

Boise State University

ScholarWorks

---

Sociology Faculty Publications and  
Presentations

Department of Sociology

---

12-2022

## Intergroup Contact and White Racial Apathy: Findings from the National Study of Youth and Religion (NSYR)

Tony N. Brown  
*Rice University*

Asia Bento  
*University of California*

Julian Culver  
*Brown University*

Raul S. Casarez  
*Boise State University*

Horace J. Duffy III  
*Rice University*

---

This article is protected by copyright and reuse is restricted to non-commercial and no derivative uses. Users may also download and save a local copy for the user's personal reference.

Brown, T.N., Bento, A., Culver, J., Casarez, R.S., and Duffy, H.J. III. "Intergroup Contact and White Racial Apathy: Findings from the National Study of Youth and Religion (NSYR)", *Sociological Perspectives*, 65(6), pp. 1188-1207.

Copyright © 2022, The Authors. Reprinted by permission of SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07311214221104041>

## **Intergroup Contact and White Racial Apathy: Findings from the National Study of Youth and Religion (NSYR)\***

**Tony N. Brown\***  
Rice University

**Asia Bento**  
University of California

**Julian Culver**  
Brown University

**Raul S. Casarez**  
Boise State University

**Horace J. Duffy III**  
Rice University

\*The National Study of Youth and Religion (NSYR) was generously funded by the Lilly Endowment, Inc., under the direction of Christian Smith, of the Department of Sociology at the University of Notre Dame, and Lisa Pearce, of the Department of Sociology at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The authors thank members of the Racism and Racial Experiences (RARE) Workgroup at Rice University for their critical feedback on an early manuscript draft and perpetual encouragement. Address all correspondence concerning this manuscript to Tony N. Brown, Rice University, Department of Sociology, MS-28, 6100 Main Street, Houston, TX 77005-1827; e-mail: [tnbrown@rice.edu](mailto:tnbrown@rice.edu)

### **Abstract**

Scholars theorize racial apathy is one form contemporary white racial prejudice takes. Racial apathy signals not caring about racial inequality. Invoking intergroup contact theory, we hypothesize interracial contact would predict less racial apathy among whites. To test our hypothesis, we analyze survey data from white teenagers participating in the National Study of Youth and Religion (NSYR). We find interracial contact matters and its inclusion improves overall model fit over and above previously specified correlates. Specifically, interracial friendship and dating, and having a different race mentor predict the tendency to care about racial equality. Further, any interracial contact as well as a count of interracial contact experiences across five settings, respectively, predicts less racial apathy. We encourage scholars to investigate the sociological significance of racial apathy and its correlates, including interracial contact.

**Keywords:** National Study of Youth and Religion (NSYR), racial apathy, racial attitudes, white racial prejudice

### **Background**

Systematic study of white racial prejudice occupies a place of crucial significance in political science (Huddy and Feldman 2009; Kinder and Sanders 1996), psychology (Allport 1954; Sears and Henry 2003), and sociology (Blumer 1958; Krysan 2000; Schuman et al. 1998). Across these disciplines, scholars typically describe white racial prejudice using survey data. They argue white racial prejudice reveals vital information about race relations (Allport 1954; Feagin and Eckberg 1980; Krysan 2000), whites' behavior (Fishbein and Ajzen 1975; Huddy and Feldman 2009; LaPiere 1934), democracy (Bobo, Kluegel, and Smith 1997; Kluegel and Smith 1982; Myrdal 1944), and racial and ethnic conflict (Blumer 1958; Brown et al. 2009; Kinder and Sanders 1996).

Not long ago, it was normative for white survey respondents to express mean-spirited, old-fashioned, blatant, overt, cruel, and hostile anti-black feelings, and supremacist beliefs (Bobo, Kluegel, and Smith 1997; Brown et al. 2009; Forman 2001, 2004; Kinder and Sanders 1996; Mueller 2017; Schuman et al. 1998). Survey researchers would ask whether whites felt disgust for blacks, would marry blacks, would live near blacks, believed whites were smarter than blacks, despised blacks, felt coldly toward blacks, would move from a neighborhood if black families moved into it, would send their children to schools with black children, and so on. Without hesitation, white respondents would divulge their black antipathy and distaste for racial integration, contact, and equality. Such responses are less socially acceptable today. Instead, it is normative now for whites to express racial prejudice in line with the *new racism*

*paradigm* (Bobo et al. 1997, 2012; Bonilla-Silva 2018; Brown et al. 2009; Dovidio and Gaertner 1996; Esposito and Romano 2014; Forman 2001; Forman and Lewis 2006; Henricks and Ortiz Forthcoming; Henry and Sears 2002; Kinder and Sanders 1996; McConahay and Hough 1976; Meertens and Pettigrew 1997; Mueller 2017; Pettigrew and Meertens 1995; Schuman et al. 1998; Sears and Henry 2003; Williams et al. 1999). According to the new racism paradigm, whites gravitate toward ideological positions supporting cultural and value-based deficiencies (e.g., blacks' low levels of work ethic, grit, self-reliance, discipline, patriotism, etc.) rather than endorsing biological deficiency as the explanation for why racial inequality endures (Bobo et al. 1997; Bonilla-Silva 2018; Forman 2001; Kluegel 1990).

The new racism paradigm forced scholars to pivot. For example, scholars generated concepts such as aversive racism (Dovidio and Gaertner 1996), colorblind racism (Bonilla-Silva 2018; Mueller 2017), laissez-faire racism (Bobo et al. 1997), modern prejudice (McConahay and Hough 1976), racial resentment (Kinder and Sanders 1996), symbolic racism (Henry and Sears 2002; Sears and Henry 2003), and subtle prejudice (Meertens and Pettigrew 1997; Pettigrew and Meertens 1995). Survey measures accompany some concepts whereas other concepts represent ideological frameworks dictating how whites should express racial prejudice. The new racism paradigm avers most whites desire not to be seen as "racist" (Bonilla-Silva 2018, 2019; Dovidio and Gaertner 2000). Still the question remains: *How should scholars capture racial animus in social surveys when white respondents understand expressing racial prejudice is socially unacceptable?*

Brown and colleagues (2019), Forman (2001, 2004), Forman and Lewis (2006, 2015), and Henricks and Ortiz (Forthcoming) suggest *racial apathy* answers the question. Racial apathy is a contemporary and subtle form of white racial prejudice. It captures not caring about racial inequality. Forman (2004:44) describes it as "...lack of feeling or indifference toward societal racial and ethnic inequality and lack of engagement with race-related social issues." It resonates with the primary frame undergirding the ideological framework of colorblind racism: *abstract liberalism* (Bonilla-Silva 2018:39-44). Abstract liberalism allows whites to not care about racial inequality because meritocracy works, anti-racism cannot be forced, and individuals should be free to make their own choices.

Studying racial apathy among white youth matters for at least two reasons. First, they represent the future electorate. For instance, respondents participating in the 2003 National Study of Youth and Religion (NSYR) were first eligible to vote in 2008. Their racial apathy probably influenced their views of and support for Barack Obama, John McCain, Mitt Romney, Hillary Clinton, Donald Trump, and Joe Biden. Second, most whites no longer deny racial inequality exists but do not care to remedy it (e.g., *principle-implementation gap*, Schuman et al. 1998). For example, examining the *Race in America* 2019 survey conducted by Pew Research Center, 56 percent of white adults think being white helps one's ability to get ahead and 58 percent of white adults say the legacy of slavery affects the position of black people in America today. Hence, we focus on reducing racial apathy among white youth while their perspectives remain malleable (see Brown et al. 2019). In this study, we first describe what is known about racial apathy and its correlates. Then, we examine whether interracial contact, which has been ignored in prior studies, associates with less racial apathy. We find interracial contact correlates negatively with racial apathy among white youth.

### **Racial Apathy: Operationalization and Correlates**

With cross-sectional data from adults (21 years and older) participating in the 2005 Chicago Area Study (CAS), Forman and Lewis (2006) measured racial apathy using agreement with this single-item statement: "First, it's not really my problem if racial minority groups experience unfair treatment and need help." Response categories were 1. "Strongly Agree," 2. "Somewhat Agree," 3. "Somewhat Disagree," and 4. "Strongly Disagree." In the CAS data, racial apathy correlated positively with opposing interracial marriage; cold feeling thermometer ratings toward blacks and Latinos; symbolic racism; perceived threat; and negative stereotypes about blacks and Latinos (i.e., they are unintelligent, prefer to live off welfare, are hard to get along with, and do not supervise their children). Moreover, racial apathy predicted opposition to race-targeted social policies. Related and using data from the Chicago Area Finances Survey 2019, Henricks and Ortiz (Forthcoming) found racial apathy predicted withholding support for liberal reforms to monetary sanctions.

With data from the 1976-2003 Monitoring the Future (MTF) study, which encompasses repeated cross-sectional, nationally representative surveys of high school seniors, Forman (2001) and Forman and Lewis (2006, 2015) measured racial apathy as agreement with this single-item statement: "Maybe some minority groups do get unfair treatment, but that's no business of mine." Response categories were 1. "Disagree," 2. "Mostly Disagree," 3. "Neither," 4. "Mostly

Agree,” and 5. “Agree.” When analyzing MTF data, Forman and Lewis (2006, 2015) reported more white youth in 2003 (17 percent) as compared to 1976 (10 percent) expressed racial apathy (i.e., agreed minority groups get unfair treatment but it is not their business).

Analyzing MTF data, Forman and Lewis (2015) examined the following (1) social background, (2) social values, and (3) academic orientation correlates of racial apathy: gender, parental education, urbanicity, region, political ideology, religiosity, grades, academic track, college aspirations, and truancy. They found boys reported higher levels of racial apathy than girls. Parental education and racial apathy linked inversely. Urbanicity was not statistically significant. Respondents in the Northwest and West reported lower levels of racial apathy than those living in the South. Liberals and respondents for whom religion was important reported low levels of racial apathy. Good grades, being on the college prep track, and college aspirations correlated negatively with racial apathy, whereas truancy associated positively.

Studies (Brown et al. 2019; Forman 2001, 2004; Forman and Lewis 2006, 2015; Henricks and Ortiz Forthcoming) confirm racial apathy: (1) manifests as a contemporary and subtle form of white racial prejudice, (2) shares similar correlates with other measures of white racial prejudice, and (3) helps survey researchers substantiate the new racism paradigm. Yet despite Forman’s (2004:53-53) suggestion racial apathy spreads because whites do not routinely interact with non-whites, scholars neglect interracial contact. The next section describes why interracial contact should be a robust correlate of less racial apathy.

### **Intergroup Contact Theory and Racial Apathy**

Allport’s *The Nature of Prejudice* (1954) serves as a guidebook for social scientists who study prejudice. One of its most important contributions was identifying intergroup contact as a mechanism for prejudice reduction (Allport 1954:281). Specifically, the *contact hypothesis* proposes interpersonal, interracial interactions can reduce white racial prejudice (Allport 1954:281; Barlow et al. 2012; Cook 1978; Emerson, Kimbro, and Yancey 2002; Pettigrew 1986, 1997, 1998; Pettigrew et al. 2011; Robinson and Preston 1976; Sigelman and Welch 1993; Stouffer et al. 1949; Williams 1947; Wilson 1996). Essential conditions for intergroup contact to reduce prejudice include: (1) common goals, (2) intergroup cooperation, (3) equal status, and (4) authority support (Allport 1954:281; Ford, 1973; Jackman and Crane 1986; Robinson and Preston 1976; Hewstone and Brown 1986; Watson 1947). Pettigrew (1997:173) added friendship potential as a fifth essential condition, writing, “Friendship across group lines has special importance. It involves long-term contact rather than brief first encounters. It is likely to meet all the key conditions of the contact hypothesis. And it occasions affective as well as cognitive processes.” Importantly, Pettigrew (1986, 1998) argued some researchers confuse essential conditions with “facilitating conditions,” which only increase the likelihood essential conditions can be achieved and/or maintained, but are insufficient for prejudice reduction.

The contact hypothesis widely informs how social scientists conceptualize racial and ethnic conflict, and ways to remedy it (Emerson et al. 2002; Gordon 1964; Jackman and Crane 1986; Jordan 1974; Moskos 1966; Myrdal 1944; Pettigrew 2016; Pettigrew et al. 2011; Schofield and Sagar 1977; Sigelman and Welch 1993; Williams 1947; Zeul and Humphrey 1971). Its popularity connects to its parsimony: *individuals do not like each other because they do not know each other*. Scholars (Pettigrew 1998; Pettigrew and Tropp 2008; Pettigrew et al. 2011) argue enhanced knowledge, reduced anxiety, and increased empathy are mechanisms whereby interracial contact reduces white racial prejudice.

Intergroup contact’s prejudice reduction effects appear reliable and generalizable. In fact, hundreds of studies confirm interracial contact reduces white racial prejudice (see Pettigrew et al. 2011). For example, Emerson and colleagues (2002) found white adults who experienced prior interracial contact in their school and neighborhood later cultivated racially diverse social networks. In addition, they tended to belong to multiracial religious congregations and marry interracially. Mancini and colleagues (2012) found four types of intergroup contact (i.e., interactions at work, knowing three minorities by name, close friendships, and interracial dating) significantly reduced whites’ prejudicial views of black criminality. Shook and Fazio (2008) found white college students preferred same-race roommate assignments in college dormitories over interracial assignments. However, over time, whites with black roommates developed more positive attitudes towards blacks. Kubota and colleagues (2017) found whites who reported high levels of contact with blacks over their life course held less pro-white implicit racial bias. These studies exemplify a body of work showing interracial contact reduces white racial prejudice. But no studies, to date, examine the correlation between interracial contact and racial apathy.

We acknowledge some sociologists of race and racism dismiss the study of white racial prejudice. Dismissal makes sense given their attraction to specifying structural underpinnings of racism. For some sociologists, studying white racial prejudice and how to reduce it represents reductionism and misplaced emphasis on the *individual white racist*. When invoking the intergroup contact hypothesis, for instance, the individual white racist needs only to interact with blacks and racialized others for racism to topple. Clearly, such reasoning is overly simplistic. In fact, evidence suggests interracial contact happens today within spaces shaped fundamentally by structural forces preserving white supremacy (Anderson 2015; Lewis 2003; Mayorga-Gallo 2014), proving interracial contact is no panacea. We agree micro-level solutions alone will never undo white supremacy, yet neither will structural solutions alone. If racism's deleterious impact can ever be mitigated, then it will occur through interventions across micro, meso-, and macro-levels. In fact, we note renewed attention to how micro-level phenomena including racialized emotions (see Bonilla Silva 2019), racial stereotypes (see Korver-Glenn 2018), and exposure to interpersonal racial discrimination (see Brown et al. Forthcoming) reinforce structural arrangements.

### **Study Contribution**

This study uses a novel and an ordinal measure of racial apathy. Prior work uses indirect measures of racial apathy and ignores its ordinality. This study investigates whether intergroup contact correlates negatively with racial apathy using survey data from white youth participating in the National Study of Youth and Religion (NSYR). *We hypothesize interracial contact would associate with less racial apathy among white youth (H1)*. Overall, results support our hypothesis.

### **Methods**

#### **Data**

The 2003 National Study of Youth and Religion (NSYR) was a nationally representative, random-digit-dial (RDD) telephone survey of 3,290 English and Spanish-speaking respondents between 13 and 17 years of age, and their parents. The field period lasted from July 2002 to April 2003. The American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) response rate was 57 percent. The 2003 NSYR asked questions about religiosity, morality, problem behaviors, dating, friendship groups, attachment to school, and additional topics germane to this age group. No more recent national data with a measure of racial apathy and multiple measures of intergroup contact exists.

Analyses comparing the 2003 NSYR data with U.S. Census data of households with adolescents, and with comparable nationally representative surveys of adolescents such as Monitoring the Future (MTF), demonstrated the 2003 NSYR exhibited no identifiable sampling or non-response biases. For additional information regarding comparisons to other data sources, the research design, sampling frame, and data collection process, see <https://youthandreligion.nd.edu/>. To view the questionnaires and codebooks or download the data, visit <http://www.thearda.com/Archive/NSYR.asp>.

#### **Measures**

***Racial Apathy.*** This question captured racial apathy: "How much do you personally care or not about equality between different racial groups?" Response options were: 1. "Very much," 2. "Somewhat," 3. "A little," or 4. "Do you not really care" (see Table 1). Because racial apathy is defined explicitly as *not caring about racial inequality* (Brown et al. 2019; Forman 2001, 2004; Forman and Lewis 2006), this measure demonstrates face validity. However, it probably underestimates racial apathy because certain whites understand caring about racial equality is socially desirable (Schuman et al. 1998; Sears and Henry 2003).

***Correlates of Racial Apathy.*** Forman and Lewis (2015) sorted correlates of racial apathy into three categories: (1) social background, (2) social values, and (3) academic orientation. Because replication is essential to robust social science, we duplicated their approach using virtually identical correlates. Gender, age, parental education, and region captured social background. Parents reported their child's gender (i.e., boy or girl). Age was self-reported and ranged from 13 to 17 years old. Parental education captured the highest level of educational attainment of the residential parent(s). We coded it as: 1. "Less than high school," 2. "High school completed," 3. "Some college," 4. "College completed," and 5. "Graduate or professional degree." Four categories indicated region: 1. "South," 2. "Northeast," 3. "Midwest," and 4. "West."

Parent political orientation and daily importance of faith captured social values. This question measured parent political orientation: “When it comes to politics, do you usually think of yourself as... 1. “Very liberal,” 2. “Somewhat liberal,” 3. “Middle of the road,” 4. “Somewhat conservative,” 5. “Very conservative,” 6. “Haven’t you thought much about this?,” or 7. “DON’T KNOW [DO NOT READ].” After assigning “Refused” to missing, we coded responses into four categories: 1=Very liberal or somewhat liberal, 2=Middle of the road, 3=Very conservative or somewhat conservative, and 4=Haven’t you thought much about this?/Don’t Know. This question tapped the daily importance of faith to respondents: “How important or unimportant is religious faith in shaping how you live your daily life?” Its response metric was: 1. “Not important,” 2. “Not very important,” 3. “Somewhat important,” 4. “Very important,” and 5. “Extremely important.”

Grades, educational aspirations, and school difficulties captured academic orientation. Grades was a dichotomy comparing students who earned “all As or mostly As” to their peers. The following question measured educational aspirations: “Given realistic limitations, how far in school do you think you actually WILL go?” Responses included: 1. “No farther in school,” 2. “Some high school,” 3. “High school graduate,” 4. “Vocational-Technical school after high school,” 5. “Some college or Associate’s degree,” 6. “College graduate,” and 7. “Post-graduate or professional school.” Ever suspended, expelled, or dropped out in the last two years measured school difficulties. The question read: “In the last TWO years, how many times, if any, have you been suspended or expelled from school?” We coded it as 0. “Never” and 1. “Yes.” Respondents who dropped out of school were skipped out of the suspension/expulsion question, therefore we coded them as “Yes” for school difficulties.

**Intergroup Contact.** Having a different race mentor, attending mixed-race religious services, living in a multi-race household, interracial friendship, and interracial dating captured intergroup contact. These five measures conform mostly to the essential conditions (described earlier) for intergroup contact to reduce prejudice. Different race mentor combined three items: (1) “Roughly how many TOTAL ADULTS, if any, do you have in your life that you can turn to when you need support, advice, or help-not including your parents?,” (2) “[If teen has only one adult to turn to for support and advice] Is this person of a different race than you, or not?,” and (3) “[If teen has more than one adult to go to for support and advice] Of those adults that you can turn to, how many, if any, of them are of a different race than you are?” The final constructed variable had two responses: 0. “No,” which meant having no adult mentor *or* no adult mentor of a different race, and 1. “Yes,” which meant having at least one adult mentor of a different race. We combined two questions to indicate mixed-race religious services: (1) “Do you attend religious services more than once or twice a year, NOT counting weddings, baptisms, and funerals [INSERT “or religious services during school” IF teen attends a private religious school]?,” and (2) “Now I have some more questions about religion. About how many of the people in the religious services that you normally attend are the same race as you?” The response categories for the second question were: 1. “All,” 2. “Nearly all,” 3. “Most,” 4. “About half,” 5. “Few,” and 6. “None.” The final constructed variable included two response categories: 0. do not attend “more than twice a year” or same race services (i.e., “All”), and 1. mixed race services (i.e., not “All”).

This question indicated living in a multi-race household: “Are all the members of your household of the same race or ethnic group as you, or not?” We coded those not living in multi-race households as 0. “No,” and coded those in such households as 1. “Yes.” We combined four questions to capture interracial friendship. (1) “Do you have any people that you consider to be your friends?,” (2) “[If teen has friends] Okay, I would like you to think of your closest friends, up to five of them. They may be from your school, neighborhood, family, a religious congregation, work, wherever, but should not include your parents. They can also include a boyfriend or girlfriend. Just to keep them straight, I would like you to tell me the first names of up to five of your closest friends.” (3) “[If teen has no friends or answered “don’t know” or “refused”] Okay, I would like you to think of the people you like and spend the most time with, up to five of them. They may be from your school, neighborhood, family, a religious congregation, work, wherever, but should not include your parents. They can also include a boyfriend or girlfriend. Just to keep them straight, I would like you to tell me the first names of up to five of them, then I will ask you some questions about them.” (4) “Which, if any, of these people [INSERT LIST A-Y] ... C. are of a different race than you?” Respondents named how many people were of a different race, including 7. “NONE OF THE ABOVE,” 8. “DON’T KNOW [DO NOT READ],” and 9. “REFUSED [DO NOT READ].” Respondents who reported having “no friends” or no different race friends were coded 0. “No.” Respondents who had at least one different race friend were coded 1. “Yes.”

Interracial dating combined three items: (1) “How many total different people, if any, have you dated since you turned 13 years old?,” (2) “[If teen has dated one person since turning 13 years old] Was the person you dated of a different race, or not?,” and (3) “[If teen has dated more than one person since turning 13 years old] How many, if any, of these

people you dated were of a different race?" The final constructed variable included two responses: 0. "Never," which meant the respondent never dated or never dated interracially, and 1. "Yes," which meant the respondent dated interracially.

### **Analytic Strategies**

We restricted analyses to 2003 NSYR white respondents and deleted cases listwise. Using Stata 16 *svy* commands with *subpop* subcommands, we applied a sampling weight (i.e., RWEIGHT2) to adjust for differential probabilities of selection and to incorporate post-stratification adjustments for census region and household income (see <http://www.thearda.com/Archive/Files/Descriptions/NSYRW1.asp> for more information about the sampling weight).

Our estimation sample size equaled 1,927 white respondents out of an available sample size of 2,091 white respondents. See Table 2. Unlike Forman and Lewis (2006, 2015) and Henricks and Ortiz (Forthcoming) who modeled racial apathy as numeric, we treated it as ordinal. Doing so necessitated application of regression models for ordered outcomes. The most popular of which is the cumulative ordered logit model. Its appropriateness depends upon the *proportional odds assumption* (Williams 2006), which assumes estimates (i.e., odds ratios and standard errors) do not vary across thresholds (i.e., levels) of racial apathy. Statistical tests revealed violation of the proportional odds assumption and confirmed treating racial apathy as numeric invites bias. As a work-around, we fit *partial* proportional odds regression models (Williams 2006) using *gologit2* commands. These models allow odds ratios and standard errors to change (i.e., be variant) or not change (i.e., be invariant) across thresholds (Williams 2006). Interpreting estimates from partial proportional odds regression models resembles interpreting estimates from a series of binary logistic regression models (i.e., "Very much" versus "Somewhat," "A little," or "Not really"; "Very much" and "Somewhat," versus "A little," or "Not really"; "Very much," "Somewhat," and "A little," versus "Not really."). Thus, racial apathy categories being compared in Tables 3, 4, and 5 cumulate across successive models. Further, an odds ratio greater than 1.0 means the respondent is more likely to fall in a higher category of racial apathy compared to a lower category. An odds ratio less than 1.0 means the respondent is less likely to fall in a higher category of racial apathy compared to a lower category.

Table 1 reports the weighted univariate distribution of racial apathy. Table 2 reports weighted descriptive statistics for the correlates and intergroup contact variables. Table 3 reports weighted estimates from partial proportional odds regressions of racial apathy on previously specified correlates. Table 4 adds the intergroup contact variables to the regression model. Table 5 examines what happens when we recode intergroup contact as a binary variable (i.e., none vs. any) or count variable (i.e., 0 - 5), respectively. Thus, results in Table 5 serve as a sensitivity analysis. Models shown in Table 3 are nested within models shown in Tables 4 and 5. This nesting allows us to test the value-added of intergroup contact. We labeled estimates producing test statistics with *p-values* less than .10, .05, and .01 as statistically significant. We flagged marginal significance (i.e.,  $p < .10$ ) because a trend reported here can guide future research.

### **Results**

Table 1 displays the weighted univariate distribution of racial apathy. Most respondents expressed attitudes *opposite* to racial apathy. In regard to caring about racial equality, 50 percent responded "Very much," 28 percent "Somewhat," 6 percent "A little," and 16 percent "Not really." The 16 percent category coincides with point estimates of racial apathy reported by Forman and Lewis (2006) using 1976-2003 Monitoring the Future (MTF) data and 2005 Chicago Area Study (CAS) data.

Table 2 presents weighted descriptive statistics for the correlates and interracial contact variables. The estimation sample was split evenly by gender. On average, respondents were 15 years old and their parents had some college education. Most respondents lived in the South (37 percent), followed by the Midwest (26 percent), the West (21 percent), and Northeast (16 percent). Just 17 percent of respondents' parents identified politically as "Liberal." In contrast, 40 percent of respondents' parents identified politically as "Conservative." A quarter of respondents' parents identified politically as "Middle of the road," and under 20 percent were unsure. Respondents stated faith was "Somewhat important" to "Very important" in their daily lives. About one in four respondents reported earning "all As or mostly As" in school. Educational aspirations were high. On average, respondents hoped to graduate from college. One in seven respondents experienced school difficulties. About a quarter of respondents reported a different race mentor. Nearly 68 percent attended mixed-race religious services. Few respondents (5 percent) lived in a multi-

race household. A third of respondents reported a different race friend. Approximately 23 percent reported ever dating interracial. Tetrachoric correlations among the interracial contact variables ranged from -.01 (multi-race household and mixed-race religious services) to .48 (interracial dating and different race friend). See Appendix.

Table 3 presents weighted estimates from partial proportional odds regressions of racial apathy on (1) social background, (2) social values, and (3) academic orientation correlates (see Forman and Lewis 2015). Three models are shown: Model 1a, Model 1b, and Model 1c. Model 1a compares respondents who stated “Very much” to respondents who said “Somewhat,” “A little,” or “Not really.” Model 1b compares respondents who stated “Very much” or “Somewhat” to those who said “A little” or “Not really.” Model 1c compares respondents who cared “Very much,” “Somewhat,” or “A little” to respondents who chose “Not really.” Odds ratios and standard errors in bold were variant, differing across thresholds of racial apathy.

Girls had 33 percent smaller odds than boys of caring “Somewhat,” “A little,” or “Not really,” compared to caring “Very much.” As the tendency to express racial apathy increased though, the gender difference was not significant. Thus, at the highest levels of racial apathy, no gender difference exists. Age and parental education predicted smaller odds of expressing racial apathy. However, the inverse relationship between age and racial apathy was invariant. In addition, the inverse relationship between parental education and racial apathy strengthened at higher thresholds. For example, comparing respondents who said “Very much” to those who said “Somewhat,” “A little,” or “Not really,” increases in parental education were not significant. But at higher thresholds, parental education was negatively predictive. Compared to respondents living in the South, those living in the Midwest had .77 smaller odds of expressing racial apathy. This odds ratio was invariant across thresholds.

Compared to respondents with politically “Liberal” parents, those whose parents identified otherwise had larger odds of caring “Somewhat,” “A little,” or “Not really,” as opposed to “Very much” about racial equality. Parent political orientation was not predictive at higher thresholds though. Daily importance of faith predicted .79 smaller odds of expressing racial apathy across thresholds. Respondents earning “all As or mostly As” had 35 percent smaller odds of expressing racial apathy than their peers. This odds ratio was invariant across thresholds. High educational aspirations correlated with 20 percent smaller odds of expressing racial apathy across thresholds. School difficulties predicted 25 percent smaller odds of caring “Somewhat,” “A little,” or saying “Not really,” compared to “Very much.” But estimates varied across thresholds. For example, school difficulties associated with 1.29 larger odds (n.s.) of expressing racial apathy at the highest threshold.

Table 4 presents weighted estimates from partial proportional odds regressions of racial apathy on correlates from Table 3 and interracial contact variables. Three models are shown: Model 2a, Model 2b, and Model 2c. Model 2a compares respondents who said they cared “Very much” to those who said “Somewhat,” “A little,” or “Not really.” Model 2b compares respondents who cared “Very much” or “Somewhat” to those who said “A little” or “Not really,” Model 2c compares respondents who cared “Very much,” “Somewhat,” or “A little” to those who reported not caring at all. Again, estimates in bold were variant, differing across thresholds of racial apathy.

Compared to boys, girls had 32 percent smaller odds of saying “Somewhat,” “A little,” or “Not really,” as opposed to saying “Very much.” However and again, girls and boys showed similar odds of expressing racial apathy at higher thresholds. Age predicted .84 smaller odds of expressing racial apathy. This association was invariant. Parental education associated with smaller odds of expressing racial apathy but only at higher thresholds. Compared to respondents living in the South, those living in the Midwest had .75 smaller odds of expressing racial apathy across thresholds. Compared to respondents whose parents were politically “Liberal,” those whose parents identified as “Middle of the road” expressed 1.40 marginally larger odds of caring “Somewhat,” “A little,” or “Not really,” compared to “Very much.” At higher thresholds, this association was not significant. Respondents’ whose parents had not thought much about or did not know their political orientation expressed 1.69 larger odds of caring “Somewhat,” “A little,” or “Not really,” compared to “Very much.” At higher thresholds, this association was not significant. Respondents’ daily importance of faith predicted .79 smaller odds of expressing racial apathy across thresholds. Across thresholds, respondents earning “all As or mostly As” had 37 percent smaller odds of expressing racial apathy, compared to peers with lower grades. High educational aspirations associated with .80 smaller odds of expressing racial apathy across thresholds. In Models 2a, 2b, and 2c, school difficulties was not predictive.

Respondents with a different race mentor had smaller odds of expressing racial apathy across higher thresholds. Attending mixed-race religious services and living in a multi-race household did not correlate significantly with racial apathy. (Grouping “All” and “Nearly all” together in one category did not alter the results.) Interracial friendship



predicted .80 marginally smaller odds of expressing racial apathy. At higher thresholds, this association was not significant. Dating interracially associated with 31 percent smaller odds of saying “Somewhat,” “A little,” or “Not really,” compared to “Very much.” However, the association between interracial dating and racial apathy flipped at higher thresholds, but was not significant. Net of previously specified correlates (see Table 3), introducing interracial contact significantly ( $p < .00$ ) improved overall model fit (Design-based F-statistic = 5.49 with 11 and 2,943 df).

Table 5 presents weighted estimates from partial proportional odds regression models predicting racial apathy when we coded interracial contact as a binary variable (i.e., none vs. any) or count variable (i.e., 0 - 5), respectively. Two panels are shown. In Panel A, we modeled the binary variable. In Panel B, we modeled the count variable. Panel A displays three models: Model 3a, Model 3b, Model 3c. Panel B displays three models: Model 3d, Model 3e, and Model 3f. Model 3a and 3d compare respondents who said they cared “Very much” to those who said “Somewhat,” “A little,” or “Not really.” Model 3b and 3e compare respondents who cared “Very much” or “Somewhat” to those who said “A little” or “Not really,” Model 3c and 3f compare respondents who cared “Very much,” “Somewhat,” or “A little” to those who reported not caring at all.

Regarding the binary variable, 18 percent of respondents reported none whereas 82 percent reported interracial contact in at least one setting. Net of correlates in Table 3, compared to those experiencing none, respondents experiencing *any* interracial contact reported .63 smaller odds of expressing racial apathy. This odds ratio was invariant across thresholds of racial apathy. Introducing the binary version of interracial contact significantly ( $p < .00$ ) improved overall model fit (Design-based F-statistic = 12.87 with 1 and 2,953 df). Further, correlates’ associations shown in Table 3 and 4 did not differ substantially when we modeled interracial contact as a binary variable.

Regarding the count variable, 18 percent of respondents reported zero, 38 percent reported one, 25 percent reported two, 13 percent reported three, and 6 percent reported four. No respondents experienced interracial contact across all five settings examined here. Net of correlates in Table 3, for every additional interracial contact experience respondents reported .82 smaller odds of expressing racial apathy. This odds ratio was invariant across thresholds. Introducing the count version of interracial contact significantly ( $p < .00$ ) improved overall model fit (Design-based F-statistic = 18.15 with 1 and 2,953 df). Again, correlates’ associations shown in Table 3 and 4 did not differ substantially when we modeled interracial contact as a count variable. Taken all together, results in Tables 4 and 5 confirm the contact hypothesis.

## Discussion

Whites not caring about racial inequality indicates racial apathy. Brown and colleagues (2019), Forman (2001, 2004), Forman and Lewis (2006, 2015), and Henricks and Ortiz (Forthcoming) argue racial apathy is a contemporary and subtle form of white racial prejudice. More pointedly, they argue racial apathy manifests a socially acceptable form of anti-black animus where whites feel no responsibility for racial inequality. This study used a novel and an ordinal measure of racial apathy. It also examined previously specified correlates of racial apathy (see Forman and Lewis 2015), providing robustness checks via replication. Finally, this study addressed whether interracial contact associated with less racial apathy, net of previously specified correlates.

Because we treated racial apathy as an ordinal variable, we could estimate whether correlates’ associations were invariant across thresholds (see Table 3). For example, girls rejected racial apathy at lower thresholds, but did not differ significantly from boys at higher thresholds. In contrast, younger respondents expressed less racial apathy across thresholds. Respondents whose parents identified politically as “Liberal” and respondents whose faith was important to them reported less racial apathy, but only faith’s association was invariant across thresholds. Respondents’ grades, educational aspirations, and school difficulties were statistically significant. In general, high performing respondents were less apathetic. For example, students with high educational aspirations expressed less racial apathy. The association between having school difficulties and racial apathy varied across thresholds (see Table 3). Some results here (e.g., girls and boys reporting similar racial apathy at higher thresholds) clash with what Forman and Lewis (2015) found, albeit with a different measure of racial apathy treated numerically.

Our primary contribution addressed whether interracial contact predicts less racial apathy (see Table 4 and 5). Specifically, we modeled having a different race mentor, attending mixed-race religious services, living in a multi-race household, interracial friendship, and interracial dating. Consistent with intergroup contact theory, respondents with a different race mentor had smaller odds of expressing racial apathy across higher thresholds. Attending mixed-race services and living in a multi-race household did not correlate with racial apathy. We found white teenagers who

had at least one interracial friendship and dated interracially expressed less racial apathy at a low threshold. H1 was supported overall, especially when modeling interracial contact as a binary and count variable (see Table 5). Though when disaggregated, certain types of interracial contact seemed unimportant and many associations varied across thresholds. Results suggest singular experiences of interracial contact may not reduce white racial apathy. We speculate contemporary and subtle forms of white racial prejudice are less responsive to singular experiences as the world has become increasingly diverse, glocalized, and electronically connected. Today, interracial contact across multiple settings may be necessary to reduce white racial prejudice.

Introducing interracial contact attenuated associations of parent political orientation and school difficulties with racial apathy (compare Tables 3 and 4). Specifically, parent political orientation became a weaker correlate. In addition, having school difficulties became not significant. Consequently, we think interracial contact should be included in models predicting racial apathy, otherwise those models may be mis-specified.

Extrapolating from the full regression model in Table 4, a high racial apathy profile would be an older boy, whose parents earned less than a high school education, who lives in the South, is not religious, has poor academic outcomes, and avoids interracial relationships or contact. Regarding gender, some evidence (Hughes and Tuch 2003; Maxwell and Schulte 2018) suggests differences between white womens' and mens' racial attitudes are exaggerated. To that point, we found no gender differences at higher thresholds of racial apathy. Consequently, we suspect girls who share these characteristics may also express high levels of racial apathy. Based on this profile, we assert racial apathy demonstrates political significance. For example, projections indicate 70 percent of U.S. citizens will live in 15 states by 2040, thus 30 percent of voters will choose the majority of U.S. Senators (Bump 2018). Compared to the 70 percent, the 30 percent are more likely to be older, men, whiter, and live in racially homogeneous places. These characteristics coincide with a high racial apathy profile, positioning racially apathetic individuals as influential in future elections.

We encourage scholars to include multiple measures of white racial prejudice in future surveys. That means old-fashioned, modern, symbolic, affective, cognitive, social distance, policy support measures, *and* racial apathy. By including multiple operationalizations of white racial prejudice, scholars could construct a *nomological net* (Cronbach and Meehl 1955), specifying connections among forms of prejudice (see, for example, work by Brown et al. 2009; Forman and Lewis 2006; Henricks and Ortiz (Forthcoming); Kleinpenning and Hagendoorn 1993; Meertens and Pettigrew 1997; Sears and Henry 2003 who link forms of prejudice). Also necessary is inclusion of social desirability scales (e.g., Marlowe and Crowne 1961). Scholars must think innovatively about white racial prejudice and why it might be evolving. For example, Forman and Lewis (2006:179-180) and Mueller (2017:220-222) assert racial apathy and *racial ignorance* share a symbiotic connection. They argue these measures harmonize to obscure white privilege. Scholars can only address their assertion by simultaneously including both measures in surveys.

### **Limitations and Future Directions**

In this study, we used a novel and an ordinal measure of racial apathy. We also corroborated previously specified correlates of racial apathy (see Forman and Lewis 2015). Further, we demonstrated for the first time interracial contact correlates negatively with racial apathy. Furthermore, we found certain correlates show variant associations across thresholds of racial apathy, a conclusion beyond studies treating racial apathy as numeric (Forman and Lewis 2006, 2015; Henricks and Ortiz Forthcoming). Still, this study has limitations.

First, researchers should explore racial apathy using longitudinal data. For example, Brown and colleagues (2019) examine consistency in racial apathy across three waves of panel data from the NSYR. Their results reveal young whites' expressions of racial apathy change dramatically across time. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) theorized consistency is a hallmark of an important attitude. Still, a logical next step would be examining what predicts prospective declines in racial apathy. Further, longitudinal data are necessary to disentangle certain associations. For example, respondents' grades negatively predict racial apathy. However, this negative influence could be a function of schooling broadening worldviews and increasing empathy, or a function of ideological refinement and social desirability (Wodtke 2016). Second, existing studies of racial apathy typically examine white youth. Future research should therefore examine older whites (see, for example, Brown et al. 2019; Forman and Lewis 2006) and evaluate birth cohort and period effects.

Third, the 2003 NSYR questionnaire did not include measures of urbanicity or respondents' political orientation, although the former was not an important correlate (see Forman and Lewis 2015). Related, Forman and Lewis (2006) and Henricks and Ortiz (Forthcoming) linked racial apathy with additional measures of white racial prejudice (e.g.,

symbolic racism; perceived threat; negative stereotypes about blacks and Latinos). Such additional measures, including views of ameliorative policies such as affirmative action, were unavailable in the 2003 NSYR questionnaire. Fourth, scholars know little about correlates of racial apathy among non-whites. Future studies should examine the degree to which blacks, Latinx, and Asian youth express racial apathy (see Brown et al. 2020). Fifth, no studies demonstrate a connection between racial apathy and behavior. This is a universal weakness in the white racial prejudice literature (for further discussion, see Fishbein and Ajzen 1975; Huddy and Feldman 2009; LaPiere 1934). Related, the significance of racial apathy may be overstated. For example, behind closed doors, evidence confirms whites routinely express mean-spirited anti-black feelings and supremacist beliefs (Picca and Feagin 2007).

Sixth, the sociopolitical climate today differs from when the first studies describing racial apathy were published. It seems whites today are less hesitant to express old-fashioned and blatant racial animus publicly. Less hesitance may signal another shift in ideological frameworks. What this latest shift means for racial apathy is an open question. Seventh, with the advent of social media and networks, interracial contact may increasingly be virtual in nature. For example, exposure to positive portrayals of Barack Obama on TV reduced white conservative Republicans' racial prejudice (Goldman 2012; Goldman and Mutz 2014). We think essential and facilitating conditions for effective interracial contact should be updated given contemporary ways of interacting. Finally, moving forward, we need measures of intergroup contact capturing frequency, duration, quality, and valence of interracial interactions (see Barlow et al. 2012). Then researchers can examine effects across a range of interracial contact experiences. Also, we may need to know the specific race of the person with whom the white person has contact (e.g., black or Asian or American Indian, for example).

### **Conclusion**

Quite possibly because of its operational dynamism over time, white racial prejudice remains an important area of inquiry for social scientists. Ignoring its operational dynamism, little has changed fundamentally about white racial prejudice in the last 50 years. Whites (still) feel negatively toward non-whites, especially blacks. Nevertheless, some scholars argue contemporary white racial prejudice sometimes takes the form of racial apathy. But this new form should not be viewed as an improvement over old-fashioned and blatant racial animus. Instead, scholars must designate not caring as treacherous because it means racial inequality becomes ignorable. Scholars should anticipate increases in racial apathy following counter-movements when people of color demand whites acknowledge their white privilege, and choose sides in the struggle to reduce every form of prejudice. As this happens, the importance of tracking white racial apathy may increase as whites themselves become more polarized. For example, it now seems increasingly common that select whites view themselves as victims, blamed unfairly for enduring racial disparities in outcomes including health, wealth, education, and incarceration. Based upon results in this study, it is possible sustained interracial contact can facilitate some whites learning to care about racial equality.

### **References**

- Anderson, Elijah. 2015. "The White Space." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 1(1):10–21.
- Allport, Gordon W. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Barlow, Fiona Kate, Stefania Paolini, Anne Pedersen, Matthew J. Hornsey, Helena R. M. Radke, Jake Harwood, Mark Rubin, and Chris G. Sibley. 2012. "The Contact Caveat: Negative Contact Predicts Increased Prejudice More Than Positive Contact Predicts Reduced Prejudice." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 38(12):1629-43.
- Blumer, Herbert. 1958. "Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position." *The Pacific Sociological Review* 1(1):3-7.
- Bobo, Lawrence, James R. Kluegel, and Ryan A. Smith. 1997. "Laissez-Faire Racism: The Crystallization of a Kinder, Gentler, Antiblack Ideology." Pp. 15-42 in *Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change*, edited by S.A. Tuch and J. K. Martin. Westport, Conn: Praeger.
- Bobo, Lawrence D., Camille Z. Charles, Maria Krysan, and Alicia D. Simmons. 2012. "The Real Record on Racial Attitudes." Pp. 38-83 in *Social Trends in American Life: Findings from the General Social Survey since 1972*, edited by P. V. Marsden. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2018. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*, 5th ed. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2019. "Feeling Race: Theorizing the Racial Economy of Emotions." *American Sociological Review* 84(1):1-25.

- Brown, Tony N., Mark K. Akiyama, Ismail K. White, Toby Epstein Jayaratne, and Elizabeth S. Anderson. 2009. "Differentiating Contemporary Racial Prejudice from Old-Fashioned Racial Prejudice." *Race and Social Problems* 1(2):97-110.
- Brown, Tony N., Asia Bento, Quintin Gorman, Jr., Lydia Koku, and Julian Culver. 2019. "'Who Cares?' Investigating Consistency in Expressions of Racial Apathy among Whites." *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World* 5:1-10.
- Brown, Tony N., Julian Culver, Asia Bento, and Quintin Gorman, Jr. 2020. "The Prevalence, Correlates, and Consequences of Racial Apathy among Black Teenagers." *Journal of African American Studies* 24(4):611-626.
- Brown, Tony N., Chase L. Lesane-Brown, Rachell Davis, and Michael Carroll. Forthcoming. "Viral Racism via Videos: A Study of Asian Americans' Experiences of Interpersonal Discrimination Because of COVID-19." *Social Currents*.
- Bump, Philip. 2018. "In About 20 years, Half the Population Will Live in Eight States." *The Washington Post*. Retrieved July 24, 2018 ([https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/politics/wp/2018/07/12/in-about-20-years-half-the-population-will-live-in-eight-states/?noredirect=on&utm\\_term=.22dae3a892cd](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/politics/wp/2018/07/12/in-about-20-years-half-the-population-will-live-in-eight-states/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.22dae3a892cd)).
- Cook, Stuart W. 1978. "Interpersonal and Attitudinal Outcomes Operating in Interracial Groups." *Journal of Research and Development and Education* 12(1):97-113.
- Cronbach, Lee J. and Paul E. Meehl. 1955. "Construct Validity in Psychological Tests." *Psychological Bulletin* 52(4):281-302.
- Dovidio, John F., and Samuel L. Gaertner. 1996. "Affirmative Action, Unintentional Racial Biases, and Intergroup Relations." *Journal of Social Issues* 52(4):51-75.
- Emerson, Michael O., Rachel Tolbert Kimbro, and George Yancey. 2002. "Contact Theory Extended: The Effects of Prior Racial Contact on Current Social Ties." *Social Science Quarterly* 83(3):745-761.
- Esposito, Luigi, and Victor Romano. 2014. "Benevolent Racism: Upholding Racial Inequality in the Name of Black Empowerment." *Western Journal of Black Studies* 38(2):69-83.
- Fishbein, Martin, and Icek Ajzen. 1975. *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Feagin, Joe R. and Douglas Lee Eckberg. 1980. "Discrimination: Motivation, Action, Effects, and Context." *Annual Review of Sociology* 6:1-20.
- Forman, Tyrone A. 2001. "Social Determinants of White Youth's Racial Attitudes." *Sociological Studies of Children and Youth* 8:173-207.
- Forman, Tyrone A. 2004. "Color-Blind Racism and Racial Indifference: The Role of Racial Apathy in Facilitating Enduring Inequalities." Pp. 43-66 in *Changing Terrain of Race and Ethnicity*, edited by M. Krysan and A. E. Lewis. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Forman, Tyrone A., and Amanda E. Lewis. 2006. "Racial Apathy and Hurricane Katrina: The Social Anatomy of Prejudice in the Post-Civil Rights Era." *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* 3(1):175-202.
- Forman, Tyrone A., and Amanda E. Lewis. 2015. "Beyond Prejudice? Young Whites' Racial Attitudes in Post-Civil Rights America, 1976 to 2000." *American Behavioral Scientist* 59(11):1394-1428.
- Goldman, Seth K. 2012. "Effects of the 2008 Obama Presidential Campaign on White Racial Prejudice." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 76(4):663-687.
- Goldman, Seth K. and Diana C. Mutz. 2014. *The Obama Effect: How the 2008 Campaign Changed White Racial Attitudes*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Gordon, Milton. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Henricks, Kasey, and Ruben Ortiz. Forthcoming. "Recognition and Disregard: The Relationship Between Racial Apathy and Liberal Reforms on Monetary Sanctions." *Sociological Inquiry*.
- Henry, P. J., and David O. Sears. 2002. "The Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale." *Political Psychology* 23(2):253-283.
- Huddy, Leonie, and Stanley Feldman. 2009. "On Assessing the Political Effects of Racial Prejudice." *Annual Review of Political Science* 12(1):423-447.
- Hughes, Michael, and Steven A. Tuch. 2003. "Gender Differences in Whites' Racial Attitudes: Are Women's Attitudes Really More Favorable?" *Social Psychology Quarterly* 66(4): 384-401.
- Jackman, Mary R., and Marie Crane. 1986. "Some of My Best Friends Are Black: Interracial Friendship and Whites' Racial Attitudes." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 50(4):459-86.
- Jordan, Winthrop. 1974. *The White Man's Burden: Historical Origins of Racism in the United States*. London, England: Oxford University Press.
- Kinder, Donald R., and Lynn M. Sanders. 1996. *Divided by Color: Racial Politics and Democratic Ideals*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Kleinpenning, Gerard, and Louk Hagendoorn. 1993. "Forms of Racism and the Cumulative Dimension of Ethnic Attitudes." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 56(1):21-36.
- Kluegel, James R. 1990. "Trends in Whites' Explanations of the Black-White Gap in Socioeconomic Status, 1977-1989." *American Sociological Review* 55(4):512-525.
- Kluegel, James R., and Eliot R. Smith. 1982. "Whites' Beliefs about Blacks' Opportunity." *American Sociological Review* 47(4):518-532.
- Korver-Glenn, Elizabeth. 2018. "Compounding Inequalities: How Racial Stereotypes and Discrimination Accumulate across the Stages of Housing Exchange." *American Sociological Review* 83(4):627-656.
- Krysan, Maria. 2000. "Prejudice, Politics, and Public Opinion: Understanding the Sources of Racial Policy Attitudes." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:135-168.
- Kubota, Jennifer T., Jaelyn Peiso, Kori Marcum, and Jasmin Cloutier. 2017. "Intergroup Contact throughout the Lifespan Modulates Implicit Racial Biases across Perceivers' Racial Group." *PLOS ONE* 12(7):1-12.
- LaPiere, Richard T. 1934. "Attitudes vs Actions." *Social Forces* 13(2):230-237.
- Lewis, Amanda E. 2003. *Race in the Schoolyard: Negotiating the Color Line in Classrooms and Communities*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Mancini, Christina, Daniel P. Mears, Eric A. Stewart, Kevin M. Beaver, and Justin T. Pickett. 2012. "Whites' Perceptions about Black Criminality: a Closer Look at the Contact Hypothesis." *Crime and Delinquency* 61(7):996-1022.
- Marlowe, David, and Douglas P. Crowne. 1961. "Social Desirability and Response to Perceived Situational Demands." *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 25(2):109-115.
- Maxwell, Angie, and Stephanie R. Schulte. 2018. "Racial Resentment Attitudes Among White Millennial Youth: The Influence of Parents and Media" *Social Science Quarterly* 99(3):1183-1199.
- Mayorga-Gallo, Sarah. 2014. *Behind the White Picket Fence: Power and Privilege in a Multiethnic Neighborhood*. Chapel Hill, NC: UNC Press Books.
- McConahay, John B., and Joseph C. Hough Jr. 1976. "Symbolic Racism." *Journal of Social Issues* 32(2):23-45.
- Meertens, Roel W., and Thomas F. Pettigrew. 1997. "Is Subtle Prejudice Really Prejudice?" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 61(1):54-71.
- Mueller, Jennifer. C. 2017. "Producing Colorblindness: Everyday Mechanisms of White Ignorance." *Social Problems* 64(2):219-238.
- Myrdal, Gunnar. 1944. *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. 1986. "The Intergroup Contact Hypothesis Reconsidered." Pp.169-195 in *Contact and Conflict in Intergroup Encounters*, edited by M. Hewstone and R. Brown. Oxford, England UK: Basil Blackwell Inc.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. 1997. "Generalized Intergroup Contact Effects on Prejudice." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 23(2):173-185.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. 1998. "Intergroup Contact Theory." *Annual Review of Psychology* 49(1):65-85.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. 2016. "In Pursuit of Three Theories: Authoritarianism, Relative Deprivation, and Intergroup Contact." *Annual Review of Psychology* 67:1-21.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F., and Linda R. Tropp. 2008. "How Does Intergroup Contact Reduce Prejudice? Meta-analytic Tests of Three Mediators." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 38(6):922-934.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F., Linda R. Tropp, Ulrich Wagner, and Oliver Christ. 2011. "Recent Advances in Intergroup Contact Theory." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 35(3):271-280.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F., and Roel W. Meertens. 1995. "Subtle and Blatant Prejudice in Western Europe." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 25(1):57-75.
- Picca, Leslie Houts and Joe R. Feagin. 2007. *Two-Faced Racism: Whites in the Backstage and Frontstage*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Robinson, Jerry W. Jr., and James D. Preston. 1976. "Equal-Status Contact and Modification of Racial Prejudice: A Reexamination of the Contact Hypothesis." *Social Forces* 54(4):911-924.
- Schofield, Janet W., and H. Andrew Sagar. 1977. "Peer Interaction Patterns in an Integrated Middle School." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 40(2):130-138.
- Schuman, Howard, Charlotte Steeh, Lawrence D. Bobo, and Maria Krysan. 1998. *Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sears, David O., and P. J. Henry. 2003. "The Origins of Symbolic Racism." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 85(2):259-275.

- Shook, Natalie J., and Russell H. Fazio. 2008. "Interracial Roommate Relationships: an Experimental Field Test of the Contact Hypothesis." *Psychological Science* 19(7):717-723.
- Sigelman, Lee, and Susan Welch. 1993. "The Contact Hypothesis Revisited: Black-white Interaction and Positive Racial Attitudes." *Social Forces* 71(3):781-795.
- Stouffer, Samuel A., Edward A. Suchman, Leland C. DeVinney, Shirley A. Star, and Robins M. Williams Jr. 1949. *The American Soldier in Social Psychology in World War II. Volume I*. Princeton, CN: Princeton University Press.
- Williams, David R., James S. Jackson, Tony N. Brown, Myriam Torres, Tyrone A. Forman, and Kendrick Brown. 1999. "Traditional and Contemporary Prejudice and Urban Whites' Support for Affirmative Action and Government Help." *Social Problems* 46(4):503-527.
- Williams, Richard. 2006. "Generalized Ordered Logit/ Partial Proportional Odds Models for Ordinal Dependent Variables." *The Stata Journal* 6(1):58-82.
- Williams, Robin M. 1947. *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions*. New York, NY: Social Science Research Council.
- Wilson, Thomas C. 1996. "Prejudice Reduction or Self-Selection? A Test of the Contact Hypothesis." *Sociological Spectrum* 16(1):43-60.
- Wodtke, Geoffrey T. 2016. "Are Smart People Less Racist? Verbal Ability, Anti-Black Prejudice, and the Principle-Policy Paradox." *Social Problems* 63(1):21-45.
- Zeul, Carolyn R., and Craig Humphrey. 1971. "The Integration of Black Residents in Suburban Neighborhoods: A Reexamination of the Contact Hypothesis." *Social Problems* 18(4):462-474.

Table 1. Distribution of Racial Apathy Among Whites Participating in the 2003 National Study of Youth and Religion (NSYR)

	Proportion	SE	Missing Values
Racial Apathy			33
Care very much (0=no; 1=yes)	.50	.01	
Care somewhat (0=no; 1=yes)	.28	.01	
Care a little (0=no; 1=yes)	.06	.01	
Do not really care (0=no; 1=yes)	.16	.01	

Notes: Analyses weighted for the probability of selection and non-coverage. Listwise estimation sample size equals 1,927. Available sample size for these analyses equals 2,091.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Social Background, Social Values, and Academic Orientation Correlates, and Interracial Contact Among Whites Participating in the 2003 National Study of Youth and Religion (NSYR)

	Mean or Proportions	SE	Missing Values
Gender (0=boys; 1=girls)	.49	.01	0
Age (range: 13 to 17 years old)	15.09	.04	0
Parental Education (1=less than HS; 5=graduate or professional degree)	3.60	.03	4
Region			0
South (0=no; 1=yes) <sup>a</sup>	.37	.01	
Northeast (0=no; 1=yes)	.16	.01	
Midwest (0=no; 1=yes)	.26	.01	
West (0=no; 1=yes)	.21	.01	
Parent Political Orientation			8
Liberal (0=no; 1=yes) <sup>a</sup>	.17	.01	
Middle of the road (0=no; 1=yes)	.25	.01	
Conservative (0=no; 1=yes)	.40	.01	
Haven't You Thought Much About This?/Don't Know (0=no; 1=yes)	.18	.01	

Daily importance of faith (1=not important; 5=extremely important)	2.39	.03	2
Grades (0=no; 1=all A's or mostly A's)	.24	.01	3
Education Aspirations (1=no farther in school; 7=post-graduate or professional school)	5.81	.03	53
School difficulties (0=never; 1=yes)	.15	.01	0
Interracial Contact			
Different race mentor (0=no; 1=yes)	.24	.01	33
Mixed race services (0=no; 1=yes)	.68	.01	15
Multi-race household (0=no; 1=yes)	.05	.01	5
Interracial friendship (0=no; 1=yes)	.32	.01	15
Interracial dating (0=never; 1=yes)	.23	.01	27

---

*Notes:* Analyses weighted for the probability of selection and non-coverage. Listwise estimation sample size equals 1,927. Available sample size for these analyses equals 2,091.

<sup>a</sup> Represents excluded groups in the regression models.



Table 3. Estimates from Partial Proportional Odds Regressions of Racial Apathy on Social Background, Social Values, and Academic Orientation Correlates Among Whites Participating in the 2003 National Study of Youth and Religion (NSYR)

	Model 1a	Model 1b	Model 1c
	Very much vs. Somewhat, A little, Not really	Very much, Somewhat vs. A little, Not really	Very much, Somewhat A little vs. Not really
Gender (0=boys ; 1=girls)	<b>.67**</b> <b>(.08)</b>	<b>.82</b> <b>(.12)</b>	<b>1.08</b> <b>(.16)</b>
Age (range: 13 to 17 years old)	.83** (.03)	.83** (.03)	.83** (.03)
Parental Education (1=less than HS; 5=graduate or professional degree)	<b>.92</b> <b>(.06)</b>	<b>.77**</b> <b>(.06)</b>	<b>.74**</b> <b>(.06)</b>
Region			
South (0=no; 1=yes) <sup>a</sup>	1.00	1.00	1.00
Northeast (0=no; 1=yes)	.79 (.13)	.79 (.13)	.79 (.13)
Midwest (0=no; 1=yes)	.77* (.13)	.77* (.13)	.77* (.13)

	(.10)	(.10)	(.10)
West (0=no; 1=yes)	1.09	1.09	1.09
	(.16)	(.16)	(.16)
<b>Parent Political Orientation</b>			
Liberal (0=no; 1=yes) <sup>a</sup>	1.00	1.00	1.00
Middle of the road (0=no; 1=yes)	<b>1.45*</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>.83</b>
	(.25)	(.21)	(.18)
Conservative (0=no; 1=yes)	<b>1.38*</b>	<b>1.29</b>	<b>.90</b>
	(.23)	(.24)	(.18)
Haven't You Thought Much About This?/Don't Know (0=no; 1=yes)	<b>1.75**</b>	<b>1.35</b>	<b>.96</b>
	(.34)	(.32)	(.23)
Daily importance of faith (1=not important ; 5=extremely important)	.79**	.79**	.79**
	(.04)	(.04)	(.04)

Grades (0=no; 1=all As or mostly As)	.65**	.65**	.65**
	(.08)	(.08)	(.08)
Educational aspirations (1=no farther in school; 7=post-graduate or professional school)	.80**	.80**	.80**
	(.04)	(.04)	(.04)
School difficulties (0=never ; 1=yes)	<b>.75+</b>	<b>.98</b>	<b>1.29</b>
	<b>(.12)</b>	<b>(.18)</b>	<b>(.25)</b>
Constant	168.84**	82.56**	64.59**
	(110.76)	(56.19)	(43.95)
<i>Pseudo R-squared</i>	.05	.05	.05

*Notes:* Bold estimates violate the proportional odds assumption. Standard errors are reported in parentheses underneath odds ratios. Analyses weighted for the probability of selection and non-coverage. Listwise estimation sample size equals 1,927. Available sample size for these analyses equals 2,091.

<sup>a</sup> Represents excluded groups in the regression models.

+  $p < .10$       \*  $p < .05$       \*\*  $p < .01$  (two-tailed tests)

Table 4. Estimates from Partial Proportional Regressions of Racial Apathy on Social Background, Social Values, and Academic Orientation Correlates, and Interracial Contact Among Whites Participating in the 2003 National Study of Youth and Religion (NSYR)

	Model 2a	Model 2b	Model 2c
	Very much vs. Somewhat, A little, Not really	Very much, Somewhat vs. A little, Not really	Very much, Somewhat, A little vs. Not really
Gender (0=boys; 1=girls)	<b>.68**</b>  (.08)	<b>.81</b>  (.11)	<b>1.01</b>  (.15)
Age (range: 13 to 17 years old)	.84**  (.03)	.84**  (.03)	.84**  (.03)
Parental Education (1=less than HS; 5=graduate or professional degree)	<b>.92</b>  (.06)	<b>.75**</b>  (.06)	<b>.73**</b>  (.06)
Region			
South (0=no; 1=yes) <sup>a</sup>	1.00	1.00	1.00

Northeast (0=no; 1=yes)	.76	.76	.76
	(.13)	(.13)	(.13)
Midwest (0=no; 1=yes)	.75*	.75*	.75*
	(.10)	(.10)	(.10)
West (0=no; 1=yes)	1.16	1.16	1.16
	(.17)	(.17)	(.17)
Parent political orientation			
Liberal (0=no; 1=yes) <sup>a</sup>	1.00	1.00	1.00
Middle of the road (0=no; 1=yes)	<b>1.40+</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>.81</b>
	<b>(.24)</b>	<b>(.20)</b>	<b>(.18)</b>
Conservative (0=no; 1=yes)	<b>1.31</b>	<b>1.25</b>	<b>.85</b>
	<b>(.22)</b>	<b>(.24)</b>	<b>(.19)</b>

Haven't You Thought Much About This?/Don't Know (0=no; 1=yes)	<b>1.69**</b>	<b>1.27</b>	<b>.94</b>
	<b>(.33)</b>	<b>(.30)</b>	<b>(.24)</b>
Daily importance of faith (1=not important; 5=extremely important)	.79**	.79**	.79**
	(.04)	(.04)	(.04)
Grades (0=no; 1=all As or mostly As)	.63**	.63**	.63**
	(.08)	(.08)	(.08)
Educational Aspirations (1=no farther in school; 7=post-graduate or professional school)	.80**	.80**	.80**
	(.04)	(.04)	(.04)
School difficulties (0=never; 1=yes)	.92	.92	.92
	(.15)	(.15)	(.15)
Interracial Contact			
Different race mentor (0=no; 1=yes)	<b>.81</b>	<b>.66*</b>	<b>.50**</b>

	(.11)	(.12)	(.10)
Mixed race services (0=no; 1=yes)	.91	.91	.91
	(.11)	(.11)	(.11)
Multi-race household (0=no; 1=yes)	.66	.66	.66
	(.18)	(.18)	(.18)
Interracial friendship (0=no; 1=yes)	<b>.80+</b>	<b>.86</b>	<b>1.30</b>
	(.10)	(.13)	(.22)
Interracial dating (0=never; 1=yes)	<b>.69**</b>	<b>.99</b>	<b>1.13</b>
	(.10)	(.16)	(.21)
Constant	175.25**	90.82**	64.62**
	(117.06)	(62.40)	(44.62)
<i>Pseudo R-squared</i>	.06	.06	.06

---

*Notes:* Bold estimates violate the proportional odds assumption. Standard errors are reported in parentheses underneath odds ratios. Analyses weighted for the probability of selection and non-coverage. Listwise estimation sample size equals 1,927. Available sample size for these analyses equals 2,091.

<sup>a</sup> Represents excluded groups in the regression models.

+  $p < .10$       \*  $p < .05$       \*\*  $p < .01$  (two-tailed tests)

Table 5. Estimates from Partial Proportional Regressions of Racial Apathy on Social Background, Social Values, and Academic Orientation Correlates, and Any Interracial Contact and a Count of Interracial Count Experiences Among Whites Participating in the 2003 National Study of Youth and Religion (NSYR)

Panel A	Model 3a	Model 3b	Model 3c
	Very much vs. Somewhat, A little, Not really	Very much, Somewhat vs. A little, Not really	Very much, Somewhat, A little vs. Not really
Any Interracial Contact (0=none; 1=yes)	.63** (.08)	.63** (.08)	.63** (.08)
Constant	199.22** (131.60)	100.50** (69.00)	79.11** (54.29)
<i>Pseudo R-squared</i>	.05	.05	.05



Panel B	Model 3d	Model 3e	Model 3f
	Very much vs. Somewhat, A little, Not really	Very much, Somewhat vs. A little, Not really	Very much, Somewhat, A little vs. Not really
Interracial Contact Count (range: 0 -5 interracial contacts)	.82**  (.04)	.82**  (.04)	.82**  (.04)
Constant	175.08**  (114.76)	86.66**  (58.82)	67.90**  (46.12)
<i>Pseudo R-squared</i>	.06	.06	.06

*Notes:* Models adjusted for correlates shown in Table 3. Bold estimates violate the proportional odds assumption. Standard errors are reported in parentheses underneath odds ratios. Analyses weighted for the probability of selection and non-coverage. Listwise estimation sample size equals 1,927. Available sample size for these analyses equals 2,091.

<sup>a</sup> Represents excluded groups in the regression models.

+  $p < .10$       \*  $p < .05$       \*\*  $p < .01$  (two-tailed tests)

Appendix. Tetrachoric Correlation Matrix for Interracial Contact Among Whites Participating in Wave 1 (2003) of the National Study of Youth and Religion (NSYR)

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Different race mentor	1.00				
2. Mixed-race services	.14**	1.00			
3. Multi-race household	.10	-.01	1.00		
4. Interracial friendship	.34**	.06	.24**	1.00	
5. Interracial dating	.36**	.08+	.21**	.48**	1.00

Notes: Listwise estimation sample size equals 1,927. Available sample size for these analyses equals 2,091.

+  $p < .10$       \*  $p < .05$       \*\*  $p < .01$  (two-tailed tests)