the vignette. In addition, I considered the selection of “inner-city” and “suburb” response in the inner city and suburb conditions, respectively, as the correct response.

In the Jamal and Lebron conditions, participants who selected either Jamal or Lebron when asked about the name of the target presented in the vignette were correct in their response, and consequently passed the manipulation. I decided on accepting both answers because the main manipulation of the study does not focus on names, but rather race and previous pilot results suggest that people associate both Jamal and Lebron strongest with the Black/African American racial group. Similarly, in the Tom and Andrew conditions, I accepted both the names Tom and Andrew as correct responses to the race
Results and discussion: Name manipulation success rate, p = %: Jamal (N = 16 p = 88), Lebron (N = 20, p = 95), Tom (N = 23, p = 100), Andrew (N = 21, p = 95), Black (N = 36, p = 92), White (N = 44, p = 97), Inner-city (N = 17, p = 95), Suburb (N = 20 p = 100). Context manipulation: Jamal (N = 16, p = 80), Lebron (N = 21, p = 100), Tom (N = 19, p = 82), Andrew (N = 19, p = 86), Black (N = 37, p = 90), White (N =38, p = 85), Inner-city (N = 16, p = 89), Suburb (N = 18, p = 85).

Participants rated the names Lebron (White: M = 2.05, SD = 1.62; Black: M = 6.05, SD = 1.28; BWI = 4.00) and Jamal (White: M =3.16, SD = 1.95; Black: M = 5.84, SD = 1.12; BWI = 2.68) as more Black/African-American than White/Caucasian-America, both ps < .05. Participants rated the names Tom (White: M = 6.26, SD = 1.01; Black: M = 3.52, SD = 1.81; BWI = -2.74) and Andrew (White: M = 5.81, SD = 1.29; Black: M = 4.67, SD = 1.06; BWI = -1.14) as more White/Caucasian-America than Black/African-American, both ps < .05. Participants rated the inner-city as more Black/African-American than White/Caucasian-America, (White: M = 3.06, SD = 1.77; Black: M = 6.38, SD = .96; BWI = 3.02), p <.05. Participants rated the suburb as more White/Caucasian-America than Black/African-American, (White: M = 5.62, S.D= 1.40; Black: M = 3.48, SD = 1.29; BWI = -2.14), p <.05. Overall, participants saw the Black Condition as more Black/African-American than White/Caucasian-America, (White: M = 2.45, SD = 1.90; Black: M = 5.80, SD = 1.51 ), p <.05, and saw the White Condition as more White/Caucasian-America than Black/African-American, (White: M = 6.16 , SD = 1.04 ; Black: M = 3.60, SD = 1.74), p <.05.

__________________________________________________________

manipulation for the above reasons. Finally, in the Jamal, Lebron, Tom and Andrew conditions, I accepted the responses “neighborhood” and “no context was presented” as correct to the question concerning the context presented in the vignette. I added “No context was presented” as a “correct” response because in the vignette “neighborhood” and no specific context is mentioned. It is possible that some participants will take this as a cue that “no specific context was presented” and therefore, “none was presented” when asked about the context presented in the vignette.
At about noon a man, alone on a block, walks up to a bike locked to a pole. He examines the bike, retrieves some tools from his bag, and then begins some work on it. He uses his wrench and begins to remove the back tire of the bike, the part of the bike locked to the pole. He stops for about 10 seconds to answer his phone. He talks on the phone for another two-three minutes. He continues to remove the wheel paying no attention to traffic or pedestrians. He frees the wheel, and then makes a phone call. “I’ll have to leave the tire here”, he says. “I’ll buy a new one”. He leaves hurriedly with the front half of the bike.

Holding the front knob, a man goes through his bag, retrieves a screwdriver and proceeds to work on the lock. After about 30 seconds he retreats to the sidewalk and pulls out his phone. “I can’t get in”, he says, and continues on the phone for about one minute while pacing up and down the block. After he hangs up he goes back to the house, but this time paces along the sides of the house. He rests on the glass and tries peeping in. He then tries to force the window open. All while doing that, he was touching his pockets and looking through his bag.
APPENDIX D

VIGNETTE

Holding the front doorknob, a man goes through his bag, retrieves a screwdriver and proceeds to work on the lock. After about 30 seconds, he retreats to the sidewalk and pulls out his phone. “Dwayne /Jamal/Tom/Andrew here…I can’t get in” he says. Then he continues on the phone for about one minute while pacing up and down the inner city neighborhood/ suburban neighborhood/neighborhood block. After he hangs up he goes back to the house, but this time paces along the sides of the house. He rests on the glass and tries peeping in. He then tries to force the window open. All while doing that, he was touching his pockets and looking through his bag.

*Bolded texts represent experimental manipulations.
### APPENDIX E

**SPACE –FOCUSED STEREOTYPE LIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black and White neighborhood stereotype items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirty+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-maintained*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposed to crime+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghetto+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run-down+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime-ridden+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. (F)= Filler items. * Reverse coded for Black neighborhood stereotype measure. + reverse coded for White neighborhood stereotype measure.*
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