Racial differences in sentiments: Exploring variant cultures

Abigail A. Sewell *, David R. Heise

Department of Sociology, Ballantine Hall 744, Indiana University, 1020 E. Kirkwood Ave., Bloomington, IN 47405, United States

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

The pervasiveness of Black–White differences in attitudes and beliefs suggest a variant Black culture is co-present with White culture. Using a data set from the 1970s, we assess whether a variant Black culture existed contemporaneously at that time. Results reveal distinct sentiment norms among Blacks and Whites about a range of concepts, comparable in magnitude to inter-nation variations. We discuss ways that Black culture manifested itself and consider methodological challenges in studying Black culture.

© 2010 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Since the 1960s and 1970s, research regarding the sociology of Blacks[1] in America has grappled with how to explain large Black–White differences in cultural attitudes and norms. Notwithstanding the deployment of multiple frameworks in any given study, early research was dominated by two ideological frameworks that held White middle-class ideals as the norm. First, cultural deviance theory conveyed aspects of Black civil society as distinctly pathological, promoting the reorganization of Black civil society through an emphasis on both structural change and personal responsibility (see Allen, 1978; Staples, 1971 for a review).[2] Second, cultural equivalence theory legitimated those Black institutions that conformed to White middle-class norms and attributed differences between Blacks and Whites to racial differences in social class and other life circumstances (e.g., Frazier, 1939; Scanzoni, 1971).

However, a third perspective, with its etiologies in the cultural variance framework of family researchers (Allen, 1978) and structural explanations of poverty (Wilson, 1978, 1996), has taken root and has given rise to a multi-faceted perspective on cultural differences in family and general social life (see Dilworth-Anderson, Burton, & Johnson, 1993; McLanahan, 1985; Small & Newman, 2001). In this approach social institutions within Black and White civil society represent distinctive cultural forms that are "outgrowths of their respective sociocultural contexts" (Allen, 1978, p. 125), and Black–White differences in sentiments across a wide array of cultural concepts are situated within America's system of racial stratification.

This article expands upon the cultural variance framework and, in particular, examines how America's racialized social system has impacted Blacks' sentiments, producing a Black culture at variance with the dominant White culture. In the next

---

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 812 855 1547; fax: +1 812 855 0781.
  E-mail addresses: aasewell@indiana.edu (A.A. Sewell), heise@indiana.edu (D.R. Heise).

[1] "Black" includes individuals of African descent living in America, regardless of immediate country of origin. Research on African and Caribbean immigrants documents that Black experiences often transcend Afro-ethnic boundaries, due to high levels of racial residential segregation, public discourses of racial identification, and the racialized structure of life opportunities (Waters, 1999).

[2] See Harvey and Reed (1996) for an alternative interpretation of the cultural deviance/culture-of-poverty framework. These authors, as do we, acknowledge that socially constructed adaptations to poverty and other oppressive social forces are not necessarily degenerative and instead may represent action frameworks that allow individuals and groups with limited resources to successfully cope with the challenges of marginalization and impoverishment (see also Gould, 1999).

section we review arguments regarding the general effects of structural racism on subjective culture. Then, we examine how Black family structures have responded to racism. These discussions lead to a hypothesis about general cultural differences between Blacks and Whites in America and three specific hypotheses about unique Black sentiment norms with regard to family, gender, and age. We then discuss the legacy data that we use for testing the hypotheses, including details regarding rating scales, rated concepts, and raters. In Section 3 we test each hypothesis by means of quantitative statistics. In Section 4 we offer some qualitative elaborations of the quantitative results and consider a number of issues that arise in comparing Black and White cultures.

1.1. Racial stratification and subjective culture

Within a racialized social system, members of the race in the superior position accrue psychological, social, material, and political benefits that do not accrue easily to members of less privileged races. Racialization in America, defined as "the extension of racial meaning to a previously racially unclassified relationship, social practice or group" (Omi & Winant, 1986, p. 64; see also Zuberi, 2001), has taken place in a wide variety of forms including, but not limited to, the enslavement, political and economic deprivation, and government-sanctioned residential and educational segregation imposed on Blacks (Kozol, 1991; Massey & Denton, 1993; Oliver & Shapiro, 1995; Williams & Collins, 2001). Such mechanisms of systemic and structural racism (Carmichael & Hamilton, 1967; Feagin, 2006; Marable, 1983) constitute disruptive social changes to Black social development (Frazier, 1939) that have instigated the evolution of special social forms and functionalities within Black civil society (Billingsley, 1968; Dickson, 1993; West, 1993; Whaley, 2001).

While much research has attended to the indirect and direct socioeconomic consequences of structured racial inequality (Oliver & Shapiro, 1995; Pager, 2003; Royster, 2003), less research has examined the ideological and attitudinal consequences of racial stratification (Hunt, Jackson, Powell, & Steelman, 2000). However, social psychological studies that note persistent racial differences in attitudes, beliefs, cognitive frames, and ideologies suggest that social stratification by race, and the racialized social system that such stratification creates, do indeed configure the Black ethos (Hunt, 1996, 2007; Jackman & Jackman, 1973; Jackson, 1997; Schuman, Steeh, Bobo, & Krysan, 1997). Shared experiences of inequality alter the resources and meanings typically attached to the cognitions and behaviors involved in Black interactional relationships (Gecas, 1982; House, 1995; Hunt et al., 2000; Kohn, 1989; Stryker, 1980).

Bonilla-Silva (1996) posits that the extent to which psychological attributes are distinct between racial groups reflects the extent to which a racialized social system uniquely defines the life structures and life opportunities of racial group members. From this theoretical perspective, the ways that people view the world are intimately tied to their place in a systemic, racial hierarchy (Feagin, 2006). Cultural sentiments, as measured by the feelings attached to concepts regularly employed by a social group in everyday interaction (Heise, 2007), can be seen as psychological manifestations of the racialization of social groups.

Black–White differences in subjective culture are reflected in linguistic structures. Distinctive oral elements of Black society – known commonly as African American Vernacular English (AAVE) – transcend geographic and temporal boundaries, leading researchers to posit that they are situated in the cultural frameworks of communities of African descent. According to Labov (1972, p. 284), "the vernacular culture itself is equally constant from one urban area to another; the grammar is just one of the many elements of the social pattern which is transmitted."

Most literature on how AAVE differs from Standard American English (SAE), however, focuses on phonology, grammar, and discourse, while semantic issues have been "severely neglected" (Mufwene & Rickford, 1998). However, Labov (1998, p. 147) observed that "the most distinctive feature of modern AAVE is the rich development of semantic possibilities [grammatical colorization] in the [African American] system, possibilities that are unavailable and unknown to speakers of [other American dialects]" (Labov, 1998, p. 147). Smitherman (1998b, p. 207) noted that AAVE has a unique lexicon "developed by giving special meanings to English words." As Smitherman (1998a, p. 30) observed, "the linguistic shape of the words. . . can readily be identified as Standard English. . . . But these words do not always hold the same meaning" in AAVE as in SAE. Smitherman (1998b) identified dozens of examples of English words and phrases which did have unique meanings in AAVE—for example, brother, bad, rip, tip, fat, and jam; plus others which have trickled into the vernacular of popular culture, like cool, boom-box, and pad.

Black–White differences in subjective culture also are reflected in social attitudes and sentiments. Primarily, research on social attitudes has explored racial differences in "hot topics," or highly politicized social attitudes (Bobo & Zubrinsky, 1996; Unnever & Cullen, 2007), beliefs about social institutions with well-documented disparities in social outcomes (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986; Lincoln & Mamiya, 1990), and mental health and distress (Hughes & Thomas, 1998; Kessler, Mickelson, & Williams, 1999)—this is not an exhaustive list but does illustrate the breadth of social attitudes where racial differences have been documented.

