

EFFECTS OF GEOGRAPHICAL UPBRINGING AND INTERGROUP CONTACT ON
RACIAL ATTITUDES

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT NEW PALTZ
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MENTAL HEALTH COUNSELING

By:

Janine M Prisco

December 2008

Notice: Signature Page Not Included

This thesis has been signed and approved by the appropriate parties.

The signature page has been removed from this digital version for privacy reasons.

The signature page is maintained as part of the official version of the thesis in print that is kept in Special Collections of Sojourner Truth Library at SUNY New Paltz.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people who have assisted and supported me through this extensive and enlightening process. First and foremost, I would like to thank my parents for allowing me all the opportunities to get to where I am today. Their continued support and motivating ways have been my fuel to accomplish my goals and always look forward. Without them, I am sure I would not be where I am today. I need to pay special recognition to my advisor, Dr. Melanie Hill, who has devoted much of her time, energy and expertise in making this thesis come together. Her devotion to my success and her honesty and commitment to this work rises above that of an advisor and for that, the thanks are infinite. Special thanks also are in order for my readers, Dr. Glenn Geher and Dr. Jonathan Rust, who have shown extreme flexibility and a genuine interest for the duration of this process. I would also like to recognize all of my co-workers who have continuously encouraged and supported me, especially my boss, Dr. Sudi Kash, who has consistently offered insight, advice and respite throughout this process and my friend and colleague, Michael Camargo who was always willing to lend a helping hand. Last but not least, I would like to offer much thanks to all of my friends and family members who have stood by me and offered continuous encouragement and support. Thank you all for all you do!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Acknowledgements.....	iii
II. Abstract.....	vi
III. Introduction.....	1
Race and Racism.....	2
Out-group Contact.....	3
Urban and Rural.....	7
Summary and Hypotheses.....	10
IV. Method.....	11
Participants.....	11
Procedure.....	12
Materials.....	12
V. Results.....	18
Quantity of Contact.....	18
Quality of Contact.....	19
Area of Upbringing.....	22
VI. Discussion.....	23
Caucasian Attitudes.....	23
African American Attitudes.....	25
Area of Upbringing.....	26
Summary, Limitation, and Future Research.....	28

VII. References.....	31
VIII. Tables.....	34
IX. Appendices.....	38

ABSTRACT

The repercussions of racism can range from ignorance and neglect to injury and even death. Ways to decrease attitudes of racism have been debated for centuries, resulting in various theories. The contact hypothesis, a half-century old idea, states that increased intergroup contact can decrease negative attitudes. Research has also found the quality of contact between racial groups plays an important role in increasing positive racial attitudes. The current study tests this theory and further theorizes that individuals from rural environments will report greater racism than individuals from urban environments. African American (n=57) and Caucasian (n=176) participants were asked about where they grew up (to assess urban/rural status), quantity and quality of contact with the racial out-group growing up, and their current racial attitudes. Overall, results suggest that the roles of quantity and quality of contacts are significant factors in predicting interracial prejudice, while area of upbringing was not.

The reality of racism has deep historical roots that date back hundreds of years. Racism, as defined by the Oxford Dictionary of Psychology (2001), is “a belief that races are inherently different from one another and that people’s characteristics and capacities are determined largely by race, usually accompanied by a belief in the intrinsic superiority of one’s particular race over another or others” (p. 612). It can include daily experiences of discrimination, racial segregation, and domination (Jones, 1997). It can be subtle or blatant and has real psychological consequences for those involved. The Department of Justice (2006) reported that of the 8,380 hate crimes documented, more than half were racially motivated. For example, in 1999, Amadou Diallo was shot 19 times and killed by Caucasian police officers because his wallet was mistaken for a gun (Diallo Legacy, 1999).

The goal of the current study was to explore the correlates of racial prejudice. More specifically, this study explored whether current racial attitudes were related to the amount and quality of contact between two racial groups (African American and Caucasian). This study also examined the relationship between an individual’s geographical upbringing (urban/rural) on his or her racial attitudes.

Race and Racism

While the concept of race has no biological basis, it has been ascribed social meaning in terms of an individual’s identity and intergroup relationships (Atkinson, 2004). From a social perspective, race is defined as “any people who are distinguished or consider themselves distinguished, in social relations with other peoples, by physical characteristics” (Cox, 1948, p. 318). As Helms and Talleyrand (1997) further argue, “people are treated or studied as though they belong to biologically defined groups on the basis of [racial] characteristics” (p. 1247). Racial categorization plays a significant role in the United States as individuals are often separated into out-groups and in-groups

based on appearance and phenotypic characteristics (Atkinson, 2004). This placement of individuals into designated groups can open the door for discrimination, racism, and stereotyping.

Due to its vast impact on society, many studies have been conducted with the aim of identifying the underlying correlates of racial attitudes, which Jones (1997) defines as “how one categorizes a racial group or a member of a racial group along an evaluative dimension of positivity-negativity” (p. 150). For example, research has found that racial prejudice is related to many variables including, but not limited to, incorrect out-group perceptions (Rokeach, Smith, & Evans, 1960), level of self-esteem (Branscombe, Schmitt & Harvey, 1999), and past experiences with the out-group population (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005).

To further uncover potential correlates of an individual’s racial out-group prejudice, the current study explored the relationship between (1) the amount of contact with members of a racial out-group, (2) the quality of contact with members of a racial out-group, and (3) whether an individual was raised in an urban versus rural environment. This study explores these variables in African American and Caucasian samples.

Contact with the out-group

The effects of intergroup contact and the contact hypothesis date back more than 60 years. While it was originally proposed by William (1947, as cited in Amir, 1969) and Rose (1948, as cited in Amir, 1969), Allport (1954) and Amir are best known for the development and enhancement of this theory. The contact hypothesis states that increased contact between groups can replace ignorance, disconfirm stereotypes and improve intergroup attitudes (Allport, 1954; Lee, Link, & Farrell, 2004). It is believed that if individuals interact and communicate with one another, they will gain a better understanding and appreciation of other’s way of life (Amir, 1969), as well as a

realization of equality between groups (Ihlanfeldt & Scafidi, 2002), subsequently reducing negative attitudes. Based on this theory, the current study hypothesized that more contact between African Americans and Caucasians would correspond to less negative racial attitudes.

When contact occurs between two groups, there is often a change in attitude (Amir, 1969). A positive attitude can change to a negative attitude, a negative attitude can become a positive attitude, or the contact can simply strengthen an already established attitude (Amir, 1969). However, increased contact alone may not be sufficient enough to change an attitude or perception. For instance, if an African American individual has daily contact with his or her Caucasian bus driver or greets the same Caucasian individual at the gym everyday, it is unlikely that racial prejudice will decrease solely based on these interactions. Many researchers agree that certain conditions must be in place for inter-group contact to have a positive consequence (Allport, 1954; Amir, 1969; Pettigrew, 1997). Allport's (1954) original list of conditions were: (1) contact needs to be between individuals of *equal status*; (2) contact needs to be *intimate* versus *casual*; (3) contact needs to be *supported* by the individual's community; and (4) both groups need to be interdependent and share or develop a *common, cooperative goal*. Amir tested these conditions and found them to be favorable in the reduction of prejudice. Amir also found that contact needed to be perceived as *pleasant and rewarding* to be conducive to prejudice reduction. If any of these factors are not in place, the results of the contact may not result in a decrease of prejudicial beliefs and may in fact strengthen negative attitudes (Amir, 1969).

Equal status can refer to equality in terms of socioeconomic status, education, employment, or society roles, amongst other variables. Although in the many studies where equal status characteristics were tested (Brophy, 1945, Mannheimer & Williams,

1949, MacKenzie, 1948, as cited in Amir, 1969), it was not general status that affected racist attitudes but specific factors that were relevant to the contact situation that enabled change (Amir, 1969). For example, in a study regarding African American and Caucasian soldiers, financial status and education level did not affect attitudes toward segregation of platoons but rank and performance during combat were the only determining factors (Mannheimer & Williams, 1949, as cited in Amir, 1969).

Intimate contact refers to close relationships and frequent face-to-face contact, eventually resulting in a friendship, while *casual contact* is considered superficial and shallow (Amir, 1969). Amir states that *support* of intergroup contact may come from family, community members, laws, or any institution that is considered important to the individuals involved in the contact. *Common, cooperative goals* involve the level of cooperation and assistance, shared concerns, and/or mutual interdependence during contact. If an individual becomes competitive during the development and/or process of reaching common goals, a decrease in negative racial attitudes is unlikely to occur.

