A STUDY IN STUDENT DEVELOPMENT: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LIBERAL ARTS EDUCATION AND RACIAL PREJUDICE

By

PAUL WAYNE INBODY

Bachelor of Arts
Free Will Baptist Bible College
Nashville, Tennessee
1958

Bachelor of Arts
University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma
1967

Master of Arts
University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma
1968

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1972

A STUDY IN STUDENT DEVELOPMENT: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LIBERAL ARTS EDUCATION AND RACIAL PREJUDICE

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

This study is concerned with student development in the area of racial attitudes. The setting is Oral Roberts University, a small, Midwestern school with a religious emphasis. The author has taught at this school during the four years of graduate study and had access to the data used in this study. The study explores a presumed relationship between the liberal arts educational experience and the degree of racial prejudice held by white students toward blacks. The data collected provided an empirical basis for examining this relationship.

I would like to express my appreciation to my major advisor, Dr. Gene Acuff, for his guidance during my graduate study at Oklahoma State University, and especially his assistance throughout this study. Appreciation is also expressed to the other committee members, Dr. Larry Perkins, Dr. Robert Alciatore, and Dr. John Hampton, for their assistance in the research design and the preparation of the final manuscript.

I am especially grateful to Oral Roberts University which provided me with typists, equipment, and supplies. Special thanks for typing and detail are expressed to Mrs. Bonnie Watkins and Mrs. Anna Bell Collins. Mr. Lynn Nichols made the manuscript more readable with his careful editing.

Finally, special gratitude is expressed to my wife, Helen, and children, Marcia, Paula, and Paul, who have come to accept, with resignation (if not patience), my commitment to various projects as a way of life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Liberal arts higher education for many years had as its aim the preparation of persons to interact meaningfully in society. Some educators (Chickering, 1969:IX) feel that the focus has shifted from "men to subjects, from persons to professionals." He contends that:

> Men themselves have become subjects--subjects to majors, to disciplines, to professions, to industries. Higher education and society are mired in frustration and conflict. These conditions will persist until men--not materials, nor systems, nor institutions--again become the focus of education and the focus of human concern.

Student Development and Education

Freeing of Interpersonal Relations

Others share in this person-centered educational philosophy and speak in terms of student development. "Freeing of interpersonal relationships" is a phrase used by White (1958:343) to describe one of the four major "growth trends" for young adults.

In White's description of this trend of change he stated that:

> Social interaction becomes more free not only from neurotic trends but also from the impulsive inconsiderateness and egocentricity of youth. The person learns not to be so immersed in his own behavior, so intent on the impression he is making or the point he is trying to put across that he fails to perceive the people around him. He becomes increasingly able to interact, responding in the way that is related to their responses. As he moves in this direction he develops a greater range and flexibility of

> responses. . . . The person moves in the direction of increased capacity to live in real relationship with people around him.

All of us are aware that it is not easy to see persons as they really are. We need to respond to people as individuals rather than stereotypic representatives of some minority group.

Tolerance

Student development involves the aspect of increased tolerance and respect for persons of different backgrounds, habits, values, and appearance. Tolerance is explained by Chickering (1969:94):

> By increased tolerance we mean not simply an improved capacity for teeth gritting and tongue biting in the face of those who differ nor the development of calluses and screening devices that shield us from, or obscure, the values and behaviors of others that might threaten our own sheltered and carefully protected structure. Instead we refer to an increasing openness and acceptance of diversity which allows our own sensitivities to expand and which increases the range of alternatives for satisfying exchanges and for close and lasting friendships.

The present study was designed to examine the relationship between a liberal arts education and the above aspect of student development called tolerance. It was to determine if liberal arts education functions as a humanizing agent in reducing racial prejudice.

College and Development

Chickering identified societal conditions that contribute to a new developmental period for the individual. Some of these conditions include complexity of life, demand for highly skilled and specialized personnel in the marketplace today, and the fact that more than

one-half of the college-age population who finish high school are now enrolled in higher education. According to the American Council on Education report (1970:71), more than 8 1/2 million people were enrolled in higher education. Because so many youth are subjected to the conditions of higher education, Chickering (1969:2) suggested certain changes may be fostered and certain adjustments may be expected:

> Developmental changes do occur during this period. Numerous cross-sectional and longitudinal studies of college students indicate that changes occur in attitudes, interests, values, future plans and aspirations, openness to impulses and emotions, personal integration, and intellectual ability. Such changes have been found for diverse students in diverse institutions. Some of these changes are shared by those who do not attend college; but college does make a difference.

Trent and Medsker (1968:149) pointed out that: "It is, after all, an avowed purpose of many colleges to provide a general, liberating education designed to promote critical, autonomous, and informed thinking." Trent and Medsker (1968:176) concluded that the development of open-mindedness and other related characteristics most distinguished the college attenders from noncollege people:

> Definitely there was a strong relationship between entrance to and length of stay in college and the growth of open-minded, flexible, and autonomous disposition as measured by two scales designed to assess these traits.

It was also found that college attenders are more tolerant and objective than similarly bright nonattenders. The scores of college dropouts fell between the college graduates and the nonattenders. Many feel that a developmental period does exist between adolescence and adulthood during which certain kinds of experiences such as liberal arts education can have substantial impact.

Liberal Arts Education and Oral Roberts University

It is difficult to sharply define liberal arts education. Oral Roberts University professes to be a liberal arts college with a major emphasis of study in some 20 areas or disciplines. Oral Roberts University is located in Tulsa, Oklahoma, (approximately 330,000 population) but draws more than 1,300 students from 49 states and 25 foreign countries. Oral Roberts University is a religious liberal arts institution with the following stated purpose (Oral Roberts University Bulletin:20):

> It is the purpose of Oral Roberts University, in its commitment to the historic Christian faith, to assist the student in his quest for knowledge of his relationship to God, man, and the universe. Dedicated to the realization of Truth and the achievement of one's potential life capacity, the University seeks to graduate an integrated person -- spiritually alive, intellectually alert, and physically disciplined.
>
> To accomplish this purpose, Oral Roberts University seeks a synthesis of the best traditions of a liberal arts education with a Charismatic concern -- healing for the totality of human need.

Oral Roberts University is a private, nonsectarian, coeducational institution governed by a board of regents. While named a university (because of the future intent in graduate studies) it now has only an undergraduate curriculum. According to The College Bulletin (1971:24), this undergraduate curriculum places special emphasis on "biblical theism and the liberal arts tradition, with courses prescribed in the great areas of knowledge: biblical studies, humanities, fine arts, social sciences, natural sciences, and mathematics."

American higher education has debated whether its function is to prepare a liberally educated citizenry for roles in a democratic society

or to prepare persons for a continually expanding list of professions. These are not always opposites as can be seen from the history of early colleges which provided basic education for many ministers, teachers, and lawyers. Classical languages and their literatures, philosophy, and theology, which constituted the liberal arts of earlier days, were the basic subjects. Historical researchers of education (Dressel et al., 1959:1-2) pointed out that:

> As models of the eastern seaboard colleges were carried westward to bring a degree of higher learning to these areas, the concept of a liberal arts curriculum was adopted. From the colonial period onward colleges had accepted as their chief purpose the provision of liberal arts education to students who might enter a number of different vocations or fields of leadership.
>
> Later in the 19th century as science and modern languages, history and the social sciences were in turn added to the curriculum and achieved the respectability of designation as one of the liberal arts, the latter lost both unity and identity. Hence no one can today list definitely the subjects included in the liberal arts.

From this historical perspective it is clear that the liberal arts cannot be defined in terms of the disciplines included. The meaning of liberal arts is and will doubtless continue to be ambiguous. There is, then, the tendency to seek refuge in the tautological reasoning that a liberal education is that which emerges from the study of the liberal arts. Since it is difficult to define the liberal arts, it is submitted that any educational experience which contributes to a liberalizing education has equal virtue.

Liberal education, as it was known for centuries in western culture, has passed with the explosive growth in new knowledge in recent years. The various departments in the liberal arts college offer instruction which by design, content, and narrowness of intellectual

methodology is no less vocational than the offerings in the professional schools. In most cases the principal aim of the departments is to offer a sequence of courses preparatory for graduate work. They often have little to do with the interests or the life activities of the great mass of students who have no choice but to pursue them if they want a bachelor of arts or a bachelor of science degree.

General Education

The term general education has been substituted by many (Dressel et al., 1959:4,5) for liberal arts:

> Many of the state universities, teachers colleges, and even privately supported technical institutes have moved to introduce more broadly conceived courses in the liberal arts or general education. Michigan State University, for example, instituted its basic college with a program of liberal arts courses required of all students.

Some liberal arts professors who hold to the "purist" approach object to labeling general education synonymous with liberal arts. They disagree with Michigan State and other colleges with similar approaches. However, change has come to education with our technological age, much as it has to other areas of our life. But for many the world situation has shaken their confidence in technology, and with it the assumed superiority of American higher education. Dressel et al., (1959:5) sound the death knell for the Old World liberal arts: "Liberal education today and in the future cannot be what it once was--and it never was what some persons of the present age had perceived it to be."

Weatherford (1960:4) makes a case for general and liberal education through the use of a core curriculum. This approach is to put all students in touch with the classics of our "great cultural heritage."

This general education approach is designed to "provide a minimum of what every educated person should know." Sharing this philosophy, many institutions offer special general education studies with emphasis on our cultural heritage.

Liberal Arts Programs and Purposes

Dressel (1963:17-60) discussed diverse higher education and pointed out that there are at least three types of liberal arts undergraduate programs. One is liberal education of a nonpreparatory nature which is seldom found today. This type helps the person to find the "good life" and become a "better citizen" as a result of grappling with the ideas of timeless import. It may help one incidentally and indirectly to be successful in a vocation. Closely related, but more practical, is the second approach which is perhaps designed to prepare the student for graduate study. A third type of undergraduate program is preprofessional education and perhaps is the most widely spread of the liberal arts programs. The preprofessional is considered by many to be quasi-liberal and is broken up into departments with varying curriculums.

From the literature some generalizations about liberal arts education emerged with considerable clarity. Most educators believe that all students should have liberal arts contact and that this contact should extend through all four years of the students' college careers. Most feel that broadly conceived courses are good and that liberal arts faculty members are conscientiously trying to provide technically oriented students with some liberal arts experience. Another generalization is that the liberal arts, which most professional groups would like to see required, are those subjects which emphasize general

intellectual skills of use to all without regard to occupation. English, mathematics, and speech, for example, are seen to have direct relevance for all fields.

It should be made clear that a vocational education is not incompatible with liberal education. Perhaps these two programs of study should be viewed as extremes on a continuum. The question is one of balance. It may be easier to say what results from a liberal education than to define liberal education. A liberal education (Dressel 1968:10) results in (1) knowledge of basic cultural heritage, (2) competency in utilizing the modes of thought characteristic of the major areas of human knowledge, (3) competency in communicating, and (4) conscious commitment to a set of values. . . .

Some authors have noted that in any democracy education is closely bound to the wishes of the people, but the strength of this bond in America has been unique. While less-developed societies have been content to pass on their culture, the American people have traditionally regarded education as a means for improving themselves and their society. The NEA (1961:1) pointed out that this includes personal improvement:

> The American commitment to the free society -- to individual dignity, to personal liberty, to equality of opportunity -- has set the frame in which the American school grew. The basic American value, respect for the individual, has led to one of the major charges which the American people have placed on their schools: to foster that development of individual capacities which will enable each human being to become the best person he is capable of becoming.

This statement expresses well the manifest goals at Oral Roberts University. Oral Roberts University is committed to the development of the "whole man," i.e., the mental, physical, and spiritual. In verbal pronouncements and written material the student is constantly urged to

"recognize all men as equal" and in general to become "all that one can be." These manifest goals call for a diminishing of prejudice and an increase of tolerance toward other races or minority groups.

Discussion of Problem

Static vs. Dynamic Personality Development

A study of attitudinal change in a liberal arts setting merits special attention. Contrary to those behavioral scientists who stress that basic personality structure is established early in childhood, Trent and Medsker (1968:1) observed:

> Now there is a growing emphasis on the view that although the effect of early environment is critical, there is potential for change, growth, and personality development at all stages of life, and particularly in adolescence and early adulthood.

This idea of continual change through life-long socialization is in keeping with Mead, Cooley, and other major theorists of the symbolic interaction school of sociological thought. One can readily see the implications of such theorizing for higher education. We do know from the authors previously cited that the college experience has generally had a liberalizing effect on various attitudes. More specifically, we are concerned with the relationship between the liberal arts college experience at Oral Roberts University and the racial attitudes held by whites toward blacks as expressed in social distance. The problem was that of measuring the degree of relationship between the liberal arts experience at Oral Roberts University and racial prejudice.

The purpose of this study was to examine the question of the relationship between liberal arts education and racial-attitude change. In doing so a contribution could be made to the growing

research concerning the phenomenon of student development in the college setting. There is mounting evidence (Bugelski and Lester, 1940:319-22; Nelson, 1954:373; Newcomb, et al., 1967; Trent and Medsker, 1968; and Chickering, 1969) that patterns established during this time may tend to persist long into adulthood. If this is true, then the author of the present study believes that a college has a responsibility to society to deliberately provide learning experiences for young people in college that will enable them to achieve maximum personal development. In order to more satisfactorily adjust to life in a pluralistic society that is increasingly polarized into ethnic groups, tolerance for ethnocentric differences is considered highly desirable.

Prejudice as an Attitude

The vector of student development being examined involves developing tolerance for a wide range of different types of persons. Primarily, this was an attitudinal study concerned with student development in the area of racial attitudes held by white seniors toward blacks at Oral Roberts University. It explored the attitudes of the white majority toward a minority of blacks in a liberal arts educational setting.

Prejudice, as expressed in social distance allowed blacks by whites, is the attitude under consideration in this study. The question considered is, how much tolerance do white seniors hold for black classmates? Tolerance means not only to "put up with," but also the capacity to engage in personal interaction that earlier caused distress. Chickering (1969:15) explained that:

> Ideally, this tolerance develops not through increased resistance and immunization, but through increased capacity to respond to persons in their own right rather than as sterotypes or transference objects calling for particular conventions.

The Nature of Attitudes

Thomas and Zaniecki are credited by Allport (1954:3-56) for the concept of attitude. The behavioral scientist must include attitudes in his domain because they have to do with the valuations of objects, ideas, and people. The concept of attitude is important in its implications for studying complex human behavior.

Attitude is often defined as a predisposition to behave in a particular way toward a given object. If you assume that man acts according to his predispositions, then it would be possible to predict his response to a stimulus if his attitude toward it were known. However, studies (Lapiere, 1934, and Katz and Stotland, 1959) showed that people do not always act toward a stimulus as indicated by expressed attitudes.

One problem in using expressed attitudes to predict behavior is that attitudes seldom exist as separate entities. Attitudes must be seen as parts of "complex attitude constellations or value systems" (Wagner and Sherwood, 1969:2). If a white person has a negative attitude toward a black person, one cannot predict that he will avoid the black person completely. To do this would be impolite in a social-educational setting and perhaps would cause others to be prejudiced toward the white actor. Though reservations must be taken into consideration, many behavioral scientists (Katz and Stotland, 1959:423-475) believe that attitudes are important as predictors of action.

Components of Attitudes

Wagner and Sherwood (1969:3) pointed out that:

> An attitude is composed of affective, cognitive, and behavioral components that correspond, respectively to one's evaluations of, knowledge of, and predisposition to act toward the object of the attitude.

In considering a white student's attitude toward a black student, the affective component would refer to the white person's evaluation of the black person. This would deal with such questions as whether the black is a nice person or a good student. The cognitive component would include the white student's knowledge or beliefs about the black student. The behavioral component would refer to the white person's predisposition to act toward the black student and would include the social distance that the white student would willingly allow the black student.

For the purposes of the present study, an attitude should be distinguished from other related concepts. For example, Wagner (1969:3) delineates the difference between attitude and opinion, belief, and value:

> The difference between an attitude and an opinion is quite simple: an opinion is merely the verbal expression of an attitude. The difference between an attitude and a belief is slightly more complex: an attitude always includes evaluation of an object (the affective component), whereas a belief does not. One is expressing a belief about a woman, for example, when he says, 'her measurements are 36-26-36'. The belief becomes an attitude when he adds, 'I like those measurements!'
>
> The difference between an attitude and a value is one of inclusiveness or scope: attitude refers to an orientation toward one object, whereas value implies an orientation toward a series or class of related objects. Thus a value is often a collection of attitudes. For example, one may have a particular religious value system that is the constellation of all of one's individual attitudes toward various facets of religion.

Definition of Attitudes

One does not see an attitude, but can only infer that it exists as a result of some overt action or expression. Therefore, an attitude cannot be measured directly. Thurstone (1963:216) pointed out that:

> The concept attitude is used to denote the sum total of a man's inclinations and feelings, prejudice or bias, preconceived notions, ideas, fears, threats, and convictions about any specified topic . . . . It is admittedly a subjective and personal affair.

There are as many specific definitions of attitudes as there are writers. Newcomb (1961:880) defines attitudes as:

> primarily a way of being set toward or against certain things which restricts the state of readiness or "set" to react toward or against and implies evaluation pro or con.

Rosenberg (1960:371) pointed out that some definitions of attitude focus on the affective tendency to favorable evaluation of objects and entirely disregard the notion that any overt behavior is implied. However, Rosenberg (1960:367) disagrees with such definitions and defines attitude as ". . . a relatively stable affective response to an object."

No study of attitudes would be complete without a definition from Allport, a pioneer in attitude studies (1935:444), who views an attitude as:

> . . . a mental or neural state of readiness, organized through experience exerting directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related.

Secord and Backman (1964:97) provided us with a more complete operational definition of attitude which is in keeping with the composition of attitudes as presented earlier by Wagner and Sherwood:

> The term attitude refers to certain regularities of an individual's feelings, thoughts, and predispositions to act toward some aspect of his environment. Feelings are often referred to as the affective component, thoughts as the cognitive component, and predispositions to act as the behavioral component.

Attitude measurement is further explained by English and English (1958: 11):

> An attitude is usually thought of as a hypothetical construct, not directly open to observation but inferred from verbal expression or overt behavior. A hypothetical construct is 'an entity or process that is inferred as actually existing . . . and as giving rise to measurable phenomena, including phenomena other than the observables that led to hypothesizing the construct'.

Formation of Attitudes

Since this was an attitudinal study which involved expressed prejudice, we were concerned about how the attitude of prejudice is formed. However, we were primarily concerned about how attitudes change, especially in relation to liberal arts education.

Most authors agree that attitudes are learned. If this is true, then the learning, retention, or decline of a prejudicial attitude follows the same process as any other learning experience. It involves the processes of perception and motivation. The present study of attitude change is related to the prejudice held by one group toward another, as expressed in social distance.

It is generally agreed that attitudes develop when a person adopts behavior derived from another person or group because the behavior is personally satisfying and assessed by the actor as pleasing to the group or person. This process in turn builds the self-esteem of the actor as he perceives that he is accepted and approved by the reference group or significant others.

Sherif (1965:203) concurred with the above symbolic interaction process. He believes attitudes are not momentary and that social attitudes have motivational and emotional properties. When attitudes develop, a person is no longer neutral, but is for or against something. Thurstone (Edwards, 1957:2) views an attitude as the degree of positive or negative affect associated with some psychological object such as a symbol, phrase, slogan, person, institution, ideal, or idea toward which people can differ with respect to positive or negative affect. Cohen (1964:105) further contributed to this symbolic interaction theory of attitude development. He suggested that the recognition of the need to validate oneself through the eyes of others provides a basis for understanding the pervasive effect of social interaction on a person's attitudes.

We do not then, form attitudes without regard for others. This is in keeping with the symbolic interaction school of thought proposed by sociologists such as Mead and Cooley. Cooley speaks of self-development socialization as a result of the "looking-glass-self" theory. In this process attitudes are developed as a result of one's judging how one is being received by others. Mead would call this process responding to "significant others" as the individual conforms to the expectations of society.

The presence of another person, performing the same task, commenting or criticizing is sufficient to affect us. Sherif (1965:204) believes that attitudes change even after childhood as a result of patterned interaction with others. The processes of attitude formation and change are important because they have to do with the way people

relate, react, and respond to others. These processes involve more than one person and therefore are social.

In a more gestalt orientation, one must consider the influences of the total environment in attitude formation. Inkles, for example, defines environment as a network of interpersonal relations and the pattern of rewards and punishments one normally experiences in them. He (Inkles, 1960:5) concluded that: " . . . people have experiences, develop attitudes, and form values in response to the forces of pressures which their environment creates."

Attitude Change

Attitudes must be perceived in dynamic terms. That is, attitudes change much the same way as they are formulated and developed, and are related to values, personality, and one's social environment. Wagner (1969:4) identified four contemporary approaches to attitude change: (1) the functional approach, (2) learning theory, (3) perceptual theory, and (4) consistency theory. These approaches are summarized briefly and references cited for those who would like to pursue the various theories in more depth.

In the functional theory it is suggested that attitudes develop and change as they serve to promote or support goals of the individual. Attitudes are instrumental to the satisfaction of one's needs. Katz and Stotland (1959:423-475) contended that attitudes develop and change because they meet psychological needs for the individual. They further suggested that there are four different motivational bases of attitudes: (1) instrumental function, (2) ego-defensive function, (3) value expressive function, (4) knowledge function. Kelman (1961:57-58) is

also a proponent of the functional position and suggested that compliance and identification are key processes in function theory.

Others explained attitude change in learning theory terms. Predictions are made about attitude development and change on the basis of well-known principles of learning such as the effect of primacy and recency of information. Studies on attitude change and learning theory are offered by Hovland and Janis, 1959; Rosenberg, Hovland, McQuire, Abelson and Brehm, 1960.

A third approach to attitude change is related to the person's perception of the object (person or idea) that he is evaluating. Asch (1952) and Sherif (1956) suggested that attitude change is primarily a reinterpretation or redefinition of the object of the attitude. Wagner (1969:12) suggested that this theory lacks clear and concise statement of its basic principles.

The consistency theory is perhaps the most developed of the four theories of attitude change (see Heider, 1946:107-112; Newcomb, 1953: 393-404; Newcomb, 1961; Cartwright and Harary, 1956:277-293; Abelson and Rosenberg, 1960:112-163; Osgood and Tannenbaum, 1955:42-55; Festinger, 1957, and Abelson et al. 1968). These various studies basically set forth the need for cognitive balance and use terms such as symmetry, cycle, system, consistency, congruity, and dissonance.

Attitude of Prejudice

Prejudice was the attitude with which this study was concerned and served as the dependent variable which was to be measured. Barron believes that prejudice is more than a tradition and that it satisfies a psychological need. He (Barron, 1957:32) stated that there are three

popular psychological theories of prejudice. One is the frustration-aggression theory in which prejudice is considered to be a type of aggression which is a universal response to frustration. A second is the projection theory in which people attribute to others motives which they sense in themselves, but which they would not wish to acknowledge openly. The third is symbolic theories of prejudice in which an unfavorable attitude suppressed by society is expressed toward an object which has psychological equivalence to the desired or revered object. All of these theories postulate a need to express antagonism toward something which is not the real object of antagonism. If Barron is correct, then he discredits many of the old theories of prejudice such as biological differences of inferiority, fear, economic competition, power or social control, and unpleasant experiences.

Whatever the source of prejudice may be, it is usually accompanied by incorrect or inadequate beliefs regarding the people to whom it is directed. Prejudice involves stereotyping groups of people which tends to evoke a generalized reaction to any member of the group. These generalizations are oversimplified and emphasize only selected traits of another group. Marden and Meyer (1962:32) explained that the selected trait emphasizes something different from the dominant norm of society. This affects the image of the entire group. It is assumed that the traits are innate, and therefore, give reason for differential treatment.

The present study sought to examine the relationship between liberal arts education and the prejudice held by white seniors toward black students at Oral Roberts University. Many educators believe that liberal arts education will reduce the degree of prejudice. However, other

variables could also contribute to the amount of prejudice held by white students toward their black classmates. These variables were considered in detail in the related literature and the findings. They included: sex, geographic location, residence, socioeconomic status (family education, occupation, and income), political affiliation, and previous interaction with blacks.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE RELATED TO THE VARIABLES OF PREJUDICE

Theoretical and research literature suggested that a variety of socio-psychological factors may contribute to racial prejudice. These aspects were considered variables and were examined separately. The H_a(alternate hypothesis) was stated for each variable based on the findings in the related literature. The H_o(null hypothesis) was then tested by the findings of this present study. The H_a hypotheses are listed at the end of this chapter.

In a study of racial attitudes, there can be no simple causal answer as to the formation or change of attitudes. In Chapter I, education was presented as the independent variable in this study. In addition to education, it was pointed out that other variables may influence the white student's attitude toward blacks. Some of the literature related to these possible influences is considered below.

Education

Liberal arts education was considered the main independent variable in the study while prejudice (as measured by expressed social distance) was the dependent variable. The present study will determine if students with three years' liberal arts education express less prejudice than entering freshmen of the same institution. The liberal arts seniors were also compared to vocationally oriented students of similar college age to further check the possibility that maturation

could be responsible for any noted difference in prejudice as expressed in social distance.

Various authors (Trent and Medsker, White, and Chickering) have already been cited who believe that college does "make a difference." Chickering (1969:94) talks about freeing interpersonal relationships through education and says that such growth involves ". . . increased tolerance and respect for those of different backgrounds, habits, values, and appearance . . . ." The idea is that people are different and must be treated as individuals. They express various idiosyncrasies which include racial, ethnic, national, and social-class backgrounds. If liberal arts education helps to gain perspective concerning the differences in people, the student should be able to more freely encounter others in a wide range of satisfying relationships.

Education Generally Increases Tolerance

Increased tolerance has been found as a result of college education. Pressey and Robinson (1944) reported that college seniors valued broad-mindedness and ranked it first in a list of admired traits. Eighth-grade students ranked broad-mindedness last after such traits as brave, reliable, quick, cooperative, and funny.

Research at Vassar (Webster, Freedman, and Heist, 1962:97) found that seniors were more flexible and less punitive than freshmen. Jacob (1957:2) also made a study concerning student change in college. He found that "social harmony with an easy tolerance of diversity pervades the student environment."

Williams (1964:50) found that "attitudes of social distance toward Negroes--expressed aversion toward close social interaction--are

less frequent among the well-educated than among the relatively uneducated." This finding was true in all of the geographic regions examined but it ranged from 91 percent among the poorly educated of Southport (South) to only 25 percent in Valley City (Far West).