A few studies have employed semantic differential methods (Osgood, 1964) to understand racial differences in cultural sentiments. One such study did not find expected differences (Gordon, Short, Cartwright, & Strodtbeck, 1963), but it examined relatively few concepts and employed semantic differential scales that were valid for Whites but not for Blacks. Another study by Landis, McGrew, Day, Savage, & Saral (1976), which did employ rating scales developed separately for Blacks and Whites, measured sentiments for 620 concepts and examined Black–White differences in affective meanings of 112 concepts. Sentiments were measured among Black adolescent boys in ghetto areas of Chicago and among White adolescent boys in Urbana, Illinois. Analyses dealing with material possessions, conflict, personal relations, and quality of life established conclusively that affective meanings of some concepts differed between Blacks and Whites. Landis et al. (1976, p. 78)

concluded: "Blacks value the same goals, relationships, and ideals that Whites do, but in many cases they value them more. Where the differences occur, they seem related to perceptions of the amount of effort necessary to achieve those goals and the potency of those aims in changing one's life." Beyond the subset of 22 concepts that they analyzed explicitly, Landis et al. (1976, p. 71) noted that their table of affective profiles for 112 concepts "reveals many concepts in which differences among the groups appear."

1.2. Black family structures

Family scholars have suggested that Blacks' structural position has produced a unique Black extended family structure (Billingsley, 1992). Beyond reproductive and nurturance functions, Black extended families often serve as a source of communal relief and survival (Adams, 1970; Billingsley, 1968; Rainwater & Yancey, 1967; Stack, 1974). They have been cited as protecting family members against social institutions that Whites might see as supportive, such as police forces, educational systems, and government agencies (Hays & Mindel, 1973). In contrast, Whites' involvement with complex extended families rapidly declined during the mid-twentieth century (Goldscheider & Bures, 2003; Ruggles, 1994). Hays and Mindel (1973) found that Whites viewed parents and siblings as more salient than extended kin, whereas Blacks viewed siblings and extended kin as more salient than parents.

The age composition of Black families is younger than that of White families, with Black grandparents being younger in age on average than their White counterparts (Burton & Bengtson, 1985; Martin & Martin, 1985). Related to the age difference, Black extended families often provide children-centered caregiving functions necessitated by high rates of single parents and parentless children among Black families (Ruggles, 1994; Stack, 1974; Tienda & Angel, 1982), while White extended families often provide parent-centered caregiving necessitated by the aging structure of the general population (Angel & Tienda, 1982; Sweet & Bumpass, 1987). As such, three-generation families of Blacks focus on care of grandchildren (Peek, Koropeckyj-Cox, Zsembik, & Coward, 2004; Taylor, Chatters, & Jackson, 1993), while three-generation families of Whites focus on care of grandparents (Hays & Mindel, 1973).

Social demographers posit that a separation of marriage and childbearing among Blacks is fostered by gradual declines in Black marriage rates over time and an unequal sex ratio favoring Black women (Bennett, Bloom, & Craig, 1989; Teachman, Tedrow, & Crowder, 2000). The paucity of marriageable Black men is caused by high infant mortality and homicide rates of Black males (Bennett et al., 1989; Staples, 1987), and the disproportionate number of Black men in penal and mental institutions (Western & Beckett, 1999; Williams & Jackson, 2005). Furthermore, increasing rates of male joblessness since the 1950s and racial inequalities in labor force participation (Quillian, 2003) posed challenges to Black men in establishing gainful employment to support a family. Some scholars assert that institutional and private forms of discrimination in residence, educational, and hiring and promoting practices have led to these racial inequalities in labor force participation (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004; Kozol, 1991; Massey & Denton, 1993; Pager, 2003) and, thereby, indirectly undermined Blacks' likelihood of entering high quality first marriages, made divorce more common, and decreased chances of remarrying after divorce (Dickson, 1993; Staples, 1987).

Socialization ideologies also vary between Blacks and Whites, in a manner yielding less stigmatized sentiments about women among Blacks. Research indicates that Black mothers have been socializing their children into an egalitarian view of gender which emphasized the independence and self-sufficiency of women and, thereby, maintained norms of gender relations atypical of Whites (Hill, 2002; Kandel, 1971; Thornton, Chatters, Taylor, & Allen, 1990). In fact, motherhood itself has been identified as conferring "a revered status" upon Black women (Collins, 1987) across an array of Black family forms (Moore, 2008).

Even Black fathers have played a role in fostering independence among their daughters (Wilson, Tolson, Hinton, & Kiernan, 1990). Researchers have found that Black men and women, compared to their white counterparts, hold more positive attitudes towards the independence of working wives even while holding more conservative attitudes towards other aspects of gender roles, like division of housework (Kamo & Cohen, 1998; McLoyd, Cauce, Takeuchi, & Leon, 2000). Black gender norms are rooted in slavery's imposition of multiple, interlocking oppressions based on race, class, and gender (Collins, 1990) and reinforced by Black children's frequent exposure to female family members who are sole providers or significant contributors to the survival of the family (Dill, 1979).

Family structure arrangements may also have influenced Blacks' sentiments regarding the elderly and youth. Research examining grandmother involvement in childrearing processes (Burton & Bengtson, 1985; Hunter, 1997) has suggested that the Black elderly have received high valuation among Black community members (Taylor, Chatters, Tucker, & Lewis, 1990), though little empirical research formally tests this assumption. Meanwhile, Black parents have expected their children to fulfill dreams they themselves were unable to actualize (Hill, 2002; McLoyd et al., 2000) due to structural conditions—a process that may not be unique to Blacks.

1.3. Hypotheses

The studies that we reviewed of the AAVE lexicon and of racial differences in attitudes and sentiments established that Black culture diverges from White culture to some degree. We state the idea of divergent cultures as our first hypothesis. (This and subsequent propositions are bounded to the time period of the legacy data we will use for testing.)

(1) During the 1960s and 1970s Black and White sentiments differed across multiple semantic domains in a manner that precludes viewing the Black culture as largely the same as White culture.
Our review of the effect of a racialized social system on Black family structures leads us to propose three additional hypotheses regarding specific differences in Black and White sentiments.

(2) More than Whites, Blacks evaluated conjugal aspects of marriage less positively than aspects related to lineage during the 1960s and 1970s.

(3) Compared to Whites, Blacks attributed more status, power, and agency to femaleness relative to maleness during the 1960s and 1970s.

(4) Blacks, compared to Whites, evaluated elder-related and youth-related concepts more positively than concepts related to mid-adulthood during the 1960s and 1970s.

2. Data

We utilize legacy data that have lain fallow for three decades, largely because racial differences evident in the data did not fit the interpretive frameworks of cultural deviance theory or cultural equivalence theory. In particular, we compare measurements in a Black atlas of affective meanings with measurements in a parallel White atlas, both published[3] in an *Atlas of Affective Meanings* (Project on Cross-Cultural Affective Meanings, 1978). Some of our analyses also make use of German data published in the *Atlas*.[4]

The data were collected as part of a comprehensive study of affective meaning in dozens of cultures around the world (Osgood, 1964, 1990; Osgood, May, & Miron, 1975; see Heise, 2010, Chapters 1–3), which established that affective meaning universally varies along three dimensions—Evaluation, Potency, and Activity. Work in each culture consisted of two phases: (1) a tool-making project to develop indigenous scales for measuring the affective meanings of concepts within the culture; and (2) compilation of an *Atlas of Affective Meanings* to apply the tools developed in phase one.

The tool-making phase in each culture involved standard procedures described in detail in the Osgood references. Heise (2007, p. 10–11) provided the following synopsis.

> 1. Concepts that exist in every culture—like father, mother, child, water, moon—were assembled into a list. 2. Natives in each culture were asked to respond to each concept on the list with a modifier, and to name the opposite of that modifier. For example, some individuals in the U.S.A. might respond to mother with the word sweet, and give the word sour as the opposite. 3. The modifier opposites were formed into scales, and natives used the scales to rate each concept on the list. Ratings of a concept on a scale were averaged to get a number indicating how raters from that culture typically positioned the concept on the scale. 4. For each culture, a table was created, with a column for each scale, a row for each concept, and average ratings of concepts on scales in the cells. This allowed correlation coefficients to be computed between scales. For example, in the American table, average ratings of concepts on the sweet-sour scale and on the good-bad scale were used to compute a numerical correlation between the two scales. . . . 5. A pan-cultural table also was created, allowing scales in different cultures to be correlated. For example, American average ratings of concepts on the sweet-sour scale and Mexican average ratings on a bueno-malo scale were compared across all concepts in order to define the correlation between those two scales. 6. Statistical analysis of correlations between scales showed that the scales clustered into three major groups—Evaluation, Potency, Activity—and every culture contributed scales to each group. For example, all three scales mentioned above ended up in the Evaluation cluster, indicating that concepts rated as sweet by Americans tended to be rated good by Americans, and bueno by Mexicans.

