



1961

A Study of the Effect of Social Factors upon the Attitudes of the White Female Office Worker Toward the American Negro

Lottie Maria Vigil
Loyola University Chicago

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

 Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Vigil, Lottie Maria, "A Study of the Effect of Social Factors upon the Attitudes of the White Female Office Worker Toward the American Negro" (1961). *Master's Theses*. 1719.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/1719

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 © 1961 Lottie Maria Vigil

A STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF SOCIAL FACTORS UPON
THE ATTITUDES OF THE WHITE FEMALE OFFICE
WORKER TOWARD THE AMERICAN NEGRO

by

Lottie Maria Vigil

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

June

1961

Vita

Lottie Maria Vigil was born in Vienna, Austria, May 17, 1924.

She was graduated from the Bundesrealgymnasium, Vienna, Austria, March, 1942.

She was working towards a Ph.D. in Philosophy at the University of Vienna but due to her migration to the United States in 1946 did not finish her degree.

From 1951 to 1956 the writer worked for the United States Government in England, at the same time attending the University of Maryland, Overseas Program, where she fulfilled undergraduate requirements necessary for admission to a graduate school. She began her graduate studies at Loyola University in June, 1956.

PREFACE

The researcher lived in Vienna, Austria throughout the years of German occupation and saw the consequences of ethnic prejudice, and often wondered how prejudice could be carried to such inhuman extremes. Although the problem in the United States differs in significant degree from that posed by Nazi, Germany, she somehow felt compelled to take an active interest in the Negro-white problem. Having learned more about the racial problem in America, the writer thought it only logical to choose this problem for the subject of her thesis.

Very special thanks are due to Dr. Frank Cizon for his kindness and helpfulness.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	<p>A short history of the American Negro—Causes of racial prejudice—Early studies on racial prejudice—Recent studies—Basis for present study—Approach to original sample.</p>	
II.	THE SAMPLE AND ITS CHARACTERISTICS	20
	<p>Breakdown of total sample—Comparisons between the original sample and the respondents and non-respondents with religious denomination—With comparisons of religion and ethnic breakdown, religion and age level, religion and educational level—Ethnic background—Catholics and Protestants in relationship to ethnic background—Germans in relationship to age level—Slavics in relationship to age level—English in relationship to age level—A study of the comparisons of the various groups to the educational level—A comparison of those with some high school, high school, some college, college and graduate education.</p>	
III.	ANALYSIS	36
	<p>Search for an attitude scale—Evaluation of each question in relationship to other questions—Discussion of the effect of role upon attitudes—Division of material between work and social roles—Analysis to determine whether attitudes differed according to role—Conclusion that it did not.</p>	
IV.	ADJUSTMENTS	61
	<p>A comparison of study with other similar studies—Merton—Bettelheim and Janowitz—Prothro and Jensen—Mayer—Sargent—Reckless and Bringen—Porterfield—Drobra—Probable reasons for the characteristics of this sample—Effect of up-ward adjustment.</p>	

V. CONCLUSIONS 69

Shortcomings of method—Loss of anonymity—Comparisons—
Questions raised—Effect of education—Effect of age—
Validity of questions—Attitude toward researcher—
Questions 2 and 7—Analysis—Projections for the future—
Education—Age—Religious resurgence—Hypothesis—
Conclusion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY 76

APPENDIX I 83

APPENDIX II 84

APPENDIX III 85

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. BREAKDOWN OF TOTAL SAMPLE	21
II. CONSOLIDATED MASTERSHEET	22
III. ORIGINAL SAMPLE - RELIGIOUS BREAKDOWN	24
IV. ORIGINAL SAMPLE - ETHNIC BREAKDOWN	25
V. ORIGINAL SAMPLE - AGE BREAKDOWN	27
VI. ORIGINAL SAMPLE - EDUCATIONAL BREAKDOWN	28
VII. RELIGIOUS GROUPINGS	30
VIII. ETHNIC GROUPINGS	31
IX. AGE GROUPS	32
X. EDUCATIONAL LEVELS	34
XI. SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS	37
XII. ANALYSIS OF RELIGIOUS GROUPS	48
XIII. ANALYSIS OF ETHNIC GROUPS	50
XIV. ANALYSIS OF AGE GROUPS	54
XV. ANALYSIS OF EDUCATIONAL LEVELS	57

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There seems to be no group of social problems in which men's attitudes have been characterized by a larger measure of emotion and a smaller measure of science than the area of race relations. Whatever research can contribute toward raising the problem from the level of feeling to the level of knowledge will probably aid in promoting better relationships between white and Negro Americans. As a sociologist, however, the researcher is interested primarily in data which will make more understandable the social dynamics of prejudice.

The introduction of Negroes to the United States begins definitely with the landing of twenty Africans at Jamestown, Virginia, in August 1619, more than one year before the Pilgrim Fathers set foot on Plymouth Rock.¹ At that time the status of the Negroes was almost the same as that of the white indentured servants. With the increase of the number of Negroes in Virginia and other colonies, and as a result of the cultivation of the cotton plant, there was a transition in their status from servants to slaves. The economic factor

¹Several books consulted on the earlier history of the Negro in America are listed below: Brewton Berry, Race Relations (Boston, 1951); Francis J. Brown and Joseph S. Roucek, One America-The History, Contributions, and Present Problems of Our Racial and National Minorities (New York, 1937); Edwin R. Embree, Brown America (New York, 1931); E. Franklin Frazier, The Negro in the United States (New York, 1957); Charles S. Johnson, The Negro in the American Civilization (New York, 1930).

seemed to be one of the basic forces in establishing and maintaining slavery.² With the institution of slavery, racial attitudes were crystallized. The organization of Negroes into slavery debased the "poor whites" and caused enmities. The new economic system of land control showed its superiority over the system of small independent land holdings and the perfection of the plantation system meant ruthless destruction and expulsion of the poor white farmer.³ With the ending of the Civil War and the period of Reconstruction the poor whites were thrown into a competitive struggle with the Negroes, since both were dependent on the planter class for economic survival. At the same time the poor whites were, for political reasons, constantly subjected to propaganda concerning their obligation to maintain the supremacy and purity of the white race. This marked the beginning of such slogans as: "Would you want your daughter to marry a Negro?", "White Supremacy", etc.⁴

These conditions of racial conflict started the eventual migration of the Negro from the South at the turn of the century, and the northern urban areas were faced with a new problem, that of rural Negroes and their adjustment to the urban culture. Certain unfriendly attitudes developed with such a large Negro migration. Even European immigrants -- the Irish and later the Poles, Italians and others -- were subjected to similarly hostile attitudes until they had assimilated a large measure of the American culture.⁵ Is it not under-

²Frazier, p. 103.

³Johnson, pp. 1-15.

⁴Frazier, p. 135.

⁵Ray Allen Billington, The Protestant Crusade- 1800-1860 - A Study of the Origins of American Nativism (New York, 1938), pp. 322-344.

understandable, then, that the Southern Negro would be subjected to hostile attitudes on the part of the northern urban population? He not only came from a rural into an urban area, but was clearly identifiable by color. Consequently, as had been true in the South, the Negro became a competitor with lower class white and this competition became an acute factor in the northern cities.⁶

Undoubtedly, economic factors, as well as historic causes,⁷ have had a great influence on the growth of racial prejudice. Yet, can we explain racial prejudice in the twentieth century exclusively on these bases? There are many other, perhaps more important, factors involved in racial prejudice.⁸ One of the oldest explanations of prejudice against all minorities is in terms of fear or dislike of differences.⁹ In addition, the concept of the "scape-goat mechanism" illustrates the functional character of racial prejudice.¹⁰ Man since the beginning of tribal life has found it convenient to blame his misfortunes and even misdeeds on others--the other tribe, the other nation, or the other race. The environmental support of beliefs and attitudes of racial prejudice is also to be considered. The influence on the attitudes of children exerted by parents, teachers, and religious organizations must also be studied

⁶Frazier, p. 670.

⁷F. Tannenbaum, Slave and Citizen (New York, 1947).

⁸David Krech and Richard S. Crutchfield, The Theory and Problems of Social Psychology (New York, 1948), pp. 493-496.

⁹Arnold and Caroline Rose, America Divided - Minority Group Relations in the United States (New York, 1948), p. 279.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 284.

to understand the phenomenon of prejudice in our country.¹¹ Finally, we must consider the effect that the visibility of the Negroes as a group has upon the formation of racial attitudes.¹²

The study of attitudes is important to successful and peaceful cooperation among people; also a knowledge of the process by which attitudes are developed is important for the understanding of social control. In short, the attitudes of groups constitute a large and important part of the phenomena necessary to describe, explain and predict the behavior of a group, as well as the behavior of individuals in a group.¹³

Many studies have been made in the last few decades trying to find a correlation between the social factors studied in this paper, namely religion, ethnic background, age and educational level and racial attitudes.

Several studies have tried to discover whether Protestants or Catholics as a group display more prejudice. The findings do not agree. Some studies find Catholics more bigoted; some, Protestants; and some find no difference.¹⁴ As Allport pointed out, many other factors such as the education or socio-economic status, etc., have to be taken into consideration.

¹¹John Henning Criswell, "A Sociometric Study of Race Cleavage in the Classroom," Archives of Psychology, XXXIII (January 1939), 18-70.

¹²Alfred J. Marrow, Living Without Hate - Scientific Approaches to Human Relations (New York, 1951), p. 70.

¹³George Andrew Lundberg, Social Research (New York, 1951), pp. 199-200.

¹⁴Gordon W. Allport, The Nature of Prejudice (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1954), pp. 449-451.

More specifically, Merton¹⁵ reports the following rank order among religious groups: Catholics show the highest amount of prejudice, Protestants show less, and Jews and people with no religious affiliation show the least amount of prejudice. Allport and Kramer¹⁶ reported the same findings. They explain this rank order with the fact that any authoritarian or disciplinarian outlook on life tends to produce a greater amount of prejudice.

Other studies show different results. Bettelheim and Janowitz state that religious affiliation has little influence on racial attitudes.¹⁷ Prothro and Jensen noted that there was a slight tendency for those persons more favorable toward a church to be more favorable toward the Negro and Jew.¹⁸ These findings agree with those made by Sanford who found that acceptance of religion usually goes with freedom from prejudice.¹⁹ Porterfield noted that sociology students who were also students of religion were less prejudiced than the group

¹⁵R. K. Merton, "Fact and Factitiousness in Ethnic Questionnaires," American Sociological Review, V (February, 1940), pp. 13-28.

¹⁶G. W. Allport and B. M. Kramer, "Some Roots of Prejudice," Journal of Psychology, XXII (July 1946), pp. 9-39.

¹⁷Bruno Bettelheim and Morris Janowitz, Dynamics of Prejudice (New York, 1950), p. 50.

¹⁸E. T. Prothro and J. A. Jensen, "Interrelations of Religious and Ethnic Attitudes in Selected Southern Populations," Journal of Social Psychology, XXXII, (August 1950), 45-49.

¹⁹R. Nevitt Sanford, Handbook of Social Psychology (Cambridge, Mass, 1954), p. 52.

considered as a whole.²⁰ Thus, the many attempts to determine the relationship between prejudice and religious affiliation have produced conflicting results. Few studies have attempted to relate both religion and socio-economic class to prejudice.

There are only a few studies primarily designed to study ethnic factors affecting racial attitudes. Bogardus considered this relationship but his study was not solely intended to study specifically ethnic attitudes toward the American Negro.²¹ He constructed a questionnaire attempting to measure seven degrees of acceptable social intimacy between races and nationalities. The respondent checked off the degree of social intimacy to which he would be willing to admit a member of each of thirty-six racial or nationality groups. By this means Bogardus presented a rank order of races and nationalities according to the degree of preference for them by a given group of Americans.

The problem of the degree of friendliness toward the Negro and various races and nationalities became a major concern for those interested in the quantitative approach to the study of attitudes, especially after L. L. Thurstone introduced a series of major technical improvements into the measuring process.²² Hinckley devised a scale of attitudes toward the Negro which

²⁰Austin L. Porterfield, "Education and Race Attitudes," Sociology and Social Research, XXI (July-August 1937), 538-543.

²¹Emory S. Bogardus, "Race Friendliness and Social Distance," Journal of Applied Sociology, XII (January-February 1927), 272-287.

²²L. L. Thurstone, "An Experimental Study of Nationality Preferences," Journal of General Psychology, I (July-October 1928), 405-425.

presumably could be administered to any group of whites.²³ In addition, Katz and Braly prepared a list of eighty-four adjectives and asked one hundred Princeton students to pick out the adjectives thought typical of each of ten different nations and races. They found that the greatest degree of prejudice was shown toward Negroes and Turks.²⁴

Another study of this type, producing similar results, was made by Bayton using a sample of Negro college students. The adjectives most frequently used were almost identical with those listed in the Princeton study.²⁵ It is interesting to note that Negro college students were found to have racial stereotypes highly similar to those possessed by white college students.

