Loyola University Chicago

Loyola eCommons

Master's Theses   Theses and Dissertations

1980

Inter-Racial Attitudes, Friendship Choices and Preferences in a Desegregated School

Pramod Raikar
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses

Part of the Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation

Raikar, Pramod, "Inter-Racial Attitudes, Friendship Choices and Preferences in a Desegregated School" (1980). *Master's Theses*. 3212.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/3212

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License.
Copyright © 1980 Pramod Raikar

Inter-racial Attitudes, Friendship Choices

and Preferences in a Desegregated School

by

Pramod Raikar

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School

of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

December

1980

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitutde to Dr. Richard A. Maier, and Dr. John Carroll for the guidance rendered to me during my work on the thesis. Special thanks go to Dr. Richard Weiner for assistance in doing the multivariate analysis required for the same.

I also extend my heartfelt thanks to Brother Terence Muelhenkamp CSC for letting me use not only the school premises, but the students from the school for this study.

VITA

The author, Pramod Raikar, is the son of Paul Piedade Viegas and Emma (Faria) Viegas. He was born April 7, 1946, in Sholapur, India.

His elementary and secondary education was obtained at St. Joseph's High School, Sholapur, India, where he graduated in 1963.

In June, 1963, he entered the Society of Jesus, and doing the initial two year Novitiate, completed one year of Humanities in May, 1966. In March, 1969, he received his Licentiate in Philosophy from Jnana Deepa University, Poona, India. In May, 1971, he received the degree of Master of Arts, in Marathi, from Karnataka University, Dharwar, India. After a two year break, during which he taught at Jesuit institutions in India, he once again entered Jnana Deepa University, Poona, India, where he received the degree of Bachelor of Theology, in March, 1976.

He is currently enrolled in the doctoral program, in Psychology, at Loyola University of Chicago, Chicago.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CONTENTS FOR APPENDICES

INTRODUCTION

The decade of the sixties witnessed a continuing ef-
fort on the part of the Blacks to improve their position in
society. This effort was not always peaceful. Race riots
erupted in the northern cities. Northern Whites, who
thought of race relations as a Southern problem, were rude-
ly jolted by demonstrations in their own back yards. There
was a growing sense of dissatisfaction over the fact that
"liberal" Whites played too prominent a role in the Civil
Rights Movement, and hence Whites were relegated to a
secondary role. This racial confrontation did provide the
Blacks a sense of solidarity and pride which was to have
lasting effects on Black-White relations. Despite Black
militancy, racial hostility towards them declined (Sheats-
ley, 1966).

Chicago has been rather slow in encouraging and
implementing desegregation in schools. The Chicago School
Board's policy of voluntary desegregation without any
mandatory back-up measures has been severely criticized.
One must remember, however, that desegregation is not an
end in itself; the final goal is integregation. Desegrega-
tion of schools has little value unless it changes the
attitudes and interaction patterns of the ethnic groups

1

involved. Hence, the Chicago School Board thinks that voluntary desegregation is the only sensible solution.

In the context of the past history of Black-White relations, and the present voluntary desegregation policy of the Chicago School Board, it is very important to study the attitudes, friendship patterns and preferences among the various groups that make up the school population of Chicago. This importance stems from the need to know and understand whether inter-ethnic attitudes, friendship patterns and preferences are favorable to the process of integration. Past studies have mostly dealt with Black-White attitudes. This study will include the Hispanic group (Mexican American and Puerto Rican) as well. Since Chicago does have a sizable group of Hispanic students, including them in the study is important to a better understanding of ethnic relations.

Literature Review

This study will focus on four important aspects related to inter-ethnic relationships: attitudes, friendship choices, preferences, and the influence of contact on friendships. The strength of favorable attitudes toward other groups will be an indication of the degree of openness toward and acceptance of the other group. Friendship choices of outgroups are a specific measure of this openness to and acceptance of other ethnic groups. Preferences will be examined as an indication of future intention to

associate with other groups. The preferences will be a measure of social distance which will indicate whether a particular student is willing to accept other ethnic group members as his classmates. The contact theory regarding the influence of propinquity on friendships will also be examined to establish whether it is true in a desegregated school setting. Hence, the literature related to these four aspects will be reviewed before stating the specific goals of this study. Literature regarding attitude-behavior consistency will also be reviewed to examine whether man's insightful but often unfounded assumption about the relationship of attitude and behavior holds good in a school situation.

a) Inter-racial attitudes:

One of the more obvious effects of the Civil Rights Movement has been a change in attitudes toward Blacks. Studies have shown that the Black stereotype is now becoming more favorable. Karlins, Coffman and Walters (1969) (Table 1) computed and compared favorability ratings for the various national and ethnic groups that were the object of study across three generations of Princeton students (Katz & Braly, 1933; Gilbert, 1951; Karlins et al., 1969). Katz and Braly had used 84 traits and had asked their subjects to select those that were 'typical' of the target group. The latter two studies used the same method to collect their data. Karlins et al. however, also collected

Table 1

Mean favorableness of traits comprising each
stereotype. Only five of the ten groups studied
by Karlins et al. (1969) are listed here.

Ethnic Group	Katz & Braly Study 1933	Gilbert Study 1951	Karlins et al Study 1969
Americans	.99	.86	.49
Chinese	-.12	.25	.46
English	.63	.59	.51
Japanese	.66	-.14	.84
Blacks	-.70	-.37	.07

favorability ratings for all the traits and utilized them
to calculate favorability indices for all the three studies.
The favorability ratings of the Blacks did show a steady
improvement from very negative to neutral. Even so, the
favorability ratings for the Blacks were among the lowest
of the ethnic groups studied.

b) <u>Choices</u>:

Though most studies have made preferences as the tar-
get of their research, there are a few which have touched
upon friendship choices. Dickson and Lundberg (1952) in a
study of selective association among ethnic groups in a
high school population, found that choices of students
from other ethnic groups for leadership, friendship, work-
ing together, taking part in a picnic together and repre-
senting the school at a national meeting, were significant-
ly less frequent among older members of the non-Jewish
White group than among their fellow younger students; con-
versely, such outgroup choices among those of the minority
groups were made mostly by the older members. While every
ethnic group showed an overall preference for its own mem-
bers, ethnocentrism was strongest among the non-Jewish
Whites and weakest among Jews so far as choice of leaders
was concerned and strongest among Negroes and weakest among
non-Jewish Whites so far as the choice of friends was con-
cerned. Kawwa (1968) in a study of London schools found
that the majority of all the groups of children (British-

born Whites, Immigrant Cypriots, West Indians and Africans)
choose their own group, and showed little age pattern.
Rowley (1968) in a similar study of social relations be-
tween British and Immigrant children between the ages of 7
and 15 asked subjects to choose someone to sit by in class,
to play with on the playground, and to invite home to tea
or to a party. He found that 90% of the British children
of all ages choose British friends for all the three pur-
poses; 75% of the Indians and 60% of the West Indians like-
wise chose their own nationality. Furthermore, there was
a slight tendency for these ingroup choices to increase as
the children grew older. Mabe and Williams (1975) in a
more recent study used a sociometric procedure which asked
2nd grade students to choose classmates for three different
activities. They found that there was a pronounced dif-
ference in the choices made: Euro-Americans were chosen
more often by both Euro-Americans and Afro-Americans.
However, they did find some evidence of less frequent
choice of Euro-American Associates in the racially bal-
anced classroom than a predominantly Euro-American class-
room.

These studies, except for the Mabe and Williams
(1975) study show that most ethnic groups tend to choose
members from their own groups.

c) Preference Studies:

Early preference studies (up to 1960) have consis-

tently shown a pro-White bias. Horowitz (1936) found a
strong preferences for Whites among five year old White
boys; he also reported adverse comments on Black boys from
a few three and four year old Whites. Preferences for
Whites by Whites (ages 8 to 18) rose in strength up to the
age of sixteen (Koch, 1946); and Black children's prefer-
ences for Blacks was not very apparent at eight, but was
very strong at fourteen. Clark and Clark (1947) in a doll
preference study discovered that a White doll was chosen
more often for being nice, and for having a nice color;
and the Black doll was chosen as the one which looked bad.
Davis et al., (1949) showed White children a "barrier
picture" depicting a Black child in the foreground watching
a group of White children at play, and asked them, "Will
you ask him to play?: The answer was "no" from 43% of
the kindergarten group (aged five to six), 67% of the first
grade (aged six to seven) and 75% of the second grade
(aged seven to eight); these results indicate a definite
rejection of Blacks by White children. Morland (1958)
also found a marked pro-White bias when 73% of the White
children in his study preferred to play with their own
race; he also found that a majority of the Negro children
preferred White children. The explanation for such a
phenomenon can be given in terms of a self-rejection and
an identification with the more dominant, privileged group.
In most of these early preference studies there has been a

strong bias favoring the Whites.

The studies of the sixties and seventies however, do not manifest this bias as strongly or fail to find it at all. Gregor and McPherson (1966), who used the Clark and Clark doll study design, found that the Black doll was chosen most of the time by Black children. Hraba and Grant (1970), again using the Clark and Clark procedure, found that the majority of Black children preferred Black dolls, while the majority of the Whites preferred dolls of their own race. Fox and Jordon (1973) also demonstrated that the majority of Blacks preferred their own race just as the Whites did. Katz and Zalk (1974) did not find strong preferences for White dolls, which some earlier studies had shown.

However, pro-White bias still exists. Pushkin (1967) found choices unfavorable to Blacks rose from 44% to 83% between ages three and seven, with a peak at six. Asher and Allen (1969) using a Brown puppet and a White puppet learned that the majority of Black and White children preferred the White puppet and rejected the Brown one. Mabe and Williams (1974) found a pro-White bias which they called pro-Euro bias. However, this bias did not show itself strongly in racially balanced classrooms.

It must be noted that even where pro-White bias is still found, it is considerably weaker than 20 years ago.

d) <u>Contact</u> <u>Hypothesis</u>:

The primary contribution of social psychology to improving race relations is the contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954). Certain types of contact are helpful in reducing prejudice and increasing acceptance of an originally disliked group (Amir, 1969). The effort being made to desegregate schools in the Chicago area aims at bringing the various ethnic groups in close contact with each other.

