

379
N81
No. 5849

CHANGES IN RACIAL ATTITUDES AS A FUNCTION OF PERSONALITY
CHARACTERISTICS AND EXPOSURE TO A COMPETENT BLACK

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Emilie J. Myers, B.A.

Denton, Texas

December, 1981

Myers, Emilie J. Changes in Racial Attitudes as a Function of Personality Characteristics and Exposure to a Competent Black. Master of Arts (General-Experimental Psychology), December, 1981, 63 pp., 2 tables, references, 42 titles.

The present study examined whether a relationship exists between level of rigidity and prejudicial attitudes and whether prejudiced attitudes could be modified as a function of exposure to a competent black model. It was predicted that individuals with a high level of rigidity would display more racial prejudice than low-rigid individuals and that individuals with a low level of rigidity would demonstrate less prejudice than high-rigid individuals after exposure to a competent model. After exposure to a competent model, a significant main effect for rigidity was found which indicated that low-rigid individuals became less prejudiced than high-rigid individuals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Thesis	
Introduction	1
Prejudice	
Personality Correlates of Racial Prejudice	
Intervention Strategies with Racial Prejudice	
Credibility and Attitude Change	
Personality Characteristics and Resistance to	
Attitude Change	
Summary	
Purpose and Hypotheses of This Study	
Hypotheses	
Method	18
Participants	
Measures	
Models	
Procedure	
Results	23
Discussion	32
Appendices	38
References	58

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Initial Means and Standard Deviations of Dependent Measures	25
2.	Means and Standard Deviations of Change Scores for the Three Dependent Measures	26

CHANGES IN RACIAL ATTITUDES AS A FUNCTION OF PERSONALITY
CHARACTERISTICS AND EXPOSURE TO A COMPETENT BLACK

An area of ongoing concern to social scientists has been attempts to identify personality correlates of prejudicial individuals and ways of reducing prejudiced thoughts. Prejudice has been defined by Allport (1950) as an irrational belief about a particular group of people with similar characteristics. Prejudice differs from racism in that prejudice is considered to be an attitude about a particular minority group, whereas, racism is concerned with a subset of attitudes within this domain which deals with perceived notions about racial groups. In contrast, discrimination refers to a biased form of behavior (Wrightman, 1974).

Various reasons have been proposed which attempt to explain why individuals develop prejudicial attitudes. One common explanation is that individuals with certain personality characteristics are predisposed to acquire biased attitudes (Allport, 1950). These theoretical formulations have led to numerous studies which examined personality correlates of prejudiced individuals with measures such as the authoritarian personality. However, research in this area has often provided contradictory, or inconclusive results. Thus, additional studies are needed to examine

whether other personality characteristics are related to prejudiced attitudes.

Several studies have also been done which investigated ways in which the attitudes of prejudiced individuals can be changed. A limitation of these studies was that, in most instances, formal therapy is required or exactly what effects changes in attitudes is unclear.

A major limitation of studies in the area of racial prejudice in general was that few studies were available which examined both personality characteristics and the susceptibility of these attitudes to change. Few studies have been shown to combine personality correlates with specific treatment interventions. An integrated approach appears to be warranted with concern for the conflicting studies of the two separate approaches.

The following study was an attempt to replicate and extend the findings of previous studies by examining personality correlates of racially prejudiced individuals and by further examining whether exposure to assumed competent blacks effects a change in prejudiced attitudes. The following sections will examine previous personality correlates of prejudiced attitudes in general, personality correlates of racial prejudice, and techniques which have been used to change attitudes of individuals with racial prejudice. A description of the purposes and hypotheses of this study will then be given.

Prejudice

Numerous studies have been done which examined personality characteristics of prejudiced people. In general, the results have yielded broad generalizations, and wide-range constructs have been used to describe these individuals. More specifically, the predisposition toward prejudicial attitudes has been related to such dimensions as religiousity, political orientation, authoritarianism, dogmatism, and various other global traits.

The majority of research done has examined the relationship between religious attitudes and prejudicial beliefs (Allport, 1967; Maranell, 1967; Rokeach, 1969; Cygnar, Jacobson, & Noel, 1977; Henley & Pincus, 1978). For example, Henley and Pincus (1978) examined the relationship between religiousity and attitudes toward different minority groups. They assessed 211 undergraduates on sexist, racial, and antihomosexual attitudes as well as religious membership and involvement and political orientation. Results indicated that all three forms of prejudice were higher for those professing more religious involvement. As well, political orientation was related to prejudice with conservatives exhibiting a greater bias towards these minority groups.

These studies not only compared religious versus nonreligious individuals, but also found differences between people who hold intrinsic versus extrinsic belief structures about religion. Intrinsic believers have been seen as

devout and sincere about their religious beliefs. They appear to take their religion seriously as an end in itself where extrinsic believers use religion as a means to some other end such as to gain social prestige (Baston, Naifeh, & Pate, 1978).

Studies examining possible relationships between religious orientations and prejudicial attitudes appeared to be inconclusive. Baston et al. (1978) administered a standard prejudice questionnaire and a measure of intrinsic versus extrinsic religious orientation to 51 undergraduate subjects. Participants were then placed in a situation where responses had clear behavioral consequences. Results indicated that, when the effects of social desirability were controlled, intrinsic religion had no relationship with prejudice as measured by their questionnaires.

Evidence in support of this result comes from an analysis of theological, sociocultural and personal-psychological contexts by Allport (1967) that concluded "intrinsic religion is related to more tolerant attitudes whereas extrinsic religious orientation provides the context of prejudice" (p. 433). In studies of this sort, however, no attempts to delineate components of either religiosity in general or extrinsic and intrinsic religiosity were made. Thus, they are of little value in determining specific personality characteristics of prejudiced individuals.

Certain political attitudes have also been related to prejudicial attitudes. However, these studies have often

reached contradictory conclusions. A study of Hindus by Bhushan and Sinha (1975) obtained 100 male, 25- to 45-year-old Hindus in a semirural area of India. All subjects were then administered a religiousity scale and modified versions of two scales (Adorno et al.) designed to measure politico-economic conservatism and antiminority prejudice against Muslims. Religiousity was found to be correlated with politico-economic conservatism. However, neither politico-economic conservatism or religiousity correlated with biased attitudes toward Muslims. The cultural difference here may have been of importance in the results obtained by these researchers as opposed to conclusions of those studying American prejudicial attitudes such as the Henley and Pincus study.

A large scale study (Maranell, 1967) has been done that offered contradictory results to the study by Bhushan and Sinha (1975). This research was conducted in both rural and urban areas at four undergraduate universities located in the midwest and southern United States. Their results revealed strong correlations between the dimensions of bigotry and political conservatism in all populations. One possible reason for the discrepancy in these two studies is that individuals used in the former study may have had more rigid personality characteristics than those in the latter study (Bhushan & Sinha, 1975).

Other researchers have attempted to relate somewhat less global studies of personality characteristics to

prejudicial attitudes. In general, these studies have used measures which seem to be heavily loaded with items measuring rigidity. Kirtley (1969) attempted to clarify relationships among authoritarianism, political ideology, and prejudice. A total of 90 male undergraduates were administered Form E of the Dogmatism Scale, Form 60 of the Politico-Economic Conservatism Scale, and adaptations of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale. Similar patterns of conformity and prejudice for authoritarians of the political right, center, and left were found when ethnic, minority, and antidemocratic groups were used as the prejudice targets. Similar conclusions about this characteristic of the authoritarian personality were obtained in a 1977 study of male Hindus by Hassan. This researcher found that fathers of prejudiced males tended to be authoritarian, more anxious, as well as, favorers of stricter parental child rearing attitudes than fathers of nonprejudiced Hindu males. These results supported a 1975 study of Hindu males by Sinha that indicated that three dimensions of prejudice (caste, religion, sex) were positively correlated to authoritarianism, anxiety, and intolerance of ambiguity.

A major problem with these studies on prejudice in general, is that they are essentially correlational in nature. As a consequence, it is not known whether personality variables predispose one toward prejudicial attitudes or whether racial attitudes result in certain personality

characteristics. Regardless of which attitude influences the other, the comparable results of both Indian and American studies in general do point to the efficacy of their generalized findings and a hypothesis that prejudiced individuals may have certain personality characteristics such as authoritarianism that distinguish them from less prejudiced individuals. If rigidity seems to be a common correlate of prejudiced individuals in general, then it seems reasonable to propose that rigidity would also correlate highly with racial prejudice.