Studies made by Merton,²⁶ Prothro and Miles,²⁷ and Prothro and Jensen²⁸ concentrate more on the attitudes of students or adults toward the Negro and

²³E. D. Hinckley, "The Influence of Individual Opinion on the Construction of An Attitude Scale," Journal of Social Psychology, III (August 1932), 283-295.

²⁴D. Katz and K. Braly, "Racial Stereotypes of One Hundred College Students," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXVIII (October-December 1933), 200-290.

²⁵J. A. Bayton, "The Racial Stereotypes of Negro College Students," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXXVI (January 1941), 97-102.

²⁶Merton, pp. 13-28.

²⁷E. T. Prothro and O. K. Miles, "A Comparison of Ethnic Attitudes of College Students and Middle Class Adults from the Same State," Journal of Social Psychology, XXXVI (August 1952), 53-58.

²⁸Prothro and Jensen, pp. 45-49.

Jews in general, but not necessarily in reference to the ethnic background of the respondents. Guilford compared the attitudes of students in colleges in the United States toward fifteen different races and nationalities.²⁹ Murphy and Likert showed how the personal background of several student groups was related to their conservative or radical tendencies in relationship to internationalism, imperialism, the Negro and economic issues.³⁰ They also found that children of two foreign-born parents averaged somewhat more radical in their prejudices on all scales than children of two American-born parents. Similar findings were made by Bettelheim and Janowitz several years later.³¹ Obviously, much more research will have to be done in the field of ethnic background in relationship to racial attitudes before any valid conclusions can be reached.

Studies attempting to find a correlation between age and racial attitudes have been made on many different age levels. Meltzer contributed information concerning the attitudes of children in the fifth to the eighth grade of the public schools in St. Louis by having them rank their racial and national preferences. He found that the white children had ranked the Negro twentieth or next to last while the Negro children had ranked their group first.³² Criswell in his study of school children concluded that the cleavages among the

²⁹J. P. Guilford, "Racial Preference of a Thousand American University Students," Journal of Social Psychology II (May 1931), 179-204.

³⁰Gardner Murphy and Rensis Likert, Public Opinion and the Individual (New York, 1938), 14-24.

³¹Bettelheim and Janowitz, p. 53.

³²H. Meltzer, "Group Differences in Nationality and Race Preference of Children," Sociometry, II (January 1939), 86-105, and "Nationality Preferences and Stereotypes of Colored Children," Journal of Genetic Psychology, LVIII (March 1941), 181-199.

sexes in greater than racial cleavage among the younger children. Race preference was weaker and more variable in the first four grades but may be significantly present in either race at least as early as grade two. As he noted, even when such race withdrawal did not occur, color preference may have been present. Large minorities of young white girls showed little or no race preference, but they accepted white and light classmates and rejected darker ones.³³

The study of adult attitudes becomes complicated by many factors including social status and education. For example, in a study by Prothro and Miles³⁴ there seems to be a strong possibility that education was an important influence upon the racial attitudes of the group studied. They found that college students showed significantly less prejudice toward both the Negro and the Jew than adults. Reckless and Bringen noted that age seems to have an influence on racial attitudes of college students since less favorable test results were received particularly from students over twenty-five years of age.³⁵ Porterfield concluded that racial social distance increased steadily by five-year periods up to the age group of thirty to thirty-four.³⁶ From the studies cited it can be concluded that there is a correlation between age and racial attitudes; as Murphy and Murphy put it: "Once it is granted that prejudice

³³Criswell, pp. 18-70.

³⁴Prothro and Miles, pp. 53-58.

³⁵Walter C. Reckless and Harold L. Bringen, "Racial Attitudes and Information About the Negro," Journal of Negro Education, II (January 1933), 128-138.

³⁶Porterfield, pp. 538-543.

against races is not a native trait, there must, of course, be age differences in racial attitudes, since attitudes develop during some period of time."³⁷

Most studies in the field of attitudes toward minorities which have primarily dealt with the educational factor have been more concerned with the Jew than with the Negro.³⁸ In addition, most of them were seeking different relationships than were sought in the present study. For example, Reckless and Bringen³⁹ were interested in the attitudes of the white college student toward the Negro in relationship to the objective knowledge possessed about the Negro and not in the general relationship between educational level and racial attitudes. Brooks was not trying to prove that people with a higher education are more tolerant toward the Negro but that college students would accept the educated Negro more readily than the uneducated Negro.⁴⁰ A study conducted at Loyola University by Marciniak based on Thurstone and Likert attitude scales is another study analyzing the attitudes of students in schools.⁴¹ His survey included seven Catholic colleges in the Chicago area. Interestingly, he found

³⁷Gardner Murphy and Lois B. Murphy, Experimental Social Psychology - An Interpretation of Research Upon the Socialization of the Individual (New York, 1931), p. 925.

³⁸A. A. Campbell, "Factors Associated with Attitudes Toward Jews," Reading in Social Psychology (New York, 1947), pp. 518-527.

³⁹Reckless and Bringen, pp. 128-138.

⁴⁰Lee M. Brooks, "Racial Distance as Affected by Education," Sociology and Social Research, XXI (November-December 1936), 128-133.

⁴¹Edward A. Marciniak, "Racial Attitudes of Students in Catholic Colleges of the Chicago Area," Unpublished Master's Thesis (Loyola University, Chicago, 1942).

that of the seven colleges examined one showed greater friendliness toward the Negro than the other six. This one was the only college where special attention was given to resolving the racial question. The presence of several Negro sisters as students at this college seemed to add to the more favorable racial attitudes. Whether this less prejudiced attitude toward the Negro results from education in general or from planned programs in the colleges has been the topic of much discussion.⁴² The more general consensus seems to be that a directed effort towards improving racial attitudes is necessary for such improvement to take place.⁴³

Other studies have attempted to find out whether the possession of certain information or misinformation about Negroes in a given situation affects a white person's attitude toward Negroes in that situation.⁴⁴ Related to these studies are those which attempt to find out whether race prejudice is a general attitude which applies to most situations or whether it is a group of attitudes, each of which applies only to a specific situation. A study of this sort was one by Euri Bell Bolton. He drew the conclusion that a "group of Southern students are much more liberal toward the economic, the political and the educational rights of the Negro than toward social inter-mixture with the race,"

⁴²D. H. Russell and I. V. Robertson, "Influencing Attitudes Toward Minority Groups in a Junior High School," School Review, LV (April 1947), 205-213.

⁴³Porterfield, pp. 538-543.

⁴⁴E. L. Horowitz, "The Development of Attitudes Toward the Negro," Archives of Psychology, XXVIII (January 1936), 283-295.

and therefore, that last factor should be measured as a distinct attitude.⁴⁵ Murphy and Likert found that students who had received scholarships were more tolerant.⁴⁶ This they attribute to a general serious-mindedness which makes the scholarship student analyze the social scene more critically. The Murphy and Likert report coincides, with some modification, with the findings of Bettelheim and Janowitz. They, however, question whether a higher degree of general knowledge is positively correlated with tolerance. If this were so, it was noted, an educational program would seem an adequate means of promoting tolerance.⁴⁷

Public opinion polls have shed little light on which social factors are related to social attitudes. Repeated polls by Gallup seem to indicate that for the nation as a whole, anti-Semitism seems to be slightly related to educational level.⁴⁸ The most educated appear the least anti-Semitic. A good case could be made for denying the existence of such differences beyond mere verbalization, since those with more education may be expected to qualify their statements more carefully, while their underlying attitudes and behavior may be the same as that of persons who express themselves more bluntly and thus might appear less tolerant.

⁴⁵Euri Bell Bolton, "Measuring Specific Attitudes Towards the Social Rights of the Negro," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXXI (January-March 1937), 396.

⁴⁶Murphy and Likert, pp. 14-24.

⁴⁷Bettelheim and Janowitz, p. 49.

⁴⁸Ibid.

Experiments have been conducted in which students were given courses in race relations or were brought into social contact with Negroes and their attitudes before and after were carefully measured through the use of attitude scales. Smith found that when students were brought in cultural contact with outstanding Negro individuals and groups in their own community, a marked increase in favorable attitudes toward the Negro was registered.⁴⁹

Droba's study and findings in particular were most similar to the ones searched for in this study.⁵⁰ His study on the relationship of educational level in general to attitudes toward the Negro showed that students became more favorably inclined toward the Negro as they ascended the educational scale. It has not been determined whether or not this is due to educational selection, the liberal ones going on to higher degrees, or due to the educational training, or a selection by social class or liberalism.

The study of attitudes is extremely complex and attitude scales are only an indirect means of studying human behavior. Much more research will have to be done in this field before we will obtain adequate knowledge of racial attitudes.

All the previous studies of attitudes toward minority groups have been made on school enrollments of different ages (from grade school to college), on war

⁴⁹F. Tredwell Smith, An Experiment in Modifying Attitudes Toward the Negro, Contributions to Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, No. 887 (New York, 1943), pp. 121-126.

⁵⁰D. D. Droba, "Education and Negro Attitudes," Sociology and Social Research, XVII (November-December 1932), 137-141.

veterans, and a few on the "white middle class."⁵¹ Many of the studies indicate that attitudes towards race have their roots in the individual's religious background, education, age or ethnic identification.

These studies have influenced the researcher in formulating her hypotheses. Among them has been Adorno's study which claimed that the more authoritarian religious groups are more prejudiced and therefore Jews and Catholics are more prejudiced. Gordon Allport found that Catholics seemed to be more bigoted; others found Protestants to be more bigoted; some found no difference at all based upon religious affiliation. As previously noted, Allport and Kramer indicated that Catholics showed the highest amount of prejudice, Protestants showed less, and Jews and people with no religious affiliation showed the least amount of prejudice.⁵² The Allport and Kramer study, along with Adorno's, influenced the writer in forming one of her hypotheses. Another factor which led the writer to come to the following hypotheses were the studies concerning the effects of immigration and age upon racial attitudes. A study by Bettelheim and Janowitz tended to show that recent immigrants proved to be more prejudiced than those who came decades ago,⁵³ and several studies showed a definite

⁵¹Meltzer, Sociometry, pp. 86-105; Katz and Braly, pp. 200-290; Bettelheim and Janowitz, p. 53; Prothro and Miles, pp. 55-58.

⁵²T. W. Adorno, The Authoritarian Personality (New York, 1951), p. 52; Allport, pp. 449-451; Allport and Kramer, pp. 9-39.

⁵³Bettelheim and Janowitz, p. 53.

correlation between age and racial attitudes.⁵⁴ Perhaps the area that was most challenging concerned the studies that indicated that the less educated were more prejudiced than the educated.⁵⁵ After studying these the writer wished to test the following hypothesis: Racial attitudes of the "average" white female office worker vary according to her religious denomination, ethnic background, age, and level of education.

More specifically, it was intended to test the assertions that Catholics are more prejudiced than Protestants or Jews; that recent immigrants are more prejudiced than earlier immigrants and persons not identifying themselves with immigrant groups, and that the older and the less educated groups were more prejudiced than the younger and the more educated groups.

The researcher is presently employed at a large temporary office service and her many contacts with office workers from all parts of Chicago indicated the possible value of analyzing the attitudes of these women. Since 1946 this office service has utilized the services of about six thousand girls. For all practical purposes this sample could be considered a relatively adequate cross section of white female office workers of Chicago as they came from all parts of the city, represented all age levels, religious affiliations, different educational levels and various ethnic backgrounds. The data concerning their religious affiliation, education, age levels and ethnic background were readily

⁵⁴Murphy and Murphy, p. 925; Porterfield, pp. 538-543; Reckless and Bringen, 128-138.

⁵⁵Brooks, pp. 128-133; Proba, pp. 137-131; Murphy and Likert, pp. 14-24; Porterfield, pp. 538-543; Reckless and Bringen, pp. 128-138; Russell and Robertson, pp. 205-213.

available on each girl's employment application. The writer used all the girls that had been hired between January 1 and December 31, 1956, which amounted to 712 girls. This particular group was chosen since it would offer the most up-to-date information concerning address and other pertinent data. The researcher originally wanted to use the girls hired in 1957, but did not get permission to do so. It was felt by management that the subject of the thesis was a rather delicate one and the office service did not want to get involved in this problem.