Development of Black rating scales is described by Landis et al. (1976). Black English was treated as the language of a distinct culture, and the tool-making phase involved three groups: ten Black undergraduates reared in lower socioeconomic communities translated the universal concepts used in the cross-cultural project and later specified opposites of modifiers associated with the universal concepts. The modifiers associated with the universal concepts were elicited from 100 Black high-school students in Trenton, NJ. Ratings of the universal concepts on bi-polar scales created from the modifiers and their opposites were obtained from 760 Black high-school males "in the ghetto area of the West side of Chicago" (Landis et al., 1976, p. 59).

Since the complete procedures of cross-cultural tool-making were implemented to obtain scales for assessing Black affective meanings, data collected from Blacks with these scales was free of ethnocentric biases that might have been introduced by employing rating scales developed for Whites. Landis and Saral (1978) applied the scales in 1973-74 to compile an atlas of affective meanings for Blacks—the data used in this study.

Assuredly, the data set that we use lacks information about some populations of great interest: mid-life adults, individuals at various socioeconomic levels, females, and contemporary individuals. However, these data permit a fair test of whether a distinct Black culture existed after successive migrations of Blacks from the Old South into the segregated North post-World

---

[3] The second author purchased the *Atlas* as a computer print-out at the University of Illinois bookstore in 1978, and scanned data from American Whites, American Blacks, and Germans into digital form in 2006. Dan Landis deemed the data as being in the public domain in an email September 14, 2006.

[4] All data may be downloaded from an FTP Internet site associated with Heise's (2010) book, *Surveying Cultures*: ftp://ftp.wiley.com/public/sci_tech_med/surveying_cultures.

Table 1
Adjectives for semantic differential scales in American Black English and American White English (extracted from Landis & Saral, 1978).

Evaluation	Potency	Activity
Adjectives for Black English		
Good-foul (0.88, 0.73, 0.77)	Large-small (0.84, 0.68, 0.63)	Fast-slow (0.57, 0.56, 0.36)
All right-mad (0.86, 0.70, 0.80)	Big-small (0.83, 0.66, 0.58)	Jive-straight (0.12, 0.37, 0.19)
Clean-nasty (0.83, 0.66, 0.76)	Big-little (0.81, 0.57, 0.49)	Frail-wide (0.09, 0.26, 0.20)
Together-wrong (0.77, 0.73, 0.75)	Get-lay (0.20, 0.14, 0.16)	Beat-straight (0.08, 0.34, 0.21)
Adjectives for White English		
Nice-awful (0.96, 0.89, 0.94)	Big-little (0.81, 0.84, 0.79)	Noisy-quiet (0.56, 0.53, 0.54)
Sweet-sour (0.94, 0.87, 0.89)	Powerful-powerless (0.75, 0.61, 0.47)	Young-old (0.56, 0.30, 0.18)
Good-bad (0.93, 0.87, 0.94)	Deep-shallow (0.69, 0.65, 0.61)	Fast-slow (0.64, 0.65, 0.73)
Helpful-unhelpful (0.90, 0.84, 0.91)	Strong-weak (0.67, 0.63, 0.47)	Alive-dead (0.55, 0.46, 0.55)

Note: The first number in parentheses is the factor loading of the scale in an indigenous principal components analysis without rotation. The second number in parentheses is the factor loading in a bi-cultural principal components analysis, with varimax rotation. The third number in parentheses is the factor loading of the scale in a pan-cultural factor analysis.

War II. Youth sampled in these studies are from the cohort of Black men studied as adults in the subsequent decades of the 1980s and 1990s—Black men whose lives and attitudes comprise much of the data for our understandings of race, urbanicity, family, and other sociological phenomenon.

2.1. Scales

Scales for measuring affective meanings in White English also were developed with the complete cross-cultural protocol, employing high-school boys in Urbana, IL, in 1961–1962 (Snider & Osgood, 1969, p. 307; Landis et al., 1976, p. 61). Detailed results of the tool-making analyses for White English are presented by Osgood et al. (1975) as Appendices A, B, C, and E.

Table 1 shows the set of scales used to compile atlases of affective meanings for Blacks[5] and for Whites. Following standard procedure in the cross-cultural project (Snider & Osgood, 1969, p. 625), four scales were chosen to assess each dimension of measurement. The numbers in Table 1 show quantitative indices that were involved in choosing the scales.

- The first number in parentheses is the factor loading of the scale in an indigenous principal components analysis without rotation. To illustrate, the scale good-foul had a loading of 0.88 on the first principal component in the analysis of Black mean ratings of the universal concepts; and the scale nice-awful had a loading of 0.96 on the first principal component in the analysis of White mean ratings of the universal concepts. For both Blacks and Whites, Evaluation was the first principal component and Potency was the second principal component; Activity was the third principal component for Whites and the fourth for Blacks.
- The second number in parentheses is the factor loading in a bi-cultural principal components analysis, with varimax rotation. In the bi-cultural analysis, principal components were computed for Black and White scales combined, thereby involving twice as many scales as the indigenous analyses. Evaluations split into two factors with Evaluation for Whites emerging as the first rotated component, and Evaluation for Blacks as the second rotated component. Potency – Blacks and Whites combined – emerged as the third rotated component, and Activity – Blacks and Whites combined – as the fourth. In Table 1, we give the loadings of Black Evaluation scales on the second rotated component, and the loadings of White Evaluation scales on the first rotated component.
- The third number in parentheses is the factor loading in a pan-cultural factor analysis with 22 other cultures in the case of Blacks and 23 other cultures in the case of Whites. According to project protocol, these are the numbers guiding selection of scales for creation of the atlases. However, the Black scales get-lay, jive-straight, frail-wide, and beat-straight, and the White scale young-old all had feeble loadings on the dimensions they were supposed to measure. These scales most likely were chosen to minimize correlations among dimensions.

The semantic differentials used to collect data consisted of seven-step scales defined by adjective opposites at either end. Check-mark positions were coded with positive numeric values to measure goodness, powerfulness, and liveliness; negative values were used for bad, powerless, or quiet. Ratings on individual scales were converted into numbers with the following assumed-intervals codes: the most extreme rating positions were coded plus or minus 3; the second-most extreme positions were coded plus or minus 2; the least extreme positions were coded plus or minus 1; and ratings in the middle position were coded zero.

The atlases report composite factor scores for each concept. Composite factor scores were defined by Snider and Osgood (1969, p. 625) as: "The mean score for each dimension (E, P, A) using the four scales derived from the pan-cultural analysis

---

[5] The set of scales used to compile the Black and White atlases were somewhat different from the scales used in analyses by Landis et al. (1976).

for each dimension." The mean scores additionally were computed across all respondents who rated a concept—typically 20 or more individuals in the White and Black English projects.

2.2. Respondents

Data for the Black atlas were gathered from Black high-school males on Chicago's south side and central city districts during 1973–1974 (Landis & Saral, 1978). It should be noted that Black–White residential segregation remained high in the city of Chicago throughout the 1970s and into the new millennium (Iceland, Weinberg, & Steinmetz, 2002; Massey & Denton, 1993)—far above the value of 0.60 that indicates a very high level of segregation. Data for the White atlas were gathered from White high-school males in Urbana, IL; survey dates are not reported, but data collection in the 1960s can be inferred from the fact that a subset of the White atlas was published as an Appendix to Snider and Osgood's (1969) book.