Personality Correlates of Racial Prejudice

A surprisingly limited number of studies have been done which examine personality correlates of racial prejudice. Of those studies available, as with the area of prejudice in general, contradictory conclusions have also often been reached by various researchers. Studies which do exist have attempted to relate racial prejudice to constructs such as religiousity, authoritarianism, and dogmatism. In addition, several studies have been done on racial prejudice that incorporate such dimensions as guilt, hostility, rejection, and the need to reduce the prestige of others.

In a 1969 study by Epstein, 80 subjects were used in a factorial design based on the independent variables of self-esteem, level of confrontation, and race of the stimulus group. Results indicated that denial of hostility,

as a personality characteristic facilitated the attribution of negative qualities to blacks. Although the authors did not consider this, it is possible that the reason that highly prejudiced individuals denied hostility was due to the inability to be flexible. If this were indeed the case, then this finding was consistent with previous findings in the area of prejudice.

Paralleling the religiosity studies concerning the broad area of prejudice, religiosity has been shown to be related to racial prejudice. Burnham (1968) administered to 1005 white undergraduates a scale of prejudice and obtained information including religious preference and parents' educational level. Sharp differences in racial prejudice were found between subjects of various religions with Catholics falling in the most prejudiced category. However, respondents who indicated no religious orientation were far more likely to be in the low prejudiced category.

Racial prejudice has also been directly linked to level of rigidity. Cooper (1977) assessed the relationship between authoritarianism, religious orthodoxy, and racial prejudice in 492 lay leaders of Southern Baptist churches in North Carolina. The California F Scale and a racial prejudice scale which consisted of selected items from the Ethnocentrism Scale were used to measure the dimensions of authoritarianism and racial prejudice. A positive relationship was found between authoritarianism and prejudice.

Even though the validity of the F Scale has been questioned as to whether it measures anything other than social desirability (Peabody, 1966), these results supported other studies of this nature and appeared to reflect an important aspect of the prejudiced personality.

In an enterprising study by Cann (1978), 85 undergraduates were assessed on a 100-item true/false questionnaire which concerned attitudes toward blacks and were presented with thematic scenes of all whites, all blacks, interracial groups, and racially ambiguous groups. Subjects were required to rank order the pictorial plots reflecting themes of dependency, aggression, insecurity, rejection, and neutral themes. Interestingly, the all black scenes were ranked highest on the theme of aggression by both low- and high-prejudiced subjects. The author concluded that the themes were pulling for different characteristics within these individuals. However, the interracial scenes produced insecurity and rejection themes in high-prejudiced individuals, whereas they produced neutral themes in low-prejudiced subjects. The validity of this thematic approach is debatable; however, this study reveals interesting possibilities for this area of study.

To summarize the findings thus far, although the results are inconclusive, findings seem to overwhelmingly indicate that prejudiced people are more likely to have a high level of rigidity and are most likely to have a strong

commitment to religious beliefs. Thus, one might expect that individuals with a rigid personality are more likely to have a higher level of prejudice than individuals with less rigid personalities.

Intervention Strategies with Racial Prejudice

Studies focusing upon changing prejudiced attitudes have been done using a variety of theoretical approaches. Using a learning theory framework, Cotharin and Mikulas (1975) reasoned that, since conditioned emotional responses to racial cues may be involved in prejudice, desensitization to these cues may alter prejudicial attitudes. Although these investigators found that they could reduce specific emotional responses, this evidence cannot be taken to support a treatment of racial prejudice in general. Elkin (1972), in a more generalized study to desensitize racial prejudice, was unable to obtain significant results. It appears as if this method is questionable at best in changing racial prejudice in general and may not contain important elements specific to this treatment target.

From another theoretical approach, Adlerian counseling in racially mixed groups of elementary school children was used as a treatment for racial prejudice (Owen, 1971). Although another contact variable was included (black and white therapists), the study found no significant changes in racial prejudice as a function of this form of treatment.

The most common technique investigated as a means to change racially prejudiced attitudes has been contact with

the group toward which one is biased. In a prison study by Foley (1977), the effects of simple interracial contact upon the attitudes of blacks and whites were investigated. It was hypothesized that interracial contact would reduce prejudice between the black and white inmates. Over a 1-month period, new inmates were requested to answer questionnaires designed to assess prejudicial attitudes. The same tests were administered again 3 weeks later. The author found a decrease in prejudice among whites. However, prejudice in blacks remained high. The failure to find changes in attitudes among both racial groups questions the validity of the broad concept of simple contact as a treatment for prejudicial attitudes. It may be that specifics are operating here as well that were not investigated as components of contact.

Studies employing interracial contact as a means of attitudes change have also been done in communities. Grossman (1967) studied attitudes of whites toward blacks in a neighborhood undergoing an influx of black residents versus attitudes of persons residing in stable white neighborhoods. No differences were found in attitudes toward blacks within the changing neighborhood. The results were attributed to the opposing forces of "threat" and "contact" that were perceived from the new black neighbors. Here, contact versus interaction was assessed. The reason that nonsignificant findings were obtained may have been

due to the failure to consider the extent to which the ethnic groups interact rather than simply the amount of contact existing between the groups.

Other studies have attempted to take into consideration other variables in addition to simple exposure as variables which might facilitate changes in racial prejudice. One variable considered has been the effect that information about blacks has upon racial prejudice. In a study investigating information about blacks, children were presented with either literature about blacks, audio-visual aids about blacks, or a combination of the two. Although this investigation found that the information was conveyed, no changes in attitudes towards blacks were found to result from the treatment (Madden, 1970). The failure of these authors to obtain significance of course may have been due to any number of factors. However, these results did indicate that a combination of simple exposure and information about blacks is inadequate as a means of changing racial prejudice.

Several studies seem to indirectly indicate that when blacks are perceived as being competent, racial prejudice is diminished. Breckheimer and Nelson (1976) compared various group methods in reducing racial prejudice in white and black high school students. The four methods included were game-playing, school issues discussion, racial discussion, and racial role playing. Although it

is reported that all groups reduced verbal prejudice on the respect factor of the Behavioral Differential, no specific measures of prejudice were employed to confirm these changes. As well, because both blacks and whites were involved in the treatment groups, both were viewed in the statistical analysis as a single group. This would confuse results focusing on white attitude change toward blacks and the change observed may have been significantly raised by the scores of the black students. As well, other factors specific to contact, such as perceived competence, may have been operating.

In another community study, prejudiced attitudes of prospective secondary school teachers were examined (Holmes, 1967). The author utilized two treatment groups. One group received a modified program consisting of listening to black speakers and panelists, participating in discussions, and watching films of blacks in society (campus group). The second group visited homes, schools, and offices owned or predominated by blacks. Results indicated that the group exposed to the community visits significantly altered their attitudes toward blacks over the campus group. The authors contributed this effect to "selective contacts" with blacks. Although this possibility was not discussed in detail by the authors, it may be that, whereas whites were able to personally see accomplishments of blacks, attitude change may have occurred due to a higher credibility factor being attributed to blacks.

While perceived competence of blacks and changes in racial attitudes seems implied in the previously cited studies, the effects of competence cannot be directly discerned. However, studies in other areas of attitude change seem to lend credence to the idea that perceived competence may be an important mechanism for changing attitudes.

Credibility and Attitude Change

In a 1977 study by Lashbrook, Snavely, and Sullivan, apathetic students were treated for attitudinal change using a source credibility manipulation. Although this did not deal with prejudiced attitudes, source credibility was found to be a significant factor in attitude change.

Subsequent studies by other investigators seemed to support the findings of Lashbrook et al. (1977). Beach, Mitchell, Deaton, and Prothero (1978), viewed job candidate choice for a bogus position in terms of relevance of job and credibility attributed to the source. The results indicated that the more credible the source, the more influence it had on candidate choice. In another study by Beach et al. (1978), the relationship between source credibility and subjects' attitudes to a nearby nuclear power plant was examined. Again, results indicated that credible sources influenced attitudes of subjects toward the nuclear power plant issue. Thus, credible sources seem to be a valuable means of changing attitudes. It may be that source credibility may be of value in changing attitudes of racial prejudice.

