

Speaking the Language of Diversity: Spanish Fluency, White Ancestry, and Skin Color in the Distribution of Diversity Awards to Latinos

Leigh S. Wilton, Diana T. Sanchez, and George F. Chavez

Rutgers University

Two studies investigated the combined effects of cultural practices, ancestry, and phenotype on ethnic categorization and the distribution of resources to minorities. Perceivers formed impressions of Latino internship candidates who varied in Spanish language fluency, White/European ancestry, and skin color. Spanish fluency influenced the distribution of minority resources to all targets, but only influenced the Latino categorization of targets who had White/European ancestry. The effect of Spanish fluency on minority resource distribution was explained by the White/European target's Latino categorization and perceived commitment to minority communities. We discuss why factors beyond racial/ethnic categorization may matter in minority resource distribution decisions.

The long-standing controversy about Latinos and how to define Latino group membership has recently risen to the forefront of public debates (e.g., M. Castillo & Basu, 2012; Navarro, 2012; Wedge, 2012). For example, in a recent *New York Times* headline, Navarro (2012, p. 1) reported that “for many Latinos, racial identity is more culture than color,” and thus, conventional racial categories in the United States based on physical appearance fail to adequately address Latinos. Indeed, the term *Latino* refers to a population that shares a common cultural heritage and language but not a common race or ancestry. Thus, the current government racial categories in the U.S. Census (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010) exclude Latinos from its list of recognized racial groups, which caused 18 million Latinos to choose not to identify with any race. Prominent in the discussions of Latino group membership were the roles of (a) the Spanish language, as a Latino cultural practice that demarcates Latino identity; (b) White/European ancestry, as a factor that may moderate a person's categorization as Latino; and (c) skin color as a feature of physical appearance that does not

wholly characterize Latinos. The present research seeks to identify how these prototype cues (language fluency, ancestry, and skin color) influence Latino categorization and the distribution of minority resources in the context of diversity awards.

Social categorization has a long and rich history as a key driver of many social-perceptual processes, including impression formation (Allport, 1954; Fiske, 1998; Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Macrae & Bodenhausen, 2000). In this vein, the categorization of Latino targets as either Latino or not (i.e., Latino categorization) is important because it should directly impact category-based judgments of Latinos, including whether they should receive minority resources such as diversity awards. However, recent evidence suggests that the cultural practice of Spanish fluency could have different effects on the categorization of and distribution of minority resources to Latino targets. For example, the discovery that the celebrated “Latino hire” of the Boston, Massachusetts, Fire Department Chief did not speak Spanish spurred controversy because many felt that his inability to speak Spanish challenged whether he should be considered an appropriate diversity hire, yet few questioned his categorization as a Latino (Wedge, 2012). In other words, a Latino person who does not speak Spanish may be categorized as Latino but disadvantaged in diversity award judgments.

Correspondence should be sent to Leigh S. Wilton, Department of Psychology, Rutgers University, 53 Avenue E, Piscataway, NJ 08854. E-mail: lwilton@rci.rutgers.edu

This article addresses the concurrent role of Spanish language fluency, White ancestry, and skin color in Latino categorization to address important gaps in the literature regarding whom perceivers consider Latino and why. Moreover, we explore whether these same factors impact the allocation of diversity awards to Latinos. Diversity awards encompass a broad range of career- or prospect-enhancing opportunities, such as internships, jobs, or scholarships, that are reserved for racial and ethnic minorities; in this research, we measure the candidate's perceived deservingness of an internship that is reserved for racial and ethnic minorities. This approach enables a broad view of how categorization and resource distribution processes operate for targets who vary in multiple prototype characteristics. In doing so, we suggest that categorization and resource distribution operate via distinct processes. Specifically, we identify both Latino categorization and the extent to which the target is perceived as upholding the cultural values and practices of greater racial and ethnic minorities (i.e., commitment to minority communities) as two separate mechanisms through which minority resources are distributed to the most difficult to categorize targets (i.e., those who have both Latino and White ancestry). Thus, this research represents a rare exploration of the influence of multiple prototype cues on categorization and category-based judgments in the context of diversity awards.

LANGUAGE AND LATINO IDENTITY

Language is a cultural symbol that can serve as a means to cue and transmit culture (Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martinez, 2000; Lau, Lee, & Chiu, 2004), and speaking a language is a cultural practice that occupies an important role in cultural identity formation and enactment (e.g., L. G. Castillo, Conoley, Brossart, & Quiros, 2007; Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010; Yip, 2005). Even though Latinos are very diverse as a group, varying for example by native country or acculturation, speaking Spanish is a common and unifying Latino cultural practice that marks Latino ethnicity as nearly 80% of all Latinos in the United States are fluent in the language (Antshel, 2002; Oboler, 1995; U.S. Census Bureau, 2008; see also Padilla, 2008; Padilla & Perez, 2003). However, the percentage of Spanish-speakers drops to about 50% of third-generation and 10% of fourth-generation Latinos (Rumbaut, Massey, & Bean, 2006), suggesting that acculturation erodes Spanish fluency. Nevertheless, Latinos experience ingroup pressure to speak Spanish and rejection when they do not, and many view Spanish proficiency as an important factor in their own feelings of Latino identity group membership, pride in the Latino heritage, and worthiness of affirmative action entitlements (Chavez & French, 2007; Corza, 2009; Navarro, 2012;

Sanchez & Chavez, 2010; Sanchez, Chavez, Good, & Wilton, 2012). In addition, outgroup perceivers also view Latinos who speak Spanish as more worthy of affirmative action than those who do not (Sanchez & Chavez, 2010; for a real life example, see Wedge, 2012).

Therefore, Spanish fluency is a powerful Latino cultural prototype that influences how perceivers construe Latino targets. Yet although Spanish fluency influences the extent to which Latinos are viewed as deserving of minority resources, Spanish proficiency may operate only as a prime indicator of categorization for Latino targets who lack other prototypical markers of Latino identity, such as those who have both Latino and White/European (i.e., Latino/White *biethnic*¹) ancestry.

DISAMBIGUATING CATEGORIZATION

Spanish fluency and other prototype cues may be particularly salient indicators of categorization for people of Latino/White biethnic ancestry. Like the growing biracial population (e.g., Chen & Hamilton, 2012; Shih & Sanchez, 2005, 2009), Latino/White biethnic targets belong to more than one ethnic group and may be ambiguous in appearance, which can increase the difficulty of categorizing them. The racial categorization literature reveals that perceivers respond to prototype cues in the categorization and perception of biracial targets when they are made salient, suggesting that individuals should also attend to such cues when assigning biethnic targets to ethnic groups. For example, greater amounts of White ancestry reduced the extent to which White/Black biracial targets were categorized as minority, described using minority-relevant stereotypes, and awarded resources reserved for racial minorities (Good, Sanchez, & Chavez, in press; Sanchez, Good, & Chavez, 2011). Racial labels (e.g., "White" vs. "Black"; Levin &

¹We use the term *biethnic* to (a) describe the unique identity of individuals who have both Latino and White/European origins stemming from one Latino and one White/European parent, and (2) distinguish between such individuals and monoethnic Latinos who also have a White racial identity. *Ethnicity* is a set of ideas and practices that allow individuals to identify or be identified with groups, typically by commonalities such as language or history, and derive meaning and belonging, whereas *race* is a set of ideas and practices that sort individuals into different ethnic groups based on characteristics such as appearance (Markus, 2008). Moreover, official government forms such as the U.S. Census define Latino/Hispanic ancestry as an ethnic, but not a racial, identity (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Thus, some do not consider individuals who have Latino and White/European origins biracial unless they also belong to two racial groups (e.g., are White/European and Black/Latino). We do not adopt the term *bicultural* to describe such individuals because bicultural people operate fluidly within two *cultures* (i.e., sets of beliefs, practices, and cognitive styles that surround ethnicity and race; Benet-Martínez & Oishi, 2008; Chui & Hong, 2007) and can be monoracial or monoethnic. For reviews, see Padilla (2008) and Sanchez, Shih, and Wilton (in press).