However, conditions facilitating prejudice reduction, such as superordinate goals (Sherif, 1966), equal status (Yarrow, Campbell & Yarrow, 1958; Mann, 1959), prolonged intimate acquaintance (Saenger, 1953), proximity (Segal, 1974), and positive feelings associated with interracial contact (Clore, et al., 1978) are not always present in real life situations and are very difficult to maintain over a long period of time. Desegregation of schools may bring about physical proximity, but may not bring about any reduction in prejudice.

If the contact hypothesis was true in a context of a desegregated school, one would expect past contact, both in their grade school and present high school, would make students more open to outgroups in terms of favorability, actual friendship choices and preferences. However, this may not be so, since prejudice reduction occurs only under certain conditions which are difficult to initiate and harder to maintain. One reason for this

difficulty is that racially homogeneous groups tend to form more easily than racially heterogeneous groups (Shaw, 1973; Silverman & Shaw, 1973). At present, with the voluntary busing policy of the Chicago School Board, and the hue and cry raised by those favoring mandatory back-up measures, it would be worthwhile to look at interracial attitudes, friendships and preferences.

e) Attitude-Behavior Consistency:

Since attitude is a learned predisposition to respond to an object in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner, it seems to mediate all responses to that object. People who behave in different ways to certain objects also differ in their attitudes to these same objects. From time to time we find studies reporting the relationship between attitude and behavior. Most of these studies have found low correlations of attitude and behavior. Wicher (1969) summarized his findings as follows: "...it is considerably more likely that attitudes will be unrelated to or only slightly related to overt behavior than that attitudes will be closely related to actions."

Prompted by reports that have questioned the assumption that a strong predictive relationship exists between attitude and behavior, social psychologists have investigated the conditions under which attitude-behavior consistency is likely to occur. Specific behaviors are best predicted by specific attitude measures (Fishbein, 1966;

Wicker & Pomazal, 1971; Weigel, Vernon & Tognacci, 1974; Herberlein & Black, 1976); and more general clusters of behavior are best predicted by more comprehensive attitude measures (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1974; Weigel & Newman, 1976).

Some studies about "willingness to have a picture with a Black both taken and widely distributed" did yield some positive relationship between attitude and behavior (De Fleur & Westie, 1958; Linn, 1965; Green, 1972). Further, other studies examining the relationship of 'attitude and agreement or commitment to participate in behavior with Blacks' did show a positive relationship. But often these relationships were not as stong as expected.

In addition, there are quite a few studies that fail to support attitude-behavior consistency. La Piere (1934) was the first to find inconsistency between self-report and actual behavior with regard to providing service to Chinese. Myrdal's (1944) "American Dilemma" is largely the societal disjunction between attitudes and behavior with a tolerant value system conflicting with discriminatory normative patterns. Bernberg (1952) and Vroom (1962) found low and negative correlations of attitude toward one's job with job absences respectively. Berg (1966) found negative relationships between attitude of college students toward Blacks and the behavior of conforming to autokinetic judgments of Blacks. Weitz (1972) found that friendly attitude toward Blacks did not correlate with voice tone

and behavior. Despite repeated failures to demonstrate a strong relationship between attitude and behavior, the basic assumption that human behavior is determined by attitudes has continued to persist.

This study will look into the attitude-behavior relationship using some specific measures of attitude, behavior and preference.

Goals of the Study

This study will examine interracial attitudes, actual friendship choices and preferences among a) Blacks, b) Whites, c) Mexican Americans, and d) Puerto Ricans. The Karlins et al. favorability index will be utilized in a form modified for high school students. The students will be asked to rate their own ethnic group and the other ethnic groups in the school. The students will also be asked to make friendship choices from their actual school companions. Last of all, the students will also choose 'would-be classmates' from a set of hypothetical applicants to the school. The favorability index will be utilized as an attitude measure, the actual choice of friends as a behavioral measure and the choice of 'would-be classmates' as a social distance measure of preference.

In the context of past attitudinal studies, it is expected that each group will be more favorable in rating its own group and less favorable to the other groups (hypothesis 1). This has always been true of Whites, but

in the context of changes of the past 15-20 years, it
is expected to be true for the Blacks as well. The Hispanic groups are expected to exhibit similar results. Since
the favorability ratings of the various groups will be
high toward their own group, it is also expected that more
actual friendship choices will be made from their own
ethnic group (hypothesis 2). The social distance measure
of preference is also expected to show more ingroup choices
than outgroup choices (hypothesis 3). In the context of
the contact hypothesis, those students who have had the
opportunity to be close to other ethnic groups in the
grade school and the present high school will be expected
to rate these groups more favorably, to choose more friends,
and also to make more preferences from among these groups.
In other words, the interracial contact at the grade school
level and the humber of years in the present desegregated
school would influence favorability, friendship choices
and preferences (hypothesis 4). And finally, if the
attitude-behavior consistency theory holds its ground,
data will yield a positive relationship between attitude
toward the ethnic groups and friendship choices from the
same; and a similar relationship could be expected between attitude and preferences (hypothesis 5).

METHOD

Basically, the methodology will be directed to three main tasks: a) to find the favorability index for each of the four ethnic groups (Blacks, Whites, Mexican American and Puerto Rican), b) to determine the proportion of friendship choices made from each of the four groups, and c) to find preferences which students make from a set of hypothetical applicants to the school (a measure of social distance).

Subjects

A desegregated, inner-city school was selected because of the sizable proportion of target populations it possessed: 28% Black, 15.7% White, 42.2% Mexican American, and 11.9% Puerto Rican. The school also had 2.2% of its students who were Orientals or others. These were not included in the study, since their numbers were too small. The school consists of 682 male students in grades 9-12. Eight classes, two from each grade, comprizing a total of 247 students were asked to fill out a questionnaire (Appendix). Of these a total of 58 subjects were dropped from the analysis: 51 because they were incomplete, and seven because they belonged to the ethnic groups categorized as "other."

14

<u>Materials</u>:

Although this study was about interracial attitudes
and friendship choices, the word interracial was not used
in the questionnaire. The questionnaire was labelled
"Friendship Patterns Questionnaire" to diminish the sali-
ence of race. Filler information was requested about
similarity, dissimilarity, neighborhood, gangs, etc., to
further disguise the racial aspect of the study. The
questionnaire was administered to all eight classes in one
morning before the lunch break to prevent students from
talking to one another about the study.

a) <u>Modified Favorability Index</u>:

Many of the 84 traits used in the three Princeton
studies were far beyond the vocabulary of the students.
This was also the opinion of two English teachers in the
school. These teachers were given the list of 84 traits
and asked to provide substitute words, which in their
opinion, would be understood by 9th grade students in the
school. In addition, 30 9th graders were asked to name
two of their friends and to describe them with a minimum
of three adjectives. Then a list of 20 adjectives was
prepared from the substitute words provided by the teachers
and the most frequently used adjectives provided by the
freshmen. Of these 20 (Table 2), 5 were very favorable,
5 were favorable, 5 average, and the remaining 5 unfavor-
able according to Anderson's (1968) ratings of likeability.

Table 2

List of 20 trait adjectives used to
describe the various ethnic groups.

Very Favorable	Favorable	Neutral	Unfavorable
Honest	Helpful	Cunning	Foolish
Happy	Religious	Quiet	Lazy
Understanding	Sportsmanlike	Tough	Show-off (showy)
Well-mannered	Nice	Ordinary	Angry
Interesting	Smart	Old-fashioned	Unreliable

As part of the questionnaire, the students were also asked to describe the ethnic groups in the school utilizing any five of these 20 adjectives. The Katz and Braly method (1933) consisted in asking what was _typical_ of each group. This too, was simplified by asking the students to _describe_ the ethnic groups. The subjects were subsequently asked to give evaluative ratings of the 20 adjectives, with 1 representing a negative trait, 5 a positive trait, and 3 a neutral trait. The favorability ratings given by each student were utilized to construct a favorability index. The favorability values of the traits used to describe each group were summed across the five trait adjectives and then divided by the number of traits. This average favorability of the groups was then transformed to a range of -1 to +1. The same method was used to get self-favorability ratings from each of the subjects.

b) Choice of Friends:

The 30 freshmen who had described their friends were asked to write down three things they normally like to do with their friends. On the basis of this information, six categories of activities were determined: 1) sharing secrets and problems, 2) going for walks, movies, or to watch a ball game, 3) playing games like basketball, baseball, etc. 4) eating lunch or sandwich, 5) sharing records, money or any other possessions, and 6) doing homework or preparing for exams together. The

subjects were asked on the questionnaire to choose an actual friend from the school for each of the six different tasks and to identify the race of his friend. These friends were from the ones they really had in school. In order to tone down the salience of race, filler information was asked, which made it appear that race was only one of the many aspects under study.

c) Preferences:

The students were asked to choose 2 out of 12 hypothetical applicants to the school, who would be with them in the same class:

> Twelve students have applied for admission to your
> school. But there are only two places free. And
> so, only two more students can be admitted to the
> school. Since these students will belong to your
> class, the Principal would like to know which of
> them you want to admit to the school. You can
> choose only two.

Each of the hypothetical applicants was described with name and race. Eight of them were good in sports and studies: two from each of the four ethnic groups. Of these one from each ethnic group was described as poor and the other as rich. The remaining four were put in as fillers, one from each of the four ethnic groups and a random combination of the other three variables (sports, studies, and economic status). The order in which the 12 hypothetical applicants were presented was varied to offset any order effect. Since there were 3 from each ethnic group, the 12 applicants were randomly assigned

to 3 groups; and the 4 within each group were again randomly ordered. These 3 groups were arranged in such a way so that each group had a chance to appear at the top, middle and bottom of the list. The 3 listings were then put in reverse order to give a total of 6 different orders in which the hypothetical applicants were presented to the subjects. These hypothetical choices were used to determine racial preferences outside of the school. They were a very specific measure of social distance.

d) Other Relevant Data:

The name and address of the previous school attended were collected together with demographic data. The racial composition of the grade schools attended by these students were obtained from the Chicago School Board and the Catholic School Board offices. Both these offices had the Mexican American and Puerto Rican populations aggregated under the title "Hispanic." Therefore, the Mexican American and Puerto Rican subjects had to be combined whenever any analysis related to grade school composition was performed. Finally, the racial composition data from the grade schools was for the current year, and therefore many differ somewhat from the actual year or years in which the subjects studied in those grade schools.