Personality Characteristics and Resistance to Attitude Change

Several studies have attempted to consider both personality characteristics and resistance to racial attitude change in general. Although this type of study is rare, findings seemed to consistently indicate that it appears critical for specific personality factors to be considered in a treatment to change racial prejudice.

In a 1977 study by Rotton, Blake, and Heslin, 48 high- and 48 low-dogmatic undergraduates, defined by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, were led to expect negative, positive, or neutral information about unidentified foreign nations. Results confirmed the authors' hypotheses which indicated that low-dogmatic subjects were not affected by the prior pronouncement of a source. However, high-dogmatic subjects were found to reject both the source and message when their prior expectancies were disconfirmed. The authors concluded that low-dogmatic persons may attend to more salient details involved in message giving whereas high dogmatics may attend solely to the surface quality of the information and the credibility of the source.

Milling (1976) investigated attitude change in general to personality factors of high and low dogmatics. A total of 135 undergraduate students were administered the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and were then exposed to persuasive speakers who argued either for or against the juvenile

court system. The interesting finding here was that subjects who scored high on the dogmatism scale remained unchanged in their attitudes following the persuasive communications, whereas low-dogmatic subjects changed their attitudes in whichever direction the speaker recommended. Similar results were obtained in a study by Krukovsky (1978) which concluded that high dogmatics evidenced less attitude change toward blacks after group discussions and lectures than did low dogmatics.

Walter and Rosenfield (1978) investigated change in racial attitudes of 65 white elementary school children after school desegregation. Results indicated increases in children's self-esteem, low parental authoritarianism and nonpunitive parental child-rearing practices, as well as the interracial contact were all significantly related to positive racial attitude change.

Summary

In summary, these studies, taken collectively, seemed to indicate that differential attitude change is a function of specific related personality characteristics. In general, highly dogmatic individuals appear to possess personality characteristics less amenable to attitude change than do low-dogmatic individuals. The reason for this may be that dogmatic individuals tend to be rigid and are thus less open to alternative ideas. Previous research also indicates that no technique has been found

which is highly successful in changing prejudiced attitudes. One technique which has been found to be successful as a means of changing attitudes in general is source credibility. However, this possibility has not been investigated in relation to these specific personality characteristics. It seems as if an approach such as this may serve to clarify the literature pertaining to racial attitude change, as well as suggest specific treatment modalities for those individuals exhibiting a rigid personality style.

Purpose and Hypotheses of This Study

The purpose of the present study was an attempt to replicate and extend the findings of previous investigators. Therefore, one purpose was to examine whether differences in level of rigidity were related to degree of racial prejudice. Based upon previous findings, it was predicted that individuals with a high level of rigidity would be more prejudiced than those with a low level of rigidity.

A second purpose of this study was to examine the effects of exposure to blacks differing in level of competence and changes in racial prejudice. For the purpose of this study, competence was defined by specific factors. Both competence and noncompetence were defined using two criteria. One was the level of professional expertise in psychology, and the other consisted of behaviors during the presentation on the topic of careers in psychology. More precisely, the person behaving in a noncompetent manner

(a) had no professional credentials hanging behind her desk, (b) was introduced as an individual with limited previous exposure to psychology, and (c) emitted 10 statements of "I'm not sure" throughout the speech and picked up her notes five times during the presentation.

In contrast, competent speakers had the following characteristics: (a) Ph.D. credentials in psychology hanging behind the desk, (b) were introduced as individuals with a high level of previous experience in psychology, and (c) emitted no statements of "I'm not sure" and did not pick up their notes throughout the presentation.

Hypotheses

1. Individuals with a high level of rigidity will display more racial prejudice than low-rigid individuals.
2. Individuals with a low level of rigidity, after exposure to a competent model, will demonstrate less prejudice than high-rigid individuals.

Method

Participants

A total of 90 white female undergraduate students from psychology classes at North Texas State University served as subjects for this study. Course credit for participation was given to each student who completed the entire experiment.

Measures

Measures utilized in this study included several classes of assessment devices. To measure rigidity as a

personality characteristic, subjects were administered the Rigidity Scale (Rehfish, 1958). Qualities suggested by the author to be contained in a rigid personality and to be tapped by this measure included conservatism, constriction and inhibition, intolerance of ambiguity and disorder, social introversion, perseverative tendencies, anxiety, and guilt. The 39-item true/false scale included items from both the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and the California Psychological Inventory. Split-half reliability is quoted at .72 and interrater reliability across samples at .73 (Appendix A).

To measure racial prejudice, several scales were utilized. Primarily, subjects were administered the Short Form of the Multifactor Racial Inventory (Ard & Cook, 1977). This form was adapted from the original version of Woodmansee and Cook (1967) and is considered to measure prejudicial attitudes in relation to blacks. Although the short form has not been widely utilized, its efficacy stems from the fact that it was composed from items of the original 120-item scale that appeared to be the most salient. The 12-item short form has eta coefficients reflecting the strength of relationship between inventory scores and attitudinal criterion group membership at a median of .58. The correlations between the short and long forms range from .86 to .93. The reliability of the 12-item form approximates that of the full inventory which ranges

from .77 to .93. A copy of this scale is provided in Appendix B.

In addition, a Verbal Attitude Scale to measure racial prejudice was used. This scale was constructed by Warner and DeFleur (1968) from items used in previous research and measures verbal attitudes toward blacks. Split-half reliability is quoted at .84 and the Spearman-Brown Prophecy coefficient at .97. This 16-item true/false scale has been validated in several studies using large groups of subjects and appears to be an effective measure to distinguish subjects who have prejudicial racial attitudes from subjects who have nonprejudicial attitudes (Appendix C).

A final prejudice measure utilized was the Behavioral Interaction Scale developed by Warner and DeFleur (1968) in conjunction with the Verbal Attitude Scale. This measure was designed to assess how willing subjects were to interact with blacks in general. The coefficient of reproducibility for this scale is quoted from .70 to .89. The coefficient of scalability is quoted at .72. Although this interaction scale has not been widely used in research, it appears to be a valid measure of subjects' willingness to interact with blacks in various situations and proved to be an important measure in the study by Warner and DeFleur (1969). This scale is available in Appendix D.

In addition, subjects were administered the Intrinsic-Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scale (Feagin, 1964; Allport

& Ross, 1967). This scale was designed to measure the two dimensions of religious orientation previously defined. Item to subscale correlations range from .18 to .58. Although no validity coefficients are quoted, in both the studies by Feagin and Allport and Ross, support for the construct validity of the scale has been demonstrated (Appendix E).

To obtain demographic information, a questionnaire was administered that included information concerning age, sex, education level, estimated grade point average, marital status, ethnic group membership, parental educational level, parents' professions, and a rating of parental strictness or permissiveness on a 10-point scale (Appendix F).

As well, a manipulation check, which asked subjects to rate the perceived competence of the model, was included to measure the validity of the competence/noncompetence distinction. These questions were designed to assess the extent to which participants who were to view the films (described in the Procedure section) felt that the black model was familiar with the topic and whether observation of the black model affected participants' attitudes toward blacks (Appendix G).

Models

Models for this study were two black female graduate students in psychology. Each female served in both roles

of the competent and noncompetent speaker to counterbalance for experimenter bias. Factors remaining constant between the models included age (26); level of training (2 years of graduate study in psychology); height (5'5", 5'6"); and approximate weight (125 lbs, 135 lbs).

Procedure

Recruited students from psychology classes were given the Rigidity Scale (Rehfish, 1958), the Verbal Attitude Scale (Warner & DeFleur, 1968), the Behavioral Interaction Scale (Warner & DeFleur, 1969), and the Short Form of the Multifactor Racial Inventory (Ard & Cook, 1977) at the first meeting. The students were then asked to participate in a brief session dealing with "Careers in Psychology" that took place 1 to 3 weeks later. An informed consent agreement was signed, and the students were instructed that they could withdraw from the study at any time; however, credit would only be given for participation in both sessions. As well, subjects were assured of confidentiality of results and guaranteed that their names would not be associated with the data analysis.