Past research has supported the contact hypothesis, finding that if the above conditions are met, an individual's negative racial attitudes can be reduced. On the other hand, if any of the conditions are compromised, the interaction may not result in a positive change of attitude or may even cause an increase in negative attitudes. In a study conducted by Plant and Devine (2003), the quantity and quality of Caucasian participants' previous contact with African American individuals was assessed, along with anxiety resulting from these interactions. Caucasian participants who lacked positive contact with African American individuals reported unclear guidelines on how an interracial interaction should occur, therefore resulting in "heightened hostility towards out-group members and a desire to avoid interacting with out-group members" (Plant & Devine, 2003, p. 790). However, participants who reported prior positive

intergroup contact reported less anxiety and more positive outcome expectancies in regards to future interactions with African American individuals (Plant & Devine, 2003).

Berryman-Fink (2006) conducted an experiment with college students and found that the reduction of racial prejudice, as well as prejudice based on gender and sexual orientation, was significantly associated with Amir's (1969) five variables. Based on these findings, the current study hypothesized that individuals who have had contact with the racial out-group (while growing up) that was perceived to occur (a) between equals, (b) was interpersonal, (c) was cooperative, (d) was rewarding, and (e) was positively sanctioned by institutions and social networks would report less prejudicial attitudes than those whose contact did not meet the one or more of the previously stated conditions.

Contact hypothesis; Is it Black and White?

For the most part, research on the contact hypothesis does not explore the possibility that it may not equally apply to Caucasians and African Americans, or other racial groups. DeMott (1998) suggested that the contact hypothesis may not be the universal answer to the reduction of prejudice due to a difference of stereotypic beliefs between groups. Each group possesses its own list of stereotypes, some more negative than others. The contact hypothesis focuses on generic intergroup contact, not specific group towards group contact, making it unknown if specific groups are affected differently (Sigelman & Welch, 1993). Therefore, quantity and quality of contact may affect racial attitudes differently for African American and Caucasians.

A study by McKinney (2006) found that Caucasian individuals who reported little or no interracial contact were more likely to express negative attitudes towards individuals of other racial groups than those who experienced intergroup contact more frequently. However, Powers and Ellison (1995) found that interracial contact did not result in more positive racial attitudes for African American participants towards

Caucasian individuals. A study by Sigelman and Welch (1993) tested the relationship between amount of contact and perception of hostility between racial groups. The majority of both African American and Caucasian participants reported having interracial friendships, although there was a significant difference in the way each group reported Black-White hostility. Although African American participants reported a higher amount of interracial friendships, they were more likely to perceive contact between groups as problematic. While in the Caucasian sample, a relationship was found between increased out-group contact and decreased perceptions of hostility between groups (Sigelman & Welch, 1993). These differing results may be due to the nature of each group's stereotypes and the ability to lift these stereotypes as a result of the interaction.

Many studies have tested the relationship between quantity of contact and racial attitudes, but few to date have focused on quality of contact in both White and non-White participants. A meta-analysis by Tropp and Pettigrew (2005) categorized the participants of 515 studies into two groups: minority and majority. The *minority* group indicated a "stigmatized, lower status group" while the term *majority* categorized "a dominant, higher status group" (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005, p. 3). It was found that: (1) minority/majority classification was a predictor of the effects of contact on racial prejudice, as the minority group reported a weaker relationship between contact and racial attitudes than the majority group, and (2) Allport's conditions for quality of contact predicted a strong relationship between contact and racial prejudice for majority group members but was not significant for minority group members. These results support the notion that differences may exist between groups and the contact hypothesis may not be universal for all groups.

Urban versus rural differences

The amount of contact an individual has with members of the out-group may be partially contingent upon the availability of the out-group population. The existence of racial heterogeneity in an area increases the chance of an interaction occurring between individuals of different races (Blau, 1977). However, a smaller, more intimate environment allows for closer, more supportive relationships. Urban and rural areas possess very different, yet unique qualities, which may affect the relationship between quantity and quality of contact and racial attitudes.

The United States Census Bureau (2000) defines an urban area as a densely settled area containing at least 50,000 people and having a population density of over 1,000 people per square mile. Rural areas have a lower population density and are more sparsely settled places, away from the influences of large cities (US Census Bureau, 2000). Urban environments tend to be culturally and ethnically diverse (Rabinowitz & Paynter, 2002) making contact between groups more accessible (Amato, 1993), while rural areas tend to have less ethnic diversity and smaller populations of people of color than urban areas (Merchant, Coussens, & Gilbert, 2006). According to the United States Department of Agriculture (2005), racial and ethnic minorities make up only 18.3% of rural environments.

For example, in the urban city of Brooklyn, New York, Caucasian individuals make up 41% of the population while in the rural town of Tivoli, New York, Caucasian individuals make up 95.7% of the population (Census, 2000). This consistent homogeneity limits intergroup contact and leaves room for individuals to use whatever information they have at their disposal, such as media or others' experiences, to generate opinions about the out-group (Sigelman & Welch, 1993). It can also leave individuals from these environments unsure of how their behavior will be perceived by racial out-

group members (Schlenker & Leary, 1982) leading to anxiety and further avoidance of out-group contact (Plant & Devine, 2003).

Racially mixed neighborhoods are likely to stimulate interracial friendships and promote interracial contacts in work, church, school, communities, and other activities (Jackman & Crane, 1986). Emerson, Kimbro, and Yancey (2002) found that those who experienced interracial contact in schools and neighborhoods were more likely to have interracial friendships as adults, as well as attend interracial churches and be interracially married. These results suggest that interracial experiences as children can have an effect on racial beliefs and attitudes as adults. The interracial experiences, or lack thereof, can be significantly influenced by a person's environment. Therefore, it is hypothesized that the area (rural/urban) in which a person is raised can influence his or her current racial attitudes due to the amount of contact and the quality of the contact one has with the out-group. More specifically, this study hypothesized that individuals from urban areas will report less negative racial attitudes than individuals from rural environments.

While urban areas may be heterogeneous, therefore increasing the opportunity for quantity of intergroup contact, the social disorganization theory (Alexander, 1973) suggests that people from larger cities experience less quality in interpersonal relationships than those from smaller towns, possibly due to the superficiality of interactions in such environments as well as a general mistrust of community members due to high crime rates (Amato, 1993). These conditions of contact may not be conducive to decreasing prejudicial attitudes based on the conditions of the contact hypothesis. People from larger cities have contact with many different people everyday making it difficult to develop close, rewarding relationships. Levels of social integration and support tend to be higher in smaller areas (House, Umberson, & Landis, 1988)

making it more likely those individuals from rural areas will have more cooperative and rewarding interactions than individuals from urban areas.

The aforementioned research demonstrates the differences that exist between urban and rural environments. Urban environments are generally larger in population and diversity, resulting in the assumption of more interracial contact in general. Rural environments are smaller and more intimate allowing for more supportive and high quality relationships. The current study will explore these qualities and assess if there is a difference in racial attitudes between individuals who were raised in an urban environment as compared to a rural environment. It is hypothesized that individuals from rural environments will report more negative racial attitudes when compared to individuals who spent most of their time in urban areas.

Current Study

Past research has investigated the influence of quantity and quality of contact on the levels of racial attitudes, but only a minimal amount of research has been conducted on African American participants and little research has examined the role of an urban versus rural upbringing. The current study explored these relationships in a sample comprised of both African Americans and Caucasians and hypothesized:

H1: Higher frequency of intergroup contact growing up would be related to less racially biased attitudes.

H2: Higher quality of intergroup contact growing up would be related to less racially biased attitudes.

H3: Individuals from urban environments would have greater quantity and quality of intergroup contact and would report less racially biased attitudes than individuals from rural environments.

METHOD

Participants

A total of 233 individuals participated in this study, (176 Caucasian and 57 African American). The Caucasian participants consisted of 141 (80.1%) females and 35 (19.9%) males. The age breakdown of the Caucasian participants consisted of 78.4% between the ages of 18-24 (n=138), 11.9% between the ages of 25-31 (n= 21), 2.8% between the ages of 32-38 (n=5), 2.8% between the ages of 39-45 (n=5), 1.7% between the ages of 46-51 (n=3), 1.7% between the ages of 51-59 (n=3), and .6% (n=1) were over the age of 60.