Sampling of respondents within behavior settings where a culture is being reproduced – in this case high schools – is appropriate in studies of subjective culture, to the extent that the target population is culturally homogenous. Romney, Weller, & Batchelder (1986) provided a formal analysis of this issue, and Heise (2010, p. 14–15) reviewed principles involved in sampling from homogenous populations in order to assess cultural norms. The ages of the boys credentialed them for utilization as cultural adepts judging from Labov's (1972, p. 257) remark that "the most consistent vernacular is spoken by those between the ages of 9 and 18."

2.3. Concepts

We conducted analyses relevant to Hypothesis 1 with all concepts that were in both the Black and the White sentiment atlases—607 concepts total. The concepts represented the following areas: Time, Kinship, Abstract Symbolisms, Concrete Symbolisms, Environmentals, Carnalities, Human Activity, Interpersonal Relations, Society, Communications, Philosophy, and Things and Stuffs. Each category divided into three or more sub-categories, and multiple words in the atlases represented each sub-category. Osgood et al. (1975) Appendix G listed the categories, the sub-categories, and the atlas concepts in each sub-category.

We pay especial attention to 49 of the 607 concepts related to the family institution. The 49 concepts included any family identity that is an English-language kinship term. Additionally, we included concepts incorporating the word, "family" (e.g., big family), and those that related to reproduction (e.g., pregnancy, birth control), or to family social events (e.g., marriage). We also included concepts that typified a period in the life course (e.g., boy, adolescence, old people) or that were related to a gendered identity associated with a life-course period (e.g., man and woman). Gender was represented in our sample of concepts by the gendering of family and life-course concepts and also by specific gender identities (e.g., female and male).

Our analyses dealt with three cross-cutting classifications of the 49 concepts. Categories relating to gender consisted of *male*, *female*, and *non-gendered*. Categories relating to family consisted of *conjugal*, *lineage*, and *peripheral-family*. Categories relating to life course periods consisted of: *youth*, *adulthood*, *senescence*, and *indeterminate*. Some cells of our cross-classification were empty—e.g., no male or female concept combined conjugal and youth. The 49 concepts and their classifications are given in the following list. Also given is the translation of each concept to Black vernacular: The first phrasing of each concept is the stimulus presented to Whites, and the phrasing following the colon is the stimulus presented to Blacks.

Male, conjugal, adulthood—bridegroom: sucker (bridegroom), father-in-law: father-in-law, husband: old man (husband); *male, conjugal, senescence*—widower: widower; *male, lineage, youth*—son: little king; *male, lineage, adulthood*—father: old man (father), uncle: unc. (uncle); *male, lineage, senescence*—grandfather: grandpa; *male, lineage, indeterminate*—brother: bro; *male, peripheral, youth*—boy: dude; *male, peripheral, adulthood*—man: cat; *male, peripheral, indeterminate*—male gender: brother, masculinity: tough; *female, conjugal, adulthood*—bride: fool (bride), mother-in-law: ole nag (mother-in-law), wife: old lady (wife); *female, conjugal, senescence*—widow: widow; *female, lineage, youth*—daughter: little queen; *female, lineage, adulthood*—aunt: aintie (aunt), mother: mamma; *female, lineage, senescence*—grandmother: nan (grandmother); *female, lineage, indeterminate*—sisters: sisters; *female, peripheral, youth*—girl: little mama; *female, peripheral, adulthood*—lady: miss (lady), pregnancy: knocked up, woman: broad (woman); *female, peripheral, indeterminate*—female gender: broad (female), femininity: femininity; *non-gendered, conjugal, youth*— illegitimate child: bastard; *non-gendered, conjugal, adulthood*—adultery: sneaking out (adultery), divorce: split up, marriage: tyin' the knot, wedding: got hitched; *non-gendered, lineage, youth*—baby: crumb snatcher, child: kid, cousin: cuz, orphan: orphan; *non-gendered, lineage, adulthood*—birth control: the pill, parenthood: folks now; *non-gendered, lineage, indeterminate*—big family: tribe, family: folks, relatives: kin folks; *non-gendered, peripheral, youth*—birth: have a baby, adolescence: warrior (adolescent), youth: junior flips/young blood; *non-gendered, peripheral, adulthood*—middle age: over the hill; *non-gendered, peripheral, senescence*—death: croak (die), old age: old as methuselah, old people: old heads.

3. Results

We now appraise our four propositions regarding Black culture by comparing Black Evaluation–Potency–Activity (EPA) sentiments with parallel White sentiments.

Table 2
Analyses of covariance testing for sentiment differences in concepts related to:

Source	d.f.	Evaluation			Potency			Activity		
		Mean square	F	p	Mean square	F	p	Mean square	F	p
Conjugality versus lineage										
Family	1	3.239	10.27	0.003	0.014	0.13	0.718	0.525	11.74	0.002
White E, P, or A	1	2.062	6.54	0.016	0.229	2.13	0.155	0.043	0.96	0.336
Residual	29	0.315			0.107			0.045		
Total	31	0.546			0.108			0.059		
Femaleness versus maleness										
Sex	1	0.079	0.218	0.645	0.004	0.041	0.842	0.014	0.249	0.622
White E, P, or A	1	1.803	4.938	0.036	0.012	0.135	0.716	0.049	0.88	0.357
Residual	25	0.365			0.091			0.056		
Total	28	1.508			0.404			0.096		
Youth, adulthood, or senescence										
Sex	2	0.01	0.023	0.977	0.032	0.362	0.699	0.019	0.309	0.736
White E, P, or A	1	5.039	11.725	0.002	0.031	0.349	0.559	0.041	0.669	0.419
Residual	35	0.43			0.089			0.062		
Total	39	1.226			0.364			0.089		

3.1. Variant cultures

The first hypothesis proposes that Black and White sentiments differ across conceptual domains, evidencing a distinct Black culture. We assess this hypothesis by determining the extent to which Black EPA sentiments measured in the atlas project were predictable from corresponding White sentiment measurements. The hypothesis of difference can be rejected if correlations indicate that Black sentiments were virtually the same as White sentiments.

The product-moment correlation between Black and White mean Evaluation ratings was 0.653 over the 607 concepts. The correlation between mean Potency ratings was 0.378. The correlation between mean Activity ratings was 0.029. Squaring these correlations, we find that variations in White Evaluation scores predicted 43 percent of the variance in Black Evaluation assessments; White Potency scores predicted 14 percent of the variance in Black Potency assessments; and White Activity scores predicted essentially zero percent of the variance in Black Activity assessments.

Fifty-nine percent of the atlas concepts were translated to Black vernacular before serving as stimuli for raters (examples are given in the aforementioned list of 49 concepts). Perhaps the translations confronted Blacks with different concepts than Whites, and this divergence could explain low correlations between sentiments of Blacks and Whites. To check this possibility, we computed the correlations for just the 245 concepts where Blacks and Whites rated the same words—e.g., artist, doctor, hand, map, professor, skin, and today. For these concepts, the product-moment correlation between Black and White mean Evaluation ratings was 0.780. The correlation between mean Potency ratings was 0.483. The correlation between mean Activity ratings was 0.038.

Thus, the translation of concepts to Black vernacular did introduce discrepancies in concepts that reduced the predictability of Black sentiments from White sentiments. Eighteen percent less variance was explained on Evaluation, nine percent less variance was explained on Potency, and there was no appreciable difference on Activity. However, even when the same stimuli were presented to Blacks and Whites, White sentiments explained only moderate percentages of variance in Black sentiments.

To appreciate how low the correlations are, consider correlations that have been found in cross-national studies. Heise (2001) (Table 2) reported cross-national EPA correlations among Canada, the People's Republic of China, Germany, Northern Ireland, Japan, and the U.S.A. The median values of the cross-national correlations were 0.83 for Evaluation, 0.66 for Potency, and 0.58 for Activity. Only China had some cross-national correlations as low as those we found between Blacks and Whites within the U.S.A.