RESULTS

Favorability

A 4 x 4 repeated measures multivariate analysis of
variance of group rating by group rated yielded a main
effect of group rated with an $F(3, 186) = 13.421$,
significant at p .001. The results also showed an
interaction effect (group rating x group rated) with an
$F(9, 445) = 10.672$, also significant at $p < .001$. No main
effect of group rating was found.

The mean ratings of favorability confirm the
findings of the analysis of variance. Each group (except
the Puerto Ricans) rated their own group as high or
higher than the rest. The Puerto Ricans rated their group
slightly lower than Whites, but not significantly different.
Table 3 shows the mean ratings and the ranks derived util-
izing correlated t-tests. These t-tests show that none of
the groups rate Whites significantly different from them-
selves.

The relationship between the ethnic groups was
examined in two ways: the ingroup effect, and the out-
group effect. The ingroup effect was defined as the dif-
ference between a group's mean self-rating and its mean
rating of other groups. The size of the ingroup effect

Table 3

Mean favorability ratings according to each group.

Group Rating	GROUP RATED			
	Blacks	Whites	Mexican American	Puerto Rican
Blacks N = 50	.400 a*	.274 ab	.226 b	.206 b
Whites N = 40	.017 b	.512 a	.255 b	.008 b
Mexican American N = 77	.038 b	.352 a	.457 a	.162 b
Puerto Rican N = 22	.118 b	.432 a	.059 b	.418 a
All raters N = 189	.139 b	.375 a	.307 a	.171 b

*Common subscripts indicate that groups are not significantly different from each other as per correlated t-tests. Since 6 correlated t-tests were performed, the alpha level was lowered to .008 before a difference was declared significant (Winer, 1971).

indicated how ingroupish a particular ethnic group was:
the larger the ingroup effect, the more ingroupish the
group. The outgroup effect was defined as the difference
between the mean rating a group received from outgroups
and the group's mean self-rating. The more negative the
outgroup effect, the more a group was likely to subjective-
ly feel rejected by the outgroups. Table 4 shows that
all the ingroup and outgroup effects are significant at
$p < .05$. Hence, all the groups were significantly ingroup-
ish, and all the groups were rated significantly lower
than their group's mean self-rating. A between-groups
comparison indicated that Whites were the most ingroupish
and the Blacks were least so. The Mexican Americans were
also very ingroupish, but not as much as the Whites. An
examination of the sizes of outgroup effects showed that
all groups were rated significantly lower than they rated
themselves. The Blacks were rated significantly lower
than were the Whites and Mexican Americans.

Besides, examining each ethnic group, the ratings w
were aggregated across all subjects (Table 3). These
ratings placed the Whites and Mexican Americans high,
and the Puerto Ricans and Blacks low. The Whites were the
most favored and the Blacks were least favored. This is
because none of the groups rated the Whites significantly
different from themselves, and the Blacks were rated as
significantly different from themselves by all groups.

Table 4

Ethnic Group	Mean Self-Rating by Group	Mean Rating Given to Outgroups	Mean Rating Received from Outgroups	Ingroup Effect of Favorability	Outgroup Effect of Favorability'
Blacks N = 50	.400	.235	.016	$.165^{b}$ t = 3.16**	$-.384^{c}$ t = -6.04***
Whites N = 40	.512	.093	.338	$.419^{a}$ t = 5.91***	$-.174^{a}$ t = -2.48*
Mexican American N = 77	.457	.184	.257	$.273^{a}$ t = 7.10***	$-.200^{ab}$ t = -3.16**
Puerto Rican N =	.418	.203	.132	$.215^{ab}$ t = 2.67*	$-.286^{bc}$ t = -2.51*

Ingroup and outgroup effects of favorability are all significant at .05. Asterisks indicate significance levels: *p < .05, **p < .01, and ***p < .001. Groups that differ significantly from each other at p < .05 have different superscripts.

This supports the hypothesis that each ethnic group will be more favorable to its own group and less favorable to other groups.

Actual Friendship Choices

A 4 x 4 repeated measures multivaraite analysis of variance of group choosing by group chosen yielded a main effect of group chosen with an $F(3, 186) = 34.96$, significant at .001. Results also showed an interaction effect with an $F(9,445) = 75.616$, significant at .001. No main effect of group choosing was expected, since each subject was permitted to choose only six friends.

The arcsin transformations of the proportion of choices made show that each group made a greater proportion of ingroup choices. Table 5 shows the mean of these transformed proportions and the ranks derived utilizing correlated t-tests.

In the case of proportion of choices too, the differences between the ethnic groups were examined in two different ways: the ingroup effect and outgroup effect. The base-rate availability of the various ethnic groups was taken to be the expected proportion of choices. Thus, the ingroup effect was computed as the difference between ingroup choices and the base-rate availability of the particular ethnic group in the school. Similarly, the outgroup effect was computed as the difference between base-rate availability

Table 5

Mean arcsin transformations of proportion of actual choices of friends made by each group

Group Choosing	GROUP CHOSEN			
	Blacks	Whites	Mexican American	Puerto Rican
Blacks N = 50	2.491 a*	.241 b	.199 b	.316 b
Whites N = 40	.306 b	1.604 a	1.103 a	.383 b
Mexican American N = 77	.184 c	.457 b	2.436 a	.237 bc
Puerto Rican N = 22	.627 ab	.509 b	.963 ab	1.374 a
All choosers N = 189	.872 b	.649 b	1.391 a	.422 c

*Common subscripts indicate that the groups are not significantly different from each other as per correlated t-tests. Alpha level was lowered to .008 since six tests were performed on each set of data.

made of that group by outgroup. Table 6 shows all the
groups to be significantly ingroupish with $p < .001$, and
the Blacks as the most ingroupish. As regards the out-
group effect, the Mexican Americans were choosen signifi-
cantly less than expected, the Blacks came next, followed
by Whites and Puerto Ricans.

Looking at the same data across all subjects
(Table 7) showed that each group was chosen more or less
according to the expected base-rate availability of the
group in the schools. Though the Z values were not signifi-
cant, Whites were chosen relatively more often than their
base-rate availability in the school. The Blacks were
underchosen.

Here again, the data support the hypothesis that
each group will have a greater proportion of ingroup
choices of actual friends.

Preferences

Here is the case of preferences for hypothetical
classmates, the multivariate $F(3, 186) = 2.32$ was marginally
significant $(p < .07)$. The interaction effect of group pre-
ferred and group preferring did yield an $F(9, 445) =$
17.86 which was significant at $p < .001$. No main effect of
group preferring was to be expected, since each subject
was permitted to choose a maximum of two only.

The mean number of choices made showed that each
group made a greater number of ingroup preferences.

Table 6

Ethnic group	Actual proportion of ingroup choices	Proportion of choices made by outgroups	Expected proportion of choices	Ingroup effect of choices	Outgroup effect of choices
Blacks N = 50	.767	.062	.280	a .487 z = 7.67***	ab -.218 z = -3.43**
Whites N = 40	.472	.091	.157	b .315 z = 5.48***	a -.066 z = -1.15
Mexican American N = 77	.735	.190	.422	b .313 z = 5.56***	b -.232 z = -4.12***
Puerto Rican N = 22	.395	.057	.119	b .276 z = 3.99***	ab -.062 z = -.898

Ingroup effect of choices is significant at $p < .001$ for all groups. Outgroup effect of choices is significant for Blacks and Mexican Americans only. Asterisks indicate significance levels: *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$. Groups that differ significantly from each other at $p < .05$ have different superscripts.

Table 7

Group chosen	Actual proportion of all choices (across all subjects)	Expected proportion of choices	Z Values
Blacks	.261	.280	-.58 NS
Whites	.194	.157	1.39 NS
Mexican American	.417	.422	-.14 NS
Puerto Rican	.126	.119	.29 NS

The z values for deviation from expected values show that actual proportion of choices made do not deviate significantly from expected base-rate availability in the school population. All above values were insignificant.

Table 8 shows these means ranked with subscripts derived by using correlated t-tests. Each group was found to be ingroupish in the preferences they made. As in the case of choices, the ingroups' and outgroups' preferences too were compared to the expected proportions to find out if these were significant. Each ethnic group should have been equally preferred since there were three from each group out of a total of 12 hypothetical would-be students. The ingroup effect of preferences was significant at $p < .01$ for each of the groups, thus showing that each group made significantly more ingroup choices than the expected proportion of .25. The Puerto Ricans were most ingroupish with an ingroup effect = .331 and the Mexican Americans were least so, with an ingroups effect of only .153. A comparison of the four ethnic groups showed that they did not differ from one another (Table 9). However, the Mexican Americans were less ingroupish than Puerto Ricans at a p .oO. As regards the outgroup effect, the Mexican Americans were preferred significantly less than expected. The groups did not significantly differ from one another on the size of the outgroup effect.

The preferences across all subjects were not significantly different from expected values, but the Blacks were preferred more often than the other three groups (Table 10). For the most part this over-preferring consists of the Blacks' ingroup preferences. The other three

Table 8

Group preferring	GROUP PREFERRED			
	Blacks	Whites	Mexican American	Puerto Rican
Blacks N = 50	1.060 a	.500 b	.160 c	.280 bc
Whites N = 40	.475 ab	.950 a	.225 b	.275 b
Mexican American N = 77	.455 b	.286 b	.805 a	.455 b
Puerto Rican N = 22	.409 b	.091 b	.318 b	1.136 a
All subjects N = 189	.614 a	.460 a	.455 a	.450 a

Mean number of preferences made by each group. Common subscripts indicate
that the groups are not significantly different from each other as per
correlated t-tests. Alpha level was fixed at .008 since a total of
six t-tests were done.