Next, participants' scores on the Rigidity Scale were obtained. Then, using a median split, participants were separated into high- and low-rigid groups. From each group, 15 subjects were then exposed to a 15-minute videotape of a competent black woman sitting at a desk discussing careers in psychology, and 15 subjects from each group were

presented with a noncompetent black woman giving the same speech. The remaining 15 high-rigid and 15 low-rigid subjects were shown a film with the same verbal content which was void of any specific communicators (Appendix H).

This 15-minute presentation appeared to be an adequate one. Doster (1972) utilized a 3-minute presentation in a study on modeling and role rehearsal and found this brief exposure to be an adequate training time. Stone and Stein (1978) used short times of 5 minutes and long times of 20 minutes in a study on modeling and found both to be effective with the longer exposure exhibiting greater efficacy. Thus, it seems as if our 15-minute exposure should be of adequate length to promote attitude change.

After subjects viewed the videotape, the following inventories were readministered: the Verbal Attitude Scale, the Behavioral Interaction Scale, the Short Form of the Multifactor Racial Inventory, and the Intrinsic-Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scale. In addition, all participants were given the demographic questionnaire and the postexperimental questionnaire. Following this, subjects were debriefed concerning the nature of the study and the actors involved (Appendix I).

Results

One purpose of this study is to examine whether a relationship exists between level of rigidity and prejudice. A second purpose is to examine whether exposure to blacks

with varying levels of competence affects prejudicial attitudes. To do this, groups of white females who varied in level of rigidity are obtained and differences in prejudicial attitudes are compared. Prior to this, however, to insure that contrasting groups of high- and low-rigid individuals are being compared, a t test was computed between the rigidity scores of these two groups. The high-rigid group obtains a mean score on the Rigidity Scale of 22.53 ($SD = 4.36$), and the low-rigid group obtains a mean of 13.09 ($SD = 13.09$). Highly significant differences in level of rigidity are found, $t(86) = 12.66$, $p < .001$.

Next, the specific hypotheses of this study are examined. One hypothesis is that high-rigid individuals would be more prejudiced than low-rigid individuals. To examine this hypothesis, initial scores on all three prejudice measures administered to the two groups of high- and low-rigid subjects are obtained and compared utilizing Hotelling's T^2 . No significant differences are found between high and low groups of rigidity and prejudice scores, $T^2(3, 84) = 6.18$, $p < .118$. Thus, the high- and low-rigid subjects do not differ initially on the three measures of prejudice. The means and standard deviations of the three measures are given in Table 1.

Table 1

Initial Means and Standard Deviations of Dependent Measures

Dependent Measures	Groups			
	High-Rigid		Low-Rigid	
	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD
Multifactor Racial Inventory	35.64	10.02	31.39	11.44
Verbal Attitude Scale	1.02	1.57	1.05	1.35
Behavioral Interaction Scale	3.18	2.06	3.00	2.53

A second hypothesis of this study is that individuals with a low level of rigidity would demonstrate less prejudice than high-rigid individuals after exposure to a competent model. To examine this hypothesis, all participants are administered three tests designed to assess level of prejudicial attitudes. Next, two of the groups are shown black models who vary in levels of competence. Groups are then readministered the three prejudice measures. For each of the three measures of racial prejudice, three 2 x 3 analyses of variance are then performed upon change scores. The independent variables used in the design are level of rigidity (high versus low) and type of exposure to a black model (competent, noncompetent, and no model). The means and standard deviations for each group on the various measures are found in Table 2.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Change Scores
for the Three Dependent Measures

Group	Dependent Measures		
	Multifactor Racial Inventory	Verbal Attitude Scale Competent Model	Behavioral Interaction Scale
High-Rigid			
(\bar{X})	1.07	.43	.43
(\underline{SD})	7.15	.90	1.64
Low-Rigid			
(\bar{X})	- .20	-.07	.33
(\underline{SD})	5.14	.58	1.45
Noncompetent Model			
High-Rigid			
(\bar{X})	-1.35	.06	- .18
(\underline{SD})	6.24	.94	1.55
Low-Rigid			
(\bar{X})	.60	-.53	- .07
(\underline{SD})	4.08	.88	1.24
No Model			
High-Rigid			
(\bar{X})	.00	-.15	- .15
(\underline{SD})	5.29	.36	1.96
Low-Rigid			
(\bar{X})	- .28	-.36	- .50
(\underline{SD})	5.87	.61	1.05

For the first measure (Multifactor Racial Inventory), a nonsignificant main effect is obtained for rigidity, $F(1, 82) = .201, p < .65$, and level of competence, $F(2, 82) = .69, p < .50$. As well, a nonsignificant interaction effect is found, $F(2, 82) = 1.25, p < .30$. This indicates that change in degree of prejudice as measured by this scale is not related to either the level of rigidity or the type of exposure to a black model.

For the second measure of prejudice (Verbal Attitude Scale), a nonsignificant main effect is obtained for level of competence, $F(2, 82) = 2.72, p < .07$. The interaction effect is also nonsignificant, $F(2, 82) = .461, p < .63$. A significant main effect is obtained for level of rigidity, $F(1, 82) = 6.73, p < .01$. This indicates that low-rigid individuals in general became less prejudiced than high-rigid individuals as measured by this scale. A Tukey post hoc analysis indicates that the high-rigid competent group does not decrease its prejudice as much as the low-rigid, noncompetent group ($p < .05$).

Finally, for the third measure of prejudice (Behavioral Interaction Scale), nonsignificant values are obtained both for main effects of rigidity, $F(1, 82) = .133, p < .72$, and level of competence, $F(2, 82) = 1.75, p < .18$, as well as the interaction effects, $F(2, 82) = .161, p < .85$. This indicates that, for this particular scale, change in racial prejudice is not dependent upon the level of rigidity or the type of model to which subjects were exposed.

As can be seen, in almost all instances, no changes in scores on the prejudice measures as a result of exposure to the experimental manipulations are observed. One possibility for the nonsignificant results on some of the measures of prejudice may be that they are highly correlated and thus measure similar facets of prejudice. To examine this possibility, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient is computed between participants' scores on the three measures of prejudice. Although all of the measures are highly correlated, the Behavioral Interaction Scale (BIS) and the Multifactor Racial Inventory (MFRI) correlate highest ($r = .61$). In contrast, the Verbal Attitude Scale does not correlate as highly with either the MFRI ($r = .58$) or the BIS ($r = .45$). This suggests that the BIS and MFRI are measuring similar domains of prejudice while the VAS is measuring a different domain of prejudice. The possibility that the VAS measures a separate component of prejudice may account for difference found between groups using this measure and not the others.

Another possible reason why groups do not differ on all of the dependent measures may be because the competency manipulation of exposing groups to different models may not be sufficient. To examine this possibility, the four questions used as manipulation checks are analyzed. This is done by computing four F tests comparing scores of groups on each question. A fifth F test, which was the sum of each group's answers to all four questions, is also done.

First, a 2 X 3 analysis of variance (level of rigidity by type of exposure) is performed upon the question, "How competent was this speaker?" The interaction effect is nonsignificant, $F(2, 82) = .142, p < .87$. However, both the main effects of level of rigidity, $F(1, 82) = 8.58, p < .004$, and type of exposure, $F(2, 82) = 7.98, p < .007$ are significant. A post hoc Tukey test reveals that the low-rigid, noncompetent group scores higher than the high-rigid, competent group ($p < .01$) and that the low-rigid, competent group scores higher than the high-rigid, no-model group ($p < .01$) and the low-rigid, no-model group ($p < .05$). These results seem to reveal that the noncompetent model was perceived as less competent than the competent model and that low-rigid subjects in general viewed the models as less competent than did high-rigid subjects.

