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ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

INDICATORS OF RACIAL PREJUDICE AMONG BLACK AND WHITE FACULTY MEMBERS IN AN "INVERSE INTEGRATION" UNIVERSITY SETTING

BY

GLORIA SMITH TUCKFIELD

---

An ex post facto study was conducted to (1) assess the racially prejudiced attitudes black and white faculty members working in an "inverse integration" university setting harbored toward the opposite race and to (2) examine the variances in these attitudes with reference to selected demographic and social-psychological stratification variables, These null hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no statistically significant difference between the racially prejudiced attitudes held by black faculty members, as measured by their scores on the Anti-White Scale, and the racially prejudiced attitudes held by white faculty members, as measured by their scores on the Anti-Black Scale.

2. There are no statistically significant differences between the prejudiced scores of the black and white faculty members, as measured by the Anti-White Scale and the Anti-Black Scale, respectively, when these scores are stratified by sex, age, region reared, undergraduate school region, graduate school region, employed years at Atlanta University, formal race/ethnic relations education, highest degree earned, father's or guardian's occupation, religious service attendance per month, political party orientation, pre-Atlanta University cross-racial contact, and Atlanta University cross-racial contact.
3. There are no statistically significant differences in the cross-racial contacts, as measured by the Cross-Racial Contact Scale, experienced by the black faculty members and the white faculty members before securing employment at Atlanta University and the cross-racial contacts experienced by the black faculty members and white faculty members after securing employment at Atlanta University.

One hundred ten full-time black and white faculty members, who worked at Atlanta University during 1973-1974, completed a 68-item Social Attitude Questionnaire. The survey instrument was comprised of 16 factual items designed to elicit ideographic information for stratifying the obtained sample; Steckler's 34-item Social Attitude Scale: Anti-Black/Anti-White (SAS: A-B/A-W) and, two 9-item cross-racial contact scales. Essentially, analysis of variance procedures were applied to questionnaire responses to test for significance of differences among means on each of the three major hypotheses. The criterion of statistical significance was the .05 level. The reliability, Coefficient Alpha was determined for the SAS: A-B/A-W (.897 and .941, respectively) and the Pre- and Atlanta University Cross-Racial Contact Scales (black .813, white .772; black .769, white .849) by the computer program, TD.

Faculty responses were stratified by race. Frequencies and percentages were derived to ascertain each racial group's responses to each questionnaire item of pertinence to the group. The SAS: A-B and A-W raw attitude scores and their corresponding T-scores were generated for the white and black subjects, respectively. Cross-racial contact quotients were derived.

While stratified according to race, the black and white groups' mean responses to the subscales SAS: A-W and A-B, respectively, were assessed for significant differences among means. Further, responses
of the subjects were stratified according to the aforespecified independent variables; and, group means on all variables were subjected to analysis of variance procedures.

1. There was no statistically significant difference in the racially prejudiced attitudes that the black faculty members harbored toward whites and the white faculty members harbored toward blacks (p < .292). Equivalently, the quality of racial attitudes that the black and white faculty members harbored toward each other was the same.

2. The main effect of age (p < .001), of years employed at the University (p < .036), and of University cross-racial contact (p < .008), produced statistically significant differences in the prejudiced attitudes of the study group. Further, the race-by-region reared interaction (p < .019), and the interaction between race and region of graduate school secured highest professional degree (p < .014), induced differential effects on the prejudiced attitudes of the study group.

3. The stratification variable, Atlanta University cross-racial contact (black p < .033; white p < .001), proved very significant in accounting for differences in degrees of prejudice exhibited by the study subjects. Subjects who participated in high degrees of cross-racial contact at the University evinced reliably more favorable racial attitudes than those who reported only limited contacts with the opposite race.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

... various studies tempt us to estimate that four-fifths of the American population harbors enough antagonism toward minority groups to influence their daily conduct.

Gordon W. Allport, 1954, p. 77

Rationale. The need to account for the direction, intensity and determinants of prejudiced attitudes is a continuing task of social psychologists. The responsibility is of special importance for biracial university faculty populations serving predominantly black student bodies, as, the probability for hostile and antipathetic attitudes having consequences ranging from person enmity to personality disintegration and group conflict is heightened within such situations.

A vital factor related to instructor effectiveness in integrated institutions of higher learning is the ability and desire on the part of instructors to work with students and colleagues of varying ethnic and racial backgrounds. Needless to say, educators who have the ability but harbor feelings of racial hostility will experience difficulty. The underlying problem of prejudice spills over into their professional life, exerts a debilitating impact on the intellectual climate of the campus and consequently adversely affects the development of the university.

Intellectual growth cannot flourish pervasively in an atmosphere infested with a residue of suspicion, dogmatism, and guarded attitude.
Intellectual growth is facilitated through human-to-human relating in free, open, rigorous, and honest communication. It depends on a kind of mutual confidence and respect between professionals and students where criticism of opposing views can be made without cavil and without rancor. Intellectual growth requires a community of scholars for its fulfillment and renewal. Today's Gesellschaft of rapid social change and legal evolution seems to indicate that this growth does not happen easily on university campuses having all white or all black faculties; and, considering the marches, demonstrations, and riots by both black and white Americans—which testify most vividly to the depth of intensity of the racial attitudes involved—it would appear that its realization on the interracial black campus would be an even greater challenge. An investigation into the scholarly literature for empirical studies to support this expectation reveals no reservoir of studies replete with titles pertinent to the impact of professors' relations in the "inverse integration" university setting on the quality of the interpersonal and/or intellectual climate of that university.

Williams and Cole (1969) studied the effects of faculty integration on the feelings of Southern Black high school students toward school and found that blacks have less affinity for the integrated faculty school setting than whites. In discussing the implications of their findings they pointed out that "the attitudes of Caucasian teachers and students can markedly accelerate or impede the adjustment of Negro students to desegregation. An atmosphere of mutual respect in which students are evaluated on an individual basis offers the greatest likelihood for successful adjustment (p. 49)."

Hocking and Schnier (1974) in stressing the importance of the
... college students typically describe favorite professors with such comments as: 'I'm not afraid to speak up or to disagree with her'; 'He seems to like students'; 'He makes the course more interesting.'...

Learning in the college classroom occurs within the context of a human relationship. It follows, then, that students will be satisfied with their learning to the extent that they perceive their professors as demonstrating the qualities necessary for good human relationships, since it is the professors who exert the greater influence over the nature of the relationships between themselves and their students (p. 608).

What accounts for variance in the quality of interpersonal relationships?

Granted that a multiplicity of factors influence human relationships, racial prejudice seems sufficiently involved to warrant a study of its contribution. Triandis (1959), for instance, proposed that interpersonal attraction is a function of attitudinal similarity between two people.

When two people are attitudinally similar and have an opportunity to interact, they reward each other because it is generally rewarding to hear another person agree with one's opinions. When a person is rewarded, he seeks to repeat the rewarding experiences, which in this case means that he seeks to interact more frequently with the person with whom he agrees. Rokeach, Smith and Evans (1960) extended this thinking by arguing that belief dissimilarity is the more important determinant of prejudice. To substantiate this idea, they asked their subjects to rate on 9-point scales, stimulus persons differing from themselves in race, religion, and belief. The ends of the scales were defined by the statements: "I can't see myself being friends with such a person," and "I can very easily see myself being friends with such a person." Friendship preferences were found to be determined mainly by congruence in be-
If beliefs instead of by race or religion.

Triandis (1961) accepted these findings on the friendship variable, but argued that prejudice involves more than non-acceptance as a friend; it involves negative behaviors as well, such as excluding someone from one's neighborhood. He showed that race, rather than belief dissimilarity, determines the rejection of hypothetical stimulus persons from intimate social situations. Triandis (1971) later concluded that both race and belief are important determinants of interpersonal attitudes. He specified the parameters that one could say which determinant would probably exert the overriding effect by asserting that for certain kinds of people, one is more important than the other. For intimate interpersonal behaviors, race is more important than belief; for formal behaviors, belief is more important than race. For behaviors intermediate in intimacy, such as friendship, both factors are important, and the relative importance is largely because of differences in subculture and personality.

The purpose of this study was to determine and compare the negative racial attitudes that black and white faculty members working in an "inverse integration" university setting hold toward the opposite race; and, to examine the relationship between these attitudes and fifteen demographic and social-psychological stratification variables. Because black/white university professors occupy a special position in our society, because the race problem is one of America's fundamental and most crucial problems, a systematic study regarding reciprocity of black/white racial attitudes among persons who have chosen to work in an interracial setting may contribute knowledge useful to maximize human relations among those who find themselves in biracial settings not by choice. Moreover,
since the counselor's forte is his expertise in human behavior and interaction; since he should continuously assess his own affect as well as others' affect to him, it was thought that the study might stimulate counselors—and other helping professionals—in biracial settings to institute and maintain ongoing recalibration programs for sensitizing themselves to their impact upon others and others upon them. The need for this kind of counselor awareness seems essential for maximizing counselor effectiveness and minimizing his "psychonxious" (Truax and Carkhuff, 1966) possibilities.

Many social psychologists have expressed a need for research in interpersonal relationships. In 1958, Blumer estimated that substantially more than "a thousand books and articles 'of a professedly learned character' dealing with race relations in the United States had been published during the previous ten years (p. 403)." A decade thereafter Hyman (1969) reported that "the Watts riots alone added another 16,000 pages of official documents to be read by any analyst who has $83 to spare (p. 3)." Yet, despite this plethora of published reports, there is a dearth of research conducted concerning black racial attitudes and behavior.

Seventeen years ago Anastasi (1958) summarized the relevant research regarding racial group differences and disclosed that despite the attention given to problems of racial integration in American schools, our knowledge of the values and attitudes of black students and teachers was sparse. She disclosed that by and large research in this realm focused on dimensions of cognitive and psychomotor behavior.

Prior to this, Tyler (1956) asserted that even "the few studies that students of racial group differences have conducted pertaining to
personality and adjustment have . . . shown no clear trends although there have been many interesting questions in this area."

Gottlieb (1964) in pointing to the need for more relevant research, professed that although few studies have appraised the attitudes and values of black students and teachers, comparatively fewer have investigated "differences and similarities between Negro and white students to find themselves in schools where there are variations in the racial compositions of students and teachers (p. 346)."

The Human Meaning of Social Change (Campbell & Converse, 1972) categorically demonstrates "that there has been very little systematic accounting of the meaning which recent social changes have had for the people of this country . . . we have been far more vigilant about monitoring changes in the objective conditions of life"—that is, monitoring hard quantitative socio-structural data—"than in the subjective experiences of life (p. 16)"—that is, monitoring the soft social-psychological data of attitudes, expectations, aspirations, and values of the American population. Ongoing research programs pertaining to repeated assessment of the psychological characteristics of the population are few. To adequately meet the needs of society, behavioral scientists are pushed toward the implementation and maintenance of a program of psychological indicators which will continuously tell us about changes in the quality of American life.

Researchers need to discern the broad structural trends and the "sense people make of them, as well as the way these changes shape and determine the fine grains of human lives and gratification: in sum, the human meaning that these changes may be said to have (Campbell &
Herbert H. Hyman's (1972) recent comprehensive assessment of present state of information regarding dimensions of social psychological change in the black population disclosed that among the thousands of titles which have been published on race relations in America, only fragments of data can be found about the beliefs and attitudes of blacks; whereas, a great deal can be found about the feelings and sentiments of whites. "Social science has failed to provide the systematic monitoring of change in the social psychology of American Negroes which the importance of the problem would appear to justify (Campbell & Converse, p. 14)."

Hyman has proposed a basic list of social-psychological variables for which trend studies of substantive significance in the black population are sorely needed. Among those enumerated are aspiration levels, feelings of hate and distrust, expectations and preferences regarding integration and separatism. Further, he "urges the special study of influentials as well as of the general public and the comparative analysis of age cohorts as an indicator of change (p. 14)."

Among the factors operating to sustain the phenomenon of "inverse faculty integration" in black institutions of higher learning is the continuous need for personnel having doctorates in sufficient numbers to meet the minimum standards of the regional accrediting agencies. "Blacks with the doctorate are highly sought after in the academic marketplace, and most black colleges are at a competitive disadvantage in bidding for them (Egerton, 1971, p. 18)."

Hence, this has mitigated against the prevalence of total black faculties. To remain in good standing with accrediting agencies, the black colleges have continuously hired non-blacks.
In illuminating this phenomenon Johnson (1971) explains:

For example, in the thirty-six United Negro College Fund schools, approximately 28 percent of the Black faculty have earned doctor's degrees. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools require 30 percent for accreditation, and this means that at least 2 percent of the doctorates necessary for good standing with the Association must be provided by nonblacks. (This is the minimum aggregate percentage, for course; the percentage is substantially higher than this at most of the schools). Consequently, the black college faculties are the only faculties in the country which are multiracial in more than a token sense (p. 805).

Since the May 17, 1954 Supreme Court's desegregation decision, black professors having Ph. D.'s—no longer restricted to working in black institutions—are taking advantage of a broader range of job alternatives. This has created the black faculty "brain drain" phenomenon.

Furthermore, Fact Book (1974) reveals that one-fourth of the historically black public colleges' 6,000 faculty is nonblack. It would appear that the phenomenon of "inverse integration" will persist. It would appear that there must be a lot of coping with the feeling of superiority and inferiority which are attributed to race transpiring in our black colleges and universities. It would appear that the extensiveness of the "inverse integration" universities setting merits its systematic study by students of intergroup relations.

Blake (1971) in his discourse pertaining to the future leadership roles of black colleges and universities asserted that

... more sophisticated analyses ... are needed. Some black social scientists should conduct ... careful studies of ... political attitudes, institutional reactions to changes in schools ..., and from these studies a series of probabilities could be developed. These would not be definitive but would certainly raise the level of black/white dialogue above its current primitive level.

Solid work should be done on the relationship between social science and solutions to human problems. Given the
dynamism in social relationships, the model for the social scientists should be small units—a school . . .—and they should deal with them without attempts to generalize. Over a year ten skilled psychologists might change one hundred schools, if their discipline has any validity in the real world. Yet no basic generalizations might occur. In a decade more might well be accomplished than from the grand hypotheses of a Daniel Moynihan or a Kenneth Clark.

A university can do other things, but it would be on the frontier if it were in any of these areas in a substantive way. The techniques developed and what is learned is not limited to Black Americans, though its primary and initial relevance is to them (p. 766-767).

Johnson (1971), p. 807) asserts:

by comparison with the black student, very little is known about the black faculty member. While it is true that relatively hard statistical data, such as age, advanced degrees, disciplines, and so forth are available, nevertheless, little or no systematic information about the basic determinants and dynamics of faculty behavior—cognitions, attitudes, values, and motivation—exist. The rudimentary state of knowledge about these dynamics is illustrated (unintentionally) by Rieseman and Jencks, in their largely anecdotal study of the Black College. . . As responsible social scientists, of course, the authors should have been aware of the seductive but logically weak tendency to attribute validity to an idea on the basis of seemingly compelling, and perhaps esoteric, anecdotes from real life (Carson, 1969, p. 5).

Brigham and Weissbach (1972) asserted that "... experimental work on the attitude-behavior relationship for black attitudes has been lacking. Certainly, this is one area in which such research is sorely needed (p. 198)."

Hare (1964) stated that researchers have devoted their attention mainly to speculations about the future role of predominantly black colleges and that the social and cultural conflicts of "reverse integration" have been largely neglected for the study of integration into "white" situations.

Pettigrew (1965) stated that we are in serious need of research on blacks, both in the North and in the South. He further pointed out that the most sweeping advances in American black history have been made
in the past generation, requiring a fresh new look. Some of the unique variables that should be considered are: migration, differential experiences with whites, education, and so forth.

Racial attitudes must be considered in the present social environment of colleges and universities. With few exceptions, Americans still live in a world in which contact between blacks and whites is formalized and members of the two races seldom meet in situations where they can gain appreciation of one another as equals.

It is assumed that interaction is a complex process and that the interacting individuals not only are acted upon, but also act and react to a multiplicity of social situations which influence and shape social relations. If significant similarities and differences should be found in the attitude structure of the black and white faculty members, it may be reasoned that knowledge of these variables may be used in allaying some of the adverse consequences that may be inherent in the process of integration.

Evolution of the problem. Seven years of experience in counseling black/white students and black/white faculty members at a predominantly white junior college, four years of intimate involvement in a deeply satisfying black/white marriage, three uniquely challenging years of parenthood in a crossracial family, and several years collectively as a student in an "inverse integration" university setting have developed the interest underlying this investigation.

Being of the conviction that the field of guidance and counseling, in the years ahead, should contribute far more than it has in the past to enrichment of personal understanding and to a constructive attack on
the problem of racial conflict—now so prominent both in this country and abroad—the writer actively sought a research problem that held potential for illuminating interracial phenomena.

As a consequence of the aforementioned experiences and as an outgrowth of numerous discussions with her spouse—who was seeking a crimino logically oriented dissertation research problem having the central thrust of uniting blacks and whites in a single perspective: a perspective denouncing the dehumanizing reality and announcing a possibly more humane one—the writer became intrigued with the thought of studying relationships between persons working in an interracial setting which has existed for one hundred years. Assuming that integration is a healthy model, a study of black/white relationships in a continuing setting could suggest viable strategies for promoting healthy living for persons in more recently created biracial environments.

On August 10, 1973, the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) was requested to perform a search of its files so as to provide the writer with an annotated bibliography pertaining to white instructors working in predominantly black colleges and universities. In its response September 19, 1973, ERIC communicated:

When the search was completed, zero items were identified. . . . We feel by broadening the search topic we can afford a printout of some scope . . . and we will forward the results of this second search with as much haste as possible.

ERIC's second search generated two items of minor pertinence to the writer's research problem.

A second information retrieval system, PROBE, was requested to perform a search, and although the writer was forwarded a ninety-seven page query request response, less than ten of the references disclosed therein
were found to be of any pertinence to the writer's research problem.

Subsequently, the writer's personal research of the related literature disclosed that there is an evident hiatus in our knowledge of differences between black and white professors of higher education with respect to their racially prejudiced attitudes. Although the scholarly literature and research findings of the past tell us a great deal about the white collectivity's attitudes and behavior toward nonwhite collectivities, and although the literature tells us considerably less about the attitudinal patterns within the black collectivity, the scholarly literature seems to provide no direct guidance regarding the reciprocity of black/white racial attitudes at the professional level in an "inverse integration" university setting. This became the writer's problem, "Indicators of Racial Prejudice Among Black and White Faculty Members in an 'Inverse Integration' University Setting."

Statement of the problem. The problem of the study was to assess the racially prejudiced attitudes that black and white faculty members working in an "inverse integration" university setting harbored toward the opposite race. Further, it sought to examine the variances in these attitudes with reference to selected demographic and social-psychological stratification variables.

Purpose of the study. Specifically, the study was undertaken as an attempt to provide answers for the following questions:

1. Do black and white faculty members who work in the "inverse integration" university setting of Atlanta University differ in the racially prejudiced attitudes (unfavorable attitudes) which they harbor toward the opposite race?

2. Do the factors of sex, age, geographic region reared, geographic region secured bachelor's degree, geographic region
secured highest professional degree, racial composition of undergraduate school, racial composition of graduate school, years employed at Atlanta University, formal race/ethnic relations education, highest degree earned, father's or guardian's occupation, religious service attendance per month, political party orientation, pre-Atlanta University cross-racial contact, and Atlanta University cross-racial contact induce differential effects on the racial attitudes that black and white faculty members of Atlanta University hold toward the opposite race?

3. Does the amount of contact that each faculty group (the blacks, the whites) had with the other race before employment at Atlanta University differ from the amount of cross-racial contact experienced after securing employment at Atlanta University?

Limitation of the study. Sources of data for this investigation were limited to the Social Attitude Questionnaire responses of 110 black and white full-time American faculty members employed at Atlanta University during the 1973-1974 academic year. It is recognized that the responses of these faculty members may not be representative of university faculty members in general; however, the findings of this investigation may offer broad hypotheses for more representative future research.