After holding conferences with sociology teachers, graduate students, Negroes, local organizations that have made similar surveys such as the Catholic Interracial Council and the Bureau on Jewish Employment Problems, and after consulting many books dealing with the use of questionnaires,⁵⁶ it was decided to use this method as the basis for the study. Brevity was of the utmost importance since it was felt that the white female office worker would not be inclined to answer a lengthy questionnaire.⁵⁷ The questionnaire was pre-tested

⁵⁶Paul H. Furfey, The Scope and Method of Sociology - A Metasociological Treatise (New York, 1953), pp. 446-461; William J. Goode and Paul K. Hatt, Methods in Social Research (New York, 1952), pp. 170-183; Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutsch, and Stuart W. Cook, Research Methods in Social Relations with Especial Reference to Prejudice (New York, 1951), pp. 428-462; H. H. Remmers, Introduction to Opinion and Attitude Measurement (New York, 1954), pp. 162-196; Quinn McNemar, "Opinion-Attitude Methodology," Psychological Bulletin, V (April 1940), 289-374; Arnold M. Rose, Theory and Methods in the Social Sciences, University of Minnesota Press (Minneapolis, Minn., 1954), p. 295; Raymond F. Sletto, "Pretesting of Questionnaires," American Sociological Review, V (April 1940) 193-200; Pauline V. Young, Scientific Social Surveys and Research (Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1956), pp. 176-204.

⁵⁷Ibid. (The above studies were also consulted on this point.)

three times for understandability and adequacy in terms of important factors.⁵⁸ The first pre-test was made on a group of undergraduate students, the second on a group of graduate students, and the third on the permanent staff of the temporary office service. After considering the findings and consulting different authorities on the subject,⁵⁹ the following seven specific questions were decided upon:

1. Would you be willing to work next to a desk occupied by a Negro woman?
2. Would you be willing to invite a Negro woman working in the same office with you on the same job to go to dinner with you?
3. Would you be reluctant to work in a building where other offices employed Negro women?
4. Would you be reluctant to work under the immediate supervision of a Negro woman?
5. Would you agree that Negro women are less capable of doing efficient office work than white women?
6. Would you be willing to work in a large office that employed Negro women if you did not have to be closely associated with them?
7. Would you be willing to take your coffee break with a Negro woman who does the same work as you?

Since other research has shown that the number of returns is usually the same

⁵⁸Sletto, pp. 193-200.

⁵⁹Hinckley, pp. 283-296; L. W. Ferguson, "An Item Analysis of Peterson's 'War' Scale," Psychological Bulletin, XXXV (February 1938), 521; R. Rintner and G. Forlando, "The Influence of Attitude Upon Scaling of Attitude Items," Journal of Social Psychology, VIII (1938, issued quarterly), 38-45.

for letters or postcards, postcards were used for this study.⁶⁰

The researcher also intended to use, in conjunction with the questionnaire, an attitude scale that would give objective, quantitative data as well as information of a qualitative nature. Several methods were taken into consideration. The Bogardus scale⁶¹ is a measure of general social distance, as distinguished from distance in regard to a specific racial or national group; it was therefore not seriously considered for this study. The Thurstone method⁶² was also discarded, even though his method was based upon a much more accurate method of establishing scale units since it involved the utilization of judges. This was not considered necessary or desirable for this study. The pre-testing done in this study could not be considered as made by judges in the meaning of Thurstone's scale. Hinckley's study⁶³ was one of the first on attitudes toward Negroes based on the Thurstone method and was taken into serious consideration, but here again the utilization of judges was necessary. At another point, the Likert scale⁶⁴, another technique for the measurement of attitudes, was considered as the basis for this study.

However, after receiving the results of the pre-testing, the researcher had to relinquish the use of an attitude scale altogether since no adequate graduation could be achieved due to the distinctions of social versus job

⁶⁰ Sletto, pp. 193-200.

⁶¹ Bogardus, pp. 272-287.

⁶² Thurstone, pp. 405-425.

⁶³ Hinckley, pp. 283-295.

⁶⁴ Rensis Likert, "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes," Archives of Psychology, XXII (June 1932), 1-55.

acceptance with the questionnaire. It was hoped, nevertheless, that the results of this study would enable the writer to set up an attitude scale which could be used in later studies. Regardless of whether or not an attitude scale could have been formulated, it was felt that the findings would enable the writer to examine the relationship between religious denomination, ethnic background, age and level of education and the racial attitudes expressed by the questions to be answered.

It was decided that the month of October would be a good month for sending the questionnaire since the vacation time would be over and at least the receipt of the questionnaire would be assured.

A cover letter was prepared, (see Appendix I), assuring the receiver of anonymity of the response. The postcards were numbered, the numbers correlating with the application cards of the girls used in the temporary employment office files, since these application cards would furnish the researcher with the necessary information as to religious, ethnic background, age and education.

CHAPTER II

SELECTIVITY

In this chapter we will deal with a comparison of the responses and non-responses. We shall look for possible selectivity in the responses and if we discover it exists attempt to evaluate it. In a study of this type it has to be kept in mind that a correlation between prejudice and reluctance to being polled might exist. Hence every questionnaire had to be considered and an attempt made to understand its significance. Of first importance are the usable questionnaires from which the identification number was removed, questionnaires that were returned because the person no longer lived at the address, and the questionnaires that were simply not returned. When we compare the ethnic, religious, age and educational factors of the respondents and non-respondents with the original sample we can determine whether or not there has been any significant selectivity in the sampling.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the original sample included 712 persons to whom the questionnaires were sent. Since the workers in this group were engaged in a temporary type of work we expected and received a large number of undeliverable returns. Of the 712 letters sent, 78 were returned with the notation, "Moved, left no address." Of the 624 that we may assume were delivered 139 were returned. Not all of these, unfortunately, were usable. One questionnaire was returned unanswered and sixteen respondents had taken the trouble to remove the identification number. The actual usable returns amounted

to 122, or 19.6 per cent of the total sample. (See Table I, below.) There are three probable reasons for the unreturned questionnaires. Undoubtedly, most of the questionnaires not returned can be attributed to simple disregard of the letter or lack of interest. The fact that the writer received sixteen cards on which the number had been erased indicated that some feared the loss of anonymity. These cards, however, did not affect the selectivity as they did not differ in their responses. (See Appendix III, page

TABLE I
BREAKDOWN OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE

Usable returns	122
Non-usable returns	95
Number erased from questionnaire	16
Returned unanswered	1
Returned to sender - unknown	78
Not returned	495
Total sample	712

One cannot help but wish that the number of returns was larger, but a response of 19.6 was considered adequate for interpretation. What biases may have existed in the returned questionnaires are given consideration in the interpretations. A mastersheet was prepared showing religion, ethnic background, age and education of the total sample. This information was taken from the data given by the respondents on their application for employment. Ethnic background therefore, based on the applicants' personal placement in an ethnic

TABLE II
CONSOLIDATED MASTERSHEET - RESPONDENTS AND NON-RESPONDENTS

	Number						Per Cent					
	Catholic		Prot.		Jew		Catholic		Prot.		Jew	
	Resp.	N-R	Resp.	N-R	Resp.	N-R	Resp.	N-R	Resp.	N-R	Resp.	N-R
Ethnic background*												
American	3	5	7	22	3	18	7.3	2.7	12.7	11.5	50.0	43.9
Italian	2	18	2	6	-	1	4.9	9.7	3.6	3.1	-	2.4
English	1	7	13	42	-	2	2.4	3.9	23.6	22.0	-	4.9
Irish	12	53	2	21	-	-	29.3	28.6	3.6	10.9	-	-
German	11	42	14	42	1	2	26.8	22.7	25.5	22.0	16.7	4.9
Scandinavian	-	9	10	40	-	-	-	4.8	18.2	20.9	-	-
Slavic	11	38	2	11	1	6	26.8	20.5	3.6	5.8	16.7	14.6
Other **	1	13	5	7	1	12	2.4	7.0	9.1	3.7	16.7	29.3
Total	41	185	55	191	6	41	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9	100.1	100.0
Age level												
20 to 29	26	85	33	75	5	9	63.4	43.1	55.0	37.9	55.5	20.0
30 to 39	7	54	10	55	-	15	17.1	27.4	16.7	27.8	-	33.3
40 to 49	2	42	5	45	2	15	4.9	21.3	8.3	22.7	22.2	33.3
50 to 59	3	15	9	18	2	6	7.3	7.6	15.0	9.0	22.2	13.6
60 to 69	3	1	3	5	-	-	7.3	0.5	5.0	2.6	-	-
Total	41	197	60	198	9	45	100.0	99.9	100.0	99.9	99.9	99.9
Education*												
Some high school	1	30	2	26	-	8	2.5	15.2	3.3	12.6	-	17.1
High School	18	111	19	103	4	18	45.0	56.1	31.7	50.0	44.5	38.3
1 year college	2	18	7	19	1	6	5.0	9.1	11.7	9.2	11.1	12.8
2 years college	6	18	16	18	1	8	15.0	9.1	26.7	8.7	11.1	17.0
3 years college	5	6	6	12	1	1	12.5	3.0	10.0	5.9	11.1	2.1
4 years college	6	14	7	27	2	5	15.0	7.1	11.7	13.1	22.2	10.6
Graduate	2	1	3	1	-	1	5.0	0.5	5.0	0.5	-	2.1
Total	40	198	60	206	9	47	100.0	100.1	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0

* As given by applicants

**Greek, French, Mexican, White, Dutch, European and Hebrew

group. See Table II, page 22.

In the original sample 42.4 per cent of the persons were Catholic, 47.9 per cent were Protestant, and 9.8 per cent were Jewish. Thus we see that in the original sample there was a slightly larger representation of Protestants than Catholics. The returns did not run according to these same percentages. Out of the total returns 37.3 per cent of the respondents were Catholics and 43.6 per cent of the non-respondents were Catholics. The Protestants accounted for 54.6 per cent of the respondents and 46.2 per cent of the non-respondents. The Jews, like the Catholics, and Protestants, did not respond in ratio to their representation in the original sample. They returned 3.2 per cent of the cards and made up 10.2 per cent of the non-respondents. (See Table III). From the above figures, one can note that Catholics are underrepresented among those who responded and overrepresented among those who did not respond. The possible reasons for the lower receptivity to being polled on this question among Catholics will be answered when we analyze the responses in relation to the respondents' religious preference.

In comparing the ethnic membership of the total original sample with the respondent and non-respondent groups the following pattern is indicated. While people who gave their nationality descent as Americans comprised 11.2 per cent of the original sample, they comprised 14.0 per cent of the respondents and only 10.6 of the non-respondents. The Italians comprised 5.8 per cent of the original sample; they comprised 3.7 per cent of the respondents and 6.2 per cent of the non-respondents. Those of English background comprised 12.5 per cent of the original sample, 14.9 per cent of the respondents, and 11.9 per cent of the non-respondents. The Irish comprised 17.1 per cent of the original sample, 13.1 per

TABLE III

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS AND NON-RESPONDENTS IN THE
ORIGINAL SAMPLE BY RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION

Religious Affiliation	Number			Percentage		
	Total	Resp.	N-Resp.	Total	Resp.	N-Resp.
Catholics	238	41	197	42.4	37.3	43.6
Protestants	269	60	209	47.9	54.5	46.2
Jews	55	9	46	9.8	8.2	10.2
Total	562*	110	452	100.1	100.0	100.0

*It will be noted that the totals on the tables vary from the mastersheet. This could not be avoided since data were not always available for all characteristics. Some girls failed to indicate either religious affiliation, or ethnic background or age or education.

cent of the respondents, and 18.1 per cent of the non-respondents. The German group comprised 21.4 per cent of the original sample, 24.3 per cent of the respondents, and 20.6 per cent of the non-respondents. The Scandinavian element comprised 11.4 per cent of the original sample, 10.3 per cent of the respondents, and 11.8 per cent of the non-respondents. The Slavic group comprised 13.4 per cent of the original sample, 13.1 per cent of the respondents, and 13.5 per cent of the non-respondents. As a result of these differences in response, the American, English and German groups are overrepresented in response. It was necessary for the writer to take into account the overrepresentation of certain ethnic groups when she attempted to analyze the importance of ethnic backgrounds in evaluating the response. (See Table IV.)

In comparing the age groups of the original sample with the respondents and

and the non-respondents the following pattern is indicated. The age group twenty to twenty-nine comprised 41.8 per cent of the original sample, 57.4 per cent of the respondents, and 38.1 per cent of the non-respondents. The age group

TABLE IV

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS AND NON-RESPONDENTS IN THE ORIGINAL SAMPLE BY ETHNIC BACKGROUND

Ethnic Background	Number			Percentage		
	Total	Resp.	N-Resp.	Total	Resp.	N-Resp.
American	61	15	46	11.2	14.0	10.6
Italian	31	4	27	5.8	3.7	6.2
English	68	16	52	12.5	14.9	11.9
Irish	93	14	79	17.1	13.1	18.1
German	116	26	90	21.4	24.3	20.6
Scandinavian	62	11	51	11.4	10.3	11.8
Slavic	73	14	59	13.4	13.1	13.5
Other	39	7	32	7.2	6.5	7.3
Total	543*	107	436	100.1	99.9	100.0

*It will be noted that the total on this table varies from the mastersheet. This could not be avoided since data were not always available for all characteristics. Some girls failed to indicate either religious affiliation, or ethnic background or age or education.

thirty to thirty-nine comprised 25.3 per cent of the original sample, 15.6 per cent of the respondents, and 27.8 per cent of the non-respondents. The age

group forty to forty-nine comprised 20.2 per cent of the original sample, 8.2 per cent of the respondents, and 23.3 per cent of the non-respondents. The age group fifty to fifty-nine comprised 10.5 per cent of the original sample, 13.9 per cent of the respondents, and 9.7 per cent of the non-respondents. Finally, the age group sixty to sixty-nine comprised 2.0 per cent of the original sample, and 4.9 per cent of the respondents, and 1.2 per cent of the non-respondents.