The next question subjected to a 2 X 3 analysis of variance is "How well did this speaker know what she was talking about?" The interaction effect is nonsignificant, $F(2, 82) = .78, p < .46$. Again, both main effects are significant--rigidity at $F(1, 82) = 9.60, p < .002$, and type of exposure at $F(2, 82) = 5.66, p < .005$. A post hoc Tukey test reveals that the high-rigid, competent group scored lower than the low-rigid, noncompetent group ($p < .05$); the low-rigid noncompetent group scores higher than the high-rigid, no-model group ($p < .01$); and the low-rigid, competent group scores higher than the high-rigid, no-model group ($p < .01$). In general, these results

indicate that the noncompetent model was seen as less knowledgeable about her speech than the competent model and that low-rigid individuals perceived the speaker as less knowledgeable in general.

The third question analyzed is that of "Was your attitude changed by this person?" Both main effects are nonsignificant--rigidity at $F(1, 82) = .077, p < .78$, and level of competence at $F(2, 82) = .71, p < .49$. A significant interaction effect is obtained, $F(2, 83) = 3.15, p < .04$; however, a post hoc Tukey analysis does not reveal any significant between-group differences.

A fourth manipulation question, "Does this black characterize blacks in general?" does not reveal any significant differences after analysis by a 2 X 3 analysis of variance. The main effects are nonsignificant--rigidity at $F(1, 82) = 1.38, p < .24$, and level of competence at $F(2, 82) = 2.38, p < .09$. The interaction effect is also nonsignificant, $F(2, 82) = .34, p < .70$.

Finally, the total of all the questions is subjected to a 2 X 3 analysis of variance. A nonsignificant main effect is obtained for level of competence, $F(2, 82) = .96, p < .38$, and the interaction effect is also nonsignificant, $F(2, 82) = 1.80, p < .07$. However, the main effect of rigidity is significant, $F(1, 82) = 5.88, p < .01$. A post hoc Tukey analysis indicates that the high-rigid, competent group scores lower than the low-rigid noncompetent

group ($p < .05$). This result again indicates that low-rigid subjects in general perceived the speaker in a less competent manner than did high-rigid subjects.

One final reason for the nonsignificant results obtained on the dependent measures may be that participants rated their attitudes toward a black psychologist rather than towards blacks in general. To explore this possibility, three 2 X 3 analyses of variance which utilized the same previous independent variables are performed, focusing on the initial scores of each of the three questions posed concerning attitudes toward black psychologists. No significant differences are found on these initial scores between groups. Subsequently, three 2 X 3 analyses of variance are performed upon the change scores of these same three questions. For the initial question, "How comfortable would you be with a black psychologist?" a significant main effect for the type of exposure is obtained, $F(2, 82) = 4.68, p < .01$; however, a post hoc Tukey analysis does not reveal any significant specific group differences. Thus, although differences do exist somewhere, the significance is not pertinent to the purposes of this study. The main effect for rigidity is nonsignificant, $F(1, 82) = .60, p < .44$, as well as the interaction effect, $F(2, 82) = .26, p < .77$. In addition, no other significant differences are obtained on the change scores of the other two items concerning black psychologists. These findings

seem to indicate that there are no specific changes toward black psychologists as a result of exposure to a competent model, because no changes are observed between the competent model (black psychologist) and noncompetent model (high school graduate).

Discussion

The purpose of the present study is twofold. One purpose is to examine whether a relationship exists between level of rigidity and prejudicial attitudes toward blacks. More specifically, the study attempts to ascertain whether highly rigid individuals were more prejudiced than less rigid individuals. It was speculated that individuals with a high level of rigidity would be more prejudiced than low-rigid individuals. A second purpose is to examine the effects of exposure to black models who differed in level of competence upon changes in racial prejudice. More specifically, it was hypothesized that, after exposure to a competent model, individuals with a low level of rigidity would demonstrate less prejudice than high-rigid individuals similarly exposed to a competent model.

The first hypothesis, that high-rigid individuals would be more prejudiced than less rigid people, is not supported by the statistical analyses. There are several possible reasons for these nonsignificant findings. One possibility may be due to the population sampled. This sample consisted of college females. It is possible that

this population, regardless of rigidity level, is not as prejudiced as the general population. As a consequence, even though level of rigidity differs significantly, the magnitude in level of prejudice may be small. This speculation seems especially germane, because the visual inspection of the data reveals a rather limited range in scores on the prejudice measures.

Another possible reason for the failure to obtain significance may be due to the measures used to assess prejudice. It is possible that the measures used measure only a limited parameter of prejudice. For example, Taylor (1980) has proposed that racially prejudiced attitudes are often manifested covertly as well as overtly. The measures used in this study seem to contain items which assess overt forms of prejudice. It is possible that groups did differ in covert prejudicial attitudes. Had measures been used which were designed to identify more subtle prejudicial attitudes, it is possible that differences would be found between groups.

The second hypothesis of this study examines the notion that, after exposure to a competent model, individuals with a low level of rigidity would demonstrate less prejudice than high-rigid individuals. Only one significant difference is found here--the Verbal Attitude Scale. It is found that low-rigid individuals in general displayed less prejudice after exposure to the models than did high-rigid individuals. Post hoc analyses reveal that the low-rigid

subjects who were exposed to a noncompetent model became less prejudiced than high-rigid subjects who were exposed to a competent model. This finding is contrary to the expectation of this study. It may point out that the low-rigid subjects did not perceive such a discrepancy between the competent and noncompetent model. Low-rigid subjects did not perceive the competent model as being as competent as did the high-rigid subjects. This may indicate that the high-rigid subjects perceived the competent model as an exception to blacks in general or, as a token, rated them as more competent than most blacks and did not change their prejudicial attitudes, because they perceived this black as an exception.

Low-rigid subjects, on the other hand, were more likely to rate the model as less competent than were highly rigid subjects. The tendency of low-rigid participants to rate the model lower than high-rigid participants may be due to the fact that they have been exposed to many competent blacks and viewed this model as just one of many competent blacks. The decrease in prejudice as compared to the high-rigid subjects may indicate that they generalized from this model to blacks in general, whereas the highly rigid subjects seemed more likely to label this black as unusual. This supports the notion that highly rigid subjects may not have been able to incorporate a generalized competent view of blacks into their rigid organizational processes and

were forced to label this as an exception and not modify their views of blacks in general.

Low-rigid subjects, alternatively, may have been able to incorporate this information and alter their organizational processes with this new data. This may well be a characteristic of low-rigid versus high-rigid individuals and supports previous literature in this finding.

The overall purpose of this study is to examine whether prejudiced attitudes could be reduced by exposure to competent blacks. However, the methodology used consists of exposure to a black psychologist who discussed psychology. Therefore, it is possible that participants may have become less prejudiced toward black psychologists but not toward blacks in general. To explore this possibility, four supplementary questions are asked which were designed to assess whether changes in attitudes toward black psychologists occurred.

A significant main effect is obtained for type of exposure on the question, "How comfortable would you be with a black psychologist?" However, post hoc analyses do not reveal any significant group differences. Because no significant differences are found between groups on the other questions, this finding may be spurious. As well, this difference seems to be a function of the no-model condition and does not appear to represent a meaningful distinction between the conditions of competent and

noncompetent model. In addition, no other significant differences are obtained on the remaining questions that concern black psychologists which support the notion that there are no specific changes regarding black psychologists versus blacks in general. Thus, it appears as if participants were not responding simply to the competence level of black psychologists.

The major purpose of this study is to examine changes in prejudicial attitudes as a function of exposure to blacks varying in level of competence. Although significance is found on one of the measures of prejudice, this may be a spurious finding, because several measures of prejudice are used. Therefore, overall, the hypotheses of this study are not supported. However, it would be premature to conclude that exposure of competent blacks to prejudiced whites is not an effective means for changing prejudiced attitudes, because the failure to find significance may be due to several extraneous variables. For example, one reason for the failure to find significance may be due to the population used. Because a college population is used, the sample obtained may not be representative of the larger population. Therefore, it may be worthwhile to replicate this study using participants obtained from a noncollege population.

Along somewhat related lines, this study uses only females. Several investigators have suggested that females

are also often the victims of prejudice (Cox, 1972; Rawlings & Carter, 1977). Therefore, although there may be differences in rigidity level among females, because of their own previous experiences as females they may not have been prejudiced. It is suggested that a similar field study of this sort be done during which samples which vary in sex, socio-economic conditions, and educational level be obtained to examine the relative contribution of these variables to prejudiced attitudes.