Further, the data relating to the variables investigated were based on self-reports. No attempt was made to verify the accuracy of these perceptions. Nevertheless, several characteristics of the study functioned to minimize extraneous sources of variance in the subject's scores. These factors include: (1) responses were made anonymously; (2) motivation to "make a good impression" or to give socially approved responses was minimal as the vast majority of the subjects were not known to the investigator, the investigator communicated from an adjacent state and, the investigator was of student status whereas the subjects were of faculty status; (3) negative responses had no foreseeable negative repercussions
for the subjects; and (4) the "forced choice" pattern was employed. To the extent the procedures employed failed to prevent the subjects from distorting their true feelings, the study's findings will represent a restricted view of reality.

In addition, Stember (1949) has noted an appropriate limitation in the study of attitudes and opinions. The framework in which opinions are being asked is important for it may have special implications for the interpretation. He continued: "This comes from the general point that expressions of opinion rooted in concrete experience are different from those on issues in which the respondents have felt no involvement (p. 494)." Stember further believed that the statements probably align themselves along a continuum with respect to their level of familiarity with the various issues presented.

**Definition of terms.** To provide for unity in thought among readers, explicit definitions of key terms which were used throughout this study are presented below:

1. "Racial attitude" refers to a person's positive feelings of admiration, sympathy, "closeness," or identification; and, his negative feelings of contempt, fear, envy, "distance," or alienation toward some or all members of a racial group. "Racial attitude" and "social attitude" will be used interchangeably within this study.

2. "Racial prejudice" refers to a negative evaluative reaction directed toward a group as a whole or toward an individual because he is a member of that group. It is based upon faulty and inflexible generalizations; and, its net effect is to place the object of prejudice at some disadvantage not merited by his own misconduct (Allport, 1954, p. 10).

3. "Prejudice" refers to a negative attitude toward persons (or a person) that is sustained by a spurious overgeneralization (Allport, 1954, p. 12).

4. "Black(s)" is used to denote a biologically heterogeneous minority group—Negro American(s)—in the United States.
whose cultural background is almost exclusively American but who is sociologically set apart from the larger society on the basis of possessing, among several other strains, varying and unspecified fractions of African ancestry (Roberts, 1950, p. 332). Since the information on race will be obtained through self-enumeration, the data regarding race of the subjects in this study will represent essentially self-classification by persons according to the race with which they identify themselves.

5. "White(s)" is used to denote the majority group in the United States whose cultural background is largely European and whose racial classification is Caucasoid. Since the information on race will be obtained through self-enumeration, the data regarding race of the subjects in this study will represent essentially self-classification by persons according to the race with which they identify themselves.

6. "Cross-racial contact" refers to the interaction between both black and white persons in specific situations which require those involved to react to the other's presence and to communicate thoughts and feelings either directly or indirectly.

7. "High degree of contact" refers to the existence of free, frequent and easy interaction on an intimate and equal status basis wherein blacks and whites reciprocally influence and modify each other's behavior.

8. "Low degree of contact" denotes the existence of infrequent, impersonal, and formal interaction between blacks and whites which is characterized by a low degree of personal involvement and communication on the part of the interactors.

9. "Integration" refers to the incorporation of blacks as equals into society or into an organization. Desegregation—i.e., the mere admission of blacks to existing institutions for white people—does not constitute integration. . . . True integration goes far beyond the mere physical fact of nonsegregation; . . . it involves as well a feeling of acceptance and a sense of belonging on the part of the participating individuals (Jenkins, 1954, p. 143).


11. "Discrimination" refers to the exclusion of all members of the group in question from certain types of employment, from the residential housing, political rights, educational or recreational opportunities, churches, hospitals, or from
some other social privileges. It includes any conduct based on a distinction made on grounds of natural or social categories, which have no relation either to individual capacities or merits, or to concrete behavior of the individual person (Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations, 1949) p. 3).

12. "Inverse integration university setting" refers to the historically and predominantly black university in which black instructional and administrative staffs comprise 60 percent or more of the full-time professional personnel and whites constitute between 1 to 40 percent of the full-time professional personnel. In this unique setting the onus of adjustment is primarily upon the white person instead of the black person. The blacks are in the established position; they are the hosts.

Method of research. The Descriptive Survey Method was employed in conducting this ex post facto study.

Setting of the study. Since the data for this investigation was secured as a result of mailing questionnaires to the 150 full-time Atlanta University faculty members, the setting of the study was considered to be Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia.

Chartered in 1867, accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the Association of American Universities, the American Library Association, the Council on Social Work Education, and the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, Atlanta University operates as a private, coeducational, non-sectarian institution devoted exclusively to graduate studies. Five schools constitute the institution's academic structure, the School of Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Education, Library Service and Social Work. Collectively, these schools offer graduate programs in thirty-one different areas of concentration leading to the master's degree; three areas leading to the specialist's degree; courses of study leading to the Doctor of Philosophy degree in biology, political science, and guidance and coun-
saling; and, studies leading to the Doctor of Education in administra-
tion and supervision.

Committed to its goal of "... complete education for a whole life, with faculty and officials representative of the highest in scholarship and character; it has been open to students of any race or creed, with emphasis on human equality..." (Atlanta University, 1865-1965, p. 1).

While the trend in today's educational institutions is toward large impersonal student populations, Atlanta University's students have the luxury of being educated in a small relatively personal setting—the 1973 fall term enrollment was 1,167 students (American Council on Education, 1974, p. 39). The University's capacity to nurture the intellectual, cultural and social development of its students is expanded through its affiliation in a university plan (i.e., a plan which provides for the sharing of resources) with the surrounding colleges: Morehouse, Spelman, Clark, Morris Brown, and the Interdenominational Theological Center.

Located within the largest cultural, industrial, commercial and distribution center in the South, the university is within walking dis-
tance from the heart of metropolitan Atlanta. Until 1966, when there were race riots in the city's black communities, Atlanta was considered one of the Deep South's most successful cities in race relations. It was the city which peacefully integrated its public school system under the 1954 United States Supreme Court ruling that racial segregation in public education is unconstitutional. But, this University did not wait for the 1954 ruling to open its doors to all members of the human family. Historically, its mixed faculty and student body have been quiet exemplars of an integrated learning environment. Its faculty housing and student
dormitories, both situated in the black community, have been shared harmoniously by a blend of persons whose social origins are imbedded in regions throughout the continental United States and numerous foreign countries.
CHAPTER II
SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

In perspective. More than thirty years ago Gwendolyn Bryant (1941) conceptualized America's race problem with an equation: "the majority group plus negative attitudes equal antagonism toward minority groups. If this equation is broken down and reconstructed, it becomes minority groups plus negative attitudes equal antagonism toward majority groups (p. 43)." This appears to be the crux of "the American dilemma."

Why is race such a powerful determinant of social distance in the American context; whereas, in some other cultures such characteristics as religion, social class, and so forth appear to be the most important determinants (Triandis, Davis, & Takezawa, 1965)?

In order to understand the black/white interracial tensions characterizing American society, a quick historical reflection will prove instructive. Dollard (1957) has documented the fact that for 200 years blacks have been exploited by whites along economic, sexual, and social lines. In the economic domain we find evidence of exploitation in the discrepancy in earning power of lower-class blacks versus whites. Clearly, the advantage in social prestige tends to facilitate social exploitation; and, this leads to increased reinforcements. Prior to December 18, 1865, the institutional arrangement of slavery in the South provided for greater exploitation of blacks in both the economic and
much larger personality structure which they termed authoritarian. The authoritarian personality is conceived to possess a cluster of traits which includes a high degree of conformity, dependence on authority, over-control of feelings and impulses, rigidity of thinking, and ethnocentrism. According to Davis (1965), "The Authoritarian Personality is the most important single publication which deals with the relationship between personality and attitudes (p. 14)." On the whole, subsequent related research has revealed more proof than disproof that the attitude networks people develop contribute to the structure of their personalities.

Although the social significance of prejudiced attitudes has promoted a great deal of theory and research, authorities are not agreed on one conceptualization of attitude. Many assert that attitudes are composed of three aspects: evaluation (feelings, affect), belief (cognitions), and action (behavioral tendencies). However, as Woodmansee and Cook (1967) have pointed out, the three-component model's verification is nonexistent. Few experimentors have stipulated a theoretical base for the measurement of attitude, developed an appropriate measure, and applied that measure in empirical studies of prejudice.

This investigator conceptualizes attitude—as do Fishbein (1967) and Shaw and Wright (1967)—as follows:

... a set of affective reactions toward the attitude object, derived from the concepts or beliefs that the individual has concerning the object, and predisposing the individual to behaving in a certain manner toward the attitude object. Although intimately related to attitude, neither the propositions that the individual accepts about the object (beliefs) nor the action tendencies are a part of the attitude itself (Wright, p. 13).

As the writer perceives cognitions, affect, and behavioral tendencies to be separate units rather than separate facets of a single unit, she
is less frustrated and less troubled theoretically—than the researcher who adheres to the three component attitude model—when behavior appears incongruent with measured attitudes. This perspective illuminates attitude as but one of the many determinants of action.

Further, the writer assumes that attitudes are learned; are relatively stable; have specific referents; vary in direction and intensity; possess varying degrees of interrelatedness, scope, and definitiveness; are multicausally determined; and are functional or need-satisfying in character for the individual.

It is believed that attitudes significantly influence man's judgment, perception, learning efficiency, social reactions, political views, religious views, and basic philosophy of life. Ultimately, the many attitudes man develops—in the process of coping with his environment—assemble into distinctive patterns which aid in forming the bases of his personality. It would appear that there can be formulated no adequate social behavior theory without the inclusion of the concept attitude. It seems equally logical to reason that an in-depth knowledge of attitudes is essential in the accurate prediction of complex social behavior.

Interracial attitudes: blacks toward whites. Edlefsen (1956) investigated the attitudes of blacks toward whites by giving an item social distance questionnaire to 174 students attending Atlanta University system of black colleges in Atlanta, Georgia. Ten of the students were selected and an average social distance score was computed from the responses of these. The findings indicated that 88 percent of the students expressed no strong feelings of social farness; however, 12 percent of the sample expressed attitudes approaching social farness.
Responses to the other 22 statements tended to substantiate the conclusions that the majority of these students indicate little social farness. However, 20 percent either strongly agreed or disagreed that most blacks hate most white people and an additional 18.4 percent were undecided. Sixty-four percent disagreed with the statement that most blacks would be better off if they migrated out of the South and 14 percent were undecided. Fifty-two percent strongly disagreed with the statement. "Negroes who pass for whites are fools if they don't," and an additional 31 percent disagreed, whereas only 4 percent indicated agreement. As Myrdal (1944) and others have pointed out, there is apparently some feeling that those who pass are deserting their group.

Steckler (1957) reported that black college students as a group accepted the racial norms of the society. The blacks sampled at that time tended to accept negative stereotypes concerning black people, and reject negative stereotypes referring to the majority group.

A study by Banks (1967) showed that minority group attitudes have changed. Banks examined the racial attitudes of black college students at a predominantly black university in a border region to determine changes in the acceptance or rejection of negative racial stereotypes. The results indicated that black students as a group accepted more anti-white ideology and less anti-black ideology than a comparable group of students sampled in 1957. It was also found that black students, particularly the males, were becoming more negative in their perception of the white majority. These students also were less authoritarian than the earlier group as measured by the California F-scale.

Campbell and Schumm (1968) completed a fifteen city study of black/white attitudes which disclosed little evidence of anti-white hostility.
Only 5 percent of the black respondents preferred to have only black friends; 6 percent wanted black children to attend all black schools; 9 percent felt that blacks should have as little as possible to do with whites; and, 13 percent preferred living in an all black or mostly black neighborhood.

Campbell and Schumn concluded that the general orientation of the black community was integrationist and optimistic; but, a distinct trend existed among younger blacks to be more separatist in their attitudes and more willing to attain social change through violent methods.

Hines (1968) conducted a study designed to test the willingness of blacks to associate with whites. Approximately 1,000 black undergraduates enrolled in predominantly black institutions in Alabama, Mississippi, and Georgia were administered a questionnaire designed to measure black preferences among members of several ethnic groups in a number of interpersonal situations.

The findings revealed that young men evidenced greater inclination toward social nearness than did the older men, while the opposite was true for women. The black student indicated greater preference for integrated situations such as dating, marriage, residential area, church affiliation and club membership; however, black association was preferred to association with whites. Blacks students indicated a preference for interaction with six groups in the following order: Whites, Jews, American Indians, Mexicans, Italians, and Chinese.

According to the Harris Survey (1971) blacks are developing a set of hardening animosities toward whites. This survey was administered to blacks in 1970 and again in 1971. It was found that the number of blacks
sexual domains. The Northerners, obtaining sufficient rewards from expanding industrialization, were less dependent on black exploitation. Hence, stronger customs involving the institutionalization of black exploitation developed in the South than in the North.

Since acquiring his freedom, the black has yet to become assimilated into the American social structure as have numerous other immigrants. Mack (1966) accounts for this situation with two major reasons:

The condition of slavery had an effect on the way the dominant majority regarded blacks. Many whites found it difficult to endure the idea that they had been subjecting their fellow-man to the degradation of slavery. They began to save their consciences by asserting that the black was subhuman. Many began to believe their own assertions and to transmit this belief to succeeding generations.

Thus freedom from slavery could not be regarded as a single act that wiped away all concomitants of slavery. The nation could not forget that the black had been a slave (p. 341).

French philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre (1948) contends that prejudice toward a minority group does not exist in isolation. The person who is anti-Semitic or anti-black is likely to be many other things. He is afraid of himself, of his consciousness, of his responsibility, and, of both change in himself and his environment. According to Sartre, hatred of minority groups is a symptom of a broader type of personality characterized by "fear of the human condition (p. 54)."

Sartre's notion that racially prejudiced attitudes are basic features of personality has been given considerable empirical support by a series of in-depth studies, collectively termed The Authoritarian Personality Study, conducted by Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford (1950), a team of researchers at the University of California at Berkeley. Briefly, they concluded that anti-Semitism, with its prejudicial, antidemocratic attitudes, is a part of a well organized and
who agreed with the statement, "Whites are really sorry slavery for
blacks was abolished," has risen from 63 to 70 percent in the past year.
The 1971 survey included a cross section of 1200 blacks who were asked
the same questions put to a comparable cross section one year ago. The
subjects were asked about whites as people: "Do you personally tend to
agree or disagree with these statements?"

Blacks' Perceptions of Whites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>1971</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whites feel blacks are inferior.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites give blacks a break only when forced.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White men secretly want black women.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites are really sorry slavery was abolished.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites have mean and selfish streaks.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites are physically weaker.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites are scared blacks are better people.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites are less honest than blacks.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites need somebody to lord it over.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites are more apt to catch diseases.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In only 1 of the 10 derogatory statements did the number of blacks
agreeing with the point of view decline. In nearly every case, a major-
ity of blacks had negative stereotype of white characteristics.

*Interracial attitudes: whites toward blacks.* Wrightsman (1967)
demonstrated that attitudes toward minority groups comprise several com-
ponents. A person may really believe in equal housing facilities but yet
not wish to have a black next door. The author noted the disparity between
belief and feeling. The white student did not state that blacks are
lazier, more stupid, dirtier, or less mannered than whites. "It is as
if the person is saying," according to the author, "I am prejudiced
against Negroes even though I can't defend it on the basis of racial
differences (p. 447)."
White students' opinions toward integration at the University of Virginia was assessed by Piedmont (1967) in 1947-1948, 1956-1957, and again in 1963-1964. The first two surveys polled graduate and professional students only, while the third included undergraduates. From 1947 to 1964 the percentage of graduate and professional students at the University increased from 44 percent, and the percentage of those with unfavorable opinions decreased from 36 percent to 3 percent. Feelings were most ambivalent in 1957 because of emotional turmoil in the South at the time.

In 1963-1964, attitudes toward blacks in six specific off-campus situations were evaluated, and a scale of social distances was discernible. Attitudes toward blacks were most favorable in voting situations (96 percent) and reasonably favorable in theatre (94 percent), restaurant (87 percent), and athletic encounters (86 percent). The students were least receptive to black working (78 percent) and housing situations (45 percent). Students were much more tolerant on-than-off campus, and while many supported legal equality, they drew the line at full social participation. In every instance graduate and professional students were more tolerant than undergraduates. Attitudes of students from the South did not differ significantly from attitudes of non-Southern students.

Minard (1952) contrasted the behavior of Southern white coal miners toward blacks within the mine and outside it. Within the mine there was a high degree of status below the supervisory level. Outside the mine the two races occupied different status levels in almost every situation. The exceptions to this role were situations closely related to mining activities, such as union meetings and the buses which carry
miners to and from work. In these situations, racial equality again prevailed.

Aber (1959) attempted to measure changes in the attitudes of 62 white students toward blacks as a result of attendance at a predominantly black university. Aber did not measure attitudes before integration but relied instead upon attitude judgments made in retrospect. Her inquiry disclosed that the white students evinced considerable improvement in their attitudes toward blacks. Forty-nine of the 62 respondents stated that their experiences on the black campus had provided them with an improved conception of blacks. No respondent reported that the association increased his prejudice. Thirteen reported that there was no change in their attitudes; however, ten of these had favorable attitudes initially.

Sheatsley (1966) charted the course of white attitudes toward blacks from 1942 to 1965 by analyzing data secured by the National Opinion Research Center. Generally he found that the responses of whites to such issues as residential integration, school integration, the educability of blacks, and the like, showed a continuous decline in prejudiced attitudes. For example, whites were asked: "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?" In 1942, 50 percent of the white Northerners and 20 percent of the white Southerners gave affirmative responses; but, in 1963 the affirmative responses of the Northerners had increased to 80 percent and those of the Southerners to 57 percent.

Sheatsley found that the most dramatic shifts in racial attitudes occurred in the South. The proportion of white Southern parents who
stated that they would not object to having their children attend classes with "a few" blacks rose from 38 percent in 1963 to 62 percent by 1965. Consistently favorable shifts also characterized white opinion in the North. Here, a school with "a few" black children was declared objectionable by 87 percent of white parents in 1963, by 91 percent in 1965; a school where the student body was one-half black was acceptable to 56 percent in 1963, to 65 percent in 1965; and, a school with a majority of black students found no objection among 31 percent in 1963, among 37 percent in 1965. Similar trends were evident in white attitudes in other realms.

Sedlacek and Brooks (1971) conducted a survey to assess the attitudes of white entering freshmen toward blacks at the University of Maryland. The Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) was administered to 470 white freshmen attending summer orientation. The results clearly indicated that white incoming freshmen had generally negative attitudes toward blacks.

According to the Harris Survey (1971), white attitudes about blacks have softened some since the survey began asking them in 1963. A cross section of 1945 whites was asked many of the same questions put to a comparable cross section eight years later. The instructions read, "Now let me ask you some questions about black people. ... Do you personally tend to agree or disagree with these statements?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree 1971</th>
<th>Agree 1973</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blacks ask for more than they are ready for.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks have less ambition.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1971 Percent</td>
<td>1963 Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks laugh a lot.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks smell different.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks have lower morals than whites.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks want to live off the hand-out.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks have less native intelligence.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks are more violent than whites.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks keep untidy homes.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks breed crime.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks care less for the family than whites.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks are inferior to white people.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In every case where there was a trend line, the number of whites who agreed with the derogative statements about blacks has declined since 1963. Nevertheless, substantial minorities of white people still cling to such stereotypes.