It should be noted that the age groups twenty to twenty-nine, fifty to fifty-nine and sixty to sixty-nine are overrepresented in the respondents whereas the age groups thirty to thirty-nine and forty to forty-nine are underrepresented in respondents. (See Table V.) The writer will discuss the apparent selectivity in the respondents when she presents her analysis of the age groups.

The most critical area of this study was the comparison of the educational levels of the group. As the writer anticipated, this group showed a receptivity pattern that could almost be equated with their education. The girls with some high school education comprised 12.0 per cent of the original sample, 3.3 per cent of the respondents and 14.1 per cent of the non-respondents. The girls who had completed high school comprised 47.9 per cent of the original sample, 37.7 per cent of the respondents, and 50.5 per cent of the non-respondents. Girls with one year of college education comprised 9.1 per cent of the original sample, 9.1 per cent of the respondents, and 9.1 per cent of the non-respondents. Girls with two years of college education comprised 12.2 per cent of the original sample, 21.3 per cent of the respondents, and 9.8 per cent of the non-respondents. Girls with three years of college education comprised 6.2 per cent of the

TABLE V

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS AND NON-RESPONDENTS IN THE ORIGINAL SAMPLE
ACCORDING TO AGE LEVELS

Age Group	Number			Percentage		
	Total	Resp.	N-Resp.	Total	Resp.	N-Resp.
Age group 20-29	255	70	185	41.8	57.4	38.1
Age group 30-39	154	19	135	25.3	15.6	27.8
Age group 40-49	123	10	113	20.2	8.2	23.3
Age group 50-59	64	17	47	10.5	13.9	9.7
Age group 60-69	12	6	6	2.0	4.9	1.2
Total	608*	122	486	99.9	100.0	100.1

*It will be noted that the total on this table varies from the mastersheet. This could not be avoided since data were not always available for all characteristics. Some girls failed to indicate either religious affiliation, or ethnic background or age or education.

original sample, 10.7 per cent of the respondents, and 5.1 per cent of the non-respondents. The girls with a bachelor's degree comprised 11.4 per cent of the original sample, 13.9 per cent of the respondents, and only 10.7 per cent of the non-respondents. The receptivity to being surveyed showed a marked increase when the writer came to those with a master's degree. Those girls comprised 1.3 per cent of the original sample, 4.1 per cent of the respondents, and 0.6 per cent of the non-respondents. Thus, girls with some high school education, girls with high school education and girls with one year of college education are

underrepresented in respondents, whereas girls with two, three, and four years of college and girls with a master's degree are overrepresented in respondents. (See Table VI.) If it is true that girls with higher education are less prejudiced, this possible selectivity of the less prejudiced will have to be

TABLE VI

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS AND NON-RESPONDENTS IN THE ORIGINAL SAMPLE BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

Educational Achievement	Number			Percentage		
	Total	Resp.	N-Resp.	Total	Resp.	N-Resp.
Some high school	74	4	70	12.0	3.3	14.1
High school	296	46	250	47.9	37.7	50.5
College-1 year	56	11	45	9.1	9.1	9.1
College-2 years	75	26	49	12.2	21.3	9.8
College-3 years	38	13	25	6.2	10.7	5.1
College-4 years	70	17	52	11.4	13.9	10.7
Graduate degree	8	5	3	1.3	4.1	0.6
Total	617	122	495	100.1	100.1	99.9

*It will be noted that the total on this table varies from the mastersheet. This could not be avoided since data were not always available for all characteristics. Some girls failed to indicate either religious affiliation, or ethnic background or age or education.

given consideration in the analysis of the educational levels.

In an effort to cast some light on the disproportionate representation in the response the writer made further comparisons of respondents within the four categories of religious affiliation, ethnic background, age and education.

These additional comparisons revealed additional factors which needed to be included in the evaluation of selectivity of respondents.

As noted in Table VII, page 30, 22.3 per cent of the Protestants answered and 77.7 did not. The Catholics had a slightly lower rate of response and 17.2 per cent of them answered and 82.8 per cent did not. The Jews were still less responsive as 16.4 per cent of their number replied and 83.5 per cent did not. Since 19.6 per cent of the original sample responded, the writer cannot escape the conclusion that Protestants were overrepresented among the respondents, whereas Catholics and Jews were underrepresented among the respondents. If it is true that Catholics and Jews are more prejudiced, their underrepresentation in the sample used would tend to bias the results of the questionnaire. This will have to be considered in the analysis.

A similar comparison of the ethnic groups revealed a similar pattern of receptivity. Those most closely identified with the Protestant dominant group were most receptive to the questionnaire. Of the American group, 24.6 answered and 75.4 per cent did not. The writer had 23.5 per cent of the English group respond and 76.5 per cent of this group did not. The German group was next in receptivity with 22.4 per cent answering and 77.5 per cent failing to answer. The Slavic group edged out the Scandinavian by having 19.2 per cent of their group answering and 80.8 per cent failing to do so. The Scandinavians were slightly behind with 17.7 per cent answering and 82.3 per cent failing to answer. Some 15.1 per cent of the Irish answered and 84.9 per cent did not and 12.9 per cent of the Italians answered and 87.1 per cent did not. (See Table VIII.) In interpreting the pattern in this ethnic comparison it must be kept in mind that in a number of instances the same person is part of a minority both ethnically

TABLE VII

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS AND NON-RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO THEIR REPRESENTATION IN THE RELIGIOUS GROUPINGS*

Religious Groupings	Number			Percentage		
	Total	Resp.	N-Resp.	Total	Resp.	N-Resp.
Protestants	269	60	209	100	22.3	77.7
Catholics	238	41	197	100	17.2	82.8
Jews	55	9	46	99.9	16.4	83.5
Total	562	110	452	100	19.6	80.4

*Listed in order of frequency or response in each group.

and religiously. If these groups tend to be less receptive then it is not surprising that only 12.9 per cent of the Italians responded, for in addition to representing a group often regarded as unassimilable by Americans, most of them are also Roman Catholics and, as the writer has previously shown, they also are less receptive.

The American, English and German groups are overrepresented since they represent a disproportionate share of the 19.7 per cent of the original sample that responded. The Slavic, Scandinavian, Irish and Italian groups are underrepresented among the respondents. The group that was most overrepresented in response was the group of girls who identified their ethnic background as "American." This response together with its high receptivity suggests additional bias in answering the questionnaire. It should also be pointed out that the English were second to the American category in frequency of response while the

TABLE VIII

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS AND NON-RESPONDENTS
BY THEIR REPRESENTATION IN THE ETHNIC GROUPINGS*

Ethnic Background	Number		N-Resp.	Percentage		
	Total	Resp.		Total	Resp.	N-Resp.
American	61	15	46	100	24.6	75.4
English	68	16	52	100	23.5	76.5
German	116	26	90	100.1	22.4	77.5
Slavic	73	14	59	100	19.2	80.8
Other	39	7	32	100	17.9	82.1
Scandinavian	62	11	51	100	17.7	82.3
Irish	93	14	79	100	15.1	84.9
Italian	31	4	27	100	12.9	87.1
Total	543	107	436	100	19.7	80.3

*Listed in order of frequency of response in each group.

*Variance caused by deviance of data in 4 characteristics.

Irish were the second largest group represented in the original sample (17.1 per cent), yet were next lowest in per cent of response (15.1) in the sample used, (See Table IV.) If it is true that ethnic groups other than American, English and German are more prejudiced such a bias will have to be considered in the final analysis of the responses.

There was no special pattern of receptivity among the age groups as can be seen in Table IX. Of the age group sixty to sixty-nine 50.0 per cent responded and 50.0 per cent did not. The writer had 27.5 per cent of the age group

TABLE IX

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS AND NON-RESPONDENTS,
BY THEIR REPRESENTATION IN THE AGE GROUP*

Age Group	Number			Percentage		
	Total	Resp.	N-Resp.	Total	Resp.	N-Resp.
60-69	12	6	6	100	50.0	50.0
19-29	255	70	185	100	27.5	72.5
50-59	64	17	47	100	26.6	73.4
30-39	154	19	135	100	12.3	87.7
40-49	123	10	113	100	8.1	91.9
Total	608	122	486	100	20.1**	79.9

**Variance caused by deviance of data on 4 characteristics.

* Listed in order of frequency of response in each group.

nineteen to twenty-nine respond and 72.5 per cent did not respond. The table shows that of the age group fifty to fifty-nine 26.6 per cent responded and 73.4 per cent did not. Of the age group thirty to thirty-nine 12.3 per cent responded and 87.7 per cent did not. Finally, 8.1 per cent of the age group forty to forty-nine responded and 91.9 per cent did not.

In every category the writer was confronted with an patterned response and the age category was no exception. Here 20.1 per cent of the original sample responded and the age groups sixty to sixty-nine, twenty to twenty-nine and fifty to fifty-nine were overrepresented in the responses. The groups thirty to thirty-nine and forty to forty-nine were underrepresented in responses. If

it is true that the thirty to thirty-nine age group and the forty to forty-nine age groups are more prejudiced than their underrepresentation in the sample used would tend to bias the results of the questionnaire. This the writer will have to consider in the analysis.

Table X, emphasizes the point we made earlier that those with the highest degree of education are among the most receptive. The reader will note that 62.5 per cent of the girls with a master's degree responded and 37.5 per cent did not. The girls with two years of college education came next with 34.8 per cent responding and 65.3 per cent not responding. Of the girls with three years of college education 34.2 per cent responded and 65.4 per cent did not. Of the girls with four years of college education 24.3 per cent responded and 75.7 per cent did not. Only 19.6 per cent of the girls with one year of college education responded and 80.4 per cent of them did not. Of the girls with a high school education 15.5 per cent of them responded and 84.5 per cent of them did not. Finally, of the girls with some high school education 5.4 per cent of them responded and 94.5 per cent of them did not. Since the response of the original sample was 19.6 per cent, the girls with a master's degree and two, three and four years of college education were overrepresented in response whereas the girls with one year of college education, high school education and some high school education were underrepresented in the responses. If it is true that girls with less educational achievement are more prejudiced, such a bias will have to be considered in the final analysis.

Every table in this chapter points to a consistent pattern of selectivity among the religious, ethnic, age and educational groups. In every category those that are felt by many sociologists to be most prejudiced are

THE TOWER
LOYOLA
CHICAGO
LIBRARY

TABLE X

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS AND NON-RESPONDENTS
ACCORDING TO THEIR REPRESENTATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL LEVELS*

Educational Levels	Number			Percentage		
	Total	Resp.	N-Resp.	Total	Resp.	N-Resp.
Graduate degree	8	5	3	100	62.5	37.5
College - 2 years	75	26	49	100.1	34.8	65.3
College - 3 years	38	13	25	100	34.2	65.4
College - 4 years	70	17	53	100	24.3	75.7
College - 1 year	56	11	45	100	19.6	80.4
High School	296	46	250	100	15.5	84.5
Some high school	74	4	70	100	5.4	94.6
	617	122	495	100	19.8**	80.2

*Listed in order of frequency of response in each group

**Variance caused by deviance of data on the four characteristics.

underrepresented and those felt to be least prejudiced are overrepresented. If this is correct it at least partially accounts for the pattern of selectivity. If this had been taken down South it is probable that the selectivity would have been different. Even those who are quite prejudiced might be hesitant to express their feelings to a sociological student in a northern university. Rather than express feelings which are seldom expressed publicly by responsible citizens in the North, these people choose not to respond.

A second factor which seems evident to the writer stems from the underrepresentation of the minority groups. These groups are usually less receptive

to any type of survey. In the religious classification both Catholics and Jews were underrepresented and in the ethnic grouping the American, English and German groups were overrepresented and those groups which have had the greatest difficulty in winning acceptance in our predominately Anglo-Saxon culture were underrepresented.