Banaji, 2006), race-stereotypic names (e.g., “David” vs. “Tan Tze”; Hilliar & Kemp, 2008), and race-stereotypic hairstyles (e.g., afro vs. not; MacLin & Malpass, 2001) were also found to disambiguate biracial faces in judgments of their racial identity. In addition, markers of lower socioeconomic status (SES; e.g., janitor’s clothes) were also found to increase the categorization of biracial targets as minority (vs. White; Freeman, Penner, Saperstein, Schetz, & Ambady, 2011). This work also shows that perceivers predominantly categorize biracial targets as minority in automatic judgments, but that when given enough time to do so, deliberate processing results in more nuanced categorizations (e.g., as “multi-racial”; Chen & Hamilton, 2012; Ho, Sidanius, Levin, & Banaji, 2011; Peery & Bodenhausen, 2008).

Consequently, we expect Spanish proficiency to function as a cultural cue similar to other prototype cues to disambiguate the categorization of Latino/White biethnic targets. Because the categorization of targets who have both Latino and White/European ancestry is ambiguous and therefore challenging, perceivers should attend to the target’s level of Spanish fluency in deliberate categorization tasks. Specifically, Spanish fluency should increase the extent to which Latino/White biethnic targets are categorized as Latino. However, Spanish fluency should not influence the categorization of monoethnic Latino targets, because categorization of such targets should not be ambiguous.

DISTRIBUTING MINORITY RESOURCES TO MINORITIES

An important consequence of categorization could be the subsequent impact it has on perceptions of individuals who have been categorized (e.g., Allport, 1954; Fiske, 1998; Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Macrae & Bodenhausen, 2000), including decisions about the distribution of resources reserved for racial or ethnic minorities. However, Latinos who do not speak Spanish may be viewed as Latino group members, but not as qualified for diversity awards or other minority resources (e.g., Wedge, 2012). In other words, categorization alone may not be sufficient for demonstrating appropriateness for diversity awards.

Beyond categorization, both ancestry and skin color have been shown to impact the distribution of minority resources to individuals. White/European ancestry has been shown to disadvantage minorities who may otherwise be eligible for minority resources from receiving such awards (Good et al., in press; Sanchez & Bonam, 2005; Sanchez et al., 2011). Phenotype characteristics such as skin color and hair type also affect perception of Latinos (e.g., Espino & Franz, 2002; MacLin & Malpass, 2001), who are also seen as less disadvantaged when they are presumed to be lighter in skin tone, and

thus less worthy of minority resources (Good et al., in press).

Prior research has also demonstrated that the distribution of minority resources to monoethnic Latinos was influenced by whether the target was described as fluent in Spanish or not (Sanchez & Chavez, 2010). At the same time, even if Latinos who have part White/European ancestry are viewed as less Latino than monoethnic Latinos, like biracial targets they may still be viewed as a racial and ethnic minority (i.e., as not White) and thus as a candidate for minority resources (e.g., Chen & Hamilton, 2012; Ho et al., 2011; Peery & Bodenhausen, 2008). In this way, Spanish fluency could also improve the perceived worthiness of both Latino/White biethnic and monoethnic Latino targets for minority resources, by making Latinos appear more connected to and invested in the greater community of racial minorities regardless of their ancestry. Thus, Spanish fluency could serve to inform minority resource distribution to all Latino targets, regardless of amount of White/European ancestry, by making them seem more committed to greater racial or ethnic minority communities.

Therefore, the distribution of minority resources should not follow the pattern of disambiguating effects of language on Latino categorization seen only for Latino/White biethnic targets. Rather, Spanish fluency and White/European ancestry should each operate as prime indicators of entitlement to minority resources for all Latino targets.

OVERVIEW OF STUDIES

In two studies, we tested the combined effects of language fluency (Spanish vs. French), ancestry (Latino/White biethnic vs. monoethnic Latino), and skin color (darker vs. lighter) prototypes on White and minority participants’ perceptions and categorizations of Latino targets. Language and ancestry were manipulated in Studies 1 and 2, whereas skin color was manipulated in Study 2 only. We measured the extent to which participants categorized the target as Latino and allocated resources reserved for minorities (i.e., a diversity internship) to him.

We predicted that Spanish fluency would serve as a cultural cue to impact the categorization and perception of Latinos who varied in ancestry and skin color. Consistent with prior research demonstrating the guiding role of prototype cues on racial categorization of biracial targets, we predicted that Spanish fluency would disambiguate the categorization of Latino targets who lacked other prototypical markers of Latino identity (i.e., Latino/White biethnic individuals), as well as influence the distribution of minority resources to them. We also predicted that Spanish fluency would affect the allocation of resources to, but not the Latino categorization of, Latino targets

with monoethnic Latino ancestry. Furthermore, categorization as Latino, as well as perceived commitment to minority communities, should underlie the process of minority resource distribution for biethnic, but not monoethnic, Latino targets. Because perceivers experience the most uncertainty in judgments of the biethnic Latino target, the extent to which perceivers view him as a member of a minority group (i.e., as Latino) or committed to minority communities should explain their support for his receipt for a diversity award. In addition, we explored whether perceiver race (i.e., whether the participant was White or minority) impacted these perceptions by adding perceiver race as an exploratory factor to the experimental design; Whites may be less generous in the distribution of minority resources than minorities, because they tend to be less supportive of affirmative action type programs (Kravitz et al., 2000).

STUDY 1

In Study 1, we tested the effects of language and ancestry on the Latino categorization of and the allocation of minority resources (i.e., a minority internship) to candidates. H1 predicted that Spanish fluency will impact the Latino categorization of the Latino/White biethnic, but not the monoethnic, Latino target, such that the biethnic target would be categorized as Latino more when he was described as Spanish speaking as opposed to French speaking. Thus, we expected an interaction between candidate language and candidate ancestry on Latino categorization. H2 predicted that monoethnic ancestry and Spanish fluency would serve as an advantage to Latino targets, increasing their perceived fit for the minority internship over biethnic ancestry and French fluency. Thus, we expected main effects of candidate language and ancestry on minority resource distribution. Moreover, we reasoned that the biethnic targets' categorization as Latino would explain his perceived deservingness of the minority resource. However, the monoethnic Latino's categorization would not underlie such judgments because his membership in a minority group is not uncertain to perceivers. Thus, H3 predicted that Latino categorization would mediate the relationship between language fluency and the minority internship allocation for the biracial target (i.e., moderated mediation).

Participants

Two hundred eleven students² (112 women; $M_{\text{age}} = 18.54$, $SD_{\text{age}} = 1.25$) enrolled in a large state university completed

²Twenty-two participants who did not indicate their race were excluded from the study. Including these participants did not change the significance of our findings.

the study in exchange for research credits. The sample included 118 White, 75 Asian, and 18 Black participants. We intentionally excluded participants of Latino or multiracial backgrounds from participating in the study to control for ingroup effects.

Procedure and Materials

Participants were randomly assigned to view an undergraduate candidate's resume and then evaluated the candidate's suitability for a competitive research internship. The resume manipulated the candidate's ancestry and language fluency, but all other information was held constant. Specifically, to manipulate the candidate's ancestry, the candidate was described as either "Latino/Hispanic" or "Latino/White Biracial" in the race/ethnicity section of the resume. The candidate's language fluency was listed in the application under languages spoken. The candidate ostensibly checked two boxes under a list of languages that either indicated that the applicant spoke both "Spanish" and "English" or both "French" and "English." Thus, all candidates were described as speaking two languages to control for increased competency effects of speaking additional languages (Sanchez & Chavez, 2010). French was selected as the control language because Spanish and French are the two most commonly taught languages in U.S. secondary schools (Branaman & Rhodes, 1997). Also, as romance languages with a high degree of lexical overlap, French and Spanish should be seen as equal in terms of language difficulty. We used a deliberate categorization task (see Latino categorization, next) to reflect the type of judgment perceivers would make when reviewing resumes.