Significance of the Educational Content

Education is related to a wide variety of social behavior from consumer behavior to political attitudes. Increasingly education is the avenue to economic, social, and occupational mobility. However, all approaches to education are not the same. Bettelheim and Janowitz pointed out that "we must distinguish between education in its 'intellectual' and moral value content, and education as a precondition for occupational probability." The rationale for the hypothesis that "better-educated persons are likely to be less prejudiced" must be considered in the above context. The following statement by Bettelheim and Janowitz (1964:18) expresses the complexity of interaction of the variable and the effect of education on prejudice:

> Education should be positively correlated with tolerance both because of what is socially experienced during the educational process and because of the selective processes that determine who will receive advanced schooling. It can be assumed that the effects of education will be different for different social groups. For example, the higher the socioeconomic position a person starts from, the less effect education will have on intolerant attitudes, because for such persons family and social background have already operated to influence the extent of their tolerant attitudes. But education in a political democracy is designed per se to strengthen one's personal controls and to broaden one's understanding of social reality (in Karl Mannheim's term "substantive rationality"). And both of these social processes are assumed to weaken ethnic prejudice.

Contradictions and Complexities

In particular, many better-educated persons show greater concern about sending their children to school with blacks. This is presumably because the educational standards may be lower. However, Tumin (1958: 193) pointed up an important regional difference in his findings in Guilford County, North Carolina: "The best educated were the most prone to accept integration in the public schools."

Since prejudice is rooted in social and psychological needs, education alone does not consistently bring about a rejection of stereotypes. It appears that the attitudes of the better-educated are more likely to change as a result of particular events, while the less-educated seem more stable in their attitudes. In spite of more education in the United States as a whole, the various data indicate a persistence of prejudice. In other words, it appears that education reduces stereotypes (or at least one's willingness to express stereotypes openly) but there is a limit as to the social distance that even the better-educated whites will allow blacks. It is at the college level of education (when young people are away from the influence of home establishing a new identity) that prejudice is significantly reduced by education. Bettelheim and Janowitz (1964:20) further analyzed the variable of education and its relation to prejudice:

> Education as a separate factor has less consequences at the upper social levels. Within the upper socioeconomic groups, educational differences make less of a difference in prejudice (toward both Negroes and Jews) than at the lower levels. Again education seems to have built-in limitations as an agent of social change for reducing prejudice; those who get the most education have been and are the least likely to be influenced by it per se. If the trend toward a "middle class" society continues, it may well be that the future effects of expanding education will not be as powerful as in the recent past. Or, to put it differently, the

> specific content of education and its personal impact as opposed to amount of it will grow in importance.

More than 25 national surveys could be cited (since 1945), showing that education is related to reduced prejudice. How does one explain the fact that a significant number of college students and graduates hold to stereotypes, and in general express racial prejudice? One basic answer would be that these conditions of remaining prejudices reflect the limits of the educational system. Again, Bettelheim and Janowitz (1964:18) in an analysis of the effect of education on prejudice concluded that:

> The lower levels of prejudice among the better educated seem to involve the social experience of education specifically and not merely the sociological origins of the educated. Throughout most of the United States outside of the South, the content of education involves some indoctrination in a tolerant outlook toward minorities. Thus, to speak of the impact of education involves more than the effort to increase intellectual skills and aptitudes; it involves also exposure to a specific liberal content. In parts of the South where the education system does not contain such a content, the effects of education would be different.

There are some contradictory findings in regard to education and prejudice even though most of the research shows that lower prejudice parallels higher education. In an analysis of data from 26 studies, Stember (1961) showed a more complex pattern:

> The better educated are less prejudiced toward minority groups in some ways, but in others they tend to be more prejudiced. Whether or not they appear to be more tolerant, therefore, depends upon the dimension of prejudice under consideration. For example, they are less likely to subscribe to stereotypes, but more likely to reject intimate relations with members of minority groups. In general, however, the better educated are found to be more tolerant. The evidence indicates that education has an effect on prejudice that is independent of other factors usually associated with high educational status (for example, urbanization and information level).

In Stember's (1961:168) review of the effects of higher education on prejudice he concluded that the better-educated are:

> (a) less likely to hold traditional stereotypes about Jews and Negroes, (b) less likely to favor discriminatory policies, and (c) less apt to reject casual contacts with minority group members. Education seems to reduce a provincial outlook and to weaken primitive misconceptions. On the other hand, the more educated are also: (a) more likely to hold highly charged and derogatory stereotypes, (b) more likely to favor informal discrimination in some areas of behavior, and (c) more apt to reject intimate contacts with minority groups.

The subtleties of the relationship between education and prejudice have been pointed out above. While the better-educated hold less-traditional stereotypes, the limits of social acceptance are sharply drawn by them toward blacks. Covert discrimination continues to exist among the better-educated in such places as the private clubs, dating, and intermarriage. The better-educated continue to maintain a social distance from blacks.

Conclusions on Education and Prejudice

Noel and Pinkney (1964:612), offer some summary statements relative to the interaction of education, socioeconomic variables and prejudice. They concluded that the variables of anti-Negro prejudice and amount of formal education are negatively correlated. They contended that this was the appropriate conclusion from previous studies and also from the data of their particular study. Their qualification of this conclusion, however, was interesting and agreed with Stember. In contrast to some of the more generalized conclusions of the literature they pointed out that:

> This must be qualified, however, in light of a recent reanalysis of over a score of studies which indicates that the relation of education to (anti-Jewish and anti-Negro) prejudice varies with the dimension of prejudice under consideration. The author reports, in contrast with the present finding, that the better educated are more likely to be prejudiced insofar as rejecting intimate relations with Negroes and Jews is concerned. On the other hand, the better educated are less likely to endorse stereotypes.

They further pointed out that: "among whites the effect of education is relatively slight until the college level is reached." This was in keeping with the findings of Kahn (1951:1-39) and Tumin et al., (1958:41-49). These findings did not, however, answer a very pressing question as to whether formal education actually reduces prejudice or whether the more educated are more discreet in expressing their prejudices.

Based on the above cited references and studies, it was expected that seniors would express less prejudice than freshmen in this present study. Therefore it is hypothesized that:

> H_a: White seniors at Oral Roberts University will express less prejudice than incoming white freshmen toward blacks showing a negative relationship between education and prejudice.

Since most of the subjects of the present study are in the age bracket from 18 through 22, the possible variable of age was included in the educational classification. Therefore, age was not considered as a separate variable.

Socioeconomic Class

Within any society there are many standard criteria by which people are evaluated and ranked in the status hierarchy. Vander Zanden (1966:128) provides a list of these criteria: "occupation,

source and size of income, style of life, length and type of education, possession of property, residential neighborhood, type and size of home, rank of associates, leisure-time activities, skill, family, and many more." The present study considered three of the more basic criteria: occupation, income, and education. Since education is the "experimental treatment" of the study, it was considered the primary independent variable and was treated separately in more detail from occupation and income in the review of literature.

Importance of Occupation and Income

Hodges (1964:89) stated that if we accept the structural-functional explanation of social class, then we must agree that the most universal means of status ascription revolves around whatever social roles are functionally essential and demand the virtually continuous participation of those who fulfill such roles. Hodges continued:

> Although no single criterion of social-class placement entirely outweighs all others in complex industrial societies, one in particular appears to meet this two-fold requirement: occupation. And of all the indices of class, none has in fact been used so frequently as "what people do."

The criterion of occupation is perhaps more tangible as well as more objective than any other. Reissman (1959:157) pointed out that occupational measures "seem to catch and concretize the impressions that most people have of the class structure." Kahl (1957:89) stated that social classes are "aggregates of persons with similar amounts of wealth and similar sources of income." Durkheim (1947:182) added strength to the occupation criterion when he observed: "In a general way classes . . . probably have no other origin nor any other nature; they arise

from the multitude of occupational organizations. . . ." It is obvious that the amount of money one makes is an integral part of the occupation criterion.

The college degree and the high school diploma have long been recognized as symbols of social-class rank in America. In fact, one could say that education goes with the "desirable" occupations and wealth. Hodges (1964:139,40) declared that:

> There is no more effectual instrument of occupational placement, material accomplishments, and status recognition than educational attainment. . . . in the America of today there is no more effective a means of massive upward mobility than formal education.

Social Class and Prejudice

What is the relation of social class and prejudice? Obviously there is nothing inherent in one's social class that would "cause" prejudice. However, Hodges (1964:172) pointed out that:

> . . . in virtually every enduring society the stratification system is a central feature of the overall cultural matrix -- an element which exerts an impress upon deep-seated facets of personality. . . . to affirm the relevance of class differences . . . is simply to emphasize that we can say of class-and-personality what must also be said of culture-and-personality: the two are indissolubly linked.

What then is the personality configuration of the classes? Perhaps no one word or phrase would describe a social-class ethos. However, it relates essentially to interpersonal relations and to a basic way of perceiving others. As a result of his study of the "Peninsula People" (1964:405) Hodges described the upper-middle level as "flexible, trusting, democratic, tolerant, and nondogmatic. . . . its antithesis is most relevantly represented by the lower-blue-collarite's character: rigid, defensive, authoritarian, parochial, and suspicious . . . ."

Martin and Westie (1959:523) conducted an empirical comparison of "prejudiced" and "tolerant" subjects. They described the "tolerant" as uniquely "able and willing to perceive graduation, variation, and relativity". These findings were in contrast to the need displayed by the more prejudiced for absolute dichotomies. The intolerants displayed a lesser capacity for compassion, sympathy, and trust. They found that tolerants showed a "significantly high mean occupational status and educational status". This concurred and gave support to the "Peninsula People" study by Hodges.

Allport (1954:240) also called attention to the low correlation between character-conditioned prejudice and higher social-class level. He noted that tolerant children tend to come from homes with permissive atmospheres (a child-rearing quality that is definitely middle to upper-class linked). He observed that:

> They [upper-class children] feel welcome, accepted, loved, no matter what they do . . . the threat orientation so often found in the background of prejudiced children is more or less lacking and tolerance for frustration is relatively high.

Noel and Pinkney (1964:612) found among whites that "the higher the occupational status, the lower the proportion of prejudice." Martin and Westie (1959:521-28) and Westie and Westie (1957:190-96) also reported that high occupational status is associated with low prejudice among whites.

Importance of Education

Williams (1964:53-54) concurred with the above findings of increased prejudice among those in the lower socioeconomic levels and stated that

"it is clear that social-distance prejudice against Negroes tends to be most frequent among white persons in the less well-paid and prestigious types of occupations." Williams pointed out that in his statistical findings, "the correlation between occupation and prejudice toward Negroes almost disappears when amount of education is held constant." This seemed to indicate that education is more important as a socio-economic factor than occupation in reducing prejudice.

Prejudice and Competition

Williams's (1947:59) data supported the theory that "prejudice reflects a sense of threat, and that white gentiles in the upper socio-economic strata are less likely to be prejudiced against Negroes . . ."

Williams explained that anti-minority responses are most common "among those classes which are most vulnerable to competition from the minority." Williams's findings were in keeping with Noel and Pinkney (1964:612) who analyzed the data collected in the Cornell Studies in Intergroup Relations from a sample of 1,430 whites. It is obvious that low-status whites are more frequently in competition with blacks than higher-status whites and therefore would have more reason to express prejudice. However, on the issue of mixed housing, Hunt (1960:196-209) reported that white laborers are more likely to favor mixed housing than are whites of higher occupational status.

A Community Case Study

While the national sample surveys reveal certain generalities, perhaps more could be learned by examining a particular metropolitan community. This type of investigation would rule out regional

differences and allow one to examine the interplay of social stratification and ethnic prejudice.

Data collected in Detroit in 1957 revealed that within the metropolitan community, when occupation is the measure of socioeconomic status, differences emerge in levels of prejudice between and within the middle and working classes. Bettelheim and Janowitz (1964:22) examined these data as presented in Table I.

TABLE I

SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND NEGRO PREJUDICE

Detroit Metropolitan Area Sample: 1957
(Percentage)

	Tolerant	Mildly Intolerant	Strongly Intolerant	Total Percentage	No.
Professional, managerial, and proprietors	32.6	53.3	14.1	100	(92)
Clerical, sales, and kindred	28.9	44.6	26.5	100	(83)
Craftsmen and foremen	31.7	50.0	18.3	100	(82)
Operatives, service, etc.	30.0	33.8	36.2	100	(80)
Number	(104)	(154)	(79)		(337)

> . . . the concentration of persons in the tolerant category remains relatively stable, and the shifts by socioeconomic status are in the strongly intolerant category. The top of the social structure -- the professional and managerial group -- displayed the lowest amount of strong intolerance, while the very bottom -- the operative and service, etc. -- had the highest amount. There was, however, no straight-line progression in the intolerant category as one moved

> down the hierarchy. While the professional and managerial category roughly represented the upper-middle stratum with less prejudice, the lower-middle stratum (clerical, sales, and kindred workers) revealed a markedly higher level. Crossing the white collar-blue collar line, the upper-working-class stratum (craftsmen and foremen) was more tolerant than the lower-middle-class stratum and much like the top professional and managerial group. The lower-working-class group, the most intolerant, was more prejudiced than even the lower-middle class, which is often described impressionistically as being especially prone to extremist attitudes.

They further pointed out that stratification in the metropolitan community involves not only the occupational category but also differential risks of unemployment. The Detroit metropolitan area during the 1950's was representative of the urban center where unemployment has persisted. The incidence of unemployment naturally fell heaviest on the lower socioeconomic strata. The higher level of ethnic hostility expected among the unemployed, as compared with the employed labor force, was found to exist.

Authoritarianism

There is a large body of literature (Adorno et al., 1950) that consistently reports a positive relationship between the variables of authoritarianism and prejudice. It should be noted that there is also a high correlation between authoritarianism and the lower socioeconomic class. Noel and Pinkney (1964:620) found that the Cornell data supported the above conclusions:

> Our findings are consistent with these interpretations inasmuch as socioeconomic status is inversely related ($p = .01$) to authoritarianism among both Negroes and whites.

However, other researchers (Christie, 1954:175; and Riessman and Miller, 1957) have suggested that authoritarian items have different meanings to middle-class and working-class persons and that we must

therefore be very cautious in interpreting the inverse relationship between social class and authoritarianism. Even with this caution, we should take note that lower-status persons are more likely to endorse authoritarian items than are persons of higher status.

Complexities and Conclusions

The bulk of the survey literature revealed that for the population as a whole, and for very broad SEC (socioeconomic class) groupings, there is an association between SEC and certain forms of ethnic prejudice. For example, the upper social groups tend to be more inhibited in their expression of prejudice. The lower socioeconomic are more susceptible to threats by blacks through economic competition and therefore are more verbal in their expressions of prejudice. The relationship between higher social class and prejudice follows the relationship of higher education and prejudice.

However, the middle class cannot be so neatly typed as to extent of prejudice. Those in the new bureaucratic middle-class occupations have a tendency to share the feelings of the upper class. On the other hand, the portion of middle class more exposed to economic competition, and therefore more vulnerable to social change, may hold prejudices similar to the lower class.

The above observations suggest that it is not possible to postulate simple and direct relations between social class and prejudice. It is not enough to "locate" a person in a social class based on some index of factors. It may be more helpful to note the dynamics of social mobility, i.e., how and when did the person reach his socioeconomic position.

Various studies have indicated that there is a definite relationship between downward mobility and prejudice. Bettelheim and Janowitz (1950) investigated World War II veterans and found that the greatest prejudice toward Negroes and Jews was manifested by those who had experienced "sudden downward shifts in occupational status." The minority group was perceived as the "cause" of failure to the unsuccessful veteran and at the same time the focus of his hostility as a result of that failure.

Greenblum and Pearlin (1948:480-91) found a relationship to exist between lack of mobility and prejudice in a study in Elmira, New York. The prejudice found was interpreted as frustration being the psychological consequences of mobility striving. Hodges (1964:210) concluded that:

> There is substantial evidence that ethnic prejudice is linked to social position -- that, in particular, the anti-Negro and anti-"foreigner" is more frequently a lower-class than a middle-class American.

The findings on the socioeconomic variable (occupation and income) paralleled closely the educational variable since both are part of the socioeconomic status index. These findings justify the following hypothesis:

> H_a: There is a negative relationship between social class and expressed prejudice with the white students of lower-class status at Oral Roberts University expressing more prejudice toward blacks than those of higher-class status.

Political Affiliation

The political affiliation of the student's family was not expected to have a great deal of influence on the amount of prejudice held toward

blacks. One reason is that political affiliation is often tied closely with the socioeconomic status. Inference can be made, but it is generally expected that the political-party affiliation will have the same relation to prejudice as socioeconomic status. In a study by Bettelheim and Janowitz (1950:3-5) it was found that:

> Further analysis revealed that the men's actual army experiences bore little relation to their attitude toward ethnic groups, nor was there any significant correlation between intolerance and age . . . religion, political affiliation . . . . There was a close relation, however, between ethnic attitude and social mobility . . . Ethnic hostility proved to be most highly concentrated in the downwardly mobile group . . . .

These conclusions support the previously cited studies that showed that social-class mobility is closely related to the amount of prejudice held by the downwardly mobile. If one can determine which class tends to belong to which political party, it is likely that it can be determined which party holds the most prejudice. It should be understood, however, that political party can have no causative relationship to prejudice outside the matrix of socioeconomic status and other related factors.

However, again the data do not lend themselves to simple conclusions. In some communities one political party tends to solicit and integrate minority groups in political affairs whereas another does not. Political independents are not numerous or easy to analyze. Basically, this study attempted to determine if there is a significant difference between white Republicans and Democrats in expressed prejudice. The Cornell Study revealed (Williams, 1964:63) that Democrats are slightly (but not significantly) more prejudiced than Republicans. When the data were available for comparison it was found that:

> Independent voters were consistently less prejudiced toward Mexican-Americans and Negroes than were either Republicans or Democrats; the difference between independents and Democrats is significant in both cases.

The above data would suggest that individuals who are willing to deviate (independent voters) are more likely to be more tolerant.

While this does not appear to be an important variable, it was interesting to note the relationship found to exist between prejudice and political party. The Democratic party has traditionally been the party of the lower-class (including the Negro). Because of the social class factor and the peculiar position of the independent voters, it was hypothesized that:

> H_a: There is a relationship between the political-party affiliation of the family of the white senior at Oral Roberts University and the degree of prejudice held toward blacks with prejudice expressed in the following descending order: Democrats (highest) Republicans (second-highest) Independents and others (lowest).

Geographic Location

Historical Perspective

What effect does a white person's geographic location have on his attitude toward blacks? If it is really a fact that the white Southerner holds more prejudice toward blacks, why have there been more major race riots in the North and West? A brief historical perspective will help to clarify the situation.

As America grew into a nation, regionalism developed with distinct ideologies regarding the position of the Negro. Williams (1969:590-644) pointed out that the Negro on the southern plantation was considered a commodity to be owned and used. Industrial conditions in the North

made attitudes toward blacks somewhat different. Before 1850, no amount of debate, compromise, or collaboration could reconcile the diverse ideologies. While the Civil War brought legal changes, it may have in fact deepened prejudices.

Prior to the Civil War more than 90 percent of all Negroes lived in the South. Taeuber and Taeuber (1965:11) found that in the beginning of the 20th century, 90 percent of all Negroes still lived in the South. If there was more prejudice in the South, it did not express itself in Negro migration to the North. It was not until generally worsening rural opportunities developed in the South, and industrial expansion in the North in response to World War I, that the first major migration of Negroes to the North took place.

Many changes have taken place in the United States since World War II that would influence prejudice. Bettelheim and Janowitz (1964: 3) contended that:

> The trends of advanced industrialization are generally considered to imply social change in the direction of less prejudice because of three sets of variables: higher levels of education, growth of middle-income occupations and professions, and increased urbanization.

They (Bettelheim and Janowitz, 1964:11) went on to explain that "typical" attitudes toward Negroes have changed during the period 1942-1956 based on the data collected by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago. A summary of that data is presented in Table II.

Changing attitudes have been accompanied by legislation in the past decade. Contrary to the desires of some, official action has preceded public sentiment. For the most part, public sentiment has attempted to accommodate itself to new legislation calling for

desegregation and integration. In many cases these changes have reduced prejudice. Pettigrew (1971) cites several instances of change:

> As discussed earlier, however, improvements in social distance attitudes are often limited to the immediate contact situation itself. Yet basic racist stereotypes are often affected, too. One white housewife in an interracial development put it bluntly: "Living with them my ideas have changed altogether. They're just people . . . they're not any different." Commented another: "I've really come to like it. I see they're just as human as we are." And a Negro officer on an interracial ship off Korea summed it up candidly: "After a while you start thinking of whites as people."
>
> Recent surveys bear out these contact findings on a national scale. Hyman and Sheatsley found that the most extensive racial attitude changes among whites have occurred where extensive desegregation of public facilities had already taken place. And data from the Equal Educational Opportunity Survey--popularly known as "the Coleman Report"--indicate that white students who attend public schools with Negroes are the least likely to prefer all-white classrooms and all-white "close friends"; and this effect is strongest among those who began their interracial schooling in the early grades. Recall, too, the similar findings of the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights for both Negro and white adults who had attended biracial schools as children.

TABLE II

CHANGING ATTITUDES TOWARD NEGROES
National Samples: 1942-1956 (Percentage)

	Northern White Population	Southern White Population	Total U.S. White Population
	"Yes, Negroes are as intelligent as whites"*		
1942	48	20	42
1944	47	28	44
1946	60	33	53
1956	82	59	77

*"In general, do you think Negroes are as intelligent as white people -- that is, can they learn things just as well if they are given the same education and training?" Data collected by the National Research Center.

Social Change and Social Distance

While there have been notable changes in racial attitudes as expressed in the various studies, the change has not been complete. The particular area of prejudice that this study was concerned with was social distance. Trends in response to social-distance questions from national samples highlight the intensity and persistence of prejudice toward the black even during this period of apparent social change. There was very little change in attitudes toward racial intermarriage from 1948 to 1958. Bettelheim and Janowitz (1964:12-13) observed that in answer to the blunt question, "do you approve or disapprove of marriage between white and colored people?"

> Four percent approved as of 1958 and most of the approval was among college graduates. By contrast, there was the marked decline in prejudice against Negroes as neighbors as measured by attitudes expressed in surveys. In 1942, two-thirds of the population objected to the idea of living in the same block with a Negro. But by 1956 a majority did not object, and in 1958, 56 percent answered "no" to the question, "If colored people came to live next door would you move?" In his study of college students, Bogardus found that between 1946 and 1958 "social distance" between these students and Negroes declined somewhat, as measured by his questionnaire tests.

The South and Prejudice

A summary was made by Hyman and Sheatsley, (1964:16) of attitudes of white Americans toward Negroes. Those findings showed that:

> A majority of white persons in the North favored racial integration of public schools, believed there should be no racial discrimination in public transportation and said they would have no objection to living near Negroes of their own income and education status. In the South a majority of whites opposed each of these views.

However, Hyman and Sheatsley pointed out that since 1942, when the above studies first began, the South and the North populations have

become less prejudiced. Part of this trend is attributed to social interaction, but it is clear that the South is more prejudiced (1964: 16):

> Exposure to integration appears to increase white support for integration. Northern whites who previously lived in the South show nearly as much support for integration and as much belief in the comparability of Negro and white intelligence as whites who have always lived in the North. Southern whites with previous Northern residence show a markedly higher support for integration and belief in the equality of white and Negro intelligence than Southerners who have never lived outside the South.

They found also that the Southern population was still more opposed to integration of schools and that the more educated were less opposed to integration. The younger Southerner was found to express less prejudice than the older.

Some authors (Myrdal, 1944:621, and Taeuber and Taeuber, 1965:5-6) pointed out the difference in residential patterns of Negroes in the South and North. However, neither indicates less prejudice, only a different kind and circumstances. In order to determine the degree of prejudice in American cities, based on residence, Taeuber (1965:29) devised a "Segregation Index" which served as a measure of dissimilarity:

> Suppose that whether a person was Negro or white made no difference in his choice of residence, and that his race was not related to any other factors affecting residential location (for instance, income level). Then no neighborhood would be all-Negro or all-White, but rather each race would be represented in each neighborhood in approximately the same proportion as in the city as a whole. Thus in a city where Negroes constitute half the population, the residents of any city block would be about equally divided between Negroes and whites . . . This situation should represent a completely even distribution of Negroes and whites, with the same proportion Negro in each and every block. For this situation, the segregation index assumes a value of zero, indicating no racial residential segregation whatsoever.

After completing this study in 207 cities, the results were summarized for the entire nation and for the nine divisions of the U. S. Census in Table III. We note that the total mean value for the nation is 86.2, which means that in America, to achieve an even distribution of Negroes and whites in every block, 86.2 out of every 100 families would have to move to a different block. Considering the various divisions of the country, the Northeast and West have Segregation Index values of 79.2 and 79.3 respectively, which is below the National mean of 86.2. The value 87.7, associated with the North Central area, is slightly higher than the national mean. However, the index value associated with the South is 90.9, a value considerably higher than the previously mentioned 79.2 or 79.3.

Taeuber (1965:19) concluded:

> A summary assessment can now be made of the three factors cited by Myrdal. Neither free choice nor poverty is a sufficient explanation for the universally high degree of segregation in American cities. Discrimination is the principal cause of Negro residential segregation.

It may therefore be assumed that a high degree of residential segregation indicates racial attitudes of high discrimination or prejudice, and lower rates of residential segregation correlate to racial attitudes of less discrimination or prejudice. On this basis, it may be stated that residents of the Southern and North Central areas would be more prejudiced than residents of the Northeastern and Western areas.

TABLE III

AVERAGE INDEXES OF RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION FOR REGIONS AND CENSUS DIVISIONS, 207 CITIES, 1960

Region and Division	Mean Segregation Index
Total, All Regions	86.2
Northeast	79.2
New England	76.2
Middle Atlantic	80.2
North Central	87.7
East North Central	87.5
West North Central	88.4
West	79.3
Mountain	81.6
Pacific	78.7
South	90.9
South Atlantic	91.1
East South Central	90.5
West South Central	90.8

Source: Taeuber and Taeuber, Negroes in Cities, 1965.

In analyzing the data from the Cornell Studies, Williams (1964:49) found that the "South is the region of the greatest antiminority prejudice, whereas the Far West is the region of least prejudice." The above cited literature suggested the hypothesis that:

H_a: There is a relationship between the white student's past geographic location and the amount of racial prejudice held toward blacks with the North Central and Southern areas showing the most prejudice and the West showing the least.