Table 9

Ethnic group	Proportion of ingroup preferences	Proportion of preferences made by outgroups	Expected proportion	Ingroup effect of preferences	Outgroup effect of preferences
Blacks N = 50	.530	.226	.25	.280[a] z = 4.57***	-.024[a] z = -.392
Whites N = 40	.493	.165	.25	.243[a] z = 3.54***	-.085[a] z = -1.24
Mexican American	.403	.107	.25	.153[a] z = 3.10**	-.143[a] z = -2.89**
Puerto Rican	.581	.179	.25	.331[a] z = 3.58***	-.071[a] z = -.769

Ingroup effect of preferences is significant at $p < .01$ for all groups. Outgroup effect is significant for only Mexican Americans. Asterisks denote significance levels: *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$. Superscripts show that the groups are not significantly different from each other at $p < .05$. As regards the ingroup effect, Mexican Americans are different from Puerto Ricans at $p < .10$.

Table 10

The proportion of preferences changed to z values

Group Preferred	Actual proportion of preferences (across all subjects)	Expected proportion of preferences	Z values
Blacks	.310	.25	1.90
Whites	.232	.25	-.57
Mexican American	.229	.25	-.66
Puerto Rican	.227	.25	-.73

groups, even with their strong ingroup preferences, were still preferred less than the expected proportion.

In the case of this third hypothesis too, each group made a great proportion of ingroup preferences from among the would be class-mates presented to them.

Contact Hypothesis and Ingroupishness

The contact hypothesis proposes that contact will lessen ingroupishness. Hence one would expect that,

a) the proportion of other ethnic groups in the previously attended grade school will corre- late with favorability toward, proportion of choices made from, and the number of preferences made from the other ethnic groups, and

b) students who have been in the desegregated school longer will be more favorable to and choose more from the outgroups.

The records of the Archdiocesan School Board in Chicago and the Chicago School Board did not have the Mexican American and Puerto Rican groups listed as separate categories, but as one Hispanic group; hence they were combined as one group. Additionally, there was an influx of students from a neighboring high school which had to close down. These students were dropped from the analysis, since their experience in another high school was con- sidered as an intervening variable which was different from those who had come to this school from other grade

schools in the neighborhood. Hence the drop in the total number of subjects from 189 to 150 for the purpose of this analysis only. Correlations were computed within each group separately, and then averaged across the ethnic group using r to z transformations. Table 11 gives these averaged correlations which indicate that Hypothesis IVa has received slight support. Within ethnic groups, those students coming from schools with proportionally more Blacks were significantly more favorable toward Blacks. Those students coming from schools with more Hispanics made more friendship choices of Hispanics. No other effects were significant although the contact hypothesis received its strongest support in actual friendship choices.

The examination of ingroup and outgroup effects showed that across the four grades there was no consistent decrease in ingroup or outgroup effect (Table 12). However, comparing the collapsed means across 9th and 10th grades with the collapsed means across 11th and 12th grades, one finds that an increased ingroup and outgroup effect was manifested on the favorability ratings. But on the behavioral measure of actual choice, the collapsed means of ingroup and outgroup effects did show a decrease. Thus, in the higher grades the subjects were relatively less ingroupish, and more open to outgroups. The collapsed means of ingroup and outgroup effects of preferences fol-

Table 11

Correlations of proportion of ethnic groups in previously attended grade schools with favorability, proportion of choices and number of preferences.

Groups rated or chosen	CORRELATIONS OF PROPORTION OF ETHNIC GROUPS IN PREVIOUSLY ATTENDED GRADE SCHOOLS WITH		
	Favor-ability	Proportion of choices	Number of Preferences
Blacks	.177 p = .05	.127 p = NS	-.085 p = NS
Whites	.011 p = NS	.077 p = NS	-.018 p = NS
Hispanics	.013 p = NS	.203 p = .05	.093 p = NS

Degree of freedom for all the above correlations is 150.

Table 12

Grades	Favorability Ratings		Proportion of Choices		Proportion of Preferences	
	Ingroup effect	Outgroup effect	Ingroup effect	Outgroup effect	Ingroup effect	Outgroup effect
Freshmen 9th Grade	.266	-.243	.462	-.151	.284	-.086
Sophomore 10th Grade	.192	-.153	.417	-.194	.139	-.048
Mean of 9th & 10th Grades	.229	-.198	.439	-.172	.211	-.066
Junior 11th Grade	.361	-.388	.361	-.098	.284	-.094
Senior 12th Grade	.237	-.285	.389	-.128	.298	-.094
Mean of 11th & 12th Grades	.299	-.337	.375	-.113	.291	-.094

Ingroup and outgroup effects of favorability, choices, and preferences for each of the four grades. Grades 9 and 10, and grades 11 and 12 are averaged to check for trends not obvious across the grade taken individually.

lowed the pattern of the favorability ratings: increased ingroup and outgroup effect. Thus, of all the three measures taken, the behavioral measure of choice of actual friends supported the contact hypothesis, while the favorability ratings and preferences did not. Testing for significant trends was not undertaken, since this was not a longitudinal study and cohort differences would have been confounded with our variables of interest.

Attitudes and Behavior

It is expected that attitude toward and ethnic group will correlate positively with the proportion of friendship choices made from that group. A similar relationship is expected between attitude and the number of preferences.

In order to avoid inflating the correlations, they were computed within each of the ethnic groups and then averaged using the r to z transformations in order to find the strength of the relationship across all the groups (Table 13). Although the ethnic groups were taken together to increase the degrees of freedom for each of the correlations, the results did not show any appreciable level of significance. The only correlation that showed significance was the one of attitude toward the Puerto Rican with the proportion of choices made from that group. However, all relationships were mildly positive in the hypothesized direction, indicating that there may be a true relationship between attitudes and behavior that is of the magnitude

Table 13

Groups rated or chosen	CORRELATIONS OF		
	Favorability with proportion of choices	Favorability with number of preferences	Proportion of choices with number of preferences
Blacks	.088 $\underline{p}$ = NS	.114 $\underline{p}$ = NS	.050 $\underline{p}$ = NS
Whites	.040 $\underline{p}$ = NS	.032 $\underline{p}$ = NS	.124 $\underline{p}$ = NS
Mexican American	.080 $\underline{p}$ = NS	.102 $\underline{p}$ = NS	.045 $\underline{p}$ = NS
Puerto Rican	.232 $\underline{p}$ = .01	.047 $\underline{p}$ = NS	.087 $\underline{p}$ = NS

Correlations of favorability with proportion of choices and with number of preferences. Correlations of proportion of choices and number of preferences are also included.

Degrees of freedom for all the correlations is 189.

of $r = .1$.

DISCUSSION

All measures used in this study, the favorability index, the proportion of actual choices made, and preferences expressed by would be classmates - showed that each ethnic group was extremely ingroupish. The size of the ingroup effects yielded a hierarchy ranging from the least ingroupish to the most ingroupish (Table 14). For the measure of favorability the Whites are the most ingroupish, and the Blacks least so. As regards proportion of actual choices, the Blacks are the most ingroupish, while the Puerto Ricans are the least so. And last of all, for the preference measure of social distance or behavioral intention, the Puerto Ricans are the most ingroupish and the Mexican Americans the least so. If one looks at the ethnic groups across the three measures, one finds that the Whites and Mexican Americans are not significantly different from each other, the Whites tending to be slightly more ingroupish than the Mexican Americans. The Blacks are the least ingroupish on favorability, but the most ingroupish on the proportion of actual choices made, and second in rank on being ingroupish on the preference measure. The Puerto Ricans who do not rate themselves too favorably, are the least ingroupish on the proportion of actual choices, but the most ingroupish on the preference

Table 14

Measures used in this study	Most ingroupish..least ingroupish			
Favorability index	a Whites .419	a Mexican Americans .273	ab Puerto Ricans .215	b Blacks .165
Proportion of actual choices	a Blacks .487	b Whites .315	b Mexican Americans .313	b Puerto Ricans .276
Preferences of would-be classmates	a Puerto Ricans .331	a Blacks .280	a Whites .243	a Mexican Americans .153

Hierarchy of ethnic groups from the most ingroupish to the least ingroupish based upon ingroup effects. Different superscripts indicate significant differences between the groups.

measure. Overall, the Blacks are the least favored by
self and by others; and though they choose friends from
their own group the most, they are the least chosen by
others.

For each of the three measures the pattern of the
most favored and most chosen groups was not very different
from the pattern found on ingroupishness (Table 15).
For the favorability index, the Whites were the most
favorably rated, and the Blacks were the least so. As
regards the proportion of actual choices, the Whites were
the most chosen but now the Mexican Americans were the
least chosen. And on the preference measure, the Blacks
were the most chosen, while the Mexican Americans were the
least chosen. Looking across all the three measures, one
finds that the Whites were the most favorably and most
chosen, and the preferences of Whites was not significant-
ly different from the Blacks, who were the most preferred.
The Mexican Americans were among the more favorably rated
but least chosen and preferred. The Puerto Ricans though
not rated quite favorably, but were chosen and preferred
the second highest. Last of all the Blacks who are rated
the lowest and chosen among the least, are preferred
most of all.

Of the four ethnic groups in this study, the Whites
are in the most comfortable position. They rate them-
selves very high, choose themselves quite moderately, and

Table 15

Measures used in this study	Most favorably rated, most chosen, and most preferred................and least preferred		Least favorably rated, least chosen,	
Favorability index	a Whites -.174	ab Mexican Americans -.248	bc Puerto Ricans -.286	c Blacks -.384
Proportion of actual choices	a Whites -.066	ab Puerto Ricans -.062	ab Blacks -.218	b Mexican Americans -.232
Preferences of would-be classmates	a Blacks -.024	a Puerto Ricans -.071	a Whites -.085	a Mexican Americans -.143

Hierarchy of ethnic groups from the most favorably rated and chosen to the least favorably rated and least chosen based upon outgroup effects. Different superscripts indicate significant differences between groups.

though they do not prefer themselves more than the Puerto
Ricans and Blacks prefer themselves, they are not signifi-
cantly different from the Puerto Ricans and Blacks. The
Whites are also among the most favorably rated and the
most chosen by other groups. However, they are not pre-
ferred as much as the Blacks and the Puerto Ricans.