The age groups sixty to sixty-nine, nineteen to twenty-nine and fifty to fifty-nine were overrepresented whereas the age groups thirty to thirty-nine and forty to forty-nine were underrepresented. While the higher prejudice factor may have entered in here, no other probable cause seemed to suggest itself. Finally, the education factor, like the religious and ethnic factors, showed a pattern that offered some clues concerning the evident selectivity. The girls with some high school education, high school education and girls with one year of college education were underrepresented and girls with two, three and four years of college education and the girls with master's degrees were overrepresented. As in the religious and ethnic groups the factor of prejudice undoubtedly was responsible for some of the selectivity. In addition there was the fact that those who spend any length of time in our colleges and universities become conditioned to surveys and interviews. They have participated in many surveys of this type and have a first-hand knowledge of their purpose and tend to take for granted the interviewer's objectivity. This group, for example, would be apt to understand that the purpose of the control number was not to violate the respondent's anonymity but was for the sake of sociological classification. Whatever the reasons for this selectivity, it has to be taken into account by the writer, both in terms of its effect upon the statistics and in terms of the factors which may account for the selectivity.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS

Disregarding for the moment the possibility of selectivity influencing the returns which comprised the sample used, an attempt is made in this section to analyze the responses that were received.¹ While it is true that the analysis of the sample indicated that an average 88.3 per cent of the respondents were not prejudiced in five of seven questions, certain characteristics in Chapter II indicated a possible bias which we will explore in a later section. (See Table XI.)

Except for question two and four the response by the religious groups indicated that 91.1 per cent gave non-prejudiced responses on the questionnaire. The replies from the ethnic groups were 87.5 per cent non-prejudiced and 12.6 per cent prejudiced, except for questions two and four. For the age groups, it was 87.2 per cent non-prejudiced and 12.8 per cent prejudiced, except for questions two and four.

It was the writer's expectation that the questionnaire would indicate a graduation of prejudice intensity in various relationships and make possible a scaled analysis of prejudice. No adequate graduation, however, was found

¹Bias factors as they possibly influence the results are considered below, p. 59.

and the development and use of an attitude scale had to be relinquished. It was therefore decided that instead of evaluating each question in relationship

TABLE XI
SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS

	Number			Percentage		
	N-Prej.	Prej.	No. Ans.	N-Prej.	Prej.	No Ans.
Question No. 1*	107	15	-	87.7	12.3	-
Question No. 3	106	16	-	86.9	13.1	-
<u>Question No. 4</u>	67	51	4	54.9	41.8	3.3
Question No. 5	109	10	3	89.4	8.1	2.5
Question No. 6	106	7	9	86.9	5.8	7.3
<u>Question No. 2</u>	76	42	4	62.3	34.4	3.3
Question No. 7	102	19	1	83.6	15.6	0.8

*See Appendix II for questions.

to the other questions, the analysis would be made in terms of attitudes toward specific roles which the Negroes might be expected to fulfill in their contact with whites. The questions were divided in terms of their reference to attitudes relating to work roles and social roles. This division was made because the basis of expectations is different on and off the job. The job role, for instance, is more structured since most rules are set by the company. Many social roles are less structured in terms of exact rules and are enforced only by more informal group and community pressures. Control in the social

situation may be greater but it is apt to be less formal. The work roles are less determined by the individual than would be the social roles. It might be that Negroes would be accepted on the job and not in social roles, or vice versa. It might also be possible that the acceptance of the Negro in his social role would be on an individual basis and not as a representative of a group. This could also apply on the job since his role is so delineated by the structure.

To better understand our analysis of differential role expectations we need to explore the concept of roles more intensively. Gross² points out that there are several possible categories in which definitions of the term role might be placed. He specifies three. First, there are authors who either equate or define roles to include normative culture patterns. Newcomb³, for example describes a role as the ways of behaving which are expected of any individual who occupies a certain position. The person learns to expect certain actions from other persons and others have expectations of him. Newcomb⁴ also stresses the fact that a role represents the dynamic aspect of status. Linton⁵ notes that roles simultaneously satisfy personal motives and meet the functional needs of society. When the individual puts the rights and duties which constitute the status into effect he is performing a role. It is the dynamic aspect of the

²Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason and Alexander McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis - Studies of the School Superintendency Role (New York, 1959), p. 11.

³Theodore M. Newcomb, Social Psychology (New York, 1952), p. 280.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ralph Linton, The Cultural Background of Personality (New York, 1945), pp. 1-26.

status. In this sense, role apparently has reference not to the actual behavior an individual must engage in but to behavioral standards. It consists of attitudes, values and behavior ascribed by the society to any and all persons occupying this status.⁶ When we talk about an ascribed role we refer to a role assigned automatically to the individual at birth, by society; whereas an achieved role is one which an individual fits into later in life because of his learning and experience.⁷ For another definition of this category Gross uses Znaniecki⁸ who says that there is obviously a fundamental and universal, though unreflective, culture pattern in accordance with which all kinds of lasting relationships between individuals and their social milieus are normatively organized and which we denote by the term social role.

Others, Gross continues, treat a role as an individual's definition of his situation with reference to his and others' social positions. He uses as an example, Sargent⁹ who states that roles refer to functioning of individuals in the group or society and it helps to explain the patterning of social behavior. He also explains that a role involves the performance of the rights and duties constituting a particular status.¹⁰ He defines a role as a pattern of behavior corresponding to a system of rights and duties and associated with a particular

⁶Gross, p. 12.

⁷S. Stansfield Sargent and Robert C. Williamson, Social Psychology - An Introduction to the Study of Human Relations (New York, 1958), p. 339.

⁸Gross, p. 13.

⁹Sargent, p. 339.

¹⁰Ibid.

position in a social group.¹¹

In the third category Gross¹² places definitions which deal with the role as the behavior of individuals occupying social positions. A role defined in this way does not refer to normative patterns, that is, how an individual actually performs in a given position but how he is supposed to perform. The role, then, is the manner in which a person carries out the requirements of his position. Because each individual tends to enact a role that may vary depending on whether he is in a work situation or a social situation it seemed desirable to compare the responses we received to the questions referring to the work role with those we received involving the social role. Theoretical formulations concerned with role analysis must include three elements: social locations, behavior and expectations - which are common to most of the definitions of role which have been considered here.

In the enactment of roles, the identification of self, behavior in a given situation which is appropriate to this identification, a background of related acts by others which serve as cues to guide specific performance, an evaluation by the individual, and by others of the role enactment is essential.¹³

Since one does not always act in all roles at the same time, one form of role behavior varies from the behavior in another role. Thus, one can speak of

¹¹Sargent, p. 347.

¹²Gross, p. 14.

¹³Ibid., p. 39.

role segmentation which refers to the classification of a group or set of expectations that individuals may hold for an individual of a specific pattern. We may have more than one role in a social society with some roles complementing each other and some conflicting, but since self identification in different situations differs, the enactment of roles will differ.¹⁴ Generally, roles make for predictability and harmony in social behavior and thus facilitate social adjustments. Roles, however, may also contribute to individual frustrations and conflict.¹⁵ A woman can be a wife, mother, sister and daughter; a man can be a husband, father, brother, son, friend or boss. Within these different roles conflict can be brought about such as in the following situation. A female college student on one hand wants to play the feminine role she interprets as being dependent and inferior towards her male counterpart; on the other hand, she wants to become a professional woman for which role she feels she must develop very different manners and skills.¹⁶

In addition, there are varying degrees of acceptance of other persons in the same role, such as in our sample used. In our study some girls did not object to work in the same building with a Negro woman, some were willing to work in the same office with a Negro worker, some had no objection to sitting next to a desk occupied by a Negro woman, some thought white women were more

¹⁴Gross, p. 61.

¹⁵Sargent, p. 349.

¹⁶Sargent, p. 349.

capable of doing efficient office work than Negro women, and some did not have any objection to having a Negro supervisor—all these different attitudes were held within the concept of the work role. It may also be noted that the girls in the sample used showed different intensities of prejudice toward different aspects of the same role, such as in our definition of social role, some girls were only willing to have their coffee break with their Negro co-worker, where others were willing to go to dinner with them.

This concept of differing role expectations is identifiable in Myrdal's Rank Order.¹⁷ The findings in this study of attitudes of white workers toward Negro co-workers deals mainly with social status. For the white group highest in order stands the bar against intermarriage and sexual intercourse. Next come the discriminations which specifically concern behavior in personal relations; i.e., barriers against dancing, bathing, eating, drinking together and social intercourse generally. Thereafter follow the discriminations in use of public facilities such as schools, churches and public transportation. Next comes political disfranchisement; thereafter discriminations in law courts and finally discrimination in securing land, credit, jobs, or other means of earning a living; discrimination in public relief and other social welfare activities. The Negro's rank order is, however, opposite to that of the white man. The Negro resents least discrimination of the rank placed highest in the white man's scale and resents most any discrimination on the lowest levels. Negroes are

¹⁷Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma (New York, 1944, Vol. I), pp. 1-31.

most in need of jobs; the marriage matter is of distant and doubtful interest.¹⁸

Along the same line of thought, Dollard¹⁹ points out that the social status of the Negro in the social stratification in the United States is so clearly defined in some instances that it could be referred to as a caste system. Fundamental rules of the system prevent social relations which imply equality, holding that any white individual is socially superior to any Negro person, regardless of differences in education, occupation or personal characteristics. This is most emphasized in the South but this separation also exists in other regions of the country where racial segregation is not legally imposed but nevertheless is practiced through various discriminatory devices. The color line often divides the two races socially into white and Negro worlds, sharply insulated from each other. This caste-like exclusion of Negroes from intimate social intercourse with other Americans illustrates the operation of racial discrimination as status factor in its most drastic form.²⁰

Two of the questions below deal with an aspect of the social role. Since we have seen that the work and social roles could alter one's attitude toward the Negro race the writer has analyzed her data to see if prejudice toward Negroes in the work roles is greater or less than prejudice toward Negroes in the social roles within the sample used. For this purpose the questionnaire was

¹⁸Arnold Rose, The Negro in America (Boston, 1948), pp.

¹⁹John Dollard, Caste and Class in a Southern Town (New York, 1949), pp. 62-97.

²⁰Ibid.

divided into the aspect of the work role represented by the following questions:

1. Would you be willing to work next to a desk occupied by a Negro woman?
3. Would you be reluctant to work in a building where other offices employed a Negro woman?
4. Would you be reluctant to work under the immediate supervision of a Negro woman?
5. Would you agree that Negro women are less capable of doing efficient office work than white women?
6. Would you be willing to work in a large office that employed Negro women if you did not have to be closely associated with them?

An aspect of the social role represented by the following questions:

2. Would you be willing to invite a Negro woman working in the same office with you on the same job to go to dinner with you?
7. Would you be willing to take your coffee break with a Negro woman who does the same work as you?

The data when analyzed to determine whether prejudice toward the work role is greater or less than prejudice toward the social role showed no such division. Neither factor seems to be a unit factor. Something other than simple work role or social role seems to influence prejudicial response. This pattern seems to be followed for each of the four social characteristics. (See Tables XII, XIII, XIV and XV,). Using the religious groups as an example we see that the responses to questions one, three, five, six and seven resemble each other in being non-prejudiced, whereas questions four and two show their relationship in being the two questions that received the most prejudiced response.

Of the two questions that received the most prejudiced response, one concerns the work role and one the social role. These two questions differ from the other questions in that they seem to be more personal and more intimate than the others in the questionnaire. These two questions do not merely indicate

acceptance of the Negro co-worker in a prescribed formal role but one suggests equal status (at dinner) and the other implies Negro superiority (work under Negro supervision). Being willing to have dinner with a Negro co-worker would mean carrying the relationship from the formal organizational structure on the job into the outside and in a personal relationship. All other questions are only one of acceptance and are within the framework of the organizational structure. Even the question on the coffee break, though a social function, is still within the confinement of the work situation. As Sargent indicates, there is a tendency to accept minority group members in certain situations but within the same day reject social relations with them in other situations.²¹ The present findings give some indication as to the reasons for this variance in acceptance.

Sargent also says that certain needs are filled by this prejudicial attitude.²² Prestige involves being superior to someone and helps therefore to keep some groups in an inferior status. It seems that this feeling of white superiority is probably still a relevant factor in our culture. Krech points out that in a culture such as ours this feeling of superiority is strongly needed by many individuals.²³ Prejudice can be attributed to a set of cultural causes operating on a need system of the individual, one of which is economic

²¹Sargent, p. 583.

²²Ibid., p. 585.

²³Krech, David and Crutchfield, Richard S., The Theory and Problem of Social Psychology (New York, 1948), p. 456.

pressures.²⁴ In our society there are many differences that divide one class from another, such as ethnic background, religion, education, clothing, income, the neighborhood we live in and many others.