Of the 57 African American participants, 59.6% were between the ages of 18-24 (n=34), 28.1% between the ages of 25-31 (n=16), 5.3% between the ages of 32-38 (n=3), 3.5% between the ages of 39-45 (n=2), 1.8% between the ages of 46-51 (n=1), and 1.8% of the participants were between the ages of 51-59 (n=1). African American females accounted for 75.4% (n=43) of the participants while the remaining 24.6% of the participants were male (n=14).

Of the 176 Caucasian participants, 38.1% were from areas categorized as rural (n=67) while the other 61.9% were from areas categorized as urban (n=109). The African American participants in this study were primarily from urban areas (86%, n=49), with only 14% (n=8) from rural areas.

Procedure

Participants were recruited through an all campus email sent to the students of SUNY New Paltz. Subject pool credit was given to those who qualified. Participants were also asked to forward the request for participation to others in an effort to increase the diversity of the sample. Data was gathered on-line using Survey Monkey, a secure on-line data collection site. If a participant identified his or her race as “White,” they

were directed to a version of the survey for White participants. If participants identified as any other race, they were directed to a survey for non-White participants, although only African American participants were included in the study. All participants were given general information describing the content and purpose of the survey and were informed of their right to discontinue the study if any feelings of discomfort arose.

Materials

Participants were asked to complete a questionnaire which included a demographics section requesting each participant's gender, age, racial background, and zip code of where the participant grew up (see Appendix A). Zip codes were used to categorize each individual's geographical location as urban or rural using *Am I Rural*, an online assessment tool created by the Rural Assistance Center (<http://www.raonline.org/funding/rural.php>) which determines whether a specific location is considered rural or urban based on various definitions, including but not limited to population, distance from urbanized area, and availability of health care. Scales generated for the purpose of this study were used to assess self-reported quantity and quality of contact between African American and Caucasian individuals growing up. To assess racial attitudes, African American participants were given the Johnson-Lecci Scale while Caucasian participants were given the Modern Racism Scale and the Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale. Two scales were used for the Caucasian sample for a variety of reasons. First, while the Modern Racism Scale (MRS) has frequently been used in research and has been found to be a valid tool for assessing the Caucasian's racial attitudes, much of the research utilizing this scale is dated. In addition, the MRS contains a limited number of statements (7) that asking about more blatant forms of prejudice. While not utilized as extensively, the Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale is a more up-to-

date scale and consists of a greater number and variability of items. Therefore, both scales were used for the purposes of cross-validation.

Quantity of Contact Scale. Amount of contact was measured using an eight-question scale created for the purpose of this study. The questions and statements were developed in correspondence to Allport's contact hypothesis (1954). This scale was used to assess past contact, which was referred to as "while growing up" or "where you spent the majority of your time growing up." The same items were used for both Caucasian and African American participants with slight rewording of the questions to represent appropriate out-groups.

The items were separated into two subscales: racial composition and amount of contact. Items in the *racial composition* subscale asked participants to rate the racial structure of his or her neighborhood, school and close friends using a five-point rating system. For the Caucasian participants, "1" corresponded to "All White" and "5" represented "All Black." In the African American population, "1" corresponded to "All Black" and "5" represented "All White" (See Appendices B and F). Higher scores on this scale indicated a larger amount of African American individuals in the Caucasian population's geographical area and vice-versa. Racial composition was conceptualized as a supporting variable to quantity of contact. Based on sheer probability, the availability of out-group members is likely affect the possibility of contact between individuals of different races. Cronbach's alpha for the racial composition subscale for the African American population was .83 while the alpha for Caucasian participants was .80.

The *amount of contact* subscale consisted of five statements. Each statement began with "*While growing up, I tended to...*" The first three statements addressed association with out-group members in participant's neighborhood, school, and circle of

friends. The remaining two statements assessed personal contact and interaction with out-group members. Statements were rated using a 4-point Likert scale (1=not applicable, 4=a great deal). Cronbach's alpha in the Caucasian population was .90 and in the African American population $\alpha=.88$ (see Appendices B and F).

Quality of Contact Scale. Quality of contact was measured for both African American and Caucasian participants using a 20-question scale also created for the purpose of this study. The statements for this scale were developed using Amir's (1969) five variables of quality (equal status, close, pleasant, cooperative and supported) in relation to general contact, contact at school, contact in his/her neighborhood, and close friends. The statements were assessed using a 6-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree, 0=Not Applicable). Along with the Quantity of Contact Scale, this scale asked questions to assess past quality of contact with the opposite race, assuming that more time spent in an environment, especially during developmental years, would have a stronger influence on an individual's racial attitudes than current interactions. Alphas for this scale for the African American population were: equal status ($\alpha=.82$), closeness ($\alpha=.82$), rewarding ($\alpha=.81$), cooperative ($\alpha=.79$), and supportive ($\alpha=.88$). Alphas for the Caucasian population were: equal status ($\alpha=.76$), closeness ($\alpha=.79$), rewarding ($\alpha=.77$), cooperative ($\alpha=.78$), and supportive ($\alpha=.77$) (see Appendices C and G).

Johnson-Lecci Scale. The Johnson-Lecci Scale (JLS) is a 20-question self-report survey measuring anti-White attitudes held among Black individuals (Johnson & Lecci, 2003). The questions are assessed using a five point Likert scale (1=Strongly Agree, 5=Strongly Disagree) with higher scores reflecting a higher level of anti-White attitudes. There are four subscales associated with this instrument: (1) In-group directed stigmatism and discriminatory expectations (e.g., *I believe that most Whites really do support the*

ideas and thoughts of racist political groups); (2) out-group directed negative beliefs (e.g., *I believe that the success of a White person is due to their color*); (3) negative views towards in-group-out-group relations (e.g., *I have referred to mixed couples as “sell-outs”*); and (4) negative verbal expression toward the out-group (e.g., *I have insulted a White person*) (Johnson & Lecci, 2003; Johnson, Lecci & Swim, 2006) (see Appendix H).

According to Johnson and Lecci (2003), the correlations among the subscales range from .42 to .62, indicating that no two subscales share more than 36% of their variance. Johnson and Lecci also report average to strong internal reliability for each of the five subscales: In-group directed stigmatism and discriminatory expectations: $\alpha=.89$, out-group directed negative beliefs: $\alpha=.61$, negative views towards in-group-out-group relations: $\alpha=.65$, and negative verbal expression toward the out-group: $\alpha=.79$. The average Cronbach's alpha of the subscales is .74 with a test-retest coefficient of .80 (Johnson & Lecci, 2003). The reliability coefficient of the total scale for the current African American sample was .92.

McConahay's Modern Racism Scale. The Modern Racism Scale (MRS) is a self-report scale designed to measure a dimension of the cognitive component of racial attitudes, requiring participants to agree or disagree with a set of beliefs that Caucasian individuals may have about African American individuals (McConahay, 1986) (see Appendix D). According to McConahay, cognitive belief systems are influenced by the affective component of attitudes toward African Americans, an individual's beliefs and values, and by the historical context specific to racism. This scale consists of seven items with responses ranging from one (strongly agree) to five (strongly disagree) and include questions such as “Black individuals should not push themselves where they are not wanted” and “Over the past few years, Black individuals have gotten more than they

deserve” (McConahay, 1986). Higher scores on this scale reflect more racially biased attitudes. The reliability coefficient for the MRS is reported as .84 (Dunbar, 1995) while in the current study was a .83.

Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale. The Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale (BSPS) is a 20-question self-report scale which measures direct (blatant) and indirect (subtle) forms of prejudicial feelings and racial attitudes (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). The original BSPS examined the prejudice of British individuals towards West Indian individuals, although has been updated a number of times based on the population of the study (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). For the purpose of this study, this scale was reworded to measure the prejudicial feelings of Caucasians towards African Americans (see Appendix E).

The BSPS consists of five subscales with two subscales categorized as “blatant” (*threat and rejection* and *intimacy*) while the other three are classified as “subtle” (*cultural differences*, *positive emotions*, and *traditional values*). Pettigrew and Meertens (1995) explain blatant prejudice as involving perceived threat from and rejection of the out-group and in more severe cases as “a belief in the genetic inferiority of the out-group.” The “threat and rejection” and “intimacy” subscales include questions such as “I would not mind if a suitably qualified African American person was appointed as my boss” and “Most African Americans living here who receive support from welfare could get along without it if they tried.”