Consistent with prior research (e.g., Good et al., in press; Sanchez & Bonam, 2005; Sanchez et al., 2011), the candidate was male with a generic first and Spanish last name (Jeff Garcia), and other qualifying credentials (e.g., psychology research assistant experience and psychology 3.8 grade point average) were provided. Participants were told that the internship was a selective national internship for exceptional psychology students and that only the most qualified candidates should be selected. Participants answered the key questions about the candidate (described next) along with filler questions about the overall merits of the application, impressions of the target, and their attitudes about affirmative action. Finally, participants were thanked and fully debriefed.

Latino categorization ($\alpha = .85$). Participants rated the extent to which each target was a member of the Latino group on a four-item scale with anchors of 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). An example item is "I consider this candidate to be Latino." We used a deliberate (not automatic) categorization measure because we felt that this would be more applicable to an

TABLE 1
Means and Standard Deviations for All Study 1 Variables by
Candidate Ancestry and Candidate Language

	Monoethnic Latino		Latino/White Biethnic	
	Spanish Speaking ^a	Non-Spanish Speaking ^b	Spanish Speaking ^c	Non-Spanish Speaking ^d
1. Latino categorization	6.13 (1.20)	6.15 (0.96)	5.85 (0.82) _a	5.30 (1.04) _a
2. Minority resources	5.27 (1.54)	5.02 (1.32)	4.96 (1.42)	4.28 (1.64)

Note. Pairs of means that share the same subscript letter denote those that differ significantly at the .05 level on a particular variable.

^a*n* = 44. ^b*n* = 39. ^c*n* = 63. ^d*n* = 65.

evaluation context and less likely to result in the biases found in automatic categorization of biracial targets (Peery & Bodenhausen, 2008). Following prior work (Sanchez et al., 2011), we chose a continuous measure of categorization rather than a binary measure so as not to explicitly encourage essentializing binary categories, though participants could indicate binary preferences by using the endpoints of the scale.

Perceived minority resource deservingness ($\alpha = .95$). After evaluating the candidate, we told the participants that a few internship positions were saved for ethnic minorities and then asked them to indicate whether the candidate should receive the minority internship on a four-item scale with anchors of 1 (*strongly agree*) to 7 (*strongly disagree*). An example item is "I believe this candidate is the best applicant for the minority internship."³

Results and Discussion

For all study variables, means and standard deviations are presented by candidate ancestry and language ability (Table 1), and correlations are presented by candidate ancestry (Table 2). To test study H1 and H2, we conducted individual analyses of variance (ANOVAs) on Latino categorization and minority internship worthiness, adding candidate language, candidate race, and participant race (1 = White; -1 = minority) as between-subjects factors.

Latino categorization. There was a significant main effect of candidate ancestry such that the monoethnic Latino target ($M = 6.14$, $SD = 1.09$) was categorized as

TABLE 2
Correlations Among All Study 1 Variables

	1	2	3
1. Latino categorization	—	.12	-.01
2. Minority resources	.31**	—	.12
3. Participant race (1 = White, -1 = minority)	-.03	-.05	—

Note. Correlations shown above and below the median line are for the Monoethnic Latino ($N = 83$) and the Latino/White Biethnic ($N = 128$) candidate, respectively.

** $p < .01$.

Latino to a greater extent than the Latino/White biethnic target ($M = 5.57$, $SD = 0.97$), $F(1, 203) = 16.10$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$. In addition, a marginal main effect of candidate language revealed that the Spanish-speaking target ($M = 5.96$, $SD = 1.00$) was categorized as Latino more than the non-Spanish-speaking target ($M = 5.62$, $SD = 1.09$), $F(1, 203) = 3.59$, $p = .06$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. These effects were qualified by the predicted interaction of candidate ancestry and candidate language on Latino categorization, though it was marginal, $F(1, 203) = 3.50$, $p = .06$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. As expected, the biethnic candidate with Spanish-speaking ability was categorized as Latino significantly more than the biethnic candidate without Spanish-speaking ability, $F(1, 126) = 10.81$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .08$, whereas there was no difference in Latino categorization for the monoethnic Latino candidate who spoke versus did not speak Spanish, $F(1, 81) = .01$, $p = .92$, *ns*. There were no other significant effects or interactions (all $ps > .35$).

Perceived minority resource deservingness. The two expected main effects of candidate ancestry and candidate language were found. The monoethnic Latino candidate ($M = 5.15$, $SD = 1.44$) was rated as significantly more qualified for the minority internship than the Latino/White biethnic candidate ($M = 4.62$, $SD = 1.57$), $F(1, 203) = 4.51$, $p = .04$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$, and the candidate who spoke Spanish ($M = 5.09$, $SD = 1.47$) was rated as significantly more qualified for the minority internship than the candidate who did not speak Spanish ($M = 4.56$, $SD = 1.56$), $F(1, 203) = 3.86$, $p = .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. Also as expected, there was no interactive effect of candidate language ability and candidate ancestry on minority resources, $F(1, 205) = 1.14$, $p = .29$, *ns*. There were no other significant main effects or interactions (all $ps > .29$).

Mediation Analysis

We tested whether Latino categorization mediated the effect of language on minority resource distribution for the biethnic, but not the monoethnic, Latino target. To test moderated mediation, we used the PROCESS

³The results of both studies remained unchanged when we controlled for participants' attitudes towards affirmative action. We measured participants' attitudes towards affirmative action among other filler items using an 18-item scale comprised of items from Kravitz & Platania (1993) and Parra (1991; $\alpha s = .95$ for both studies; see also Brutus, Parra, Hunter, Perry & Ducharme, 1998).

program to compute 95% confidence intervals based on an inferred asymmetrical distribution of the mediated effect (Hayes, 2012; Preacher, Rucker, & Hayes, 2007). To do so, we regressed minority resource (dependent variable [DV]) on language (independent variable [IV]), with Latino categorization and candidate ancestry entered as the respective mediator (M) and moderator, in the PROCESS program. The confidence intervals for the mediated effect did not include zero for the biethnic target (lower bound = .03, higher bound = .38), but they did include zero for the monoethnic target (lower bound = -.13, higher bound = .17), suggesting that the biethnic target's categorization as a member of mediated the effect of language fluency on resource distribution. We also followed the procedures outlined in Baron and Kenny (1986) by regressing (a) minority resource (DV) on language (IV) at the first step, (b) Latino categorization (M) on language (IV) at the second step, and (c) minority resource (DV) on both language (IV) and Latino categorization (M) at the final step for the biethnic target only. The original effect of language (1 = Spanish; -1 = French) on the biethnic target's minority resource deservingness reduced to non-significance (from $\beta = .68, p = .01$ to $\beta = .45, p = .11$) when Latino categorization was included in the regression equation. Therefore, full mediation was established. In further support of this relationship, Latino categorization and minority resource distribution were correlated only for the bi-ethnic candidate (see Table 2).

Discussion. In summary, Spanish fluency prompted perceivers to categorize targets as Latino if they were biethnic, and view targets as worthy of a minority internship regardless of ancestry. In addition, biethnic ancestry emerged as a disadvantage for minority internship allocation, relative to monoethnic ancestry. Therefore, Study 1 shows that the cultural practice of language fluency can disambiguate categorization for Latino/White biethnic targets, as well as influence the distribution of minority resources to all minorities of Latino descent. Moreover, the results suggested that the extent to which a biethnic target is viewed as deserving of minority resources is explained by his perceived membership in a racial or ethnic minority group (i.e., as Latino).