Family Residence

Residential Patterns

The literature indicated a relationship between residence and prejudice held by whites toward blacks. In a study by McEntire (1960:34) he concluded that "characteristic of all cities studied is a principal area of nonwhite concentration near the business center of the city." Segregation in our cities has been described by Grodzins (1957:33):

> The white and nonwhite citizens of the U.S. are being sorted out in a new pattern of segregation. In each of the major urban centers the story is the same: the better-off white families are moving out of the central cities into the suburbs; the ranks of the poor who remain are being swelled by Negroes from the South. This trend threatens to transform the cities into slums, largely inhabited by Negroes, ringed about with predominantly white suburbs.

Returning to Taeuber and Taeuber's segregation index (1965:58) the following mean index values were found:

Central Cities	86.8
Suburbs	82.3
Independent Cities	89.5

From this it seems that suburbs tend to be less segregated than the central city, as it would only be necessary for 82.3 families to move in order to achieve an even racial distribution in the suburbs. Independent cities with their segregation index value of 89.5 would be the most segregated and hence the most prejudiced, with central cities second on the ranking of segregation. While the Negro increase within the cities and its concentration in highly restricted districts have often been listed as major reasons for the white migration to the suburbs, Grier and Grier (1966:24) found that this is not entirely true. According to McEntire (1960:18), the shift of population to the

suburbs can be considered a continuation of historic trends in that American cities have always grown outward from their centers. Cars and super-highways have greatly facilitated the mobility of Americans in many ways and in many places. According to Taeuber and Taeuber (1965:7), "To attribute the processes of racial transition primarily to racial attitudes -- to whites fleeing incoming Negro population is an exaggeration." Likewise, Grier and Grier (1966:24) felt that the suburbanization of white Americans can be attributed to several things:

> The combination of all these factors -- rapid urbanization, the concentration of Negro population growth within the cities, the migration of young and fertile white families to the suburbs, the fact that subsequent childbearing among the two racial groups has both reinforced and perpetuated trends begun by selective migration and segregation -- these interacting forces have produced the same general effects in Metropolitan areas throughout the country: central cities that are increasingly Negro, suburbs that are almost exclusively white.

Glazer (1960:4-5), in the introduction to his Studies in Housing and Minority Groups, stated simply the relationship as follows:

> Prejudice in its pure form -- that is to say as unreasoning and inflexible antipathy -- rarely plays a decisive role in the determination of the housing of minority groups.
>
> A rise in the economic capacity of a group is an extremely powerful force in improving its housing, even though it may have little effect on the degree of segregation and on prejudice against it.

However, in addition to the inevitable expansion of cities, there is the desire for both Negroes and whites to escape the "crime, grime, bad schools, and shortage of housing" that Weaver (1970:19) stated is so prevalent in the central cities.

Residence and Conditions Affecting Prejudice

Many earlier studies have focused in the area of residential integration and prejudice (Allport, 1954; Wilner et al., 1955; Deutsch and Collins, 1951; and Merton et al., 1949). The essential finding of these studies was that residential social interaction reduces prejudice when the whites and blacks living in close proximity are of equal socioeconomic status. Wilner (1955:4), taking the cumulative evidence into consideration, concluded:

> . . . equal-status contact between members of initially antagonistic ethnic groups under circumstances not marked by competition for limited goods or by strong social disapproval of intergroup friendliness tends to result in a favorable attitude change.

In a more recent study, Meer and Freedman (1966:18) investigated an integrated neighborhood in Stockton, California (100,000 population) and found that while prejudice was reduced in some aspects of life, it did not carry over into more intimate relationships:

> The impression one gets from the summarized comments is that the Negro families did indeed have an impact on their white neighbors, and on the whole, it was favorable. Thus the overall results indicate that, whereas this impact made Negroes more acceptable to the experimental than to the control group as neighbors, it did not generalize to other areas, such as "being treated by a Negro physician" (item 4) and "being invited into the home for social reasons" (item 16). This failure to obtain a generalization effect has been noted by Katz and appears to be the more frequent result in studies of this kind.

Deutsch and Collins (1958:91) made a similar point in noting that:

> . . . before a prejudiced person develops the desire to be friendly with Negro people, he must first see them as "human beings" or equals. However, perceiving Negroes as equals provides only the opportunity for the development of friendly feelings. For this opportunity to be fully realized, intimate social contacts with Negroes on an equal-status basis seem to be necessary also.

The Urban Milieu

There is reason to believe that an urban setting produces less prejudice than a rural or small-town setting. Curtis et al., (1967: 235-244) investigated the hypothesis that prejudice may be accounted for in part by the extent and nature of social participation. The urban milieu, with its religious and ethnic diversities, was believed to provide primary and secondary social interaction that would diminish prejudice. The study considered the amount of intimacy of one's participation in the urban structure on primary and secondary levels of interaction. It was found that:

> Independently of education, age, and other social position variables, participation in secondary structures is associated with reduced prejudice, while interaction with relatives and friends has no effect or may even be associated with increased prejudice. However, the secondary participations most markedly associated with reduced prejudice are of a special kind; they are primary interactions between persons who are brought together by common membership in an external organization: club, neighborhood, or work firm.
>
> Universalistic norms occur quite frequently in non-primary social structures, but the process of socialization in secondary groups lacks the emotional impact characteristic of primary socialization. Our findings suggest that the most effective influences fitting personal attitudes to universalistic social norms occur where primary relationships develop within a secondary structure. Urbanites most typically are placed in a job, a neighborhood, a school, or even a consumption category by fairly impersonal forces. But it is the set of personal relationships they develop within these secondary contexts which may have the greater effect in reducing prejudice.

It is believed that demographic variables such as size of community, size of minority population within the community, amount of discrimination, and customs of segregation affect the patterns of intergroup interaction. However, it is difficult to identify a specific national

pattern of intergroup relations. Some data do reveal that group relations are different in the North and South and vary by size from big cities to small towns.

A community of 300,000 people is not inherently different from a community of 50,000. However, the size of a city does create identifiable differentials such as: patterns of interaction, tradition, and value differences between those who prefer to live in large cities rather than small towns or rural settings. The urban milieu therefore influences the regulation of personal behavior. Williams (1964:117) pointed out:

> In both absolute numbers and relative proportions, Negroes are concentrated in the larger cities of both the North and the South. However, Southern cities in each size class have larger Negro communities and a higher ratio of Negroes to whites than do Northern cities. In 24 cities in this sample, usually either small Northern towns or suburban areas, there are no Negroes.

One study (Schuman and Gruenberg, 1970:255) attempted to ascertain whether the cities in which Americans live produce distinctive effects upon citizens' attitudes, experiences, and perceptions. They contended that:

> we have shown this to be so and that we have also begun to identify some of these connections. They do not appear to be simply reflections of differences among cities in demographic composition, although there are important relations to more standard demographic and ecological indices. One can usefully explore antecedent factors that shape cities, but it is the outcome of this process -- cities as perceptually "real" to individuals -- that in turn shapes attitudes.

Effects of Racial Proportions

Many social scientists feel that the proportion of a minority to a majority in a population is an important factor in the type and

extent of intergroup relations. In analyzing the Cornell data, covering more than 250 cities on a nationwide basis, Williams (1964:119) found that:

> Half of the Southern cities had over 20 percent Negro populations. Half of the northern cities had less than 5 percent Negro population.

The point Williams made is that there is a greater likelihood that blacks will be segregated in those cities where the population is higher, in schools, playgrounds, hospitals, public clinics, and so on. This is true for cities of all sizes of both the North and the South.

Conflicts of various kinds between blacks and whites are characteristically reported by the cities in the North and the South (whether they be large or small) with a high proportion of Negroes. This includes street fights and reports of police brutality. Williams (1964: 138) summarized the above-stated conditions as found in cities with a high proportion of blacks in the population:

> We have found that when Negroes are confined to living in one or a few areas of a city, civic and social organizations are more likely to be segregated, and discrimination and interracial conflict are more serious problems. Denied access to the facilities of the white community, Negroes develop their own professional class and community services. Also, in the rigidly segregated city Negroes are more likely to join protest organizations, and to move toward more militant action.
>
> The more determined efforts on the part of Negroes to reduce discrimination and segregation through organized action tend to occur in the larger cities (but not always -- witness Montgomery, Alabama), in the North (again, not always or at all times), and where both the proportion and the absolute size of the Negro population is large. Also, organized protest and defense is more likely in cities characterized by improving conditions, by the presence of a relatively large Negro middle class, and by recent instances of successful group action against discrimination.

Other Factors in Cities That Affect Prejudice

There are certain indices in cities that make up a "white Racial Liberalism." According to Schuman and Gruenberg (1970:251), these indices include a city's per capita city expenditures, median white education, and degree of segregation. The education factor has the highest correlation ($p = .57$) and the study concluded, "it remains true that cities with more educated white population display more liberal white racial attitudes."

While the Schuman and Gruenberg study was from a cumulative city point of view, it should be considered that the high education-low prejudice relationship might simply reflect the individual level of association between education and racial liberalism. Either viewpoint is compatible with other studies of similar nature.

The above results were found to be highest in such western and northern cities as Boston, San Francisco, and Washington, D.C. Again, education is believed to be the overriding factor (Schuman and Gruenberg, 1970:255):

> Certainly Boston, San Francisco, and Washington share characteristics besides high education, such as northern location or influences. No doubt selective factors also operate to draw people to certain of these cities, notably San Francisco and Washington, and perhaps away from others such as Newark (which incidentally has the second-lowest white educational level of all fifteen cities). At the same time, it is certainly possible that we are measuring contextual effects from education of the following sort: a more educated city population produces more liberal institutions (city administration, local newspaper, etc.), and these in turn react upon the general population, including the less-liberal elements, to liberalize it still further.

General Conclusions on Size of Residence and Prejudice

Bettelheim and Janowitz (1964:21) found that: "there is a gradual decrease in the level of ethnic intolerance as one goes from rural areas and small towns to cities under a million to cities over a million."

On the basis of Taeuber and Taeuber's study alone, it can be concluded that people living in the central city would be more prejudiced than those living in suburbia. However, other studies cited showed that economic and occupational forces exert a more direct influence on residential settings than does prejudice. People in any given city would tend to have somewhat homogeneous racial attitudes representative of the geographic area in which the city is situated. While differences between geographic areas of the country would be more significant than local residence in determining the racial attitude of a person residing there, the literature justified the following hypothesis:

H_a: There is a relationship between the white student's residential setting and racial prejudice with students from rural and smaller town settings expressing more prejudice than those from urban and suburban settings.

Sex Differences

Many changes have occurred in the roles of women since Poole (1926:114-120) found that white women were more prejudiced toward Negroes than men. Not the least of these changes has been women's educational role. However, two recent studies (Cowgill, 1968: 363-76; and Smith, 1970:220-236) both found women to be more

prejudiced than men to all outgroups. Another study (Ames, et al., 1968:283) conducted in a northern university with a sample of 1144 males and 1239 females also found women to be more prejudiced than men. It found that women have a tendency to stereotype more often than men. Thus, if a woman experienced an incident to which she reacted negatively, she would tend to generalize this for all similar racial or ethnic people.

In the Cornell data, Noel and Pinkney (1964:614) found that females are "much more likely to manifest social-distance prejudice than are males." This is consistent with the findings of two other studies of social-distance prejudice (Edlefsen, 1956:79-73 and Bogardus, 1959:439-41). Pettigrew (1959:28-36) also found southern white females more prejudiced than white males and had an interesting explanation for the finding. He theorizes that women are the "carriers of culture" and reflect the mores more directly than males. Therefore, women should be expected to be more prejudiced. While this is an interesting theory, it breaks down at some points, dependent upon the dimension of prejudice involved. The Cornell data examined by Noel and Pinkney (1964: 614) revealed examples of inconsistency on sex and racial prejudice:

> Similarly, white males are significantly more likely than white females to agree that "Generally speaking, Negroes are lazy and ignorant." Five other stereotype items involving various outgroups reveal no significant differences by sex among Negroes or whites.
>
> The fact that the greater likelihood of prejudice among females is confined to social-distance prejudice suggests a possible explanation for this sex difference. Differences in the amount and intimacy of interracial contact do not account for the variation in prejudice by sex, but males probably also experience a much greater variety of interracial contacts than females do. It seems likely that the intergroup contacts of females typically occur in a rather restricted role change -- that is, they

> are generally confined to roles which are defined in functionally specific and relatively authoritarian terms. Role relationships exclusively of this type might reasonably be expected to promote a negative attitude toward intergroup contacts and a desire to avoid further contacts, including the types specified in our index of prejudice.

The role explanation by Noel and Pinkney is consistent with Stewart and Hoult (1959:274-79) who suggested that "the number of roles mastered is inversely related to authoritarianism." These are interesting explanations for high female prejudice in the general public. However, the sample for this present study is taken from college seniors who have had three or more years to learn new roles and interact with black students.

The findings on sex and prejudice are varied and inconclusive. The Cornell Studies (Williams, 1964:63) did not reveal a great difference in prejudice based on sex:

> In two of our cities, females are more likely than males to express social-distance prejudice toward Negroes; in another the reverse is the case. Only in Hometown are white women significantly more likely than white men to reject contact with Negroes as distasteful.

There did appear to be a slight tendency for women to manifest more social-distance feelings toward blacks. Although the Cornell findings were rather inconclusive, they were generally supportive of the other literature indicating women to be slightly more prejudiced than men. The bulk of the literature allowed the hypothesis that white women were generally more prejudiced toward blacks than white men.

> H_a: There is a relationship between sex and prejudice with white women expressing more social distance than white men toward blacks at Oral Roberts University.

Social Interaction

Sociologists as well as other behavioral scientists have been interested in the effects of social interaction on prejudice. Studies have been done on prejudice and interaction in many diverse areas. While most of these have not been in educational settings, the principles of social interaction involved are the same.

Social Interaction in Public School

Will early social interaction between whites and blacks influence racial prejudice? This was the question that Coleman, et al. (1967:21-47) investigated. They found that white pupils who had not attended class with blacks were more likely to express a preference for segregated classrooms than those who had previously attended desegregated classrooms. Further, they found that white students whose interracial education began in the early grades were even more likely to prefer desegregated schools than whites whose first association with blacks in school was in the secondary grades. The decline of prejudice was strongest for those white children who attended desegregated schools earlier and who had also made personal friends among blacks.

Army, Jobs, and Housing

A study conducted in New Haven, Connecticut (Curtis, et al., 1967: 234), revealed that ". . . Contact with neighbors, work associates, and friends met through voluntary associations is associated with less prejudice." After World War II, a study was conducted (Newcomb, et al., 1958) among American soldiers in Europe to determine how white Americans felt about integration of the Armed Forces. It found

that more than 95 percent of the officers and enlisted men approved of Negroes being assigned to combat platoons. At that time few close friendships developed between blacks and whites. However, the general attitude of the white soldiers was favorable enough that the military evaluated the integration program as successful. Later studies revealed that when close friendships did develop, they did not carry over into civilian life.

In a job-related study by Harding and Hogrefe (Secord and Backman, 1964:437) it was reported that Negroes were accepted in job-related associations to the degree that racial prejudices of whites toward blacks could not be distinguished. However, prejudiced attitudes would reappear away from the work situation.

In the area of housing there have been numerous studies which indicate social interaction reduces prejudice. Cook (1955:149) conducted a study of integrated housing in Minneapolis and found that:

> When contact is intimate and the perceived social climate favorable, attitudes are most favorable; when contact is superficial and the perceived climate unfavorable, attitudes are least favorable, and when contact is intimate, but the perceived social climate unfavorable, or when the contact is superficial and the perceived social favorable, the favorableness of the attitudes is intermediate.

This seems to indicate that close associations in housing are accepted and least strained when the general public attitude is more tolerant toward Negroes.

In an integrated housing project with various opportunities for personal interaction, Deutsch and Collins (1958:612-623) found that white women who were initially dubious of blacks came to respect them. However, another study was conducted by Meer and Freedman (1966:11-19)

in a white area of Stockton, California, into which a few Negroes had recently moved. They interviewed the white families that were immediate neighbors of Negroes and concluded that:

1) No overall change in prejudice took place.
2) Only items referring to the acceptability of Negroes in the neighborhood showed change in a favorable direction.
3) Spontaneous comments made by some of the white neighbors of the Negro families indicated that whereas they had developed a new respect for these particular Negroes, they were reluctant to become involved in more intimate interpersonal contacts.

These authors suggested that equal-status residential contact between Negroes and whites, even though it starts at a superficial level, may lead to more intimate interpersonal contact that would reduce racial prejudiced attitudes of whites toward blacks.

It is obvious from literature and life experiences that all social interaction does not reduce prejudice. Perhaps one of the most important qualifications is interaction based on equal-status association. One author (Curtis, 1967:235-43) offered a theory of the process of reduction of prejudice and social interaction that helps qualify and clarify the issue:

> Participation in secondary structures is associated with reduced prejudice. Secondary participations most markedly associated with reduced prejudice are of a special kind; they are primary interactions between persons who are brought together by common membership in an external organization, club, neighborhood, or work.
>
> Personal contacts of this order seem to reduce racial prejudices according to:
> 1) the amount and frequency of contact (friends, clubs, groups, etc.)
> 2) range of contacts (number of different groups)
> 3) barriers in communications (forbidden topic).

Dimensions for Evaluation

In a later study Cook (1957:1-12), after analyzing the relationship between interracial contact and attitude change, presented three dimensions for evaluating the effectiveness of the contact situation. He found that positive attitude change could be expected when there was opportunity for personal interaction. A second dimension called for relatively equal-status levels for the participants. Another area not covered in most studies was that of the nature of the social norm toward interracial contact. He explained that the general expectation of persons in authority strongly influences whether interracial contact diminishes or increases prejudice.

In an Army related study, Stouffer et al., (1949) found that the likelihood of a positive change increased when interracial contact involved individuals interacting on an equal-status basis. They reported that the overwhelming majority of white officers and men gave approval to the blacks' performance in combat and later they played ball, joked, and boxed together.

Another study on interracial camping experiences (Radke-Yarrow, et al., 1958:623-36) found that the situational structure of the camp brought about conformity to new norms as a result of the influence of the camp counselor. His definitions in ambiguous situations and handling of racial issues played a decisive role in establishing new norms for the white children.

The accepted social norm was a decisive factor in white women showing favorable attitudes toward blacks in an interracial housing study. Wilner et al., (1955:149) found that white housewives showed

much more favorable attitudes toward blacks when they believed that other whites approved of these.

Complexity and Contradiction

All of the studies of interaction have not been favorable toward reducing prejudice (see Lombardi, 1963:129-36; Whitmore, 1956; Valien, 1954:80-110; Webster, 1961:292-96). In Cairo, Illinois, Valien found that the experience of desegregation strengthened negative stereotypes held by whites toward blacks. This was attributed to the lack of student preparation before the integrated experience. The fact that resistance to integration by the adult population failed to establish a social norm for acceptance by the children was also involved. In a Junior High study, Webster found negative results after integration. The white pupils studied were less willing to accept members of the black group after one year of integration than they were before the experience.

Amount of Interaction

How much a white person interacts with blacks is influenced by many variables. Age, education, sex, occupation, residence, etc., are all variables indexing status and role. However, Williams (1964:167) contended that these have only slight influence upon interaction. He felt that these variables are not really "determinants" of interaction but that:

> Their significance lies rather in their effect upon one's opportunities for contact. They are important in prescribing where we go and whom we see, but they have much less importance in influencing social interaction within these situations.

Summary Statement on Interaction

While all the previous variables discussed are indicators of social status and role and provide opportunities for contact and interaction, the present study is primarily concerned with the relationship between prejudice and interaction. The major finding of the Cornell Studies (Williams, 1964:167) was that out of hundreds of tabulations, the major finding emerged that in "all the surveys in all communities and for all groups, majority and minorities, the greater the frequency of interaction, the lower the prevalence of ethnic prejudice."

Williams further concluded that the level of prejudice against specific individuals with whom one interacts was very low. The more intimate the level of interaction, the lower the prejudice. Prejudice was found to be almost nonexistent among the majority group with regard to those minority individuals with whom one interacts on a close social basis. The more intimate the specific interaction, and the more favorable, the lower will be the level of prejudice toward the entire group. It should be noted that very little dyadic interaction, if any, is socially and culturally isolated. Interaction usually takes place within a situational context and between groups of individuals. Williams (1964:191) summarized the Cornell Studies data on interaction and prejudice:

> Our data have suggested, and to some extent supported, the hypothesis that the greater the frequency of interaction with members of another social category who are of approximately equal status in respects other than membership in this category (education, occupation, etc.), the less the tendency to accept derogatory stereotypes, to feel sentiments of social distance, or to favor public discrimination. Further examination of the pattern of interaction in relation to prejudices now suggests that the wider the variety of social categories represented by

> persons with whom the individual establishes any important degree of communication, the less likely that individual will be to adhere to dogmatic or categorical rejection of other individuals and the more likely he will be to accept and/or support universalistic norms in public life.
>
> Further, we suspect, although we have no analyses bearing directly on the point from our data, that categorical prejudice is generally less among persons who have experienced a variety of social roles in their own life courses -- relatively independent of the variety of ethnic contacts involved -- provided that their history has not been such as to impose excessive insecurity and frustration of kinds which inevitably are felt to be arbitrary.

From the above it can be concluded that much of the ethnic prejudice in community life is compounded by isolation, timidity, and social fear. Three things stood out in the Williams analysis of the Cornell data that causes one to think of the old question of primacy regarding the "chicken and egg."

1. The frequency and kinds of contacts across ethnic lines vary greatly according to situational context, minority group, and status characteristics or participants.
2. Persons who are relatively unprejudiced are most likely to have ethnic contacts.
3. Persons who interact across ethnic lines are most likely to be relatively unprejudiced and to form ethnic friendships.

The literature supports the conclusion that social interaction generally reduces racial prejudice. As a result of three years of social interaction between whites and blacks at Oral Roberts University, it is expected that seniors will express less prejudice than entering freshmen. Therefore it is hypothesized that:

H_a: There is a relationship between social interaction and prejudice. Those whites who had a high rate of integration in high school and other past social relations will express less prejudice than those without these experiences.

Conceptual Model and Alternate Hypotheses

A conceptual model was derived from the related literature. This model provided a basis for a series of hypotheses to be tested against the data generated by this present study.

One's educational level is significantly associated with the degree of expressed prejudice. The higher the educational level, generally the less frequently are high degrees of prejudice toward blacks overtly expressed. The socioeconomic variable will parallel closely the educational variable since both are part of the socio-economic status index. Those of the upper class hold a certain social distance from blacks but express less traditional stereotypes of prejudice than the lower class. The middle class is "muddled" in its expression of prejudice, but is generally more like the upper class than the lower class. While the amount of income is similar, there were two orientations of the middle class. Those who identify with the "working" class express more prejudice than those middle-class people who hold higher "occupational" status.

Political-party affiliation is not strongly related to differences in prejudice, except as the respective parties are aligned with socio-economic statuses. However, the independent voters have a tendency to show the least prejudice followed by Republicans and Democrats respectively.

People from the South are more prejudiced than those from the West with the Northeast and Midwest falling in between. A slight decrease in prejudice will take place as one moves from rural areas and small towns to cities, and especially cities of large populations. However,

if the large city has a high proportion of black population then there is usually more segregation and conflict.

For various reasons, women stereotype more than men, and in general show more prejudice. White men occupy more varied roles than women as a result of more interaction with blacks and this may account for less male stereotyping. Interaction of whites with blacks will generally lead to reduced prejudice. Particular conditions facilitate a reduction in prejudice. These conditions include close personal contacts, equal status, and social norms that call for low prejudice.

Based on the conceptual model the following hypotheses were projected. These hypotheses were tested against the findings in Chapter IV.

1. White seniors at Oral Roberts University will express less prejudice than incoming white freshmen toward blacks, showing a negative relationship between education and prejudice.

2. There is a negative relationship between social class and expressed prejudice with the white students of lower-class status at Oral Roberts University expressing more prejudice toward blacks than those of higher-class status.

3. There is a relationship between the political party affiliation of the family of the white student at Oral Roberts University and the degree of prejudice held toward blacks with prejudice expressed in the following descending order: Democrats (highest) Republicans (second-highest) Independents and others (lowest).

4. There is a relationship between the white student's past geographic location and the amount of racial prejudice held toward blacks with the North Central and Southern areas showing the most prejudice and the West showing the least.

5. There is a relationship between the white student's residential setting and racial prejudice with students from rural and smaller town settings expressing more prejudice than those from urban and suburban settings.

6. There is a relationship between sex and prejudice with white women expressing more social distance than white men toward blacks at Oral Roberts University.

7. There is a relationship between social interaction and prejudice. Those whites who had a high rate of integration in high school and other past social relations will express less prejudice than those without these experiences.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Review of Problem

This study explores a presumed relationship between liberal arts education and racial prejudice (as expressed in social distance) held by white students toward blacks. Although education was the main independent variable in the study, several subvariables were also investigated. These were treated as Third Variables (T. Variables) held constant to examine the relationship of each to prejudice.

Variables Involved

Many of the students' former life experiences were presumed important to the central problem being studied. Antecedent variables considered were: sex, geographic location, residence of family, socioeconomic status, political affiliation of family, and previous social interaction with blacks. Once the student arrived on the campus, liberal arts education became the "treatment" of the study. Liberal arts education at Oral Roberts University includes the total environment of the educational setting. An earlier quote from the Oral Roberts University Bulletin operationally defines liberal arts as used in this study (see introduction for this definition).

In addition to the antecedent variables, one must also consider any other influences on the student during the period of time at the

educational setting. The primary concern here was the variable of maturation. During the time under consideration, the student became three years older. He had been away from home, perhaps for the first time on an extended basis. A process of "growing up" may have taken place that could account for some change in prejudice.

General Research Design

Collection of Data

The questionnaire method provided the basic data for the study. The instrument (see appendix) was designed to yield quantifiable information on each of the variables discussed in Chapter II. The population of the liberal arts classes sampled included 115 returning seniors and 290 incoming freshmen at Oral Roberts University in the fall of 1970.

The basis for selecting the liberal arts freshmen and seniors was universal. The entire population of both classes was polled and given equal opportunity to respond. Permission was granted to administer the questionnaire at the close of a general assembly. Those seniors and freshmen responding that day signed a list (not the questionnaire). The list was then compared to a complete list of the classes provided by the registrar. Those who were not present at the assembly were contacted personally and by mail until all had a chance to respond. Some 35 questionnaires were rejected because of incompleteness. There were 109 seniors and 234 freshmen who responded with completed questionnaires (out of a possible 405) to make a total liberal arts N of 343. This sample represented 85 percent of the universal population and was considered adequate representation.