**Demographic and social-psychological variables and racial attitudes.**

Why do some people manifest hostilities toward members of another race while others, under similar provocation, do not? Why do people differ in the direction and amount of prejudice which they exhibit? What forces in the lives of people operate to sustain prejudices? These are queries for which social scientists have yet to find definitive answers. Although the development of prejudice against minority groups has been a problem which has been subjected to considerable theoretical analysis and systematic investigations, social psychologists and sociologists are not agreed about the origins of prejudices. Sociologists and anthropologists tend to stress the social environmental influences; whereas, psychologists are more prone to stress determinants within the individual personality. Researchers generally agree, however, that the complexity of racial prejudice requires more than some simple cause and effect relationship explanation. Considering the "fact that attitudes toward the same object vary in terms of their structural properties and the
kinds of needs they may satisfy in the individual... it is evident that prejudice undoubtedly takes many forms rather than a single form; hence not one but several methods will be required to change these attitudes (Proshansky & Seidenberg, 1965, p. 613)."

Allport (1954) takes the position that a comprehensive theory of prejudice cannot be derived by those who exclusively focus on such external factors as cultural and group norms, conflict and competition between groups, intergroup contacts, status mobility, parental influences, and so forth. Neither does a comprehensive explanation of prejudice abound in the exclusive focus on such determinants within the individual as frustration and displaced hostility, projection, cognitive function, personality structure and the like. The best explanation of prejudice emerges through the convergence of these two orientations. In stressing the need for a blended (eclectic) approach Allport asserted: "By far the best view to take toward this multiplicity of approaches is to admit them all. Each has something to teach us (p. 218)." "There are no good reasons for professional rivalry and backbiting among social scientists preferring one approach or the other. They can and should be blended in our outlook (1963, p. 129)."

A substantive review of the scholarly literature pertaining to relevant variables which account for the variance in racial prejudice among individuals and groups discloses that the development of intergroup attitudes are rarely seen before nursery years and that these attitudes seem to take shape in children during their third or fourth years. Horowitz (1936) investigated the emergence of race-consciousness in children by studying how white boys in New York City, urban Tennessee, and urban and rural Georgia interpreted pictures of white and black boys.
She found that preference by whites for other whites increased gradually from kindergarten on, reaching a peak around grade six. This was valid in New York as well as in the South; in mixed and segregated schools, with children having few or no contacts with black children as well as those having numerous contacts. Some prejudice was demonstrated in a few of these subjects before five years of age. Horowitz discovered one marked exception: Those white children having communist parents evidenced no preference for white children as individuals or as groups. This demonstrated that usually children developed prejudice from the prevailing attitudes in their families and neighborhoods, not from negative out-group experiences.

Some two decades later approximately the same attitudes were revealed in young children in two northeastern urban communities (Goodman, 1952; Trager & Yarrow, 1952), in a Texas community (Stevenson & Stewart, 1958), and in a Virginia community (Morland, 1948, 1962). These findings support Horowitz's conclusions that emerging attitudes toward blacks are "now chiefly determined not by contact with Negroes but by contact with the prevalent attitude toward Negroes (p. 35)."

Kenneth and Mamie Clark (1949) investigated the emergence of "racial identification" in black children and found that children as young as three years of age are aware of identification as white or black and have been found to be a little ashamed or defensive about being black.

Goodman (1952) studied 57 black and 46 white nursery school children ranging in age from three and one-half to five and one-half years. All of the children in her investigation lived in or near a black-white area in a northern metropolis. Goodman found from her investigation that there was a relationship between racial awareness and age. High
awareness did not appear before the age of four years and three months while low awareness did not occur in this sample after four years and eleven months. In those subjects, who had developed racial preferences, Goodman found only a minority who showed signs of racial hostility. The finding from the Horowitz, Clark and Clark, and Goodman studies have been confirmed in several replications and modified research projects (Ammons, 1950; Landreth & Johnson, 1953; Morland, 1958; Stevenson, 1960; Stevenson & Stewart, 1958; Vaughan, 1964).

The development of intergroup attitudes after nursery school years is complicated and difficult to describe. However, in general, investigators (Harding, Kutner, Proshansky & Chein, 1969) assume that attitudes become fully developed through a process of "differentiation" in which the child gradually learns specific stereotypes that are applied by adults in his environment to members of a given group and specific kinds of treatment that members of that group are supposed to receive in different situations. Blake and Dennis (1943) supported this view in a study of the development of stereotypes concerning blacks in a group of 324 white children of grades 1 through 11. It was found that the attitudes of all children in all grades were strongly anti-black. While the children in the lower grades believed that blacks had only bad traits, those in the upper grades attributed a few favorable characteristics to blacks together with a great majority of unfavorable ones. There was also more agreement among older children in the stereotypes assigned to blacks, and their stereotypes approximated those of adults in the community.

Greenberg and Hutto (1958) tried to ascertain student attitudes toward school integration in a West Texas town. It was found that seniors
had more negative attitudes toward school integration than college freshmen. Although a vast number of these students did their best to accept blacks into their clubs and as good friends, a definite majority would not bring their black classmates or friends to their home due to fear of parental disapproval.

Garrison and Burch (1933) studied the racial attitudes of 163 Southern college students. They found a noticeable decline in the percentage of prejudiced individuals from the freshmen to the senior level, thus indicating a more liberal attitude toward blacks among the upper-classmen. Gaffrey, Anderson, and Garrison (1969) conducted a similar study in which 60 white students equally divided among men and women and freshmen and seniors were randomly selected from a Southern university roster and given a 10-item-Likert-type Black Attitude Test. The seniors' responses indicated significantly less prejudice scores, followed by freshmen women, senior women and senior men. No differences in attitudes toward blacks were found between students whose parents had attended college and those whose parents had not attended college.

Holtzman (1956) studied the relationship between personal background characteristics and attitudes toward school segregation held by a random sample of undergraduate men at the University of Texas. He found that the region within Texas from which students came was related to their scores on the attitudes scale. The greater the proportion of blacks in a geographical area, the more likely it was that students from that area had an intolerant attitude.

Eddy (1961) investigated attitudes toward integration among Southern male freshmen and seniors in a large northwestern Ivy League
college. The relationship between attitudes and length of time in the North was observed. She concluded from her data: Deep South seniors were more liberal than freshmen toward desegregation and integration of Northern public housing; Border State seniors approved the Supreme Court decisions more widely than freshmen and seniors were less liberal than Northern and Border State students in attitudes toward desegregation of elementary schools and the 1954 Supreme Court decision, and Border State students were less liberal than Northern students in their attitudes toward high school desegregation and integration of Northern colleges and of community social activities in the North and South.

Larson et al. (1964), in a study in 1962, tested students in several introductory sociology classes hypothesizing that Alabama students would manifest a degree of intolerance similar to that of Texas students.

The first instrument, Image of the Negro Scale, containing four items, indicated that 30 percent of the women and 40 percent of the men considered the Negro to be inferior to the white with respect to intelligence, responsibility, morality, and ambition. Twelve percent of the men and 17 percent of the women had a view of some equality of the Negro. This pattern existed regardless of college class. Significant differences were not found when religious preference, social class, and the size of city of residence were used as variables.

The Tolerance of Non-Segregation Scale, contained items relating to the maintenance of segregation. Sixty-one percent of the Alabama sample were in the intolerant group as compared to 57 percent of the students at the University of Texas in the 1952 study. In the Texas
study, positive relationships existed between college class and tolerance of non-segregation. The relationship was not as apparent in the Alabama study, although a slight positive relationship did exist. There were no statistically significant relationships between tolerance of non-segregation and religion, grade point average, social class, or size of the city of residence.

When the scores on the Integration Attitude Scale, which consisted of positive statements toward integration were delineated with respect to sex, college class, social class, grade point average and size of the city of residence, no systematic relationship was indicated. A relationship did exist when religious preference had the highest number in the integration group (Jewish 83 percent, no religious preference 83 percent), while Roman Catholic students had 50 percent in that category. Larson concluded from the above analysis that the Alabama students of 1962 were more reticent toward integration than were the students of 1952.

In attempting to account for patterns of racial hostility Melvin Tumin (1961, p. 28) conducted an intensive review study of empirical work on American anti-Semitism and arrived at the conclusion that "no single sociological characteristic will suffice to give adequate understanding or prediction of where we will encounter the greatest amount and intensity of anti-Semitism. Not education, nor income, nor age, nor region, nor any other sociological factor by itself, is adequate. Nor can valid statements be made about the impact of various combinations of these characteristics, unless we specify the situational context." However, in addition to highlighting the complex and interactive impact of key variables, Tumin's review study disclosed the
following trend hypothesis regarding the effect of education, socioeconomic status, and age on prejudice:

1. Better educated persons are likely to harbor lower levels of prejudice. The rationale for this hypothesis rests on the fact that education strengthens one's personal controls, broadens one's understanding of social reality, stresses rational processes, and is an index to one's socioeconomic position.

2. Higher socioeconomic status is more likely to be associated with less prejudice than is lower status. The rationale for this hypothesis lies in the fact that higher social position may enhance personal security and thus minimize fears of out-groups.

3. Younger persons are likely to be less prejudiced than older persons. The fundamental rationale for this hypothesis is the generation conflict. The older generation is the "culture carrier;" whereas, the younger generation is searching for identity. As young people tend to assert their independence from their elders, they frequently express this assertion through greater tolerance toward racial groups.

There are conflicting studies relative to the relationship between prejudice and the amount of formal education. Studies by Allport (1954), Rose (1948), and Williams (1964) show a negative correlation between prejudice and amount of formal education. However, Bettelheim and Janowitz (1964) contend that:

... on the basis of some 25 national sample survey since 1945, the positive effect seems to be real, not spurious. 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 (p. 18).

Stember (1961) insists that most studies tend to understate the prevalence of prejudice among the educated. As a consequence of re-analyzing the data of a number of studies of prejudice, Stember concluded that the better educated are less likely to: (a) hold traditional stereotypes about blacks, (b) favor discriminatory policies,
and (c) reject casual contacts with minorities. However, the better educated are more likely to: (a) hold highly charged stereotypes, (b) favor informal discrimination in selected areas of behavior, and (c) reject intimate associations with minorities. Thus, Stember contends that the impact of education is limited; "its chief effect is to reduce traditional provincialism—to counteract the notion that members of minorities are strange creatures . . . and to diminish fear of casual personal contact. But the limits of acceptance are sharply drawn; while legal equality is supported, full social participation is not (p. 171)."

Pettigrew (1959) studied regional differences in anti-black prejudice and provided clear evidence that Southern whites were more anti-black than Northern whites and that this difference was due to social norms. Further, he disclosed the following interesting relationships regarding prejudice:

1. Southerners who attended church were more anti-black than non-attenders.

2. Southerners who were political independents were considerably more tolerant of blacks than Democrats or Republicans.

3. Southerners who lived in communities where blacks constitute less than 30 percent of the population harbor attitudes toward blacks that are more positive and flexible. Furthermore, manifested less racial discrimination than Southerners in high ratio Negro communities.

4. Southern females were more prejudiced than Southern males.

5. Southerners who held nonmanual employment whose fathers had held manual employment tended to be slightly more anti-black than other nonmanual Southerners.

In providing a general explanation for these findings Pettigrew
stated:

The anti-Negro norms of the South are reflected on the personality level in social conformity. The maintenance of negative attitudes toward Negroes becomes a mechanism of social adjustment for the white Southerner. And, as the data indicate, conformity is associated with intolerance, deviance with tolerance.

In specifically accounting for the correlation between religion and prejudice Pettigrew adopted Allport's (1954) and Adorno's (1950) position that prejudice tends to be associated with those adhering to the social (extrinsic) forms of religion, but not with those who take their religion seriously in a more internalized sense. For the irregular attender, religion is probably something which confers status, provides sociability, pleasant excitement at Christmas, and the like; whereas, for the frequent attender religion is to be manifested in his every day behavior.

Struening (1963) investigated the relationship between prejudiced attitudes of university professors and frequency of church attendance and found that professors who did not attend church were less prejudiced than professors who attended church less than 11 times per month.

Pettigrew accounted for the sex difference in prejudice by proposing the women are that "carriers of culture;" hence, they are more conforming to the Southern mores of anti-black hostility.

Bettelheim and Janowitz (1964) analyzed data from the Detroit Area Study of 1957 to study the relationship between socioeconomic status and levels of prejudice and found the following pattern:

| Professional and managerial group (upper-middle stratum) | Lowest in strong intolerance |
| Clerical, sales, and kindred (lower-middle stratum) | More tolerant than lower-working stratum only |
Craftsmen and foremen
(upper working class stratum) More tolerant than
lower-middle and lower working stratum

Operatives, service, etc.
(lower working class stratum) Most intolerant

It is significant to note that the above pattern of racial prejudice, wherein the upper strata of the middle and working classes are more tolerant than the lower strata of the same classes, runs parallel to the syndrome of authoritarianism in representative national samples. (Janowitz & Marvick, 1953)

As the earliest national survey of white attitudes toward blacks was conducted by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC), it seems appropriate to highlight the value that public opinion research holds regarding helping social scientists to clarify the phenomenon of racial prejudice.

Sheatsley (1966) analyzed the NORC surveys of December 1963 and June 1965 to determine the locus of pro- and anti-civil rights attitudes among American whites. He reported, among others, these significant findings:

1. The greatest differences among whites were regional. For example, the average Northerner endorsed integrated schools and would hardly object having a black guest for dinner; whereas, the average Southerner accepted equal job opportunities and integrated transportation, but objected to integrated schools.

2. Regarding age differences, starting with the most intolerant going to the least intolerant, the groups were distributed as follows: (a) 65 or older; (b) 45-64; (c) 21-24; (d) 25-44).

3. The respondents who manifested the most acceptance of racial integration were the respondents who had the highest socioeconomic status—socioeconomic status being derived by combining the occupational, educational and family income status into a single measure.
4. Southern whites whose children had attended school with blacks held significantly greater pro-integrationist attitudes than those whose children had never attended school with blacks—implying that exposure to integration facilitates pro-integrationist attitudes.

In 1948, Bierstedt, upon completing a survey of evaluative reports regarding the effectiveness of various types of formal programs to improve intergroup relations, reported in despair;

The findings are bewilderingly diverse. Sometimes there is reported a diminution of prejudice, or at least of adverse opinion; sometimes there is no diminution. Sometimes the conclusion is that prejudice is diminished in this respect but not in that; sometimes the relation is reversed. Sometimes one category of students is reported to be more responsive; sometimes another category (App. 5).

MacIver (1948, p. 22) concluded in his survey of strategies useful for combating prejudice, "All we can claim for instruction of a purely factual kind is that it tends to mitigate some of the more extreme expressions of prejudice."

Lindsey and Aronson (1969) concluded after their investigation into the literature to discern the effects of anti-prejudice education that:

1. Long range attempts at determining the effects of intergroup attitudes lacked control groups and have yielded quite inconsistent results.

2. Research regarding the impact of specific school courses has often employed control groups and has yielded results that are a little more consistent than the long range studies. Nonetheless, the diverse methods of the investigators makes it difficult to ascertain the crucial factors inducing the variation in findings.

The prevailing situation regarding the effectiveness of formal educational programs in reducing prejudice is one of conflict. Some
evidence indicates that attitudes and prejudices are changed, and that there is a positive correlation between knowledge and tolerance; but, the results of other studies do not bear this out.

Cross-racial contact and racial attitudes. With reference to intergroup contact, it has been pointed out that direct observation of ethnic group members over a period of time plays some role in the formation of stereotypes concerning them. This is the "kernel of truth" hypothesis (Klineberg, 1950) which has been substituted for the "well-earned reputation" theory (Zawadski, 1948). The latter theory holds that prejudice is not an unjustified unreasonable opinion, but it is based on a reliable source of knowledge. The "kernel of truth" hypothesis is the notion that a stereotype must have some basis in reality. It seems as if there is a relationship between attitudes and the number of minority persons in a region. The results of a Fortune Survey conducted by Horowitz (1944) showed that there was a definite correlation between the number of minority members in a geographical region and the frequency with which the group was described as a "problem" by residents of that region. Blacks were most frequently cited in the South and the East; Jews in the Northeast and Middle West, Mexicans in the West, and Japanese in the Pacific Coast.

With reference to integroup contact and attitude change, studies have shown that contact between ethnic groups may lead to an increase or decrease in intergroup prejudice. Attaining more favorable ethnic attitudes depends on conditions of interaction in which the members of different groups are cooperatively engaged in the pursuit of common objectives under equal-term conditions or as functional equals (Harding,
Proshansky & Chein, 1969). Sherif (1958) found that conflict between two groups of boys who were attending a summer camp was reduced when they were confronted with a common problem which could only be solved by co-operative action on the part of members of both groups.

With reference to contact in a school setting, Dorothy Singer (1964) compared the racial attitudes of white children in two fifth-grade classes in a neighboring suburb of New York City. One class attended an integrated school that had ended segregation 13 years earlier and the other class attended an all-white school. Children in the integrated school showed significantly more positive and fewer negative stereotypes about blacks than those in the all-white school. Also, those in the integrated school indicated a greater desire for personal contact with blacks.

Webster's (1961) study of attitude changes among both white and black students in an integrated junior high school in California found that white students accepted blacks less following integration, and that black attitudes moved toward the extremes but with more changing in the favorable than in the unfavorable direction.

Campbell (1958) gave an attitude questionnaire toward blacks to 746 white high school students just before and after school integration, and found that a change toward more favorable attitudes toward blacks was a function of classroom contact and friendship with blacks. He also noted that the direction of attitude change (less prejudiced or more prejudiced) was related to how his subjects perceived the racial attitudes of their parents and friends.

With respect to educational settings outside the school, studies
have usually involved non-competitive contact situations and have typically shown favorable attitude change. Smith (1943) found a substantial increase in favorable attitude toward blacks among Columbia Teachers College students who spent two weekends on guided tours of Harlem. The tours included a number of social gatherings arranged so as to be enjoyable for the students and to emphasize the high cultural levels of their black hosts. All of the activities of the two weekends were conducted by prominent black men and women and included contacts with black clergymen, business and professional people, novelists, the editor of a black magazine, and a concert artist. The favorable attitude change of this group remained at least over an 11-month period. An attempt was made to discover some of the factors related to gain in favorable attitude, but no statistically significant relationships were found. Young (1932) arranged a similar program of contacts with blacks, together with a course in American race relations, for 16 graduate students in sociology. Course and contacts together produced a small and statistically unreliable average increase in favorable attitudes toward blacks.

Studies of the effects of interracial contact in recreational settings have not produced consistent evidence of a reduction in prejudice. Mussen (1950) and Hogrefe, Evans and Chein (1947) report no change in the overall direction of attitude towards blacks among white boys in an interracial group and an interracial play center respectively. However, Yarrow and a team of associates (1958) did find that during a two-week study at a summer camp of 8 to 13 year-old white and black boys and girls that the social distance between the two groups was reduced
under integrated conditions, but there was no radical shift in the longstanding interracial orientations.

The most dramatic changes in attitude as a result of intergroup contact have been observed in situations in which two different groups both lived and worked together in circumstances requiring a high degree of mutual cooperation. During World War II the general policy of the U. S. Army was to keep black troops out of combat assignments; however, in the spring of 1945 black riflemen were assigned to some of the infantry companies operating in Europe. A survey several months later showed that 64 percent of the white enlisted men in companies to which blacks had been assigned thought that this was a good policy for the Army to follow. In contrast, only 18 percent of the enlisted men in divisions that contained no black troops thought that black troops would be a good idea.

Studies of residential contact between different ethnic groups have shown favorable changes in attitude. A study by Deutsch and Collins (1951) supported these findings. They found that 53 percent of the white housewives in two integrated public housing projects favored a policy of interracial integration for city housing projects in general, while only 5 percent of the white housewives in two segregated projects favored such a policy.

A study by Wilner, Walkley and Cook (1952) reported similar findings to those of Deutsch and Collins. They compared white housewives living near black families and those living far from black families in four different cities. The differences between "near" and "far" respondents were the same as those found by Deutsch and Collins for respondents living in integrated and segregated projects. The "near" respondents were
likely to have more positive attitudes toward blacks and to have more contacts with them than the "far" respondents.