It is also suggested that a second possible reason is that dependent measures used may not be sensitive to changes which may have occurred as a result of exposure to blacks varying in level of competence. Therefore, it is also suggested that additional studies be done in which whites are exposed to blacks who vary in level of competence but in which different measures of prejudice are used to assess outcomes.

Finally, at a more speculative level, regardless whether exposure to competent blacks has an effect upon changes in prejudicial attitudes toward blacks, this may be an effective technique for changing prejudicial attitudes toward other minority groups such as Mexican-Americans, handicapped individuals, and homosexuals. It is suggested that other similar studies be done which are designed to examine whether exposure to competent members from these populations is an effective means to modify prejudiced attitudes toward these minority group members.

Appendix A

- | | | |
|--|------|-------|
| 1. I usually don't like to talk much unless I am with people I know very well. | True | False |
| 2. I like to talk before groups of people. | True | False |
| 3. It is hard for me to start a conversation with strangers. | True | False |
| 4. I would like to be an actor on the stage or in the movies. | True | False |
| 5. It is hard for me to act natural when I am with new people. | True | False |
| 6. I feel nervous if I have to meet a lot of people. | True | False |
| 7. I usually feel nervous and ill at ease at a formal dance or party. | True | False |
| 8. When I work on a committee I like to take charge of things. | True | False |
| 9. I usually take an active part in the entertainment at parties. | True | False |
| 10. I am a better talker than listener. | True | False |
| 11. I try to remember good stories to pass them on to other people. | True | False |
| 12. I am embarrassed with people I do not know well. | True | False |
| 13. A strong person doesn't show his/her emotions and feelings. | True | False |
| 14. I must admit that it makes me angry when other people interfere with my daily activity. | True | False |
| 15. I find that a well-ordered mode of life with regular hours is congenial to my temperament. | True | False |
| 16. It bothers me when something unexpected interrupts my daily routine. | True | False |

- | | | |
|--|------|-------|
| 17. I don't like to undertake any project unless I have a pretty good idea as to how it will turn out. | True | False |
| 18. I find it hard to set aside a task that I have undertaken, even for a short time. | True | False |
| 19. I don't like things to be uncertain and unpredictable. | True | False |
| 20. I am very slow in making up my mind. | True | False |
| 21. At times I feel that I can make up my mind with unusually great ease. | True | False |
| 22. I must admit I try to see what others think before I take a stand. | True | False |
| 23. I do not like to see women smoke. | True | False |
| 24. I would be uncomfortable in anything other than fairly conventional dress. | True | False |
| 25. I keep out of trouble at all costs. | True | False |
| 26. It wouldn't make me nervous if any members of my family got into trouble with the law. | True | False |
| 27. I must admit that I would find it hard to have for a close friend a person whose manners or appearance made him somewhat repulsive, no matter how brilliant or kind he/she might be. | True | False |
| 28. I would certainly enjoy beating a crook at his own game. | True | False |
| 29. I would like the job of a foreign correspondent for a newspaper. | True | False |
| 30. I get very tense and anxious when I think other people are disapproving of me. | True | False |

- | | | |
|--|------|-------|
| 31. I am certainly lacking in self-confidence. | True | False |
| 32. Criticism or scolding makes me very uncomfortable. | True | False |
| 33. Most people inwardly dislike putting themselves out to help other people. | True | False |
| 34. I am against giving money to beggars. | True | False |
| 35. Many of the women I knew in college went with a man only for what they could get out of him. | True | False |
| 36. I always follow the rule: business before pleasure. | True | False |
| 37. I get disgusted with myself when I can't understand some problem in my field, or when I can't seem to make any progress on a research problem. | True | False |
| 38. I have never been made especially nervous over trouble that any members of my family have gotten into. | True | False |
| 39. I have no fear of spiders. | True | False |

Appendix B

Here are 12 questions about your opinions on controversial issues. You can state your position by checking one (and only one) of the seven answers listed under each question. If your exact position is not given, please choose the answer that comes closest to it. Please answer every question and work quickly.

1. Do you believe that integration (of schools, businesses, residences, etc.) will benefit both whites and blacks?

- I agree strongly that integration will benefit both whites and blacks.
- I agree on the whole that integration will benefit both whites and blacks.
- I agree slightly that integration will benefit both whites and blacks.
- I am undecided about whether integration will benefit both whites and blacks.
- I disagree slightly that integration will benefit both whites and blacks.
- I disagree on the whole that integration will benefit both whites and blacks.
- I disagree strongly that integration will benefit both whites and blacks.

2. Do you think desegregation should be gradual or should it take place all at once.

- I strongly favor gradual rather than an all-at-once desegregation.
- I moderately favor gradual rather than an all-at-once desegregation.
- I slightly favor gradual rather than an all-at-once desegregation.
- I am undecided between gradual and all-at-once desegregation.
- I slightly favor all-at-once rather than gradual desegregation.
- I moderately favor all-at-once rather than gradual desegregation.
- I strongly favor all-at-once rather than gradual desegregation.

3. Who do you think should decide about desegregation: the federal government, or states and local communities?

 I strongly favor having the federal government decide about desegregation.

 I moderately favor having the federal government decide about desegregation.

 I slightly favor having the federal government decide about desegregation.

 I am undecided about who should decide about desegregation.

 I slightly favor letting states and local communities decide about desegregation.

 I moderately favor letting states and local communities decide about desegregation.

 I strongly favor letting states and local communities decide about desegregation.

4. Do you believe that a businessman or landlord has a right to choose whom he will deal with, even if this means refusing to deal with blacks?

 I agree strongly that the businessman or landlord has this right.

 I agree moderately that the businessman or landlord has this right.

 I agree slightly that the businessman or landlord has this right.

 I am undecided whether the businessman or landlord has this right.

 I am slightly opposed to giving the businessman or landlord the right to refuse to deal with blacks.

 I am moderately opposed to giving the businessman or landlord the right to refuse to deal with blacks.

 I am strongly opposed to giving the businessman or landlord the right to refuse to deal with blacks.

5. What is your opinion of this statement: "The fact that blacks are human beings can be recognized without raising them to the social level of whites."

 I strongly disagree.

 I moderately disagree.

 I slightly disagree.

(continued)

- I am uncertain.
 I slightly agree.
 I moderately agree.
 I strongly agree.

6. If a black person were put in charge of you, how would you feel about taking advice and direction from him/her?

- I would dislike it a great deal.
 I would dislike it on the whole.
 I would dislike it a little.
 I am uncertain whether I would like or dislike it.
 I wouldn't mind it.
 I would like it.
 I would be very pleased about it.

7. If you had a chance to introduce black visitors to your friends and neighbors, how would you feel about it?

- I would be very pleased about it.
 I would like it.
 I wouldn't mind it.
 I am uncertain whether I would like or dislike it.
 I would dislike it a little.
 I would dislike it on the whole.
 I would dislike it a great deal.

8. What is your opinion of this statement: "Although social equality of the races may be the democratic way, a good many blacks are not yet ready to practice the self-control that goes with it."

- I strongly disagree.
 I disagree on the whole.
 I disagree a little.
 I am uncertain whether I agree or disagree.
 I agree a little.
 I agree on the whole.
 I strongly agree.

9. How would you feel if you were eating with a black person of the opposite sex in a public place?

- I would feel extremely self-conscious.
 I would feel quite self-conscious.
 I would feel a little self-conscious.
 I am uncertain whether I would feel at ease or self-conscious. (continued)

- I would feel at ease a little.
 I would feel at ease on the whole.
 I would feel completely at ease.

10. Which do you think helps blacks more: laws preventing discrimination against blacks or programs aimed at improving blacks' ability to compete in our society?

- I would give much more emphasis to laws preventing discrimination.
 I would give somewhat more emphasis to laws preventing discrimination.
 I would give slightly more emphasis to laws preventing discrimination.
 I am undecided.
 I would give slightly more emphasis to improving blacks' ability to compete.
 I would give somewhat more emphasis to improving blacks' ability to compete.
 I would give much more emphasis to improving blacks' ability to compete.

11. How do you feel about interracial marriage?

- I am strongly opposed.
 I am moderately opposed.
 I am slightly opposed.
 I am undecided whether I am in favor or opposed.
 I am slightly in favor.
 I am moderately in favor.
 I am strongly in favor.