Also included in the sample were 140 vocationally-oriented students from the Vocational Technical division of Northeastern Oklahoma A & M College. These students were chosen as a convenience sample since access to a systematic random sample was not available. Using a similar age group, the vocationally-oriented sample was an effort to control for maturation. The Vo-Tech sample further served as a comparison to the liberal arts freshmen who also had not experienced the "treatment" of three years' liberal arts education. The Vo-Tech director allowed the questionnaires to be administered in eight classes during the regular class time.

Static-Longitudinal Aspect of Study

The present study was not a longitudinal study per se. However, there was a basic assumption that the entering freshmen were similar in attitude to the tested seniors when they entered Oral Roberts University. This "assumption" of similarity was supported by the findings of Astin who was primarily concerned with the goodness of fit of colleges and students. He (1965:53) concluded that:

> In general there appears to be a relatively good fit between student and institutional characteristics. Additional analyses indicated that relative differences in the characteristics of both colleges and their entering students remained relatively stable over time.

Various reasons were given for this stability. The students have access to information about the general nature of the school. Again, the school uses appropriate recruitment techniques to select students whose career aspirations are consistent with the curricular offerings of the institution. Astin's (1965:53) assumption that the type of students remain relatively consistent over time was summarized as follows:

> This assumption, which requires simply that the selection criteria used by colleges (sex, academic achievement, and academic ability) and prospective students (cost, reputation, geographical proximity, type of institution, prestige, availability of scholarships) remain constant, is supported by the findings of several earlier studies (Astin and Holland, 1962:113-125). It may be that the institutions, confronted with student bodies that varied little from year to year, gradually adapted their curricula to fit characteristics of their student populations.

Comparison of Subgroups in Research Design

The present study was a static one in that the data were taken at one point in time from the three different groups. The study lends itself to the nature of a dynamic study, if one grants the assumption that similar students are attracted to a college year after year. However, this assumption was not necessary in this case since there was control over maturation and selection. Maturation was controlled in that a third group, of similar age as the seniors, was examined but not exposed to the experimental variable of liberal arts education. Biases resulting in differential selection of respondents for the comparison groups of liberal arts seniors and freshmen were avoided by administering the questionnaire to the universal population of both classes.

It was necessary to deal with the assumption that the college in question had in fact enrolled similar students for the two groups involved. In order to determine this, a close comparison was made of the responses to the variables in the questionnaire. Such variables as residence, geographic location, sex ratio, socioeconomic status, etc., were compared to determine just how different or alike the two groups of students were in these aspects. For instance, if it were determined that Southerners are more prejudiced than those from other

geographic locations, then a significant difference in the number of students from the South would show up in the statistical analysis. This was further explained and illustrated in the presentation of the data and statistical techniques used in the study.

The research design (Campbell and Stanley, 1970:6) is presented as:*

Liberal Arts Seniors	R	X	O_1
Liberal Arts Freshmen	R		O_2
Vo-Tech Students (college age)			O_3

---

*X represents the exposure of a group to an experimental variable or event (liberal arts education), the effects of which are to be measured.

O refers to some process of observation or measurement (prejudice measured by the Bogardus Social Distance Scale).

R indicates that representative selection from separate treatment groups has been accounted for (measuring instrument administered to universal populations of both senior and freshman classes with equal opportunity to respond).

This research design then was a combination of types three and six as presented by Campbell and Stanley (1970:8). It has been pointed out that maturation and selection are accounted for.

TABLE IV

SOURCES OF INVALIDITY FOR DESIGNS 1 THROUGH 6

	Sources of Invalidity													
	Internal									External				
	History	Maturation	Testing	Instrumentation	Regression	Selection	Mortality	Interaction of Selection and Maturation, etc.		Interaction of Testing and X	Interaction of Selection and X	Reactive Arrangements	Multiple X Interference	
Design 3. Static-Group Comparison X 0 0	+	?	+	+	+	-	-	-			-			
Design 6. Posttest-Only Control Group Design R X 0 R 0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	?	?		

Note: In the tables, a minus indicates a definite weakness, a plus indicates that the factor is controlled, a question mark indicates a possible source of concern, and a blank indicates that the factor is not relevant.

There was no way to avoid the fact of mortality, i.e., many of the freshmen who enrolled three years previously were not available to be examined as seniors.

Measuring Racial Prejudice

Quantifying Attitudes

The study of attitudes is a basic and central concern for much research in sociology, particularly social psychology. A difficulty arises, however, in quantifying for measuring purposes such a qualitative entity as attitude. Shaw and Wright (1967:15) stated that:

> Measurement is the assignment of numerals to objects or events according to a rule or a set of rules. When we attempt to measure attitudes, we assign numerals to persons according to a set of rules that are intended to create an isomorphism between the assigned numeral and the person's attitude toward the object in question. Since an attitude is a hypothetical, or latent, variable rather than an immediately observable variable, attitude measurement consists of the assessment of an individual's responses to a set of situations.

Attitude is defined by Shaw and Wright (1967:13) as:

> . . . a set of affective reactions toward the attitude object, derived from the concepts of beliefs that the individual has concerning the object, and predisposing the individual to behave in a certain manner toward the attitude object.

The main components of attitude are thus taken to be: an attitude object, beliefs about the attitude object, and a predisposition to act toward the object according to these beliefs. Thurstone (1967:77) maintains that an opinion is "a verbal expression of attitude" and may therefore be used as a means for measuring attitudes. Although an attitude may predispose a person to act, Thurstone (1967:78) pointed out that:

> . . . the measurement of attitudes expressed by a man's opinions does not necessarily mean the prediction of what he will do. . . . we are not setting out to predict overt conduct. . . . Even if they are intentionally distorting their attitudes, we are measuring at least the attitude which they are trying to make people believe that they have.

In 1925, Bogardus (1967:71) introduced the concept of social distance which he defines as "the degrees and grades of understanding and feeling that persons experience regarding each other." He went on to say that social distance explains the degree of human interaction. Social distance is here taken to mean the degree of closeness to which an individual will allow members of another racial or ethnic group.

Criteria of Objectivity

Reliability is one of the criteria of objectivity or integrity of a testing device. Sargent and Williamson (1966:250) define reliability as "the degree to which the test secures the same score on retest." Validity is the second criterion, and according to Sargent and Williamson it "refers to the tendency of the test to measure what it purports to measure." They added that:

> . . . validity is particularly difficult in attitude tests because the verbalized reactions may be very different from the deep-seated feelings of the person, or from his responses may be when confronted with a behavioral situation.

A third criterion is unidimensionality, i.e., whether or not the scale measures only one attitude. In a unidimensional scale, two persons having the same score may be assumed to have the same attitude with reference to the particular attitude object for that scale. Shaw and Wright (1967:563) maintain that, "The degree to which a scale is unidimensional is largely a function of the technique used in its construction, and . . . each technique has its own definition of unidimensionality." Shaw and Wright (1967:21) provided as a fourth criterion of integrity, a zero point, i.e., the point where the continuum changes from positive to negative. It indicates neutrality, or what some would

call no attitude at all, since an attitude must have a positive or negative sign.

Bogardus Scale: Comparison and Use

Selltiz et al., (1959:357) gave a basis for comparing the attitude scales of Bogardus, Thurstone, Likert, and Guttman in that "Attitude scales differ in method of construction, method of response, and basis for interpreting scores."

Bogardus was the first of the four above-mentioned men to develop an attitude-measurement scale. Bogardus (1925:299-308) published his first study using the social-distance scale with reference to 40 different nationalities and ethnic groups. Such a scale as Bogardus's "is an economical method, widely used, and easy to apply" (Allport, 1967:10). Selltiz et al., (1959:371) explained that on the Bogardus scale,

> The respondent is asked to indicate, for specified nationality or racial groups, the relationships to which he would be willing to admit members of each group. His attitude is measured by the closeness of relationship that he is willing to accept.

Allport (1967:10) reproduced one form of Bogardus's seven-point scale with the listed degrees of intimacy and corresponding "scale values":

1-to close kinship by marriage
2-to my club as personal chums
3-to my street as neighbors
4-to employment in my occupation in my country
5-to citizenship in my country
6-as visitors only to my country
7-would exclude from my country

Bogardus, as well as others, has used modified versions of the above seven-point scale in various studies (some of which will be referred to later).

According to Sargent and Williamson (1966:251):

> The scale cannot be considered to have equidistant intervals nor is it certain that acceptance at one level precludes rejection at a previous level: One may admit a member of an ethnic group to employment in one's occupation yet not desire him as a neighbor.

Selltiz et al., (1959:372) counteracted the second part of the above criticism: "Although individuals not infrequently show such reversals in replies on the social-distance scale, it is relatively uncommon to find an entire group reversing items." Therefore, in comparing attitudes of different groups of people toward various nationalities, the social-distance scale has been effective. Sargent and Williamson (1966: 251) pointed out that investigators indicated "the scale is a valid and reliable one." It also meets the criterion of unidimensionality, thereby possessing three of the four criteria of integrity cited previously for testing devices. When Thurstone and Likert developed their attitude-measurement scales, interest waned in the Bogardus scale. Interest revived again with emphasis on the development of unidimensional scales (Selltiz et al., 1959:372-3).

The Bogardus social-distance scale has been one of the most frequently used measures of racial attitudes. Reasons for frequent use include the following: it was developed earliest; it is already constructed and can be conveniently altered for various groups; and the data are relatively easy to collect and analyze.

In a 1926 study, Bogardus obtained the responses of 1,725 Americans to 40 racial and ethnic groups. The respondents (college and graduate students) were from 32 well-distributed areas in the United States. Ten percent were Negroes. A racial distance quotient (R.D.Q.) was obtained for each group by adding the number of points associated with

the statement nearest the top of the scale list in the questionnaires and then dividing this figure by the total number of completed questionnaires. Studies were made again in 1946 (with 1,950 subjects) and in 1956 (with 2,053 subjects) which produced similar results. Although results were originally obtained (Vander Zanden, 1966:73) for 40 ethnic and national groups, this present study focused only on native white Americans and Negroes:

		R.D.Q.	Rank
1926	Whites	1.10	2
	Negroes	3.28	26
1946	Whites	1.04	1
	Negroes	3.60	29
1956	Whites	1.08	1
	Negroes	2.74	27

The general conclusion drawn by Vander Zanden (1966:75) was that "there is a standardized pattern of preferences or prejudices prevalent in the United States." Bogardus (Sargent and Williamson, 1966:688) has also tested the persistence of stereotypes, "attitudinal identification of ethnic minorities," with results showing that "responses to individuals of a national group remained relatively constant over a long period."

Sargent and Williamson (1966:676) reported the Bogardus scale was used to measure the ethnic prejudice of a group of school children in an experimental school system organized on an intercultural basis. The results showed that children in the intercultural system showed less prejudice than a control group.

Ames et al., (1968:280-289) used a modified Bogardus scale to explore in a systematic manner differences in social-distance scores by sex, and to relate to the findings of other studies. They report that:

"Bogardus, in his comparison over time, indicates that the differential in responses between males and females is decreasing." In addition, "the rank-order of racial and ethnic groups is nearly the same, while females tend to be more rejecting overall than males."

Brown (1967:114) employed a Bogardus Social Distance Scale with some modifications in wording in a study with Ethiopian students. He remarked:

> One final comment should be made about the Bogardus Social Distance Scale. It appears to be a valid, useful, and adaptable instrument for this special situation. The form and content, modified as little as it was, were easily comprehensible to the Ethiopian students. For example, the seven graded response positions evoked no questioning as to order.

Conclusions showed that Ethiopian students "react more strongly against ethnic groups than do American students tested, and . . . women students react more strongly than do their male counterparts." Cowgill (1968:363-76) used a Bogardus scale in Thailand with some modifications of wording and the addition of one question. He noted (1968:363) that:

> The changes of wording were largely to make accommodations to the culture and to avoid semantic difficulties on the part of the students who would be responding to a questionnaire which was in what was to them a foreign language (English).

Thus, one may note the tremendous versatility of the Bogardus scale. The specific testing results are not as important to the present study as the demonstration of the use of the testing instrument.

Triandis and Triandis (1960:110-118) used a process of standardization of the Social Distance Scale, combining the methods of Bogardus and Thurstone. They presented to judges 36 statements used by Sartain and Bell (1949) plus 24 additional ones. Using a graphic form of the Thurstone successive interval procedure permits the development of an

equal-interval scale such as the one they employed with a total of 15 statements valued along a 100-point scale.

Warner and Dennis (1970:473-484) conducted a study in which they used the Bogardus concept of social distance and Guttman's scale of prejudice. The purpose of the study was to determine if there is a relationship between attitude and overt behavior. In the Warner Study items making up the Guttman scale were dispersed in a questionnaire with questions concerning such issues as the Vietnam War, the draft, student protests, and integration. The scale was dichotomized at the median to identify the "most prejudiced" and "least prejudiced" subjects. It was concluded that separate theories for prejudice and discrimination are necessary; the study of each separately is more important than the study of their relationship "for understanding and predicting human behavior" (Warner and Dennis, 1970:480).

Shaw and Wright (1967:570) summarized their discussion of attitudinal scales by saying that:

> Many investigators do not use the best scale available. The reasons for this are not clear, but we believe more careful measurement would materially improve the quality of research. . .
>
> In general the measurement of attitude may be improved in at least four ways: by improving the techniques of scale construction, by careful construction of attitude scales according to the best procedures known, by selecting the best scales available, and/or by modifying or reevaluating the scales that are selected for use.

Based on the versatility and demonstrated effectiveness of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale, in addition to the ease with which it may be modified and scored, it was maintained that it should be employed in this study.

Following the pattern of some of the studies cited, the present study at Oral Roberts University employed a modified version of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale. The scale was modified in the following manner to more accurately measure attitudes of college students:

> Please think carefully and then indicate the social relationship to which you would willingly allow Negroes: (the lower the number chosen, the closer you would willingly associate with members of the Negro race.)
>
> _____1. To close kinship by marriage.
>
> _____2. To personal social dating (unrestricted).
>
> _____3. As my roommate with all school privileges and social clubs.
>
> _____4. To my dorm with the right to hold school and class offices.
>
> _____5. As a student in my school, restricted to separate but equal facilities and organizations of their own.
>
> _____6. As a visitor only to my school.

Statistical Techniques

Various statistical techniques were employed to measure the variables. The relationships among variables were examined and established through systematic analysis. The treatment of system properties was on a collective basis comparing the subgroups previously mentioned.

After the questionnaires were completed, the information was coded and transferred to computer cards. A program was written to process the cards and compile the basic information which prepared the data for appropriate tables and charts for analysis.

Chi-Square

A tentative relationship was established between the seniors and freshmen on the independent variable (education) and the dependent variable (prejudice as expressed by social distance). The data were placed in a two by six table and later appropriately collapsed to a two by four table because there were so few cases in the fifth and sixth categories on social distance. A chi-square value was computed for the data in the various tables to see if there was a significant difference between the responses of the seniors and freshmen.

Riley (1963:178) explains that chi-square is a test of significance:

> Chi-square is used to test the hypothesis that two or more subsamples differ in respect to some characteristic [e.g. that the percentages in a two-dimensional table differ]. The measurement may be at any level--nominal, ordinal, or ratio.

It is a useful statistic in research because no particular assumptions have to be made about the shape of the distribution of the frequencies being tested. It is most commonly used when data are in frequencies such as in the number of responses in different categories. It can be used with any data that can be reduced to proportions or percentages. Social psychologists involved in attitudinal research find chi-square a very useful statistical tool. The formula (Riley, 1963:178) is:

$$X^2 = \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$$ where:

O = observed frequency in each cell,
E = expected frequency in each cell, and
Σ = summation

Mueller and Schuessler (1961:244-249) provide explanatory information about the chi-square technique as it is applied in this study.

Percentages

Riley (1963:138) observes that "one of the most useful procedures in sociology for determining the relationship between variables is the simple comparison of percentages." It is understood that for percentage comparison, one of the variables must be treated as "independent and the other as "dependent." Where appropriate in this study, percentages were compared.

Gamma

Gamma, developed by Goodman and Kruskal, has the following characteristics as noted by Riley (1963:141):

1) Where there is complete lack of any association, the coefficient equals zero.
2) The direction of the association is indicated by the sign.
3) Unlike epsilon, the coefficient will equal one (unity) when the variables show complete dependence on each other--i.e., when they are perfectly correlated (although small differences in the sizes of the coefficients must be interpreted cautiously).

The formula for gamma is:

$$\gamma = \frac{N_s - N_d}{N_s + N_d}$$

In computing gamma, absolute frequencies are used, rather than percentages. The gamma tells the strength of relationship between two variables. Gamma varies between -1 and +1 and can be used on a table of any size. The statistical technique of gamma was used also to show the direction of the relationship between the variables.

In order to examine the validity of the original relationship, the different variables were held constant as third variables and partial

tables were constructed. Gamma was then computed for each of the partials to observe the effect of the third variables. This revealed the conditions under which the original relationship became stronger or weaker.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

In this chapter the data are presented systematically as related to the independent and dependent variables of education and social distance respectively. Other possible influences were treated, during the study, as third variables held constant (geographic background, residence, socioeconomic status, political affiliation, sex, and previous interaction with blacks).

Partial tables (see Table X for example) were constructed based on the third variables in order to analyze the data and systematically test the hypotheses stated in a previous chapter based on the related literature. This procedure revealed the influences of the third variables on the original relationship between the independent variable (education) and the dependent variable (prejudice as measured by social distance).

The data comparing liberal arts seniors and freshmen are presented and analyzed. In addition, findings are also presented comparing the vocationally oriented students with the liberal arts students.

Justifiable interpretations are presented and null hypotheses have been tested. The testing of the null hypotheses allowed us to compare the findings of the present study with the alternate hypotheses projected from the related literature. The present study used a modified Bogardus Scale containing six choices to indicate the level of prejudice or amount of social distance held by the respondents. Since the

fifth and sixth levels of social distance contained so few responses (nine), these were appropriately collapsed into the fourth level. All computations in the present study were based on the collapsed data.

The Bogardus Scale is cumulative and arranged in ascending order. The social distance expressed is measured quantitatively by assigning numerals to the various levels. The lowest number (one) represents the least amount of social distance.

Education and Prejudice

Liberal Arts: Seniors vs. Freshmen

An analysis was made of the relationship between white-student prejudice toward blacks and amount of liberal arts education of these students. These data and the results of the analysis are presented in Table V.

The chi-square (X_2 = 4.78, df = 3) computed on Table V did not justify the rejection of the null hypothesis at the .05 level.

The negative gamma (-.07) indicated the direction and strength of a potentially significant relationship between educational status and social distance. The negative gamma coefficient also suggested a tendency toward a slight positive relationship between education and prejudice in this sample. This finding indicated that the higher the educational status, the higher the level of prejudice or social distance that could be expected.

TABLE V

A COMPARISON OF PREJUDICE BETWEEN LIBERAL ARTS SENIORS AND FRESHMEN*

Expressed Social Distance	Educational Status				
	SR	%	Fr	%	Totals
Close Kinship--Marriage (1)	20	(18)	33	(14)	53
Social Dating (2)	11	(10)	39	(17)	50
Roommate--All privileges (3)	46	(42)	109	(47)	155
Dorm--Class officers (4)	32	(29)	53	(22)	85
Totals	109		234		343
Mean RDQ =	2.83		2.78		2.79
X^2 = 4.78 df = 3 p .20 γ = -.07					

H_o: There is no significant relationship between educational status and social distance held by white seniors and freshmen toward blacks in this particular sample.

The mean RDQ (Racial Distance Quotient) of all seniors was slightly higher than the mean RDQ of the combined freshman sample. It was interesting to note that the mean RDQs of seniors in almost all the findings were larger than the mean RDQs of freshmen when the gammas were negative. This is what one would have expected to find. Correspondingly in the gamma analyses where the freshman RDQ was larger than the senior RDQ, the gamma coefficients were positive.

The seniors tended to be more polarized in their opinions toward blacks. It was noted that 29 percent of the seniors (compared to 22

*This table, containing the basic data of the independent and dependent variables, is repeated over each set of partial tables when the third variables are held constant. This is for the convenience of the reader in comparing the data.

percent of freshmen) indicated willingness to allow blacks no closer than living in the same dorm. On the other hand 18 percent of the seniors (compared to 14 percent of the freshmen) indicated a willingness to admit blacks to close kinship by marriage.

Liberal Arts Freshmen vs. Vocational Technical Students

An analysis was made between white-student prejudice toward blacks and type of education. All students in the analysis were characterized by one of two categories on the education variable, freshman liberal arts students or vocational technical students. These data and the results of the analysis are presented in Table VI.

TABLE VI

TYPE OF EDUCATION AND PREJUDICE: A COMPARISON OF LIBERAL ARTS FRESHMEN AND VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL STUDENTS

	Type of Education				
	L.A. Freshmen		Voc. Tech.		
Expressed Social Distance	No.	%	No.	%	Totals
Close Kinship--Marriage (1)	33	(14)	8	(6)	41
Social Dating (2)	39	(17)	3	(2)	42
Roommate--All privileges (3)	109	(46)	46	(33)	155
Dorm--Class offices (4)	53	(23)	83	(59)	136
Totals	234		140		374
Mean RDQ =	2.78		3.46		3.03
X^2 = 58.04	df = 3		$p < .001$		γ = +.60

H_o: There is no significant relationship between type of education and expressed prejudice.

The chi-square value (X^2 = 58.04) revealed a significant relationship between type of education and amount of prejudice at the .001 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The positive gamma (γ = +.60) indicated that the vocational technical students were more prejudiced than the freshman students. This was supported by the mean RDQs of the freshman and vocational technical groups (RDQ = 2.78 and RDQ = 3.46, respectively). The vocational technical student sample was composed of freshmen and sophomores.

Liberal Arts Seniors vs. Vocational Technical Students

An analysis was made between white-student prejudice toward blacks and type of education. All students in the analysis were characterized by one of two categories on the latter variable, senior liberal arts students or vocational technical students. These data and the results of the analysis are presented in Table VII.

TABLE VII

TYPE OF EDUCATION AND PREJUDICE: A COMPARISON OF LIBERAL ARTS SENIORS AND VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL STUDENTS

	Type of Education				
	L.A. Seniors		Voc. Tech.		
Expressed Social Distance	No.	%	No.	%	Totals
Close Kinship--Marriage (1)	20	(18)	8	(6)	28
Social Dating (2)	11	(10)	3	(2)	14
Roommate--All privileges (3)	46	(42)	46	(33)	92
Dorm--Class offices (4)	32	(30)	83	(59)	115
Totals	109		140		249
Mean RDQ =	2.83		3.46		3.18
X^2 = 28.86	df = 3		p < .001		γ = +.53

H_o: There is no significant relationship between type of education and expressed prejudice.

In Table VII the chi-square value (X^2 = 28.86, df = 3) indicated a significant association between the type of education and amount of prejudice at the .001 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The positive gamma (γ = +.53) indicated that the vocational technical students were more prejudiced than the liberal arts students. This was supported by the mean RDQs of the liberal arts senior students (RDQ = 2.83) and vocational technical students (RDQ = 3.46).

Liberal Arts Students vs. Vocational Technical Students

An analysis was made of the relationship between white-student prejudice toward blacks and type of education. All students in the analysis were characerized by one of two categories on the latter variable, liberal arts students (freshmen and seniors) and vocational technical students. These data and the results of the analysis are presented in Table VIII.

In Table VIII the chi-square value (X^2 = 59.11, df = 3) indicated a statistically significant association between the type of education and amount of prejudice at the .001 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The positive gamma (γ = +.58) suggested that vocational technical students are more prejudiced than liberal arts students. This was supported by the relative means RDQs of the type of education (liberal arts RDQ = 2.79 and vocational technical RDQ = 3.46).

It was interesting to note that a much higher percent of vocational technical students (59 percent) responded to the extreme level of social distance as compared to the liberal arts students (25 percent).

TABLE VIII

TYPE OF EDUCATION AND PREJUDICE: A COMPARISON OF LIBERAL ARTS AND VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL STUDENTS

Expressed Social Distance	Type of Education				
	Liberal Arts		Voc. Tech.		
	No.	%	No.	%	Totals
Close Kinship--Marriage (1)	53	(15)	8	(6)	61
Social Dating (2)	50	(15)	3	(2)	53
Roommate--All privileges (3)	155	(45)	46	(33)	201
Dorm--Class offices (4)	85	(25)	83	(59)	168
Totals	343		140		483
Mean RDQ =	2.79		3.46		2.99

$X^2 = 59.11$ df = 3 $p < .001$ $\gamma = +.58$

H_o: There is no significant relationship between type of education and expressed prejudice.

Summary Statement on Education and Prejudice

The findings on the basic data were not generally in keeping with the related literature. It was expected that there would be a negative relationship between educational status and prejudice. Though not significant, the findings of the present study showed a slight positive relationship ($\gamma = -.07$) between educational status and prejudice (see Table V).

However, in Tables VI, VII, and VIII a significant relationship was found between the types of education when other than liberal arts students were compared. Explanations for this difference are offered in Chapter V.

Parents' Socioeconomic Class

The literature suggested that lower socioeconomic persons have a tendency to estimate themselves as middle class. The estimated SEC (Socioeconomic Class) data are presented in Tables IX and X. They are followed by parents' actual education (Tables XI and XII), occupation (Tables XIII and XIV), and income (Tables XV and XVI). The three components combined make up the socioeconomic class index of this study. The final aspect of SEC considered in this study was the actual SEC as computed from the index for each student. The computed SEC was the total sum of the numbers assigned to the three components of the SEC index (see Appendix items 8, 9, and 10) which indicated the students' parents' education, occupation, and amount of income. Any computed score totaling between 3 and 6 was considered lower class. The range from 7 - 12 was moderate class and the range from 13 - 18 was considered higher class. For example, if a student chose category 3 on item 8 in the questionnaire, category 4 in item 9; and category 4 in item 10, then the total computed SEC would be 11. This would place that student in the moderate class SEC with a range of 7 - 12.

Parents' Estimated SEC and Prejudice

From the literature it was hypothesized that the lower socioeconomic class expresses more racial prejudice than the higher class. This projection was not found when socioeconomic class was estimated by the students surveyed. However, there was such a small amount of data in the lower category of the estimated SEC that no meaningful conclusions could be reached. The data and the results of the analysis are presented in Table IX.