Subtle prejudice is considered as a lack of understanding and accepting of the out-group’s values, culture and belief system, while denying positive emotion exists for members of the out-group (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). The cultural differences subscale (e.g. *How different or similar do you think African Americans living here are to other Caucasian people like yourself in the values they teach their children*), positive

emotions subscale (e.g. *Have you ever felt sympathy for African Americans living here*), and the traditional values subscale (e.g. *African Americans should not push themselves where they are not wanted*) are categorized as subtle subscales and measure feelings regarding out-group behavior, differences, stereotypes and emotional responses. Alphas for the blatant subscales ranged consistently higher (.87 to .90) than the alphas for the subtle scales (.73 to .82). The ranges of each subscale varied (*threat and rejection* $\alpha=.73-.81$; *intimacy* $\alpha=.70-.93$; *traditional values* $\alpha=.54-.67$; *cultural differences* $\alpha=.57-.72$; *positive emotions* $\alpha=.61-.73$) (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). In the current study, alphas for the scales were as follows: *threat and rejection* $\alpha=.70$; *intimacy* $\alpha=.70$; *traditional values* $\alpha=.77$; *cultural differences* $\alpha=.74$; *positive emotions* $\alpha=.59$.

The scoring scale for the scale varied between as well as within each subscale. While the majority of the statements used a 5-point Likert scale (1=strongly agree, 5=strongly disagree), the positive emotions subscale used a 4-point Likert scale (1=never, 4=fairly often), the cultural differences subscale as well as one question in the threat and rejection subscale used a different 4-point Likert scale (1=very similar and 4=very different) and one question in the intimacy subscale (*How bothered would you be if your child had a child with a person of a different color and your grandchild did not physically resemble your side of the family*) used a 4-point Likert scale where 1=Not bothered at all and 4=very bothered. Higher summed scores on this scale represent an increased level of blatant and/or subtle prejudice.

RESULTS

Quantity of Contact and Racial Attitudes

The first hypothesis proposed that as quantity of contact between Caucasian and African American individuals increased, racial prejudice would decrease. To test this hypothesis, Pearson correlations were calculated. The two main variables in this section

are titled *racial composition* and *amount of contact*. *Racial composition* refers to the diversity of each participant's neighborhood, school and friendships. Higher scores in this scale corresponded to a higher level of diversity in these areas. *Amount of contact* refers to how much the participant actually interacted with individuals of the opposite race. Higher scores on this scale indicated more contact with out-group members in general, in school, in his or her neighborhood, and in friendship circles.

Caucasian participants. The majority of Caucasian participants reported to be from neighborhoods (56.2%) and schools (60.8%) that were mostly White (see table 1). The majority reported intergroup contact occurring "sometimes" at school (48.3%) and in his or her neighborhood (29.5%). As anticipated, the racial composition of participant's community while growing up was significantly, positively correlated with the amount of contact the participants had with African Americans ($r(176)=.76, p=.01$).

The amount of contact Caucasian participants had with African American individuals was significantly, and negatively correlated with the Modern Racism Scale ($r(176)=-.20, p=.01$), the Blatant Subtle Prejudice Scale intimacy subscale ($r(176)=-.33, p=.00$), traditional values subscale ($r(176)=-.28, p=.00$), and the positive emotions subscale ($r(176)=-.21, p=.00$). These results indicate that an increase in reported acceptance of African Americans in relationships including friendships, intimate, and vocational (intimacy subscale) and a decrease in perceived negative values and customs of African Americans (traditional values subscale) were related to increased contact of Caucasian participants with African American individuals. The results of the positive emotions subscale indicate that as participants reported more sympathy and admiration for African American individuals, their negative attitudes towards African Americans decreased. The threat and rejection (blatant) and cultural differences subscale (subtle) did not show any significance when compared to racial contact. The racial composition of

Caucasian participants' community was significantly, negatively correlated with the Modern Racism Scale ($r(176)=-.25, p=.01$), the BSPS threat and rejection subscale ($r(176)=-.15, p=.05$), intimacy ($r(176)=-.26, p=.00$), traditional values ($r(176)=-.30, p=.00$) and the positive emotions subscale ($r(176)=-.20, p=.01$) indicating that the more African Americans in a participant's area was related to lower levels of reported negative racial attitudes (see table 2).

African American participants. The majority of African American participants reported having considerable amount of contact with the out-group (49.5%), were from areas that were half Black and half White (47.4%), had a considerable amount of Black and White friends (36.8%) and went to schools that were mostly White (50.9%) (See table 1). As in the Caucasian sample, the availability of Caucasians in the participant's community (racial composition) was significantly positively correlated with the amount of contact the individual had with Caucasians ($r(57)=.72, p=.00$). While racial composition did not show a correlation with the Johnson Lecci Scale ($r(57)=-.07, p=.60$), the amount of contact with the out-group was significantly negatively correlated with the Johnson Lecci Scale ($r(57)=-.30, p=.03$) such that more contact with Caucasian individuals equals less racist attitudes. More specifically, contact with Caucasian individuals was significantly, negatively correlated with the in-group-directed stigmatism subscale ($r(57)=-.40, p<.01$) and the out-group directed negative beliefs subscale ($r(57)=-.37, p<.01$) while the negative views and negative verbal expression subscale did not show significant results (see table 3).

Quality of Contact and Racial Attitudes

The second hypothesis in this study stated that as the quality of contact between racial groups increased, racial prejudice would decrease. To test this hypothesis, Pearson correlations were used to examine the relationship between five measures of quality

(equal status, closeness, rewarding, cooperative, and supported by others) and racial attitudes. The results of these correlations and descriptive statistics are presented in tables 2 and 3.

Caucasian participants. The majority of Caucasian participants reported to *strongly agree* or *agree* that quality of contact with African American individuals at school was (1) of equal status (69.9%), (2) close rather than informal (44.9%), (3) pleasant and rewarding (59%), (4) more cooperative than competitive (59.6%), and (5) supported by environment (62.5%). Quantity of contact was significantly, positively correlated with all five of these variables of quality indicating that increased contact is related to a more positive perception of the interaction. Racial composition was also significantly, positively correlated with all five variables of quality such that more availability of African American individuals in the participant's community was related to a higher quality of contact. Participants were asked to rate their level of quality with African American individuals in their neighborhood and those considered close friends. Possibly due to the low percentage of reported contact with African Americans in participants' area of upbringing (29.5%), the majority of the Caucasian population responded *not applicable* to all five items regarding quality of contact in his or her neighborhood. Items regarding quality of contact with close friends who are African American resulted in the majority of the population *strongly agreed* that contact was (1) of equal status (37.5%), (2) rewarding (35.5%), and (3) cooperative (34.9%). When questioned if the contact with close friends was *close* and *supported by the environment*, the majority responded *not applicable*. When generally asked about the quality of contact, the majority of the population *agreed* that the contact was (1) of equal status (44.1%), (2) close (36.0%), (3) rewarding (45.7%), (4) cooperative (45.2%), and (5) supported by the environment (38.7%).

All five of Amir's variables of quality were significantly, negatively correlated with the Modern Racism Scale, the Blatant Subtle Prejudice Scale threat and rejection, traditional values, positive emotions, and the intimacy subscale. The BSPS cultural differences subscale was significantly, negatively correlated with a more cooperative than competitive interaction ($r(176)=-.15, p=.04$) and a relationship that is supported and readily accepted by family members and/or the social environment ($r(176)=-.15, p=.05$). These results suggest that as the quality of an interaction is perceived as more positive, negative racial attitudes and beliefs decrease.

African American participants. The majority of African American participants reported to *agree* that quality of contact with Caucasian individuals at school was of equal status (49.1%), close rather than informal (43.9%), pleasant and rewarding (36.8%), more cooperative than competitive (40.4%), and supported by environment (35.1%). Similar to the Caucasian sample, racial composition and quantity of contact was significantly, positively correlated with all five variables of quality indicating that availability of Caucasian individuals in the participant's community and increased contact with those individuals relates to a more positive perception of the interaction. In the remaining three categories of interaction (neighborhood, close friend, and general), the majority of the population *agreed* that contact was of equal status, rewarding, and cooperative, close, and supported by the environment.