A rejection of the lower classes by the higher classes is a common phenomenon.²⁵ Rose classifies this as part of the escape reaction since knowledge is constantly twisted in one direction toward classifying the Negro low and the white high.²⁶ Sargent feels that this use of the Negro as a scapegoat is a defense mechanism predominantly growing out of economic and other frustrations.²⁷ Krech summarizes these attitudes quite well when he states that beliefs about members of a minority racial group may serve as a means of maintaining identity with society.²⁸ "Nice people" do not have Jews as club members and do not invite Negroes to parties. If we do not want to be classified as non-conformists we will do what society expects of us. We may honestly believe these people to be valuable members of our society, but we will make sure that they do not live in our neighborhoods, do not enter our homes or come in contact with our children.

Such behavior places many Americans in a dilemma of values. On the one hand, as Rose has insisted, whites are influenced by high national and Christian morals, and on the other hand they have this concept of racial superiority.²⁹

²⁴Sargent, p. 584.

²⁵Krech, p. 456.

²⁶Rose, pp. 1-31.

²⁷Sargent, p. 585.

²⁸Krech, pp. 456-457.

²⁹Rose, pp. 1-31.

Since these different and conflicting values are held by the same people, this must lead to a moral compromise. This compromise consists of saying one thing and doing another. People will try to rationalize the following of conflicting values by resorting to psychological mechanisms of selecting only those behaviors which serve the purpose of preserving prejudice. This is one of the reasons which makes logical Myrdal's development of the rank order of discrimination.

While the questionnaire did not indicate a graduation of prejudice, it evoked responses of varying intensity. The questions covered both the concept of work role and social role and dealt with varying levels of intimacy. Some involve acceptance as equals, others involve total acceptance; some involve acceptance as subordinates and some involve superiority on the part of the Negro worker. On this approach that data were evaluated to discover whether patterns of prejudice could be discovered toward the work role as opposed to the social role, or whether patterns of prejudice were varied even within the same roles. It was found that no clear-cut unified prejudicial attitude toward work role versus social role exists. One question in each group tends to resemble a question in the other group more than it resembles other questions in its own group in regard to prejudicial intensity. It was deduced that the two questions in each group that received the most negative response were the most personal and required in one instance total subordination and in the other total equality; all other questions were merely a matter of acceptance of the Negro co-worker.

TABLE XII

BREAKDOWN OF RELIGIOUS GROUPS

Catholics							Protestants					
	Number			Per Cent			Number			Per Cent		
	Total	Prej.	N. Pr.	Total	Prej.	N. Pr.	Total	Prej.	N. Pr.	Total	Prej.	N. Pr.
Qu 1	41	5	36	100	12.2	87.8	60	10	50	100	16.7	83.3
Qu 3	41	6	35	100	14.6	85.4	60	11	49	100	18.3	81.7
Qu 4	41	19	22	100	46.3	53.7	57	24	33	100	42.1	57.9
Qu 5	40	2	38	100	5.0	95.0	59	7	52	100	11.9	88.1
Qu 6	39	2	37	100	5.1	94.9	57	5	52	100	8.8	91.2
Qu 2	40	13	27	100	32.5	67.5	60	24	36	100	40.0	60.0
Qu 7	41	8	33	100	19.5	80.5	60	10	50	100	16.7	83.3

TABLE XII (CONT'D)

BREAKDOWN OF RELIGIOUS GROUPS

	Jews					
	Number			Per Cent		
	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.
Qu 1	9	-	9	100	-	100
Qu 3	9	-	9	100	-	100
Qu 4	9	3	6	100	33.3	66.7
Qu 5	8	-	8	100	-	100
Qu 6	9	-	9	100	-	100
Qu 2	9	5	4	100	55.6	44.4
Qu 7	9	-	9	100	-	100

Where totals are less than 41, 60 or 9 respectively, the particular question was not answered in the missing number of cases.

TABLE XIII

BREAKDOWN OF ETHNIC GROUPS

	American						Italian					
	Number			Per Cent			Number			Per Cent		
	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.
Qu 1	15	-	15	100	-	100	4	-	4	100	-	100
Qu 3	15	2	13	100	13.3	86.7	4	-	4	100	-	100
Qu 4	15	6	9	100	40.0	60.0	4	-	4	100	-	100
Qu 5	15	1	14	100	6.7	93.3	4	-	4	100	-	100
Qu 6	15	-	15	100	-	100	4	-	4	100	-	100
Qu 2	15	5	10	100	33.3	66.7	4	-	4	100	-	100
Qu 7	15	2	13	100	13.3	86.7	4	-	4	100	-	100

TABLE XIII (CONT'D)

BREAKDOWN OF ETHNIC GROUPS

English							Irish					
	Number			Per Cent			Number			Per Cent		
	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.
Qu 1	16	3	13	100	18.8	81.2	14	1	13	100	7.1	92.9
Qu 3	16	3	13	100	18.8	81.2	14	3	11	100	21.4	78.6
Qu 4	15	9	6	100	60.0	40.0	14	8	6	100	57.1	42.9
Qu 5	16	1	15	100	6.3	93.7	14	2	12	100	14.3	85.7
Qu 6	14	2	12	100	14.3	85.7	14	1	13	100	7.1	92.9
Qu 2	15	7	8	100	46.7	53.3	14	4	10	100	28.6	71.4
Qu 7	16	4	12	100	25.0	75.0	14	4	10	100	28.6	71.4

TABLE XIII (CONT'D)

BREAKDOWN OF ETHNIC GROUPS

German							Scandinavian					
	Number			Per Cent			Number			Per Cent		
	Total	Prej.	N. Pr.	Total	Prej.	N. Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.
Qu 1	26	5	21	100	19.2	80.8	11	2	9	100	18.2	81.8
Qu 3	26	6	20	100	23.1	76.9	11	2	9	100	18.2	81.8
Qu 4	26	12	14	100.1	46.2	53.9	9	6	3	100	66.7	33.3
Qu 5	26	3	23	100	11.5	88.5	11	2	9	100	18.2	81.8
Qu 6	25	2	23	100	8.0	92.0	11	-	11	100	-	100.0
Qu 2	25	11	14	100	44.0	56.0	11	4	7	100	36.4	63.6
Qu 7	26	4	22	100	15.4	84.6	11	1	10	100	9.1	90.9

TABLE XIII (CONT'D)

BREAKDOWN OF ETHNIC GROUPS

Slavic

	Number			Per Cent			
	Total	Prej.	N. Pr.	Total	Prej.	N. Pr.	
Qu 1	14	1	13	100	7.1	92.9	Where the totals are less than 16, 26 or 11 respectively, the particular question was not answered in the missing number of cases.
Qu 3	14	-	14	100	-	100.0	
Qu 4	14	9	5	100	64.3	35.7	
Qu 5	14	1	13	100	7.1	92.9	
Qu 6	14	2	12	100	14.3	85.7	
Qu 2	14	4	10	100	28.6	71.4	
Qu 7	14	2	12	100	14.3	85.7	

TABLE XIV

BREAKDOWN OF AGE GROUPS

20-29

30-39

	Number			Per Cent			Number			Per Cent		
	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.
Qu 1	70	10	60	100	14.3	85.7	19	1	18	100	5.3	94.7
Qu 3	70	9	61	100	12.9	87.1	19	2	17	100	10.5	89.5
Qu 4	70	27	43	100	38.6	61.4	19	7	12	100	36.8	63.2
Qu 5	68	6	62	100	8.8	91.2	19	1	18	100	5.3	94.7
Qu 6	67	5	62	100	7.5	92.5	18	1	17	100	5.6	94.4
Qu 2	70	22	48	100.1	31.4	68.6	18	5	13	100	27.8	72.2
Qu 7	69	11	58	100	15.9	84.1	19	2	17	100	10.5	89.5

TABLE XIV (CONT'D)

40-49

50-59

	Number			Per cent			Number			Per cent		
	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N. Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.
Qu 1	10	1	9	100	10.0	90.0	17	3	14	100	17.6	82.3
Qu 3	10	3	7	100	30.0	70.0	17	1	16	100	5.9	94.1
Qu 4	9	4	5	100	44.4	55.6	16	10	6	100	62.5	37.5
Qu 5	10	2	8	100	20.0	80.0	16	1	15	100	6.3	93.7
Qu 6	8	-	8	100	-	100.0	15	1	14	100	6.6	93.4
Qu 2	10	6	4	100	60.0	40.0	17	8	9	100	47.1	52.9
Qu 7	10	2	8	100	20.0	80.0	17	1	16	100	5.9	94.1

TABLE XIV (CONT'D)

60-69

	Number			Per cent			
	Total [*]	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N. Pr.	
Qu 1	6	1	5	100	16.7	83.3	Where the totals are less than 70, 19, 10, 17 and 6 respectively, the particular question was not answered in the missing number of cases
Qu 3	6	2	4	100	33.3	66.7	
Qu 4	6	4	2	100	66.7	33.3	
Qu 5	6	-	6	100	-	100.0	
Qu 6	6	1	5	100	16.7	83.3	
Qu 2	5	2	3	100	40.0	60.0	
Qu 7	6	2	4	100	33.3	66.7	

TABLE XV

BREAKDOWN OF EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

Some High School							High School					
	Number			Per Cent			Number			Per Cent		
	Total*	Prej.	N. Pr.	Total	Prej.	N. Pr.	Total	Prej.	N. Pr.	Total	Prej.	N. Pr.
Qu 1	4	1	3	100	25.0	75.0	45	10	35	100	22.2	77.8
Qu 3	4	-	4	100	-	100.0	46	10	36	100	21.7	78.3
Qu 4	4	1	3	100	25.0	75.0	45	28	17	100	62.2	37.8
Qu 5	4	-	4	100	-	100.0	45	7	38	100	15.6	84.4
Qu 6	3	-	3	100	-	100.0	44	4	40	100	9.1	90.9
Qu 2	3	2	1	100	66.7	33.3	45	25	20	100	55.6	44.4
Qu 7	3	1	2	100	33.3	66.7	46	12	34	100	26.1	73.9

TABLE XV (CONT'D)

BREAKDOWN OF EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

College - 1 year

College - 2 years

Number				Per Cent			Number			Per Cent		
	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.
Qu 1	11	-	11	100	-	100.0	26	3	23	100	11.5	88.5
Qu 3	11	1	10	100	9.1	90.9	26	2	24	100	7.7	92.3
Qu 4	11	4	7	100	36.4	63.6	25	10	15	100	40.4	60.0
Qu 5	10	-	10	100	-	100.0	25	1	24	100	4.0	96.0
Qu 6	11	-	11	100	-	100.0	24	2	22	100	8.4	91.6
Qu 2	11	5	6	100	45.5	54.5	26	6	20	100	23.1	76.9
Qu 7	11	1	10	100	99.1	90.9	26	2	24	100	7.7	92.3

TABLE XV (CONT'D)

BREAKDOWN OF EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

College - 3 years							College 4 - years					
Number			Per Cent				Number			Per Cent		
	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.
Qu 1	13	1	12	100	7.7	92.3	17	-	17	100	-	100.0
Qu 3	13	2	11	100	15.4	84.6	17	1	16	100	5.9	94.1
Qu 4	12	5	7	100	41.7	58.3	17	3	14	100	17.6	82.3
Qu 5	13	1	12	100	7.7	92.3	17	1	16	100	5.9	94.1
Qu 6	13	-	13	100	-	100.0	15	1	14	100	6.7	93.3
Qu 2	13	3	10	100	23.1	76.9	16	1	15	100	6.3	93.7
Qu 7	13	1	12	100	7.7	92.3	16	1	15	100	6.3	93.7

TABLE XV (CONT'D)

BREAKDOWN OF EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

Graduate Degree							
Number				Per Cent			
	Total *	Prej.	N.Pr.	Total	Prej.	N.Pr.	
Qu 1	5	-	5	100	-	100.0	Where the totals are less than 4, 45, 11, 26, 13 or 17 respectively, the particular question was not answered in the missing number of cases.
Qu 3	5	-	5	100	-	100.0	
Qu 4	5	1	4	100	20.0	80.0	
Qu 5	5	-	5	100	-	100.0	
Qu 6	4	-	4	100	-	100.0	
Qu 2	5	1	4	100	20.0	80.0	
Qu 7	5	1	4	100	20.0	80.0	

CHAPTER IV

ADJUSTMENTS

As previous research has shown, prejudice of whites toward Negroes is much higher than the returns received in this study. In Chapter II the writer noted that selectivity apparently accounted for many of the non-respondents. She noted that the letter that was sent with the questionnaire did not hide the fact that the survey was being conducted by a student at a Chicago university. It may well be that many of the more biased workers felt reluctant to reveal their prejudice to someone who most likely did not share their views.

As was pointed out in Chapter II, the original sample consisted of 42.4 per cent Catholics, 47.9 per cent Protestants and 9.6 per cent Jews. Of the total returns, 37.3 per cent of the respondents were Catholics and 43.6 per cent of the non-respondents were Catholics; 54.5 per cent of the respondents were Protestants and 46.2 per cent of the non-respondents were Protestants. Catholics are underrepresented among those who responded and overrepresented among those who did not respond. Therefore, proportionately more Protestants than Catholics answered the questionnaire.