12. How do you feel about it when blacks hold mass demonstrations to demand what they want?

- I am strongly in favor of such demonstrations.
 I am moderately in favor of such demonstrations.
 I am slightly in favor of such demonstrations.
 I am uncertain whether I favor or oppose such demonstrations.
 I am slightly opposed to such demonstrations.
 I am moderately opposed to such demonstrations.
 I am strongly opposed to such demonstrations.

Appendix C

- | | | |
|--|------|-------|
| 1. Blacks ought to have the same access to swimming pools as whites. | True | False |
| 2. The reason so many blacks are on "relief" is that they do not want to work. | True | False |
| 3. I would be willing to invite a black into my home for lunch. | True | False |
| 4. White candidates can do a better job than blacks in political office. | True | False |
| 5. I would be willing to sit in public (for example in the Student Union) with a black. | True | False |
| 6. Blacks seem to learn a little slower than whites. | True | False |
| 7. I would be willing to have a black family live next door to me. | True | False |
| 8. Blacks do not make good workers, because they are lazy. | True | False |
| 9. If I had children, I would not mind if they were taught by a black school teacher. | True | False |
| 10. Blacks cannot be trusted in positions of responsibility. | True | False |
| 11. There is nothing wrong with both races attending the same church. | True | False |
| 12. Most blacks would become overbearing and disagreeable if not kept in their place. | True | False |
| 13. It is unimportant to me if an elected official is black or white, as long as she/he is capable and honest. | True | False |
| 14. I would not be willing to invite blacks to a dinner party at my home. | True | False |
| 15. I would be willing to have a black as my supervisor in my place of work. | True | False |

16. I prefer to see white and black children attend different schools. True False

Appendix D

1. If you were asked for a date by an attractive black college student, in order to participate in an evening of dancing, good music, and good fellowship, what would you do?
 - a. I would go.
 - b. I would not go.

2. If you were asked to contribute a very small sum of money (like 25¢) to a black civil rights organization, what would you do?
 - a. I would contribute.
 - b. I would not contribute.

3. If a campus organization asked you to endorse an appeal to both political parties to seek out qualified black candidates for public office, what would you do?
 - a. I would endorse the appeal.
 - b. I would not endorse the appeal.

4. Even today some local restaurants and hotels discriminate against black clients. If you were asked to sign a petition urging a local hotel or restaurant to serve blacks, what would you do?
 - a. I would sign the petition.
 - b. I would not sign the petition.

5. If you were invited to a dinner being held to welcome new black students to campus, what would you do?
 - a. I would go.
 - b. I would not go.

6. The State Board of Education is considering a new policy of giving more complete treatment to the contributions of blacks to American history and our society. If you were asked to endorse such a policy, what would you do?
 - a. I would endorse such a policy.
 - b. I would not endorse such a policy.

7. If you were asked to volunteer to go into the home of a black family of potential college students and tell them about your experiences as a college student, what would you do?
 - a. I would go.
 - b. I would not go.

8. There are several outstanding charitable groups organized to give aid to black college students who otherwise could never attend college. If you were asked to donate a very small sum of money (like 25¢) to such a charity, what would you do?
 - a. I would donate.
 - b. I would not donate.

Appendix E

1. What religion offers me most is comfort when sorrows and misfortune strike.
 - a. I definitely disagree.
 - b. I tend to disagree.
 - c. I tend to agree.
 - d. I definitely agree.

2. One reason for my being a church member is that such membership helps to establish a person in the community.
 - a. Definitely not true.
 - b. Tends not to be true.
 - c. Tends to be true.
 - d. Definitely true.

3. The purpose of prayer is to secure a happy and peaceful life.
 - a. I definitely disagree.
 - b. I tend to disagree.
 - c. I tend to agree.
 - d. I definitely agree.

4. It doesn't matter so much what I believe so long as I lead a moral life.
 - a. I definitely disagree.
 - b. I tend to disagree.
 - c. I tend to agree.
 - d. I definitely agree.

5. Although I am a religious person I refuse to let religious considerations influence my everyday affairs.
 - a. Definitely not true of me.
 - b. Tends not to be true.
 - c. Tends to be true.
 - d. Clearly true in my case.

6. The church is most important as a place to formulate good social relationships.
 - a. I definitely disagree.
 - b. I tend to disagree.
 - c. I tend to agree.
 - d. I definitely agree.

7. Although I believe in my religion, I feel there are many more important things in my life.
 - a. I definitely disagree.
 - b. I tend to disagree.
 - c. I tend to agree.
 - d. I definitely agree.

8. I pray chiefly because I have been taught to pray.
 - a. Definitely true of me.
 - b. Tends to be true.
 - c. Tends not to be true.
 - d. Definitely not true of me.

9. A primary reason for my interest in religions is that my church is a congenial social activity.
 - a. Definitely not true of me.
 - b. Tends not to be true.
 - c. Tends to be true.
 - d. Definitely true of me.

10. Occasionally I find it necessary to compromise my religious beliefs in order to protect my social and economic well-being.
 - a. Definitely disagree.
 - b. Tend to disagree.
 - c. Tend to agree.
 - d. Definitely agree.

11. The primary purpose of prayer is to gain relief and protection.
 - a. I definitely agree.
 - b. I tend to agree.
 - c. I tend to disagree.
 - d. I definitely disagree.

12. Religion helps me to keep my life balanced and steady in exactly the same way as my citizenship, friendships, and other memberships do.
 - a. I definitely agree.
 - b. I tend to agree.
 - c. I tend to disagree.
 - d. I definitely disagree.

13. I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life.
 - a. I definitely disagree.
 - b. I tend to disagree.
 - c. I tend to agree.
 - d. I definitely agree.

14. Quite often I have been keenly aware of the presence of God or the Divine Being.
 - a. Definitely not true.
 - b. Tends not to be true.
 - c. Tends to be true.
 - d. Definitely true.

15. My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life.
 - a. This is definitely not so.
 - b. Probably not so.
 - c. Probably so.
 - d. Definitely so.

16. The prayers I say when I am alone carry as much meaning and personal emotion as those said by me during services.
 - a. Almost never.
 - b. Sometimes.
 - c. Usually.
 - d. Almost always.

17. If not prevented by unavoidable circumstances, I attend church:
 - a. More than once a week.
 - b. About once a week.
 - c. Two or three times a month.
 - d. Less than once a month.

18. If I were to join a church group I would prefer to join (1) a Bible study group, or (2) a social fellowship.
 - a. I would prefer to join (1).
 - b. I probably would prefer (1).
 - c. I probably would prefer (2).
 - d. I would prefer to join (2).

19. Religion is especially important to be because it answers many questions about the meaning of life.
 - a. Definitely disagree.
 - b. Tend to disagree.
 - c. Tend to agree.
 - d. Definitely agree.

20. I read literature about my faith (or church).
 - a. Frequently.
 - b. Occasionally.
 - c. Rarely.
 - d. Never.

21. It is important to me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and meditation.
 - a. Frequently true.
 - b. Occasionally true.
 - c. Rarely true.
 - d. Never true.

Appendix F

Please answer the following questions:

1. Age _____.
2. Sex _____.
3. Education level _____.
4. Estimated grade point average _____.
5. Marital status _____.
6. Ethnic group membership _____.
7. Education level of mother _____.
8. Education level of father _____.
9. Mother's profession _____.
10. Father's profession _____.
11. How would you rate the overall strictness or permissiveness of your parents while you were growing up?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Very Strict									Very Permissive

Appendix G

Please rate your answers on the following 1-10 item scales indicating your degree of agreement or disagreement with each item below.

1. How competent do you feel that this speaker was?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Very Competent								Not very Competent	

2. Did the speaker appear to know what she was talking about?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Yes, very well							Not well at all No,		

3. Do you feel that your attitude was changed because of this person?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Yes, definitely							definitely not No,		

4. Do you feel that this black characterizes blacks in general?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
No, definitely not							Yes, definitely so		

Appendix H

Competent and noncompetent speakers will be introduced in the following ways:

Competent

"The speaker today, Dr. Frances Terrell, is a clinical psychologist who is rapidly gaining recognition in the field as a psychology career counselor. She graduated Summa Cum Laude from Harvard and also received her Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology from Harvard. Dr. Terrell is a Fulbright scholar and has been widely recognized for her research into the field of careers in psychology."

Noncompetent

"The speaker today, Ms. Frances Terrell, is a high school graduate who is trying to enter North Texas in the fall. Although she has no previous experience in psychology, she is interested in the field and prepared this speech for a career day at her high school."

Appendix I

The purpose of this experiment really was to examine changes in knowledge about blacks as a function of how a black person behaved. To examine this, several weeks ago we had you to fill out several questionnaires which assessed your knowledge about blacks. Then some of you saw a film during which a black female behaved in a competent manner. Others saw a film depicting a black female behaving in a relatively noncompetent way in regard to knowledge about psychology. Since we also wanted to collect some baseline data, some of you watched a film which did not have a person giving a speech in it at all. For those of you who saw a female, both were actually advanced graduate students in the psychology department at NTSU. At any rate, after you finished watching the film, we asked you to fill out the same inventories again. We will want to see if there is any change in your knowledge about blacks after watching the film.

To reiterate, the people you may have seen in the film were doctoral students in the psychology department who were asked to act in certain ways. As I have already stated, we were interested in group differences as a function of what the group was exposed to and not individual scores. So, no individual's performance on any of the tests will be looked at. Finally, since this is an experiment, we ask that you keep the exact nature of this experiment confidential until

the end of this term. Your friends may be participating in this study at a later date, and if they were aware of the purpose of this experiment, it might influence how they respond.

We anticipate some preliminary results from this study to be available in the fall. If you would like to know what we found among the groups, please feel free to get in touch with me by calling the psychology department.

Are there any questions?

Appendix J

Please indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with each of the two items below on the 1-10 point scale.

1. There are some ethnic groups who are inferior to other ethnic groups.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Disagree								Agree	
Strongly								Strongly	

2. There are some ethnic groups who cannot do as well as other ethnic groups on tasks requiring the ability to think.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Disagree								Agree	
Strongly								Strongly	

References

- Allport, G. W. Prejudice: A problem in psychological and social causation. Journal of Social Issues, Supplementary Series (4), 1950.
- Allport, G. W. The religious context of prejudice. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1966, 5(3), 448-451.
- Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. Personal religious orientation and prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 432-443.
- Ard, N., & Cook, S. A short scale for the measurement of change in verbal racial attitudes. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1977, 37, 741-744.
- Baston, C. D., Naifeh, S., & Pate, S. Social desirability, religious orientation and racial prejudice. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1978, 17(1), 31-41.
- Beach, L. R., Mitchell, T. R., Deaton, M. D., & Prothero, J. Information relevance, content and source credibility in the revision of opinions. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1978, 21, 1-16.
- Bhushan, L. I., & Sinha, N. Politico-economic conservatism and ethnic prejudice in religious and non-religious cast Hindus. Journal of Psychological Researches, 1975, 21(2), 60-64.
- Breckheimer, S. E., & Nelson, R. O. Group methods for reducing racial prejudice and discrimination. Psychological Reports, 1976, 39, 1259-1268.

- Burnham, E., Connors, J. F., & Leonard, R. Racial prejudice in relation to education, sex, and religion. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1968, 8(2), 318.
- Cann, A. The effects of the attitudes of whites towards blacks on thematic apperception of racial stimuli. Unpublished dissertation, New York University. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, (Dec.), 39(6-B), 2975.
- Cooper, C. L. A study of orthodoxy, authoritarianism, and racial prejudice among lay leaders in Southern Baptist churches in North Carolina. Unpublished dissertation, North Carolina State University at Raleigh. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, (Oct.), 38(4-A), 1819.
- Cotharin, L., & Mikulas, W. L. Systematic desensitization of racial emotional responses. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1975, 6, 347-348.
- Cox, S. Female psychology: The emerging self. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1975.
- Cygnar, T. E., Jacobson, D., & Noel, D. L. Religiosity and prejudice: An interdimensional analysis. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1977, (Jan.), 16(2), 183-191.
- Doster, J. A. Effects of instruction modeling and role rehearsal on interview verbal behavior. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1972, 39, 202-209.

- Elkin, T. E. The systematic desensitization of racial prejudice. Unpublished dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32(12-B), 7307.
- Epstein, R., & Baron, M. Cognitive dissonance and projected hostility toward outgroups. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 79(2), 171-182.
- Feagin, J. Prejudice and religious types: A focused study of southern fundamentalists. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1964, 4, 3-13.
- Foley, L. A. Personality characteristics and interracial contact as determinants of black prejudice toward whites. Human Relations, 1977, (Aug.), 30(8), 709-720.
- Grossman, J. S. Psychological determinants of reaction to neighborhood racial change. Unpublished dissertation, Western REserve University. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1967, 27(10-A), 3514.
- Hassan, M. K. Child-rearing attitudes and some personality traits of the parents of prejudiced school children. Manas, 1977, 24(1), 1-10.
- Henley, N. M., & Pincus, F. Interrelationship of sexist, racist, and antihomosexual attitudes. Psychological Reports, 1978, (Feb.), 42(1), 83-90.
- Holmes, F. The effect of a community field study on the tolerant-prejudice attitudes of prospective secondary teachers toward Negroes. Unpublished dissertation,

- University of Denver. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1968, 28(11-A), 4510.
- Kirtley, D. Conformity and prejudice in authoritarians of opposing political ideologies. Journal of Psychology, 1968, 71(2), 199-204.
- Krukovsky, R. A. The effects of instructional mode, cognitive dissonance, and dogmatism on the change of a particular conception of the relative manifest anxiety levels of inner-city and suburban school children. Unpublished dissertation, Temple University. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 39(2-A), 778.
- Lashbrook, W. B., Snavelly, W. B., & Sullivan, D. L. The effects of source credibility and message information quantity on the attitude change of apathetics. Communication Monographs, 1977, (Aug.), 44(3), 252-262.
- Madden, L. E. Impact of information about Negroes on attitude change. Unpublished dissertation, Ball State University. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 31(10-A), 5039.
- Maranell, G. M. An examination of some religious and political attitude correlates of bigotry. Social Forces, 1967, 45(3), 356-362.
- Milling, F. W. Attitude differential in dogmatic and nondogmatic personality types as a function of persuasive communications and source credibility. Unpublished dissertation, University of Southern

- Mississippi. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 37(4-B), 1917.
- Mussen, P. H. Some personality and social factors related to changes in children's attitudes toward Negroes. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1950, 45, 423-441.
- Owen, I. Adlerian counseling in racially mixed groups of elementary school children. Individual Psychologist, 1970, 7(2), 53-58.
- Peabody, D. Authoritarian scales and response bias. Psychological Bulletin, 1966, 64, 11-23.
- Rawlings, E. I., & Carter, D. K. Psychotherapy for women. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1977.
- Rehfish, J. M. A scale for personality rigidity. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1958, 22, 10-15.
- Rotton, J., Black, F., & Heslin, R. Dogmatism, trust, and message acceptance. Journal of Psychology, 1977, (May), 96(1), 81-88.
- Sinha, R. R., & Hassan, M. D. Some personality correlates of social prejudice. Journal of Social and Economic Studies, 1975, (Sept.), 3(2), 225-231.
- Stephan, W. G., & Rosenfield, D. Effects of desegregation on racial attitudes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1978, (Aug.), 36(8), 795-804.
- Stone, G. L., & Stein, M. L. Effects of modeling and instructions as a function of time, task, and order. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25(2), 150-156.

- Taylor, J. Dimensionalizations of racism and the black experience: The Pittsburg project. In R. L. Jones (Ed.), Black psychology. New York: Harper and Row, 1980.
- Warner, L., & DeFleur, M. Attitude as an interactional concept: Social constraint and social distance as intervening variables between attitudes and action. American Sociological Review, 1969, 34(2), 153-169.
- Woodmansee, J. J., & Cook, S. W. Dimensions of verbal racial attitudes: Their identification and measurement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 7(3), 240-250.
- Wrightsman, L. S. Social psychology in the seventies. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1972, 257-287.