The majority of the population reported the contact they had with White individuals was considered to be of high quality and fulfilling all of the five criteria of the contact hypothesis. The Johnson-Lecci Scale, as a whole, was significantly, negatively correlated with all five criteria for quality of contact. In-group directed stigmatism was significantly, negatively correlated with perception of an equal status relationship ($r(57)=-.46, p=.00$), a close versus informal relationship ($r(57)=-.46, p=.00$), a pleasant and rewarding

relationship ($r(57)=-.46, p=.00$), a more cooperative than competitive relationship ($r(57)=-.45, p=.00$), and a relationship that is supported and readily accepted by family members and/or the social environment ($r(57)=-.44, p<.01$). The out-group directed negative beliefs subscale was also significantly, negatively correlated to all five variables, while the negative views towards in-group-out-group relations was significantly negatively correlated to equal status, closeness, and support. The negative verbal expression subscale did not show significant results in relation to any of the five variables.

Area of Geographical Upbringing and Racial Attitudes

The third hypothesis stated that individuals who spent the majority of their upbringing in rural areas would report more racial prejudice than those who grew up in an urban area. Due to the low sample size of African American participants who were from rural environments ($n=8$), this test was only performed on Caucasian participants. A between groups t-test was used to test this hypothesis. Participants were categorized as “rural” or “urban” based on their zip code growing up. These categories were then compared with participant’s scores on the Modern Racism Scale and the Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale. While the results showed no significant differences on any of the predicted variables (see table 4), it is interesting to note that there were significant differences between Caucasian participants raised in urban and rural environments in relation to racial composition ($t(176)=-2.09, p=.04$) and amount of contact ($t(176)=-2.20, p=.03$), with those growing up in rural environments reporting significantly less availability and contact with African Americans than those growing up in urban environments.

DISCUSSION

The major objective of this study was to determine if a relationship existed between an individual’s area of upbringing and the attitudes held about members of his or

her racial out-group. Overall, the results showed that it was not a person's geographical area but the quantity and quality of intergroup contact that acted as a determinant of negative racial attitudes. In addition, this was one of the few studies to test this hypothesis with both Caucasian and African American samples. The results for both samples will be explored in more detail below, along with the implications, limitations and directions for future research.

Caucasians Attitudes about African Americans

The current study generally found that the more contact Caucasian participants had with African Americans growing up, the more positive their racial attitudes were towards the group. These results were expected based on Allport's theories and the vast amount of research on this topic. It is interesting to explore the differences in responses on the racial attitudes subscales. Subscales directly relating to acceptance of African Americans in everyday life had a more positive response from people who have had a considerable amount of contact with African Americans. This appears sensible as the more experiences a person has with particular groups of people, whether positive or negative, the easier it becomes to accept them. Yet, more internal, personal subscales regarding threat, racial and cultural differences, and feelings about African Americans were not significantly related to the amount of interaction. It may be possible that these more value-based feelings are deep-rooted and complex. It may be possible that increased inter-group contact alone may not be enough to change opinions regarding such vast and intense topics as racial differences and perceived threat. While quantity of contact is deemed an important factor in the decrease of inter-group prejudice, mere prevalence of out-group members hardly ensures quality of interaction (Taylor, 1998). If the interaction is perceived as negative, unimportant or unsupported, consequential feelings may be less than positive.

In the Caucasian sample, the results support the contact hypothesis. As the quality of the contact was perceived as more positive, negative racial attitudes decreased. This was true for all the constructs with the exception of one. Questions regarding cultural differences between Caucasians and African Americans were not significantly related to the amount of contact between groups. Cooperative and supported interactions with African Americans were related to fewer beliefs of cultural differences, while rewarding, close, and equal status interactions were not related. To look more closely at this construct due to its consistency in both hypotheses, it may be that cultural differences are not viewed as a negative to most participants. Differences in culture are now learned in schools and exhibited in the community, possibly making it a way of life rather than a separation of groups.

A study conducted by Stein, Hardyck and Smith (1965) found that belief differences with African Americans are assumed and exaggerated by Caucasians when no personal information about the African Americans was supplied. This information can be associated with contact and/or quality of contact. The current study found that the conceptualization of belief differences was related to the perception of relationships that were cooperative and supported by others. Cooperation is an important aspect of working towards a common goal while feeling supported by one's environment may enhance comfort and ease, possibly making for a more positive experience.

African American attitudes towards Caucasians

The current study generally found that the more interaction African American participants had with Caucasian individuals, the more positive their racial attitudes were towards the group as a whole. The scores from the racial attitudes construct were directly related to the amount of contact with Caucasian individuals. These results correspond

with the results found in the Caucasian population as well as with the first objective of the study that a relationship may exist between quantity of contact and racial beliefs.

It was found that the more contact African Americans had with Caucasians, the less prejudice they felt towards Caucasians and the less likely they were to believe that Caucasians (1) held negative thoughts about African Americans; (2) think they are superior to African Americans; and (3) would behave negatively towards African Americans if they could. Quantity of contact did not appear to be related to negative verbal expressions or inter-group relations. In other words, there was no increase or decrease in the reported use of negative stereotypes towards Whites or the existence of negative attitudes towards Black-White relationships as the amount of contact African American participants had with Caucasians increased. It is interesting to note that although both samples rendered similar results in regards to significance of contact, the values and beliefs that decreased racial prejudice were almost exactly opposite for the two groups. For example, statements regarding government views of the out-group and intentions and motivation of the out-group were significantly related to lower levels of negative racial attitudes in the African American sample but not in the Caucasian sample, while statements regarding relationships (both intimate and casual) between African Americans and Caucasians concluded in opposite results with the Caucasian sample showing significant results.

Although contact plays a significant role in reducing intergroup racism, quality of contact needs to be positive to reduce racial prejudice. Based on this idea and Allport's contact hypothesis, it was hypothesized that racist attitudes would decrease if interactions between Caucasian and African American individuals were perceived as more positive. This hypothesis was generally true for the African American sample. At least three of Amir's (1969) five variables were related to a decrease in negative attitudes towards

Caucasians, a general decrease in overall racism, and an increase in positive attitudes towards Caucasians. Quality of contact was not related to negative verbal expressions about Caucasian individuals, which may be due to the nature of the expression, as well as the reaction to these expressions. Stereotypical terms appear to be categorized in society in regards to severity and intensity. Some words or expressions create stronger reactions from racial groups than others. In general, terms that relate to Caucasians in a derogatory manner are not generally viewed by society as severe or harmful when compared to expressions regarding other races.

Area of Upbringing

The third objective of this study was in regards to area of upbringing. Individuals who were from rural areas were presumed to have a higher level of racist attitudes based on the idea that rural areas were less diverse with less members of the out-group available for interaction. Individuals from urban areas, which tend to be more diverse, have more opportunities for contact. Therefore, based on the contact hypothesis, individuals from urban areas were presumed to have a lower amount of negative racial attitudes when compared to those from rural areas.

Findings in the current study did not support that idea and actually did not show any relationship between area of upbringing and racial attitudes. Although the findings for this relationship concluded in non-significant results, an interesting path of relationships was revealed. The classification of rural or urban upbringing was related to the quantity of contact Caucasian participants had with African Americans. In other words, participants from urban areas reported more diversity in their area and interacted more with African American individuals as compared to participants from rural areas. Quantity of contact was related to quality of contact and both were related to racial attitudes. So although area of upbringing was not directly related to racial attitudes, the

relationship between area and quantity of contact may indicate some corresponding attributes. For future research, a path analysis may be helpful in uncovering these variables.

These findings may be due to a variety of reasons. Higher quantity and quality of contact may result in more positive racial attitudes, but if no contact occurs, it is possible for no change in beliefs to occur as well. This may be the case for the participants in this sample. However, it may also be due to the area in which the study was conducted. Seventy-seven percent of the Caucasian participants in this study were currently living in rural areas with a majority of them living in or going to school in a college town. Although this town may be classified as rural, much racial diversity exists, making it possible for current area of residence to influence current racial attitudes more than geographical area growing up. A larger sample with a more detailed separation of classification of areas would be interesting for future research. A longitudinal study of racial attitudes based on experiences and geographical area is also in the direction for further research.

SUMMARY

Research, both old and new, explores the possible reasons racism occurs in the United States and worldwide. The current study explored three of those reasons: diversity of area, amount of interaction, and quality of those interactions. The results of this experiment support previous research as well as provide new information and direction for the reduction of racial prejudice. Overall, the results of the current study indicate that participants who endorsed more negative racial attitudes reported a limited amount and quality of contact with individuals from the out-group. Being from more diverse areas increases the possibility of contact, but area of upbringing did not act as a determinant for increased or decreased racial prejudice.