However, Study 1 failed to include skin color, a primary factor in minority categorization and perception. Perceivers make more minority categorizations (e.g., categorize as Black) and category-based judgments (i.e., use more minority-relevant stereotypes) of minorities (including Latinos) who have more prototypical phenotypes (e.g., darker skin tones), compared to minorities who have less prototypical phenotypes (e.g., lighter skin tones; Blair, Judd, & Chapleau, 2004; Blair, Judd, & Fallman, 2004; Livingston & Brewer, 2002; Maddox, 2004). Moreover, White ancestry influences expectations of phenotype when no pictures are provided,

such that people presume that biethnic minorities are less prototypical in their physical appearance (e.g., lighter in skin tone) than monoethnic minorities, which subsequently impacts their perceived merit for minority resources (Sanchez et al., 2011). Thus, skin tone influences racial categorization and minority resource distribution, and the effects of Spanish fluency on Latino categorization and minority resource distribution could have been explained instead by beliefs about the targets' skin color. In addition, Study 1 did not measure perceived commitment to minority communities to determine if such perceptions may account for the effects of language fluency on resource distribution.

STUDY 2

The purpose of Study 2 was to attempt to replicate the effects of language on (a) categorization of biethnic Latinos and (b) resource allocation to all Latinos, as well as to extend the research to explore the role of skin color on such judgments. Therefore, in Study 2 H1 and H2 were the same as those for Study 1, except predictions for the effect of skin color were also added. Specifically, H1 predicted that Spanish fluency and darker skin color would impact the Latino categorization of the biethnic, but not monoethnic, Latino target, such that the biethnic target would be categorized as Latino more when he was described as Spanish speaking or darker skinned as opposed to French speaking or lighter skinned. Thus, we expected Candidate Language \times Candidate Ancestry and Candidate Skin Color \times Candidate Ancestry interactions on Latino categorization. H2 predicted that monoethnic ancestry, Spanish fluency, and darker skin color would each serve as an advantage to Latino targets, increasing their perceived fit for the minority internship over biethnic ancestry, French fluency, and lighter skin color. Thus, we expected main effects of candidate language, ancestry, and skin color on minority resource distribution.

Study 2 also aimed to replicate the mediating effect of Latino categorization on resource distribution for the biethnic target (H3). In addition, it sought to explore the role of perceived commitment to greater minority communities as a pathway from language fluency to resource distribution that does not include Latino categorization. Doing so enables us to address lingering questions about the potentially contradictory nature of the findings reported in Study 1 (i.e., the disambiguating effect of Spanish fluency for biethnic targets on Latino categorization, and the main effects of language and ancestry on minority resources). We affirm that the criteria for being considered Latino versus appropriate for minority resources can be different. In the present studies, we measured the target's perceived deservingness of an

internship that was described as reserved for all racial and ethnic minorities (not just Latinos). Thus, this minority resource is reserved for individuals whom identify as racial or ethnic minorities (not just Latinos). Even if a person believes that a Latino/White biethnic individual who does not speak Spanish should not be considered Latino, he or she may still be considered a minority (i.e., not White) and thus worthy of receiving minority resources. Moreover, perceivers, and especially non-Latino minority perceivers, may wish to allocate minority resources to Latino candidates based on whether they view them as a minority who is committed to the greater community of racial and ethnic minorities. Accordingly, H4 predicted that allocation of minority resources to the biethnic candidate would also operate through a channel that focuses on the distribution of resources to individuals whom are perceived as committed to the greater community of racial and ethnic minorities, and which is distinct from categorization specifically as Latino. Thus, we also expected perceived commitment to minority communities to mediate the effect of Spanish fluency on resource distribution to the biethnic Latino/White target.

While testing for mediation, we also rule out the possibility that Spanish fluency effects are driven by societal-level factors (i.e., perceived SES and immigrant status), because Spanish speakers could be viewed as lower in SES or more likely an immigrant than French speakers. Prior work has shown that SES increases both minority categorization and minority resource distribution (Penner & Saperstein, 2008; Young, Sanchez, & Wilton, in press). Immigrant status has never to our knowledge been included as a factor in racial categorization or minority resource distribution. However, Spanish fluency drops significantly among later-generations Latinos who acculturate in the United States (Rumbaut et al., 2006), so perceivers may hold assumptions that reflect this tendency. Thus, we included immigrant status to rule out that language effects could have been driven by alternative impressions.

Participants

One hundred sixty-nine students (78 women; $M_{\text{age}} = 19.01$, $SD_{\text{age}} = 2.45$) enrolled in a large state university completed the study in exchange for research credits. There were 95 White, 50 Asian, 16 Black, and 8 "Other" race/ethnicity participants. As in Study 1, we intentionally excluded Latino and multiracial participants from Study 2.

Procedure and Materials

The procedures directly replicated Study 1, with the exception that we added candidate photographs to the resumes to manipulate skin color. We randomly assigned

participants to view either one of three darker skinned or one of three lighter skinned photographs of the candidate, in addition to manipulating the candidate's ancestry (as mono-ethnic Latino or Latino/White biethnic) and language fluency (as Spanish and English or French and English). After viewing the candidate's resume, participants completed the same measures of Latino categorization ($\alpha = .90$), and perceived minority resource deservingness ($\alpha = .94$) as in Study 1, in addition to the new measures of perceived minority commitment, SES, and immigrant status (see next). All other aspects of the study protocol, including the candidate's name and credentials, and the internship description and filler questions (e.g., regarding participants attitudes about affirmative action), were identical to that presented in Study 1.

Photographic stimuli. Six photos (three dark-skinned and three light-skinned faces) were selected from the Productive Aging Lab Face Database (Minear & Park, 2004) to serve as photographic stimuli. Independent raters ($N = 26$) coded the attractiveness and physical appearance of the photos. Paired samples t tests confirmed that the darker skinned faces indeed looked darker ($M = 2.97$, $SD = 0.84$) than the lighter skinned faces ($M = 1.07$, $SD = 0.23$), $t(23) = 11.71$, $p < .001$. In addition, the darker skinned faces looked more Latino ($M_{\text{dark}} = 3.93$, $SD_{\text{dark}} = 0.74$ vs. $M_{\text{light}} = 1.14$, $SD_{\text{light}} = 0.39$), $t(23) = 17.15$, $p < .001$, and less White ($M_{\text{dark}} = 1.63$, $SD_{\text{dark}} = 0.53$ vs. $M_{\text{light}} = 4.88$, $SD_{\text{light}} = 0.29$), $t(23) = -23.57$, $p < .001$, than the lighter skinned faces. Furthermore, the darker skinned ($M = 1.96$, $SD = 0.69$) and lighter skinned ($M = 2.03$, $SD = 0.66$) photographs were rated as equally attractive, $t(23) = -1.07$, $p = .30$, *ns*.

Perceived minority commitment. We measured the extent to which participants viewed the candidate as committed to the ethnic minority community on a four-item scale with anchors of 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). The exact question wording is as follows: "This candidate makes an effort to be an active member of the ethnic minority community," "This candidate tries to connect with members of the ethnic minority community," "This candidate puts a lot of energy into his/her relationship with the ethnic minority community," and "The candidate tries to learn as much about the ethnic minority community as possible." The scale reliability was good ($\alpha = .96$).

Perceived socioeconomic status. The candidate's perceived SES was measured via three items on a scale with anchors of 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). The exact question wording is as follows: "The candidate likely gets financial aid to attend Rutgers," "This candidate comes from a low-income neighborhood," and "This candidate comes from a dangerous neighborhood."

TABLE 3
Means and Standard Deviations for All Study 2 Variables by Candidate Ancestry and Candidate Skin Color

	Monoethnic Latino		Latino/White Biethnic	
	Spanish Speaking ^a	Non-Spanish Speaking ^b	Spanish Speaking ^c	Non-Spanish Speaking ^d
Latino categorization	5.92 (1.09)	6.08 (1.16)	5.52 (1.37) ^a	5.11 (1.45) ^a
Minority resources	4.89 (1.14)	4.58 (1.28)	4.62 (1.64)	3.92 (1.29)
Minority commitment	3.89 (1.11)	3.31 (1.12)	3.68 (1.50)	3.42 (1.07)
	Darker Skin Color ^e	Lighter Skin Color ^f	Darker Skin Color ^g	Lighter Skin Color ^h
Latino categorization	6.23 (1.07) ^b	5.76 (1.13) ^b	5.99 (1.12) ^c	4.61 (1.50) ^c
Minority resources	4.91 (1.22)	4.58 (1.19)	4.56 (1.32)	3.94 (1.62)
Minority commitment	3.61 (1.12)	3.65 (1.19)	3.94 (1.24) ^d	3.15 (1.24) ^d

Note. *N* = 167. Pairs of means that share the same superscript letter denote those that differ significantly at the .05 level on a particular variable. The mean differences between the Spanish and non-Spanish-speaking biethnic target on Latino categorization differ significantly only for White participants.