The Mexican Americans are not very far behind the
Whites. In fact, on all three measures, they are as in-
groupish as the Whites, though only slightly less. Fur-
thermore, they are rated by other groups almost as
favorably as the Whites. However, other groups choose and
prefer the Mexican Americans the least of all the four
ethnic groups.

The Puerto Ricans are not as ingroupish as the
Whites and Mexican Americans on the favorability measure,
and are the least ingroupish on the proportion of friend-
ship choises made; but they are the most ingroupish on
the preference measure. The favorability ratings of
Puerto Ricans by other groups are fairly low, but they
seem to be chosen and preferred a lot better than their
favorability ratings indicate.

Last of all, the Blacks though significantly in-
groupish, rate themselves lower than the other groups rate
themselves. Thus relative to other groups they evaluate
their own group poorly on the favorability index. Looking
at this phenomenon from another point of view, they are

the least ingroupish, and rate other groups quite favorably.
As regards actual friendship choices however, they are the
most ingroupish and are fairly ingroupish on the preference
measure. They seem to be "low-caste" - least favored by
everyone, and though they choose themselves very highly,
they are avoided by others as friends. On the preference
measure they were the most preferred of all the groups.

The favorability ratings show a consistent hierarchi-
cal pattern on both the ingroup and outgroup effect:

Whites   Mexican Americans   Puerto Ricans   Blacks

But on the friendship choices the hierarchical pattern is
not only inconsistent across ingroup and outgroup ef-
fects, but is also different from the pattern found for
favorability ratings:

Ingroup effect (choices):

Blacks   Whites   Mexican Americans   Puerto Ricans

Outgroup effect (choices):

Whites   Puerto Ricans   Blacks   Mexican Americans

It may well be that Blacks, who are not rated favorably
or chosen frequently by outgroups, choose themselves more
often in an effort to compensate themselves for this "un-
fair" treatment. The Mexican Americans, though rated
fairly high, are the least chosen. Since the Mexican
Americans are the single largest group in the school, the
subjects are probably looking for a little diversity in
the type of friends they have. On the preference measure,

the ingroup and outgroup hierarchical patterns do not

show marked differences among themselves:

Ingroup effect (preferences):

Puerto Ricans   Blacks   Whites   Mexican Americans

Outgroup effect (preferences):

Blacks   Puerto Ricans   Whites   Mexicans

The Blacks and the Puerto Ricans are preferred more than

the Whites and Mexican Americans. Compared with the

favorability ratings, there is a shift toward the Blacks

and Puerto Ricans on the preferences. Although the

reasons for this have not been explored, two possible

factors may have been responsible for this. First, the

subjects may have been influenced by "what is thought to

be socially desirable." Hence, they seem to prefer to go

along a socially desirable course on the preference mea-

sure. This is also understandable when one interprets

the preference measure as an indication of behavioral

intention. However, one cannot rule out the possibility

that the students really desire a change in their attitudes

and behavior toward the Blacks and Puerto Ricans. Second,

the school where the study was conducted is in recent years

vying for the regional and state championships in Basket-

ball. Moreover, 10 out 12 hypothetical choices were

described as "good in sports" and across all subjects

those good in sports were overpreferred ($z = 3.18$, signifi-

cant at $p < .005$). It is extremely likely, that the phrase

"good in sports" was interpreted as being "good in basket-
ball." This interpretation together with the fact that
most of the players on the school basketball team are
Blacks, could have led to the shift toward the Blacks.
Many of the Puerto Ricans in the school are "Black," i.e.,
are dark-skinned and have negroid features. Many of the
"Blacks" on the basketball team may in fact have been
Puerto Ricans, which in turn could explain why Puerto
Ricans too were preferred over Whites and Mexican Americans.

Although there are no marked differences between the
ingroup and outgroup effects, there seems to be a slight
shift between the Puerto Ricans and Blacks:

Ingroup effect (preferences):

Puerto Ricans   Blacks

Outgroup effect (preferences):

Blacks   Puerto Ricans

This shift shows that the assumption about many of the
"Blacks" on the team being Puerto Rican is reasonable,
because the Puerto Ricans are more ingroupish than the
Blacks on the preference measure; and the outgroups, who
would be less in a position to discriminate between the
"Black" Puerto Ricans and Blacks would choose more Blacks
than Puerto Ricans.

The reasons given above for the shift a) from Whites
and Mexican Americans on the favorability measure to
Puerto Ricans and Blacks on the preference measure, and

b) from Puerto Ricans on the ingroup effect to Blacks on the outgroup effect, are only conjectural and need further study. Over all the three measures, there is a slight bias manifested by outgroups in favor of the Whites, since they are the most preferred, most chosen and fairly moderately preferred. The pro-White bias found by earlier researchers has not completely disappeared, though it may have considerably dwindled.

Another consideration worth looking into is the reason for this extreme ingroupishness of the four ethnic groups. First of all, this ingroupishness does not stem from any lack of regard for one's own group. This is borne out by the fact that each one rates his own group higher than the other groups (except of course for the Puerto Ricans who rate their own group only marginally lower than the Whites). Furthermore, a self-rating of the subjects made in the same way as the favorability index of the ethnic groups, correlated highly and significantly with the rating they made of their own ethnic group. The correlations were as follows: Blacks .304, $p < .013$; Whites .633, $p < .000$; Mexican American .533, $p < .000$; and Puerto Ricans .542, $p < .005$. These indicate that the subjects identified themselves very strongly with their own ethnic group. Hence, one can conclude that none of the ethnic groups involved in this study rejected their own ethnic group in favor of another. Secondly, the precise

reasons for this ingroupishness cannot be delineated from this study. No questions about this were asked about the reasons for the existence of ingroupishness. This would have to be the focus of another study.

The contact hypothesis did not seem to make any significant contribution to the reduction of ingroupishness. First of all, the proportion of ethnic groups in the grade schools attended by the students was not related to their favorability indices, choice of friends and preferences. Quite a few of the students had to be dropped from the analysis at this point, since they were transfer students from another higher school. The proportion of ethnic groups which were collected from the School Board offices were only taken for the current year (78-79, year of data collection), rather than for the years during which the students actually attended the grade schools. It was also assumed that the racial composition of these grade schools was relatively stable and did not change significantly during the last three or four years. This may not have been so, and could have affected the strength of these correlations. Secondly, the length of a student's stay in the school did not contribute to any significant reduction in ingroupishness. The comparison between collapsed means of grades 9th and 10th, and collapsed means of 11th and 12th, indicated that the favorability ratings and the preferences did not support the contact

hypothesis. However, in the case of actual choices, there
was a gradual reduction in the ingroup and outgroup
effects. It seems that in a desegregated context an
individual is somehow compelled to make choices even when
one's attitudes do not favor them. Thus the subjects in
this study have "grown" to be conservative in their
attitudes, but relatively liberal in their behavioral
choices of friends. Since the racial composition of
each grade was not significantly different from one another
$(X^2(9) = 9.14$, NS) the difference in the proportion of
students in the various grades could not have accounted
for the differences in the mean ingroup and outgroup
effects.

The fifth hypothesis too was not confirmed by the
results. Attitude-behavior consistency followed Wicker's
(1969) conclusion of low and insignificant relationships
of attitude with behavior. One explanation for this
lack of significant relationship could be that the attitude
measure, although built up from traits used by students
to describe their friends, was too general a measure and
did not really measure the attitude of the subjects toward
having friends from other ethnic groups. The measures of
choices of actual friends and preferences were too specific
to correlate with the more general measure of favorability
toward the ethnic group. Moreover, the preference measure
was more of a social distance measure than a concrete

behavioral measure.

CONCLUSION

As a result of this study, one can see that minority groups have come a long way from the time they rejected their own ethnic group in favor of Whites. Although, ac across all subjects, there is a slight bias in favor of the Whites with regard to both favorability and choice of actual friends, this is not too strong. Besides, each group is more favorable to and very comfortable with its own group. The decrease of ingroup and outgroup effect in the choice of actual friends points to the fact that liking or attraction between the various ethnic groups is on the increase. The fact that Puerto Ricans and Blacks were preferred more than the other groups could have been due to the strong basketball team in this school and the presence of the Puerto Ricans and Blakes as the backbone of the basketball team. But, since being good in sports cannot necessarily be equated with being good in basketball, this guess can in no way be substantiated. One could interpret the preferences as an "intention" of what the students might like the relationship to be. Thus, though the de facto situation indicates that other groups do not look upon Blacks and Puerto Ricans favorably, among them, the preferring of more Blacks and Puerto Ricans could

point to their intention to move in a socially desirable
direction.

One would be led to think that, since all the sub-
jects have the same status as students, it would be easier
for them to be more open and friendly toward one another.
But this equal status is confounded with other factors
like socio-economic background, gangs to which certain
students belong, the neighborhoods in which they live and
the race of the students. Although the school does field
many teams for interschool sports and athletic events,
there is not much team work nor working toward common
goals among the various ethnic groups. The various sports
and extracurricular activities apparently do not demand a
racial mix: the soccer team is almost exclusively Mexican
American, the basketball team mostly Black, and the school
newspaper is edited by a board that is more White. Al-
though across all these activities in the school, each
ethnic group does get a fair chance to take part in one or
another activity, there is quite a bit of monopolization
of any one given activity by one or other ethnic group.
This prevents the different ethnic groups from working
together on common tasks (Raikar, 1979).

Of course, one cannot deny that there is a lot of
physical proximity among the ethnic groups in the school.
This proximity without prolonged cooperation or intimate
friendly contact, or without positive feelings associated

with interracial contact, cannot be expected to reduce prejudice and increase appreciation of outgroups. These issues have not been examined in this study, and will have to be explored before any statement about their presence or absence can be made.