The chi-square value (X^2 = 11.66, df = 6, p = .07) of Table IX did not justify the rejection of the null hypothesis at the .05 level. The null hypothesis could be rejected at the .07 level since a chi-square value of only 12.59 is required for significance at the .05 level.

TABLE IX

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE BETWEEN CATEGORIES OF PARENTS' ESTIMATED SEC

Expressed Social Distance	Parents' Estimated SEC						
	Lower		Moderate		Higher		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Totals
Marriage (1)	5	(42)	41	(14)	7	(18)	53
Dating (2)	2	(16)	42	(14)	6	(16)	50
Roommate (3)	3	(25)	140	(48)	12	(32)	155
Dorm (4)	2	(16)	70	(24)	13	(34)	85
Totals	12		293		38		343

Mean RDQ = 2.17 2.82 2.82
X^2 = 11.66, df = 6, p = .07

H_o: There is no significant relationship between the categories of parents' estimated SEC and expressed racial prejudice.

Analyses were made of the relationships between white-student education and prejudice toward blacks within categories of parent socioeconomic status as estimated by students. These data and the results of the analyses are presented in Table X.

In Table X none of the null hypotheses could be rejected because there were no statistically significant relationships between student

educational status and prejudice found within any of the categories of parents' estimated SEC. Only the Moderate category approached significance ($X^2 = 4.03$, df = 3, p = .25).

The gammas revealed that the relationship between educational status and prejudice was more positively related within two SEC categories (Lower, $\gamma = -.70$ and Moderate $\gamma = -.10$) than for the original relationship ($\gamma = -.07$) between education and prejudice as presented in the Higher SEC category ($\gamma = +.03$). The gamma of -.70 in the Lower SEC category indicated that education and prejudice have a higher positive relationship in this category than in Moderate or Higher SEC categories.

The increase in prejudice from freshman to senior year tended to be greater in the Lower SEC category than the increase and decrease for the Moderate and Higher SEC categories. While the data were few, they indicated that education tends to effect a prejudiced attitude for Lower SEC students. This finding was quite contrary to the literature which projected a great deal of change for the Lower SEC toward less prejudice. The literature did suggest the finding that the Moderate and Higher SECs would be similar, with little change, as a result of education.

It is interesting to note that the mean RDQs of both freshmen and seniors in the Lower SEC category were smaller than the comparable RDQs of the Moderate and Higher categories. The Lower-category freshmen have the smallest RDQ, and increased the most in RDQ by the time they were seniors. However, the senior RDQ of the Lower category was still smaller than any of the freshman or senior RDQs of the other two categories. Again, it should be noted that the N was very small in the lower category.

TABLE X

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE WITHIN CATEGORIES OF PARENTS' ESTIMATED SEC

Expressed Social Distance	Educational Status				
	Sr	%	Fr	%	Totals
Close Kinship--Marriage (1)	20	(18)	33	(14)	53
Social Dating (2)	11	(10)	39	(17)	50
Roommate--All privileges (3)	46	(42)	109	(47)	155
Dorm--Class offices (4)	32	(29)	53	(22)	84
Totals	109		234		343
Mean RDQ =	2.83		2.78		2.79

$X^2 = 4.78$ df = 3 p = .20 $\gamma = -.07$

PARENTS' ESTIMATED SEC (T-VARIABLE HELD CONSTANT)

Expressed Social Distance	Lower					Moderate					Higher					Totals
	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	
Marriage (1)	3	(33)	2	(67)	5	15	(16)	26	(13)	41	2	(33)	5	(16)	7	53
Dating (2)	1	(11)	1	(33)	2	9	(9)	33	(17)	42	1	(17)	5	(16)	6	50
Roommate (3)	3	(33)	0	(0)	3	43	(46)	97	(49)	140	0	(0)	12	(37)	12	155
Dorm (4)	2	(22)	0	(0)	2	27	(29)	43	(21)	70	3	(50)	10	(31)	13	85
Totals	9		3		12	94		199		293	6		32		38	343
Mean RDQ =	2.44		1.33		2.17	2.87		2.79		2.82	2.67		2.84		2.82	
X^2 =			2.76					4.03 p = .25					3.61			
γ =			-.70					-.10					+.03			

It is also interesting to note that 50 percent of the seniors of the Higher category of estimated SEC fell in the most-prejudiced level of social distance while 33 percent of those seniors were willing to marry blacks. One may note also that 67 percent of the Lower SEC freshmen were willing to marry blacks while none of this group of freshmen were in the highest prejudice level.

Parents' Education and Prejudice

An analysis was made of the relationship between white-student prejudice toward blacks and the educational achievements of the students' parents. These data and the results of the analysis are presented in Table XI.

TABLE XI

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE BETWEEN CATEGORIES OF PARENTS' EDUCATION

Expressed Social Distance	Parents' Education								
	Elementary		High School		College		Graduate		Totals
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Marriage (1)	4	(10)	20	(15)	14	(18)	15	(16)	53
Dating (2)	1	(3)	24	(18)	8	(11)	17	(18)	50
Roommate (3)	21	(54)	59	(44)	35	(46)	40	(43)	155
Dorm (4)	13	(33)	32	(23)	19	(25)	21	(23)	85
Totals	39		135		76		93		343
Mean RDQ =	3.10		2.76		2.78		2.72		

$X^2 = 9.86$, df = 9

H_o: There is no relationship between parents' educational status and expressed racial prejudice of white students toward black students.

The chi-square value ($X^2 = 9.86$, df = 9) of Table XI did not justify the rejection of the null hypothesis at the .05 level. This means that no relationship was found between various categories of parents' education and student prejudice in this particular sample.

Analyses of the relationship between white-student education and prejudice were made within categories of parent educational levels. For instance, the relationship between student education and prejudice was made for students whose parents had no more than an elementary education. Similar analyses were made for students whose parents had a high school education, college education, and graduate school training. These data and the results of the analyses are presented in Table XII.

In Table XII none of the null hypotheses could be rejected because there were no statistically significant relationships between students' educational status and prejudice within the examined categories of parents' education. Only the High School group approaches significance ($X^2 = 4.06$, df = 3, p = .25).

The gammas specify the condition under which the original relationship ($\gamma = -.07$ as presented in Table V) between students' educational status and prejudice becomes more or less pronounced. The relationship between educational status and prejudice became more pronounced for students whose parents had college and graduate education. This indicated that the higher the educational level of parents, the higher the increase of prejudice during the college experience for the students in this particular sample.

The relationship was in the opposite direction from the original relationship for students whose parents had elementary education. This

TABLE XII

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE WITHIN CATEGORIES OF PARENTS' EDUCATION

Expressed Social Distance	Educational Status Sr	%	Fr	%	Totals
Close Kinship--Marriage (1)	20	(18)	33	(14)	53
Social Dating (2)	11	(10)	39	(17)	50
Roommate--All privileges (3)	46	(42)	109	(47)	155
Dorm--Class offices (4)	32	(29)	53	(22)	85
Totals	109		234		343
Mean RDQ -	2.83		2.78		2.79

X^2 = 4.78 df = 3 p = .20 γ = -.07

PARENTS' EDUCATION (T-VARIABLE HELD CONSTANT)

Expressed Social Distance	Elementary Sr	%	Fr	%	T	High School Sr	%	Fr	%	T	College Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Graduate Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Tls
Marriage (1)	2	(9)	2	(12)	4	9	(21)	11	(12)	20	6	(24)	8	(16)	14	3	(15)	12	(16)	15	53
Dating (2)	1	(5)	0	(0)	1	7	(17)	17	(18)	24	1	(4)	7	(14)	8	2	(10)	15	(21)	17	50
Roommate (3)	13	(59)	8	(47)	21	14	(33)	45	(48)	59	10	(40)	25	(49)	35	9	(45)	31	(42)	40	155
Dorm (4)	6	(27)	7	(41)	13	12	(29)	20	(22)	32	8	(32)	11	(21)	19	6	(30)	15	(21)	21	85
Totals	22		17		39	42		93		135	25		51		76	20		73		93	343
Mean RDQ =	3.04		3.18		3.10	2.69		2.80		2.76	2.80		2.76		2.78	2.90		2.67		2.72	
X^2 =			1.57					4.06	p = .25				3.16					1.68			
γ =			+.26					+.05					-.08					-.21			

suggested that the lower the education of parents, the stronger was the negative relationship between student educational status and prejudice in this particular sample.

An overall comparison of the mean RDQs of educational groups revealed that students with less-educated parents are most prejudiced. The Elementary Education category was most prejudiced (RDQ = 3.10) while the students of Graduate School parents were least prejudiced (RDQ = 2.72). As expected, the students in the categories of parents with lower education were most prejudiced, but tended to become less prejudiced with liberal arts education.

Within the category of parents having an elementary education, an unusually large number of freshmen (41 percent) fell in the extreme-prejudice level. In this same group there were no freshmen from an N of 17 who scored on the dating level of expressed social distance.

It was interesting to note that for the most part the percentage of students in the least-prejudiced level (willing to marry) was higher than in the second level (willing to date). This points out that of those willing to date, most would probably marry, but some would not.

Parents' Occupation and Prejudice

An analysis was made of the relationship between white-student prejudice toward blacks and the occupations of the parents of those students. These data and the results of the analysis are presented in Table XIII.

The chi-square value ($X^2 = 12.97$, df = 9) of Table XIII did not justify the rejection of the null hypothesis at the .05 level. This meant that no relationship was found between the various categories of parents' occupation and student prejudice in this particular sample.

TABLE XIII

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE BETWEEN CATEGORIES OF PARENTS' OCCUPATION

Expressed Social Distance	Parents' Occupation: Unskilled and Semi-skilled Workers No.	%	Skilled Workers and Clerks No.	%	Proprietor, Manager and Officials No.	%	Professionals No.	%	Totals
Marriage (1)	7	(19)	18	(18)	8	(9)	20	(18)	53
Dating (2)	4	(11)	14	(14)	14	(15)	18	(16)	50
Roomate (3)	22	(59)	39	(38)	42	(46)	52	(46)	155
Dorm (4)	4	(11)	30	(30)	28	(30)	23	(20)	84
Totals	37		101		92		113		343
Mean RDQ =	2.62		2.80		2.98		2.69		

$X^2 = 12.97$, df = 9

H_o: There is no significant relationship between the categories of parents' occupation and expressed prejudice.

Analyses were made of the relationship between white-student prejudice toward blacks and student education within four categories of parent occupational status. These data and the results of analyses are presented in Table XIV.

In Table XIV, none of the null hypotheses could be rejected because there were no statistically significant relationships between students' educational status and prejudice within any of the categories of parents' occupation.

The gamma coefficients revealed that the potential relationship between educational status and prejudice became more positive than the original relationship within the Skilled Workers and Clerks category ($\gamma = -.09$) and the Professionals category ($\gamma = -.21$). The relationship

TABLE XIV

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE WITHIN CATEGORIES OF PARENTS' OCCUPATION

Expressed Social Distance	Educational Status				
	Sr	%	Fr	%	Totals
Close Kinship--Marriage (1)	20	(18)	33	(14)	53
Social Dating (2)	11	(10)	39	(17)	50
Roommate--All privileges (3)	46	(42)	109	(47)	155
Dorm--Class offices (4)	32	(29)	53	(22)	85
Totals	109		234		343
Mean RDQ =	2.83		2.78		2.79
X^2 = 4.78	df = 3	p = .20			γ = -.07

PARENTS' OCCUPATION (T-VARIABLE HELD CONSTANT)

Expressed Social Distance	Unskilled and Semi-skilled workers					Skilled worker and clerks					Proprietor, managers and officials					Professionals					Totals
	SR	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	
Marriage (1)	3	(26)	4	(16)	7	9	(20)	9	(16)	18	2	(11)	6	(8)	8	6	(18)	14	(18)	20	53
Dating (2)	1	(8)	3	(12)	4	5	(12)	9	(16)	14	3	(16)	11	(15)	14	2	(6)	16	(20)	18	50
Roommate (3)	7	(58)	15	(60)	22	14	(32)	25	(44)	39	8	(42)	34	(47)	42	17	(50)	35	(44)	52	155
Dorm (4)	1	(8)	3	(12)	4	16	(36)	14	(24)	30	6	(31)	22	(30)	28	9	(26)	14	(18)	23	85
Totals	12		25		37	44		57		101	19		73		92	34		79		113	343
Mean RDQ =	2.50		2.68		2.62	2.84		2.77		2.80	2.95		2.99		2.98	2.85		2.62		2.69	
X^2 =			.51			2.75							.16					3.24			
γ =			+.15			-.09							+.02					-.21			

was also more pronounced but in the opposite direction in the category of the Unskilled and Semiskilled Workers (γ = +.15) while the relationship seemed to disappear in the category of Proprietors, Managers, and Officials (γ = +.02).

Within the occupational categories of Unskilled Workers (RDQ = 2.62) and Proprietors, Managers and Officials (RDQ = 2.98), the RDQs indicated the freshmen to be more prejudiced than seniors. This was consistent with the gamma coefficients which were both in the positive direction (γ = +.15, γ = +.02) away from the overall original relationship (γ = -.07) between student educational status and prejudice.

The students whose parents were skilled workers and clerks, as well as professionals, showed negative gammas (-.09 and -.21 respectively). In these categories the RDQ indicated that the senior students were slightly more prejudiced than freshmen.

The most prejudiced occupational category was the Proprietor, Manager, and Officials (RDQ = 2.98) with the seniors and freshmen approximately equal in RDQ (2.95 and 2.99 respectively).

The most interesting observation among the percentages was that the solid middle-class proprietors, managers, and officials had almost identical percentages in each of the four levels of expressed prejudice. This was consistent with the gamma coefficient (γ = +.02) which indicated that there was almost no relationship between student education and prejudice.

Parents' Income and Prejudice

An analysis was made of the relationship between white-student prejudice toward blacks and the annual incomes earned by the parents

of these students. These data and the results of the analysis are presented in Table XV.

TABLE XV

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE BETWEEN CATEGORIES OF PARENTS' INCOME

Expressed Social Distance	Parents' Income										
	3000-4999		5000-6999		7000-9999		10,000-14,999		15,000-up		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No	%	Totals
Marriage (1)	7	(25)	9	(23)	9	(10)	14	(14)	14	(16)	53
Dating (2)	3	(11)	4	(10)	13	(15)	18	(18)	12	(14)	50
Roommate (3)	12	(43)	17	(44)	44	(51)	44	(43)	38	(43)	155
Dorm (4)	6	(21)	9	(23)	21	(24)	25	(25)	24	(27)	85
Totals	28		39		87		101		88		343
Means RDQ =	2.61		2.67		2.89		2.79		2.82		

$X^2 = 7.61$, df = 12

H_o: There is no significant relationship between the categories of parents' income and expressed racial prejudice.

The chi-square value ($X^2 = 7.61$, df = 12) of Table XV did not justify the rejection of the null hypothesis at the .05 level. This meant that in this particular sample no relationship was found between the various income levels and expressed racial prejudice.

Analyses of the relationship between white-student education and prejudice toward blacks was made within five different categories of parental income. These data and the results of the analyses are presented in Table XVI.

In Table XVI none of the null hypotheses could be rejected because there were no significant relationships between student educational

status and prejudice found within any of the categories of parents' income.

Only the $10,000-$14,999 category approached significance ($X^2 = 5.87$, df = 3, p = .13).

The gammas revealed that the relationship between educational status and prejudice became more positive within three categories: $7,000-$9,999, $\gamma = -.19$; $10,000-$14,999, $\gamma = -.14$; $15,000-up, $\gamma = -.17$. The relationship was also more pronounced but in the opposite direction in the two lower-income categories: $3,000-$4,999, $\gamma = +.09$ and $5,000-$6,999, $\gamma = +.17$.

The $7,000-$9,000 category revealed the highest mean RDQ. It was interesting to note that the mean RDQs of seniors in all income categories having a negative gamma were larger than the mean RDQs of freshmen in those categories. This was what one would have expected to find. Correspondingly in the income categories where the freshman mean RDQ was larger than the senior mean RDQ, the gamma coefficients were positive. This held in most analyses throughout the study. However, there were a few exceptions which could probably be attributed to chance.

As the income categories advanced, the percentage willing to marry blacks became smaller. There was also somewhat of a trend for the mean RDQs to become larger as the income increased.

TABLE XVI

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE WITHIN CATEGORIES OF PARENTS' INCOME

Expressed Social Distance	Educational Status Sr	%	Fr	%	Totals
Close Kinship--Marriage (1)	20	(18)	33	(14)	53
Social Dating (2)	11	(10)	39	(17)	50
Roommate--All privileges (3)	46	(42)	109	(47)	155
Dorm--Class offices (4)	32	(29)	53	(22)	85
Totals	109		234		343
Mean RDQ =	2.83		2.78		2.79

$X^2 = 4.78$ df = 3 $\gamma = -.07$

PARENTS' INCOME (T-VARIABLE HELD CONSTANT)

Expressed Social Distance	$3,000 - $4,999 Sr	%	Fr	%	T	$5,000 - $6,999 Sr	%	Fr	%	T	$7,000 - $9,999 Sr	%	Fr	%	T	$10,000 - $14,999 Sr	%	Fr	%	T	$15,000 - up Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Tls
Marriage(1)	3	(22)	4	(29)	7	6	(32)	3	(15)	9	3	(10)	6	(10)	9	6	(20)	8	(11)	14	2	(12)	12	(17)	14	53
Dating (2)	2	(14)	1	(7)	3	1	(5)	3	(15)	4	4	(14)	9	(16)	13	3	(10)	15	(21)	18	1	(6)	11	(15)	12	50
Roommate(3)	7	(50)	5	(35)	12	8	(42)	9	(45)	17	12	(41)	32	(55)	44	10	(33)	34	(48)	44	9	(53)	29	(41)	38	155
Dorm (4)	2	(14)	4	(29)	6	4	(21)	5	(25)	9	10	(35)	11	(19)	21	11	(37)	14	(20)	25	5	(29)	19	(27)	24	85
Totals	14		14		28	19		20		39	29		58		87	30		71		101	17		71		88	343
Mean RDQ =	2.57		2.64		2.61	2.53		2.80		2.67	3.00		2.83		2.89	2.87		2.76		2.79	3.00		2.77		2.82	
X^2 =			1.48					2.05					2.71			5.87 p=.13							1.59			
γ =			+.09					+.17					-.19			-.14							-.17			

Parents' Computed SEC and Prejudice

An analysis was made of the relationship between white-student prejudice toward blacks and the overall socioeconomic status (as computed on an index described in a previous chapter) of the parents of these students. These data and the results of the analysis are presented in Table XVII.

The chi-square value ($X^2 = 3.31$, df = 6) of Table XVII did not justify the rejection of the null hypothesis at the .05 level. This means that no relationship was found between the various categories of parents' computed SEC and expressed racial prejudice in this particular sample.

TABLE XVII

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE BETWEEN CATEGORIES OF PARENTS' COMPUTED SEC

Expressed Social Distance	Parents' Computed SEC						
	Lower		Moderate		Higher		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Totals
Marriage (1)	0	(0)	23	(18)	30	(14)	53
Dating (2)	0	(0)	17	(13)	33	(16)	50
Roommate (3)	2	(50)	57	(44)	96	(46)	155
Dorm (4)	2	(50)	32	(25)	51	(24)	85
Totals	4		129		210		343
Mean RDQ =	3.50		2.76		2.80		

$X^2 = 3.31$, df = 6

H_o: There is no significant relationship between the categories of parents' computed SEC and expressed racial prejudice of white students.

Analyses of the relationship between white-student education and prejudice were made within three categories of computed socioeconomic status of parents. These data and the results of the analyses are presented in Table XVIII.

In Table XVIII none of the null hypotheses could be rejected at the .05 level because there were no statistically significant chi-square values between prejudice and student educational status within any of the categories of SEC. Only the category of Higher SEC approached significance ($X^2 = 4.91$, $p = .19$).

Two of the gammas (Lower, $\gamma = -.99$ and Higher, $\gamma = -.16$) became more pronounced in the same direction as the original relationship ($\gamma = -.07$). In these two categories the negative gamma indicated a positive relationship between student educational status and prejudice.

In the third category (Moderate $\gamma = +.05$) the gamma went in the opposite direction than the original relationship ($\gamma = -.07$) and tended to disappear.

The exceptionally high gamma coefficient in the Lower category could probably be attributed to chance since the N was so small. The mean RDQ for seniors in the Lower category was smaller than the mean RDQ for freshmen, which was not expected with the negative gamma coefficient. This, too, was attributed to the small amount of data in the category.

The positive gamma ($\gamma = +.05$) of the Moderate category and the negative gamma ($\gamma = -.16$) of the Higher category were coupled with the expected RDQs. Freshmen were more prejudiced than seniors in the Moderate category and seniors were more prejudiced than freshmen in the Higher category.

TABLE XVIII

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE WITHIN CATEGORIES OF PARENTS' COMPUTED SEC

Expressed Social Distance	Educational Status				
	Sr	%	Fr	%	Totals
Close Kinship--Marriage (1)	20	(18)	33	(14)	53
Social Dating (2)	11	(10)	39	(17)	50
Roommate--All privileges (3)	46	(42)	109	(47)	155
Dorm--Class offices (4)	32	(29)	53	(22)	85
Totals	109		234		343
Mean RDQ =	2.83		2.78		2.79
$X^2 = 4.78$ df = 3 p = .20					$\gamma = -.07$

PARENTS' COMPUTED SEC (T-VARIABLE HELD CONSTANT)

Expressed Social Distance	Lower					Moderate					Higher					Totals
	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	
Marriage (1)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	11	(22)	12	(15)	23	9	(16)	21	(14)	30	53
Dating (2)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	7	(14)	10	(13)	17	4	(7)	29	(19)	33	50
Roommate (3)	2	(67)	0	(0)	2	18	(36)	39	(49)	57	26	(46)	70	(45)	96	155
Dorm (4)	1	(33)	1	(100)	2	14	(28)	18	(23)	32	17	(30)	34	(22)	51	85
Totals	3		1		4	50		79		129	56		154		210	343
Mean RDQ =	3.33		4.00		3.50	2.70		2.80		2.76	2.91		2.76		2.80	
X^2 =			2.00					2.43			4.91 p = .19					
γ =			-.99					+.05			-.16					

The relatively even distribution of the percentages and mean RDQs of the Moderate and Higher categories indicated similar levels of prejudice.

It was interesting to note that more students estimated (see Table IX) that they were lower class (12) than were computed to be lower class (4) based on family occupation, education, and income of the SEC index. Again in the Moderate category (see Table X) the responding students underestimated their SEC level (seniors 94 and freshmen 199) as compared with the computed SEC in Table XVIII (seniors 50 and freshmen 79). Based on the computed index, more of the students should have been in the Higher category than estimated themselves to be.

Political-Party Affiliation and Prejudice

An analysis was made of the relationship between white-student prejudice toward blacks and political-party affiliation. These data and the results of the analysis are presented in Table XIX.

The chi-square value ($X^2 = 21.03$, $df = 6$, $p < .01$) of Table XIX justified the rejection of the null hypothesis at the .01 level of significance. This means that a relationship was found between the various categories of political-party affiliation and expressed prejudice.

TABLE XIX

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE BETWEEN CATEGORIES OF POLITICAL-PARTY AFFILIATION

Expressed Social Distance	Political-Party Affiliation						
	Democrats		Republicans		Independents		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Totals
Marriage (1)	13	(16)	30	(14)	10	(23)	53
Dating (2)	5	(6)	33	(15)	12	(28)	50
Roommate (3)	34	(41)	105	(48)	16	(37)	155
Dorm (4)	30	(37)	50	(23)	5	(12)	85
Totals	82		218		43		343
Mean RDQ =	2.96		2.80		2.37		

$X^2 = 21.02$, df = 6, $p < .01$

H_o: There is no significant relationship between the categories of political-party affiliation and expressed prejudice.

Analyses of the relationship between white-student education and prejudice were made within three different categories of political-party affiliation. These data and the results of the analyses are presented in Table XX.

In Table XX none of the null hypotheses could be rejected because none of the chi-square values examining relationships within the categories were statistically significant. Only one category (Democrats $X^2 = 5.66$, df = 3, p = .14) approached the significant level.

The gammas revealed that the relationship between educational status and prejudice became more positive within two categories: Republicans, $\gamma = -.08$, and Independents, $\gamma = -.34$. The relationship was also more pronounced but in the opposite direction in the Democrat category ($\gamma = +.13$).

TABLE XX

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE WITHIN CATEGORIES OF POLITICAL-PARTY AFFILIATION

Expressed Social Distance	Educational Status				
	Sr	%	Fr	%	Totals
Close Kinship--Marriage (1)	20	(18)	33	(14)	53
Social Dating (2)	11	(10)	39	(17)	50
Roommate--All privileges (3)	46	(42)	109	(47)	155
Dorm--Class offices (4)	32	(29)	53	(22)	85
Totals	109		234		343
Mean RDQ =	2.83		2.78		2.79

$X^2 = 4.78$ df = 3 p = .20 $\gamma = -.07$

POLITICAL-PARTY AFFILIATION (T-VARIABLE HELD CONSTANT)

Expressed Social Distance	Democrats					Republicans					Independents					Totals
	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	
Marriage (1)	7	(28)	6	(10)	13	12	(16)	18	(13)	30	1	(14)	9	(25)	10	53
Dating (2)	0	(0)	5	(9)	5	10	(13)	23	(16)	33	1	(14)	11	(31)	12	50
Roommate (3)	9	(36)	25	(44)	34	33	(43)	72	(51)	105	4	(58)	12	(33)	16	155
Dorm (4)	9	(36)	21	(37)	30	22	(28)	28	(20)	50	1	(14)	4	(11)	5	85
Totals	25		57		82	77		141		218	7		36		43	343
Mean RDQ =	2.80		3.04		2.96	2.84		2.78		2.80	2.71		2.31		2.37	
X^2 =			5.66 p = .14					2.45					1.82			
γ =			+.13					-.08					-.34			

The more pronounced negative gamma coefficient (γ = -.34) in the Independent political category indicated a greater positive relationship between educational-status prejudice than in the Democrat or Republican categories.

Again, the mean RDQs of freshmen and seniors in all three categories were related to one another as would be expected by their respective gamma coefficients. Democrats (RDQ = 2.96) were most prejudiced followed by Republicans (RDQ = 2.80) and Independents (RDQ = 2.37).

The least amount of data was found in the Independent category as would be expected from the literature. The RDQs were lower in this category for both freshmen and seniors. This was similar to the estimated SEC variable where the lower-class category had the least amount of data and lowest RDQs.