There are differences, however, of whites who live in "lily white" neighborhoods and were subsequently "invaded" by blacks. In such situations, whites perceived the presence of blacks as a threat to their social status which resulted in a more unfavorable attitude toward them.

Studies of the effects of intergroup contact in work situations show conflicting results. The fact is that mere physical proximity or contact will not guarantee a reduction in prejudice. The effect of contact depends upon the type of contact and upon the kind of persons involved. Harding and Hogrefe (1952) found that in a study of the attitudes of white department store employees toward black coworker employees who had worked on an equal status basis were more willing to continue such a relationship in the future than were those who had never worked with blacks. Minard (1952) investigated the attitudes of white coal miners in West Virginia and found that the majority of the miners were quite friendly toward blacks in the mine, but (except for union meetings) in the community outside the mine were not willing to associate with them.

The extensive literature on the effects of contact on the reduction of prejudice generally indicate that in black/white contacts, the less prejudiced individuals are most likely to develop close associations and friendships that contribute to further reduction of prejudice. According to Vander Zanders (1972, p. 468-469) the conditions of contact which provide for decreased racial prejudice among black/white groups and individuals seem to be the following:
1. The contact takes place between status equals (Deutsch & Collins, 1951, p. 128).

2. The behavior of the objects of prejudice is at variance or does not conform with the beliefs of the prejudiced individual, e.g., the blacks with whom the prejudiced has contact are not "lazy," "ignorant," "delinquent," etc. (Deutsch & Collins, 1951, p. 128).

3. The contact is of sufficient duration and intimacy to sufficiently challenge the stereotypes of the prejudiced individual (Brown & Albee, 1966).

4. The prevailing social norms dictate that prejudiced attitudes and behavior are inappropriate (Brown & Albee, 1966).

5. The members of the differing racial groups within the contact situation have a common interest, goal, or task that is the focus of the interaction (Brophy, 1949).

6. The individuals involved are personally secure and have low aggressive needs (Williams, Jr., 1964).

7. Positive support for change is forthcoming from reference groups outside the specific contact situation (Williams, Jr., 1964).

**Summary of the related literature.** A review of representative research regarding the status and determinants of the racial attitudes held by black and white Americans has been presented. The following tentative conclusions appear to emerge:

1. Since World War II, there has been a positive collective movement in white attitudes away from the traditional belief in black inferiority–white superiority and the associated patterns of segregation and discrimination and toward a more egalitarian view of the races and their appropriate relations. However, despite the positive character of this movement, a substantial minority of white Americans are highly resistant to change in the old pattern of race relations and are bitterly anti-black.

2. When considered in the aggregate, blacks are less favorably disposed toward whites than they have been historically. There is increasing impatience among
blacks, particularly younger blacks, with the rate and achievements of the movement for racial equality. Nonetheless their general orientation appears to be toward integration and racial harmony.

3. In attempting to account for patterns of racial hostility researchers have investigated many factors. A large number of independent studies have tended to yield contradictory results. It seems safest at the present time to say that while claims may be valid for single studies, they do not form an adequate foundation for generalizations. The generalizations that appear to be most widely supported by evidence are:

a. Individuals who are very authoritarian are likely to be more prejudiced than individuals characterized by low levels of authoritarianism.

b. Whites living in both the North and South develop similar negative attitudes toward blacks. Further, whites who have had no contacts with blacks harbor hostilities toward blacks similar to whites who have associated with blacks. Hence, it is more probable that attitudes toward blacks are determined by contact with the prevalent attitude toward blacks rather than by personal affiliation with blacks.

c. Cultural influences (institutional norms) are generally greater determiners of the quality of interracial attitudes and behaviors than personality influences, such as insecurity, anxiety, authoritarianism, and the like.

d. Attitudes toward blacks are less favorable in the Southern regions of the United States than in non-Southern regions.

e. Younger persons are likely to be less prejudiced than older persons.

f. Generally the correlation between prejudice and the amount of formal education is negative. Hence, highly educated persons are likely to be more tolerant than persons who have attained low levels of education.

g. Higher socioeconomic status is likely to be associated with less prejudice than is lower socioeconomic status.

h. Prejudice may be reduced through voluntary, equal-status, non-competitive contact between majority
and minority groups who are in the pursuit of a superordinate or mutual goal, under conditions sanctioned by the social climate.

It should be remembered that while each of the above key factors permits a general trend hypothesis about its effect on prejudiced attitudes, prejudiced attitudes are multicausally determined; no single factor in isolation will suffice to give adequate understanding or prediction of where the greatest amount and intensity of racial hostility will be encountered. The impact of the factors above is likely to be complex and interactive. A valid statement about social or psychological characteristics with regard to the phenomenon of prejudice requires the specification of the situational context.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Statement of the null hypotheses. Although a flood of research has been conducted to determine the quality of and causal factors which account for black/white relations in many different settings, racial attitudes of black and white professors in higher education have been investigated infrequently. Furthermore, an intensive review of the relevant literature will disclose no empirical studies regarding the status and determinants of racial attitudes of professors working in "inverse integration" university settings.

In spite of the vast amount of research that has been generated regarding the "hows" and "whys" of intergroup attitudes, definitive explanations are yet to be found. Research findings frequently conflict and there is a notable diversity of views among the authorities regarding the major determinants of racial attitudes. For example: Stein, Hardyck, and Smith (1965); Rokeach (1968); and Byrne and Wong (1962) emphasize belief congruence. Deutsch and Collins (1951) and Star, Williams, and Stouffer (1949) stress intergroup contact. Pettigrew (1959); Hyman and Sheatsley (1956); and Myrdal (1944) stress the effects of cultural norms. Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford (1950) emphasize personality. Campbell (1963) and Kiesler, Collins, and Miller (1969) have highlighted the complexity of the
issue by pointing out that different situations have different "thresholds" for action. Many cultural and personality factors may operate to influence a person's behavior, in addition to attitudes in a particular situation. Clearly, the issue remains unresolved. As the range of investigator differences is wide and as the number of broad assumptions on which the authorities are agreed is very small, an empirical investigation to evaluate racial attitudes among the professionals in the Atlanta University setting was the approach applied for discerning answers regarding racial attitudes in this unique situation.

Therefore, as answers to the central questions posed in chapter one of this study could be obtained through subjecting the raw data to analysis of variance procedures, it was essential that the questions under consideration be restated as null hypotheses.

Specifically the manifold purpose of the investigation was to test the following null hypotheses:

1. There is no statistically significant difference in the racially prejudiced attitudes that the black faculty members hold toward the white faculty members, as measured by the group scores on the Anti-White Scale, and the white faculty members hold toward the black faculty members, as measured by the group scores on the Anti-Black Scale.

2. There are no statistically significant differences between the prejudice scores of the black and white faculty members, as measured by the Anti-White Scale and the Anti-Black Scale respectively, when these scores are stratified by the following independent variables:

   a) Sex
      (1) Male
      (2) Female

   b) Age
      (1) Under 35
      (2) 35-44
      (3) 45-54
      (4) Over 54
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Geographic region reared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) South Atlantic Region = SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) East South Central Region = ESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) West South Central Region = WSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) New England Region, NE = NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Middle Atlantic Region = MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) East North Central Region = ENC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) West North Central Region = WNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Mountain Region = M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Pacific Region = P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collapsed Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) South = SA, ESC, WSC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Geographic region secured bachelor's degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) South Atlantic Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) East South Central Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) West South Central Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) New England Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Middle Atlantic Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) East North Central Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) West North Central Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Mountain Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Pacific Region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (1) South = SA, ESC, WSC |
| (2) Non-South = NE, MA, ENC, WNC, M, P |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e) Geographic region secured highest professional degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) South Atlantic Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) East South Central Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) West South Central Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) New England Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Middle Atlantic Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) East North Central Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) West North Central Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Mountain Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Pacific Region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (1) South = SA |
| (2) Non-South = NE, MA, ENC, WNC, M, P |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f) Racial composition of undergraduate school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) All of own race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Predominantly of own race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Predominantly of other race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) All of other race except me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (1) All of own race |
| (2) Predominantly of own race |
| (3) Predominantly of other race |
| (4) All of other race except me |
g) Racial composition of graduate school
   (1) All of own race
   (2) Predominantly of own race
   (3) Predominantly of other race
   (4) All of other race except me

h) Years employed at Atlanta University
   (1) Under 2
   (2) 2-4
   (3) 5-7
   (4) Over 7

i) Formal race/ethnic relations education
   (1) Taken two or more courses and attended one or more workshops
   (2) Taken two or more courses
   (3) Taken one course and attended one or more workshops
   (4) Taken one course
   (5) Attended one or more workshops
   (6) Not taken course but plan to
   (7) Not taken course and do not plan to

j) Highest degree earned
   (1) Master's
   (2) Specialist's
   (3) Doctor's

k) Father's or guardian's occupation
   (1) Professional
   (2) Semiprofessional, managerial
   (3) Clerical, skilled trades, retail business
   (4) Farmers
   (5) Semiskilled occupations, minor clerical
   (6) Slightly skilled trades, occupations requiring little training or ability
   (7) Day laborers
1) Religious service attendance per month
   (1) Under 1  
   (2) 1-3  
   (3) Over 3  

m) Political party orientation
   (1) Democrat  
   (2) Independent  
   (3) Republican, apolitical, other  

n) Pre-Atlanta University cross-racial contact
   (1) High  
   (2) Limited  

o) Atlanta University cross-racial contact
   (1) High  
   (2) Limited  

3. There are no statistically significant differences in the cross-racial contacts, as measured by the Cross-Racial Contact Scales, experienced by the black faculty members and the white faculty members before securing employment at Atlanta University and the cross-racial contacts experienced by the black faculty members and the white faculty members after securing employment at Atlanta University.

Population and sampling. The population for the study consisted of all the full-time black and white American citizens incorporated among the 150 professionals listed as the University faculty in the 1973-1974 Atlanta University General Catalog, Series III, April 1974, No. 164, pp. 17-28. As the racial and citizenship statuses of each faculty member would be disclosed only through his responses to the personal data items on the Social Attitude Questionnaire, and, as the population was relatively small, the entire Atlanta University faculty population served as the target group for the investigation. However, because of the incompleteness of significant parts of the questionnaire by some subjects; the lack of participation, due to declinations and mailing inaccessibleesses, by others; and, the lack of meeting the participator-criteria of American
citizenship and black or white racial membership, the final usable study group consisted of 110 subjects. Because four respondents indicated that they were not American citizens and/or that they were not of black nor white racial description, the maximum population for the research was discerned as 146 faculty members. Hence, the 110 usable questionnaires represented 74.3 percent of the parent population—a respectable return rate estimate because the mailing list included faculty members who were on leave of absence or had left the university, as well as those not meeting the citizenship/race criteria.

Collection of data. On September 8, 1974, a questionnaire entitled "Social Attitude Questionnaire" (see Appendix A) was mailed to each of the 150 professionals who qualified, by the standard outlined above, as a member of the 1973–1974 Atlanta University faculty. To maximize the response rate, the instrument was coded, the anonymity of the respondent was assured, the questionnaire was kept to a reasonable length, and a postage-paid return envelope addressed to the investigator was provided. Further, a transmittal letter, comprising the face of the instrument, stated the purpose and value of the research and offered to potential respondent a summary of the findings. Eighty-eight responses were received from the initial mailing. Followup mailings of October 14, 1974 and November 6, 1974 were executed and these yielded 27 and 12 replies respectively. Consequently, the total number of responses received was 127. Of these, 4 did not meet the citizenship/race standards as outlined above; 3 declined to participate but gave no reason for refusal; 6 stated opposition to the nature of the questionnaire items as justification for refusing; 2 had substan-
tial omissions; and 2 were received after the statistical data for the study were being incorporated into the final dissertation document, hence, they were excluded. Thus, the final sample for statistical analysis numbered 110 respondents which was composed of 80 black and 30 white faculty members. However, in some of the statistical analyses the N was less than 110, as, in some comparisons all of the data were not available for each faculty member.

Instrument. The completed Social Attitude Questionnaire was a 68-item composite with a transmittal letter embracing its face (Appendix A). The items which comprised the survey instrument proper were trichotomized into content areas advanced below:

Part one: Socio-psychological-demographic data

Part two: The Anti-Black Scale (A-B), the Anti-White Scale (A-W), which together constitute the Social Attitude Scale.

Part three: The Cross-Racial Contact Scale

Part one included 16 factual items designed to elicit ideographic information for screening, characterizing, and stratifying the obtained sample. The questions pertained to citizenship, sex, race, age, region reared, region attended undergraduate school, region attended graduate school, racial composition of undergraduate school, racial composition of graduate school, length of employment at Atlanta University, formal race relations training, level of education, father's or guardian's occupation, religious service attendance per month, and political party preference.

Part two, the Social Attitude Scale (SAS) embraced 34 attitudinal propositions categorized under two scales: the Anti-Black Scale (A-B)
and the Anti-White Scale (A-W), having 16 and 18 items respectively. Table 1 presents the items comprising each subscale with direction of scoring in parentheses. All but one of the racial attitude items were stated in the same direction and may correlate highly because of response set. However, even if this tendency was present in these scales, it would not influence the comparison across this investigation because the response set would be present equally across research conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Attitude:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Black (A-B)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1(-), 2(-), 3(-), 4(-), 5(-), 6(-), 7(-), 8(-), 9(-), 10(-), 11(-), 12(-), 13(-), 14(-), 15(-), 16(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-White (A-W)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17(-), 18(-), 19(-), 20(-), 21(-), 22(-), 23(-), 24(-), 25(-), 26(-), 27(-), 28(-), 29(-), 30(-), 31(-), 32(-), 33(+), 34(-), 35(-), 36(-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(-) indicates a negative statement
(+ ) indicates a positive statement

Both subscales were developed by George A. Steckler, (1954), Ph.D., clinical psychologist. The Anti-Black Scale is formally known as the Anti-Negro Scale; however, at the permission of its designer, the investigator changed "Negro" to "black," as currently this is the more acceptable term in society.

The Anti-Black and Anti-White Scales are Likert-type scales which measure the degree to which the subject accepts anti-black and anti-
white prejudice, respectively. Both scales comprise statements expressing negative stereotypes of the two racial groups. The subject indicates the degree to which he endorses each statement on a Likert-type continuum ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The sum of the weighted alternatives endorsed by the subject represents his score. High scores are reflective of racial prejudice.

Steckler developed and used concurrently the Anti-Black and Anti-White Scales with 449 Northern and Southern Black College and University students to measure the attitudes of blacks in his investigation of authoritarianism among blacks. Atlanta University participated in Steckler's study by providing 39 of the subjects. For his Anti-White Scale, he reported a split-half reliability coefficient of .88 and evidence of construct validity from correlations of .60 and .55 between his scale and the California E and F scales, respectively. The California E Scale, Ethnocentrism Scale, developed by Levinson (1949) and having a reliability of .85 - .90, is a 20-item scale containing three subscales which measure attitudes toward Jews, blacks and other minorities. The F Scale, Fascism Scale, measures anti-democratic attitudes. Both scales are often used as criteria in validating new attitudinal instruments, where appropriate. The following authors, among others, have used the F Scale in validating their studies: Quinn and Lichtenstein (1962), Michigan Total Personality Inventory; Myers and Briggs (1962), Myers-Briggs Type Indicator; and Schuman and Harding (1968), Rationality Questionnaire. The correlation of the Anti-White Scale with the Anti-Black Scale is .24. For the Anti-Black Scale, Steckler reported a split-half reliability of .84 and evidence of con-
struct validity from correlations of .40 and .57 with the California E and F Scales, respectively.

Shaw and Wright (1967) conclude that although each of Steckler's scales is valuable when considered separately, "its value is enhanced still further by the fact that the author provided a counterpart. The two scales together should produce valuable research regarding eneral-ity of hostility in attitudes, strength of attitude and group membership, and so forth (p. 368)." Furthermore, Shaw and Wright conclude that a high degree of content validity characterizes both scales.

Banks (1968) used Steckler's scales as primary instruments in his study, "The Changing Attitudes of Black Students," and reports high odd-even reliability coefficients of .88 and .90 for the Anti-Black and Anti-White Scales, respectively.

All in all, it would appear that the prior reputation and accept-ance of the standardized Anti-Black and Anti-White Scales makes it plausible for one to assume that they might have sufficient reliability to be used in the present study. However, since the reliability of an instrument is a function of both the instrument and the sample of sub-jects to whom the instrument is administered, a measure of each scale's reliability, Cronbach's alpha, was computed. Table 4 shows that both scales yielded high reliability coefficients: Anti-Black Scale, .897; Anti-White Scale, .941, supplying corroborating evidence that the data are relatively free from chance errors of measurement and insuring that the scales are characterized by more than minimal internal consistency.

Part three of the questionnaire was comprised of two 9-item cross-racial contact scales developed by the investigator specifically to
ascertain the respondent's actual approach-avoidance actions toward members of the other race before and after attaining employment at Atlanta University. The Pre-Atlanta University Cross-Racial Contact Scale (hereafter referred to as P-UCCS) gauged interracial contact in various domains of the subject's life prior to working at the University; whereas, the Atlanta University Cross-Racial Contact Scale (hereafter referred to as UCCS) provided a measure of change in perceived biracial actions pertaining to the identical domains which P-UCCS surveyed. The two contact scales together permitted meaningful interpretation of contact data in that the P-UCCS data served as the baseline or norm against which the UCCS findings could be evaluated. These scales required the subject to report the extent of his contacts with members of the other race in diverse socially mixed situations. The subject completed each of the 18 contact statements by selecting from among five alternatives ranging from "all of the other race except me," reflecting a high degree of contact and yielding a score of 1, to "all of my own race," reflecting a low degree of biracial contact and yielding a score of 5. A pre-Atlanta University contact quotient was derived for each faculty member by dividing the sum of his nine precontact ratings by nine. Likewise, the Atlanta University Contact quotient was calculated. The contact quotient for each of the cross-racial scales was dichotomized into high and low groups. During the designing phase of the investigation, it was established that subjects securing quotients less than 3 would be placed in the "high" contact category; those securing quotients greater than 3, in the low category; and those securing quotients of 3, the median, would be assigned to the category within which the levels of
their greatest item score frequencies fell. However, because the number of cases which fell below the median was insufficient for deriving reliable percentages and other statistical measures, the original high-low subject-assignment criterion was modified. The cut was made conceptually by assigning respondents with contact quotients of 3.78 or less to the high cross-racial contact group and those with quotients exceeding 3.78 to the low group. The degree of contact was substantiated further by the subject's self evaluation of his contact with the other race by checking either "high degree of contact" or "limited degree of contact."

**Scoring.** All 34 propositions of the SAS: A-B, 16 items; A-W, 18 items, were arranged on a six-point Likert-type continuum of ratings which ranged from -3 for favorably-oriented statements to +3 for unfavorably-oriented statements: -3, "I disagree very much;" -2, "I disagree pretty much;" -1, "I disagree a little;" +1, "I agree a little," +2, "I agree pretty much;" +3, "I agree very much." The subjects rated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each of the propositions.

The subjects' ratings of the statements were assigned scores from 1 to 7, with 4.0 considered as the theoretical neutral point on the 7-point Likert-continuum. Since higher scores were intended to express correspondingly high degrees of anti-black/anti-white prejudice, those item responses which expressed these attitudes were scored as follows:

+3 = 7 points  
+2 = 6 points  
+1 = 5 points

-1 = 3 points  
-2 = 2 points  
-3 = 1 point

Notably the original Steckler rating scale used a -3 to +3 with no zero. This covers numerically and mathematically a 7-point range. The
1 to 7 was a constructed response change from the -3 to the +3 so that all scores would be positive. The zero point, or the midpoint, of the scale is 4; and, as Steckler did not use a possible response of midpoint on his scale, there is no 4 included for the 1 to 7 distribution.