Lastly, there are a few questions that could be raised in the context of desegregation policy. Has the scientific world misled educationlists and community builders regarding the effects of desegration? Is desegregation really working? Is it helping toward the goal of integration or is it just polarizing groups and pitting them against one another? The ambiguous results of past studies point to the fact that the whole issue of desegregation is complex.

What the School Board wants most is not just desegregation, but integration which will facilitate the growth of more favorable attitudes of the ethnic groups towards each other, an increase of interpersonal liking and friendship choices, and an increase in the desire to associate with each other. Looking at the results of this study, the School Board would do well to examine more closely the reasons for a decrease in favorable attitudes towards other groups. The increase in interracial friendship choices is a good sign and an indication that desegregation is helping, however slowly, to increase liking and friendships between the ethnic groups. The shift towards

the Blacks and Puerto Ricans on the preference measure
points to the fact that these groups are being accepted
and appreciated for their contribution in the area of
sports. The School Board needs to encourage the unique
talents of each of the ethnic groups so that what is good
and positive in them will be noticed and appreciated. This
latter could go a long way to increase favorable attitudes
towards each other.

Desegregation by itself, without specific programs
to promote integration will not serve any purpose. This
study with its one shot approach cannot answer the question
about the effectiveness of desegregation. One would
need to find base-rate favorability, and base-rate for
actual friendship choices before and after implementing
desegregation in order to answe these questions. Long-
term systematic research to examine the effectiveness
of the factors instrumental in bringing about integration
is required. This calls for an extensive research which
is clearly beyond the scope of this study.

REFERENCES

Allport, G.W. The Nature of Prejudice, New York: Addison-
      Wesley Publishing Company, Inc. 1954.

Amir, Y. Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. Psycho-
      logical Bulletin, 1969, 71, 319-342.

Anderson, N.H. Likeableness ratings of 555 personality-
      trait words. Journal of Personality and Social
      Psychology, 1968, 9, pp. 272-279.

Asher, S.R., & Allen, V.L. Racial preference and social
      comparison process. Journal of Social Issues, 1969,
      Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 157-165.

Berg, K.E. Ethnic attitudes and agreement with a Negro
      person. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,
      1966, 4, 215-220.

Bernberg, R.E. Socio-psychological factors in industrial
      morale: I. The prediction of specific indicators.
      Journal of Social Psychology, 1952, 36, 73-82.

Clark, K.B., & Clark, M.P. Racial identification and
      preference in Negro children. In E.E. Maccoby, T.L.
      Newcomb & E.L. Hartley (Eds.) Readings in Social
      Psychology, New York: Holt, 1958.

Clore, G.L., Bray, R.M., Itkin, S.M., & Murphy, P.
      Interracial Attitudes and Behavior at a Summer
      Camp. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,

1975, Vol. 36, No. 2, 107-116.

Davis, H., Radke, M.J., & Trager, H.G. Social percep-
tions and attitudes of children. Genetic Psycho-
logy Monographs, No. 40, pp. 327-447.

DeFleur, M.L., & Westie, F.R. Verbal attitudes and
overt acts: An experiment on the salience of
attitudes. American Sociological Review, 1958, 23,
pp. 667-673.

Dickson, L., Lundberg, G.A. Selective association among
ethnic groups in a high school population. Ameri-
can Sociological Review, 1952, 17, pp. 22-35.

Fishbein, M. Sexual behavior and propositional control.
Paper read at the Psychonomic Society Meeting, 1966.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. Attitudes towards objects as
predictors of single and multiple behavioral criter-
ia. Psychological Review, 1974, 81, pp. 59-74.

Fox, D.J., & Jordon, V.B. Racial preference and identifi-
cation of Black, American Chinese, and White
children. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1973, 88,
pp. 229-286.

Gilbert, G.M. Stereotype persistence and change among
college students. Journal of Abnormal and Social
Psychology, 1951, 46, pp. 245-254.

Green, J.A. Attitudinal and situational determinants of
intended behavior toward Blacks. Journal of
Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 22, pp.

13-17.

Gregor, A.J., & McPherson, D.A.   Racial attitudes among
White and Negro children in a deep-south standard
metropolitan area.   Journal of Social Psychology,
1966, 68, pp. 95-106.

Heberlein, T.A., & Black, J.S.   Attitudinal specificity
and the prediction of behavior in a field setting.
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976,
33, pp. 474-479.

Horowitz, E.L.   The development of attitudes toward
the Negro.   Archives of Psychology, 1936, No. 194.

Hraba, J., & Grant, G.   Black is beautiful: A reexamina-
tion of racial preference and identification.
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970,
16, pp. 398-401.

Karlins, M., Coffman, T.L., & Walters, G.   On the fading
of social stereotypes: studies in three genera-
tions of college students.   Journal of Personality
and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, No. 1, pp. 1-16.

Katz, D., & Braly, K.   Racial stereotypes of one hundred
college students.   Journal of Abnormal and Social
Psychology, 1933, 28, pp. 280-290.

Katz, P.A., & Zalk, S.R.   Doll preference: An index of
racial attitudes.   Journal of Educational Psychology,
1974, 66, No. 5, pp. 663-668.

Kawwa, T.   Three sociometric studies of ethnic relations

in London Schools. Race, 1968, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 172-180.

Koch, H.L. The social distance between certain racial, nationality and skin-pigmentation groups, in selected populations of American school children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, No. 68, pp. 63-95.

La Piere, R.T. Attitudes versus actions, Social Forces, 13, pp. 230-237.

Linn, L.S. Verbal attitudes and overt behavior: A study of racial discrimination. Social Forces, 1965, 44, pp. 353-364.

Mabe, P.A., & Williams, J.E. Relation of racial attitudes to sociometric choices among second grade children. Psychological Reports, 1975, 37, pp. 547-554.

Mann, J.H. The effects of interracial contact on sociometric choices and perceptions. Journal of Social Psychology, 1959, 50, pp. 143-152.

Morland, J.K. Racial recognition by nursery school children in Lynchburg, Virginia. Social Forces, 1958, 37, pp. 132-137.

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

Pushkin, I. A study of ethnic choice in the play of young children in 3 London districts. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of London, 1967.

Raikar, P. "Racial composition and evenness of partici-

pation in an inner-city school: an evaluation"
Unpublished manuscript. Loyola University of Chicago.
1979.

Rowley, K.G. Social Relations between British and Immi-
grant children. Educational Research, vol. 10,
pp. 145-148.

Saenger, G. The Social Psychology of Prejudice. New York:
Harper & Row, 1953.

Segal, M.W. Alphabet and attraction: An unobtrusive
measure of the effect of propinquity in a field
setting. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,
1974, 30, pp. 654-657.

Shaw, M.E. Changes in sociometric choices following forced
integration in an elementary school. Journal of
Social Issues, 1962, 18(1), pp. 7-23.

Sheatsley, P.B. Whites' attitudes toward the Negro.
Daedalus, 95, No. 1, pp. 217-238.

Stephan, W.G., & Rosenfield, D. Effects of desegregation
on racial attitudes. Journal of Personality and
Social Psychology, 1978, 36, pp. 795-804.

Sherif, M. Group Conflict and Cooperation. London:
Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966.

Silverman, I., & Shaw, M.E. Effects of sudden mass school
desegregation on interracial interaction and attitudes
in one southern city. Journal of Social Issues,
1973, 29(4), pp. 133-142.

Vroom, V.H. Ego involvement, job satisfaction and job
   performance. Personnel Psychology, 1962, 15, 159-177.

Winer, B.J. Statistical principles in experimental design,
   2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Weigel, R.H., & Newman, L.S. Increasing attitude-behavior
   correspondence by broadening the scope of the behav-
   ioral measure. Journal of Personality and Social
   Psychology, 1976, 33, pp. 793-802.

Weigel, R.H., Vernon, D.T.A. & Tognacci, L.N. The speci-
   ficity of the attitude as a determinant of attitude-
   behavior congruence. Journal of Personality and
   Social Psychology, 1974, 30, pp. 724-728.

Weitz, S. Attitude, voice and behavior: a repressed
   affect model of interracial interaction. Journal of
   Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 24, No. 1,
   pp. 14-21.

Wicker, A.W. Attitudes versus actions: The relationship
   of verbal and overt responses to attitude objects.
   Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, pp. 41-78.

Wicker, A.W., & Pomazal, R.J. The relationship between
   attitudes and behavior as a function of specificity
   of attitude object and presence of significant others
   during assessment conditions. Representative Re-
   search in Social Psychology, 1971, 2, pp. 26-31.

Yarrow, M.R., Campbell, J.P., & Yarrow, L.J. Acquisition
   of new norms: A study of racial desegregation.

Appendix

FRIENDSHIP PATTERNS QUESTIONNAIRE

What is this questionnaire all about?

     This questionnaire is to study friendship patterns in this school, that is, to see who your friends are and how they are similar or different from you. Hence, this questionnaire will ask you for information about yourself and your friends. Whatever answers you give are completely secret (nobody will know who wrote what about whom). Therefore, do not write your name anywhere on this questionnaire.

1. Age: _____   2. Sex: Male / Female

3. Grade in this school: _____

4. Name and address of school last attended:

    _____

    _____

5. Name two streets which cross near your house:

    _____

6. Identify your ethnic group: (Check any one):

   a) Black _____ b) White _____ c) Mexican Amer. _____
   d) Puerto Rican _____ e) Any other? Describe: _____

7. Head of the household where you live: (Check any one):

   a) Father _____ b) Mother _____ c) Other Guardian _____

8. Education of Head of household: (Check any one):

   a) Below grade 8 _____   b) Grade 8 complete _____
   c) School beyond 8th _____ d) High school graduate _____
   e) Some College _____   f) College graduate _____
   g) Advanced degree (M.A., M.D., or Ph.D.) _____

9. Annual Income (dollars) of Head of household: (Check any one):

   a) Less than 5,000 _____   b) 5,000 to 9,999 _____
   c) 10,000 to 14,999 _____   d) 15,000 to 19,999 _____
   e) 20,000 to 24,999 _____   f) 25,000 and above _____

10. Now on the next three pages you have to choose and describe six of your REAL FRIENDS FROM THIS SCHOOL. Do not choose the same friend more than twice.