This becomes a significant factor when we recall Merton's Rank Order among religious groups.¹ His study indicated that Catholics show the highest amount

¹R. K. Merton, "Fact and Factitiousness in Ethnic Questionnaires," American Sociological Review V (February 1940), 13-28.

of prejudice, Protestants show less and Jews and people with no religious affiliation show the least amount of prejudice. Allport and Kramer² reported similar findings. There are, of course, other studies that show different results. Bettelheim and Janowitz³ state that religious affiliation has little influence on racial attitudes. Prothro and Jensen⁴ noted that there was a slight tendency for those persons more favorable toward the church to be more favorable toward the Negro and Jew. It has been the general belief, however, in the past that any authoritarian, disciplinarian outlook on life tends to produce a greater amount of prejudice. Sargent⁵ agrees that religion appears to be a conditioning agent on prejudicial attitudes. Catholics often are also lower middle class and also represent ethnic groups which are in economic competition for jobs with the Negroes. These factors may be more important than their authoritarian religion. Regardless of why, there is some indication that they are more prejudiced. If this is true and they are underrepresented among the respondents in the sample used, we can assume that to some extent the more prejudiced in the original sample did not respond.

The same type of selectivity occurred in our study of the ethnic groups. In a comparison between the original sample and the respondents and non-

²G. W. Allport and B. M. Kramer, "Some Roots of Prejudice," The Journal of Psychology, XXII (July 1946), 9-39.

³Bruno Bettelheim and Morris Janowitz, Dynamics of Prejudice (New York, 1950), p. 50.

⁴E. T. Prothro and J. A. Jensen, "Interrelations of Religious and Ethnic Attitudes in Selected Southern Populations Populations," Journal of Social Psychology, XXXII (August 1950), 45-49.

⁵Sargent, p. 577.

respondent groups the following pattern was indicated. While Americans comprised 11.2 per cent of the original sample, they comprised 14.0 per cent of the respondents and only 10.6 per cent of the non-respondents. Those who thought of themselves as Italians comprised 5.8 per cent of the original sample but made up only 3.7 per cent of the respondents and comprised 6.2 per cent of the non-respondents. The original sample was made up of 12.5 per cent English in comparison to being 14.9 per cent of the respondents and only 11.9 per cent of the non-respondents. The original sample also consisted of 17.1 per cent Irish but they made up 13.1 per cent of the respondents and 18.1 per cent of the non-respondents. The Germans comprised 21.4 per cent of the original sample, and they comprised 24.3 per cent of the respondents and only 20.6 per cent of the non-respondents. The original sample comprised 11.4 per cent Scandinavians but only 10.3 per cent were respondents and 11.8 per cent were non-respondents. The original sample was made up of 13.4 per cent Slavic in comparison to being 13.1 per cent of the respondents and 13.5 per cent of the non-respondents. Thus, the American, English and German groups were over-represented and the Italian, Irish, Scandinavian and Slavic groups were under-represented in response. It is therefore evident that there is an over-representation of those ethnic groups usually considered less prejudiced.

As Mayer⁶ pointed out: during the second half of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth century immigration brought large

⁶Mayer, pp. 51-53.

numbers of people to this country who differed from the "Old American" population. Frequently penniless and illiterate, the members of these ethnic groups were generally forced to begin life in this country at the bottom of the occupational ladder, filling the most menial and poorly paid jobs. It seems apparent that the Negro's greatest competitor was the lower class of white people, the people without economic or social security who were competing with the Negro.⁷ As several studies have shown, these immigrants who came early were soon able to show some upward mobility; other groups who arrived more recently, particularly many of the immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe, have progressed more slowly. Of the various European nationality groups it is the Italians with whom the Negroes have been in closest contact.⁸ Since all minorities share the common experience of discrimination, it would be logical to suppose that they would be sympathetic toward one another, but there is very little literature available to help test such a hypothesis. To begin with, the relationship between the two groups was friendly. Later, however, since the Italians were considered assimilable and the Negroes were not, the Italians adopted the same attitude as all other ethnic groups. Since the Italian group particularly was underrepresented in response, and other studies tend to show this ethnic group to be more prejudiced toward the Negro due to economic threats, this might again indicate that the more prejudiced in the original

⁷Rose, pp. 189-203.

⁸Marden, pp. 285-312.

sample did not respond. Sargent verifies this assumption⁹ by stating that this prejudicial attitude among the lower socio-economic classes is conspicuous. He goes on to say that the necessity for ego-expansion is felt most keenly by those who experience frustrations of lower status. He also states that a number of studies have found that expressed attitudes tend to follow this pattern.

In comparing age groups of the original sample and the respondents and non-respondents in the sample used, it was found that the age group twenty to twenty-nine comprised 41.8 per cent of the original sample, while it comprised 57.4 per cent of the respondents and only 38.1 per cent of the non-respondents. The age group thirty to thirty-nine comprised 25.3 per cent of the original sample and only 15.6 per cent of the respondents and 27.8 per cent of the non-respondents. While the age group forty to forty-nine comprised 20.2 per cent of the original sample, it comprised 8.2 per cent of the respondents and 23.3 per cent of the non-respondents. The age group fifty to fifty-nine included 10.5 per cent of the original sample and 13.9 per cent of the respondents and only 9.7 per cent of the non-respondents. The age group sixty to sixty-nine made up 2.0 per cent of the original sample and 4.9 per cent of the respondents and only 1.2 per cent of the non-respondents. Thus, the age groups twenty to twenty-nine, fifty to fifty-nine and sixty to sixty-nine were overrepresented in response; and the age groups thirty to thirty-nine and forty to forty-nine were underrepresented in response.

Most studies conducted on finding a correlation between age and racial attitudes were with college students and there is a possibility that education

⁹Sargent, p. 580.

might have been a factor in these studies. However, Reckless and Bringen¹⁰ found that less favorable results were received particularly from students over twenty-five years of age. Porterfield¹¹ concluded that racial-social distance increased steadily by five-year periods up to the age group thirty to thirty-four. Since the age group thirty to thirty-nine and forty to forty-nine was underrepresented in response this again would tend to favor and support the assumption that the more biased did not answer the questionnaire.

In comparing education levels of the original sample and the respondents and non-respondents the same pattern of selectivity was apparent. While girls with some high school education comprised 11.9 per cent of the original sample, they comprised 3.3 per cent of the respondents and 14.1 per cent of the non-respondents. Of the original sample 47.9 per cent were girls with a high school education; 37.7 per cent of them were respondents and 50.0 per cent were non-respondents. The original sample was made up of 9.1 per cent of girls with one year of college in comparison to being 9.1 per cent of the respondents and 9.1 per cent of the non-respondents. The original sample also consisted of 12.2 per cent of girls with two years of college education and they made up 21.3 per cent of the respondents and only 9.8 per cent of the non-respondents. While the girls with three years of college education comprised 6.2 per cent of the original sample, they comprised 10.7 per cent of the respondents and only

¹⁰Walter C. Reckless and Harold L. Bringen, "Racial Attitudes and Information about the Negro," Journal of Negro Education, II (January 1933), 128-138.

¹¹Austin L. Porterfield, "Education and Race Attitudes," Journal of Applied Sociology, XII (January-February 1927), 272-287.

5.1 per cent of the non-respondents. Those with a bachelor's degree comprised 11.4 per cent of the original sample and 13.9 per cent of the respondents and only 10.7 per cent of the non-respondents. Girls with a master's degree included 1.3 per cent of the original sample and 4.1 per cent of the respondents and only 0.6 per cent of the non-respondents. Thus, girls with some high school education, girls with high school education and girls with one year of college education were underrepresented in response; whereas girls with two, three and four years of college and girls with a master's degree were over-represented in response.

As Sargent¹² points out, both negative and positive findings have been made in regards to the effect of education on the formation of race attitudes. Generally speaking, however, most studies have indicated that higher education is favorable toward the reduction of prejudice. In one study it was found that a college sample was more tolerant of both Jews and Negroes than was an adult middle-class sample, largely without higher education. This is particularly true in the South, where college students have shown more liberalism in the area of integration than have their parents.¹³ Droba¹⁴ in his study on relationship of educational level in general to attitudes toward the Negro

¹²Sargent, p. 577.

¹³E. T. Prothro and O. K. Miles, "A Comparison of Ethnic Attitudes of College Students and Middle Class Adults from the Same State," Journal of Social Psychology, XXXVI (August 1952).

¹⁴D. D. Droba, "Education and Negro Attitudes," Sociology and Social Research, XVII (1932), 137-141.

showed that students became more favorably inclined toward the Negro as they ascended the educational scale. It seems that many studies indicate that the less educated tend to be more prejudiced. Since the girls with high school education are underrepresented in response in the sample used, this would again indicate that the more prejudiced did not answer.

It seems obvious then to conclude that in all probability there is even greater prejudice than has been indicated by the 50% figures for questions two and four, as well as for the other questions. A questionnaire of the type we have used does to a large extent invite selectivity. Its obvious disadvantage lies in the fact that the respondent knows without a doubt what is being studied. Since the more prejudiced are less receptive to this type of study selectivity takes place. In the following chapter we shall discuss the comparisons that can be made in spite of these limitations. Those that did respond showed interesting and various reactions that served to support the hypothesis which we were testing. Since there is every indication that those that did not respond would prove more biased this would not necessarily have the effect of nullifying the variation we received in responses along religious, education, ethnic and age group lines.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

The writer has throughout the paper compared the results of this study with those made in the same general area. For, when we compare the results of this questionnaire with equivalent measures, we can more objectively judge its accuracy. After allowances are made for selectivity, we can, according to current testing standards, regard the results of this questionnaire as reliable.

The method did have some shortcomings, but some of its deficiencies supplied additional insight into the problem. When 16 persons erase the control number from the questionnaire we have an indication of how important the respondents regarded their anonymity. Undoubtedly, many of the non-respondents were people who feared having their views known. It must be kept in mind that these questions were asked in a northern city by someone attending a northern university. Many of the respondents must have felt some desire to shade their answers to conform to the northern climate of opinion concerning racial prejudice. While, as we have seen from the study itself, racial prejudice is not uncommon, it can be said that in general it is not regarded as good form in northern urban centers to speak openly of our prejudices. If any large number of persons felt the control number deprived them of anonymity we have the answer for the large number of non-respondents and an additional explanation of why this study showed less prejudice than other similar studies of this kind.

As the writer indicated, she had hoped to use an attitude scale in connection with this study but did not find it feasible. The questions the writer used are very obvious and the respondent could have no doubt that they are intended to measure racial prejudice. In an area that generally frowns on expressions of prejudice some less obvious method of determining racial prejudice might produce more accurate results. We know, for example, that those who are better educated tend to measure their statements carefully on this subject in order to appear to themselves and others as less prejudiced than they are. Yet, the results obtained by this study do not differ significantly from the results obtained by use of various attitude scales. It seems therefore quite likely that the attitude scales may be almost equally as obvious to the respondents as the questions used by the writer in her questionnaire. The writer expressed disappointment at the number of replies received, but realizes that in studies of this kind the percentage of respondents is much higher when the questions are asked in a direct interview instead of by mail. It is easier to refuse a request by mail; consequently, the 19.6 per cent response can be considered quite a relatively adequate response. It can also claim an objectivity that a personal interview might have lacked.

An even more important issue concerns whether or not the seven questions measure to any degree of accuracy the prejudice or lack of it upon the part of the respondents. When comparisons were made with similar studies it was noted that equivalent results were obtained. Most of those who responded apparently felt that the questions were adequate to bring out their views on the subject. There were twenty-five respondents who felt somewhat hampered by the questions and they chose to make additional comments on the cards. For the most part this

indicated that they wished to give a wider expression of opinion than the simple checkmark an answer to the questions would have permitted. Only one, in answer to question number seven, made a statement expressing dissatisfaction with the manner in which the questions were asked. She stated, "I cannot answer your postcard truthfully by just a few check marks." It is possible that many of the non-respondents felt a similar inadequacy of the questions but this would be a proper matter for another study.

Since all of the girls were white collar workers the social factors should be almost the same for each of the various categories. While there are differences between what the girl with Irish background might regard as having social status, and let us say a girl with German background, they are not major and would probably not vary in this matter of race. In Myrdal's¹ Rank Order he demonstrates that whites tend to exclude Negroes from certain social situations with varying degrees of intensity. For example, there is a very rigid barrier against intermarriage and social intercourse generally, but less feeling about jobs or public relief and other social welfare services.² In short, a white American loses status when he takes a stand against discrimination in social situations but it does not hurt - in fact, it might even be expected of him that he take a stand under certain situations against discrimination involving

¹Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma (New York, 1944), Vol. I.