Limitations and directions for future research

One important limitation of the current investigation is the small sample size of both groups, especially the African American population (n=57). Due to this small sample, t-tests were not able to be performed on the African American sample to assess if a relationship exists between area of upbringing and racial attitudes. Also, the majority of the population included college students who were between the ages of 18 and 31 and primarily grew up in urban areas. In the future, it would be beneficial to have a larger sample and a greater amount of diversity in regards to age and geographical location. It would be interesting to include other variables, such as age, education, and gender to see how they relate to racial attitudes and the contact hypothesis. Future research could also include other racial groups that were not included in this study.

Self-reporting racism may not be an accurate measure in determining an individual's actual attitudes about the out-group. Due to a person's desired perception of themselves as "good people" and his or her internal political correctness, individuals may consciously or subconsciously respond in a way that makes them appear "better." Even though the survey was anonymous, people may feel discomfort reporting negative racial attitudes. With race being such a controversial issue, possessing the stigma of "racist" may be less than desirable. Research has found that people have a strong tendency to hide characteristics about themselves that are not considered socially acceptable (Paulhus, 1991, as cited in Walker & Jussim, 2002). In a study conducted by Walker and Jussim (2002), it was found that people are "willing to lie to appear unprejudiced under situational pressure to do so" (p.9).

It should also be noted that although the objective of the Modern Racism Scale is to measure "modern" racism, the scale dates back to over 20 years ago and many of the questions may appear extreme or irrelevant to the college-aged population involved in

this study. Issues such as school segregation and equal rights may not appear as a modern day problems. It would be extremely beneficial for future research to create an updated Modern Racism Scale that would involve modern day issues and have corresponding scales for Black and White participants.

Another possible scale limitation involved the quantity of contact scale and the quality of contact scale. These scales were both developed for the purpose of this study. Pilot studies were not conducted therefore the validity of each of these scales is unknown. It would be interesting to perform tests on these scales to assess validity and/or create other scales that measure quantity and quality of contact between groups.

Finally, due to the correlational nature of the research, predictions cannot be made about directionality or causation. It is possible that racial attitudes growing up influence the amount of contact and the perceived quality of that contact. Individuals may have negative racial attitudes instilled in them at a young age, which may cause them to avoid out-group members as they become adults. Parents living in more racially diverse areas, whether rural or urban, but influencing amount of contact, teach children more positive racial attitudes. Research involving parenting information and/or racial views of parents may be appealing to future research.

In conclusion, many researchers have studied and tested the theories and perceived variables that are associated with racism and racial attitudes. Some have found similar results to the current study; increased contact that is perceived as high quality is related to decreased negative racial attitudes. However others have found differing results between groups as well as between variables. Much of the research on this specific topic is dated and does not assess a variety of races; therefore more research is needed to provide accurate, up-to-date information that relates to many racial groups in many different areas and situations.

References

- Alexander, C. (1973). The city as a mechanism for sustaining human contact. In J. Helmer and N. Eddington (Eds.), *Urban man: The psychology of urban survival*. New York: Free Press.
- Allport, G.W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Amato, P. (1993). Urban-rural differences in helping friends and family members. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 56(4), 249-262.
- Amir, Y. (1969). Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. *Psychological Bulletin*, 71, 319-342.
- Atkinson, D.R. (2004). Defining populations and terms. *Counseling American Minorities*. McGraw Hill: New York.
- Berryman-Fink, C. (2006). Reducing prejudice on campus: The role of intergroup contact in diversity education. *College Student Journal*, 40(3), 511-516.
- Blau, P. (1977). *Inequality and Heterogeneity*. New York: Free Press.
- Branscombe, N., Schmitt, M.T., & Harvey, R.D. (1999). Perceiving pervasive discrimination among African Americans: Implications for group identification and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(1), 135-149.
- Cox, O.C. (1948). Caste, class, and race. In F.C. Serafica, A.I. Schwebel, R.K. Russell, P.D. Isaac, & L.B. Myers (Eds.). *Mental health of ethnic minorities*. New York: Praeger.
- DeMott, B. (1998). *The trouble with friendship: Why Americans can't think straight about race*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dunbar, E. (1995). The prejudiced personality, racism and anti-Semitism: The PR scale 40 years later. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 65(2), 270-277.
- Emerson, M., Kimbro, R. & Yancey, G. (2002). Contact theory extended: The effects of prior racial contact on current social ties. *Social Science Quarterly*, 83(3), 745-761.
- Helms, J.E., & Talleyrand, R.M.(1997). Race is not ethnicity. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1246-1247.
- House, J.S., Umberson, D., & Landis, K.R. (1988). Structures and processes of social support. *American Review of Sociology*, 14, 293-318.
- Ihlanfeldt, K. & Scafidi, B. (2002). The neighborhood contact hypothesis: Evidence from the multicity study of urban equality. *Urban Studies*, 39(4), 619-641.
- Jackman, M.R. & Crane, M. (1986). Some of my best friends are black; Interracial

- friendship and whites' racial attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 50, 459-486.
- Johnson, J.D. & Lecci, L. (2003). Assessing anti-White attitudes and predicting perceived racism: The Johnson-Lecci Scale. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29,(3), 299-312.
- Johnson, J.D., Lecci, L., & Swim, J. (2006). Predicting perceived racism and acceptance of negative behavioral inter-group responses: Validating the JLS in a college and community sample of Blacks. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40, 421-431.
- Jones, J. M. (1997). *Prejudice and Racism* (2nd ed). McGraw-Hill.
- Lee, B.A., Link, B.G., & Farrell, C.R. (2004). Revisiting the contact hypothesis: The case of public exposure to homelessness. *American Sociological Review*, 67, 40-67.
- McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the modern racism scale. *In: Prejudice, discrimination, and racism*. Dovidio, John F.; Gaertner, Samuel L.; San Diego, CA, US: Academic Press, 1986. pp. 91-125.
- McKinney, K.D. (2006). I really felt white: Turning Points in whiteness through interracial contact. *Social Identities*, 12(2), 167-185.
- Merchant, J. Coussens, C., & Gilbert, D. (Eds.), (2006). *Rebuilding the Unity of Health and the Environment in Rural America*. The National Academies Press: Washington, D.C..
- Oxford Dictionary of Psychology (2001). Oxford University Press: New York.
- Pettigrew, T.F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(2), 173-186.
- Pettigrew, T.F. & Meertens, R.W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 57-75.
- Plant, E.A. & Devine, P.G. (2003). The antecedents and implications of interracial anxiety. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(6), 790-801.
- Police Shooting Haunts King Tribute. (Metropolitan Desk). (2007, January 16) *In The New York Times*, pB1(L). Retrieved January 19, 2007, from *Custom Newspapers* via Thomson Gale.
- Powers, D. & Ellison, C. (1995). Interracial contact and black racial attitudes: The contact hypothesis and selectivity bias. *Social Forces*, 74(1), 205-226.
- Rabinowitz, H.K. & Paynter, N.P. (2002). The rural versus urban practice decision. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 287, 113.

- Rokeach, M., Smith, P.W., & Evans, R.I. (1960). Two kinds of prejudice or one? In M. Rokeach (Ed.), *The Open and Closed Mind*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schlenker, B.R. & Leary, M.R. (1982). Social anxiety and self presentation: A conceptualization and model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 92, 641-669.
- Sigelman, L. & Welch, S. (1993). The contact hypothesis revisited: Black-White interaction and positive racial attitudes. *Social Forces*, 71(3), 781-795.
- Stein, D.D., Hardyck, J.A., & Smith, M.B. (1965). Race and belief: An open and shut case. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1(4), 281-289.
- Taylor, M.C. (1998). How white attitudes vary with the racial composition of local populations: Numbers count. *American Sociological Review*, 63(4), 512-535.
- The Diallo Legacy. (Editorial). (1999, February 28). *The New York Times*, p. NA.
- Tropp, L.R. & Pettigrew, T.F. (2005). Relationships between intergroup contact and prejudice among minority and majority status groups. *Psychological Science*, 16(12), 951-957.
- U.S. Department of Justice, (2006). Federal Bureau of Investigation, Hate Crime Statistics Washington, DC: USGPO, October 2006.
- United States Census Bureau (2000). Twenty-second United States Census.
- United States Department of Agriculture (2005). Rural population and migration. Retrieved June 18, 2007. www.ers.usda.gov/Briefing/Population/Diversity.htm.
- Walker, R. & Jussim, L. (2002). Do people lie to appear unprejudiced. *The Rutgers Scholar*, 4(1), 1-19.