Choose a REAL FRIEND FROM THIS SCHOOL with whom you like to go
for walks, movies or to watch a ball game:

a) Name your friend: _____

b) Name two streets which cross near your friend's house:

    _____

c) Your friend's ethnic group (Check any one):

    i) Black _____ ii) White _____ iii) Mexican Amer. _____
    iv) Puerto Rican _____ v) Any other? Describe: _____

d) Describe your friend: (Circle Yes or No):

    i) Lives in my neighborhood .... Yes / No
    ii) My own relative .... Yes / No
    iii) Member of my gang .... Yes / No
    iv) Similar to me .... Yes / No
    v) In my grade .... Yes / No
) Was in grade school with me .... Yes / no

e) Now describe your friend using any five of the following
   adjectives: (Circle any five):

    Honest, Cunning, Foolish, Smart, Lazy, Sportsmanlike,
    Quiet, Happy, Show-off, Helpful, Angry, Religious, Nice,
    Unreliable, Understanding, Old-fashioned, Well-mannered,
    Interesting, Tough, and Ordinary.

Choose a REAL FRIEND FROM THIS SCHOOL with whom you like to eat
your lunch or sandwich:

a) Name your friend: _____

b) Name two streets which cross near your friend's house:

    _____

c) Your friend's ethnic group: (Check any one):

    i) Black _____ ii) White _____ iii) Mexican Amer. _____
    iv) Puerto Rican _____ v) Any other? Describe: _____

d) Describe your friend: (Circle Yes or No):

    i) Lives in my neighborhood .... Yes / No
    ii) My own relative .... Yes / No
    iii) Member of my gang .... Yes / No
    iv) Similar to me .... Yes / No
    v) In my grade .... Yes / No
) Was in grade school with me .... Yes / No

e) Now describe your friend using any five of the following
   adjectives: (Circle any five):

    Honest, Cunning, Foolish, Smart, Lazy, Sportsmanlike,
    Quiet, Happy, Shoff-off, Helpful, Angry, Religious, Nice,
    Unreliable, Understanding, Old-fashioned, Well-mannered,
    Interesting, Tough, and Ordinary.

Choose a REAL FRIEND FROM THIS SCHOOL with whom you like to
share your records, money or any other things you have: `

a) Name your friend: _____

b) Name two streets which cross near your friend's house:

_____

c) Your friend's ethnic group: (Check any one):

   i) Black _____ ii) White _____ iii) Mexican Amer. _____
   iv) Puerto Rican _____ v) Any other? Describe: _____

d) Describe your friend: (Circle Yes or No):

     i) Lives in my neighborhood .... Yes / No
    ii) My own relative .... Yes / No
   iii) Member of my gang .... Yes / No
    iv) Similar to me .... Yes / No
     v) In my grade .... Yes / No
    vi) Was in grade school with me .... Yes / No

e) Now describe your friend using any five of the following
   adjectives: (Circle any five):

   Honest, Cunning, Foolish, Smart, Lazy, Sportsmanlike,
   Quiet, Happy, Show-off, Helpful, Angry, Religious, Nice,
   Unreliable, Understanding, Old-fashioned, Well-mannered,
   Interesting, Tough, and Ordinary.

Choose a REAL FRIEND FROM THIS SCHOOL with whom you like to
study, do your homework or prepare for your examinations.

a) Name your friend: _____

b) Name two streets which cross near your friend's house:

_____

c) Your friend's ethnic group: (Check any one):

   i) Black _____ ii) White _____ iii) Mexican Amer. _____
   iv) Puerto Rican _____ v) Any other? Describe: _____

d) Describe your friend: (Circle any five):

     i) Lives in my neighborhood.............. Yes / No
    ii) My own relative .... Yes / No
   iii) Member of my gang .... Yes / No
    iv) Similar to me .... Yes / No
     v) In my grade .... Yes / No
    vi) Was in grade school with me .... Yes / No

e) Now describe your friend using any five of the following
   adjectives: (Circle any five):

   Honest, Cunning, Foolish, Smart, Lazy, Sportsmanlike,
   Quiet, Happy, Show-off, Helpful, Angry, Religious, Nice,
   Unreliable, Understanding, Old-fashioned, Well-mannered,
   Interesting, Tough, and Ordinary.

Choose a REAL FRIEND FROM THIS SCHOOL with whom you like to talk, share your secrets and problems:

a) Name your friend: _____

b) Name two streets which cross near your friend's house:

_____

c) Your friend's ethnic group: (Check any one):

i) Black _____ ii) White _____ iii) Mexican Amer. _____
iv) Puerto Rican _____ v) Any other? Describe: _____

d) Describe your friend: (Circle Yes or No):

i) Lives in my neighborhood .... Yes / No
ii) My own relative .... Yes / No
iii) Member of my gang .... Yes / No
iv) Similar to me .... Yes / No
v) In my grade .... Yes / No
vi) Was in grade school with me .... Yes / No

e) Now describe your friend using any five of the following adjectives: (Circle any five):

Honest, Cunning, Foolish, Smart, Lazy, Sportsmanlike, Quiet, Happy, Show-off, Helpful, Angry, Religious, Nice, Unreliable, Understanding, Old-fashioned, Well-mannered, Interesting, Tough, and Ordinary.

Choose a REAL FRIEND FROM THIS SCHOOL with whom you like to play games like basketball, baseball or soccer:

a) Name your friend: _____

b) Name two streets which cross near your friend's house:

_____

c) Your friend's ethnic group: (Check any one):

i) Black _____ ii) White _____ iii) Mexican Amer. _____
iv) Puerto Rican _____ v) Any other? Describe: _____

d) Describe your friend: (Circle Yes or No):

i) Lives in my neighborhood.............. Yes / No
ii) My own relative .... Yes / No
iii) Member of my gang .... Yes / No
iv) Similar to me .... Yes / No
v) In my grade .... Yes / No
vi) Was in grade school with me .... Yes / No

e) Now describe your friend using any five of the following adjectives: (Circle any five):

Honest, Cunning, Foolish, Smart, Lazy, Sportsmanlike, Quiet, Happy, Show-off, Helpful, Angry, Religious, Nice, Unreliable, Understanding, Old-fashioned, Well-mannered, Interesting, Tough, and Ordinary.

16. Twelve students have applied for admission to your school.
    But there are only two places free. And so only two more
    students can be admitted to the school. Since these students,
    if admitted, will belong to your class, the school Principal
    would like to know which of them you want to admit to the
    school. You can choose only two.

   a) Juan Perez, is a Puerto Rican student, who is good in
      sports and studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and
      his father is a doctor.

   b) Robert Munson, is a White student, good in sports but
      not in studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his
      father is a bus driver.

   c) James Jackson, is a Black student, good in sports and
      studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is
      a construction worker.

   d) Alfredo Marquez, is a Mexican American student, neither
      good in sports nor in studies. He lives in a rich neigh-
      borhood and his father is a bank manager.

   e) Richard Smith is a White student, good in sports and
      studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is
      a gas-station attendant.

   f) Miguel Sanchez, is a Mexican American student, good in
      sports and studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and
      his father is a lawyer.

   g) George Grabowski, is a White student, good in sports and
      studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood, and his father
      is a manager.

   h) Jacinto Perez, is a Puerto Rican student, good in sports
      and studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his
      father is a janitor.

   i) Thomas Page, is a Black student neither good in sports
      nor in studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his
      father is a delivery man.

   j) Martin Jefferson, is a Black student, good in sports and
      studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father
      is a lawyer.

   k) Luis Garcia, is a Puerto Rican student, good in sports but
      not studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his
      father is a factory worker.

   l) Rudolfo Gutierrez, is a Mexican American student, good
      in sports and studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood
      and his father is a farm-helper.

Now choose any two of all the students described above; they will
be admitted to your class: (Write names below):

1) _____   2) _____

16. Twelve students have applied for admission to your school.
But there are only two places free. And so only two
students can be admitted to the school. Since these students,
if admitted, will belong to your class, the Principal of
the school would like to know which of them you want to
admit to the school. You can choose only two.

   a) Luis Garcia, is a Puerto Rican student, good in sports
   but not in studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and
   his father is a factory worker.

   b) Rudolfo Gutierrez is a Mexican American student, good in
   sports and studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and
   his father is a fram-helper.   .

   c) Martin Jefferson, is a Black student, good in sports and
   studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father
   is a lawyer.

   d) Thomas Page, is a Black student, neither good in sports
   nor in studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his
   father is a delivery man.

   e) Juan Perez, is a Puerto Rican Student, good in sports and
   studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father
   is a doctor.

   f) Alfredo Marquez, is a Mexican American student, neither
   good in sports nor in studies. He lives in a rich neigh-
   borhood and his father is a bank manager.

   g) James Jackson, is a Black student, good in sports and
   studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father
   is a construction worker.

   h) Robert Munson, is a White student, good in sorts but
   not in studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his
   father is a bus-driver.

   i) Richard Smith, is a White student, good in sports and
   studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father
   is a gas station attendant.

   j) Jacinto Perez, is a Puerto Rican student, good in sports
   and studies. Je lives in a poor neighborhood and his
   father is a janitor.

   k) Miguel Sanchez, is a Mexican American student, good in
   sports and studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and
   his father is a lawyer.

   l) George Grabowski, is a White student, good in sports and
   studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father
   is a manager.