²Arnold Rose, The Negro in America (Boston, 1948), pp. 1-31.

the Negroes' opportunities in employment or education.

With this as a background the writer devoted considerable attention in Chapter III to a study of the answers to the questions that reflected the work role as contrasted with those that dealt with an aspect of the social role.

The social role was represented by the following questions:

2. Would you be willing to invite a Negro woman working in the same office with you on the same job to go to dinner with you?
7. Would you be willing to take your coffee break with a Negro woman who does the same work as you?

The second question was answered by 34.4 per cent negatively while the seventh only drew 15.6 per cent negative replies. Both were questions regarding the social role but obviously question number two involved some factors not present in question number seven. This becomes more apparent when we note that question number four which asks,

4. Would you be reluctant to work under the immediate supervision of a Negro woman?

drew the highest percentage of negative responses. This is a work role question but 41.8 per cent of the respondents answered in the negative. Clearly, there is no scale here that indicates a greater prejudice in the social as against the work role situation. What did exist was a strong feeling against any very personal relationship, such as dinner in one's home, or against becoming subordinate to a Negro worker. In both, the factor of status could be an important variable.

The only significant difference between the results of this study and those by Merton, Bettelheim and Janowitz and others is one of degree. The

writer found the same rank order among religious groups as did Merton³ with Catholics showing the highest degree of prejudice, followed by Protestants and Jews. The pattern for the ethnic groups did not vary greatly from those studied by Mayer in "Class and Society", and the pattern for educational groups concurred with that studied by Reckless and Bringen which they reported on in an article which appeared in the January 1933 issue of the Journal of Negro Education. The writer did not find less prejudice than the other studies, but we have pointed out that this was due to the overrepresentation of the least prejudiced groups.

The writer feels that the study has proven her hypothesis that "Racial attitudes of the 'average' white female office worker vary according to her religious denomination, ethnic background, age and level of education." In addition to answering some of the questions raised by this hypothesis the writer feels the study has raised several additional questions. Perhaps the most conclusive portion of the study is the segment dealing with education. There seems to be a definite correlation between the amount of education a person has received and the absence of prejudice. While we cannot rule out the possibility that the less prejudiced may be those who go on to higher education, it seems reasonable to believe on the basis of this study that education as such is an important factor in breaking down the walls of prejudice. As Americans in larger numbers receive more and more education we can expect

³Merton, pp. 13-28.

prejudice to decline. In any event the cruder and more open forms of racial discrimination seem to be less manifest with the number of years an individual spends in institutions of higher learning.

As we have shown, both our study and similar studies lead to the conclusion that Americans who are conscious of their ethnic background are among the most prejudiced. The girls in this study were asked when they applied for work to indicate their nationality. The answer for almost all should have been American but they indicated their lineage thereby revealing how strongly they felt tied to their ethnic group. Since those with a strong sense of ethnic identification are among the most prejudiced we can look for a decrease in prejudice as the number of second and third generation Americans declines.

The age factor is the most difficult to project and evaluate. Neither this study nor any that we have seen answers the question of why older people are more prejudiced. Does one become more prejudiced as he increases in age or is the high level of prejudice among the aged due to the fact that they lived through a different time, marked by fewer educational opportunities.

There is but one category which might bring some slight increase in prejudice in the years to come, and that is the religious grouping. If one accepts Bettelheim and Janowitz, or Prothro and Jensen, then the increase in the number of religious adherents will not affect the amount of prejudice. However, Sargent⁴ contends that religion appears to be a conditional agent on

⁴Sargent, p. 577.

prejudicial attitudes. If we accept Sargent's view then the current resurgence of religious feeling might bring with it an increase in prejudice. Our study shows the religious factor would be offset by the decline that would follow a change in the ethnic awareness or in the increase of education of Americans. A similar study a generation from now should produce different results. It is the writer's expectation and hope, based on the increase of Americans who regard themselves simply as Americans without ethnic overtones and of the increase in education, that prejudice among white collar working girls will continue to be on the decline in the foreseeable future.

The writer believes her study has demonstrated the accuracy of her hypothesis that "Racial attitudes of the 'average' white female office worker vary according to her religious denomination, ethnic background, age and level of education." These factors will continue to play a role in the development of racial attitudes but in an ever-changing degree. As the sociological composition of American society changes the racial attitudes which in a small way are but its reflections will change with it. The knowledge that such attitudes have a sociological basis will enable concerned people to analyze the problem with greater understanding.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

I. PRIMARY SOURCES

- Adorno, T. W. The Authoritarian Personality. New York, 1952.
- Allport, Gordon W. The Nature of Prejudice. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1954.
- Berry, Brewton, Race Relations. Boston. 1951.
- Bettelheim, Bruno and Janowitz, Morris. Dynamics of Prejudice. New York, 1950.
- Billington, Ray Allen. The Protestant Crusade - 1800-1860 - A Study of The Origins of American Nativism. New York, 1938.
- Brown, Francis J. and Rousek, Joseph S. One America - The History, Contributions, and Present Problems of Our Racial And National Minorities. New York, 1937.
- Dollard, John. Caste and Class in a Southern Town. New York, 1949.
- Embree, Edwin R. Brown America. New York, 1931.
- Frazier, Franklin E. The Negro in The United States. New York, 1941.
- Fursey, Paul H. The Scope and Methods of Sociology - A Metasociological Treatise. New York, 1953.
- Goode, William J. and Hatt, Paul K. Methods in Social Research, New York, 1952.
- Gross, Neal Mason, Ward S. and McEachern, Alexander. Explorations in Role Analysis - Studies of The School Superintendency Role. New York, 1959.
- Jahoda, Marie, Deutsch, Morton and Cook, Stuart W. Research Methods in Social Relations With Especial Reference to Prejudice. New York, 1951.
- Johnson, Charles S. The Negro in American Civilization. New York, 1930.
- Krech, David and Crutchfield, Richard S. The Theory And Problems of Social Psychology. New York, 1948.

- Linton, Ralph. The Cultural Background of Personality. New York, 1945.
- Landberg, George A. Social Research. New York, 1951.
- Marrow, Alfred J. Living Without Hate - Scientific Approaches to Human Relations. New York, 1951.
- Murphy, Gardner and Likert, Rensis. Public Opinion and The Individual. New York, 1938.
- Murphy, Gardner and Murphy, Lois B. Experimental Social Psychology - An Interpretation of Research Upon The Socialization of The Individual. New York, 1931.
- Myrdal, Gunnar. An American Dilemma - The Negro Problem And Modern Democracy. New York, 1944.
- Newcomb, Theodore M. Social Psychology. New York, 1950.
- Remmers, H. H. Introduction to Opinion and Attitude Measurement. New York, 1954.
- Rose, Arnold and Caroline. America Divided - Minority Group Relations in The United States. New York, 1948.
- Rose, Arnold M. Theory and Methods in The Social Sciences. Minneapolis, Minn., 1954.
- Sanford, Nevitt R. Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge, Mass., 1954.
- Sargent, Stansfeld, and Williamson, Robert C. Social Psychology - An Introduction to The Study of Human Relations. New York, 1958.
- Tannenbaum, F. Slave and Citizen. New York, 1947.
- Young, Pauline V. Scientific Social Surveys and Research. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1956.

B. ARTICLES

- Allport, G. W. and Kramer, B. M. "Some Roots of Prejudice," Journal of Psychology, XXII (1946), 9-39.
- Bayton, J. A. "Racial Stereotypes of Negro College Students," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXXVI (1941), 97-102.

- Bogardus, Emory S. "Race Friendliness and Social Distance," Journal of Applied Sociology, XXVII (January-February), 272-287.
- Bolton, Euri Bell. "Measuring Specific Attitudes Towards The Social Rights of The Negro," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, (January-March 1937), 396.
- Brooks, Lee M. "Racial Distance as Affected by Education," Sociology and Social Research, XXI (1936), 128-133.
- Campbell, A. A. "Factors Associated With Attitudes Toward Jews," Reading in Social Psychology, (1947), 518-527.
- Chase, Wilton P. "Attitudes of North Carolina College Students Toward The Negro," Journal of Social Psychology, XII (1940) 367-378.
- Criswell, John Henning, "A Sociometric Study of Race Cleavage in The Classroom," Archives of Psychology, (1939), 18-70.
- Droba, D.D. "Education and Negro Activities," Sociology and Social Research, VXII (1932), 137-141.
- Ferguson, L. W. "An Item Analysis of Peterson's War Scale," Psychological Bulletin, XXXV, 521.
- Guilford, J. P. "Racial Preferences of A Thousand American University Students," Journal of Social Psychology, II (1931), 179-204.
- Hinckley, E. D. "The Influence of Individual Opinion on The Construction of an Attitude Scale," Journal of Social Psychology, (August 1932), 283-295.
- Horowitz, E. L. "The Development of Attitudes Toward The Negro," Archives of Psychology, 194 (1936), 283-295.
- Katz, D. and Braly K. "Racial Stereotypes of One Hundred College Students," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXVIII (1933), 280-290.
- Likert, Rensis. "A Technique For The Measurement of Attitudes," Archives of Psychology, XXII (1932), 1-55.
- McNeman, Quinn, "Opinion-Attitude Methodology," Psychological Bulletin, V (April 1940), 289-374.
- Meltzer, H. "Group Differences in Nationality and Race Preference of Children," Sociometry, (1936), 86-105.
- . "Nationality Preferences and Stereotypes of Colored Children," Journal of Genetic Psychology, LVIII (1949), 181-199.

- Merton, R. K. "Fact and Factitiousness in Ethnic Questionnaires," American Sociological Review, V (1940), 13-28.
- Pintner, R. and Forlando G. "The Influence of Attitude Upon Scaling of Attitude Items," Journal of Social Psychology, VIII, 38-45.
- Porterfield, Austin L. "Education and Race Attitudes," Sociology and Social Research, XXI (1937), 538-543.
- Prothro, E. T. and Miles, O. K. "A Comparison of Ethnic Attitudes of College Students and Middle Class Adults From The Same State," Journal of Social Psychology, XXXVI (1952), 53-58.
- Prothro, E. T. and Jensen, J. A. "Interrelations of Religious and Ethnic Attitudes in Selected Southern Population," Journal of Social Psychology, XXXII (1950), 45-49.
- Reckless, Walter C. and Bringen, Harold L. "Racial Attitudes and Information About The Negro," Journal of Negro Education, II (1933), 128-138.
- Russell, D. H. and Robertson, I.V. "Influencing Attitudes Toward Minority Group in a Junior High School," School Review, LV (April 1947), 205-213.
- Sims, V. M. and Patrick, J. R. "Attitude Toward The Negro of Northern and Southern College Students," Journal of Social Psychology, VII (1936), 192-204.
- Sletto, Raymond F. "Pretesting of Questionnaires," American Sociological Review, V (April 1940), 193-200.
- Smith, Tredwell F. "An Experiment in Modifying Attitudes Toward The Negro," Teachers College, Columbia University, (1943).
- Thurstone, L. L. "An Experimental Study of Nationality Preferences," Journal of General Psychology, (July-October 1928), 405-425.

C. UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

- Marciniak, Edward A. "Racial Attitudes of Students in Catholic Colleges of The Chicago Area," Unpublished Master's Theses, (Loyola University, Chicago, 1942).

II. SECONDARY SOURCES

A. BOOKS

- Appel, Livia. Bibliographical Citations in The Social Sciences And The Humanities. Madison, Wisconsin, 1946.
- Bagley, William Alfred. Facts and How to Find Them, A Guide to Sources of Information And to The Methods of Systematic Research. London, 1950.
- Baruch, Dorothy W. Glasshouse of Prejudice. New York, 1946.
- Bird, Charles. Social Psychology. New York, 1940.
- Bogardus, E. S. Introduction to Social Research. Los Angeles, 1936.
- Brown, Ian Corinne. Race Relations in a Democracy. New York, 1949.
- Cartwright, Dorwin. Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. Evanston, Ill., 1953.
- Chicago Commission on Race Relations. The Negro in Chicago. Chicago, Ill., 1922.
- Cooley, C. H. Sociological Theory And Social Research. New York, 1930.
- Culver, D. C. Methodology of Social Research. Berkeley, California., 1936.
- Doby, John T. An Introduction to Social Research. Harrison, Pa., 1954.
- Doob, Leonard W. Social Psychology. New York, 1952.
- Durkheim, E. The Rules of Sociological Method. Glencoe, Ill., 1938.
- Eaton, Allen. A Bibliography of Social Surveys. New York, 1930.
- Edwards, Allen Louise. Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. New York, 1957.
- Fry, C. L. The Technique of Social Investigation. New York, 1934.
- Furnas, J. C. Goodbye to Uncle Tom. New York, 1956.
- Gee, W. P. Social Science Research Methods. New York, 1950.
- Handlin, Oscar. Race and Nationality in American Life. