Liking Is Not the Opposite of Disliking: The Functional Separability of Positive and Negative Attitudes Toward Minority Groups

Todd L. Pittinsky
Stony Brook University

Seth A. Rosenthal and R. Matthew Montoya
Harvard University

Two studies tested the hypotheses that positive and negative attitudes toward minority groups are not interchangeable in predicting positive versus negative behaviors toward those groups. In Study 1, positive attitudes about Latinos were a better predictor of a positive behavior toward Latinos than were negative attitudes or stereotyped positive attitudes. In Study 2, positive attitudes about African Americans were a better predictor of positive behavioral intentions toward that group than were negative attitudes, whereas negative attitudes were better predictors of negative behavioral intentions than were positive attitudes. Taken together, the studies support the perspective that positive and negative attitudes toward minority groups are theoretically and functionally distinct constructs. We conclude that it is important to measure both positive and negative attitudes to understand and predict behaviors toward minority groups.

Keywords: positive attitudes, liking, allophilia, prejudice reduction, racism

Is liking a minority group the opposite of disliking a minority group? Are positive and negative attitudes toward a minority group interchangeable as predictors of behaviors toward that group? Practically speaking, would a high school curriculum that focuses only on prejudice reduction, but not on fostering positive interethnic attitudes, be as effective in spurring friendly integration in the lunchroom as it would at preventing interracial violence (see Pittinsky, 2009)? The pervasive bias in the literature toward studying only negative attitudes makes such questions difficult to answer (Dienstbier, 1970; Phillips & Ziller, 1997; Wright & Taylor, 2003).

However, there is persuasive evidence that it is important to take both positive and negative attitudes into account to fully understand how attitudes predict behaviors toward minority group members (Herr & Page, 2004; Pittinsky, 2010; Pittinsky, Rosenthal, & Montoya, 2011). For instance, research on functional separability (Cacioppo & Berntson, 1994) has indicated that positive and negative attitudes differentially predict positive and negative behaviors according to their valence. Specifically, Cacioppo and colleagues (Cacioppo & Berntson, 1994, 2001; Cacioppo, Gardner, & Berntson, 1997, 1999) concluded that positive attitudes act as predispositions to approach responses, whereas negative attitudes act as predispositions to withdrawal responses. These functionally separate positive and negative attitude processes occur automatically (Chen & Bargh, 1999), and are evident in the different neurological systems involved in the assessment of whether a stimulus is friendly or hostile (LeDoux, 1995) and in the different

memory systems involved in making judgments about liking and disliking (Herr & Page, 2004).

Fredrickson's (1998, 2001) broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions provides a compelling theoretical framework for the functional separability of positive and negative attitudes. Fredrickson indicated that from an evolutionary standpoint, positive emotions were more likely to lead to positive behaviors, whereas negative emotions were more likely to lead to negative behaviors. This positive–negative asymmetry is adaptive. Negative emotions evolved to alert humans to respond to negative stimuli with safety-related social behaviors (e.g., fight, flight, freeze responses). Alternatively, positive emotions evolved to help humans build social resources by developing bonds and alliances through approach-related social behaviors. Positive emotional states have long-lasting effects (Fredrickson & Branigan, 2005). They broaden individuals' "thought–action repertoires" (Fredrickson, 2001, p. 220), increasing the availability and probability of positively oriented behaviors toward others.

Research has suggested that the asymmetrical relationship between positive and negative emotions may function at the group level as well as at the individual level. For instance, positive affective ratings (e.g., inspired, proud) toward a wide range of social and ethnic groups predicts "favorability" ratings, but not "unfavorability" ratings toward those groups (Stangor, Sullivan, & Ford, 1991), and positive emotions (e.g., enthusiastic, happy) toward minority groups are correlated with social contact with members of those groups (Dijker, 1987). Further, laboratory evidence indicates that positive emotions reduce own-race bias in facial recognition (K. J. Johnson & Fredrickson, 2005). And in an applied setting, positive emotions predicted approach behaviors among sectarian factions in Northern Ireland, whereas negative emotions predicted aggressive and avoidant behaviors (Tam et al., 2011).

Some initial research suggested that the broaden-and-build theory not only applies to emotions, but may extend to positive and negative attitudes as well. Specifically, although attitudes such as

Todd L. Pittinsky, Department of Technology and Society, Stony Brook University; Seth A. Rosenthal and R. Matthew Montoya, Center for Public Leadership, Harvard Kennedy School, Harvard University; R. Matthew Montoya, University of Dayton.

R. Matthew Montoya is now at the University of Dayton.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Todd L. Pittinsky, Stony Brook University, 347 Harriman Hall, Stony Brook, NY 11794. E-mail: Todd.Pittinsky@stonybrook.edu

"like" and "dislike" may be correlated, they appear to be functionally separable such that positive attitudes are more strongly linked to approach-related positive behaviors whereas negative attitudes are more strongly linked to avoidance-related negative behaviors (Cacioppo & Berntson, 1994; Chen & Bargh, 1999; Jordan, 1965). At the group level, factor analyses indicate that positive and negative attitudes toward members of minority groups comprise separate factors (Patchen, Hofmann, & Davidson, 1976; Triandis, 1964; Woodmansee & Cook, 1967). However, there is little research that investigated whether this separability of group-level positive and negative attitudes was meaningful in predicting group-level behaviors. In the current research, we investigate whether theories and research regarding the functional separability of emotions also may (a) pertain to attitudes and (b) do so at the group level. To be specific, we investigate whether positive attitudes toward members of minority groups are more closely linked to positive behaviors (e.g., charity allocations, personal intervention on behalf of group members) than to negative behaviors (e.g., support for policies to limit government benefits to the group), and vice versa.

There are important implications to the possibility that attitudes toward minority groups are functionally separable—that is, that positive and negative attitudes are differentially linked to positive and negative behaviors based on their valence. This is especially true of positive attitudes, which have been largely underinvestigated relative to negative attitudes (Dienstbier, 1970; Phillips & Ziller, 1997; Wright & Taylor, 2003). If positive attitudes toward minority group members are a better predictor of positive behavior than are negative attitudes, measures of positive interethnic attitudes should be embraced and more widely adopted by researchers interested in diversity and minority psychology.

Study 1

In Study 1, participants completed measures of positive and negative attitudes toward a minority group (i.e., Latinos) and were then given the opportunity to act positively toward that group by allocating donations to a Latino charity. We hypothesized that positive attitudes toward the group would predict the positive behavior toward that group better than would negative attitudes.

The current research differs from some past studies that were also framed as investigations of positive attitudes. We refer to the types of positive attitudes studied previously as stereotyped positive attitudes because they are associated with stereotypes, and ambivalent or negative psychological correlates such as paternalism, sympathy, or even antipathy, which limit the extent of their positivity. For instance, stereotyped positive attitudes about Asians (i.e., that they are a model minority—intelligent, hardworking, and self-disciplined) are linked to an ambivalent combination of admiration, hostility, and envy toward them (Ho & Jackson, 2001). In another example, Katz and Hass (1988) identified and measured stereotyped positive attitudes (i.e., pro-Black attitudes) that resulted from feelings of sympathy and helpfulness toward African Americans based on their underdog status. Katz and Hass found that such sympathetic attitudes are separable from negative attitudes (see also Schuman & Harding, 1963; Woodmansee & Cook, 1967). However, sympathetic recognition of prejudice toward African Americans is not the same as unconditional positive feelings or beliefs about the group (Czopp & Monteith, 2006). This differ-

ence may help explain why, for instance, increased scores on the Pro-Black Scale (Katz & Hass, 1988) are not necessarily linked to increased support for pro-Black policies (e.g., increasing the number of college scholarships for African Americans; Eisenstadt, Leippe, Stambush, Rauch, & Rivers, 2005).

Because stereotyped positive attitudes may differ from nonstereotyped positive attitudes (which we refer to simply as *positive attitudes* when contrasting the two types of attitudes), we included a measure of stereotyped positive attitudes and hypothesized that positive attitudes would predict charity allocations toward a minority group better than would stereotyped positive attitudes.

Method

Participants and procedure. A sample of 275 U.S. citizens (224 women, 50 men, and one unknown) were recruited through a study pool associated with a large professional school in the northeastern United States. The mean age of the participants was 37.33 years ($SD = 10.64$). Because the goal of the study was to measure attitudes toward Latinos as members of a minority group, Latinos and other South and Central Americans, as well as other first-language Spanish-speakers were excluded from the sample.

The surveys were completed online. Participants first gave their informed consent in accordance with Institutional Review Board requirements. They then completed the attitude measures and answered a series of demographic questions. Approximately six weeks later, participants received a form in the mail (accompanied by payment for their participation) asking them to allocate funds to one or more charities for a donation to be made by the experimenters (the dependent variable). Participants were asked to complete the form and return it to the primary investigator in a self-addressed stamped envelope. Six weeks after that, data collection ended, and all participants were sent debriefing materials.

Materials.

Positive attitudes. Positive attitudes were measured using a 12-item version of the Allophilia Scale (Pittinsky et al., 2011). The Allophilia Scale assessed positive attitudes by measuring the degree to which individuals like a specific out-group. The scale included items such as "I like Latinos," and "I am motivated to get to know Latinos better," and was rated on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) scale.

Negative attitudes. Negative attitudes were assessed using an Anti-Allophilia Scale adapted from a measure of xenophobia (see Radkiewicz, 2006; Soldatova, 2007). The Anti-Allophilia Scale was comprised of four items that were essentially the converse of items that comprise the Allophilia Scale, such as "I do not like Latinos at all" and "I keep Latinos out of my every day life if I can," and was rated on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*) scale.

Stereotyped negative attitudes. Negative stereotypical attitudes that are typical of cognition-based prejudice and racism scales were measured using an adapted Latino version of the Anti-Black Scale (Katz & Hass, 1988). The Anti-Latino Scale was comprised of 10 items such as "Latino children would do better in school if their parents had better attitudes about learning," was rated on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*) scale. The Anti-Black Scale has been adapted in previous research to measure negative attitudes toward another minority group (i.e., immigrants; Van Hiel & Mervielde, 2005).

Stereotyped positive attitudes. Positive attitudes that result from perceptions that Latinos are disadvantaged and deserving of help were measured using an adapted version of the Pro-Black Scale (Katz & Hass, 1988). The scale was comprised of 10 items, such as "It's surprising that Latinos do as well as they do, considering all of the obstacles they face," was rated on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*) scale. An adapted version of the Pro-Black Scale has been used in previous research to measure pro-immigrant attitudes (Van Hiel & Mervielde, 2005).

Dependent variable.

Charitable allocations. Participants received one of six counterbalanced versions of a charitable donations form. The form listed three charities to which participants could direct the experimenters to make a donation: one to benefit the target out-group (i.e., the Hispanic Scholarship Fund), and two others (i.e., Habitat for Humanity, the Nature Conservancy). Participants were asked to divide the donations among the three charities so that they totaled 100%, and then to mail the form back to the experimenters in a self-addressed stamped envelope. The experimenters subsequently made donations in accordance with participants' allocations.

Results

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics and correlations for the measures. As expected, the Allophilia Scale was negatively correlated with the Anti-Allophilia and Anti-Latino Scales and positively with the Pro-Latino Scale.

Predicting positive behavior. One hundred participants (36.4% of the initial sample) returned the charity form. Among those 100 participants, the mean allocation to the Latino charity was 13.61% ($SD = 21.12$) of their overall contribution to the three charities. Thirty-nine of the 100 participants allocated money to the Latino charity, whereas the other 61 allocated all of their money between the other two charities. Among the 39 who allocated to the Latino charity, the mean allocation was 34.91% ($SD = 19.98$). Data from participants who did not return the charity form were excluded from further analyses.

We conducted a relative weights analysis (RWA; see J. W. Johnson, 2000; Tonidandel, LeBreton, & Johnson, 2009) to determine the relative importance of each of the attitude variables in predicting the percentage of the charitable contribution allocated to the Latino charity. RWA enables estimation of the relative importance of predictor variables that are correlated with each other. Unlike multiple linear regression coefficients, relative weights accurately partition variance that is shared among multiple predictor variables. By properly accounting for the correlations among

predictor variables, RWA, in essence, treats each of the predictor variables as if it were orthogonal to each of the other predictor variables. Because of this, the relative weights sum to the R^2 for the full regression equation. In other words, the weight associated with each predictor variable is effectively the independent R^2 of that variable on the dependent variable. Thus, the weights can be used to accurately calculate the percentage of the total R^2 accounted for by each predictor relative to the other predictors by dividing each weight by the sum of all of the weights.

After the relative weights are calculated, a bootstrapping method (Tonidandel et al., 2009) can be used to generate a 95% confidence interval (CI) around each weight that can determine (a) whether each predictor accounts for a significant amount of variance in the dependent variable, and (b) whether the amount of variance accounted for by each predictor is significantly different from the variance accounted for by each of the other predictors. For the analyses, a variable with a 95% CI that contains a value of zero or below would indicate a predictor that does not account for a significant amount of variance in the dependent variable at the $p < .05$ level. Further, if one predictor's 95% CI has a lower bound that is higher than the weight associated with a second predictor, the first would be considered to be a significantly stronger predictor of the dependent variable than would the second at the $p < .05$ level.

Table 2 presents the correlations between the predictor variables and the charity allocation variable as well as the RWA results. Allophilia was positively correlated with the amount allocated to the Latino charity. None of the other three variables was correlated with the amount allocated. When the four predictors are considered together in a RWA, allophilia is the only variable that predicts the amount allocated to the Latino charity. This is evidenced by the fact that allophilia is the only variable with a 95% CI that does not contain a value of zero. The 95% CIs for the other three predictors, anti-allophilia, stereotyped anti-Latino attitudes, and stereotyped pro-Latino attitudes indicated that they were not significant predictors of the amount allocated to the Latino charity. Important for our purposes, and as noted in Table 2, allophilia is also a significantly stronger predictor of allocations to the Latino charity than are the other three predictor variables.

Discussion

The results of Study 1 supported the hypothesis that positive attitudes toward a minority group are functionally separable from negative attitudes as predictors of positive behaviors toward that group. To be specific, positive attitudes are a better predictor of a positive behavior (allocations to a charity) than are negative atti-

Table 1

Correlations and Descriptive Statistics, Study 1

Measure	Allophilia	Anti-allophilia	(Stereotyped) anti-Latino attitudes	(Stereotyped) pro-Latino attitudes	M	SD
Allophilia	.93				4.63	1.10
Anti-allophilia	−.63**	.88			1.56	0.60
(Stereotyped) anti-Latino attitudes	−.42**	.49**	.85		3.31	0.76
(Stereotyped) pro-Latino attitudes	.36**	−.19*	−.18*	.87	3.40	0.81

Note. $N = 275$. Alpha coefficients reported on the diagonal.
* $p < .01$. ** $p < .001$.

Table 2
Relative Weights Analysis Predicting Amount Allocated to a Latino Charity, Study 1

Predictor	r	Relative weight	95% CI	Explained R^2
Allophilia	.32**	0.085*	0.020, 0.187	82.5%
Anti-allophilia	−.12	0.007	−0.063, 0.037	6.8%
(Stereotyped) anti-Latino attitudes	−.12	0.003	−0.024, 0.046	2.9%
(Stereotyped) pro-Latino attitudes	.15	0.008	−0.024, 0.084	7.8%

Note. $N = 100$. $R^2 = .103$.
* $p < .05$.   ** $p < .01$.

tudes. This is the case even when the positive and negative attitude measures (i.e., allophilia and anti-allophilia) contain items that are nearly the direct converse of each other. We also found that positive attitudes toward a minority group are better predictors of positive behaviors than are stereotyped positive attitudes. Overall, these findings are consistent with the theory that positive attitudes toward minority groups are particularly important for understanding and predicting positive behaviors toward those groups.

One potential concern about the results of Study 1 is that a large number of participants did not return the charity form. This would be especially problematic if there were systematic differences between those who returned the form and those who did not. However, this does not appear to be the case. Scores of participants who did and did not return the form did not differ on any of the four predictor variables.[1] Further, the response rate (36.4%) compared favorably to similar real-world studies in which participants were asked to return a form in the context of helping behaviors. For instance, 23.2% of participants in McClintock and Allison's (1989) study of helping behaviors returned a similar form in a similar context. For these reasons, we believe that the attitudes of the participants who returned the form were representative of the attitudes of the larger sample who began the study, and thus we were able to exclude them from further analysis. However, because there is some uncertainty about the intentions of those who did not return the charity allocation form, we suggest some caution in interpreting the results. In Study 2, we addressed this potential shortcoming of Study 1 by using a design in which nearly all participants completed all measures. We also directly addressed the hypothesis that positive and negative attitudes toward a minority group are functionally separable in predicting behaviors toward that group by including both positive and negative behaviors in the design.

Study 2

In Study 1, we found that positive and negative attitudes toward a minority group were functionally separable. Positive attitudes were better predictors of a positive behavior than were negative attitudes, stereotyped negative attitudes, and stereotyped positive attitudes. In Study 2, we tested whether positive and negative attitudes are separable when predicting both positive and negative behaviors. Theory suggests that positive attitudes operate on approach tendencies and negative attitudes operate on withdrawal tendencies (Cacioppo & Berntson, 1994; Fredrickson, 1998, 2001). As such, positive attitudes toward a minority group should be more important for predicting positive behavior toward that group than negative behavior, whereas negative attitudes

should be more important for predicting negative behavior than positive behavior. To test this, we considered three dependent variables as they related to African Americans: two positive behavioral intentions (personal support and support for policies to extend government benefits) and one negative behavioral intention (support for policies to limit government benefits). We examined the ability of positive attitudes toward African Americans to predict these behavioral intentions relative to diverse measures of negative attitudes, including old-fashioned and modern racism (McConahay, 1986), symbolic racism (Henry & Sears, 2002), and color-blind racial attitudes (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000).

Hypotheses

Personal support (i.e., actively intervening on behalf of members of the minority group) is interpersonally dynamic and socially proactive. Because of the approach-related nature of this positive behavior (see Fredrickson, 1998, 2001), we predicted that positive attitudes would predict personal support toward African Americans better than would negative attitudes.

The determinants of support for policies to extend government benefits to minority groups (e.g., affirmative action programs), however, may be complex (Harrison, Kravitz, Mayer, Leslie, & Lev-Arey, 2006). Positive attitudes are likely to predict support for such policies. However, even people predisposed to support a minority group may have conflicting beliefs about the wisdom of

---

[1] *T*-tests indicated that scores on the four attitude measures of participants who returned the form versus those who did not return the form did not differ, Allophilia Scale, $t(272) = -0.38$, $p = .72$; Anti-Allophilia Scale, $t(266) = -1.36$, $p = .17$; Anti-Latino Scale, $t(269) = -0.98$, $p = .33$; Pro-Latino Scale, $t(269) = 0.68$, $p = .50$. Further, in a separate RWA, data from all 275 participants was analyzed. Participants who did not return the charity form were coded as though they had chosen specifically not to allocate any money to the Latino charity. In this case, none of the four predictor variables (including allophilia) predicted allocations to the Latino charity—the total R^2 for the four predictors combined was only .023. This suggests that none of the four predictor variables represents an appropriate construct for understanding the act of giving (or not giving) to charitable causes in general (in contrast to giving to a charity linked to a specific group as was investigated here). However, even in this case, allophilia contributed a much higher percentage of the overall R^2 (65.2%) than did anti-allophilia (8.7%), anti-Latino attitudes (8.7%), or stereotypes pro-Latino attitudes (17.4%). Further research would help clarify whether allophilia (or any attitude toward a specific group) is an appropriate means for understanding the attitudes that are associated with charitable giving in general.

involving the government in promoting such support (Crosby, Iyer, & Sincharoen, 2006). For instance, they may believe that such government policies are potentially harmful and stigmatizing to the minority group, or may derail the group's progress by not providing enough support (Crosby et al., 2006; Harrison et al., 2006). Others may hold the color-blind belief that programs such as affirmative action violate the meritocratic idea that all individuals should be treated and judged equally regardless of ethnicity or race (Bobocel, Son Hing, Davey, Stanley, & Zanna, 1998; Sniderman & Piazza, 1993). Because of the diversity of attitudes involved in supporting extension of government benefits, we expected both positive and negative attitudes (particularly color-blind racial attitudes) to independently predict extending government benefits to African Americans.

Although there is likely a diverse set of predictors of support for extending benefits to African Americans, research has indicated that support for limiting beneficial government policies was most robustly predicted by modern forms of racism (Crosby et al., 2006; Harrison et al., 2006). Modern racist beliefs emanated from the beliefs that minorities are not the victims of discrimination, are overly demanding, and receive undeserved special treatment. This contrasts with "old-fashioned" racist beliefs about racial inferiority, which are generally no longer acceptable to hold or express publicly (McConahay, 1986). Support for limiting beneficial policies is connected to modern forms of racism because "by disliking policies rather than people, an individual can safely express negative attitudes toward Blacks without directly appearing racist" (Czopp & Monteith, 2006, p. 236). In light of the theory that negative attitudes predict negative behaviors (Cacioppo & Berntson, 1994; Cacioppo et al., 1997), we hypothesized that modern forms of racism, but not positive attitudes, would predict support for limiting government policies.

Method

A sample of 586 U.S. citizens (284 women, 274 men, and 28 unknown) were recruited through a commercial online survey sampling service. Ages were reported by age range (median age group = 36–40 years). Because the goal of the study was to measure attitudes toward African Americans as members of a minority group, African American and other Black participants were excluded from the sample.

Materials and procedure. The surveys were completed online. Participants first gave their informed consent in accordance with Institutional Review Board requirements. They then completed the Allophilia Scale, the Old-Fashioned and Modern Racism Scales (McConahay, 1986), the Symbolic Racism Scale (Henry & Sears, 2002), and the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (Neville et al., 2000) in random order. Participants then completed randomized items comprising the dependent variables, which included personal support of African Americans, support for policies extending benefits to African Americans, and support for policies limiting benefits for African Americans. Finally, participants completed a series of demographic questions and were debriefed.

Positive attitudes. Participants completed the 17-item Allophilia Scale (Pittinsky et al., 2011) with respect to their positive attitudes toward African Americans on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*) scale.

Negative attitudes. Negative attitudes toward African Americans were assessed using measures grounded in multiple-theoretical orientations. The 7-item Old-Fashioned Racism Scale (McConahay, 1986) was used to measure explicit prejudices based on "traditional" racist values such as support for segregation, belief in biological inferiority, and a desire for social distance. It includes items such as "it is a bad idea for African Americans and Whites to marry one another" rated on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) scale. The 7-item Modern Racism Scale (McConahay, 1986) was used to assess beliefs that African Americans are not the victims of discrimination, are overly demanding, and receive undeserved special treatment. It includes items such as "over the past few years, the government and news media have shown more respect to African Americans than they deserve" rated on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) scale. The 8-item Symbolic Racism Scale (Henry & Sears, 2002) was used to measure the interaction of affective components of modern types of racism (e.g., feelings of discomfort, uneasiness, disgust) with beliefs that African Americans violate traditional norms by failing to be self-sufficient. It includes items such as "Irish, Italian, Jewish, and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. African Americans should do the same" on a 1 to 4 scale with varied anchors based on question content. Finally, we used the 20-item Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (Neville et al., 2000) to measure the extent to which individuals believe that minority groups' claims of discrimination based on race or ethnicity are not valid. It includes items such as "everyone who works hard, no matter what race they are, has an equal chance to become rich" rated on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) scale.

Dependent variables.

Personal support. Participants were asked how much they agreed with eight statements of self-reported personal intervention on behalf of African Americans rated on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*) scale. Sample items include "I would speak in defense of African Americans if I heard someone demeaning them," "I have encouraged other people to be more positive about African Americans," and "I get mad when news organizations overemphasize the negative aspects of African Americans in their reporting."

Policies to extend benefits. Participants were asked how much they agreed with six statements in support for policies to extend benefits to African Americans such as "I support preferential hiring for African Americans" rated on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*) scale.

Policies to limit benefits. Participants were asked how much they agreed with two statements in support for policies to limit benefits to African Americans such as "I would support a ballot measure to eliminate affirmative action for African Americans" rated on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*) scale. Higher scores reflected stronger anti-benefit attitudes.

Results

Independent and dependent variables. Table 3 presents descriptive statistics and correlations for the attitude and behavioral intention measures. Variables generally correlated with each other in the expected direction. The positive and negative attitude measures generally correlated with both the positive and negative behavioral intention measures. However, positive attitudes were gen-

Table 3
Correlations and Descriptive Statistics, Study 2

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	M	SD
Allophilia	.96								3.79	1.01
Old-fashioned racism	−.54	.77							2.44	1.06
Modern racism	−.56	.66	.85						3.22	1.22
Symbolic facism	−.52	.42	.73	.85					2.51	0.56
Color-blind racial attitudes	−.40	.32	.65	.81	.87				3.63	0.76
Personal support	.80	−.58	−.55	−.49	−.35	.91			4.29	1.01
Support for policies to extend benefits	.60	−.28	−.50	−.66	−.66	.51	.90		3.05	1.14
Support for policies to limit benefits	−.17	.07	.30	.36	.42	−.06	−.34	.72	3.83	1.30

Note. N = 586. Alpha coefficients reported on the diagonal. All correlations with a magnitude greater than .08 are significant, $p < .05$.

erally correlated more strongly with personal support than were the negative attitude measures, whereas the negative attitude measures were generally correlated more strongly with support for policies to limit benefits than were positive attitudes (see Meng, Rosenthal, & Rubin, 1992, for the method used to compare correlated correlation coefficients throughout this article).

To be specific, positive attitudes were correlated more strongly with personal support than were old-fashioned racism ($z = 8.89$, $p < .001$), modern racism ($z = 10.02$, $p < .001$), symbolic racism ($z = 11.52$, $p < .001$), and color-blind racial attitudes ($z = 14.08$, $p < .001$). Results for support for policies to extend benefits were mixed. Positive attitudes were correlated more strongly with support for extending benefits than were old-fashioned racism ($z = 6.33$, $p < .001$) and modern racism ($z = 3.25$, $p < .01$), whereas symbolic racism was more strongly related to support for extending benefits than were positive attitudes ($z = 2.08$, $p < .05$). Color-blind racial attitudes were marginally more strongly related to support for extending benefits than were positive attitudes ($z = 1.90$, $p = .06$). Finally, the measure of positive attitudes was less strongly related to support for limiting government benefits than were modern racism ($z = 3.47$, $p < .001$), symbolic racism ($z = 4.90$, $p < .001$), and color-blind racial attitudes ($z = 5.86$, $p < .001$), but was more strongly related to support for limiting government benefits than was old-fashioned racism ($z = 2.54$, $p < .05$).

Predicting behavioral intentions. To determine whether positive attitudes toward a minority group predicted positive behavioral intentions toward that group better than did negative attitudes, and vice versa, we conducted separate RWAs that compared the relative ability of the Allophilia Scale and the four prejudice measures to predict the three behavioral intentions (see Table 4).

Personal support. We compared the relative effectiveness of positive attitudes and the four racism measures to predict personal support. As illustrated in the top section of Table 4, the relative weights and their associated 95% CIs indicate that each of the five variables contributed significant variance to predicting personal support; none of the CIs contained a value of zero or below. However, positive attitudes contributed significantly greater variance to this prediction than did any of the negative attitude measures.

Policies to extend benefits. We compared the effectiveness of positive and negative attitudes to predict support for policies to extend benefits for African Americans. The middle section of Table 4 illustrates that each of the five attitude measures contributed significant variance to predicting support for policies to

extend benefits. However, when the relative contribution of the five attitude variables is compared, allophilia and color-blind racial attitudes contribute significantly more variance to predicting support for policies to extend benefits than do old-fashioned racism or modern racism. Allophilia and symbolic racism did not differ in their prediction of support for policies to extend benefits.

Policies to limit benefits. We compared the effectiveness of the negative attitude measures, relative to positive attitudes, to predict support for policies to limit benefits for African Americans. The bottom section of Table 4 illustrates that each of the predictor variables except for old-fashioned racism predicts a significant amount of variance in support for policies to limit benefits. However, consistent with our hypothesis, color-blind racial attitudes were the strongest predictor of support for limiting benefits. Further, both modern racism and symbolic racism also predicted support for limiting benefits better than did allophilia.

Discussion

Results indicated that positive and negative attitudes were functionally separable in predicting behavioral intentions toward a minority group—positive attitudes were most strongly predictive of positive behavioral intentions, whereas negative attitudes were most strongly predictive of negative behavioral intentions. To be specific, positive attitudes predicted personal support behaviors better than did negative attitudes. Conversely, negative attitudes generally predicted support for policies limiting government benefits, better than did positive attitudes. Consistent with theories of attitudes toward extending government benefits, positive attitudes, color-blind racial attitudes, and symbolic racism predicted support for extending benefits. It is noteworthy that measures of both valences contributed significant predictive variance to this dependent variable, suggesting that positive and negative attitudes function independently and thus can provide incremental improvement in our understanding of complex behaviors.

Taken together, these findings are consistent with the hypothesis that positive attitudes toward minority groups are more closely related to positive than negative behaviors toward those groups, whereas negative attitudes are more closely related to negative than positive behaviors (see Fredrickson, 1998, 2001). These data also support the more general theory that positive and negative attitudes have nonequivalent, valence-congruent effects on behavior (Cacioppo & Berntson, 1994; Jordan, 1965).

Table 4
Relative Weights Analysis Predicting Positive and Negative Behavioral Intentions Towards African Americans, Study 2

Predictor	Relative weight	95% CI	Explained R^2
DV: Personal support			
Allophilia	0.393*	0.331, 0.446[a]	57.7%
Old-fashioned racism	0.125*	0.093, 0.164	18.4%
Modern racism	0.075*	0.055, 0.097	11.0%
Symbolic racism	0.062*	0.042, 0.084	9.1%
Color-blind racial attitudes	0.026*	0.017, 0.040	3.8%
$R^2 = .681$			
DV: Policies to extend benefits			
Allophilia	0.175*	0.131, 0.224[a]	29.8%
Old-fashioned racism	0.017*	0.008, 0.028	2.9%
Modern racism	0.057*	0.040, 0.077	9.7%
Symbolic racism	0.154*	0.126, 0.186[b]	26.2%
Color-blind racial attitudes	0.185*	0.155, 0.219[a]	31.4%
$R^2 = .588$			
DV: Policies to limit benefits			
Allophilia	0.008*	0.000, 0.025	3.9%
Old-fashioned racism	0.007	−0.000, 0.021	3.4%
Modern racism	0.035*	0.018, 0.058	17.3%
Symbolic racism	0.056*	0.034, 0.086	27.6%
Color-blind racial attitudes	0.097*	0.059, 0.141[a]	47.8%
$R^2 = .203$			

Note. $N = 586$. Percentages rounded to total 100.0%. DV = dependent variable.
[a] Variable(s) contribute most relative variance to the prediction of the DV.   [b] Symbolic racism contributes less relative variance to the prediction of the DV than does color-blind racial attitudes, but symbolic racism does not differ from allophilia in predicting the DV.
* $p < .05$.

General Discussion

We explored positive and negative attitudes toward minority groups. Despite the emphasis in previous research on understanding the negative aspects of attitudes and behaviors toward minority groups, we found that it is important to include measures of positive attitudes to understand positive behaviors toward minority groups. Results indicated that positive attitudes predicted positive, approach-related behaviors independently of, and generally significantly better than, a theoretically diverse set of negative attitudes, including nonstereotyped negative attitudes that were the direct semantic converse of those positive attitudes (see Study 1). Measuring positive attitudes was an important step in predicting positive behaviors toward minority groups, whereas measuring negative attitudes was more important for predicting negative behaviors. This indicates that a multidimensional model of attitudes toward minority groups adds important incremental information that cannot be fully accounted for by a unidimensional model (see Cacioppo & Berntson, 1994). In this light, the research practice of relying on measures of negative attitudes toward minority group members—or at best of studying stereotyped positive attitudes—inhibits the ability of researchers to predict and understand positive behaviors toward members of ethnic minority groups. A multidimensional approach that includes measures of positive attitudes, alongside the negative measures, should increase the ability of researchers to accurately predict and explain behavior.

One benefit of applying such a multidimensional attitude model is that it subsumes, rather than eliminates, the possibility of a unidimensional model (Cacioppo & Berntson, 1994). In other words, a multidimensional model can account accurately for attitudes that are multidimensional (such as attitudes toward minority groups), but also for attitudes that turn out to lie along a single dimension. Another benefit is that a multidimensional model can differentiate ambivalent (i.e., strong but conflicted) from indifferent (i.e., weak) attitudes. These types of attitudes would both simply appear near the midpoint of a unidimensional, bipolar scale, making them impossible to distinguish (Green & Goldfried, 1965; Kaplan, 1972). For the small "cost" of increasing the number of attitude measures in a study, one can reap the benefit of more precise results that can lead to the development of more accurate theories on which to base more useful and valid predictions (see Cacioppo et al., 1997).

Limitations

The positive attitudes measure used in the current research (i.e., the Allophilia Scale) consists largely of affect-based assessments (e.g., "I like members of the group"), whereas the typical prejudice and racism scales that were used, particularly in Study 2, consist largely of cognition-based assessments (e.g., "members of the group do not meet certain standards of behavior"). This may lead to a potential confound in the results: Is the independent prediction of positive and negative behaviors the result of the valence-congruent multidimensionality of attitudes toward minority groups, or is it simply the unintended consequence of comparing the effects of affective versus cognitive attitude measures? We believe there is strong evidence for the valence-congruence hy-

pothesis. In particular, in Study 1, we directly compared the effects of positive and negative affective assessments in predicting a positive behavior. We found that positive affective assessments (i.e., allophilia) explained a significant amount of variance in allocations to a Latino charity. In contrast, negative affective assessments that were the near exact semantic converse of the positive assessments (i.e., anti-allophilia) did not significantly predict the positive behavior. However, given the concern about the effects caused by the differences between the measures used in this research, the results should be treated with some caution. Further research directly comparing the effects of positive and negative affective assessments on both positive and negative behaviors would help clarify the issue.

In this research, we studied attitudes toward two particular minority groups, one ethnic (i.e., Latinos) and one racial (i.e., African Americans). Future research will be needed to determine whether the results are generalizable to other ethnicities and races, and to other types of minority groups (e.g., religious, sexual orientation, ability, etc.). Further, our studies focused on attitudes toward these minority groups within the context of the United States (all research participants were U.S. citizens). Although we have no theoretical reason to expect that the pattern of findings would not hold in settings outside the United States, the social and institutional contexts in which ethnic and racial attitudes in the United States emerge, take root, and ultimately wither or thrive may bracket the generalizability of our results.

Assessment of Positive Attitudes

The study of positive attitudes that are measured independently of negative attitudes has practical benefits. Measures of positive attitudes toward a minority group may be less affected by impression management than are measures of explicit negative attitudes. Positive assessments may be expressed more spontaneously (Herr & Page, 2004), and by a wider range of individuals (Gross, John, & Richards, 2000), than are negative assessments. In addition, research participants are more willing to reliably express positive than negative out-group attitudes (Fiske, Xu, Cuddy, & Glick, 1999). This may be the case in part because positive prejudices are less inhibited by conscious processing than are negative prejudices, which makes them more likely to be "expressed and experienced in [their] 'raw' form" (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003, pp. 414–415).

One potential critique is that studying positive attitudes toward minority groups may be of limited utility because, although such attitudes may emerge in questionnaire data, they may not be ecologically valid. Woodmansee and Cook (1967) signaled this concern when they developed the Multifactor Racial Attitudes Inventory. They initially conceived of that scale's Ease of Interracial Contacts subscale, which included items such as "I would have no worries about going to a party with an attractive black date," as a lie scale, rather than as representing honestly held positive attitudes. However, as they noted, their own research indicated that the Ease of Interracial Contacts subscale actually functioned as a valid instrument of positive attitudes among White participants.

Other research also indicated that positive attitudes toward African Americans were ecologically valid. Patchen et al. (1976) found that a majority of White high school students rated African American students as having each of the nine positive traits they assessed. Most striking, however, is that African American high school students in that study actually identified positive attitudes that White students held toward their group (e.g., that African Americans are friendly, helpful). Further, factor analyses indicated that African Americans viewed Whites' positive and negative attitudes toward their group as independent. Taken together, these findings suggest that not only do Whites express positive attitudes toward African Americans that are independent of their negative attitudes, but African Americans recognize that these positive attitudes exist, and perceive them to be independent of negative attitudes. More applied research will help determine when and how positive and negative attitudes toward minority groups add independent variance to making valid predictions about real-world behaviors toward those groups.

Conclusions

Our research provides evidence that liking a minority group is not the same as not disliking that group. Positive and negative attitudes toward minority groups are functionally separable, exerting differential influences on behavior. In contrast to negative attitudes toward minority group members (i.e., ethnic prejudices and ethnic hate), which are widely known to predict negative behaviors, positive attitudes are better predictors of positive behaviors, particularly approach behaviors related to building social resources (Fredrickson, 1998, 2001).

The functional separability of positive and negative attitude processes implies that merely measuring negative attitudes is not adequate for predicting and understanding behaviors, particularly positive behaviors. Yet, in general social psychology has "seemed uninterested" in accounting for positive attitudes and their effects (Wright & Taylor, 2003, p. 433). Although often ignored, positive attitudes toward minority groups are an important area of study, as they appear to be more readily expressed than are negative attitudes toward minorities (Fiske et al., 1999), and are generated by different processes than, and operate independently of, positive attitudes. Accordingly, developing a literature on positive attitudes toward minority groups to parallel the negative attitude literature may be crucial for developing a comprehensive basic theory of behavior toward minority groups. Research based on such a theory could then be applied to furthering our ability to predict and promote positive behaviors toward those groups.

References

Bobocel, D. R., Son Hing, L. S., Davey, L. M., Stanley, D. J., & Zanna, M. P. (1998). Justice-based opposition to social policies: Is it genuine? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75,* 653–669. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.75.3.653

Cacioppo, J. T., & Berntson, G. G. (1994). Relationship between attitudes and evaluative space: A critical review, with emphasis on the separability of positive and negative substrates. *Psychological Review, 115,* 401–423. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.115.3.401

Cacioppo, J. T., & Berntson, G. G. (2001). The affect system and racial prejudice. In J. Bargh & D. K. Apsley (Eds.), *Unraveling the complexities of social life: A* festschrift *in honor of Robert B. Zajonc* (pp. 95–100). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Cacioppo, J. T., Gardner, W. L., & Berntson, G. G. (1997). Beyond bipolar conceptualizations and measures: The case of attitudes and evaluative space. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 1,* 3–25. doi: 10.1207/s15327957pspr0101

Cacioppo, J. T., Gardner, W. L., & Berntson, G. G. (1999). The affect system has parallel and integrative processing components: Form follows function. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76,* 839–855. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.76.5.839

Chen, M., & Bargh, J. A. (1999). Consequences of automatic evaluation: Immediate behavioral predispositions to approach or avoid the stimulus. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25,* 215–224. doi: 10.1177/0146167299025002007

Crandall, C. S., & Eshleman, A. (2003). A justification-suppression model of the expression and experience of prejudice. *Psychological Bulletin, 129,* 414–446. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.129.3.414

Crosby, F. J., Iyer, A., & Sincharoen, S. (2006). Understanding affirmative action. *Annual Review of Psychology, 57,* 585–611. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190029

Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2006). Thinking well of African Americans: Measuring complimentary stereotypes and negative prejudice. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 28,* 233–250. doi: 10.1207/s15324834basp2803

Dienstbier, R. A. (1970). Positive and negative prejudice: Interactions of prejudice with race and social desirability. *Journal of Personality, 38,* 198–215. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.1970.tb00004.x

Dijker, A. J. M. (1987). Emotional reactions to ethnic minorities. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 17,* 305–325. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2420170306

Eisenstadt, D., Leippe, M. R., Stambush, M. A., Rauch, S. M., & Rivers, J. A. (2005). Dissonance and prejudice: Personal costs, choice, and change in attitudes and racial beliefs following counterattitudinal advocacy that benefits a minority. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 27,* 127–141. doi: 10.1207/s15324834basp2702

Fiske, S. T., Xu, J., Cuddy, A. C., & Glick, P. (1999). (Dis)respecting and (dis)liking: Status and interdependence predict ambivalent stereotypes of competence and warmth. *Journal of Social Issues, 55,* 473–490. doi: 10.1111/0022-4537.00128

Fredrickson, B. L. (1998). What good are positive emotions? *Review of General Psychology, 2,* 300–319. doi: 10.1037/1089-2680.2.3.300

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist, 56,* 218–226. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.218

Fredrickson, B. L., & Branigan, C. (2005). Positive emotions broaden the scope of attention and thought–action repertoires. *Cognition and Emotion, 19,* 313–332. doi: 10.1080/02699930441000238

Green, R. F., & Goldfried, M. R. (1965). On the bipolarity of semantic space. *Psychological Monographs, 79*(6, Whole No. 599).

Gross, J. J., John, O. P., & Richards, J. M. (2000). The dissociation of emotion expression from emotion experience: A personality perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26,* 712–726. doi: 10.1177/0146167200268006

Harrison, D. A., Kravitz, D. A., Mayer, D. M., Leslie, L. M., & Lev-Arey, D. (2006). Understanding attitudes toward affirmative action programs in employment: Summary and meta-analysis of 35 years of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91,* 1013–1036. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.1013

Henry, P. J., & Sears, D. O. (2002). The Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale. *Political Psychology, 23,* 253–283. doi: 10.1111/0162-895X.00281

Herr, P. M., & Page, C. M. (2004). Asymmetric association of liking and disliking judgments: So what's not to like? *Journal of Consumer Research, 30,* 588–601. doi: 10.1086/380291

Ho, C., & Jackson, J. W. (2001). Attitudes toward Asian Americans: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31,* 1553–1581. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2001.tb02742.x

Johnson, J. W. (2000). A heuristic method for estimating the relative weight of predictor variables in multiple regression. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 35,* 1–19. doi: 10.1207/S15327906MBR3501_1

Johnson, K. J., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2005). "We all look the same to me:" Positive emotions reduce own-race bias in face recognition. *Psychological Science, 16,* 875–881. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2005.01631.x

Jordan, N. (1965). The "asymmetry" of "liking" and "disliking": A phenomenon meriting further reflection and research. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 29,* 315–322. doi: 10.1086/267327

Kaplan, K. J. (1972). On the ambivalence–indifference problem in attitude theory and measurement: A suggested modification of the semantic differential technique. *Psychological Bulletin, 77,* 361–372. doi: 10.1037/h0032590

Katz, I., & Hass, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and American value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55,* 893–905. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.55.6.893

LeDoux, J. E. (1995). In search of an emotional system in the brain: Leaping from fear to emotion and consciousness. In M. S. Gazzaniga (Ed.), *The cognitive neurosciences* (pp. 1049–1062). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

McClintock, C. G., & Allison, S. T. (1989). Social value orientation and helping behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 19,* 353–362. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.1989.tb00060.x

McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91–125). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Meng, X.-L., Rosenthal, R., & Rubin, D. B. (1992). Comparing correlated correlation coefficients. *Psychological Bulletin, 111,* 172–175. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.111.1.172

Neville, H. A., Lilly, R. L., Duran, G., Lee, R. M., & Browne, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47,* 59–70. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.47.1.59

Patchen, M., Hofmann, G., & Davidson, J. D. (1976). Interracial perceptions among high school students. *Sociometry, 39,* 341–354.

Phillips, S. T., & Ziller, R. C. (1997). Toward a theory and measure of the nature of nonprejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72,* 420–434. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.72.2.420

Pittinsky, T. L. (2009). Look both ways. *Phi Delta Kappan, 90,* 363–364.

Pittinsky, T. L. (2010). A two-dimensional model of intergroup leadership: The case of national diversity. *American Psychologist, 65,* 194–200. doi:10.1037/a0017329

Pittinsky, T. L., Rosenthal, S. A., & Montoya, R. M. (2011). Measuring positive attitudes toward outgroups: Development and validation of the Allophilia Scale. In L. R. Tropp & R. K. Mallett (Eds.), *Beyond prejudice reduction: Pathways to positive intergroup relations* (pp. 41–60). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Radkiewicz, P. (2006). Feeling of integration with socio-political system and authoritarian-ethnocentric syndrome as two general factors determining attachment to a country. In A. G. de Zavala & K. Skarzynska (Eds.), *Understanding social change: Political psychology in Poland* (pp. 105–134). Hauppauge, NY: Nova.

Schuman, H., & Harding, J. (1963). Sympathetic identification with the underdog. *The Public Opinion Quarterly, 27,* 230–241.

Sniderman, P. M., & Piazza, T. (1993). *The scar of race.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Soldatova, G. (2007). Psychological mechanisms of xenophobia. *Social Sciences, 38,* 105–121.

Stangor, C., Sullivan, L. A., & Ford, T. E. (1991). Affective and cognitive determinants of prejudice. *Social Cognition, 9,* 359–380.

Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J., Voci, A., Cairns, E., & van Dick, R. (2011). *The role of intergroup emotions and empathy in contact between Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Tonidandel, S., LeBreton, J. M., & Johnson, J. W. (2009). Determining the statistical significance of relative weights. *Psychological Methods, 14,* 387–399. doi: 10.1037/a0017735

Triandis, H. C. (1964). Exploratory factor analyses of the behavioral component of social attitudes. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 68,* 420–430. doi: 10.1037/h0043175

Van Hiel, A., & Mervielde, I. (2005). Authoritarianism and social dominance orientation: Relationships with various forms of racism. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35,* 2323–2344. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2005.tb02105.x

Woodmansee, J. J., & Cook, S. W. (1967). Dimensions of verbal racial attitudes: Their identification and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 7,* 240–250. doi: 10.1037/h0025078

Wright, S. C., & Taylor, D. M. (2003). The social psychology of cultural diversity: Social stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In M. A. Hogg & J. Cooper (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of social psychology* (pp. 432–457). London, England: Sage.

**Call for Papers: *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*
Special Issue on Behavioral Medicine and Clinical Health Psychology**

The *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* plans to publish a special issue on "Behavioral Medicine and Clinical Health Psychology" in 2012. As such, we are calling for original manuscript submissions within this broad area. Such a special issue will be the fourth that *JCCP* has published in behavioral medicine over the last four decades. Past issues have proven to be a seminal resource for researchers, practitioners, and policymakers interested in the relationships among behavior, psychological science, and health. Empirical, review (descriptive or quantitative), or novel conceptual or methodological contributions related to the association between clinical and behavioral science and the development and course of disease or the promotion of health are welcomed. Updated or innovative examinations of topics addressed in previous *JCCP* behavioral medicine and clinical health psychology special issues (e.g., interventions targeting behavioral risk factors for disease, behavioral management of chronic conditions) are welcomed, as are examinations of recently emerging topics (e.g., technology and behavioral medicine, implications of behavioral and psychological science for the clinical translation of genomic methods). Papers addressing behavioral medicine and clinical health psychology topics as part of a broader biopsychosocial or ecological systems perspective are also welcomed. Articles addressing issues of diversity in behavioral medicine (e.g., RCTs of culturally-sensitive psychosocial interventions, diversity-related health care disparities) are especially sought.

The editors for this issue are Alan J. Christensen (Guest Editor) and Arthur M. Nezu (*JCCP* Editor). Authors interested in having a manuscript considered for this special issue need to first submit a 1-page proposal outlining the full manuscript by **July 1, 2011.** Authors of selected proposals will be notified inviting them to submit a full paper due **September 30, 2011**. All such papers will undergo normal peer review evaluations. Note that an initial invitation does not signify eventual acceptance. All manuscripts should be prepared in strict accordance with *JCCP* guidelines (please refer to the website: http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/ccp/) and eventually submitted through the standard *JCCP* portal. Questions about appropriate topics, as well as the 1-page proposals, can be sent to either Alan Christensen (alan-christensen@uiowa.edu) or Art Nezu (amn23@drexel.edu).