Heise's (2001) cross-national analyses were based on ratings just of social identities and social behaviors—a less diverse range of concepts than appeared in the atlases. To determine if this is an important matter, we computed the EPA correlations across 611 atlas concepts in the White U.S. and German atlases and found a correlation of 0.821 between Evaluations, 0.662 between Potencies, and 0.615 between Activity ratings.[6] Thus, measurements of U.S. White sentiments predicted German sentiments better than they predicted U.S. Black sentiments, over nearly the same set of concepts.

Errors in measurement could reduce correlations and possibly explain low Black–White correlations. For instance, atlas measurements may have been unreliable for Blacks, for Whites, or for both. To examine this possibility, we computed modified omega reliabilities (Heise & Bohrnstedt, 1970, Eq. 33) for each of the measurements. Our source data were pan-cultural factor structures printed in the Black and White atlases (these tables were used to select scales for measuring

---

[6] For the sub-set of concepts where stimuli were the same for Blacks and Whites, the U.S.–German correlations are 0.817 for Evaluation, 0.712 for Potency, and 0.639 for Activity.

Evaluation, Potency, and Activity). The tables gave scale loadings on six rotated factors, from which we computed close approximations to the original correlation matrix for the scales and the commonality for each scale—the required quantities for computing omegas.

With some algebra we modified the Heise–Bohrnstedt formula defining the reliability of a composite score used by an individual into a formula defining the reliability of a score averaged over four scales and 20 raters. The resulting reliabilities for *Blacks* were: 0.99 on Evaluation, 0.97 on Potency, and 0.99 on Activity; and the reliabilities for *Whites* were: 0.998 on Evaluation, 0.99 on Potency, and 0.98 on Activity. These reliabilities are high for both Blacks and Whites, so errors in measurement did not account for the low Black–White correlations.

We additionally computed validities for each EPA measurement (Heise & Bohrnstedt, 1970, Eq. 21). Heise and Bohrnstedt's validity measure is the correlation between composite scores and the theoretical true scores that the scores are intended to measure. Again, we employed some algebra to extend the Heise–Bohrnstedt validity formula to composite scores averaged over four scales and 20 raters. The validity of the Black Evaluation measure was 0.96, of the Black Potency measure 0.93, and of the Black Activity measure 0.46. For Whites, the validity of the Evaluation measure was 0.99, of the Potency measure 0.88, and of the Activity measure 0.93.

With the validities of the EPA measurements in hand, we corrected the Black–White correlations for attenuation due to measurement errors and invalidity (Heise & Bohrnstedt, 1970, p. 125). The corrected correlations amount to estimations of the hypothetical true Black–White correlations. The corrected correlations were 0.69 on Evaluation, 0.46 on Potency, and 0.07 on Activity over all 607 concepts rated by both Blacks and Whites. The corrected correlations for the 245 concepts presented to Blacks and Whites with the same words were 0.82, 0.59, and 0.09 for Evaluation, Potency, and Activity, respectively. Thus, even upward extrapolations of Black–White correlations to their hypothetical true values yielded correlations comparable to cross-national correlations.

We conclude that our key proposition is substantiated for at least one historical period and locale in the U.S.A. During the 1970s in Illinois, Black–White differences in sentiments were comparable to cross-national differences. Consequently, Black sentiments at that time were distinctive enough to be treated as a parallel subjective culture co-existing with the White subjective culture.

3.2. Family

Next, we examine Black and White sentiments about concepts in the atlases that relate to family, gender, and life course. In each case we compute analyses of covariance of Black EPA scores for relevant concepts, using White EPA scores as a covariate. For example, analyses of Black Evaluations of Family concepts were conducted over concepts related to conjugality or lineage, and White Evaluations of each concept were used to remove variation in Evaluations between concepts that were associated with White culture. The White covariate assured that patterns discerned in the results represented a pattern in Black culture unpredictable from White culture.

Table 2 shows the results of analyses of covariance with family concepts. The Family factor – Conjugality versus Lineage – had a significant impact on Evaluation and Activity scores, though not on Potency scores.

After removing variations associated with White evaluations, the mean Black Evaluation of concepts related to conjugality[7] was 0.41, and the mean Black Evaluation of concepts related to lineage was 1.10. The difference was highly significant (Table 2), and it was as Proposition 2 predicted: Blacks evaluated conjugal aspects of marriage less positively than aspects related to lineage. Since White variations were controlled, the difference in evaluating these two facets of family was a unique characteristic of Black culture.

Examining the conjugal-related concepts in more detail, we found that Blacks evaluated concepts related to the establishment and maintenance of marriages less positively than Whites did—e.g., fool/bride, sucker/bridegroom, old lady/wife, tyin' the knot/marriage, got hitched/wedding, and old man/husband. However, Blacks evaluated concepts associated with the breakdown of marriages more positively than Whites did—split up/divorce, and sneaking out/adultery. This difference accords logically with relatively low evaluations of conjugal-related concepts: Higher evaluations were given to conjugal concepts that were anti-marriage while lower evaluations were given to conjugal concepts that were pro-marriage. Thus, the detailed results provide even greater evidence that Blacks had less positive evaluations of concepts related to the formation and nurturance of marriages.

The mean Black Activity rating of concepts related to conjugality, after removing variations associated with White Activity ratings, was −0.01, and the mean Black Activity rating of lineage-related concepts, after controlling for White variations, was −0.28. The implication is that, for Blacks as compared to Whites, more Activity was attributed to marriage-related concepts than to lineage-related concepts. By the interpretation of Landis et al. (1976) – the greater a concept's Activity, the more effort required to realize the concept – these findings indicate that more effort was required from Blacks to fulfill conjugal obligations than to fulfill lineal obligations. This interpretation would fit with previously discussed literature noting the reduced returns of marriage for Blacks and the significant role lineal relatives performed when fulfilling childrearing needs.

---

[7] We compute mean values for cells from the regression equation paralleling the analysis of variance, with the co-variate assigned its mean value over the relevant concepts.

3.3. Gender

Analyses of covariance revealed no significant differences in Blacks' EPA ratings of concepts gendered as female or male when White variations were controlled (Table 2). However, we conducted a more detailed analysis of the EPA profiles for the 26 paired female and male identities in the atlas study: aintie/aunt vs. unc./uncle; fool/bride vs. sucker/bridegroom; little queen/daughter vs. little king/son; broad/female gender vs. brother/male gender; femininity vs. tough/masculinity; little mama/girl vs. dude/boy; nan/grandmother vs. grandpa/grandfather; ole nag/mother-in-law vs. father-in-law; mamma/mother vs. old man/father; sisters vs. bro/brother; widow vs. widower; old lady/wife vs. old man/husband; and broad/woman vs. cat/man (analysis available upon request). We assessed standardized EPA scores for pair comparisons in order to adjust for possible differences in Black and White metrics. (For example, the grand mean of Black Evaluation ratings was subtracted from each concept's Evaluation score, and the result was divided by the overall standard deviation of all Black Evaluation ratings.)

Our first question is whether female social identities were evaluated more positively relative to male social identities among Blacks than among Whites. To answer this question, we computed the female–male difference in Evaluation for each gendered pair and determined whether the Black difference was more positive (or less negative) than the White difference. Compared to Whites, Blacks evaluated females higher than males in six of the 13 comparisons. Suppose that the probability of higher evaluation was the same for Blacks and Whites (i.e., $p = 0.5$); then, the binomial probability of getting seven or fewer of 13 comparisons where Whites, relative to Blacks, would evaluate females higher than males would be 0.50, which is not significant. Consequently, the atlas data provided no reason to believe that Blacks more often evaluated females higher relative to males than did Whites.

Secondly, we conducted a parallel analysis to determine if, relative to Whites, Black attributed more power to females than to males. Specifically, we computed the female–male difference in Potency for each gendered pair of identities and compared the Black and White differences to see how often Blacks attributed more power to females than to males. In this case 11 of the 13 comparisons indicated Blacks favored females over males, while only 2 of the 13 comparisons indicated Whites did so. The binomial probability of so few comparisons where Whites would attribute more power to females than Blacks did is 0.002, which is highly significant. Thus, the atlas data indicated female social identities had relatively more perceived power among Blacks than among Whites. In fact, when examining actual mean composite scores, Blacks rated females higher in potency than corresponding males in eight of the 13 comparisons, whereas Whites always rated females lower in potency than males.