^a*n* = 44. ^b*n* = 36. ^c*n* = 42. ^d*n* = 45. ^e*n* = 40. ^f*n* = 40. ^g*n* = 44. ^h*n* = 43.

Thus, higher scores reflect lower perceived SES. The scale reliability was good ($\alpha = .70$).

Perceived immigrant status. Participants rated the extent to which they viewed the candidate as an immigrant via two items with anchors of 1 (*strongly disagree*) and 7 (*strongly agree*). The exact wording of the two items, which correlated significantly ($r = .64, p < .01$), was “This candidate is likely an immigrant” and “This candidate was likely born outside the U.S.”

Results and Discussion

For all study variables, means and standard deviations are presented by candidate ancestry and language and by candidate ancestry and skin color (Table 3), and correlations are presented by candidate race (Table 4). To test the study hypotheses, we again conducted individual ANOVAs on each dependent variable, adding candidate ancestry, language, and skin color and participant race (1 = White; -1 = minority) as the between-subjects variables. In addition to demonstrating whether we observed main effects or interaction effects of ancestry, language, skin color, and participant race on Latino categorization and minority resource deservingness (to test study H1 and H2), the ANOVA analyses also confirmed which variables are appropriate mediators of the effect of language on minority resource distribution (H3 and H4).

Latino categorization. A main effect of candidate ancestry revealed that the monoethnic Latino target ($M = 5.99, SD = 1.12$) was categorized as Latino more than the Latino/White biethnic target ($M = 5.31, SD = 1.42$), $F(1, 151) = 19.02, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .11$, and a main effect of candidate skin color revealed that the darker skinned target ($M = 6.10, SD = 1.00$) was categorized as Latino more than the lighter skinned

target ($M = 5.16, SD = 1.45$), $F(1, 151) = 36.32, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .19$. However, candidate ancestry interacted significantly with skin color, $F(1, 151) = 9.78, p = .002, \eta_p^2 = .06$, and marginally with language, $F(1, 151) = 3.12, p = .08, \eta_p^2 = .02$, to influence the extent to which perceivers categorized the target as Latino. Participant race also interacted significantly with skin color, $F(1, 151) = 5.05, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = .04$. Moreover, there were two significant three-way interactions of candidate ancestry and participant race together with skin color, $F(1, 151) = 6.03, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = .04$, and with language, $F(1, 151) = 4.86, p = .03, \eta_p^2 = .03$. Consistent with hypotheses, the biethnic candidate was categorized as Latino more when he was described as darker skinned as compared to lighter skinned by both White, $F(1, 45) = 5.78, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = .11$, and minority, $F(1, 34) = 44.69, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .57$,

TABLE 4
Correlations Among All Study 2 Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Latino categorization	—	.06	-.00	.00	.07	-.04
2. Minority resources	.28**	—	.18	-.13	-.09	.02
3. Minority commitment	.32**	.41**	—	.13	.09	-.18
4. Socioeconomic status	.28**	.07	.22*	—	.22*	-.00
5. Immigrant status	.19	.09	.17	.32**	—	-.03
6. Participant race (1 White, -1 minority)	.02	.02	.01	-.13	-.19	—

Note. Correlations shown above and below the median line are for the monoethnic Latino (*N* = 82) and the Latino/White Biethnic (*N* = 87) candidate, respectively.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

participants, though the effect of skin color on Latino categorization was greater for minority participants than White participants. Moreover, the biethnic candidate was categorized as Latino more when he was described as Spanish speaking as compared to not Spanish speaking by White, $F(1, 45) = 7.44, p = .01, \eta_p^2 = .14$, but not minority, $F(1, 35) = 0.29, p = .60, ns$, participants. For the monoethnic Latino candidate, darker skin tone also marginally increased the target's Latino categorization for White participants, $F(1, 42) = 3.74, p = .06, \eta_p^2 = .08$, but had no effect for minority participants, $F(1, 42) = 1.16, p = .29, ns$. Consistent with Study 1, no difference was found in Latino categorization for the monoethnic Latino candidate who spoke versus did not speak Spanish, regardless of participant race (all F s < .14, all p s > .71). In other words, language disambiguated the biethnic targets only, but this effect was found just for White participants in Study 2. No other main effects or interactions emerged (all p s > .19).

Perceived minority resource deservingness. As expected, three separate main effects of candidate ancestry, language, and skin color emerged on minority resources. The monoethnic Latino candidate ($M = 4.75, SD = 1.21$) was rated as significantly more qualified for the minority scholarship than the biethnic Latino/White candidate ($M = 4.26, SD = 1.50, F(1, 151) = 5.19, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = .04$). The candidate who spoke Spanish ($M = 4.76, SD = 1.41$) was rated as significantly more qualified for the minority scholarship than the candidate who did not speak Spanish ($M = 4.21, SD = 1.32, F(1, 151) = 6.28, p = .01, \eta_p^2 = .04$). The darker skinned candidate ($M = 4.73, SD = 1.28$) was rated as significantly more qualified for the minority scholarship than the lighter skinned candidate ($M = 4.25, SD = 1.46, F(1, 151) = 5.24, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = .03$). No other significant main effects or interactions were found (all p s > .10).

Perceived minority commitment. The Spanish-speaking candidate ($M = 3.79, SD = 1.31$) was seen as more committed to the ethnic minority community than the non-Spanish-speaking candidate ($M = 3.37, SD = 1.09, F(1, 151) = 5.16, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = .03$), and the lighter skinned candidate ($M = 3.39, SD = 1.24$) was seen as marginally less committed to the minority community than the darker skinned candidate ($M = 3.78, SD = 1.19, F(1, 151) = 3.60, p = .06, \eta_p^2 = .02$). There was also a significant interaction between ancestry and skin color, $F(1, 151) = 6.96, p = .01, \eta_p^2 = .04$, and a marginal interaction between ancestry and participant race, $F(1, 151) = 3.39, p = .07, \eta_p^2 = .02$. The biethnic candidate was seen as more committed to the minority community when he had darker skin as compared to lighter skin, $F(1, 79) = 9.99, p = .002, \eta_p^2 = .11$, whereas the monoethnic candidate's perceived commitment to minority communities did not

differ based on his skin color, $F(1, 72) = .29, p = .87, ns$. Moreover, minority participants ($M = 3.91, SD = 1.26$) viewed the monoethnic Latino target as more committed to minority communities than White participants ($M = 3.42, SD = 1.02$), regardless of his language or skin color, $F(1, 72) = 3.65, p = .06, \eta_p^2 = .05$, whereas there was no effect of participant race on the biethnic candidate's perceived commitment to minority communities, $F(1, 79) = 0.53, p = .47, ns$. No other main effects or interactions emerged (all p s > .11).

Perceived SES. There was a marginal main effect of skin color such that the darker candidate ($M = 4.09, SD = 0.88$) was seen as lower in SES than the lighter candidate ($M = 3.84, SD = 0.77, F(1, 151) = 2.78, p = .10, \eta_p^2 = .02$). No other main effects or interactions emerged (all p s > .20).

Perceived immigrant status. There was a significant main effect of skin tone such that the darker candidate ($M = 3.57, SD = 1.03$) was viewed as more of an immigrant than the lighter candidate ($M = 3.18, SD = 1.29, F(1, 151) = 4.79, p = .03, \eta_p^2 = .03$), which was qualified by a significant interaction with participant race, $F(1, 151) = 5.13, p = .03, \eta_p^2 = .03$. Minorities viewed the target as more of an immigrant when he was described as darker ($M = 3.88, SD = 0.95$) versus lighter ($M = 3.04, SD = 1.30$) in skin color, $F(1, 70) = 10.35, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .13$, whereas there was no similar effect of skin color for Whites, $F(1, 93) = 0.01, p = .95, ns$. No other main effects or interactions emerged (all p s > .14).