TABLE 1: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR RACIAL COMPOSITION FOR CAUCASIAN (N=176) AND AFRICAN AMERICAN (N=57) SAMPLES

<i>Caucasian Sample</i>	All White	Mostly White	Half Black/ Half White	Mostly Black	All Black	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Neighborhood	35.8	56.2	5.7	2.3	0	1.74	.67	1-4
School	16.5	60.8	17.0	5.7	0	2.12	.76	1-4
Close Friends	35.2	53.3	10.8	1.7	0	1.79	.70	1-4
<hr/>								
<i>African American Sample</i>								
Neighborhood	5.3	42.1	24.6	21.1	7.0	3.18	1.05	1-5
School	3.5	50.9	24.6	17.5	3.5	3.33	.93	1-5
Close Friends	8.8	28.1	36.8	21.1	5.3	3.14	1.03	1-5

NOTE: Numbers in the first five columns represent percentages of sample

TABLE 2: Correlations among Quantity, Quality, and Racial Attitudes for the Caucasian Sample

Variable	1a	1b	2a	2b	2c	2d	2e	3a	4a	4b	4c	4d	4e
1a. Racial Composition	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1b. Contact	.76***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2a. Equal Status	.56***	.68***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2b. Close	.60***	.71***	.92***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2c. Pleasant/Rewarding	.60***	.70***	.94***	.94***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2d. Cooperative	.57***	.68***	.94***	.90***	.95***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2e. Supported	.52***	.64***	.89***	.86***	.89***	.90***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3a. Modern Racism Scale	-.25**	-.20**	-.24**	-.21**	-.24**	-.25**	-.23**	-	-	-	-	-	-
4a. Threat & Rejection	-.15*	-.13	-.21**	-.19*	-.22**	-.23**	-.24**	.69***	-	-	-	-	-
4b. Intimacy	-.26***	-.33***	-.25**	-.22**	-.25**	-.24**	-.23**	.53***	.49***	-	-	-	-
4c. Traditional Values	-.30***	-.28***	-.28***	-.29***	-.32***	-.29***	-.27***	.78***	.72***	.54***	-	-	-
4d. Cultural Differences	-.08	-.14	-.11	-.13	-.13	-.15*	-.15*	.37***	.47***	.28***	.34***	-	-
4e. Positive Emotions	-.20**	-.21**	-.19*	-.22**	-.22**	-.20**	-.18*	.52***	.46***	.43***	.54***	.24**	-

NOTES: n=176 *= $p < .05$, **= $p < .01$, ***= $p < .001$.

Racial Composition- measuring quantity of contact, higher scores = greater racial diversity in community; Items 2a-2e correspond to the 5 variables of quality of contact. Higher scores = higher quality of contact. Items 3a and 4a-4e represent racial attitudes scales and subscales. Higher scores= higher level of negative racial attitudes.

TABLE 3: Correlations among Quantity, Quality, and Racial Attitudes for the African American Sample

Variable	1a	1b	2a	2b	2c	2d	2e	3a	3b	3c	3d
1a. Racial Composition	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1b. Contact	.72***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2a. Equal Status	.51***	.56***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2b. Close	.58***	.69***	.84***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2c. Pleasant/Rewarding	.67***	.71***	.84***	.93***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2d. Cooperative	.55***	.62***	.76***	.89***	.92***	-	-	-	-	-	-
2e. Supported	.52***	.58***	.78***	.88***	.84***	.80***	-	-	-	-	-
3a. Out-group Directed Negative Beliefs	-.20	-.37**	-.41**	-.50***	-.50***	-.54***	-.47***	-	-	-	-
3b. Negative Views towards In-group-Out-Group Relations	-.09	-.20	-.29*	-.28*	-.17	-.15	-.36**	.61***	-	-	-
3c. Negative Verbal Expression towards Out-group	.13	-.06	-.03	-.12	-.03	-.07	-.16	.49***	.66***	-	-
3d. In-group Directed Stigmatization	-.19	-.40**	-.46***	-.46***	-.46***	-.45***	-.44**	.69***	.52***	.40**	-

NOTES: n=57 *= $p < .05$, **= $p < .01$, ***= $p < .001$.

Racial Composition- measuring quantity of contact, higher scores = greater racial diversity in community; *Items 2a-2e* correspond to the 5 variables of quality of contact. Higher scores = higher quality of contact. *Items 3a-3d* represent racial attitudes subscales. Higher scores= higher level of negative racial attitudes.

TABLE 4: MEANS OF MAJOR VARIABLES FOR RURAL (n=67) AND URBAN (n=109) SUBSAMPLES

Variable	Subsample	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>
Racial Composition	Rural	1.77	.52	-2.09*
	Urban	1.96	.63	
Race Contact	Rural	2.51	.68	-2.20*
	Urban	2.76	.75	
Equal Status	Rural	2.96	1.36	-1.79
	Urban	3.34	1.36	
Closeness	Rural	2.60	1.32	-1.71
	Urban	2.95	1.33	
Pleasant/Rewarding	Rural	2.82	1.35	-1.76
	Urban	3.19	1.31	
Cooperative	Rural	2.87	1.36	-1.39
	Urban	3.16	1.37	
Supported	Rural	2.84	1.36	-1.53
	Urban	3.16	1.33	
Blatant & Subtle Prejudice Scale-Threat & Rejection Subscale	Rural	2.13	.60	1.38
	Urban	1.99	.66	
BSPS-Intimacy Subscale	Rural	1.69	.76	.18
	Urban	1.67	.75	
BSPS-Traditional Values Subscale	Rural	2.35	.72	.88
	Urban	2.24	.78	
BSPS-Cultural Differences Subscale	Rural	2.98	.89	1.32
	Urban	2.80	.88	
BSPS-Positive Emotions Subscale	Rural	2.43	.72	1.92
	Urban	2.22	.73	
Modern Racism Scale	Rural	2.17	.64	1.14
	Urban	2.05	.68	

NOTES: *= $p < .05$

APPENDIX A

Demographics for African American and Caucasian Samples

Age: 18-24 25-31 32-38 39-45 45-51 52-59 60+

Gender: Male Female

Race:

Asian/Pacific Islander _____

African-American _____

Hispanic/Latino _____

Caucasian _____

Other _____

(Please specify)

Zip Code of current address _____

Zip Code of where you grew up (or spent majority of your time growing up)

APPENDIX B
Quantity of Contact Scale for Caucasian Sample

PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BASED ON YOUR EXPERIENCES
****WHILE YOU WERE GROWING UP**** USING THE SCALE BELOW:

1	2	3	4	5
ALL BLACK	MOSTLY WHITE	ABOUT HALF BLACK AND HALF WHITE	MOSTLY BLACK	ALL BLACK

1. What was the racial composition of your **neighborhood**?
2. What was the racial composition of your **school**?
3. What was the racial composition of your **close friends**?

PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BASED ON YOUR EXPERIENCES
****WHILE YOU WERE GROWING UP**** USING THE SCALE BELOW:

1	2	3	4
A GREAT DEAL	SOMETIMES	HARDLY EVER	NOT APPLICABLE

4. I tended to associate with children in my **neighborhood** who were Black.
5. I tended to associate with children **at my school** who were Black.
6. I tended to have **close friends** who were Black.
7. In general, I had contact with people who are Black.
8. In general, I personally interacted with those who are Black.

APPENDIX C
Quality of Contact Scale for Caucasian Sample

PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BASED ON YOUR EXPERIENCES
****WHILE YOU WERE GROWING UP**** USING THE SCALE BELOW:

0	1	2	3	4	5
N/A	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE

Equal Status

9. The contact I had with Black individuals at school tended to be of equal status (I felt on the same level).
10. The contact I had with Black individuals in my neighborhood tended to be of equal status (I felt on the same level).
11. The contact I had with close friends who were Black tended to be of equal status (I felt on the same level).
12. In general, the contact I had with Black individuals tended to be of equal status (I felt on the same level).

Closeness

13. The contact I had with Black individuals at school tended to be close (vs. informal).
14. The contact I had with Black individuals in my neighborhood tended to be close (vs. informal).
15. The contact I had with close friends who were Black tended to be close (vs. informal).
16. In general, the contact I had with Black individuals tended to be close (vs. informal).

Rewarding

17. The contact I had with Black individuals at school tended to be pleasant and rewarding.
18. The contact I had with Black individuals in my neighborhood tended to be pleasant and rewarding.

19. The contact I had with close friends who were Black tended to be pleasant and rewarding.
20. In general, the contact I had with Black individuals tended to be pleasant and rewarding.

Cooperative

21. The contact I had with Black individuals at school tended to be more cooperative than competitive.
22. The contact I had with Black individuals in my neighborhood tended to be more cooperative than competitive.
23. The contact I had with close friends who were Black tended to be more cooperative than competitive.
24. In general, the contact I had with Black individuals tended to be more cooperative than competitive.

Support

25. My family and/or my general social environment readily accepted the contact I had with Black individuals at school.
26. My family and/or my general social environment readily accepted the contact I had with Black individuals in my neighborhood.
27. My family and/or my general social environment readily accepted the contact I had with close friends who were Black.
28. In general, my family and/or my general social environment readily accepted the contact I had with individuals who were Black.

APPENDIX D

Modern Racism Scale (MRS) for Caucasian Sample

PLEASE RATE YOUR AGREEMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING ITEMS USING THE SCALE BELOW:

1	2	3	4	5
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE

1. Over the past few years blacks have gotten more economically than they deserve.
2. Blacks have more influence upon school desegregation plans than they ought to have.
3. Discrimination against blacks is no longer a problem in the United States.
4. Over the past few years the government and news media have shown more respect to blacks than they deserve.
5. Blacks should not push themselves where they're not wanted.
6. Blacks are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights.
7. It is easy to understand the anger of black people in America.

APPENDIX E

Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale (BSPS) for Caucasian Sample

PLEASE RATE YOUR AGREEMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING ITEMS USING THE SCALE BELOW:

1	2	3	4	5
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE

- 1.) Black individuals have jobs that the White individuals should have.
- 2.) Most Black individuals who receive support from welfare could get along without it if they tried.
- 3.) White and Black individuals can never really be comfortable with each other even if they are close friends.
- 4.) Most politicians in the U.S. care too much about Black individuals and not enough about the average White person.
- 5.) Black individuals come from less able races and this explains why they are not as well off as most White people.
- 6.) I would be willing to have sexual relationships with a Black individual.
- 7.) I would not mind if a suitably qualified Black person was appointed as my boss.
- 8.) I would not mind if a Black person who had a similar economic background as mine joined my close family by marriage.
- 9.) Blacks living here should not push themselves where they are not wanted.
- 10.) Many other groups have come to the U.S. and overcome prejudice and worked their way up. Black people should do the same without special favor.
- 11.) It is just a matter of some people not trying hard enough. If Black individuals would just try harder, they would be as well as off as White people.
- 12.) Black people teach their children values and skills different from those required to be successful in the U.S.

PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS USING THE SCALE BELOW:

1	2	3	4
VERY DIFFERENT	SOMEWHAT DIFFERENT	SOMEWHAT SIMILAR	VERY SIMILAR

How different or similar do you think Blacks living here are to other Whites like yourself:

13. In how honest they are?
14. In the values they teach their children?
15. In their religious beliefs and practices?
16. In their sexual values and sexual practices?
17. In the language that they speak?

PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS USING THE SCALE BELOW:

1
VERY
OFTEN

2
FAIRLY
OFTEN

3
NOT TOO
OFTEN

4
NEVER

Have you ever felt the following ways about Blacks and their families living here?

18. Sympathy for Blacks living in the U.S.?
19. Admiration for Blacks living in the U.S.?

20. Suppose that a child of yours had children with a person of a very different color and physical characteristics than your own. Do you think you would be very bothered, bothered, bothered a little, or not bothered at all, if your grandchildren did not physically resemble the people on your side of the family?
 - a. **Very bothered**
 - b. **Bothered**
 - c. **Bothered a little**
 - d. **Not bothered at all**

APPENDIX F
Quantity of Contact Scale for African American Sample

PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BASED ON YOUR EXPERIENCES WHILE YOU WERE GROWING UP USING THE SCALE BELOW:

1	2	3	4	5
ALL BLACK	MOSTLY WHITE	ABOUT HALF BLACK AND HALF WHITE	MOSTLY BLACK	ALL BLACK

8. What was the racial composition of your neighborhood?
9. What was the racial composition of your school?
10. What was the racial composition of your close friends?

PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BASED ON YOUR EXPERIENCES WHILE YOU WERE GROWING UP USING THE SCALE BELOW:

1	2	3	4
A GREAT DEAL	SOMETIMES	HARDLY EVER	NOT APPLICABLE

11. I tended to associate with children in my neighborhood who were White...
12. I tended to associate with children at my school who were White...
13. I tended to have close friends who were White...
14. In general, I had contact with people who are White...
8. In general, I personally interacted with those who are White...

APPENDIX G
Quality of Contact Scale for African American Sample

PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BASED ON YOUR EXPERIENCES WHILE YOU WERE GROWING UP USING THE SCALE BELOW:

0	1	2	3	4	5
N/A	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE

Equal Status

- 29. The contact I had with White individuals at school tended to be of equal status (I felt on the same level).
- 30. The contact I had with White individuals in my neighborhood tended to be of equal status (I felt on the same level).
- 31. The contact I had with close friends who were White tended to be of equal status (I felt on the same level).
- 32. In general, the contact I had with White individuals tended to be of equal status (I felt on the same level).

Closeness

- 33. The contact I had with White individuals at school tended to be close (vs. informal).
- 34. The contact I had with White individuals in my neighborhood tended to be close (vs. informal).
- 35. The contact I had with close friends who were White tended to be close (vs. informal).
- 36. In general, the contact I had with White individuals tended to be close (vs. informal).

Rewarding

- 37. The contact I had with White individuals at school tended to be pleasant and rewarding.
- 38. The contact I had with White individuals in my neighborhood tended to be pleasant and rewarding.
- 39. The contact I had with close friends who were White tended to be pleasant and rewarding.

40. In general, the contact I had with White individuals tended to be pleasant and rewarding.

Cooperative

41. The contact I had with White individuals at school tended to be more cooperative than competitive.

42. The contact I had with White individuals in my neighborhood tended to be more cooperative than competitive.

43. The contact I had with close friends who were White tended to be more cooperative than competitive.

44. In general, the contact I had with White individuals tended to be more cooperative than competitive.

Support

45. My family and/or my general social environment readily accepted the contact I had with White individuals at school.

46. My family and/or my general social environment readily accepted the contact I had with White individuals in my neighborhood.

47. My family and/or my general social environment readily accepted the contact I had with close friends who were White.

48. In general, my family and/or my general social environment readily accepted the contact I had with individuals who were White.

APPENDIX H
Johnson-Lecci anti-White Attitudes Scale (JLS) for African American Sample

PLEASE RATE YOUR AGREEMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING ITEMS USING THE SCALE BELOW:

1	2	3	4	5
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE

1. I believe that most White individuals would love to return to a time in which non-White individuals had no civil rights
2. I believe that most White individuals really do support the ideas and thoughts of racist political groups.
3. I believe that most White individuals really believe that non-White individuals are generally inferior.
4. I believe that most White individuals would discriminate against non-White individuals if they could get away with it.
5. I believe that most of the negative attitudes of White individuals towards non-White individuals are due to racist feelings.
6. I believe that most White individuals would harm non-White individuals if they could get away with it.
7. I believe that most White individuals think that they are superior to non-White individuals.
8. I believe that White individuals smell.
9. I have suspected Whites trying to destroy something created by non-White individuals.
10. I believe that the success of a White person is due to their color.
11. I consider myself to be a racist towards Whites.
12. I have blamed White people for my problems or for the problems of other non-Whites.
13. I look negatively upon those involved in interracial relationships.
14. I have referred to mixed couples as “sell-outs”.
15. I have referred to Whites as “cracker”.
16. I have spoke negatively about White people without concern as to their feelings.
17. I have referred to a White person as a “honkey”.
18. I have made racial comments.
19. I have called a White person a “redneck”.
20. I have insulted a White person.