Lastly, we calculated the female–male differences in Activity for the gendered pairs of identities, and compared the Black and White differences to see how often Blacks, contrasted with Whites, expected relatively more activity from females than males. Nine of the 13 comparisons showed an advantage for females among Blacks, whereas only four indicated such an advantage among Whites. The binomial probability of this outcome is 0.046, which is significant by conventional standards. Thus, women were viewed as more activated relative to men among Blacks than they were among Whites. In assessments of unadjusted mean composite scores, Blacks indicated females had equal or greater activation than men in seven of the paired identities, whereas Whites indicated such an occurrence in just three pairs.

Previous research regarding the prevalence of Black matriarchy implied that women would have been perceived as more valued, potent, and active than men among Blacks. We did not find a difference in Evaluation, but we did find that Blacks were more likely than Whites to attribute more Potency and Activity to females than to males.

3.4. Life course

As Table 2 shows, an analysis of variance with White Evaluation scores as a covariate offered no support for the idea that Blacks evaluated the elderly and youth more positively than mid-life adults. Nor did the analyses of covariance indicate that Blacks attributed more potency or activity to the young and the old. However, examples of youths and the elderly being venerated among Blacks in the literature often refer specifically to the social positions of grandparents and children relative to parents. Accordingly, we conducted matched comparisons of standardized EPA scores, as we did with gender, this time comparing mamma/mother versus nan/grandmother, mamma/mother versus little queen/daughter, old man/father versus grandpa/grandfather, and old man/father versus little king/son. In only one of the four comparisons was the difference in Black evaluations of a younger or older identity versus a parental identity more positive (or less negative) than the same comparison among Whites. On the other hand, Blacks attributed more Potency than Whites to younger or older identities in three of four comparisons and more Activity in three out of four comparisons. However, the total number of comparisons is too small for any of these results to be statistically significant.

The Potency difference between Blacks and Whites was less a matter of Blacks giving power to youths and the elderly than a matter of Blacks disempowering these social roles less. Among Blacks nan was rated a bit more potent than mamma, but otherwise parent identities have somewhat more power than the identities with which they were paired. Among Whites, though, the parental identities always were substantially more powerful than the grandparent or offspring identities.

Thus, we found no significant support for Hypothesis 4, but some results did fit with the proposition. Life course categories generally were not associated with distinctive Black sentiments, but in family situations mid-life Blacks may have been perceived to have less of a power and activity advantage than did mid-life Whites.

4. Discussion

Our study of data from atlases of affective meanings compiled in the 1960s and 1970s showed that Black youths in Chicago maintained a distinct subjective culture—as different from White subjective culture as White culture was different from the subjective culture of another nation. This finding supports the cultural variance framework with quantitative empirical results.

Distinctive sentiments in the Black culture were manifested and maintained in several ways. First, Blacks deployed an evaluative system involving unique adjective contrasts. Two Evaluation factors emerged in a bi-cultural factor analysis reported by Landis and Saral (1978) in which ratings on Black scales and White scales were pooled in a single analysis (Table 1 illustrates some of the results). Black Evaluation ratings were defined by contrasts like hip versus dumb, cool versus silly, and hip versus lousy, whereas White Evaluation ratings were defined by contrasts like good versus bad, nice versus awful, and beautiful versus ugly. Black and White Evaluation ratings correlated imperfectly across the concepts in the analysis in part because Blacks and Whites were using these different evaluative frameworks.

Second, Blacks and Whites maintained distinctive sentiments, even when both groups anchored their judgments in essentially the same scales. The Potency dimension provides an example. The first three Black Potency scales in Table 1 are employed in this study were very similar to White Potency scales, and indeed White raters could readily assess Potency associations using the Black scales. Yet, Black and White assessments of Potency varied substantially, notwithstanding the similarity of the measurement frameworks. Black and White Potency associations shared at most 68 percent variance, even for stimuli which had been presented in the same words and even after correcting for attenuation due to measurement errors. We saw some examples of how Blacks differed from Whites in Potency assessments when examining Hypotheses 3 and 4—Blacks rated females as more potent than males whereas Whites rated males as more potent. Additionally, Blacks rated grandmother as more potent than mother whereas Whites rated mother as more potent.

A third kind of separation between Black and White subjective cultures was rooted in Blacks' references to many concepts in terms of words or phrases particular to African American Vernacular English. Referring to man as cat, to boy as dude, and to adolescents as warriors are examples. Such verbalizations outside of Standard American English veered Black meanings away from White meanings. While translations of some concepts may have been distortions of Black subjective culture (for instance, we guess that babies were not actually called crumb snatchers in everyday Black society of the 1970s), many of the translations probably did reflect daily life in Black society.

The gaping cultural differences in sentiments between Blacks and Whites beg the question of what explains such differences. In addition to its basic tenets of distinctiveness, the cultural variance framework suggests that answers lie in the unique forms and functionalities of Black social institutions. As a first step, we corroborated that some sentiments in Black culture corresponded to unique aspects of Black social institutions by exploring concepts related to family structures and relations between the sexes.

We found that Blacks evaluated conjugal aspects of family less positively and attributed more activity (or effort) to them than aspects related to lineage. These findings fit with literature noting the absence of legal recognition of Black marriages historically (Du Bois, [1908] 1969; Frazier, 1939), the impact of structural forces, such as poverty, male unemployment, incarceration patterns, on marriage rates (Dickson, 1993; Quillian, 2003; Staples, 1987; Wilson, 1996), and the significant role lineal relatives performed in fulfilling childrearing needs (Billingsley, 1968; Collins, 1990; Hays & Mindel, 1973; Ruggles, 1994; Stack, 1974).

Analyses of covariance revealed no significant differences in Blacks' EPA ratings of concepts gendered as female or male or concepts related to life course periods when White variations in sentiments were controlled. However, more detailed analyses of paired female and male identities suggested that Blacks were more likely than Whites to attribute more Potency and Activity to females than to males. This confirms previous research regarding the unique roles of Black women as strategic, "revered," and active members of Black civil society (Collins, 1987; Gilkes, 1994; Moore, 2008), even though women were not found to be especially more valued than men among Blacks. One exception to this pattern was the comparison of brother to sister: Blacks rated brother as substantially more valued and powerful than Whites rated brother, and this comparison went against the general trend of Blacks attributing somewhat lower goodness and potency to males than did Whites and, in particular, of rating a kind of male less powerful than a corresponding kind of female (in this case, brother and sister). The term brother may not have been interpreted by respondents in terms of specific male family members but instead as an informal greeting Blacks give to individuals of their same race (Smitherman, 1998a), and the seemingly anomalous ratings of brother may have reflected respondents' perceptions of the strength of their community.

Undoubtedly more detailed data regarding family, gender, and age could be obtained with conventional sample surveys that focus on these issues. However, we have demonstrated that sentiment lexicons, compiled with well-established procedures (Heise, 2010), can be applied to exploring a variety of questions relating to institutional norms, in lieu of costly special-purpose surveys.

The atlas also revealed Black–White differences for a great variety of concepts beyond those associated with the family. Examination of social institutions besides the family that have unique importance to Blacks (e.g., religion and social clubs) or that are shaped by racial segregation (e.g., neighborhoods and education) might be strategic in theorizing about such differences. We offer the general thesis that structural racism, as typified by racial residential segregation across the United States, has over time created community spaces fostering the creation and maintenance of affective norms appropriate to the experiences of individuals who inhabit these segregated communities.

The translation issue makes some of our results provisional. For example, would conjugal-related concepts still have been evaluated less positively than lineage-related concepts if there were fewer derogatory translations among the marriage concepts (e.g., sucker for bridegroom, fool for bride, and ole nag for mother-in-law)? We do not have information to resolve this issue. However, importantly, we were able to side-step the translation problem in assessing the strength of our most general hypothesis. Correlations computed over hundreds of stimuli where stimulus words were the same for Blacks and Whites demonstrated conclusively that Black sentiments differed from White sentiments as much as the sentiments of one nation differed from another's—clear evidence that the Black sentiments represented a variant culture.