Prejudice and Geographic Location

An analysis was made of the relationship between white-student prejudice toward blacks and the geographic origin of these students within the continental United States. These data and the results of the analysis are presented in Table XXI.

The chi-square value (X^2 = 37.07, df = 9) of Table XXI revealed a significant relationship between geographic location and amount of prejudice at the .001 level. Therefore, the null hypotheses was rejected.

TABLE XXI

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE BETWEEN CATEGORIES OF GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION

Expressed Social Distance	Geographic Location								
	Northeast		N. Central		South		West		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Totals
Marriage (1)	10	(20)	16	(17)	12	(9)	15	(21)	53
Dating (2)	7	(14)	19	(21)	15	(12)	9	(13)	50
Roommate (3)	28	(56)	45	(48)	48	(37)	34	(48)	155
Dorm (4)	5	(10)	13	(14)	54	(42)	13	(18)	85
Totals	50		93		129		71		343

Mean RDQ = 2.56 2.59 3.12 2.63

$X^2 = 37.07$, df = 9, $p < .001$

H_o: There is no significant relationship between the white student's past geographic location and the amount of racial prejudice held toward blacks.

Analyses of the relationship between white-student education and prejudice were made within four categories of geographic origin of students. These data and the results of the analyses are presented in Table XXII.

While a significant relationship was found between the various categories of geographic location, Table XXII revealed that none of the null hypotheses within the categories of geographic location could be rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Therefore, no significant relationship was found between the variables of prejudice and student educational status. Only two categories of geographic location (Northeast $X^2 = 5.30$, df = 3, p = .17 and West $X^2 = 6.65$, df = 3, $p \approx .09$) approached significance.

TABLE XXII

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE WITHIN CATEGORIES OF GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION

Expressed Social Distance	Educational Status				
	Sr	%	Fr	%	Totals
Close Kinship--Marriage (1)	20	(18)	33	(14)	53
Social Dating (2)	11	(10)	39	(17)	50
Roommate--All privileges (3)	46	(42)	109	(47)	155
Dorm--Class offices (4)	32	(29)	53	(22)	85
Totals	109		234		343
Mean RDQ =	2.83		2.78		2.79

$X^2 = 4.78$ df = 3 p ≅ .20 $Y = -.07$

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION (T-VARIABLE HELD CONSTANT)

Expressed Social Distance	Northeast					North Central					South					West					Tls
	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	
Marriage (1)	3	(16)	7	(23)	10	7	(24)	9	(14)	16	4	(10)	8	(9)	12	6	(29)	9	(18)	15	53
Dating (2)	3	(16)	4	(13)	7	4	(13)	15	(24)	19	4	(10)	11	(12)	15	0	(0)	9	(18)	9	50
Roommate (3)	9	(47)	19	(61)	28	16	(53)	29	(46)	45	12	(31)	36	(40)	48	9	(42)	25	(50)	34	155
Dorm (4)	4	(21)	1	(3)	5	3	(10)	10	(16)	13	19	(49)	35	(39)	54	6	(29)	7	(14)	13	85
Totals	19		31		50	30		63		93	39		90		129	21		50		71	343
Mean RDQ =	2.74		2.45		2.56	2.50		2.63		2.59	3.18		3.09		3.12	2.71		2.60		2.63	
X^2 =			5.30 p≅ .17					2.71					1.33					6.65 p≅ .09			
Y =			-.35					+.09					-.12					+.15			

Two of the gammas were negative and more pronounced in the same direction as the original relationship (γ = -.07). The Northeast section (γ = -.35) and the South (γ = -.12) tended to show a positive relationshp between education and prejudice. As educational status increased the prejudice level increased.

Two of the gammas were positive (North Central, γ = +.09 and West, γ = +.15) and more pronounced in the opposite direction of the original relationship (γ = -.07). As educational status increased the level of prejudice decreased.

The South category revealed the highest mean RDQ (3.12) with the seniors' RDQ (3.18) being higher than the freshmen's RDQ (3.09). The South was followed by the West, North Central and Northeast in decreasing amounts of prejudice. In the case of the negative gammas, the senior RDQs were larger than the freshman RDQs. The North Central positive gamma was associated with a higher freshman RDQ as expected. However, the positive gamma of the West was associated with a higher senior RDQ. This was not as expected and could probably be attributed to chance.

It was interesting to note that the South percentages of the South category revealed a high concentration of respondents unwilling to allow blacks any closer than dorm occupancy in social distance. The South also had the smallest percentage of freshmen and seniors willing to allow blacks to close kinship by marriage.

Based on the related literature it was hypothesized that the Southern and North Central areas would express the most prejudice

followed by the Northeastern and Western areas. This projection held true for all areas except the West which had the second-highest mean RDQ rather than the least.

Residence and Prejudice

An analysis was made of the relationship between white-student prejudice toward blacks and the place of residence of these students. These data and the results of the analysis are presented in Table XXIII.

TABLE XXIII

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE BETWEEN CATEGORIES OF RESIDENCE

Expressed Social Distance	Residence										Totals
	Central City		Urban Area		Suburban		Urban Place		Rural		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Marriage (1)	7	(15)	13	(15)	15	(18)	10	(13)	8	(14)	53
Dating (2)	7	(15)	9	(11)	12	(15)	16	(21)	6	(11)	50
Roommate (3)	20	(44)	42	(50)	33	(40)	34	(46)	26	(46)	155
Dorm (4)	12	(26)	20	(24)	22	(27)	15	(20)	16	(29)	85
Totals	46		84		82		75		56		343
Mean RDQ = 2.80			2.82		2.76		2.72		2.89		

$X^2 = 6.63$, df = 12

H_o: There is no significant relationship between the white Oral Roberts University student's residential setting and racial prejudice.

The chi-square value (X^2 = 6.63, df = 12) of Table XXIII did not justify the rejection of the null hypothesis at the .05 level. No relationship was found between the various categories of residence and prejudice in this particular sample.

Analyses of the relationship between white-student education and prejudice were made within five areas of student residence. These data and the results of the analyses are presented in Table XXIV.

None of the null hypotheses within the categories of residence in Table XXIV could be rejected at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, no significant relationship was found between the variables of prejudice and student educational status. Only two categories of residence, Central City (X^2 = 6.41, df = 3, p = .10) and Urban Place (X^2 = 4.42, df = 3, p = .23) approached significance.

Three of the gammas were negative and more pronounced in the same direction as the original relationship (γ = -.07).

The Central City (γ = -.20), Suburban (γ = -.11), and the Rural (γ = -.14) tended to show a positive relationship between education and prejudice. This meant that as educational status increased, the prejudice level increased.

One gamma was positive (Urban Area, γ = +.13) and more pronounced in the opposite direction than the original relationship (γ = -.07). This meant that as educational status increased, the level of prejudice decreased. In one of the gammas (Urban Place γ = -.03) the original relationship tended to disappear.

TABLE XXIV

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE WITHIN CATEGORIES OF RESIDENCE

Expressed Social Distance	Educational Status				
	Sr	%	Fr	%	Totals
Close Kinship--Marriage (1)	20	(18)	33	(14)	53
Social Dating (2)	11	(10)	39	(17)	50
Roommate--All privileges (3)	46	(42)	109	(47)	155
Dorm--Class offices (4)	32	(29)	53	(22)	85
Totals	109		234		343
Mean RDQ =	2.83		2.78		2.79

$X^2 = 4.78$ df = 3 p = .20 $\gamma = -.07$

RESIDENCE (T-VARIABLE HELD CONSTANT)

Expressed Social Distance	Central City					Urban Area					Suburban					Urban Place					Rural					Totals
	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	
Marriage (1)	4	(21)	3	(11)	7	5	(24)	8	(13)	13	5	(21)	10	(17)	15	5	(21)	5	(10)	10	1	(5)	7	(20)	8	53
Dating (2)	2	(11)	5	(19)	7	2	(9)	7	(11)	9	2	(8)	10	(17)	12	2	(8)	14	(27)	16	3	(14)	3	(9)	6	50
Roommate (3)	5	(26)	15	(55)	20	9	(43)	33	(52)	42	9	(38)	24	(42)	33	12	(50)	22	(43)	34	11	(52)	15	(43)	26	155
Dorm (4)	8	(42)	4	(15)	12	5	(24)	15	(24)	20	8	(33)	14	(24)	22	5	(21)	10	(20)	15	6	(29)	10	(28)	16	85
Totals	19		27		46	21		63		84	24		58		82	24		51		75	21		35		56	343
Mean RDQ =	2.89		2.74		2.80	2.67		2.87		2.82	2.83		2.72		2.76	2.71		2.73		2.72	3.05		2.80		2.89	
X^2 =			6.41	p= .10				1.67					1.64					4.42	p= .23				2.83			
γ =			-.20					+.13					-.11					-.03					-.14			

The Rural category revealed the highest mean RDQ (2.89) with the seniors' RDQ (3.05) being higher than the freshmen's RDQ (2.80). The Rural category was followed by the Central City, Urban Area, Suburban, and Urban Place with decreasing amounts of prejudice. From the related literature it was projected that the Rural category would be highest in expressed prejudice.

In the case of the more pronounced negative gammas, the senior RDQs were larger than the freshman RDQs. The negative gamma associated with Urban Place (γ = -.03) was accompanied by a senior RDQ (2.71) that was lower than the freshman RDQ (2.73). One should note that the negative gamma tended to disappear and was not more pronounced than the original relationship. This could probably be attributed to chance.
The positive gamma associated with the urban area was accompanied by a higher freshman RDQ (2.87) as expected.

The Rural category had a large grouping of freshmen (28 percent) and seniors (29) percent) in the extreme-prejudice level. The largest group of extreme expressions was represented by the Central City seniors (42 percent)

Note that the Rural category also had a very small percent (5) of seniors in the low-prejudice group with a larger percent (20) of freshmen willing to allow blacks to close kinship by marriage.

Sex and Prejudice

An analysis was made of the relationship between sex and white-student prejudice toward blacks. These data and the results of the analysis are presented in Table XXV.

TABLE XXV

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE BETWEEN CATEGORIES OF SEX

Expressed Social Distance	Sex				
	Male		Female		
	No.	%	No.	%	Totals
Marriage (1)	22	(12)	31	(19)	53
Dating (2)	33	(19)	17	(10)	50
Roommate (3)	78	(44)	77	(46)	155
Dorm (4)	44	(25)	41	(25	85
Totals	177		166		343
Mean RDQ =	2.81		2.77		

$X^2 = 6.32$, df = 3

H_o: There is no significant relationship between sex and expressed prejudice.

The chi-square value ($X^2 = 6.32$, df = 3) of Table XXV did not justify the rejection of the null hypothesis at the .05 level. There was no significant relationship between the categories of sex and expressed social distance in this particular study.

Analyses of the relationship between white-student education and prejudice toward blacks were made within the two categories of sex, Male and Female. These data and the results of the analyses are presented in Table XXVI.

In Table XXVI the chi-square value ($X^2 = 9.37$, df = 3, $p < .025$) in the Female category was large enough to justify the rejection of the null hypothesis at the .025 level of significance.

Consequently one might conclude that there was a significant relationship between educational status and prejudice within the Female category.

TABLE XXVI

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE WITHIN CATEGORIES OF SEX

Expressed Social Distance	Educational Status				
	Sr	%	Fr	%	Totals
Close Kinship--Marriage (1)	20	(18)	33	(14)	53
Social Dating (2)	11	(10)	39	(17)	50
Roommate--All privileges (3)	46	(42)	109	(47)	155
Dorm--Class offices (4)	32	(29)	53	(22)	85
Totals	109		234		343
Mean RDQ =	2.83		2.78		2.79

$X^2 = 4.78$ df = 3 p = .20 $\gamma = -.07$

SEX (T-VARIABLE HELD CONSTANT)

Expressed Social Distance	Male					Female					Totals
	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	
Marriage (1)	8	(13)	14	(12)	22	12	(27)	19	(16)	31	53
Dating (2)	9	(14)	24	(21)	33	2	(4)	15	(12)	17	50
Roommate (3)	31	(48)	47	(42)	78	15	(33)	62	(51)	77	155
Dorm (4)	16	(25)	28	(25)	44	16	(36)	25	(21)	41	85
Totals	64		113		177	45		121		166	343
Mean RDQ =	2.86		2.79		2.81	2.78		2.77		2.77	

$X^2 =$ 1.68 9.37 $p < .025$

$\gamma =$ -.07 -.08

However, within the Male category the chi-square value ($X^2 = 1.68$) was very small and did not justify the rejection of the null hypothesis.

The gammas revealed that the relationship between educational status and prejudice was slightly more positively related within one category (Females $\gamma = -.08$) and remained the same as the original relationship ($\gamma = -.07$) for the Male category ($\gamma = -.07$).

The positive relationship between educational status and prejudice in the basic table (Table V) did not change significantly when data were sorted into partial tables by sex.

The mean RDQs of freshman and senior males were slightly larger than the mean RDQs for comparable categories of females. Note also that the male senior's mean RDQ was the highest.

Senior females tended to polarize on the variable of prejudice. They had the largest percent (27) willing to marry blacks and the largest percent (36) in the most-prejudiced category. Both categories of females (freshmen 16 percent and seniors 7 percent) were more willing to accept blacks to close kinship by marriage than the comparable categories of males (freshmen 12 percent, seniors 13 percent).

Social Interaction and Prejudice

High School Integration and Prejudice

An analysis was made of the relationship between white-student prejudice toward blacks and the degree of racial integration characteristic of their high schools. These data and the results of the analysis are presented in Table XXVII.

TABLE XXVII

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE BETWEEN CATEGORIES OF HIGH SCHOOL INTEGRATION

Expressed Social Distance	High School Integration						
	0-10% Black		10-25% Black		25-50% Black		Totals
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Marriage (1)	36	(14)	11	(17)	6	(23)	53
Dating (2)	41	(16)	5	(8)	4	(15)	50
Roommate (3)	116	(46)	33	(50)	6	(23)	155
Dorm (4)	59	(24)	16	(25)	10	(39)	85
Totals	252		65		26		343
Mean RDQ =	2.79		2.83		2.77		

$X^2 = 9.30$, df = 6

H_o: There is no significant relationship between degree of high school integration and expressed prejudice by whites toward blacks.

The chi-square value ($X^2 = 9.30$, df = 6) of Table XXVII did not justify the rejection of the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. No relationship was found between the various categories of high school integration and expressed prejudice in this particular sample.

Analyses of relationship between white-student education and prejudice were made within three categories of degree of high school integration. These data and the results of the analyses are presented in Table XXVIII.

In Table XXVIII none of the null hypotheses could be rejected at the .05 level. Therefore, no significant relationship was found between prejudice and student educational status within any of the categories

of high school integration. Only the one category of 10-25 percent blacks approached a significant level ($X^2 = 4.28$, $p = .24$).

The data were presented for only the three categories of least integration since there were no data for the three higher categories.

All three of the gammas were negative, indicating a positive relationship between student educational status and prejudice for all categories of high school integration.

In one category (10-25 percent, $\gamma = -.32$) the relationship between student educational status and prejudice was more pronounced than the original relationship ($\gamma = -.07$).

The remaining categories (0-10 percent Black and 25-50 percent Black) revealed gammas that tended to weaken or almost disappear. This indicated that there was possibly a very slight positive relationship between white-student educational status and prejudice in those two categories.

The 10-25 percent Black category revealed the highest mean RDQ (2.83) with the senior mean RDQ (3.06) being higher than the freshman mean RDQ (2.74). This was expected with the more pronounced negative gamma ($\gamma = -.32$).

The exception to be noted where a negative gamma was associated with a lower RDQ for seniors was in the category of 0-10 percent Blacks. However, the difference was so slight that it probably could be attributed to chance.

In observing the various examples of extremities it was interesting to note that the seniors tended to polarize at times with large proportions being in social-distance categories of one and four. In the

TABLE XXVIII

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE WITHIN CATEGORIES OF HIGH SCHOOL INTEGRATION

Expressed Social Distance	Educational Status				
	Sr	%	Fr	%	Totals
Close Kinship--Marriage (1)	20	(18)	33	(14)	53
Social Dating (2)	11	(10)	39	(17)	50
Roommate--All privileges (3)	46	(42)	109	(47)	155
Dorm-Class offices (4)	32	(29)	53	(22)	85
Totals	109		234		343
Mean RDQ =	2.83		2.78		2.79

$X^2 = 4.78$ df = 3 p = .20 $\gamma = -.07$

HIGH SCHOOL INTEGRATION (T-VARIABLE HELD CONSTANT)

Expressed Social Distance	0 - 10% Black					10 - 25% Black					25 - 50% Black					Totals
	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	
Marriage (1)	14	(17)	22	(13)	36	3	(17)	8	(17)	11	3	(33)	3	(18)	6	53
Dating (2)	11	(13)	30	(18)	41	0	(0)	5	(11)	5	0	(0)	4	(23)	4	50
Roommate (3)	36	(44)	80	(47)	116	8	(44)	25	(53)	33	2	(22)	4	(23)	6	155
Dorm (4)	21	(26)	38	(22)	59	7	(39)	9	(39)	16	4	(45)	6	(36)	10	85
Totals	82		170		252	18		47		65	9		17		26	343
Mean RDQ =	2.78		2.79		2.79	3.06		2.74		2.83	2.78		2.76		2.77	
X^2 =			1.57					4.28 p = .24					2.86			
γ =			-.02					= .32					-.04			

category of 25-50 percent Black, 33 percent of the seniors were willing to marry blacks while 45 percent were only willing to have blacks in the dorms.

It was also significant that in the category of highest integration (25-50 percent Black) the seniors and freshmen experienced greater polarization on the social-distance scale.

Prejudice and Past Social Relations

An analysis was made of the relationship between white-student prejudice toward blacks and the degree of past social relations with blacks experienced by these students. These data and the results of the analysis are presented in Table XXIX.

TABLE XXIX

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE BETWEEN CATEGORIES OF PAST SOCIAL RELATIONS

Expressed Social Distance	Past Social Relations: Dated Blacks No.	%	Mingled Socially with Blacks No.	%	Have Eaten with Blacks No.	%	Shared Public Facilities No.	%	Attended School with Blacks No.	%	Totals
Marriage (1)	14	(58)	26	(15)	2	(9)	5	(8)	6	(10)	53
Dating (2)	5	(21)	29	(17)	3	(13)	7	(11)	6	(10)	50
Roommate (3)	5	(21)	95	(55)	12	(52)	24	(36)	19	(33)	155
Dorm (4)	0	(0)	22	(13)	6	(26)	30	(45)	27	(47)	85
Totals	24		172		23		66		58		343
Mean RDQ =	1.62		2.66		2.96		3.20		3.16		

$X^2 = 84.22$, df = 12, $p < .001$

H_o: There is no significant relationship between past social relations between whites and blacks and expressed prejudice.

The chi-square (X^2 = 84.22, df = 12) of Table XXIX justified the rejection of the null hypothesis at the .001 level. A relationship was found between the various categories of past social relations between whites and blacks and expressed prejudice in this particular sample.

Analyses of the relationship between white-student education and prejudice toward blacks were made within five categories of past social relations with blacks as experienced by these students. These data and the results of the analyses are presented in Table XXX.

In Table XXX none of the chi-square values for the categories of past social relations were statistically significant. Therefore, the null hypotheses could not be rejected at the .05 level.

In only one category, (Mingled Socially with Blacks) did the chi-square value (X^2 = 6.56, df = 3, p = .09) approach significance at the .05 level.

The positive relationship between educational status and prejudice in four of the five categories was more pronounced than the original relationship (γ = -.07). The relationship tended to disappear in the category of those who dated blacks (γ = +.04).

It could be stated then that for the most part these data revealed a positive relationship between student educational status and prejudice within the various categories of past social relations with blacks.

None of the respondents in the survey had immediate family members who had married blacks. Consequently, that category was eliminated. However, 24 respondents had dated blacks (5 seniors and 19 freshmen).

The sampled categories on past social relations were ordered similarly to the modified Bogardus Social Distance Scale. It was

TABLE XXX

A COMPARISON OF EXPRESSED PREJUDICE WITHIN CATEGORIES OF PAST SOCIAL RELATIONS

Expressed Social Distance	Educational Status				
	Sr	%	Fr	%	Totals
Close Kinship--Marriage (1)	20	(18)	33	(14)	53
Social Dating (2)	11	(10)	39	(17)	50
Roommate--All privileges (3)	46	(42)	109	(47)	155
Dorm--Class offices (4)	32	(29)	53	(22)	85
Totals	109		234		343
Mean RDQ =	2.83		2.78		2.79

$X^2 = 4.78$ df = 3 p = .20 $\gamma = -.07$

PAST SOCIAL RELATIONS (T-VARIABLE HELD CONSTANT)

Expressed Social Distance	Dated Blacks					Mingled Socially with Blacks					Have Eaten with Blacks					Shared Public Facilities					Attended School					Tls
	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	Sr	%	Fr	%	T	
Marriage(1)	3	(60)	11	(58)	14	13	(20)	13	(12)	26	1	(11)	1	(7)	2	2	(11)	3	(6)	5	1	(10)	5	(10)	6	53
Dating (2)	1	(20)	4	(21)	5	6	(9)	23	(22)	29	0	(0)	3	(21)	3	2	(11)	5	(11)	7	2	(20)	4	(8)	6	50
Roommate (3)	1	(20)	4	(21)	5	36	(54)	59	(57)	95	5	(56)	7	(50)	12	4	(20)	20	(43)	24	1	(10)	18	(38)	19	155
Dorm (4)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	11	(17)	11	(9)	22	3	(33)	3	(21)	6	11	(58)	19	(40)	30	6	(60)	21	(44)	27	85
Totals	5		19		24	66		106		172	9		14		23	19		47		66	10		48		58	343
Mean RDQ =	1.60		1.63		1.62	2.68		2.64		2.66	3.11		2.86		2.96	3.26		3.17		3.20	3.20		3.15		3.16	
X^2 =			0.00					6.56 p=.09					2.45					3.01					3.34			
γ =			+.04					-.09					-.31					-.18					-.12			

interesting to note that the more intimate the past social relationship experienced with blacks, the lower the mean RDQ.

All categories with negative gammas revealed positive relationships between student educational status and prejudice as indicated by senior mean RDQs that were larger than freshman mean RDQs.

While the data were sparse in the most intimate relationship category (Dated Blacks), a high percent of both freshmen and seniors expressed willingness to allow blacks to close kinship by marriage. In this category none expressed the highest level of social distance. However, some of those who had dated blacks in the past were not willing to marry them.

On the other end of the continuum of past social relations (Attended School Only with Blacks) a high percent of seniors and freshmen would allow blacks no closer social distance than sharing dorms (60 percent of seniors and 44 percent of freshmen).

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Relationship of Education and Prejudice to the Problem

The Purpose of Education in Student Development

Some educators believe that higher education has shifted its focus from the development of people to the teaching of subjects. Tolerance and acceptance of others who are different are considered desirable aims for liberal education. In the related literature a liberalizing of the individual was a stated aim for most institutions of higher learning, and various student development studies found this aspiration being fulfilled.

Liberal arts education is vague and diversified as we know it today. It is not incompatible with vocationally oriented education, but is on the opposite end of the educational continuum. A liberal education is sometimes considered as synonymous with general education and results in (1) knowledge of basic cultural heritage, (2) competency in utilizing the modes of thought characteristic of the major areas of human knowledge, (3) competency in communicating, and (4) conscious commitment to a set of values. The setting for this study was Oral Roberts University which professes to strive for the above-stated liberal arts goals. One of the values held and propagated by Oral

Roberts University is the freeing of interpersonal relationships, resulting in tolerance toward minority groups.

The Problem

Many behavioral scientists believe personality continues to develop throughout life. Educational research studies showed that an important developmental period does exist during the college age. The problem was to examine the relationship between the liberal arts experience at Oral Roberts University and the degree of racial prejudice (as expressed in social distance) held by white students toward black students.

Prejudice as an Attitude in Student Development

Primarily this was an attitudinal study concerned with student development in the area of racial attitudes. Attitude was defined as a predisposition to behave in a particular way toward a given object in one's environment. An attitude was defined as comprising at least three components: affective, cognitive, and behavioral. These components correspond respectively to the white student's evaluations of, knowledge of, and predisposition to act toward the black student as an object in his environment. The behavioral component would include the social distance that the white student would willingly allow the black student.

In order to operationalize "attitude" for the purpose of measurement, attitude was thought of as a hypothetical construct, not directly open to observation, but inferred from verbal or written expression. The attitude of racial prejudice was measured by the social distance

the white student would willingly allow the black student in responding to the Bogardus Social Distance Scale.

Various theories were presented to explain attitude formation and change. All of the psychological theories postulate a need to express antagonism toward something that is not the real object of antagonism. These psychological theories are in contrast to and attempt to discredit older theories such as biological differences of inferiority, fear, economic competition, power or social control, and unpleasant past experiences. Whatever the source of prejudice, it is accompanied by incorrect beliefs regarding the people to whom it is directed.

This study sought to examine the relationship between liberal arts education and the prejudice held by white students toward black students at Oral Roberts University. Variables other than education were known to exist which could influence prejudice. They included: sex, past geographic location and type of residence, parents' socioeconomic status, parents' political affiliation, and students' previous interaction with blacks.

Research Design

Data Collection

A questionnaire was used to collect data about the involved students on each variable under consideration. The sample included 109 liberal arts seniors, 234 liberal arts freshmen, and 140 vocationally oriented students for a total N of 483. This was a static study comparing the racial prejudice (expressed social distance) of the above-named educational groups. The study was primarily to examine the

relationship between liberal arts education and prejudice, with the data from the vocationally oriented students serving as a check for maturation (see p. 68 for explanation of research design and sources of validity and invalidity of the study).

The Bogardus Scale

In attempting to measure attitudes, numerals were assigned to persons' expressions. This was intended to create an isomorphism between the assigned numeral and the person's attitude toward the object in question. It is understood that an attitude is a hypothetical construct rather than an immediately observable variable. Attitude measurement consists of the assessment of an individual's responses to a set of situations. The situations deal with the attitude object so that an individual's responses indicate his attitude concerning that particular object. A scale of expressions was developed by Bogardus to measure attitudes toward groups such as races and nationalities. This scale was modified for more appropriate use in an educational setting and administered as part of the questionnaire survey to the entire sample. The Bogardus Scale has been modified by other researchers and used extensively since 1925. While it does not contain a zero point, it does possess the other three criteria generally accepted as necessary to measure attitudes: reliability, validity, and unidimensionality.

Statistical Techniques

Various statistical techniques were employed to measure and compare the relationships between variables. The data were transferred to

computer cards which allowed computation for appropriate tables for systematic analysis.

A chi-square value was computed on the data of the various tables to determine significant relationships between variables. Simple comparisons of percentages were made when cells of the tables appeared to reveal significant data. The statistical technique of gamma was computed to show the strength and direction of the relationship between variables. The gamma coefficient was especially useful in examining the validity of the original relationship between the dependent variable (prejudice) and the independent variable (education) when third variables were held constant and partial tables were constructed.

Related Research Compared to Present Findings

When first confronted with the literature on studies in prejudice, there was a tendency to feel each study was "conclusive." After reading several studies this investigator felt much like the Rabbi of which Rokeach (1960:3) spoke. One day the town Rabbi was visited by a man and wife who were experiencing a marital problem. He first heard the husband's side and said, "You are right." Then he listened carefully to the wife's side of the story and said, "You are right." When they both left, the Rabbi's wife, who had overheard the whole episode, asked, "But how could they both be right?" The Rabbi turned to her and answered, "You are right!" However, eventually a pattern began to evolve from the literature allowing hypotheses to be made on expected findings of this study.

The related literature revealed that prejudice consists of sets of interwoven attitudes and opinions that often are not clearly

formulated. Most white people are more or less prejudiced and, under certain conditions, the prejudice becomes manifest. These prejudices are expressed most frequently in situations where no blacks are present. The expression of prejudice is usually a response to interaction among group (white) members. Unless these responses have specific occasions to be directed later into intergroup action, they remain nonfunctional or disengaged.

In keeping with other researchers' conclusions (Tumin, 1961:28; Bettelheim and Janowitz, 1964:15; and many others), it became obvious that no single sociological characteristic was sufficient to give adequate understanding or prediction of where one will encounter the greatest quantity or intensity of racial prejudice. In other words, not education, occupation, sex, income, age, residence, geographic location, politics, or any other single variable by itself adequately explains prejudice.

However, valid statements about the impact of various combinations of these characteristics can be made if we specify the situational context. It became apparent that the impact of the variables is likely to be complex and interactive. However, each of the key variables revealed a general trend about its relationship to prejudice.

While the literature revealed an abundance of studies on tolerance and education, the conceptual model revealed a gap in knowledge of the relationship between liberal arts education and prejudice. It also revealed the variables that influence prejudice. Here a comparison is made between the conceptual model based on related literature and "reality" as found in the sample of this present study.

Liberal Arts Education

Several studies (Pressey and Robinson 1944; Webster, et al., 1962; Williams, 1964; and many others) reported a positive relation between college education and tolerance. More than 25 national surveys could be cited since 1945 showing that education is related to reduced prejudice. However, other studies produced qualifying data.

Bettelheim and Janowitz (1964), Stember (1961), and Noel and Pinkney (1964) provide the following qualifications:

> (1) Within the upper SEC educational differences have less effect on prejudice than at the lower levels because social and family backgrounds have already operated to influence tolerant attitudes. (2) Those who get the most education are the least influenced by it. (3) The specific content of education is more important than amount. (4) The better educated are less likely to subscribe to traditional stereotypes but more likely to reject intimate relations with members of minority groups.

In the present study, the data in Table V revealed no significant relationship between liberal arts education as presented at Oral Roberts University and level of prejudice as expressed in social distance. The seniors (RDQ = 2.83) unexpectedly appeared to be slightly more prejudiced than the freshmen (RDQ = 2.78). This very slight tendency was confirmed by the negative gamma coefficient (γ = -.07). The computed percentages indicated that the seniors had made up their minds in regard to relationships with blacks in that they were more polarized in the extreme categories of prejudice. More of the freshmen, on the other hand, tended toward the median and fell in categories two and three in Table V.

These findings are not in keeping with the general expectations of the related literature which suggested that higher education would be

associated with lower prejudice. However, these data are not incompatible with the previously stated qualifications of the general expectations. Note particularly the first and second qualifications regarding social class. These indicate that the higher SEC would be least influenced by college education because of the person's social and family background which had already operated to reduce prejudice. Table XVII reveals that there were only 4 students in the Lower SEC category, 129 in the Moderate SEC category, and 210 in the Higher category. From these data one would expect education to have very little effect on prejudice in this particular sample.

When type of education was examined (Table VI) using the categories of liberal arts freshmen and vocational technical, a significant difference was found at the .001 level. The positive gamma coefficient (γ = +.60) and the high mean (RDQ = 3.46) for the vocationally oriented students indicated a relationship between type of education and prejudice.

This conclusion is further supported by the data of Tables VII and VIII. In each case there was a significant chi-square value at the .001 level which indicated a significant relationship between the type of education one pursues and prejudice.

Parents' Socioeconomic Class

It was generally agreed (Noel and Pinkney, 1964; Christie, 1954: Reissman and Miller, 1957) that a particular life-style was associated with each SEC. The middle and higher classes were usually described (Hodge, 1964) as flexible, trusting, democratic, tolerant, and non-dogmatic. The lower class was generally described as rigid, defensive,

authoritarian, parochial, and suspicious. Most studies revealed that the higher the occupational status the lower the overall proportion of prejudice (Allport, 1964; Martin and Westie, 1959; Noel and Pinkney, 1964; Williams, 1964, and others).

There are complexities involved, however, in relating prejudice to SEC. The higher social groups tend to express less prejudice and hold less-traditional stereotypes. On the other hand, they may hold more highly charged prejudices when it comes to close, intimate relationships with blacks.

For this particular study an index was constructed using the basic components of occupation, education, and income to determine social class. Education was treated separately since it was the independent variable of the present study, but was also a part of the index used to compute the students' SEC (see questionnaire in Appendix).

The questionnaire asked the respondent to estimate his SEC. The SEC was then computed from the index of the student's parents' education, occupation, and income for comparison to the estimated SEC.

Based on the students' estimated SEC (see Table X), there was a significant relationship between social class and prejudice at the .07 level. However, there was a very small amount of data in the lower SEC category and therefore this finding may not be conclusive.

The gamma of -.70 in the Lower estimated SEC category indicated that education and prejudice have a higher positive relationship in this category than in the estimated Moderate or Higher SEC categories. The indication that education tended to effect a prejudiced attitude for Lower SEC students was quite contrary to the literature. However,

the literature did suggest that the Moderate and Higher SEC's would be similar in amount of prejudice.

It is interesting to note that while only 1 freshman and 3 seniors fell in the Lower SEC, (Table XVIII) there were 12 vocational technical students. All 12 vocational technical students fell in the highest levels of prejudice (3) and (4) with 9 in category 4. It was also observed that only 38 percent of the liberal arts students were in the Moderate SEC category compared to 56 percent of the vocational technical students. However, 88 percent of the vocational technical students judged themselves to be in the Moderate SEC category. This is in keeping with the related literature which indicated that those who have manual or technical jobs may identify with the "working class" and its values and attitudes. White-collar workers and those of the new bureaucratic occupations tend to identify with the upper class. Both groups share comparable levels of SEC as computed on a social class index, but they may not share the same values in life and attitudes of prejudice.

Data in Table XII revealed that students whose parents had college education tended to become slightly more prejudiced during the college experience in this particular sample. The relationship was in the opposite direction for students whose parents had elementary education. This indicated that higher education for the lower-class student was related to reduced prejudice. Both of these findings were in keeping with the cited literature.

Even though the student whose parents had low education showed reduced prejudice related to the student's higher educational experience, this category had the highest mean RDQ. The elementary-education

category was most prejudiced (RDQ = 3.10), while the students of graduate-school parents were least prejudiced (RDQ = 2.72). Family social class based on education did appear to operate on the children's attitudes, increasing or reducing prejudice as expected from the literature. However, the higher-educational experience was more significant in reducing prejudice for the lower-class student who began with high prejudice.

Table XIV revealed that the students whose parents were skilled workers and clerks, as well as those whose parents were professionals, showed negative gamma coefficients (-.09 and -.21 respectively). In these categories the RDQs indicated that seniors were slightly more prejudiced than freshmen. This suggested that the higher-education experience was related to increased prejudice for these two groups.

However, the most-prejudiced occupational category was the solid, middle-class proprietor, manager, and officials (RDQ = 2.98). The mean RDQs for seniors (2.95) and freshmen (2.99) are almost identical and the gamma coefficient almost disappeared (γ = +.02), indicating that this group brings a very decided opinion to college and leaves with it.

It was interesting to note that as the income categories advanced, the percentage willing to marry blacks decreased. This is in keeping with Stember (1961) who noted that the more-educated and higher-class were "more apt to reject intimate contacts with minority groups." However, this finding was not in keeping with the general findings of the literature which suggested that the higher-class is less-prejudiced.

Noel and Pinkney (1964) pointed out this seeming contradiction. They concluded that the variables of anti-Negro prejudice and amount of formal education are negatively correlated. However, the dimension of

prejudice must be specified. They found that while in general the higher class will exhibit less traditional stereotyped prejudice, they are more likely to reject intimate relations with Negroes.

It was projected from the literature that there would be a negative relationship between social class and expressed prejudice with the white students of lower-class status at Oral Roberts University expressing more prejudice toward blacks than those of higher-class. No statistically significant relationship was found to exist between the various categories of parents computed SEC and prejudice in this particular sample.

Table XVIII revealed only four students in the Lower category and the mean RDQ of 3.50 was extremely high compared to the mean RDQs of the Moderate category (2.76) and the Higher category (2.80). However, because of the small amount of data in the Lower category, a meaningful conclusion could not be made.

Political Affiliation

Political affiliation is closely tied to socioeconomic status and was expected to have about the same relationship to prejudice. It was expected that political party could have no causative relationship to prejudice outside the matrix of one's SEC and other related factors. It was hypothesized that there would be a relationship between political affiliation and prejudice, and projected that Democrats would express the most prejudice followed by Republicans and Independents.

The chi-square value of Table XIX justified the rejection of the null hypothesis at the .01 level of significance. This influence meant that a statistically significant relationship was established between

the various categories of political-party affiliation and expressed prejudice. However, Table XX data revealed that within categories of political affiliation there were no significant relationships. As projected, Democrats were most prejudiced (RDQ 2.96), followed by Republicans (RDQ 2.80), and Independents (RDQ 2.37).

The gamma coefficients in Table XX revealed that the relationship between educational status and prejudice became more positive than the original (γ = -.07) within two categories (Republicans γ = -.08 and Independents γ = -.34). This means that the higher educational experience for these two categories was related to increased prejudice, i.e., the more education they received the more their prejudice increased. This was true in spite of the fact that these two groups were less prejudiced than the Democrats at the beginning of the educational experience.

On the other hand, while the Democrats were most prejudiced of the three groups, the positive gamma coefficient (γ = +.13) indicated that the higher educational experience was related to reduced prejudice.

Geographic Location

Southerners have traditionally been stereotyped as most prejudiced among the various geographic divisions of the United States. The related studies showed that while prejudice has diminished in the South in the last 30 years, generally Southerners still express the most prejudice of all geographic populations. Taeuber (1965) offered the most comprehensive examination of geography and prejudice using a "Segregation Index" (see Table III).

It was projected that there would be a relationship between the students' past geographic location and the amount of prejudice held toward blacks. The data in Table XXI revealed a significant relationship between geographic location and prejudice at the .001 level. This means that there is a difference in expressed prejudice between the student populations of the categories examined.

The most prejudiced category was the South (RDQ = 3.12) as projected. However, the category expressing the second most prejudice was the West (RDQ = 2.63), followed by the North Central (RDQ = 2.59) and the Northeast (RDQ = 2.56). The West was expected from the literature to be least prejudiced.

While a significant relationship was found between categories of geographic location, Table XXII revealed that none of the relationships within the categories of geography were significant. This means that the educational experience was not related to a significant change in prejudice for the students in either direction.

It is notable that while the chi-square value did not indicate that the change was significant at the .05 level, the negative gamma coefficients reveal that the South and Northeast students became more prejudiced during the educational experience. As noted above, these are the two categories expressing the most and least prejudice respectively.

Family Residence

The essential finding of several studies (Allport, 1954; Wilner, et al., 1955; Deutsch and Collins, 1951; and Merton, et al., 1949) was that residential social interaction reduces prejudice when the

whites and blacks living in close proximity are of equal socioeconomic status. However, this reduction of prejudice was not found to carry over to intimate personal relations.

The urban milieu with its religious and ethnic diversities was believed to provide primary and secondary social interaction that would diminish prejudice because it tends to influence the regulation of personal behavior.

However, Williams (1964) found that Negroes are more likely to be segregated in cities of large population. He pointed out that more racial conflict existed when the black population was proportionately large.

Basically it was concluded that there is a gradual decrease in the level of ethnic intolerance as one goes from the rural areas and small towns to cities of a million or more.

The findings of the Oral Roberts University study (see Table XXIII) showed no statistically significant relationship between the categories of students' residence and prejudice. Also, no significant relationships were found comparing the expressed prejudice of seniors and freshmen within the categories of residence. While not statistically significant it is interesting to note that the categories of Central City, Suburban, and Rural, all showed a negative gamma coefficient indicating a tendency to increase in prejudice as education increased.

As expected, the Rural category revealed the most prejudice (RDQ = 3.05). The Rural category was followed by the Central City, Urban Area, Suburban, and Urban Place categories in that order of decreasing prejudice.

Sex and Prejudice

The findings on sex and prejudice are varied and inconclusive. However, generally the studies showed women to be slightly more prejudiced than men. Women were found to stereotype more often than men and to hold more social distance toward blacks.

It was hypothesized that a relationship between sex and prejudice exists and that white women would express more social distance than men in the Oral Roberts University study. Table XXV data revealed no significant relationship between the categories of sex and expressed social distance in this particular study.

However, when comparing freshmen women to senior women (see Table XXVI) the data revealed a significant chi-square value at the .025 level. Consequently, one might conclude that there was a significant relationship between educational status and prejudice within the Female category. On the other hand, within the Male category the chi-square value was very small and did not justify the rejection of the null hypothesis.

The difference in mean RDQs was very small, with the Male (RDQ = 2.81) being slightly higher than the Female (RDQ = 2.77). This finding was not as expected from the literature which suggested that women would be slightly more prejudiced. The difference was too small to warrant drawing any conclusions.

Unexpected was the fact that the male senior's mean RDQ of 2.86 was the highest. Senior females tended to polarize on the variable of prejudice. They showed the largest percent (27) willing to marry blacks and the largest percent (36) in the most-prejudiced category.

Both categories of females were more willing to marry blacks than the comparable categories of males.

Social Interaction

Most of the major findings in the literature on social interaction and prejudice agreed with Williams's (1964) analysis of the Cornell Studies. Out of these data emerged the major finding that in all the surveys in all the communities, and for all groups, majority and minorities, the greater the frequency of interaction, the lower the prevalence of ethnic prejudice.

However, all of the studies of interaction have not been favorable toward diminishing prejudice (see Lombardi, 1963: Whitmore, 1956; Valien, 1954; Webster, 1961). Cook (1957) presented three dimensions for evaluating the effectiveness of the contact situation that were meaningful. He found that interaction was associated with reduced prejudice when there was (1) opportunity for personal interaction, (2) equal status levels for participants, and (3) when the social norm called for tolerance. From the related literature it was concluded that much of the ethnic prejudice in community life is compounded by isolation, timidity, and social fear.

As a result of three years of social interaction between whites and blacks at ORU it was hypothesized that white seniors would express less prejudice than entering white freshmen. It was further projected that those white students who had a high rate of high school and other past social relations would express less prejudice than those without these social interaction experiences.

In Table XXVII the data revealed that no statistically significant relationship was found between the various categories of high school integration and expressed prejudice in this particular sample. In Table XXVIII the data revealed a similar finding within the categories of high school integration when freshmen and seniors were compared. The data were presented for only three categories of least integration since none of the sample had gone to high schools integrated at more than the 50 percent level.

The 10-25 percent black category revealed the highest mean RDQ (2.83), with the senior mean RDQ (3.06) being higher than the freshman mean RDQ (2.74). This was expected with the more pronounced negative gamma (γ = -.32). Note that all of the gamma coefficients are negative (two only slightly). This indicates a positive relationship between interaction and prejudice. This means that the more interaction whites had with blacks, the more prejudice they developed. This was not expected from the general findings of related literature.

In observing the various examples of extremities in Table XXVIII, it was noted that the seniors tended to polarize at times with large proportions being in social-distance categories of one and four. In the category of 25-50 percent black, 33 percent of the seniors were willing to marry blacks while 45 percent were only willing to have blacks in the dorms. Note also that in the category of highest integration (25-50 percent black), the seniors and freshmen experienced greater polarization on the social-distance scale.

When the analysis was made of the relationship between white-student prejudice toward blacks and the degree of past social relations (see Table XXIX), the chi-square value justified the rejection of the

null hypothesis at the .001 level. This means that a statistically significant relationship was found between the various categories of past social relations between whites and blacks and expressed prejudice in this particular sample. This finding was in keeping with general expectations of the literature.

However, in Table XXX none of the null hypotheses could be rejected at the .05 level when freshmen and seniors were compared within categories of past social relations for a relationship between educational status and prejudice. In only one category (Mingled Socially with Blacks) did the chi-square value approach significance ($p = .09$).

The gamma coefficients were negative in four of five categories, indicating a positive relationship between past social relations and prejudice. This meant that the more the white student associated with blacks previous to the college experience, the more prejudice he expressed in this particular sample.

It is interesting to note that there was a positive gamma coefficient ($\gamma = +.04$) in the category of those who dated blacks. This indicates a slight negative relationship which means that for those who dated blacks socially, they expressed less prejudice in this particular sample.

The sampled categories on past social relations with blacks were ordered similar to the modified Bogardus Social Distance Scale as used in this study. It may be significant that the more intimate the past social relationship experienced with blacks, the lower the mean RDQ for that category of respondents. This finding was in keeping with Cook's findings based on the three dimensions of social interaction.

The category for marriage with blacks was eliminated because there were no respondents choosing that category. While there were only a few who chose the most intimate category (dated blacks) a higher percentage of both freshmen and seniors expressed willingness to marry blacks. No respondents in this category chose the highest level of prejudice. However, a few who had dated blacks were not willing to marry them. Note also that in the category Attended School With Blacks there was the smallest percentage who would allow blacks no closer social distance than living in their dorm.

Major Findings Summarized

1. No significant relationship was found between liberal arts education and level of prejudice as expressed in social distance in this particular sample. The seniors (RDQ = 2.83) were unexpectedly found to be slightly more prejudiced than freshmen (RDQ = 2.78).

2. When type of education was examined (liberal arts vs. vocational-technical) a significant relationship was found at the .001 level between type of education and prejudice, with the vocational students (RDQ = 3.46) considerably more prejudiced than liberal arts students (RDQ = 2.81).

3. This study revealed that the white students at ORU are mostly moderate to higher class socially. As expected, very few of this level SEC expressed extreme prejudice toward blacks. It appeared that the family social class did operate on the students' attitudes in that close intimate relations were rejected, with only a few agreeing to allow blacks to close kinship by marriage.

4. The data revealed that the college experience did reduce prejudice for those few students of lower SEC who started with very high prejudice, while the moderate and higher-class students remained unchanged at a lower level of prejudice.

5. A significant relationship was found between the various categories of family political-party affiliation at the .01 level with Independents (RDQ = 2.37) being least prejudiced followed by Republicans (RDQ = 2.80) and Democrats (RDQ = 2.96).

6. The data revealed a significant relationship between categories of geographic location and prejudice at the .001 level with Southerners most prejudiced (RDQ = 3.12), followed by the West (RDQ = 2.63), North Central (RDQ = 2.59), and Northeast (RDQ = 2.56). Rural students, as expected, tended to express higher prejudice than students from the various categories of city residence.

7. On the sex variable the males (RDQ = 2.81) unexpectedly were slightly more prejudiced than females (RDQ = 2.77). When comparing the prejudice of freshmen women to senior women a significant relationship was found at the .025 level. Senior women tended to polarize on the variable of prejudice with the largest percent (27) willing to marry blacks and the largest percent (36) in the most-prejudiced category.

8. The data revealed no statistically significant relationship between degree of high school integration and prejudice at the .05 level. Unexpectedly, those whites who attended the more-integrated schools revealed the most prejudice. However, when an analysis was made between the categories representing degrees of past social relationships and prejudice, the chi-square value justified the rejection of the null hypothesis at the .001 level of significance.

Within the categories of past social relations when freshmen and seniors were compared on a college level, no significant relationships were found. It was concluded that some social relations do reduce prejudice, but those conditions of interaction did not exist on the high school or college level for the students of this particular sample.

Recommendations for Further Study

Meaningful research could be done if a longitudinal study were to be conducted using three schools of comparable size and stated purpose. The incoming freshmen could be tested and then retested each year. This approach would be especially meaningful if one college attempted to implement the recommendations of this study, thereby serving as a control group.

Only white students were tested in this study. It would be interesting to determine the amount of prejudice the black-student population would express toward whites on the Bogardus Social Distance Scale. If the black students were more prejudiced than white students, it might reveal a point of antagonism, explaining in part the prejudice maintained by the white seniors.

It is recommended that a follow-up study be made on the freshmen who were tested for prejudice. If they were tested again as seniors, then the study would be longitudinal and perhaps more conclusive. This retesting would be especially interesting if the administration of Oral Roberts University should elect to implement the recommendations for reduction of prejudice.

Limitations of the Study

This study was restricted to one sample of liberal arts students from one college in the Midwest. One cannot infer from this limited sample the results of a study of the general college population.

This was a static study even though seniors were compared to freshmen and an attempt was made to control for maturation by taking a sample from a similar age group of nonliberal arts students.

The instrument (Bogardus Social Distance Scale) used to measure racial attitudes required the white respondent to indicate how much intimacy he would accept with black students. Other research instruments might be used to measure racial attitudes. Also, the use of open-ended questions would allow students to express the basis for their prejudice.

The Changing of Racial Attitudes

The available research on changes of attitude of white and black people toward one another through interracial contact revealed certain necessary conditions. It is not enough just to interact. Trubowitz (1969:15) summarized these conditions:

> (1) Negro and white people who have experienced satisfying interracial contact are more likely to express a preference for further contact; (2) positive change of attitude is more likely when Negro and white people have an opportunity to interact on a personal level; (3) Negro and white people who have contact on an equal-status basis are more likely to have a positive change of attitude; (4) Negro and white people who view their peers as approving of interracial contact tend to change positively in an interracial situation; (5) when authority persons communicate that friendly association between races is desirable, positive change of attitude is more likely; and (6) Negro and white people may experience considerable conflict in interracial situations. The Negro

> person tends to be uncertain about his role and may express hostility. The white person may be aggressive and resist contact.

Williams provided a paradigm (1964:221) which explained his theory of conditions necessary to reduce intergroup tensions. He explained that with consensus and interdependence, threat disappears and individuals can form their attachments and antipathies on the basis of personality and strictly situational factors. He further explained:

> The materials are now here for a miniature theory. We will speak only of situations in which external social constraints are not placed upon individuals to prevent them from initial interaction--circumstances that are somehow of minimal common interest to all present. Unless active external interference occurs, then, we predict the following:
>
> 1. When individuals interact, when neither is a threat to the other, either directly or indirectly, and when their cultural backgrounds are merely similar enough to permit personally meaningful (intimate) communication then: (a) initial interaction will be on the average more rewarding than not; hence, (b) these interactions will tend to be repeated.
>
> 2. If proposition 1 is true, the statistically modal outcome of interaction will be the formation of continuing relationships of harmony or interpersonal liking. This outcome is favored by (a) similarity of beliefs and values and (b) compatibility of interests.
>
> 3. Most of the relationships thus formed (proposition 2) will stabilize at a level of acceptance, casual association, friendly acquaintance, or friendship. Some small proportion will develop into relations or great intimacy of communication, of mutual trust, diffuse sharing of values, mutual identification, and strong and complex affectivity. These are the relationships we usually call comradeship or love.
>
> 4. For relationships of the latter kind (proposition 3), the crucial factors in the maintenance of positive affection and mutually gratifying behavior became more heavily weighted by (a) idosyncratic beliefs, value and expressive patterns and (b) basic psychodynamic tendencies of the individual personality.

Cook (1957:1-13) has analyzed the relationship between interracial contact and attitude change. He has been previously quoted as

finding three dimensions for evaluating the effectiveness of the contact situation for inducing attitude change. There are in keeping with Trubowitz's summary and research findings in general. In order to reduce prejudice, Cook notes that contact between blacks and whites must include personal interaction and equal status of the participants. He further stated that social norms (supported by peers and those in authority) must call for and consider tolerance and equal acceptance appropriate.

Recommendations for Policymaking

What are the implications of this study for policymaking? It should be pointed out that not all of society is eager to accept, much less act upon, research implications. Sometimes old beliefs are comfortable, while in other cases expediency calls for maintaining the status quo. This present research could lead to academic and student personnel policies that would reduce prejudice on any given liberal arts campus.

At this point the academic involvement as well as the black and white interaction at Oral Roberts University will be examined using Cook's three dimensions. Recommendations will be suggested for the use of those who may be interested in reducing prejudice.

Personal Interaction

In order to create the context for increased tolerance and freedom in interpersonal relationships, there must be encounter among all types of students. Direct, full, and intimate encounters with roommates and dorm mates of diverse backgrounds are necessary to allow tolerance to

develop. It is necessary for students to interact even to the extent of conflict, argument, and debate, as well as friendly sharing and exchange. This is the only way individual biases and idiosyncrasies are exposed and faced. Given enough time, perspective will develop through this mutual exchange. Chickering (1969:151) states:

> Residence hall arrangements either foster or inhibit development of competence, purpose, integrity, and freeing interpersonal relationships depending upon the diversity of backgrounds and attitudes among the residents, the opportunities for significant interchange, the existence of shared intellectual interests, and the degree to which the unit becomes a meaningful culture for its members. Development in residence hall settings stems from two major sources: close friendships and concomitant reference groups, and the general attitudes and values carried by the house as a cultural entity. Well-considered action can call on these forces to amplify several factors of change.

The college setting provides a milieu of diversity. Persons differ in racial backgrounds and prejudiced attitudes. They also differ in ethnic, national, social, and religious backgrounds. When a student comes to campus, he usually selects his friends from among those most like himself. Unless a deliberate effort is made to arrange residence hall living so that the new student is exposed to diversity, he remains isolated from new experiences and insulated socially. This allows provincial and class misconceptions as well as prejudice to continue almost without challenge.

The student personnel department has the opportunity to exercise the most influence on the residence halls. They can provide arrangements in housing that will allow diverse relationships rather than extended social homogeneity for the student through self-selection.

This approach can also have a tendency to reduce tension in the dorms over rules imposed by the school administration. When a new

student comes into the dorm he becomes a part of a new subculture with its own unique pattern of living. The tendency of the new student to resent arbitrary rules enforced by the school will be reduced as a result of his adhering to the norms of the student subculture which has incorporated the rules. Chickering (1969:153) explained the potential of the well-planned dorm life when he stated:

> A residence hall has most impact when it becomes an effective--and affective--subculture, when it becomes a reference group for its members. The values and behavioral norms of the group become the background against which individual decisions about behavior, values, and attitudes are taken. Under such conditions, the shared standards and rules for conduct are not viewed as arbitrary, capricious, or functionalist, nor are they felt to be unduly coercive, intrusive, or authoritarian. Of course, decisions are not made on a simple one-to-one relationship with group standards. Through continuing interaction alternatives are developed, tested, and modified, and thus individuals assume their own positions and roles. Such conditions exert powerful forces for the development of integrity, for discrepancies between expressed beliefs and behavior will not go unchallenged. And when one is known and observed through a year or more, such discrepancies as exist will out. All may be fooled for a while and some may be fooled forever--but most before long will see us clearly for what we are. And given sufficient concern and a supporting atmosphere, they will not keep their knowledge from us.

One explanation for the seniors' being more prejudiced than freshmen is that the interaction of the white person with the black person has been only on the surface. Research showed, and this study confirmed, that just going to school with blacks in high school and college may be related to increased prejudice. However, this present study showed that those whites who had previous personal social relations with blacks had less prejudice. This indicates that intergroup interaction may have to be intensive and varied before it reduces prejudice.

Equal-Status Basis

Approximately 50 blacks attend Oral Roberts University. This is less than five percent of the total population of the school. Almost half of this group are on athletic scholarships. Under the present housing arrangements, all athletes live in an "athletic dorm." This housing arrangement causes about half of the small black population to be relegated to either an "elite" or "second-class" category (depending on one's perspective and mode of assessing the situation). According to Chickering (1969:156):

> The impact of student culture on freeing interpersonal relationships needs a little elaboration. Where the culture precludes or assigns second-class citizenship to students of particular background, particular talents, particular interests, values, or attitudes, then stereotypes are reinforced and opportunities to learn how to live and work with such persons are limited. Therefore, the degree of openness and flexibility that characterizes that particular student culture and the extent to which restrictive subcultures exist on a given campus are factors of special significance for freeing interpersonal relationships.

When the remaining 25 blacks are distributed among the residence halls, very few are left to interact with the white students. Most of these choose black roommates and congregate near one another on given halls of the dorms. Obviously, there is very little "normal" interaction in the dorms between whites and blacks. One should also take into consideration that the blacks are known also to express prejudice toward whites. Perhaps blacks express more prejudice than whites at Oral Roberts University, and should be an area for further study.

In order to experience equal-status basis between whites and blacks, each group must receive equal treatment in the classroom and campus activities. Several students (black and white) and faculty members have expressed in interviews that blacks now receive

preferential treatment over whites. However, information regarding the history and contributions of blacks in America and the world is lacking in the curriculum.

All students at Oral Roberts University receive exceptional consideration compared to that at the various other schools with which this investigator has been associated. For the most part, students are treated with dignity as people rather than "students" by the faculty. However, those interviewed generally agreed that Oral Roberts University has followed the liberal trend to give special attention to the minority groups including the blacks.

White students generally resent this preferential treatment when they become aware of it. Faculty members in their attempt to "help the minority person" face a dilemma. The faculty senate could discuss the problem and formulate a policy regarding this issue. Whatever policy is formulated by the faculty, it should be communicated to the student body. This investigator is convinced that preferential treatment to blacks will have two consquences: the white students will resent it, and the black students will look upon it with contempt even though they may take advantage of the situation. In neither case will preferential treatment reduce prejudice on the part of whites or blacks.

Tolerance and Norms

The norm of the school population must be tolerance in order to reduce prejudice for whites or blacks. It must be remembered that any viable society rests on the sharing of norms and interests by its members. It is ideal that this sharing of norms be a willing and even an enthusiastic acceptance of some central set of standards and

aspirations. If the college experience promotes this kind of climate, then it will contribute to the lessening of prejudice.

This writer feels that the administration and faculty support and work to promote an atmosphere in which tolerance for all groups is the norm. However, it may be that appropriate social telesis would intensify this norm. One excellent suggestion has already been made by the Academic Dean that information regarding ethnic groups be integrated into the curriculum of the various disciplines. This has been implemented in the disciplines of sociology, history, English, and perhaps others. Without overselling the issue, similar opportunities can be found in other disciplines and perhaps intensified in those areas already participating. This likely would be more effective than a "Black Studies Program" which possibly could serve to polarize the whites and blacks.

The President of Oral Roberts University (with his Indian ancestry) strongly lends his support to the establishment of the norm of tolerance. This dimension of prejudice reduction is probably carried out more adequately than the other two dimensions of equal status and close personal interaction. The only caution suggested is that the school not oversell the dimension of establishing the norm of tolerance.

Perhaps the best way to establish the norm of tolerance would be through student government and student leaders of both white and black groups. Research has shown that the students are more influenced by other students than by faculty and administration. Student peers form the strongest reference groups for the student and constitute the principal sources from which his "own stand" on social issues is derived.

The school is open to and at times has actively sought black faculty members. If black faculty members could be recruited who would support the norm of tolerance, then perhaps this would help to reduce prejudice. It is hoped that recruiting black faculty would not cause resentment among white faculty since a black person of the same status and competence can command considerable more money than the white faculty member.

Final Observations

While Trent and Medsker (1968) did not deal specifically with the same subject of education and prejudice, they made some observations that can be applied to this present study. One of the major theses of their study, Beyond High School, is that society will need a greater number of flexible, creative people with highly developed human potential. The educational system is the obvious vehicle through which this kind of human development can be fostered. While education could play a significant role in this human development, many young people do not complete high school, and many who do forfeit their right to higher education.

Still others who graduate from college exhibit very little intellectual development and flexibility required in an age marked by so much change. The liberal arts goal has always been to educate so that each individual could realize his potential as he takes his place among his fellowmen. The goal now should be to educate so that persons can discover how to prepare to live effectively in a world which is changing in their own lifetime.

Those who advocate liberal arts education would do well to examine if in fact their students do become liberalized. If a student is influenced by a prejudiced adult reference group to go to college, then it may be little wonder that the student shows little if any change in prejudice as a result of college education. From the present study it is obvious that the respondents in this sample (liberal arts freshmen, seniors, and vocationally oriented students) bring their racial prejudices to college with them. Unless a deliberate effort is made by the institution, the student may well leave with the same degree or perhaps even more prejudice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abelson, R. P., et al.
1968 Theories of Cognitive Consistency: A Sourcebook. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.

Abelson, R. P., and M. J. Rosenberg
1958 "Symbolic Psycho-logic: A Model of Attitudinal Cognition." Behavioral Science, 3.

Adorno, T. W., et al.
1950 The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Allport, Gordon W.
1935 The Nature of Prejudice. Massachusetts: Addison - Wesley.

Allport, Gordon W.
1954 "The Historical Background of Modern Social Psychology." In G. Lindzey (Ed.) Handbook of Social Psychology. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley.

Allport, Gordon W.
1967 "Attitudes." Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement. New York: Wiley.

American Council on Education
1971 A Factbook on Higher Education. Washington, D.C.

Ames, Richard, Sharon Y. Moriwaki, and A. K. Basu
1968 "Sex Differences in Social Distance: A Research Report." Sociology and Social Research.

Asch, S. E.
1952 Social Psychology. P. 11 in Wagner & Sherwood, The Study of Attitude Change. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Astin, A. W. and J. L. Holland
1962 "The Distribution of 'Wealth' in Higher Education." College and University, 37.

Astin, Alexander W.
1965 Who Goes Where to College. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc.

Barron, Milton L.
1957 American Minorities. New York: Knopf.

Bettelheim, Bruno and M. Janowitz
1950 "Prejudice." Scientific American. U.S.A.

Bettelheim, Bruno, and Morris Janowitz
1964 Social Change and Prejudice. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Bettelheim, Bruno and Morris Janowitz
1950 P. 370 in Leonard Reissman, Class In American Society. Glencoe: The Free Press.

Bogardus, Emory S.
1925 "Measuring Social Distance." Journal of Applied Sociology, IX.

Bogardus, E. S.
1959 "Race Relations by Sexes." Sociology and Social Research, XLIII.

Bogardus, Emory S.
1967 "Measuring Social Distances." In Martin Fishbein (Ed.), Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement. New York: Wiley.

Brown, Robert L.
1967 "Social Distance and the Ethiopian Students." Sociology and Social Research 52, (October).

Bugelski, B. R., and O. Lester
1940 "Changes in Attitude in a Group of College Students During Their College Course and After Graduation." Journal of Social Psychology, 12.

Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley
1970 Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.

Cartwright, D., and F. Harary
1956 Structural Balance: A Generalization of Heider's Theory. Psychological Review.

Chickering, Arthur W.
1969 Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Christie, R.
1954 Studies in the Scope and Method of "The Authoritarian Personality." Glencoe: Free Press.

Cohen, Arthur R.
1964 Attitude Change and Social Influence. New York: Basic Books.

Coleman, James S. et al.
1967 "Equality of Educational Opportunity," in United States. Commission on Civil Rights (ed.), Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, Vol. 2, Appendices. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Cook, Stuart W., et al.
1955 Human Relations in Interracial Housing, A Study of the Contact Hypothesis. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Cook, Stuart W.
1957 "Desegregation: A Psychological Analysis." The American Pscyhologist, XII.

Cowgill, Donald D.
1968 "Social Distance in Thailand." Sociology and Social Research, 52 (July).

Curtis, Richard F., Dianne M. Timbers, and Elton F. Jackson
1967 "Prejudice and Urban Social Participation." American Journal of Sociology, 73 (September).

Deutsch, M., and Mary E. Collins
1951 Interracial Housing: A Psychological Evaluation of a Social Experiment. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deutsch, Morton and Mary E. Collins
1950 "Intergroup Relations in Interracial Public Housing: Occupancy Patterns and Racial Attitudes." Journal of Housing, 7 (April).

Deutsch, Morton, and Mary E. Collins
1958 "The Effect of Public Policy in Housing Projects Upon Interracial Attitudes." In Maccoby, Newcomb, and Hartly (eds.), Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Holt.

Dressel, Paul L.
1968 College and University Curriculum. Berkeley: McCutchen Publishing Corporation.

Dressel, Paul L.
1963 The Undergraduate Curriculum in Higher Education. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc.

Dressel, Paul L., Lewis B. Mayhew, and Earl J. McGrath
1959 "Liberal Arts as Viewed by Faculty Members in Professional Schools." Columbia University: Institute of Higher Education.

Durkheim, Emile
1947 The Division of Labor in Society. George Simpson (tr.). Glencoe: The Free Press.

Edlefsen, J. B.
1956 Social Distance Attitudes of Negro College Students." Phylon, XVII.

Edwards, Allen L.
1957 Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. New York: Appleton-Century.

English, H. B. and Ava C. English
1958 A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytical Terms. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., Inc.

Festinger, L.
1957 "A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance." In Wagner & Sherwood (Eds.), The Study of Attitude Change. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.

Glazer, Nathan and Davis McEntire (Eds.)
1960 Studies in Housing and Minority Groups. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Grier, George, and Eunice Grier
1966 Equality and Beyond. Chicago: Quadrangle Books.

Grodzins, Morton
1957 "Metropolitan Segregation." Scientific American, CXCVII (October).

Heider, F.
1946 "Attitudes and Cognitive Organization." Journal of Psychology, 21.

Hodges, Harold M., Jr.
1964 Social Stratification. Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Co., Inc.

Hovland, C. L., and I. L. Janis (Eds.)
1959 Personality and Persuasibility. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hunt, C. L.
1960 "Private Integrated Housing in a Medium Size Northern City." Social Problems, VII.

Hyman, Herbert H. and Paul B. Sheatsley
1964 "Attitudes Toward Desegregation." Scientific American, Vol. 211, 1 (July).

Inkles, Alex
1960 "The Industrial Man, the Relation of Status to Experience, Perception and Value." American Journal of Sociology, LXVI (July).

Jacob, Philip E.
1957 Changing Values in College. New York: Harper & Row.

Kahl, Joseph A.
1957 The American Class Structure. New York: Rinehart & Company, Inc.

Kahn, L. A.
1951 "The Organization of Attitudes Toward the Negro as a Function of Education." Psychological Monographs, LXV, No. 131.

Katz, D., and E. Stotland
1959 "A Preliminary Statement to a Theory of Attitude Structure and Change." In S. Koch (Ed.), Psychology: A Study of a Science. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kelman, H. C.
1961 "Processes of Opinion Change." Public Opinion Quarterly, 21.

LaPiere, R. T.
1934 "Attitudes versus Actions." Social Forces, 13.

Lombardi, Donald N.
1963 "Factors Affecting Change in Attitudes Toward Negroes Among High School Students." Journal of Negro Education, XXXII.

McEntire, Davis
1960 Residence and Race. Berkeley: The University of California Press.

Marden, Charles T. and Gladys Meyer
1962 Minorities in American Society. New York: American Book Company.

Martin, James G., and Frank R. Westie
1959 "The Tolerant Personality." American Sociological Review, XXIV.

Meer, Bernard, and Edward Freedman.
1966 "The Impact of Negro Neighbors on White Homeowners." Social Forces, 45 (September).

Merton, R. K., Patricia S. West, and Marie Jahoda.
1949 Social Facts and Social Fictions: The Dynamics of Race Relations in Hilltown. New York: Columbia University Bureau of Applied Social Research.

Mueller, John H. and Karl F. Schuessler
1961 Statistical Reasoning in Sociology. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Myrdal, Gunnar
1944 An American Dilemma. New York: Harper & Row.

National Education Association
1961 The Central Purpose of American Education. Educational Policies Commission.

Nelson, E. N. P.
1954 "Persistence of Attitudes of College Students Fourteen Years Later." Psychological Monographs, Whole No. 373.

Newcomb, T. M.
1953 "An Approach to the Study of Communicative Acts." Psychological Review, 60.

Newcomb, T. M.
1961 The Acquaintance Process. New York: Holt.

Newcomb, T. M., et al.
1967 Persistence and Change: "Bennington College and Its Students after Twenty-five Years." As quoted in Arthur W. Chickering, Education and Identity.

Newcomb, Macroly, and Hartly (Eds.)
1958 Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Holt.

Noel, Donald L. and Alphonso Pinkney
1964 "Correlates of Prejudice: Some Racial Differences and Similarities." American Journal of Sociology, 69, (May).

Oral Roberts University
1971 Bulletin, Vol. 5, No. 1.

Osgood, C. E., and P. H. Tannenbaum
1955 The Principle of Congruity in the Prediction of Attitude Change. Psychological Review, 62.

Pettigrew, Thomas F.
1971 "Racially Separate or Together." Pp. 385, 86 in Horton and Leslie (Eds.) Studies in the Sociology of Social Problems. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Pettigrew, T. F.
1959 "Regional Differences in Anti-Negro Prejudice." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIX.

Poole, E. M.
1926 "Social Distance and Personal Distance." Journal of Applied Sociology, 28.

Pressey, S. L. and F. P. Robinson
1944 P. 97 in Arthur W. Chickering, Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.

Radke-Yarrow Marian, John D. Campbell, and Leon F. Yarrow.
1958 "Interpersonal Dynamics in Racial Integration." In Newcomb, Macroly, and Hartly (Eds.). Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt & Co.

Reissman, Leonard
1959 Class in American Society. Glencoe: The Free Press.

Riessman, F., and S. M. Miller
1957 "Social Class and Authoritarianism." Abstracts of Annual Meeting Papers. P. 621 in American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 69. American Sociological Society.

Riley, Matilda White
1963 Sociological Research I: A Case Approach. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc.

Rokeach, Milton
1960 The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books.

Rosenberg, M. J., and R. P. Abelson
1960 "An Analysis of Cognitive Balancing." In M. J. Rosenberg, et al., (Eds.), Attitude Organization and Change. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Rosenberg, M. J., et al., (Eds.)
1960 Attitude Organization and Change. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Sargent, S. Stansfeld, and Robert C. Williamson.
1966 Social Psychology. New York: Ronald.

Schuman, Howard, and Barry Gruenberg
1970 Impact of City on Racial Attitudes. Survey and Research Center, Institute for Social Research. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Secord, Paul F. and Carl W. Backman
1964 Social Psychology. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.

Selltiz, Claire
1959 Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Shaw, Marvin E. and Jack M. Wright
1967 Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes. Saint Louis: McGraw Hill, Inc.

Sherif, M., and C. W. Sherif
1956 An Outline of Social Psychology. P. 11 in Wagner and Sherwood, The Study of Attitude Change. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Sherif, Carolyn W., et al.
1965 Attitude and Attitude Change. Philadelphia: Saunders.

Smith, Margot W.
1970 "Measuring Ethnocentrism in Hilo, Hawaii." Sociology and Social Research.

Stember, Charles H.
1961 Education and Attitude Change: The Effects of Schooling on Prejudice Against Minority Groups. New York: Institute of Human Relations Press.

Stewart, D. and T. Hoult
1959 "A Social Psychological Theory of the Authoritarian Personality." American Journal of Sociology, LXV.

Stouffer, Samuel A., Shirley A. Star, and Robin M. Williams, Jr.
1949 "The American Soldier: Adjustment During Army Life." "Studies in Social Psychology in World War II," Vol. 1. P. 17 in Julius Trubowitz, Changing the Racial Attitudes of Children, New York: Frederick A. Prazen Publishers.

Taueber, Karl E., and Alma F. Taueber
1965 Negroes in Cities. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Thurstone, L. L.
1963 The Measurement of Values. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Thurstone, L. L.
1967 "Attitudes Can be Measured." In Martin Fishbein (Ed.), Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement. New York: Wiley.

Trent, James W., and Leland L. Medsker
1968 Beyond High School. As quoted in Arthur W. Chickering, Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Triandus, Harry S., and Leigh Minturn Triandus.
1960 Race, Social Class, Religion, and Nationality as Determinants of Social Distance." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 61.

Tumin, Melvin
1961 Inventory and Appraisal of Research on American Anti-Semitism. New York: Freedom Books.

Tumin, Melvin
1958 Desegregation: Resistance and Readiness. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Tumin, Melvin, Paul Barton, and Bernie Burris
1959 "Education, Prejudice and Discrimination." American Sociological Review, XXIII.

Valien, Bonita
1954 "Community in Chaos, Cairo, Illinois." In Robin M. Williams, Jr., and Margaret W. Ryan, (Eds.), Schools in Transition: Community Experience in Desegregation. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Vander Zenden, James W.
1966 American Minority Relations. New York: Ronald.

Wagner, Richard V. and John J. Sherwood
1969 The Study of Attitude Change. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Warner, Lyle G., and Rutledge Dennis
1970 "Prejudice Versus Discrimination: An Empirical Example and Theoretical Extension." Social Forces 48, (June).

Weatherford, Willis D., Jr.
1960 The Goals of Higher Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Weaver, Robert C.
1970 "From Inner City to Suburbia: Negroes Join in Exodus." U. S. News and World Report, (December).

Webster, H., Freedman, and P. Heist
1962 "Personality Changes in College Students." P. 811-864 in N. Sanford (Ed.) The American College. New York: Wiley.

Webster, Staten W.
1961 "The Influence of Interracial Contact on Social Acceptance in a Newly Integrated School." Journal of Educational Psychology, LII.

Westie, F. R., and M. R. Westie
1957 "The Social-Distance Pyramid: Relationships between Caste and Class." American Journal of Sociology, LXIII.

White, R. W.
1958 Lives in Progress. New York: Dryden Press.

Whitmore, Paul G., Jr.
1956 "A Study of Desegregation: Attitude Change and Scale Validation." (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Tennessee)

Williams, Robin M., Jr.
1964 Strangers Next Door. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Williams, Robin M., Jr.
1947 The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Williams, T. Harry, et al.
1969 A History of the U. S. to 1877. New York: Knopf.

Wilner, Daniel M., Rosabelle P. Walkley, and Stuart W. Cook.
1955 Human Relations in Interracial Housing, a Study of the Contact Hypothesis. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

APPENDIX

This is a questionnaire designed to gather information about racial attitudes held by white Americans toward Negroes. It will help to further scientific knowledge when you answer the following questions by checking the appropriate item of your choice. Your cooperation is strictly voluntary. Under no circumstances is your name to be identified with your answers. Please answer <u>every</u> question.

Item

4. Indicate your sex:
   __1. Male __2. Female
5. Check the number nearest your actual age:
   __1. 17 __5. 21
   __2. 18 __6. 22
   __3. 19 __7. 23
   __4. 20 __8. over 23
6. Check the geographic location which includes the state you lived in during most of your teenage life:
   __1. <u>Northeast: New England</u> (Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut)
   __2. <u>Northeast: Middle Atlantic</u> (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania)
   __3. <u>North Central: E. North Central</u> (Ohio, Indiana, Ill., Michigan, Wisconsin)
   __4. <u>North Central: W. North Central</u> (Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, N. Dakota, S. Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas)
   __5. <u>South: South Atlantic</u> (Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, W. Virginia, N. Carolina, S. Carolina Georgia, Florida)
   __6. <u>South: East South Central</u> (Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi)
   __7. <u>South: West South Central</u> (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas)
   __8. <u>West: Mountain</u> (Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona Utah, Nevada)
   __9. <u>West: Pacific</u> (Washington, Oregon, California Alaska, Hawaii)

Item

7. Designate which of the following best describes your residence during your teenage years:
   __1. Central city of 50,000 or more within the city limits. House located so that you attended a downtown or centrally located high school. Downtown shopping most convenient. Older housing area.
   __2. Urban area setting within the city limits, adjacent to central city. New housing addition less than 20 years old. Newer high school. Shopping centers most convenient.
   __3. Suburban setting outside of city limits but contiguous to a large city of 50,000 or more. If not contiguous, a place with 2,500 people or more with economic and social relations with nearby city. If rural area, non-farm use of land.
   __4. Urban place with 2,500 population or more, but less than 50,000 people. Some industry and non-agriculture primary source of economy.
   __5. Rural setting where agriculture is the primary way of life. Near or in a small town, but less than 2,500 population.

Item

8. Indicate the choice that best states the educational achievement of the head of your family: (that is your father or primary source of income during your teenage years)
   __1. Elementary, less than 8 years.
   __2. Elementary, 8 years.
   __3. High school, 1-3 years.
   __4. High school, 4 years.
   __5. College, 1-3 years.
   __6. College, 4 yrs. or more.
9. Indicate the choice that best describes your father's occupation: (or the head of your family during your teenage years)
   __1. Unskilled workers.
      (a) farm and non-farm laborer
      (b) servants
   __2. Semiskilled workers
   __3. Skilled workers and foremen.
   __4. Clerks and kindred workers
   __5. Proprietors, managers and officials.
      (a) farmers (owners)
      (b) wholesale and retail dealers
   __6. Professional persons
10. Indicate the approximate annual income received by your family:
   __1. Under $3,000.
   __2. $3,000 - $4,999.
   __3. $5,000 - $6,999.
   __4. $7,000 - $9,999.
   __5. $10,000 - $14,999.
   __6. $15,000 and over.
11. Estimate generally your family's socioeconomic class as you perceive it:
   __1. Lower
   __2. Moderate
   __3. Higher
12. Indicate your present educational status:
   __1. Senior
   __2. Freshman
13. Check the political preference of your parents:
   __1. Democrat
   __2. Republican
   __3. Independent or Other

Item

14. Estimate the approximate degree of integration in the high school you attended:
   __1. Between 0 and 10% Negro
   __2. Between 10 and 25% Negro
   __3. Between 25 and 50% Negro
   __4. Between 50 and 75% Negro
   __5. Between 75 and 90% Negro
   __6. Between 90 and 100% Negro
15. Please think carefully and then indicate the social relationship to which you would willingly allow Negroes: (the lower the number chosen, the closer you would willingly associate with members of the Negro race.)
   __1. To close kinship by marriage.
   __2. To personal social dating (unrestricted).
   __3. As my roommate with all privileges and social clubs.
   __4. To my dorm with the right to hold school and class offices.
   __5. As a student in my school restricted to separate bu equal facilities and orga izations of their own.
   __6. As a visitor only to my school.
16. Check the item that most nearly describes your past social relations with Negroes:
   __1. Members of my immediate family have married Negroes.
   __2. I have dated Negroes.
   __3. I have mingled socially with Negroes.
   __4. I have eaten with Negroes privately.
   __5. I have worked and shared public facilities with Negroes.
   __6. I have attended school with Negroes.

VITA

Paul Wayne Inbody

Candidate for the Degree of Doctor

of Education

Thesis: A STUDY IN STUDENT DEVELOPMENT: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LIBERAL ARTS EDUCATION AND RACIAL PREJUDICE

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Tulsa, Oklahoma, April 6, 1933, the son of Mr. and Mrs. R. C. Inbody. Married to Nina Helen Smithee Inbody; three children: Marcia, 21; Paula, 14; Paul, Jr., 11.

Education:

Free Will Baptist Bible College, Nashville, Tennessee, 54-58, BA, Theology
Tulsa University, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 64-67, BA, Sociology
Tulsa University, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 67-68, MA, Sociology
Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 68-72, Ed.D., Higher Education

Professional Experience: Coordinator, Behavioral Science Department, Oral Roberts University; taught at Oral Roberts University four years; Social Worker Consultant for Tulsa County Schools two years; Director of Planning and Development for Office of Economic Opportunity, Tulsa, two years; served as Consultant to Oklahoma University Extension Department (Gerontology); served as Consultant to the following: community development project for Mexican-American community of Tulsa; Model Cities, Tulsa; Oklahoma University and Oklahoma State University on social concern and code enforcement in small Oklahoma towns.

Memberships and Honors: Board of Regents for Free Will Baptist College, Nashville, Tennessee, and Hillsdale Junior College, Moore, Oklahoma; Alpha Kappa Delta, Honors Sociology Club (determined by grade); Human Relations Commission, National Association of Free Will Baptist; Oklahoma Health and Welfare Association; American Sociological Association; Southwestern Sociological Association.