Mediation Analysis

We tested two separate mediation models (Latino categorization and perceived minority commitment) to explain the effect of language on resource distribution using the same procedures described in Study 1 (i.e., computing 95% confidence intervals of the mediated effect using the PROCESS program). In the first mediation, we again examined whether Latino categorization mediated the effect of language on minority resource distribution for the biethnic, but not the monoethnic, Latino target using the same method described in Study 1. However, because we found the disambiguating effect of language on Latino categorization only for White participants in Study 2, we examined this effect separately for White and minority participants. For White participants, the confidence intervals for the mediated effect did not include zero for the biethnic target (lower bound = .01, higher bound = .43), but they did include zero for the monoethnic target (lower bound = -.17, higher bound = .11). For minority participants, the confidence intervals for the mediated effect included zero for both the biethnic (lower bound = -.29, higher bound = .13) and monoethnic

(lower bound = $-.36$, higher bound = $.03$) target. Moreover, for White participants, the original effect of language on the biethnic target's minority resource deservingness reduced to nonsignificance (from $\beta = .90$, $p = .03$ to $\beta = .75$, $p = .09$) when Latino categorization was included in the regression equation. Thus, we established that Latino categorization fully mediated the effect of resource distribution to the biethnic target for White, but not minority, participants.

In the second mediation, we tested whether perceived minority commitment mediated the effect of language on minority resource distribution for the biethnic, but not the monoethnic, Latino target. Because the effect of language on the target's perceived minority commitment was not qualified by participant race, we examined this mediation for White and minority perceivers together. To do so, we regressed minority resource (DV) on language (IV), with perceived minority commitment and candidate ancestry entered as the respective mediator and moderator, in the PROCESS program. The confidence intervals for the mediated effect did not include zero for the biethnic target (lower bound = $.05$, higher bound = $.48$), but they did include zero for the monoethnic target (lower bound = $-.09$, higher bound = $.31$), suggesting that the biethnic target's perceived commitment to minority communities mediated the effect of language fluency on resource distribution. The original effect of language on the biethnic target's minority resource deservingness reduced in significance (from $\beta = .70$, $p = .03$ to $\beta = .58$, $p = .05$) when perceived minority commitment was included in the regression equation. Therefore, we concluded that we established partial mediation. Further in support of this notion, in both studies Latino categorization and minority resources were only found to be correlated for the Latino target who had White/European ancestry.

Furthermore, we ruled out alternate mediators of the effect of language on minority resource distribution for the biethnic target. Consistent with the ANOVA analyses, for the biethnic target, language did not predict either perceived SES ($\beta = -.08$, $p = .65$, *ns*) or perceived immigrant status ($\beta = .14$, $p = .61$, *ns*), and perceived SES alone correlated with Latino categorization and resource distribution (see Table 4). Moreover, 95% confidence intervals for the mediated effect of both perceived socioeconomic status (lower = $-.09$, upper = $.05$) and perceived immigrant status (lower = $-.06$, upper = $.11$) included zero. Thus, perceived SES or perceived immigrant status are not suitable alternate mediators of the effect of language on minority resource distribution.

Discussion

In summary, Study 2 replicated the general pattern of disambiguating effects of Spanish fluency on Latino

categorization for biethnic targets, demonstrating that cultural practices along with skin color aid in perceivers' categorization of biethnic targets. However, the disambiguating effect of language (along with skin color) on Latino categorization was only found for White participants; minority participants relied on skin color alone to determine the Latino categorization of the biethnic Latino candidate. Study 2 also replicated the main effects of ancestry and language, with the addition of skin color, in determining allocation of minority resources. That is, for all Latino targets (and for all non-Latino perceivers), prototypicality of ancestry, Spanish fluency, and skin color facilitate the allocation of minority resources. Moreover, although Spanish fluency declines with generation status and acculturation, only skin color, and not language, was found to be related significantly to immigrant status for minority participants and marginally to SES regardless of participant race.

Study 2 also found that the effect of language on resource distribution to the biethnic target was mediated by Latino categorization for White perceivers, and by perceived commitment to minority communities by both White and minority perceivers. White perceivers, therefore, were found to distribute minority resources to biethnic targets if they also viewed them as either more of a member of a particular minority group (Latino) or more committed to the general minority community. However, when skin tone was also made salient to minority perceivers, they distributed more minority resources to biethnic Latinos whom they viewed as more committed to the greater community of racial and ethnic minorities. Latino/White biethnic minorities, therefore, may be perceived as less Latino if they do not speak Spanish, but they may still be considered a minority eligible for minority resources if they seem committed to minority communities. These mechanisms provide a first step in clarifying the differential effects of language on Latino categorization and minority resource distribution.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The present research demonstrates the important role of culture, construed as fluency in a language, in the categorization and perception processes that guide the distribution of minority resources to minority group members. We found that the Latino cultural practice of Spanish fluency, along with skin color, disambiguated Latino targets' categorization only when he was described as having part-White/European ancestry, though perhaps only for White perceivers. We also found that Latino targets who were proficient in Spanish were perceived as most worthy of minority resources, as were targets who had darker skin color and monoethnic Latino ancestry. Together these studies demonstrate how culture and skin

color serve to define ethnicity primarily for difficult-to-categorize Latino (i.e., Latino/White biethnic) targets, yet also (together with ancestry) determine the allocation of minority resources to all Latino targets.

In addition, the data suggested some possible points of distinction between White and minority perceivers' judgments of Latinos. Most notably, when both language and skin color were made salient in categorization tasks, Whites relied on both skin color and language fluency to disambiguate the biethnic Latino's categorization, but minorities used only skin color. Minorities also viewed the target as an immigrant more when he was described as darker versus lighter in skin color, and the monoethnic target as more committed to minority communities than Whites. Perhaps, the introduction of skin color encouraged non-Latino minorities to focus on the aspects of minority identity that they might share in common with Latinos (i.e., appearance, or skin color) and downplay elements that distinguish them from Latinos (i.e., language, or Spanish fluency), when evaluating the biethnic Latino candidate. Non-Latino minorities, on the other hand, may be more sensitive to skin color as a determinant of categorization and discrimination for minorities, and thus rely more heavily on skin color to inform the categorization of minorities when it is made salient. Alternately, Whites are not beneficiaries of diversity awards, so they have more stringent or different criteria as to who should be eligible for such resources. Given the exploratory nature of the analyses by participant race, future research should be conducted to further investigate its role in similar judgments.⁴

Moreover, we found two mechanisms that accounted for the advantage that Spanish-speaking biethnic Latinos had over non-Spanish-speaking biethnic Latinos in the distribution of minority resources. Specifically, when the biethnic target's skin color was prominent in decisions regarding the distribution of minority resources, Whites distributed resources to him because they viewed him as either a member of a particular minority group (as Latino

or as perceived commitment to minority communities, whereas minorities distributed resources to him only because they viewed him as committed to minority communities. Thus, although our main analyses confirm research demonstrating that White ancestry disadvantages biracial people in minority resource distribution (Good et al., in press; Sanchez & Bonam, 2005; Sanchez et al., 2011), these mechanisms suggest that displaying commitment to minority communities by engaging in cultural practices may be one way to increase biethnic (or biracial) minorities' perceived appropriateness for such resources. These mechanisms also provide some evidence to explain why categorization and minority resource distribution are distinct processes that should not necessarily operate in tandem.

Although broadening the cultural psychology literature to consider culture as a pathway to categorization, our findings are consistent with work demonstrating the role of language in identity and impression formation. The literature also abounds with research demonstrating how accented speech, and most notably non-native accents, affects categorizations and perceptions (e.g., Dailey, Giles, & Jansma, 2005; Dovidio, Gluszek, John, Dittmann, & Lagunes, 2010; Giles & Billings, 2004; Kinzler, Shutts, DeJesus, & Spelke, 2009; Lippi-Green, 1997). Cultural researchers have also asserted the ability of language and other cultural icons (e.g., contexts, symbols) to transmit cultural ideologies to individuals who are members of that particular culture (e.g., Aaker, Benet-Martinez, & Garolera, 2001; Hong et al., 2000). The present research demonstrates that beyond accent, fluency may send cultural information to perceivers who are cultural outgroup members.

At the same time, by examining the role of the cultural practice of Spanish fluency in the categorization of Latinos who have White/European ancestry, this research contributes more broadly to contemporary dialogues concerning the meanings of and relationships among race, ethnicity and culture. Latino populations reveal a challenge to contemporary definitions and categorizations of race and ethnicity because there is confusion about whether to define them as an ethnic or racial group (Campbell & Rogalin, 2006; Hitlin, Brown, & Elders, 2007; Navarro, 2012; Sanchez, Shih, & Wilton, 2012). Latinos in the United States do not have an official, distinct Latino racial identity because they are defined as an ethnic group via institutional structures such as the Census. However, in society they are treated as separate from White, Black, and Asian groups and thus as a distinct racial group associated with separate stereotypes (see Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002) and perceptions (e.g., as less American than Blacks or Whites; Dovidio et al., 2010). Thus, it is important to examine components of culture and race that influence perceptions of Latinos, who are a varied and diverse ethnic minority group in the

⁴Members of racial and ethnic minority groups tend to be considered deserving of diversity awards based on their group's historical experiences with disadvantage. African Americans and Asian Americans both belong to racial minority groups, but the former are typically considered to be historically disadvantaged and thus deserving of diversity awards whereas the latter are not. We were unable to test whether there were differences between participants' racial group memberships according to whether they were members of potentially nonbeneficiary (e.g., White or Asian) or beneficiary (e.g., Black or "other" race) groups because we did not have enough Black or "other" race participants (18 in Study 1; 24 in Study 2). Notably, however, the general pattern of results still hold across both studies when only (a) Asian Americans or (b) Asian Americans and Whites are included in the analysis. However, the effect of the language cue in Latino categorization and resource distribution may be dampened for Asian American perceivers when Asian American and White participants are contrasted in the factorial design (e.g., participant race is coded as Asian American vs. White).

United States, because doing so addresses the inherent ambiguity and difficulty of racial categorization.

Researchers have also noted the challenge biracial populations present to contemporary definitions and categorizations of race and ethnicity (Ho et al., 2011; Shih & Sanchez, 2005; 2009). However, the scant research on biracial categorization has focused largely on automatic judgments based on either physical appearance (e.g., biracial faces) or ancestry (not both), and on targets of White and either Asian or Black descent (not Latinos). Thus biracial research often fails to (a) address multiple cues that influence categorization and (b) examine Latino populations, especially individuals of Latino and White/European descent who are not classified as biracial in official government records.

Limitations and Future Research

This research is an important first step in exploring culture among the constellation of prototype cues that may affect categorization and minority resource distribution, but more work is needed. Future work should explore the role of culture, conceived more broadly than language, in person perception and categorization processes, and for other cultural groups of both clearer (e.g., Asians) and ambiguous (e.g., Jews) racial categories. This research could provide important information concerning the ways in which aspects of culture and physical appearance are tied up in meanings and perceptions of race, ethnicity, and culture. For example, would language similarly cue racial categorization for biracial Asian targets, whom perceivers tend to categorize as minority based on aspects of their physical appearance? Or is the disambiguating effect of language limited to ethnic or cultural groups that lack defining physical characteristics but have distinct cultural identities closely associated with a language (such as Jews and Hebrew)? Alternatively, would perceivers infer greater commitment to Latino cultures for Latino targets based on their friendship network (i.e., number of cultural ingroup member friendships) or generation status (i.e., first vs. second vs. third generation)? In addition, future research should examine if the disambiguating effect of Spanish fluency on categorization of biethnic Latino targets would extend to automatic categorization tasks (in which perceivers tend to categorize targets as minority more than as multiethnic or White), as well as explore possible mediators of the effect of culture on such categorization processes. Finally, although we only found evidence for a marginal and significant effect of skin tone on perceived socioeconomic and immigrant status, respectively, future research could manipulate these factors to explore if they have a causal role in perception and categorization processes.

Last, we acknowledge that there is some difficulty associated with comparing secondary language fluency in

French as compared to Spanish in the context of this study. Namely, it may be considered unlikely that any individual with Latino ancestry would develop secondary language fluency in French and not Spanish, at least in the United States where Spanish could be easily studied in most secondary schools even if it is not learned at home (e.g., Branaman & Rhodes, 1997). Thus, a Latino who spoke French and not Spanish would not likely be considered a particularly committed member of the Latino community. Alternately, perceivers could have inferred that the French-speaking Latinos in the study were European, which is an ethnic identity that is not typically considered to be underrepresented and thus deserving of minority resources. Notably, we included a secondary language in our control condition to reduce perceived differences in competence that may have occurred when comparing dual language speakers to single language speakers (Sanchez & Chavez, 2010). In the future, manipulations should include a condition wherein the absence of Spanish speaking was also included.

Conclusion

The role of language in the categorization of and distribution of minority resources to Latino targets, including those of Latino/White biethnic ancestry, is an important and understudied area of research. The present research reveals how distinctive elements of a group's culture may transmit important information to perceivers and influence greater perceptual processes including whom to categorize as Latino and whom should be considered worthy of minority resources and other diversity-based awards. The present studies highlight the multiple prototype features that determine category fit and category-based judgments and conclude that both culture and color influence Latino categorization and resource distribution, though likely via different processes.

REFERENCES

- Aaker, J. L., Benet-Martinez, V., & Garolera, J. (2001). Consumption symbols as carriers of culture: A study of Japanese and Spanish brand personality constructs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 492–508.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Antshel, K. M. (2002). Integrating culture as a means of improving treatment adherence in the Latino population. *Psychology, Health & Medicine, 7*, 435–449.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 1173–1182.
- Benet-Martinez, V., & Oishi, S. (2008). Culture and personality. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 542–567). New York, NY: Guilford.

- Blair, I. V., Judd, C. M., & Chappleau, K. M. (2004). The influence of Afrocentric facial features in criminal sentencing. *Psychological Science, 15*, 674–679.
- Blair, I. V., Judd, C. M., & Fallman, J. L. (2004). The automaticity of race and Afrocentric facial features in social judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*, 763–778.
- Branaman, L., & Rhodes, N. (1997). Foreign language instruction in the United States: A national survey of elementary and secondary schools. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/topics/fl/flsurvey97exec-summary.pdf>
- Brutus, S., Parra, L. F., Hunter, M., Perry, B., & Ducharme, F. (1998). Attitudes toward Affirmative Action in the United States and Canada. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 12*, 515–533.
- Campbell, M. E., & Rogalin, C. (2006). Categorical imperatives: The interaction of Latino and racial identification. *Social Science Quarterly, 87*, 106–128.
- Castillo, L. G., Conoley, C. W., Brossart, D. F., & Quiros, A. (2007). Construction and validation of the intragroup marginalization inventory. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 13*, 232–240.
- Castillo, M., & Basu, M. (2012). Hispanics spell out why labels don't fit. Retrieved from <http://inamerica.blogs.cnn.com/2012/04/04/hispanics-spell-out-why-labels-dont-fit/>
- Chavez, N. R., & French, S. E. (2007). Ethnicity-related stressors and mental health in Latino Americans: The moderating role of parental racial socialization. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 37*, 1974–1998.
- Chen, J. M., & Hamilton, D. L. (2012). Natural ambiguities: Racial categorization of multiracial individuals. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*(1), 152–164.
- Chiu, C., & Hong, Y. (2007). Cultural processes: Basic principles. In E. T. Higgins & A. E. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 785–809). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Corza, S. (2009). Latinos who don't speak Spanish object to getting criticized for it. Readingeagle.com. Retrieved from <http://readingeagle.com/article.aspx?id=122043>
- Dailey, R., Giles, H., & Jansma, L. (2005). Language attitudes in an Anglo-Hispanic context: The role of the linguistic landscape. *Language & Communication, 25*, 27–38.
- Dovidio, J. F., Gluszek, A., John, M.-S., Dittmann, R., & Lagunes, P. (2010). Understanding Bias toward Latinos: Discrimination, dimensions of difference, and experience of exclusion. *Journal of Social Issues, 66*, 59–78.
- Espino, R., & Franz, M. M. (2002). Latino phenotypic discrimination revisited: The impact of skin color on occupational status. *Social Science Quarterly, 83*, 612–623.
- Fiske, S. T. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 4, pp. 357–411). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 878–902.
- Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). *Social cognition* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Freeman, J. B., Penner, A. M., Saperstein, A., Scheutz, M., & Ambady, N. (2011). Looking the part: Social status cues shape race perception. *PLoS ONE, 6*, e25107. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0025107.
- Giles, H., & Billings, A. (2004). Language attitudes. In A. Davies & E. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 187–209). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Gluszek, A., & Dovidio, J. F. (2010). The way they speak: A social psychological perspective on the stigma of nonnative accents in communication. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 14*, 214–237.
- Good, J. J., Sanchez, D. T., & Chavez, G. (in press). White ancestry in perceptions of Black/White biracial individuals: Implications for affirmative action contexts. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*.
- Hayes, A. F. (2012). PROCESS: A versatile computational tool for observed variable mediation, moderation, and conditional process modeling [White paper]. Retrieved from <http://www.afhayes.com/public/process2012.pdf>
- Hilliar, K. F., & Kemp, R. I. (2008). Barack Obama or Barry Dunham?: The appearance of multiracial faces is affected by the names assigned to them. *Perception, 37*, 1605–1608.
- Hitlin, S. J., Brown, S., & Elder, G. H. (2007). Measuring Latinos: Racial classification and self-understandings. *Social Forces, 86*, 587–611.
- Ho, A. K., Sidanius, J., Levin, D. T., & Banaji, M. R. (2011). Evidence for hypodescent and racial hierarchy in the categorization and perception of biracial individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*, 492–506.
- Hong, Y.-y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C.-y., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist, 55*, 709–720.
- Kinzler, K. D., Shutts, K., DeJesus, J., & Spelke, E. S. (2009). Accent trumps race in guiding children's social preferences. *Social Cognition, 27*(4), 623–634. doi:10.1521/soco.2009.27.4.623
- Kravitz, D. A., Klineberg, S. L., Avery, D. R., Nguyen, A. K., Lund, C., & Fu, E. J. (2000). Attitudes toward affirmative action: Correlations with demographic variables and with beliefs about targets, actions, and economic effects. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*, 1109–1136.
- Kravitz, D. A., & Platania, J. (1993). Attitudes and beliefs about affirmative action: Effects of target and of respondent sex and ethnicity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 928–938.
- Lau, I. Y.-m., Lee, S.-l., & Chiu, C.-y. (2004). Language, cognition, and reality: Constructing shared meanings through communication. In M. Schaller & C. S. Crandall (Eds.), *The psychological foundations of culture* (pp. 77–100). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Levin, D. T., & Banaji, M. R. (2006). Distortions in the perceived lightness of faces: The role of race categories. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 135*, 501–512.
- Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with accents: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Livingston, R. W., & Brewer, M. B. (2002). What are we really priming? Cue-based versus category-based processing of facial stimuli. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 5–18.
- MacLin, O. H., & Malpass, R. S. (2001). Racial categorization of faces. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 7*, 98–118.
- Macrae, C. N., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2000). Social cognition: Thinking categorically about others. *Annual Review of Psychology, 51*, 93–120.
- Maddox, K. B. (2004). Perspectives on racial phenotypicity bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 8*, 383–401.
- Markus, H. R. (2008). Who am I? Race, ethnicity and identity. In H. R. Markus & P. M. Moya (Eds.), *Doing race: 21 essays for the 21st century* (pp. 359–389). New York, NY: Norton.
- Minear, M., & Park, D. C. (2004). A lifespan database of adult facial stimuli. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers, 36*, 630–633.
- Navarro, M. (2012). For many Latinos, racial identity is more culture than color. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/>
- Oboler, S. (1995). *Ethnic labels, Latino lives: Identity and the politics of (re)presentation in the United States*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Padilla, A. M. (2008). Developmental processes related to intergenerational transmission of culture: Growing up with two cultures. In U. Schönplüg (Ed.), *Cultural transmission psychological, developmental, social, and methodological aspects* (pp. 185–211). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511804670.010>
- Padilla, A. M., & Perez, W. (2003). Acculturation, social identity, and social cognition: A new perspective. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 25*, 35–55.
- Parra, L. F. (1991). *Development of an attitude toward affirmative action scale* (Unpublished master's thesis). Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University.

- Peery, D., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2008). Black + White = Black. Hypodescent in reflexive categorization of racially ambiguous faces. *Psychological Science, 19*, 973–977.
- Penner, A. M., & Saperstein, A. (2008). How social status shapes race. *Proceedings from the National Academy of Sciences United States of America, 105*, 19628–19630.
- Preacher, K. J., Rucker, D. D., & Hayes, A. F. (2007). Addressing moderated mediation hypotheses: Theory, methods, and prescriptions. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 42*, 185–227.
- Rumbaut, R. G., Massey, D. S., & Bean, F. D. (2006). Linguistic life expectancies: Immigrant language retention in Southern California. *Population and Development Review, 32*, 447–460.
- Sanchez, D. T., & Bonam, C. M. (2005). To disclose or not to disclose: The effect of biracial disclosure on perceiver evaluations and target responses. *Journal of Social Issues, 65*, 129–149.
- Sanchez, D. T., & Chavez, G. (2010). Are you minority enough? Language ability affects targets' and perceivers' assessments of minority status. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 32*, 99–107.
- Sanchez, D. T., Chavez, G., Good, J. J., & Wilton, L. S. (2012). The language of acceptance: Spanish proficiency and perceived intragroup rejection among Latinos. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 43*, 1019–1033.
- Sanchez, D. T., Good, J. J., & Chavez, G. (2011). Blood quantum and perceptions of Black/White biracial targets: The Black ancestry prototype model of Affirmative Action. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*, 3–14.
- Sanchez, D. T., Shih, M., & Wilton, L. S. (in press). Multicultural and multiracial: Integrating theory and research. In V. Benet-Martínez, C.-y. Chiu, & Y.-y. Hong (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural identity: Basic and applied perspectives*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Shih, M., & Sanchez, D. T. (2005). Perspectives and research on the positive and negative implications of having multiple racial identities. *Psychological Bulletin, 131*, 569–591.
- Shih, M., & Sanchez, D. T. (2009). When race becomes more complex: Towards understanding the landscape of multiracial identity and experiences. *Journal of Social Issues, 65*, 1–11.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2008). *Facts for features: Hispanic Heritage Month 2008: Sept. 15–Oct. 15*. U.S. Census Bureau News. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/facts_for_features_special_editions/cb08-ff15.html
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). *Section 1: Population*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/01statab/pop.pdf>
- Wedge, D. (2012). Celebrated Latino hire not bilingual. Retrieved from <http://www.bostonherald.com/news/regional/view.bg?articleid=1061119131>
- Yip, T. (2005). Sources of situational variation in ethnic identity and psychological well-being: A palm pilot study of Chinese American students. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 1603–1616.
- Young, D., Sanchez, D. T., Wilton, L. S. (in press). At the crossroads of race: Racial ambiguity and biracial identification influence psychological essentialist thinking. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*.

Copyright of Basic & Applied Social Psychology is the property of Taylor & Francis Ltd and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.