We had to compare responses of Black high-school students from segregated areas of Chicago with those of White high-school students from a small city in downstate Illinois. Thus, our analyses could not separate the impact of race from that of class, and this issue will have to be examined in future studies.[8] We also had to compare Black and White sentiments that were measured about a decade apart. The time difference, however, is unlikely to have been consequential given the high degree of stability that has been found in sentiment norms (Heise, 2007; MacKinnon & Luke, 2002).

5. Conclusion

Our analyses show unequivocally that a variant culture, distinct from White culture, existed within the Chicago Black population of the 1970s. This finding is not merely of historical interest. It demonstrates in general that distinctly different cultures can confederate in modern societies, with individuals from the different cultures cross-interacting in the society's public venues. Our proof of this as an empirical fact aligns with anthropologist Barrett's (2002, p. 1) contention that "cultures have now become multicultures." Our finding suggests that cultural diversity may continue even in a highly networked global society (Castells, [1997] 2000).

A new survey is needed to address the questions of whether a variant Black culture still exists and whether it permeates Blacks in various social locations. Such a survey must continue to utilize the non-ethnocentric methods in Black–White studies pioneered by Osgood et al. (1975) and employed by Landis et al. (1976); the survey must measure sentiments about hundreds of concepts; and respondents must be selected to represent multiple social positions of both Blacks and Whites in order to determine whether variant cultures persist when considering White and Black adults with similar social and economic advantages. The expense and commitment required to conduct such a survey precludes its happening until there is reason to believe that the work will further scientific knowledge. The current study provides such a reason. Moreover, our results provide a baseline for future research aimed at discerning internal differences in Black culture and at assessing how Black culture has changed over time.

Acknowledgements

References

Adams, B. N. (1970). Isolation, function, and beyond: American kinship in the 1960's. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *32*(4), 575–597.
Allen, W. R. (1978). The search for applicable theories of black family life. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *40*(1), 117–129.
Angel, R., & Tienda, M. (1982). Determinants of extended household structure: Cultural pattern or economic need? *The American Journal of Sociology*, *87*(6), 1360–1383.
Barrett, S. R. (2002). *Culture meets power*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
Bennett, N. G., Bloom, D. E., & Craig, P. H. (1989). The divergence of Black and White marriage patterns. *The American Journal of Sociology*, *95*(3), 692–722.
Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *The American Economic Review*, *94*(4), 991–1013.
Billingsley, A. (1968). *Black families in White America*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Billingsley, A. (1992). *Climbing Jacob's ladder: The enduring legacy of African-American families*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
Bobo, L., & Zubrinsky, C. L. (1996). Attitudes on residential integration: Perceived status differences, mere in-group preference, or racial prejudice? *Social Forces*, *74*(3), 883–909.
Bonilla-Silva, E. (1996). Rethinking racism: Toward a structural interpretation. *American Sociological Review*, *62*(3), 465–480.
Burton, L. M., & Bengtson, V. L. (1985). Black grandmothers: Issues of timing and continuity of roles. In *Grandparenthood*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc., p. 61–77
Carmichael, S., & Hamilton, C. V. (1967). *Black power: The politics of liberation in America*. New York, NY: Random House.
Castells, M. ([1996] 2000). *The information age: Economy, society, and culture* (Vol. 1 of 3. 2nd Ed. The Rise of the Network Society). Oxford & Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Collins, P. H. (1987). The meaning of motherhood in Black culture and Black mother/daughter relationships. *SAGE: A Scholarly Journal on Black Women*, *4*(2), 3–10.
Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.

---

[8] Landis et al. (1976) reported mean ratings of 15 concepts from Black and White college students, and supplementary analyses that we conducted did hint that class (educational) differences may be found in more comprehensive studies.

Dickson, L. (1993). The future of marriage and family in black America. *Journal of Black Studies*, *23*(4), 472–491.

Dill, B. T. (1979). The dialectics of black womanhood. *Signs*, *4*(3), 543–555.

Dilworth-Anderson, P., Burton, L. M., & Johnson, L. B. (1993). Reframing theories for understanding race, ethnicity, and families. In P. Boss, W. J. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. R. Schumm, & S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach* (pp. 627–646). New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Du Bois, W. E. B. ([1908] 1969). *The Negro American family*. New York, NY: New American Library.

Feagin, J. R. (2006). *Systemic racism: A theory of oppression*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the "burden of 'acting White'". *The Urban Review*, *18*(3), 176–206.

Frazier, E. F. (1939). *The Negro family in the United States*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Gecas, V. (1982). The self-concept. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *8*, 1–33.

Gilkes, C. T. (1994). If it wasn't for the women. . .": African American women, community work, and social change. In M. B. Zinn, & B. T. Dill (Eds.), *Women of color in U.S. society* (pp. 229–246). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Goldscheider, F. K., & Bures, R. M. (2003). The racial crossover in family complexity in the United States. *Demography*, *40*(3), 569–587.

Gordon, R. A., Short, J. F., Jr., Cartwright, D. S., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1963). Values and gang delinquency: A study of street-corner groups. *The American Journal of Sociology*, *69*(2), 109–128.

Gould, M. (1999). Race and theory: culture, poverty, and adaptation to discrimination in Wilson and Ogbu. *Sociological Theory*, *17*(2), 171–200.

Harvey, D. L., & Reed, M. H. (1996). The culture of poverty: An ideological analysis. *Sociological Perspectives*, *39*(4), 465–495.

Hays, W. C., & Mindel, C. H. (1973). Extended kinship relations in Black and White families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *35*(1), 51–57.

Heise, D. R. (2001). Project Magellan: Collecting cross-cultural affective meanings via the internet. *Electronic Journal of Sociology*, *5*(3) http://www.sociology.org/content/vol005.003/mag.html

Heise, D. R. (2007). *Expressive order: Confirming sentiments in social actions*. New York, NY: Springer.

Heise, D. R. (2010). *Surveying cultures: Discovering shared conceptions and sentiments*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Interscience.

Heise, D. R., & Bohrnstedt, G. W. (1970). Validity, invalidity, and reliability. *Sociological Methodology*, *2*, 104–129.

Hill, S. A. (2002). Teaching and doing gender in African American families. *Sex Roles*, *47*(11), 493–506.

House, J. S. (1995). Social structure, relationships, and the individual. In K. S. Cook, G. A. Fine, & J. S. House (Eds.), *Sociological perspectives on social psychology*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Hughes, M., & Thomas, M. E. (1998). The continuing significance of race revisited: A study of race, class, and quality of life in America, 1972 to 1996. *American Sociological Review*, *63*(6), 785–795.

Hunt, M. O. (1996). The individual, society, or both? A comparison of Black, Latino, and White beliefs about the causes of poverty. *Social Forces*, *75*(1), 293–322.

Hunt, M. O. (2007). African American, Hispanic, and White beliefs about Black/White inequality, 1977–2004. *American Sociological Review*, *72*(3), 390–415.

Hunt, M. O., Jackson, P. B., Powell, B., & Steelman, L. C. (2000). Color-blind: The treatment of race and ethnicity in social psychology. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *63*(4), 352–364.

Hunter, A. G. (1997). Counting on grandmothers: Black mothers' and fathers' reliance on grandmothers for parenting support. *Journal of Family Issues*, *18*(3), 251–269.

Iceland, J., Weinberg, D. H., & Steinmetz, E. (2002). *Racial and ethnic residential segregation in the United States 1980–2000*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

Jackman, M. R., & Jackman, R. W. (1973). An interpretation of the relation between objective and subjective social status. *American Sociological Review*, *38*(5), 569–582.

Jackson, P. B. (1997). Role occupancy and minority mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *38*(3), 237–255.

Kamo, Y., & Cohen, E. L. (1998). Division of household work between partners: A comparison of Black and White couples. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, *29*(1), 131–145.

Kandel, D. B. (1971). Race, maternal authority, and adolescent aspiration. *The American Journal of Sociology*, *76*(6), 999–1020.