The one item phrased in a direction opposite to the trend of the scale (item 33, prowhite phrased) was scored in a reverse manner: a +3 response received a score of 1 whereas a -3 response was scored 7. An individual's raw score was the sum of the weighted alternatives endorsed by him divided by the number of items constituting his appropriate subscale.

As the central task of conducting the study was to determine whether black and white faculty members differed in the racially prejudiced attitudes that they held toward the opposite race, only the black subjects' answers to the 18-item Anti-White Scale (imbedded in the SAS as items 17-34) were used to calculate their raw attitude scores. Likewise, only the white respondents' answers to the Anti-Black Scale (imbedded in the SAS as items 1-16) were used to calculate their raw attitude scores. To render the black and white faculty members' raw attitude scores comparable, appropriate standardization procedures were applied to transform the raw scores into T-scores. Since the T-score always has a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10, each of the subject's T-scores was directly interpretable. The performance of the blacks on the A-W subscale and the whites on the A-B subscale thus became directly comparable.

With reference to the subject's contact with the other race, the investigator assigned the number "1" to the subjects with a high degree of contact prior to and/or since commencing work at Atlanta University,
and, the number "5" to those subjects who had a limited degree of contact prior to and/or after beginning work at the University according to the scoring procedure described earlier in this chapter.

**Treatment of data.** Coded responses to the Social Attitude Questionnaire were recorded on master data sheets. In the Miami-Dade Community College Computation Center, Miami, Florida, these coded data were converted to a final deck of IBM cards and processed in the electronic computer to obtain relevant descriptive and inferential measures.

Essentially, the computer two-tailed univariate analysis of variance program, MANOVA, was applied to test for significance of differences among means of each of the three major hypotheses. For all tests, the criterion of statistical significance was the .05 level.

The reliability, Coefficient Alpha, was determined for the A-B, the A-W, and the two cross-racial contact scales, P-UCCS and UCCS, by the computer program TD. As TD is a relatively new computer program, at this point it seems appropriate to note that TD: A PL/1 Program for test Descriptions was authored by Tien-teh Lin, Ph. D., Educational Research, Miami-Dade Community College, Miami, Florida. The program has been used for processing the author's and a number of other dissertation studies at the University of California at Los Angeles. In 1972 TD was accommodated to the computer installation at Miami-Dade Community College, IBM 360/50, and has since facilitated data processing for numerous researchers.

Faculty members were divided into two groups according to race, and, frequencies and percentages were derived to ascertain each racial group's responses to each questionnaire item of pertinence to the group. The
A-B and A-W attitude scores and their corresponding T-scores were generated for the white and black subjects, respectively. Cross-racial contact quotients (means) were derived for all respondents.

While stratified according to race, the black and white group's mean responses to the subscales, A-W and A-B respectively, were assessed for significant differences among means by the computer analysis of variance program, MANOVA.

Further, responses of the subjects were stratified according to these independent variables: sex, age, geographic region reared, geographic region secured undergraduate degree, geographic region secured highest degree, racial composition of undergraduate school, racial composition of graduate school attained highest degree, years of employment at Atlanta University, formal race relations education, highest degree attained, father's or guardian's occupation, frequency of religious service attendance per month, political party orientation, cross-racial contact before University employment, and cross-racial contact after University employment. Each group's mean responses to the germane items of the Social Attitude Questionnaire were assessed for significant differences among the means by the computer analysis of variance program, MANOVA. Means and standard deviation were computed for all stratification variables.

Regarding the third major hypothesis, to determine whether each racial group's interracial contacts prior to joining the University differed significantly from those biracial contacts experienced after attaining work at the University, each group's means on the Pre-Atlanta University Cross-Racial Contact Scale and the Atlanta University Cross-Racial Contact Scale were subjected to one-way analysis of variance procedures.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS

Introductory statement. This chapter presents the findings and interpretations of the data collected in the same order as the problem areas and hypotheses are posed in Chapter I. The first part of the chapter briefly discusses the characteristics of the study group and the reliability of the instrument.

The obtained sample. There were 110 faculty members in the study group. This number represented all the faculty members from whom usable questionnaires were obtained. However, in some of the statistical analyses the N is less than 110; as, all of the relevant data were not available for each faculty member. The subject characteristics presented in Tables 2 and 3 describe the study group. Table 2 portrays the number and percentage of blacks and whites in the study group, disclosing that 80 blacks constitute 72.7 percent of the sample and 30 whites constitute 27.3 percent. There are 2.67 blacks for every white in the sample.

Table 3 reveals that females constitute 47.3 percent of the sample and males 52.7 percent, this representing 52 females and 58 males respectively. Black males comprise 65.5 percent of the total male sample and white males 34.5 percent. Regarding the female group, most notable is the underrepresentation of the white female, 19.2 percent whites versus
80.2 percent blacks. When sex comparisons within the black group are made, the findings disclose that black females constitute 52.5 percent of the group whereas black males constitute only 47.5 percent.

The findings in Table 3 where age is cross-tabulated by race, indicate that 26.4 percent of the study group were under thirty-five, 25.5 percent were between thirty-five and forty-four, 24.5 percent were between forty-five and fifty-four, and 23.6 percent were over fifty-four. A further analysis shows that blacks compose 79.3 percent of the subjects under thirty-five, 67.9 percent of those between thirty-five and forty-four, 66.7 percent of the forty-five to fifty-four age group, and 76.9 percent of the subjects who were over fifty-four.

Table 3 reflects data regarding the actual nine regions (specified by the U. S. Bureau of the Census) presented in the original questionnaire, along with the subsequent two categories into which these were collapsed for the data analysis. It is notable that 63.6 percent of the study group grew up in the South, wherein 37.4 percent of the subjects were reared in five of the non-South regions. None of the subjects grew up in the Mountain Region. A further analysis discloses
that 70.0 percent of all the blacks were reared in the South, compared with the 46.7 percent whites who spent their formative years in the South. As 52 percent of all America's blacks reside in the South, and as 18 percent of the white population of the United States is southern, clearly, the South contributes more than its proportionate share of white and black faculty members at Atlanta University.

Regarding undergraduate training, 61.9 percent of the study group secured their bachelor's degree from a southern institution, of which 85.3 percent were black and 14.71 percent white. Most whites (66.7 percent) earned their four-year degrees from regions outside of the South.

Table 3 also shows a substantial change in the geographic region of education for both black and white groups. Whereas only 38.1 percent of the study group received their undergraduate education in a non-South region, 56.4 percent attained their highest academic degrees in institutions situated out of the South. The resultant of this exodus for the black group and the white group was substantially different; 63.8 percent of the blacks secured their highest professional degrees from non-South institutions; whereas, 63.3 percent whites attained theirs in the South.

Inspection of the undergraduate section of Table 3 reveals that 41.8 percent of the study group secured their undergraduate training on totally segregated campuses, 38.2 percent on campuses populated predominantly by students of their own race, and 20 percent on campuses populated primarily by students of a race other than their own. Subgroup data show that 43.8 percent of the blacks attended all black schools, whereas 36.7 percent of the whites attended all white insti-
tutions. Further, 28.7 percent of the blacks attended "racially imbalanced" schools which afforded only limited opportunity for cross-racial associations as compared with 63 percent of the whites. Although 27.5 percent of the blacks attained their college training in predominantly white schools which afforded maximum exposure to the opposite race, not one of their white counterparts had a comparable experience.

Regarding graduate training, 10 percent of the study group attended segregated graduate schools which restricted their student associations to members of their own race, 39.1 percent attended slightly racially mixed schools, and 50.9 percent attended highly racially mixed schools. Subgroup comparisons reveal that 24 percent of the blacks in contrast to 100 percent of the whites attained graduate training in schools whose student populations were predominantly of their own race. Further, 70 percent of the blacks attended predominantly white institutions; but, none of their white counterparts was educated in a black setting. Simultaneous consideration of racial composition of undergraduate and graduate schools gives prominence to the trend that blacks generally moved from black enclaves, restricting their contact with whites, to highly integrated learning settings, affording great opportunity for their extending relationships across racial lines, as they advanced in education. No doubt this phenomenon is attributed mainly to three factors: the large volume of outmigration from the South; the white state universities' implementation of the 1954 Supreme Court's ruling that the separate-but-equal doctrine (which had been used to exclude blacks from public institutions maintained for whites) was unconstitutional; and, the limited number of advanced degree granting black institutions providing limited areas for specialization.
It can also be gleaned that most of the study group, whether black (53.8 percent) or white (76.6 percent), had worked at Atlanta University for five or more years. Among the 16.4 percent of the group that had worked at the University for less than two years, markedly more blacks (20 percent) than whites (6.7 percent) were found. Among the 22.7 percent of the group employed from two to four years, proportionately 25.0 percent of the blacks as compared with 16.7 percent of the whites was found. The modal employment years for the whites (63.3 percent) were from five to seven years, as compared with over seven years for the blacks (33.8 percent).

Table 3 amplifies that 46.4 percent of the sample had no formal training in racial and ethnic relations, 30.0 percent had a little training, and 23.6 percent had considerable training. At this point it should be noted that within the context of this study the term "considerable" indicates that the subject had taken two or more courses in race/ethnic relations and attended one or more workshops, or had taken two or more courses in race/ethnic relations, or had taken one course and attended one or more workshops. The term "little" implies that the subject had taken one course, or has participated in one or more workshops. Approximately half of both subgroups (blacks, 45.0 percent; whites 50.0 percent) had no formal antiprejudice training. The black group (27.5 percent) had twice the proportion of respondents with considerable race relations training as the white group (13.3 percent).

Table 3 highlights that 60.9 percent of the sample held the doctor's degree and 39.1 percent held the master's degree. The white academics (80.0 percent) held substantially more doctorates than the compared group of black professors (53.8 percent).
Regarding father's or guardian's occupation, Table 3 documents the exact frequency distribution of the subjects' responses so that important characteristics of the sample would not be obscured by the condensed findings which follow. The system of categories, based primarily upon occupational duties, follows Goodenough's (1931, p. 235) schema, which was derived from census classifications. Strikingly documented is the fact that a markedly higher proportion of white fathers (90.1 percent) than black fathers (47.6 percent) were in professional, semiprofessional, managerial, clerical, skilled trades, and retail business occupations. Further, whereas 46.2 percent of the black fathers found their greatest opportunities for employment in the semiskilled, slightly skilled and laborers categories, only 3.2 percent of the white fathers found these categories to be a source of work.

Table 3 also presents the original occupational research data discussed above transformed into the functional manual and nonmanual dichotomy suitable for subsequent comparative analysis in accordance with the design of the study. Following the manual–nonmanual distinction of Lipset and Bendix (1959, pp. 14–17) the occupational categories of professional and semiprofessional, managerial were merged into nonmanual; and, the remaining five categories were merged into manual. Manual jobs (59.1 percent) represented the most important source of work for the fathers of the study group. Black fathers (63.8 percent) were substantially more heavily concentrated in manual occupations; whereas, the larger proportion of white subjects (53.3 percent) came from families where the father was employed in a nonmanual occupation.

Table 3 conveys that in the survey sample the proportion of sub-
jects who did not attend religious services to those who attended from one to three times per month is identical (39.1 percent). The subjects who attended services four or more times per month constituted 21.8 percent of the sample. More whites (50 percent) than blacks (35 percent) evinced no formal religious affiliations. As only 21.2 percent of the blacks and 23.3 percent of the whites attended religious services four or more times each month, apparently organized religion did not play a very significant role in the lives of most survey subjects.

Table 3 reveals that approximately equal proportions of blacks (48.8 percent) and whites (50.0 percent) identified themselves as democrats. Forty percent of the blacks, compared with 30 percent of the whites, saw themselves as Independents. Of the 13.6 percent of the study group who indicated that they had some other political leaning than those discussed above, 11.3 percent were blacks and 20.0 percent were whites.

Table 3 shows that 72.7 percent of the study group had limited contact with members of the other race before commencing work at Atlanta University; and, 27.3 percent had high contact. A further analysis revealed that although most blacks (65.0 percent) and most whites (93.3 percent) experienced limited preuniversity contact, the white group had substantially more limited biracial contacts than the black group.

Finally, Table 3 reveals that when viewed collectively, the combined degree of contact manifested by the black and white groups while working in the Atlanta University setting was almost identical with the combined degree that transpired before securing employment at the University. However, there occurred a marked difference in the contact rate of the black and white subgroups. Whites experienced a substantial
increase (53.3 percent had high biracial contact); whereas, blacks manifested a decline (only 20 percent manifested high intergroup mixing).

**Reliability.** The internal reliability (Coefficient Alpha or Cronbach's alpha) of the two prejudice scales was determined by the computer program, TD. As shown in Table 4, the Anti-Black and Anti-White Scales manifested high Cronbach's alpha reliabilities of .897 and .941 respectively. The results provided corroboration of Steckler's (1957) reported split-half reliability coefficients of .84 and .88, respectively, for the A-B and A-W scales; and, Banks (1968) calculated odd-even reliability coefficients of .88 and .90 for respective scales.

**TABLE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Black Scale, A-B</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Measured whites' attitude toward blacks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-White Scale, A-W</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Measured blacks' attitude toward whites)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients were computed for each of the cross-racial contact scales. Table 5 presents the relevant data.

The two contact scales' Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients ranged from .769 to .849. These data demonstrated that the contact
scales met the reliability property at a level sufficiently high for practical usefulness in discriminating between the subjects.

### TABLE 5

**RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS OBTAINED FOR THE PRE-ATLANTA UNIVERSITY CROSS-RACIAL CONTACT SCALE AND THE ATLANTA UNIVERSITY CROSS-RACIAL CONTACT SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Atlanta University Cross-Racial Contact Scale, P-UCCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta University Cross-Racial Contact Scale, UCCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report of the findings. This portion of the chapter will give prominence to the outcomes that resulted from subjecting the raw survey data to the hypothesis-testing procedures which were designed to disclose the differences in racial attitudes among black and white faculty members at Atlanta University and to determine some of the statistically significant factors which might account for the existing situation.

In considering the subsequent research findings, it is crucial that ambiguous conclusions not evolve. The highly select group of black and white professors of this study cannot be compared solely as representatives of their races. They were not random samples. As they were pre-selected on the basis of social class, education, and other attri-
butes as well as race, one should be circumspect about advancing interpretations from the results rooted in the obtained sample distributions.

The analyses advanced below are not idiographically oriented. Conversely, they are primarily normothetic, i.e., designed to reflect group patterns. As amplification of individual scale items did not fall within the purview of this investigation, the findings were based on total scale scores of the groups in question. Nevertheless, summary tables of mean scores, standard deviations, and percentages of black and white responses to the items comprising the attitude scales and the cross-racial contact scales have been presented in Appendices C, D, and E. For each of the analyses, the .05 level of significance was applied as the standard for rejecting the null hypothesis of the equality of means on prejudiced attitudes or on cross-racial contacts.

Generally, in interpreting the findings it should be remembered that low scores are more indicative of positive attributes than high scores. The value premises underlying the scoring interpretation stem from and find justification in those formally stated in the Constitution of the United States, especially the Bill of Rights, and the Supreme Court's interpretation of those statements. Furthermore, this scoring interpretation is congruent with the investigators internalized norms of justice, rationality, and "human heartedness."

More specifically, the prejudice scores relative to Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 are portrayed in terms of T-scores and 7-point scale scores which were described in the scoring subsection of Chapter III. (Also see Table 7 and Appendix F.) These scores are constructed such that the higher the score the more prejudiced (unfavorable) the racial
attitude; and conversely, the lower the score the less prejudiced (more favorable) the racial attitude. As the transformation of the Anti-Black Scale scores and the Anti-White Scale scores to T-scores rendered the two different scale scores comparable and was vital to the application of analysis of variance procedures to the problem of determining the significance of differences among prejudiced means; and, as the 7-point scale scores more clearly reflected the anti-black/anti-white prejudiced ratings adhered to by Dr. Steckler (the author of the A-B and A-W Scales), the portrayal of results in Table 7 with both types of scoring distributions was deemed appropriate. In the subsequent discussion prejudiced means are first reported in T-score units, then in the equivalent 7-point scale score units, thus: 4.031 (2.262), i.e., the T-score being 4.031; the 7-point scale score unit being (2.262).

In interpreting means derived from the 7-point scoring procedure, 4.0 would be considered the theoretical neutral point. Theoretically, scores suggest progressive increase in hostile attitudes with progressive increase in magnitude beyond 4.0. Conversely, scores falling below 4.0 would be suggestive of tolerant racial attitudes. Hence, a mean of 1.0 would imply that the respective group harbors highly egalitarian racial attitudes and most probably strong reject negative stereotypes regarding the outgroups. Further, a mean of 1.0 would suggest a greater degree of racial tolerance than a mean of 2.0; and, substantially more tolerance of the other race than the mildly tolerant racial orientation implied by the mean of 3.0.

Hypothesis 1.—There is no statistically significant difference in the racially prejudiced attitudes that the black faculty members hold toward whites, as measured by the group scores on the Anti-White
Scale, and the white faculty members hold toward blacks, as measured by the group scores on the Anti-Black Scale.

TABLE 6
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PREJUDICE BY BLACK RACE VS. WHITE RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Probability Less Than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86.304</td>
<td>1.122</td>
<td>.292^ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ns Not significant
^Significant at the .05 level

A one-way analysis of variance was performed comparing black and white faculty members on their Social Attitude Scale: Anti-White/Anti-Black (SAS: A-W/A-B) mean scores, respectively. Table 6 shows that (F = 1.122; p < .292) the difference between the paired means failed to meet the .05 level criterion of a statistically reliable difference; hence, the null hypothesis was supported. It is plausible to infer that there was no disparity in the mean amount of racial hostility that black and white faculty members harbored toward the opposite race. The means for the black and white groups as reported in Table 7 were 48.031 (2.262) and 50.020 (2.338) on the Social Attitude Scale (SAS).

Hypothesis 2—There are no statistically significant differences between the prejudice scores of the black and white faculty members, as measured by the Anti-White Scale and the Anti-Black Scale, respectively, when these scores are stratified by the independent variables: sex, age, region reared, region secured undergraduate degree, region secured highest professional degree, racial composition of undergraduate school, racial composition of graduate school,
formal race/ethnic relations education, highest degree earned, father's occupation, religious attendance, political party orientation, pre-Atlanta University cross-racial contact, and Atlanta University cross-racial contact.

Guided by the theoretical assumption that the aforespecified demographic and social-psychological variables possessed the virtue of accounting for the status of prejudiced attitudes among the study group, that they held psychological significance which would find indirect expression in the racial attitude scores of the subjects, these variables were employed to classify the responses of the subjects and to determine whether they induced differential effects on the mean Social Attitude Scale: Anti-Black/Anti-White (SAS: A-B/A-W) scores of the black and white subjects. Table 7 presents the means and standard deviations for the different classifications of the subjects' responses on the total scores of the SAS: A-B/A-W. Table 8 gives prominence to the F ratios and their corresponding probabilities—which were derived by subjecting the SAS scores, of the black and white subjects formed by the pertinent independent variables, to two-way analysis of variance procedures.

At this point, an orientation to Table 8 may prove facilitative. Independent variables, except for race, are listed vertically in the table. The first entry in the vertical listing is sex. The horizontal dimension across the table represents the results of the analysis of variance when the independent variable of sex is run with independent variable of race for the anti-white/anti-black attitudes of blacks and whites, respectively. Across the row, next to sex, are numbers, the first of which is 1. One represents degrees of freedom; the second, 136.646, represents the mean square; and, the third, 1.770, represents
the F ratio obtained in this particular test. This test is a test of race. The probability value of 0.186 indicates that the race variable in this case is not significant.

The second set of major columns in Table 8 pertain to the stratification variables. Sex is the first entry in the vertical column of stratification variables. Across from sex is a set of numbers which represent, in this case, the outcome of sex. There is 1 degree of freedom, a mean square of 7.365, and a F ratio of 0.095. Likewise, this variable was not significant, the value being 0.758 for the probability indicated.

Finally, the third set of major columns in the table is interaction, that is, the joint action of race and sex. The interaction set will in all cases represent the joint action of race with the other independent variable on that row. The degree of freedom is 1. The mean square is 73.952. The F ratio is 0.958 and that value is not significant, as the obtained probability level of 0.330 falls short of the adopted standard of confidence, which is the .05 level of significance.

The outcomes pertaining to the significance tests for the analysis of variance problems shown in Table 8 are summarized below.

a) Prejudice by Race and Sex.—No statistically significant differences existed across sample means on prejudiced attitudes when the sample responses were stratified by sex (F = 0.095; p < .758). The null hypothesis was tenable as the F for sex was less than the F of a size that would occur by chance. As expected, race (F = 1.770; p < .186) was not significant. In addition, there was an absence of significant interaction between sex and race on the SAS scores (F = .958; p < .330); hence, the two variables sex and race, acted independently. It is logically plausible to conclude that the two sexes were equivalent in the racially prejudiced attitudes which they harbored.
b) Prejudice by Race and Age.—A statistically significant difference occurred across sample means on prejudiced attitudes when the SAS responses were stratified by age (F = 6.286; p < .001). The null hypothesis was refuted. As the probability of the F (attained by age) occurring by chance was less than 1 in 1000, in all probability at least one of the age subgroups differed from the others on the degree of racial hostility harbored within the subgroup. Since F furnished only a comprehensive test of the significance of the difference among the means and as age was producing differences, the investigator made separate comparisons of the age subgroups in order to further analyze these differences.

Table 10 shows that in the reanalysis of SAS scores, holding race constant and using the age variable for the analysis, the following comparisons were made:

- Comparison I Under 35 vs. 35-44
- Comparison II 35-44 vs. 45-54
- Comparison III 45-54 vs. Over 54

Among the three subgroup comparisons, two were significant: between the 45-54 and the over 54 subgroups (F = 1869.546; p < .001) and, between the 35-44 and the 45-54 subgroups (F = 85.141; p < .001). There was no significant difference between the under 35 and the 35-44 subgroups (F = 2.825; p < .096) hence, indicating that for these two subgroups, at least, the mean scores were not significantly different. Their prejudiced attitudes were therefore similar. This is illustrated in the mean values portrayed in Table 9. The mean values for the under 35 and the 35-44 subgroups were 52.972 (2.801) and 50.818 (2.532), respectively. A considerable difference is noted between the 35-44 and the 45-54 subgroups, as the mean for the former is 50.818 (2.532) and the latter is 44.700 (1.907). Differences also existed between the 45-54 and the over 54 subgroups, whose means are 44.700 (1.907) and 45.273 (1.860), respectively. These differences, while apparently small numerically, are likely to have arisen because of increased homogeneity of feelings within the subgroups, as evidenced by the standard deviations of 5.758 and 7.173 for the over 54 and the 45-54 subgroups, respectively, versus the standard deviations of 9.646 and 9.093 for the under 35 and the 35-44 subgroups, respectively.

Table 8 reveals that the effects of race (F = 2.024; p < .158) and the interaction between age and race (F = .371; p < .774) on the SAS scores were not significant.

c) Prejudice by Race and Region Reared.—Neither of the main effects (race and region reared), operating in and of itself,
TABLE 9

MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR REANALYSIS OF GROUPS
FOR AGE AND YEARS EMPLOYED AT ATLANTA UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Number of Subjects</th>
<th>Mean Prejudice Scores in T-Score Units</th>
<th>Mean Prejudice Scores in 7-Point Scale Units</th>
<th>Standard Deviations in T-Score Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52.972</td>
<td>2.801</td>
<td>9.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50.818</td>
<td>2.532</td>
<td>9.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44.700</td>
<td>1.907</td>
<td>7.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 54</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45.273</td>
<td>1.860</td>
<td>5.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Employed at Atlanta University</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52.928</td>
<td>2.796</td>
<td>10.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48.248</td>
<td>2.226</td>
<td>7.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49.111</td>
<td>2.329</td>
<td>9.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45.932</td>
<td>1.940</td>
<td>6.537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 10

REANALYSIS F TESTS OF GROUPS FOR AGE AND YEARS EMPLOYED AT ATLANTA UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Probability Less Than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 35 vs. 35-44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>189.182</td>
<td>2.825</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 vs. 45-54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5701.039</td>
<td>85.141</td>
<td>.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 vs. over 54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125184.625</td>
<td>1869.546</td>
<td>.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Employed at Atlanta University</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 2 vs. 2-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.971</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 vs. 5-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15615.285</td>
<td>211.514</td>
<td>.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7 vs. over 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>123524.938</td>
<td>1673.187</td>
<td>.001***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***The .001 level of significance
*The .05 level is considered significant in these analyses.
produced a statistically significant difference between the mean SAS scores of the study group when the scores were stratified by subjects' South/non-South region of origin. Inspection of Table 8 shows that race operating alone attained a nonsignificant F ratio of 1.183 (p < .279). Likewise, region reared operating alone attained a nonsignificant F ratio of 2.126 (p < .148). As the independent effect of race neither region reared induce no systematic variance in the South/non-South subgroup's mean attitude scores, it would appear that the null hypothesis was accorded credibility. Consequently, it was reasoned that the faculty members reared in the South and non-South regions were equivalently accepting of negative racial stereotypes.

Nevertheless, the significance of the two-factor interaction, race by region reared, was evinced by the attained F ratio of 5.716 (p < .019). It was concluded probabilistically that the joint effect of race and region reared had an effect on the prejudiced attitudes harbored by the subjects. Thus, under the specific circumstances of the coupling effect of race and region reared, the null hypothesis was discredited. In all probability the differences between the degree of prejudice harbored by the black/white subjects is not independent of their South/non-South regions of origin or, equivalently, the difference between the amount of racial hostility harbored by subjects from the South/non-South is not independent of their race. In other words, a statement about the impact of origin region on prejudiced attitudes must be qualified by the particular race involved. Consequently, the magnitude of the difference in racial hostility harbored by blacks and whites is not the same, within the limits of random variation, for the two regions of origin.

The nature of the significant race by region reared interaction may be illuminated by the means presented in Table 7; South—for blacks 47.961 (2.252); for whites, 54.686 (2.823), and non-South—for blacks, 48.196 (2.285); for whites, 45.937 (1.913).

d) Prejudice by Race and Undergraduate School Region.—No statistically reliable difference occurred between the mean SAS scores of the study group when the scores were stratified by the South/non-South regions of the subjects' undergraduate schools. Inspection of Table 8 discloses that all the values of F in this analyses were small; (a) for race, 1.107; p < .295; (b) for undergraduate school region, .164; p < .687; (c) for interaction, .433; p < .512.
The null hypothesis was sustained. Hence, there seems to be little doubt that faculty members who attended college in the South/non-South regions held equivalently unfavorable attitudes about the other race.

e) Prejudice by Race and Graduate School Region.—Neither of the main effects (race and region of graduate school), operating alone, produced a statistically sufficient variation between the mean SAS scores of the subjects when the scores were classified by the South/non-South regions of the subjects' graduate schools. As portrayed in Table 8, race and region of graduate school produced differences in prejudice of magnitudes that obtained F ratios of 1.175 (p < .281); and .882 (p < .350). Thus, for each variable the null hypothesis was sustained. It would eappear that operating separately the specified variables evince no relation to prejudiced attitudes harbored by the subjects.

The race by region of graduate school interaction was statistically significant (F = 6.281; p < .014). Hence, the null hypothesis was refuted. It is therefore reasonable to believe that the joint effect of graduate school region and race is to produce differences in prejudiced attitudes. The nature of the significant race by graduate school region interaction may be illuminated by the means presented in Table 7: South—for blacks, 47.383 (2.171); for whites, 53.147 (2.261), and non-South—for Blacks, 48.400 (2.314); for whites 44.618 (1.776).

f) Prejudice by Race and Racial Composition of Undergraduate School.—

And

g) Prejudice by Race and Racial Composition of Graduate School.— The hypotheses set forth for f and g may be combined as follows: No reliable differences existed across sample means on prejudiced attitudes when the sample responses were stratified by racial composition of undergraduate or by racial composition of graduate school. Regarding the classificatory variables g and h, analysis of variance procedures were applied to the data to solve the problems in question, after the responses had been trichotomized for each hypothesis as shown in Table 7. As the distribution and the frequencies available for the white group failed to fill the cells of the design employed (the structure of the design was guided by the specific objectives of the study), the output from these analyses was incomplete. It can be seen in Table 7 that for the subgroup "predominantly of other race," there were 22 frequencies for the black group and zero for the white group. As information which might be generated by dichotomizing the two variables of interest would be too broadly based to be of special interest to the investigator, the two variables in question were not
investigated further. Consequently, hypotheses g and h were neither accepted nor rejected.

h) Prejudice by Race and Employment Years.—A statistically significant difference occurred across sample means on prejudiced attitudes when the SAS responses were stratified by the subjects' years of employment at Atlanta University ($F = 2.964; p < .036$). The null hypothesis was refuted. As the obtained $F$ was less than the $F$ of a size that would occur by chance less than 5 times in 100, it was reasoned that at least one of the employment years subgroups differed from the others on the degree of racial hostility harbored within the subgroups. As $F$ furnished only a comprehensive test of the significance of the difference among the means and since employment years was producing differences, the investigator made separate comparisons of the relevant subgroups in order to further evaluate these differences.

Table 10 shows that in the reanalysis of SAS scores, holding race constant and using the employment variable for the analysis, the following comparisons were made:

Comparison I Under 2 years vs. 2-4 years
Comparison II 2-4 years vs. 5-7 years
Comparison III 5-7 years vs. Over 7 years

Among the three subgroup comparisons, two were highly significant: the 2-4 years vs. the 5-7 years ($F = 211.514; p < .001$), and the 2-4 years vs. the 5-7 years ($F = 211.514; p < .001$). Other comparisons did not reach significance. This is reflected in the mean values exhibited in Table 9. It was noteworthy that the subjects who were employed the shortest interim manifested the highest degree of intolerance (Under 2 years, $X = 52.928 (2.796)$ whereas, those having worked the longest interim manifested the most tolerance (Over 7 years, $X = 45.932 (1.940)$). A difference as much as 6.996 T-score units separated these two subgroups. There was, however, no straight line of progression in intolerance with the decline in years employed; as, the 2-4 years subgroup ($X = 48.248 (2.226)$) displayed a slightly lower level of prejudice than the 5-7 years subgroup ($X = 49.111; 2.329)$. These differences are strengthened by the fact that the two least prejudiced subgroups were characterized by considerable homogeneity of feelings (standard deviation of 6.537 for the over 7 years subgroup and 7.641 for the 2-4 years subgroup); whereas, the two most prejudiced subgroups were characterized by considerable heterogeneity of feelings (standard deviation of 9.686 for the 5-7 years subgroup and 10.573 for the under 2 years subgroup). Race alone ($F = 1.766; p < 1.87$) did not produce a differential effect on the subjects' SAS scores. Furthermore, there was an absence of a significant
race by years employed at Atlanta University interaction effect \( F = 1.337; p < .267 \).

i) Prejudice by Race and Race/Ethnic Relations Education.—No systematic differences existed across sample means on prejudiced attitudes when the sample responses were stratified by the subjects' formal training in race/ethnic relations. Table 8 shows that neither race \( F = 1.841; p \geq .178 \); nor race/ethnic relations education \( F = 2.947; p \leq .057 \); nor interaction between race and race/ethnic relations education \( F = .659; p \leq .519 \) had a statistically significant effect on the SAS scores. As the results of all three F tests supported the null hypothesis, it is reasonable to conclude that the study subjects who had secured formal training in race and ethnic relations and the subjects who had secured no formal training in race/ethnic relations were equally tolerant of members of another race. It seems noteworthy, however, that race/ethnic relations education produced an interaction with race that approached significance. It can be gleaned from Table 7 that the subjects who had considerable training in race/ethnic relations manifested SAS scores \( \bar{X} = 45.936 \pm 1.967 \) for blacks and \( \bar{X} = 43.050 \pm 1.612 \) for whites) lower than the subjects who had little training \( \bar{X} = 50.695 \pm 2.637 \) for blacks and \( \bar{X} = 52.980 \pm 2.646 \) for whites) as well as those who had no training \( \bar{X} = 47.972 \pm 2.254 \) for blacks and \( \bar{X} = 51.257 \pm 2.466 \) for whites).

j) Prejudice by Race and Level of Education.—No systematic differences existed across sample means on prejudiced attitudes when the sample responses were stratified by the subjects' level of education \( F = .344; p \leq .559 \). As the level of education produced no differential effects on the SAS means, the null hypothesis was upheld. As expected, there were no significant differences in prejudice induced by race \( F = 1.760; p \leq .188 \). Furthermore the race by level of education interaction \( F = .104; p \leq .748 \) proved to be relatively barren in so far as statistically significant effects are concerned. It seems highly reasonable to conclude that the subjects who had earned the master's degree and subjects who had attained the doctor's degree harbored equivalent degrees of racial hostility toward members of the other race.

k) Prejudice by Race and Father's or Guardian's Occupation.—No consistent differences occurred across sample means on prejudiced attitudes when the subjects' responses were stratified by the manual/nonmanual occupations held by the subjects' fathers or guardians \( F = .342; p \leq .560 \). As the father's/guardians' occupation did not produce a significant disparity between the means scores of the manual/nonmanual groups, the null hypothesis was confirmed. The F attained by race \( F = 1.557; p \leq .215 \) and the F attained by the interaction between race and father's/guardians' occupation
It seems reasonable to conclude that the black and white subjects who had fathers/guardians who were manual workers harbored relatively identical degrees of prejudiced attitudes as the black and white subjects who had fathers/guardians who held nonmanual jobs.

1) Prejudice by Race and Religious Service Attendance Per Month.—No reliable differences occurred across sample means on prejudiced attitudes when the responses of the black and white subjects were classified by the subjects' frequency of religious service attendance ($F = .187; p < .829$). Since frequency of church attendance effect no significant variance in the SAS means of the black and white subjects, the null hypothesis was substantiated. The $F$ attained by race ($f = 1.814; p < .181$) and the $F$ attained by the interaction between race and religious service attendance per month ($F = 2.614; p < .078$) were both statistically insignificant. It is noteworthy, however, that the interaction between race and religious service attendance per month neared significance. Table 7 reveals that the trends of the black and white means differ. For the black group the under once a month attenders ($\bar{x} = 49.046 \pm 2.405$) manifests the most prejudice. The 1-3 times per month attenders ($\bar{x} = 47.688 \pm 2.211$) the next, and the over 3 times per month attenders ($\bar{x} = 47.541 \pm 2.193$) manifested the least prejudiced attitudes. The white group did not demonstrate this inverse relationship of increasing prejudice with decreasing religious service attendance. For the white group the under once a month attenders ($\bar{x} = 47.360 \pm 2.061$) manifested the least amount of prejudice, the over 3 times per month attenders ($\bar{x} = 52.800 \pm 2.627$) the second least amount of prejudice, and the 1-3 subgroup ($\bar{x} = 55.650 \pm 2.924$) the greatest degree of prejudice.

m) Prejudice by Race and Political Party Orientation.—No statistically significant difference occurred across sample means on prejudiced attitudes when the responses of the black and white subjects were classified by the subjects' political party preference ($F = 2.471; p < .090$). The null hypothesis was sustained. It is noteworthy, however, that political party orientation neared the .05 level of significance. Table 7 reveals that the trends of the black and white means differ substantially. For the black group, Independents ($\bar{x} = 45.239 \pm 1.868$) exhibited the least racial prejudice, with the Democrats ($\bar{x} = 49.087 \pm 2.411$) next, and the Republican, apolitical, and other subgroup ($\bar{x} = 53.933 \pm 3.094$) showing the most prejudice. On the other hand, for the white group, the Democrats ($\bar{x} = 50.000 \pm 2.336$) exhibited the least racial prejudice, with the Republican, apolitical, and other subgroup ($\bar{x} = 50.600 \pm 2.398$) next, and the Independents ($\bar{x} = 52.286 \pm 2.574$)
showing the most prejudice. Race ($F = 1.863; p < .175$) did not produce a significant main effect. Furthermore, the interaction between race and political party orientation ($F = 1.775; p < .175$) failed to reach significance.

n) Prejudice by Race and Pre-Atlanta University Cross-Racial Contact.—No statistically significant differences existed across sample means on prejudiced attitudes when the SAS scores were stratified by the subjects' high-limited pre-Atlanta University cross-racial contact experiences ($F = .001; p < .974$). The null hypothesis was accorded credibility, as the mean differences associated with the SAS scores and the subjects' degree of pre-Atlanta University cross-racial contact were not of sufficient magnitude to generate a significant $F$ at the five percent level of confidence.

Table 8 reveals that the independent effect of race ($F = 1.104; p < .296$) did not produce a differential effect on the mean SAS scores of those in the study group who had experienced high and limited cross-racial contact before beginning work at the University. Furthermore, there was an absence of a significant race by pre-Atlanta University cross-racial contact interaction effect ($F = .268; p < .606$). Hence, it is plausible to conclude that the subjects who experienced high degrees of contact with members of the other race before securing employment at the University and the subjects who experienced low degrees of cross-racial contact prior to gaining employment at the University harbored equivalently hostile (or friendly) attitudes toward members of the other race.

o) Prejudice by Race and Atlanta University Cross-Racial Contact.—A statistically significant difference occurred across sample means on prejudiced attitudes when the SAS scores were stratified by the subjects' high-limited degree of cross-racial contact at Atlanta University ($F = 7.040; p < .008$). The null hypothesis was refuted. As the obtained $F$ was less than the $F$ of a size that would occur by chance less than 8 times in 1000, it is reasonable to conclude that the subjects who experienced a high degree of contact with members of the other race during their employment at the University harbored racial attitudes which were significantly different from the limited University cross-racial contact subjects. Inspection of Table 7 reveals that high cross-racial contact blacks ($X = 44.135 \pm 1.713$) and whites ($X = 49.000 \pm 2.307$) attained significantly lower SAS means than the limited cross-racial contact blacks ($X = 49.083 \pm 2.402$) and whites ($X = 52.886 \pm 2.636$). It would appear that the high cross-racial contact subjects held considerably more favorable attitudes toward members of the other racial group than did the limited cross-racial contact subjects.
Table 8 shows that race \((F = 1.178; \ p < .280)\) did not produce a differential effect on the SAS means. Further, Table 8 reveals that the \(F\) attained by the interaction between race and Atlanta University cross-racial contact \((F = .012; \ p < .913)\) was statistically insignificant.

Hypothesis 3.---There are no statistically significant differences in the cross-racial contacts, as measured by the Cross-Racial Contact Scale, experienced by the black faculty members and the white faculty members before securing employment at Atlanta University and the cross-racial contacts experienced by the black faculty members and the white faculty members after securing employment at Atlanta University.

For the analyses pertaining to Hypothesis 3, separate comparisons were made of the black faculty members and the white faculty members employing their respective Pre-Atlanta University Cross-Racial Contact Scale \((P-UCCS)\) scores and their Atlanta University Cross-Racial Contact Scale \((UCCS)\) scores as the basic data for these analyses. (See scoring subsection of Chapter III.) Analysis of variance procedures were used to compare the black group's \(P-UCCS\) scores and \(UCCS\) scores. As can be seen in Table 12 \((F = 4.619; \ p < .033)\) the difference between the black subjects' Pre- and Atlanta University Cross-Racial Contact Scale means was of a magnitude large enough to generate a significant \(F\) ratio at the five percent level of confidence. The null hypothesis was refuted. It is reasonable to conclude that the degree of cross-racial contacts experienced by blacks while employed at the University differed significantly from the degree of cross-racial contacts experienced prior to their employment at the University.

At this point it should be remembered that the 5-point scale contact scores were constructed such that the lower the mean scores the greater the extent of cross-racial contact experienced by the group, and
TABLE 11
MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR BLACK AND WHITE FACULTY GROUPS FOR BEFORE AND AFTER ATLANTA UNIVERSITY EMPLOYMENT CROSS-RACIAL CONTACT SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Number of Subjects</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Probability Less Than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before University Employment Cross-Racial Contact</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.987</td>
<td>0.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After University Employment Cross-Racial Contact</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.167</td>
<td>0.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before University Employment Cross-Racial Contact</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.370</td>
<td>0.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After University Employment Cross-Racial Contact</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.736</td>
<td>0.565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 12
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF BEFORE AND AFTER ATLANTA UNIVERSITY EMPLOYMENT CROSS-RACIAL CONTACT SCORES FOR BLACK AND FOR WHITE FACULTY GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Probability Less Than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before vs. After Atlanta University Cross-Racial Contact for Black Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.304</td>
<td>4.619</td>
<td>0.033*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before vs. After Atlanta University Cross-Racial Contact for White Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.017</td>
<td>26.768</td>
<td>0.001***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***The .001 level of significance
*The .05 level of significance, which is the criterion set forth for these analyses.
the higher the mean value the more limited the degree of cross-racial contact experienced by the group. Hence, the greatest degree of racial interaction would be reflected in a score of 1 and the least degree in a score of 5. For the black group, the before and after Atlanta University cross-racial contact means reported in Table 12 were 3.087 and 4.167, respectively. The black subjects interacted more with whites prior to their employment at the University than after their employment.

Finally, Table 12 shows the results of the significance test for the analysis of variance problem comparing the white group's mean PUCCS scores and mean UCCS scores (F = 26.768; p < .001). As can readily be seen, the discrepancy between the two means was too great to be attributed to chance; hence, the null hypothesis was discredited. It is logical to conclude that the degree of interracial contact experienced by whites before their employment at the University differed significantly from that experienced after their employment. The before and after Atlanta University cross-racial contact means reported in Table 12 are 4.370 and 3.736, respectively. It would appear that the white subjects experienced a marked increase in their associations with blacks after gaining employment at Atlanta University.

These findings demonstrate that the changes in cross-racial contacts experienced by the black and white groups after attaining employment at Atlanta University were in opposite directions: the blacks experienced a decline in their associations with whites; whereas, the whites experienced a marked increase in their associations with blacks.

Summary of Findings and Discussion. The ensuing discussion is designed to present, in succinct summary statements, the tentative answers
which the statistical analysis yielded to the questions which prompted this inquiry. Further, it intends to integrate the findings, in a larger context by interpreting them from a broader perspective. The discussion will proceed in the same order as the hypotheses in Chapter I.

In this empirical investigation to ascertain the existence (or non-existence) of a statistically significant difference in the racially prejudiced attitudes that blacks and whites teaching in the "inverse integration" setting of Atlanta University during the 1974-1975 academic year, harbored toward the opposite race, 110 faculty members' scaled racial attitudes were evaluated in relation to selected demographic and social-psychological variables by analysis of variance procedures. The .05 probability value was applied as the criterion for evaluating the statistical significance of 48 F ratios yielded by these analyses. The principal findings are summarized in the subsequent propositions.

Findings (Hypothesis 1), Statistically Nonsignificant.—There was no statistically significant difference in the racially prejudiced attitudes that the black faculty members harbored toward whites, as measured by the group mean scores on the Social Attitude Scale: Anti-White (SAS: A-W), and the white faculty members harbored toward blacks, as measured by the group scores on the Social Attitude Scale: Anti-Black (SAS: A-B).

The quality of racial attitudes that the black and white faculty members harbored toward the opposite race was the same. Evidently the two groups formed by race came from psychologically common populations on the prejudice variable under consideration. This finding was fortified dramatically when the research data were classified according to thirteen independent variables and subjected to analysis of variance
procedures. As epitomized in the race section of Table 8 (F ratios having non-significant probability values ranging from .158 to .296) in none of these comparisons did the race variable evince that there was a systematic difference in the racial outlook of the black and white professors which was attributable to the race factor. It would appear that the two groups harbored equivalent tolerant dispositions toward each other.

Further corroborating evidence is reflected in the distribution of means and standard deviations for the demographic and social-psychological stratification variables (hereafter referred to as the independent variables) presented in Table 7. It should be remembered that for means in T-score units as well as those in 7-Point scale units the lower the value the more positive the attitude of the group. Particularly, it should be noted that on the 7-Point scale, mean values above 4 portray varying degrees of negative racial attitudes while those below 4 suggest varying degrees of positive attitudes. Inspection of the array of 7-Point scale mean values presented in Table 7 discloses that none exceeds the magnitude of 4 and only 3 exceed the value of 3. Thus, the general configuration of black/white racial orientations is markedly positive.

Research abundantly documents the disparity in racial attitudes between black/white Americans (Banks 1970), Berelson and Steiner (1964), Campbell (1971). The statistical independence of the prejudice variable regarding the race variable documented by this study runs counter to the plethora of attitude studies. Thus, it may give constructive impetus to effectuating better race relationships by simply exploding
long-cherished myths about the inherent psychological differences between blacks and whites.

In accounting for the zero race affect on prejudiced attitudes, the investigator contends that these data do not run counter to the best-supported findings within the behavioral sciences, those broad assumptions on which most authorities are agreed. Among these are:

1. The higher the level of education the less the prejudice and discrimination (Allport, 1963).

2. The balance is particularly favorable to a lessening of prejudice when the ethnic groups meet on personal terms, on a common task with shared interests or tastes that run across ethnic lines, and on terms of social and economic equality (Berelson & Steiner, 1964, p. 513).

3. The greater the belief congruence, the lower the prejudice (Rokeach, 1968).

4. The emerging attitudes toward Negroes are now chiefly determined not by contact with Negroes but by contact with the prevalent attitude toward Negroes (Lindsey & Aronson, 1969, p. 26).

As legislation has greatly facilitated the extent of racial integration (thus compromising the institutionalized exclusion-discriminatory "Southern mores") in recent years, as the general Atlanta University subcultural norms appear to support equalitarian treatment of all persons, as the normative character of the group of black and white academicians constituting the study group is extensively saturated by the four advanced generalizations, and, as the investigator's intensive review of the relevant literature has uncovered no study regarding prejudiced attitudes of university professors in an "inverse integration" setting, it would be most probable that the black/white subjects of this single study would manifest no statistically significant difference in their racial orientations toward each other.
Findings (Hypothesis 2), Statistically Nonsignificant.—
Eleven stratification variables (operating separately produced no statistically significant differential effect upon the prejudiced attitudes of the study group: sex, region reared, region secured undergraduate degree, formal race/ethnic relations education, highest degree earned, father's occupation, religious attendance, political party orientation, pre-Atlanta University cross-racial contact. Hence, there is no statistical association between each of the aforespecified independent variables and the dependent variable prejudiced attitudes held by the study group.

The interaction combinations of race by sex; race by age; race by region secured undergraduate degree; race by formal race/ethnic relations education; race by highest degree earned; race by father's occupation; race by religious attendance; race by political party orientation; race by pre-Atlanta University cross-racial contact; and race by Atlanta University cross-racial contact did not produce statistically reliable differences in the prejudiced attitudes harbored by the study group.

Thus, the quality of racial attitudes harbored by the study group could not be accounted for by the aforespecified factors.

Findings (Hypothesis 2), Statistically Significant.—
The main effects of age (p < .001), of years employed at Atlanta University (p < .036) and of Atlanta University cross-racial contact (p < .008) produced statistically significant differential effects upon the prejudiced attitudes of the study group. In essence, the greater acceptance of prejudice was characteristic of the younger subjects (the under 45 versus the over 54), the subjects having the least years of service at Atlanta University (the under 2 years versus the over 7 years), and the subjects who reported a low degree of University cross-racial contact (versus the high degree of University cross-racial contact subject).

The interaction between race and region reared (p < .019 and the interaction between race and region of graduate school (p < .014) produced statistically reliable differential effects on the prejudiced attitudes of the study group. Essentially, the greater acceptance of prejudice was characteristics of the southern reared whites who attained their highest professional degrees from graduate schools located in the South and the non-southern reared blacks who secured their highest professional degrees from schools of the non-South region. The non-southern reared whites who received their highest degrees from non-South institutions harbored the most positive racial attitudes of all the subgroups; and the southern reared blacks who
received their highest degrees from southern graduate schools manifested the second lowest degree of prejudice.

It can be concluded that the systematic variance of the subjects' scores on the SAS: A-B/A-W was appreciably attributable to the aforespecified factors; nor, equivalently, the quality of racial attitudes harbored by the study group can be appreciably accounted for by the statistical association localized in the aforespecified three main effect variances and the two interaction variances.

Table 8 discloses that only five of the thirty-eight F ratios calculated to determine the effects of selected factors on prejudice attained statistical significance. As the underlying function of the array of subsidiary hypotheses comprising Hypothesis 2 was to serve as a guiding mechanism for constructively documenting statistically significant factors which would account for the quality of the study group's racial attitudes, the subsequent discussion will preclude explanations of the statistically independent factors and will be concerned only with those variances that proved significant at the .05 probability level.

Of the two significant main effects, the inverse relationship between age and degrees of prejudiced attitudes harbored was the more reliable ($p < .001$). Table 7 shows a continuous incline in the acceptance of unfavorable attitudes regarding the other race with the decline in age levels; as, the least degree of racial prejudice was exhibited by the over 54 age level and the greatest degree by the under 35 age level. Again, it is significant to remember that although younger faculty members were more racially intolerant than were the older faculty members, the intensity of unfavorable feelings held toward the opposite race was not strong. These findings run counter to the trend hypothesis disclosed by Tumin's (1961) review study—that collectively younger persons are generally less prejudiced than older persons—and a host of corroborating
data (Allport, 1954; Hyman and Sheatsley, 1956; Noel and Pinkney, 1964; Campbell and Schum, 1968; Harding, Kutner, Proshansky, and Chein, 1968). Tumin cautions, however, that historical and political conditions have at times produced a reversal of this trend and points to the conspicuous example of the youth of Germany who were more Nazi than their elders.

In attempting to account for the discovered inverted age-related configuration of racial attitudes, the relevant findings of previous investigators are advanced.

1. Higher social position serves to broaden personal perspectives and in turn to reduce prejudice (Bettelheim and Janowitz, 1964, p. 21).

2. There is a notable diversity in views concerning race relations matters among blacks born in the United States. Empirical findings reveal that younger blacks tend to be more separatist in their thinking than older blacks and that nationalistic separation appeals more to blacks at the poverty level than to those whose incomes are higher. If it is correct to assume that separatism has less appeal for blacks in stable and secure socio-economic positions, then it is understandable that older and higher income blacks are more inclined to support less extreme positions on race distinctions (Wilson, 1973, p. 402).

3. The current group of young white adults in the South have grown up and received their schooling and formed their attitudes during the stormy years which followed the 1954 Supreme Court decision outlawing segregated schools. It is they who have been most exposed to the crises and dislocations brought to the South by the Negro protest movement (Sheatsley, 1966, p. 228).

4. The social realities of race in American society strongly support the thesis that white people are responsible for many of the frustrations faced by the blacks. To expect young blacks to ignore this fact is to expect an unquestioning tolerance that is uniquely absent from American society. The black movement toward awareness and pride has created negative feelings about the majority group (Banks, 1970, p. 744).
The more hostile attitudes harbored by the younger subjects converge with the findings of Sheatsley (1966). As white attitudes cannot be considered without reference to black attitudes, since it is apparent that each influences the other, the younger black and white subjects may have developed a more prejudiced outlook as a consequence of having been exposed to the stormy post-1954 years of "massive resistance" to racial change during the sensitive years of their lives.

The more positive racial attitudes exhibited by older blacks as compared with young blacks are consistent with the new dimension of militancy and self-assertiveness of younger blacks today as compared with the passive and docile behavior of older blacks. These findings are also consistent with those of Banks (1970), Harris (1971) and Rafky (1972). The civil rights and black awareness movements claim to have influenced the social perceptions of blacks, especially the young blacks, by heightening their awareness of and sensitivity to race exploitations. It would appear that the mutual acceptance of more negative cultural stereotypes on the part of the young black and white subjects is suggestive of an underlying need for hostile expression toward the "out group." Although the intensity of hostility is not strong, it is suggestive of a potential conflict-laden situation which enjoins sensitive administrators to measure periodically and to design experiences which would diminish, rather than exacerbate, its presence.

Since age is related to teaching experience, it is not surprising that the years employed at Atlanta University (p < .036) factor induced a differential effect on the prejudiced attitudes of the subjects and that the direction of the difference simulated that of the age factor.
Subjects who were employed the shortest interim were the most prejudiced and those employed the longest interim the least prejudiced. Plausible explanations regarding these findings might be found in the following relevant research:

1. People over 40 tend to be more satisfied with their life circumstances than people under 40. It is tempting to conclude that older people are more satisfied because they have more to be satisfied with. Alternatively, it may be that older people have learned to accept what they have and no longer aspire for more. Younger people may still be pursuing aspirations which are further removed from their present achievements and may not yet have adjusted these aspirations downwards as consideration of reality may eventually require that they do (Campbell, 1971, p. 99).

2. Keeping the same job and/or getting a promotion both result in a more positive attitude toward the self and of others. Personality does change as a function of promotion or job turnover, but the nature of these changes is only beginning to be understood and still needs to be studied in many different contexts (Barton and Cattell, 1972, p. 89).

3. In a study of police attitudes, researchers found a progression toward positive attitudes related to experience. In other words, there is a steady increase in percentage of agreement concerning job attitudes as the level of experience increases (Watson and Sterling, 1969, p. 89).

4. Blacks over 50 typically prepared for the traditionally "closed" occupations which would permit them to "teach, preach, or serve" in the black community. Blacks who are somewhat younger earned their graduate degrees during the time when enthusiasm for integration was greatest. The youngest blacks are of the "new black generation" which stresses action and service to their black brothers together with a distrust of whites (Rafky, 1972, p. 238).

Furthermore, it is probable that the young black and white faculty members began their teaching careers at the University with a type of missionary zeal and dedication to the ideal of facilitating the intellectual growth of students. The gap between the high pre-job expectations and the realities of the job may have created a disillusionment that reflected itself in these subjects' SAS scores.
Table 7 highlights two most interesting, but not surprising, characteristics of the significant variance of scores on prejudice; the recurrence of the regional effect in two interaction variances.

The two-factor interaction or mutual interplay of race and geographic region reared \((p < .019)\) produced a differential effect on the prejudiced attitudes of the study group, and thus accounted for a noticeable portion of the differences in prejudice among the subjects reared in the South/non-South regions (see Table 7). Collectively, the subjects reared in the South were more prejudiced than those reared in non-South regions. The interaction effect, however, worked differently with the black and white racial groups in the South and non-South regions. The non-South reared white manifested the least prejudice, the South reared blacks the second smallest degree of prejudice, the non-South reared black next, and the South reared whites harbored the greatest degree of prejudice.

The two-factor interaction, or joint action, of race and geographic region secured highest degree produced a differential effect on the prejudiced attitudes of the study group. Subjects who secured their highest degrees from the non-South region collectively harbored less prejudice than those who secured their degrees from schools in the South. The non-South educated whites and the South educated whites harbored considerably less prejudice than his white counterpart who secured his highest degree in the South; whereas, the South educated black harbored less prejudice than the non-South educated black and South educated white.

Notably the general configuration of SAS means remained the same
for the black and white subjects in both regions for both interaction
variances: the non-South whites exhibiting the least degree of preju-
dice, the South black the second least, the non-South next, and the
South white last. These findings converge such studies reflecting re-
gional differences in racial prejudice as the following:

1. Horowitz (1944), Myrdal (1944), Pettigrew (1957),
Sheatsley (1966), and Campbell (1971) advanced
evidence which demonstrated that white Southerners
are typically more prejudiced against blacks than
are white Northerners.

2. Steckler (1957), and Eddy (1961), documented research
showing that students of Northern colleges are more
liberal in their social attitudes than are students
of Deep South colleges.

3. Steckler (1957) studied the ideology of black college
students and found that black college students as a
group accept the racial norms of the society.

Furthermore, Sedlacek and Brooks (1971) advanced evidence showing
that higher education seems to effect more positive racial orientations
in students.

It would appear that the differences in degrees of racial preju-
dice can largely be attributed to differences in the acculturation of
the subjects.

Because of the differences in social climate between North and
South, it is not surprising that the greatest degree of racial hos-
tility was exhibited by the South reared and schooled whites who resided
in the subculture where prejudicial attitudes were most tolerated or
even encouraged. Regarding the fact that the non-South reared and
schooled blacks harbored the second greatest degree of racial hostility,
it is plausible that the less restrictive social climate of the North
permitted their wider exposure to and increased conscious awareness of the inequalities of the system and those responsible for racial exploitations. Harboring less fear of being harmed by the white power holder than their black brothers in the South, they feel free to manifest their hostility, as was reflected in their SAS scores. On the other hand, the South reared and schooled blacks, living in relative subjugation in the authoritarian social climate of the South, being forced to submit to restrictive anti-black mores, together with the relative paucity of direct outlets for reactive hostility toward white authority—all of these factors may logically lead to identification with the white aggressor. Hence, it seems reasonable to hold that this reaction, in large measure, resulted in the South black attaining a lower prejudice score than did the non-South black. Considering the nature of the cultural orientations of the subjects, it is not surprising that the non-South reared and schooled white emerged as the most tolerant of all the subjects.

With reference to cross-racial contact, the stratification variable Atlanta University cross-racial contact \( p < .008 \) proved very significant in accounting for differences in degrees of prejudice exhibited by the study subjects. The subjects who participated in a high degree of cross-racial contact while employed at the University evinced reliably more favorable racial attitudes than those who reported having only limited contacts with members of the other race. It would appear that the negative statistical association discerned between prejudiced attitudes and degrees of University intergroup contact lends credence to the assumption that intergroup contact lessens prejudiced attitudes
toward the "outgroup."

These results converge with, among others, the findings of the following investigators:

1. Sheatsley (1966) analyzed the NORC surveys and found that Southern whites whose children had attended school with blacks held significantly greater pro-integrationist attitudes than those whose children had never attended school with blacks.

2. Campbell (1958) studied before-after attitude changes of 746 white high school students toward blacks and disclosed that more favorable attitudes toward blacks was a function of classroom contact and friendship with blacks.

3. Smith (1943) found a substantial increase in favorable attitudes toward blacks among Columbia Teachers College students who spent two weekends on guided tours of Harlem.

4. Deutsch and Collins (1951) and Wilner, Walkley and Cook (1952) studied residential contact between different ethnic groups and found that whites who lived near and had more contacts with blacks held markedly more positive attitudes toward blacks than did those who lived far from and had little or no contact with blacks.

Noteworthy, studies abound in the literature which have shown that contact between ethnic groups may lead to increase or decrease in inter-group prejudice (Harding, Proshansky, & Chein 1969). According to Vander Zanden (1972, pp. 468-69), scholarship in the field of race relations has distinguished the conditions of contact which appear to provide for decreased racial prejudice among blacks and whites as:

1. The contact takes place between status equals.

2. The behavior of the objects of prejudice is at variance or does not conform with the beliefs of the prejudiced individual.

3. The contact is of sufficient duration and intimacy to sufficiently challenge the stereotypes of the prejudiced individual.
4. The prevailing social norms dictate that prejudiced attitudes and behavior are inappropriate.

5. The members of the differing racial groups within the contact situation have a common interest, goal, or task that is the focus of the interaction.

6. The individuals involved are personally secure and have low aggressive needs.

As these very factors seem to be highly indicative of the study group, it is reasoned that their synergistic operation consummated the differential effect of pre-Atlanta University cross-racial contact on the subjects' SAS scores.

Findings (Hypothesis 3), Statistically Significant.—A statistically significant difference occurred in the before and after Atlanta University cross-racial contacts experienced by the black faculty members (p<.033) and by the white faculty members (p<.001). The black group experienced a significant decline in contacts with whites after gaining employment at the University; conversely, the white group experienced a highly significant increase in contacts with blacks after securing employment at Atlanta University.

Reference to Table 3 (page 66) reveals that prior to beginning work at Atlanta University only 6.7 percent (2) of the whites had experienced a high degree of association with blacks; whereas, 35 percent (28) of the blacks manifested a high degree of association with whites. After commencing employment at the University a marked inversion in the contact rate for both groups transpired: 53.3 percent of the whites (16) experienced high association with blacks; whereas, only 21.2 percent (17) of the blacks experienced a high degree of contact with whites.

Conceivably the principal explanation for these findings is propinquity. Other things being equal, people are more likely to interact with those who are nearby. As the whites, prior to working at the University,
probably lived almost totally in an environment absent of blacks, their opportunities for cross-racial association were quite limited. On the other hand, the blacks may have lived and/or worked in a more integrated setting prior to joining the Atlanta University faculty by virtue of the fact that they constitute only 11.3 percent of the total resident population of the United States (U. S. Department of Commerce, 1974, p. 9).
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions. The statistical results of this investigation indicate these substantive conclusions:

1. Research on the attitudes of black and white faculty members working in an "inverse integration" university setting is necessary and valuable. The data from the 1974 sample of professors documented that no statistically significant differences existed in the racially prejudiced attitudes that black faculty members, as measured by the Anti-White Scale, harbored toward whites and white faculty members, as measured by the Anti-Black Scale, harbored toward blacks which were attributable to the main effects of race, sex, region reared, region secured undergraduate degree, region secured highest professional degree, formal race/ethnic relations education, highest degree earned, father's or guardian's occupation, religious service attendance, political party orientation, and pre-University cross-racial contact.

2. The interaction of race with sex, with age, with undergraduate school region, with formal race/ethnic relations education, with highest degree earned, with father's occupation, with religious service attendance, with political party orientation, and with pre-University cross-racial contact did not produce a statistically significant difference in the racially prejudiced attitudes of the study group.

3. The main effects of age, of years employed at Atlanta University, and of University cross-racial contact induced a differential effect in the racially prejudiced attitudes of the study group.

4. The interaction of race with region reared and of race with graduate school region induced a differential effect on the prejudiced attitudes of the study group.
5. Essentially, the greatest differences among the black and white faculty study group were age and University cross-racial contact: The average faculty member under 44 harbored significantly less tolerant racial attitudes than did the average faculty member over 44; and, the average limited University cross-racial contact faculty member held significantly less tolerant racial attitudes than did the average high University cross-racial contact faculty member. In addition, faculty members who had been employed the shortest interim at the University, who were reared in the South, and/or who received their highest professional degrees in the South, harbored less degrees of racial tolerance than did those who had been employed the longest interim at the University, who were reared in the non-South, and/or who received their highest professional degrees in the non-South region. Thus, the aforespecified stratification variables are concluded to be helpful in understanding prejudiced attitudes in a university faculty population.

**Implications.** The findings of this investigation would appear to warrant these implications:

1. A systematic study of racial attitudes and racial attitude changes of black and white faculty members in an "inverse integration" university setting may allay some of the adverse consequences that may be inherent in the process of integration. A knowledge or understanding of attitudes of persons toward each other may have considerable value toward the quality of interpersonal relations that exist between them.

2. It appears that belief similarity is the prime factor in accounting for the quality of interpersonal attitudes. With this knowledge, belief similarity should be considered in order to develop guidelines for an effective environment for fostering more positive racial attitudes. Some of the following activities may be attempted in order to develop more belief congruence in a positive direction: provide direct experiences with the attitude objects; increase one's insight into the reasons he holds certain attitudes; provide positive reinforcement for certain attitudes; and, provide an anxiety-reducing stimulus in the presence of the negative attitude object.

3. The study would have been materially enhanced if an additional technique of measurement, including observations of overt behavior, had been used in conjunction with the Social Attitude Questionnaire.

4. The University administrators must recognize that the total climate of the institution can seemingly have much influence
on a variety of faculty attitudes. It is evident from this study that university contact was more important than pre-university contact in influencing the positive social attitudes of faculty members.

5. Because university professors are mentors of America's future adults and leaders, they hold crucial roles in assisting their students to establish appropriate patterns of interracial behavior—i.e., behavior functional of racial attitudes characterized by feelings of human-heartedness, rationality, and justice toward members of another race. New students on the integrated university campus are likely to seek patterns of approved and expected interracial behavior when these patterns are not clear. These ego-relevant ambiguities lend themselves to structuring by readily available influence agents. It is in this respect that professors (as potential influence agents in integration) both as formal, institutionally accepted leaders, and, as individual participants whose attitudes have subtle impact on the total academic climate, directly (knowingly or unknowingly) influence students' responses to the experiences of an integrated education. Consequently, the quality of the professor's racial attitudes affect the quality of the learning environment, for better or for worse.

6. It appears that attitudes of different racial groups in an "inverse integration" setting may have implications for which educational administrators have exhibited little interest. The limited research which has been done has emphasized the importance in the development and alterations of attitude patterns of students with no systematic attention given to mentors of students in the "inverse integration" university setting. Given this knowledge the institution will hopefully provide systematic experiences in which both races, on the student and faculty levels, can gain appreciation of one another as equals.

Recommendations for Further Research. The following recommendations are advanced:

1. The results of the present study indicate the need for further research with the attitude questionnaire measuring attitudes of blacks and whites toward each other. Item analysis might introduce further refinement of the questionnaire thereby reducing misinterpretation.

2. The present study was delimited to an investigation of present attitudes. A replication of this study, using better equated groups, conducted over a three- to four-year period appears to be beneficial. Annual assessment of the attitudes would be helpful in terms of making comparisons as the percentage of whites increases in previously predominantly black colleges. Gottliev and Ten Houten
(1965) pointed out that as one varies the racial composition of a given group, while holding other relevant factors (e.g., social class, educational obtainment, etc.) fairly constant, one would expect definite changes in intra- and interracial interaction patterns. In an already established social system of black or white faculty members, the incoming group will enter first into those activities which call for a minimum of social or unstructured contact between the races.

3. A replication of this study allowing the involvement of all participants in the learning environment—faculty, students, and administrators—should provide a more comprehensive view of the dynamics of racial prejudice.

4. Further research may determine whether there are differences between faculty members who have had serious attitudinal convictions and have internalized them and those in whom the influence is external.

5. Validity and reliability studies of the social attitudes of blacks and whites toward each other in an "inverse integration" setting must be undertaken. Most work in this area has been focused on attitudes of whites toward blacks.

6. Differential staff development programs should be provided to enhance the social attitudes of the faculty members, as the younger professors appear to require systematic training designed to appeal to individuals having more hostile racial attitudes than do the older faculty members. Perhaps all new faculty members might be provided a series of orientation experiences designed to meet their unique needs relative to enhancing their racial attitudes.
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APPENDIX A

SOCIAL ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE
APPENDIX B

Follow-up Letters
Dear Research-Study Recipient:

As my Social Attitude Questionnaire of September 8th may not have reached you, I am sending you a second copy. A reply by October 23rd would ensure the success of my research study; for, it is through your contribution of unique responses that I will be able to develop a dissertation which will help to provide a cognitive map for enhancing the quality of life at Atlanta University and for guiding man's perceptions and action toward a clearer appreciation of humanity.

The pretesting of the survey instrument indicated that the average time required for completing it was 18½ minutes.

Further, to develop the attitudinal propositions comprising part two of this questionnaire, Dr. George A. Steckler used 449 subjects from Northern and Southern colleges and universities. Thirty-nine of his subjects were Atlanta University students. In 1967 Dr. Marvin E. Shaw and Dr. Jack M. Wright, professors of psychology at the University of Florida, reported in their book, Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes, that Steckler's propositions were characterized by a high degree of content validity. Also, in 1970 William M. Banks reported that he used Steckler's statements in his attitudinal study and secured high odd-even reliability coefficients of .88 and .90.

As the successful completion of my research study heavily depends on your input, your participation will be deeply appreciated.

I wish also to reassure you that all responses will be highly confidential. YOUR HELP IS NEEDED!!

Most sincerely,

Gloria S. Tuckfield
Dear Research-Study Recipient:

Since extenuating circumstances may have prevented your responding to the Social Attitude Questionnaire which I mailed to you on September 8th and again on October 11th, I am sending you a third copy hoping that your assistance will be forthcoming; as, my academic career at Atlanta University has always been characterized by generous support from its community of scholars.

Presently I am encountering an impasse at the most critical step of the dissertation process, the data collection phase. By kindly contributing a few minutes to complete the survey instrument, you will provide data vital to the success of this investigation. To dispel any reservations you may have regarding anonymity, feel free to cut your code number off the questionnaire and drop it in a mailbox.

If, for personal or other reasons, you are unable to return the completed questionnaire within ten days, please check one of the statements below and return this letter in the postage-paid reply envelope. I shall then fly to Atlanta to conduct a personal interview with you.

[ ] You may arrange an office interview with me on Thursday, November 21, 1974.
[ ] You may arrange an office interview with me on Friday, November 22, 1974.
[ ] You may arrange an office interview with me on Saturday, November 23, 1974.
[ ] You may arrange an office interview with me on Monday, November 25, 1974.

As the implementation of the other phases of my research is predicted on your input of responses, your participation is truly needed.

Most sincerely,

Gloria Tuckfield
APPENDIX C

Summary of Attitude Responses of White Faculty Members as Measured by the Anti-Black Scale
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>DVM</th>
<th>DPM</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>APM</th>
<th>AVM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A large part of the problems facing blacks today are caused by</td>
<td>-0.833</td>
<td>2.086</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blacks themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would rather not marry a person who has very kinky hair, wide</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
<td>2.285</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nostrils, and thick lips.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The lower-class black is to blame for a lot of anti-black prejudice.</td>
<td>-0.867</td>
<td>2.240</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Whites and blacks can get along on jobs until too many blacks try</td>
<td>-1.900</td>
<td>1.709</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to push themselves in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. One big reason why racial prejudice is still so strong is that</td>
<td>-1.567</td>
<td>1.832</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blacks offend people by being so sensitive about racial matters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. One important reason why blacks are discriminated against in</td>
<td>-1.633</td>
<td>1.564</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing is that they don't keep up the property.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. One reason why racial prejudice still exists today is the fact</td>
<td>-2.167</td>
<td>1.392</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that many blacks are dirty, loud, and generally offensive in their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. One trouble with blacks is that they are even more jealous of each other’s success than are whites.

9. Too many blacks have abused the privilege of attending baseball games by being rowdy, noisy, and cheering only for the black ballplayers.

10. Segregation and jimmie will never end unless the average black person becomes better educated and better mannered.

11. Black people can hardly be expected to gain social equality until many more of them exert some effort to better themselves and live more decently.

12. With all of the drinking, cutting, and other immoral acts of some blacks, white people are almost justified for being prejudiced.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>DVM</th>
<th>DPM</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>APM</th>
<th>AVM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Too many blacks, when they get a little money, spend it all on whiskey, flashy cars, or expensive clothes.</td>
<td>-1.667</td>
<td>1.516</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>One is almost ashamed to be a black person when he sees so many of them who look and act like cotton pickers fresh from the fields.</td>
<td>-2.367</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>A great many blacks become officious, overbearing, and disagreeable when given positions of responsibility and authority.</td>
<td>-2.033</td>
<td>1.377</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Blacks would solve many of their social problems if so many of them were not irresponsible, lazy, and ignorant.</td>
<td>-2.167</td>
<td>1.074</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a standard deviation, b disagree very much, c disagree pretty much, d disagree a little, e agree a little, f agree pretty much, g agree very much.
APPENDIX D

Summary of Attitude Responses of Black Faculty Members as Measured by the Anti-White Scale
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>DVM</th>
<th>DPM</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>APM</th>
<th>AVM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. There is nothing lower than white trash.</td>
<td>-0.912</td>
<td>2.194</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. White people may be all right, but they carry it too far when they try to butt into the affairs of black people and go around with black women</td>
<td>-2.225</td>
<td>1.728</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The whites have shown by their actions that they are naturally immoral, vicious, and untrustworthy.</td>
<td>-1.612</td>
<td>1.978</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. No matter how nicely they treat a colored person, white people don't really mean it.</td>
<td>-1.375</td>
<td>2.166</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. It is usually a mistake to trust a white person.</td>
<td>-2.238</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Any black who marries a white is a traitor to his people.</td>
<td>-1.987</td>
<td>1.650</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. There may be a few exceptions, but white musicians and athletes are definitely inferior to black musicians and athletes.</td>
<td>-2.225</td>
<td>1.622</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>DVM</td>
<td>DPM</td>
<td>DL</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>APM</td>
<td>AVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>White people are only friendly to blacks when they want something out of them.</td>
<td>-0.938</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Most whites are always looking for ways to cheat and steal from blacks.</td>
<td>-2.125</td>
<td>1.649</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Blacks can expect no real help from whites in their fight against racial discrimination.</td>
<td>-2.500</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>The black race has been pushed around long enough; it's about time that whites were made to get out of the black community.</td>
<td>-1.587</td>
<td>2.017</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>If there is a heaven, it is hard to imagine that there are many white people up there.</td>
<td>-2.375</td>
<td>1.487</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Although the white man now rules the world, it will be a happy day when the tables are turned and black people become the rulers.</td>
<td>-1.337</td>
<td>2.122</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>The world might be a better place if there were fewer white people.</td>
<td>-2.425</td>
<td>1.385</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>DVM</th>
<th>DPM</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>APM</th>
<th>AVM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. When the bible says, &quot;The bottom shall rise to the top,&quot; it gives hope that the black people will someday give the orders in this country instead of whites.</td>
<td>-1.237</td>
<td>2.020</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. It may be wrong to damn all whites, but it's plain that whites have all the money and power, and that they look down on anyone who is black.</td>
<td>-2.325</td>
<td>1.329</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#33. There are many whites who are not prejudiced and who sincerely believe that blacks are equal.</td>
<td>-1.225</td>
<td>2.164</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. When it comes to such things as sports, dancing, music and love making, the white man is not as talented as the black.</td>
<td>-1.450</td>
<td>1.909</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This proposition is positive and thus is phrased in a direction opposite to the trend of the scale.
APPENDIX E

Summary of Contact Responses of Black and White Faculty Members as Measured by the Cross-Racial Contact Scales
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people where I shop and trade are</td>
<td>B2.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W4.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The neighborhood in which I live is</td>
<td>B3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The place of religious worship which I attend</td>
<td>B4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my personal life, the people who attend most of social affairs I</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attend (as club meetings, meetings of organizations other than my</td>
<td>B4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional organizations, parties, and so forth) are</td>
<td>W4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My three closest personal friends with whom I can say what I really</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>think are</td>
<td>B4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W4.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My closest personal friends with whom I can talk over confidential</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matters are</td>
<td>B4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W4.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p^a</td>
<td>A^b</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The people whose homes I visit most frequently are</td>
<td>B4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The people who I entertain most frequently are</td>
<td>B4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The persons (person) whom I date and/or am amorous toward are</td>
<td>B4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aPrior to working at Atlanta University.

^bAfter beginning work at Atlanta University.
APPENDIX F

Formula to reconvert T-Score Units to 7-Point Social Attitude Scale: Anti-Black/Anti-White Score Units
FORMULA TO RECONVERT T-SCORE UNITS TO 7-POINT SOCIAL ATTITUDE SCALE: ANTI-BLACK/ANTI-WHITE SCORE UNITS

\[ SE^a = \frac{(T^b - 50)}{10} \times SD^c + M^d \]

\(^a\)Score equivalent in terms of the 7-point scale units described in the scoring subsection of Chapter 111.

\(^b\)T-score mean of the relevant group.

\(^c\)Standard deviation of the appropriate racial group: black group, 25.37; white group, 16.65.

\(^d\)Mean of the appropriate racial group: black group, 45.71; white group, 37.37.

\(^e\)Number of items comprising the appropriate Social Attitude Scale: Anti-Black Scale, 16; Anti-White Scale, 18.
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INDICATORS OF RACIAL PREJUDICE AMONG BLACK AND WHITE FACULTY MEMBERS IN AN "INVERSE INTEGRATION" UNIVERSITY SETTING

BY

GLORIA SMITH TUCKFIELD

An ex post facto study was conducted to (1) assess the racially prejudiced attitudes black and white faculty members working in an "inverse integration" university setting harbored toward the opposite race and to (2) examine the variances in these attitudes with reference to selected demographic and social-psychological stratification variables. These null hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no statistically significant difference between the racially prejudiced attitudes held by black faculty members, as measured by their scores on the Anti-White Scale, and the racially prejudiced attitudes held by white faculty members, as measured by their scores on the Anti-Black Scale.

2. There are no statistically significant differences between the prejudiced scores of the black and white faculty members, as measured by the Anti-White Scale and the Anti-Black Scale, respectively, when these scores are stratified by sex, age, region reared, undergraduate school region, graduate school region, employed years at Atlanta University, formal race/ethnic relations education, highest degree earned, father's or guardian's occupation, religious service attendance per month, political party orientation, pre-Atlanta University cross-racial contact, and Atlanta University cross-racial contact.
3. There are no statistically significant differences in the cross-racial contacts, as measured by the Cross-Racial Contact Scale, experienced by the black faculty members and the white faculty members before securing employment at Atlanta University and the cross-racial contacts experienced by the black faculty members and white faculty members after securing employment at Atlanta University.

One hundred ten full-time black and white faculty members, who worked at Atlanta University during 1973-1974, completed a 68-item Social Attitude Questionnaire. The survey instrument was comprised of 16 factual items designed to elicit ideographic information for stratifying the obtained sample; Steckler's 34-item Social Attitude Scale: Anti-Black/Anti-White (SAS: A-B/A-W) and, two 9-item cross-racial contact scales. Essentially, analysis of variance procedures were applied to questionnaire responses to test for significance of differences among means on each of the three major hypotheses. The criterion of statistical significance was the .05 level. The reliability, Coefficient Alpha was determined for the SAS: A-B/A-W (.897 and .941, respectively) and the Pre- and Atlanta University Cross-Racial Contact Scales (black .813, white .772; black .769, white .849) by the computer program, TD.

Faculty responses were stratified by race. Frequencies and percentages were derived to ascertain each racial group's responses to each questionnaire item of pertinence to the group. The SAS: A-B and A-W raw attitude scores and their corresponding T-scores were generated for the white and black subjects, respectively. Cross-racial contact quotients were derived.

While stratified according to race, the black and white groups' mean responses to the subscales SAS: A-W and A-B, respectively, were assessed for significant differences among means. Further, responses
of the subjects were stratified according to the aforespecified independent variables; and, group means on all variables were subjected to analysis of variance procedures.

1. There was no statistically significant difference in the racially prejudiced attitudes that the black faculty members harbored toward whites and the white faculty members harbored toward blacks ($p < .292$). Equivalently, the quality of racial attitudes that the black and white faculty members harbored toward each other was the same.

2. The main effect of age ($p < .001$), of years employed at the University ($p < .036$), and of University cross-racial contact ($p < .008$), produced statistically significant differences in the prejudiced attitudes of the study group. Further, the race-by-region reared interaction ($p < .019$), and the interaction between race and region of graduate school secured highest professional degree ($p < .014$), induced differential effects on the prejudiced attitudes of the study group.

3. The stratification variable, Atlanta University cross-racial contact (black $p < .033$; white $p < .001$), proved very significant in accounting for differences in degrees of prejudice exhibited by the study subjects. Subjects who participated in high degrees of cross-racial contact at the University evinced reliably more favorable racial attitudes than those who reported only limited contacts with the opposite race.