Now choose any two of the students described above; they will
be admitted to your class: (Write names below):

1) _____   2) _____

16. Twelve students have applied for admission to your school. But there are only two places free. And so only two students can be admitted to the school. Since these students, if admitted, will belong to your class, the Principal of the school would like to know which of them you want to admit to the school. You can choose only two.

a) George Grabowski, is a White student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father is a manager.

b) Miguel Sanchez, is a Mexican American student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father is a lawyer.

c) Jacinto Perez, is a Puerto Rican student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a janitor.

d) Richard Smith, is a White student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a gas-station attendant.

e) Robert Munson, is a White student, good in sports but not in studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a bus-driver.

f) James Jackson, is a Black student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a construction worker.

g) Alfredo Marquez, is a Mexican American student, neither good in sports nor in studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father is a bank manager.

h) Juan Perez, is a Puerto Rican student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father is a doctor.

i) Thomas Page, is a Black student, neither good in sports nor in studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a delivery man.

j) Martin Jefferson, is a Black student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father is a lawyer.

k) Rudolfo Gutierrez, is a Mexican American student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a farm-helper.

l) Luis Garcia, is a Puerto Rican student, good in sports but not in studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a factory helper.

Now choose any two of all the students described above; they will be admitted to your class: (Name any two):

1) _____   2) _____

16. Twelve students have applied for admission to your school. But there are only two places free. And so, only two students can be admitted to the school. Since these students, will be admitted to your class, the Principal of the school would like to know which of them you want to admit to the school. You can choose only two.

a) James Jackson is a Black student, good in sports and in studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a construction worker.

b) Juan Perez, is a Puerto Rican student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father is a doctor.

c) Alfredo Marquez, is a Mexican American student, neither good in sports nor in studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father is a bank manager.

d) Robert Munson, is a White student, good in sports but not in studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a bus driver.

e) Luis Garcia, is a Puerto Rican student, good in sports but not in studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a factory worker.

f) Thomas Page, is a Black student, neither good in sports nor in studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a delivery man.

g) Martin Jefferson, is a Black student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father is a lawyer.

h) Rudolfo Gutierrez, is a Mexican American student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a farm-helper.

i) George Grabowski, is a White student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father is a manager.

j) Jacinto Perez, is a Puerto Rican student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a janitor.

k) Miguel Sanchez, is a Mexican American student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father is a lawyer.

l) Richard Smith, is a White student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a gas-station attendant.

Now choose any two of all the students described above; they will be admitted to your class: (Write two names below):

1) _____   2) _____

16. Twelve students have applied for admission to your school. But there are only two places free. And so, only two more students can be admitted to the school. Since these students, if admitted, will belong to your class, the school Principal would like to know which of them you want to admit to the school. You can choose only two.

a) Richard Smith, is a White student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a gas-station attendant.

b) Miguel Sanchez, is a Mexican American student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father is a lawyer.

c) Jacinto Perez, is a Puerto Rican student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a janitor.

d) George Grabowski, is a White student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father is a manager.

e) Rudolfo Gutierrez is a Mexican American student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a farm-helper.

f) Martin Jefferson is a Black student, good in sports and studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father is a lawyer.

g) Thomas Page, is a Black student, neither good in sports nor in studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a delivery man.

h) Luis Garcia, is a Puerto Rican student, good in sports but not in studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a factory worker.

i) Robert Munson, is a White student, good in sports but not in studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a bus-driver.

j) Alfredo Marquez, is a Mexican American student, neither good in sports nor in studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father is a bank manager.

k) Juan Perez, is a Puerto Rican student, who is good in sports and studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father is a doctor.

l) James Jackson is a Black student, good in sports and in studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father is a construction worker.

Now choose any two of all the students described above; they will be admitted to your class: (Write names below):

1) _____   2) _____

16. Twelve students have applied for admission to your school.
    But there are only two places free. And so only two stu-
    dents can be admitted to the school. Since these students,
    if admitted will belong to your class, the Principal of
    the school would like to know which of them you want to
    admit to the school. You can choose only two.

   a) Rudolfo Gutierrez, is a Mexican American student, good in
      sports and studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and
      his father is a farm-helper.

   b) Luis Garcia, is a Puerto Rican student, good in sports but
      not studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his
      father is a factory worker.

   c) Martin Jefferson, is a Black student, good in sports and
      studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father
      is a lawyer.

   d) Thomas Page, is a Black student, neither good in sports
      nor in studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his
      father is a delivery man.

   e) Jacinto Perez, is a Puerto Rican student, good in sports
      and studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his
      father is a janitor.

   f) George Grabowski, is a White student, good in sports and
      studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and his father
      is a manager.

   g) Miguel Sanchez, is a Mexican American Student, good in
      sports and studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and
      his father is a lawyer.

   h) Richard Smith, is a White student, good in sports and
      studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father
      is a gas-station attendant.

   i) Alfredo Marquez, is a Mexican American student, neither
      good in sports nor in studies. He lives in a rich neigh-
      borhood and his father is a bank manager.

   j) James Jackson, is a Black student, good in sports and
      studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father
      is a construction worker.

   k) Robert Munson, is a White student, good in sports but not
      in studies. He lives in a poor neighborhood and his father
      is a bus-driver.

   l) Juan Perez, is a Puerto Rican student, who is good in
      sports and studies. He lives in a rich neighborhood and
      his father is a doctor.

Now choose any two of all the students described above; they
will be admitted to your class: (Write two names below):

1) _____   2) _____

Now I want you to describe each of the national or ethnic groups in this school by circling only five adjectives for each group:

17. Describe the Blacks in this school: (Circle five only):

   Honest, Cunning, Foolish, Smart, Lazy, Sportsmanlike,
   Quiet, Happy, Show-off, Helpful, Angry, Religious, Nice,
   Unreliable, Understanding, Old-fashioned, Well-mannered,
   Interesting, Tough, and Ordinary.

18. Describe the Whites in this school: (Circle five only):

   Honest, Cunning, Foolish, Smart, Lazy, Sportsmanlike,
   Quiet, Happy, Show-off, Helpful, Angry, Religious, Nice,
   Unreliable, Understanding, Old-fashioned, Well-mannered,
   Interesting, Tough, and Ordinary.

19. Describe the Mexican Amer. in this school: (Circle five only):

   Honest, Cunning, Foolish, Smart, Lazy, Sportsmanlike,
   Quiet, Happy, Show-off, Helpful, Angry, Religious, Nice,
   Unreliable, Understanding, Old-fashioned, Well-mannered,
   Interesting, Tough, and Ordinary.

20. Describe the Puerto Ricans in this school: (Circle five only):

   Honest, Cunning, Foolish, Smart, Lazy, Sportsmanlike,
   Quiet, Happy, Show-off, Helpful, Angry, Relibious, Nice,
   Unreliable, Understanding, Old-fashioned, Well-mannered,
   Interesting, Tough, and Ordinary.

21. Describe the Oriental Americans in this school (Circle five only):

   Honest, Cunning, Foolish, Smart, Lazy, Sportsmanlike,
   Quiet, Happy, Show-off, Helpful, Angry, Religious, Nice,
   Unreliable, Understanding, Old-fashioned, Well-mannered,
   Interesting, Tough, and Ordinary.

Now describe yourself, just as you have described the ethnic groups in the school:

22. Describe yourself: (Circle five only):

   Honest, Cunning, Foolish, Smart, Lazy, Sportsmanlike,
   Quiet, Happy, Show-off, Helpful, Angry, Religious, Nice,
   Unreliable, Understanding, Old-fashioned, Well-mannered,
   Interesting, Tough, and Ordinary.

Evaluative Ratings of Traits

23. Given below is a list of 20 adjectives. Before each of them are numbers 1 to 5. One stands for a bad quality, and 5 stands for a good quality. Keeping this in mind, circle any one number from 1 to 5 indicating your opinion of which quality is good and which quality is bad to have.

	Bad Quality		Not Bad Not Good		Good Quality
a. Honest	1	2	3	4	5
b. Cunning........	1	2	3	4	5
c. Foolish........	1	2	3	4	5
d. Smart	1	2	3	4	5
e. Lazy	1	2	3	4	5
f. Sportsmanlike .	1	2	3	4	5
g. Quiet	1	2	3	4	5
h. Happy	1	2	3	4	5
i. Show-off	1	2	3	4	5
j. Helpful	1	2	3	4	5
k. Angry	1	2	3	4	5
l. Religious	1	2	3	4	5
m. Nice	1	2	3	4	5
n. Unreliable	1	2	3	4	5
o. Understanding..	1	2	3	4	5
p. Old-fashioned..	1	2	3	4	5
q. Well-mannered..	1	2	3	4	5
r. Interesting ...	1	2	3	4	5
s. Tough	1	2	3	4	5
t. Ordinary	1	2	3	4	5

24. Are you interested in knowing the results of this study?

Yes / No

25. Do you want to have any discussion or more information about this study?

Yes / No

Self-description

26. Please indicate to what extent you experience the following feelings, using the response code:

    1 = almost never true of me
    2 = seldom true of me
    3 = sometimes true of me
    4 = often true of me
    5 = almost always true of me

(Circle the number which you think to be correct about yourself)

	Never true				Always true
a. I feel in good spirits	1	2	3	4	5
b. I am very satisfied with life in general	1	2	3	4	5
c. I do not feel good being in school	1	2	3	4	5
d. I do not feel good about my home life	1	2	3	4	5
e. I find a good deal of happiness in life	1	2	3	4	5
f. I am satisfied with social life	1	2	3	4	5
g. I feel that I am a person of little worth, not on an equal level with others..............	1	2	3	4	5
h. I feel that I have a number of good qualities	1	2	3	4	5
i. I am able to do things as well as most other people...........	1	2	3	4	5
j. I feel that I have little to be proud of	1	2	3	4	5
k. I take a positive attitude about myself.........................	1	2	3	4	5
l. I am a useless person to have around.........................	1	2	3	4	5
m. When I do a job I do not do it well.........................	1	2	3	4	5
n. I feel that my life is very useful	1	2	3	4	5

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Pramod Raikar has been read and approved by the following committee:

> Dr. Richard A. Maier, Director
> Associate Professor, Psychology, Loyola
>
> Dr. John S. Carroll
> Associate Professor, Psychology, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the thesis is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____/ - 2 /- 8 /_____   _Richard Maier_____
Date   Director's Signature