Kessler, R. C., Mickelson, K. D., & Williams, D. R. (1999). The prevalence, distribution, and mental health correlates of perceived discrimination in the United States. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *40*(3), 208–230.

Kohn, M. L. (1989). Social structure and personality: A quintessentially sociological approach to social psychology. *Social Forces*, *68*(1), 26–33.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York, NY: Crown Pub.

Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black english vernacular*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Labov, W. (1998). Co-existent systems in African-American vernacular english. In S. Mufwene, J. R. Rickford, G. Bailey, & J. Baugh (Eds.), *African-American English: Structure, history and use* (pp. 110–153). London: Routledge.

Landis, D., McGrew, P. L., Day, H. R., Savage, J., & Saral, T. (1976). Word meanings in Black and White. In H. C. Triandis (Ed.), *Variations in Black and White perceptions of the social environment* (pp. 45–80). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Landis, D., & Saral, T. (1978). Atlas of American Black English. In Project on Cross-Cultural Affective Meanings (Ed.), *Atlas of affective meanings: Tables for 17 cultures*. Urbana, IL: University of Illnois Bookstore [Computer print-out].

Lincoln, C. E., & Mamiya, L. H. (1990). *The Black church in the African-American experience*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

MacKinnon, N. J., & Luke, A. (2002). Changes in identity attitudes as reflections of social and cultural change. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, *27*(3), 299–338.

Marable, M. (1983). *How capitalism underdeveloped Black America: Problems in race, political economy, and society*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Martin, J. M., & Martin, E. P. (1985). *The helping tradition in the Black family and community*. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of Social Workers.

Massey, D. S., & Denton, N. A. (1993). *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass*. Cambridge: MA Harvard University Press.

McLanahan, S. (1985). Family structure and the reproduction of poverty. *The American Journal of Sociology*, *90*(4), 873–901.

McLoyd, V. C., Cauce, A. M., Takeuchi, D., & Leon, W. (2000). Marital processes and parental socialization in families of color: A decade review of research. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *62*(4), 1070–1093.

Moore, M. R. (2008). Gendered power relations among women: A study of household decision making in Black, lesbian stepfamilies. *American Sociological Review*, *73*, 335–356.

Mufwene, S., & Rickford, J. R. (1998). Introduction. In S. Mufwene, J. R. Rickford, G. Bailey, & J. Baugh (Eds.), *African-American English: Structure, history and use* (pp. 1–7). London: Routledge.

Oliver, M. L., & Shapiro, T. M. (1995). *Black Wealth/White Wealth: A new perspective on racial inequality*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1986). *Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1980s*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Osgood, C. E. (1964). Semantic differential technique in the comparative study of cultures. *American Anthropologist*, *66*(3), 171–200.

Osgood, C. E. (1990). Probing subjective culture. In C. E. Osgood, & O. C. S. Tzeng (Eds.), *Language, meaning, and culture: The selected papers of C.E. Osgood* (pp. 235–272). New York, NY: Praeger Publishers.

Osgood, C. E., May, W. H., & Miron, M. S. (1975). *Cross-cultural universals of affective meaning*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Pager, D. (2003). The mark of a criminal record. *The American Journal of Sociology*, *108*(5), 937–975.

Peek, C. W., Koropeckyj-Cox, T., Zsembik, B. A., & Coward, R. T. (2004). Race comparisons of the household dynamics of older adults. *Research on Aging*, *26*(2), 179–201.

Project on Cross-Cultural Affective Meanings. (1978). *Atlas of affective meanings: Tables for 17 cultures*. Urbana, IL: University of Illnois Bookstore. [Computer print-out].

Quillian, L. (2003). The decline of male employment in low-income Black neighborhoods, 1950–1990. *Social Science Research*, *32*(2), 220–250.

Rainwater, L., & Yancey, W. L. (1967). *The Moynihan report and the politics of controversy: A trans-action social science and public policy report*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.

Romney, A. K., Weller, S. C., & Batchelder, W. H. (1986). Culture as consensus: A theory of culture and informant accuracy. *American Anthropologist*, *88*(2), 313–338.

Royster, D. A. (2003). *Race and the invisible hand: How White networks exclude Black men from blue-collar jobs*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Ruggles, S. (1994). The origins of African-American family structure. *American Sociological Review*, *59*(1), 136–151.

Scanzoni, J. H. (1971). *The Black family in modern society*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Schuman, H., Steeh, C., Bobo, L. D., & Krysan, M. (1997). *Racial attitudes in America: Trends and interpretations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Small, M. L., & Newman, K. (2001). Urban poverty after the truly disadvantaged: The rediscovery of the family, the neighborhood, and culture. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *27*, 23–45.

Smitherman, G. (1998a). Black English/Ebonics: What it be like? In T. Perry, & L. D. Delpit (Eds.), *The real Ebonics debate: Power, language, and the education of African-American children*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Smitherman, G. (1998b). Word from the Hood: The lexicon of African-American vernacular English. In S. Mufwene, J. R. Rickford, G. Bailey, & J. Baugh (Eds.), *African-American English: Structure, history and use* (pp. 203–225). London: Routledge.

Snider, J. G., & Osgood, C. E. (Eds.). (1969). *Semantic differential technique: A sourcebook*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Co.

Stack, C. B. (1974). *All our kin: Strategies for survival in a Black community*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Staples, R. (1971). Towards a sociology of the Black family: A theoretical and methodological assessment. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *33*(1), 119–138.

Staples, R. (1987). Social structure and black family life: An analysis of current trends. *Journal of Black Studies*, *17*(3), 267–286.

Stryker, S. (1980). *Symbolic interactionism: A social structural version*. Menlo Park, CA: Benjamin/Cummings.

Sweet, J. A., & Bumpass, L. L. (1987). *American families and households*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Taylor, R. J., Chatters, L. M., & Jackson, J. S. (1993). A profile of familial relations among three-generation Black families. *Family Relations*, *42*(3), 332–341.

Taylor, R. J., Chatters, L. M., Tucker, M. B., & Lewis, E. (1990). Developments in research on Black families: A decade review. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *52*(4), 993–1014.

Teachman, J. D., Tedrow, L. M., & Crowder, K. D. (2000). The changing demography of America's families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *62*(4), 1234–1246.

Thornton, M. C., Chatters, L. M., Taylor, R. J., & Allen, W. R. (1990). Sociodemographic and environmental correlates of racial socialization by Black parents. *Child Development*, *61*(2), 401–409.

Tienda, M., & Angel, R. (1982). Headship and household composition among Blacks, Hispanics, and other Whites. *Social Forces*, *61*(2), 508–531.

Unnever, J. D., & Cullen, F. T. (2007). The racial divide in support for the death penalty: Does White racism matter? *Social Forces*, *85*(3), 1281–1301.

Waters, M. C. (1999). *Black identities: West Indian immigrant dreams and American realities*. New York/Cambridge, MA: Russell Sage Foundation, Harvard University Press.

West, C. (1993). *Race matters*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Western, B., & Beckett, K. (1999). How unregulated is the U.S. labor market? The penal system as a labor market institution. *American Journal of Sociology*, *104*(4), 1030–1060.

Whaley, A. L. (2001). Cultural mistrust and mental health services for African Americans: A review and meta-analysis. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *29*(4), 513–531.

Williams, D. R., & Collins, C. (2001). Racial residential segregation: A fundamental cause of racial disparities in health. *Public Health Report*, *116*(5), 404–416.

Williams, D. R., & Jackson, P. B. (2005). Social sources of racial disparities in health. *Health Affairs*, *24*(2), 325–334.

Wilson, M. N., Tolson, T. F. J., Hinton, I. D., & Kiernan, M. (1990). Flexibility and sharing of childcare duties in Black families. *Sex Roles*, *22*(7), 409–425.

Wilson, W. J. (1978). *The declining significance of race: Blacks and changing American institutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, W. J. (1996). *When work disappears: The world of the new urban poor*. New York, NY: Knopf.

Zuberi, T. (2001). *Thicker than blood: How racial statistics lie*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.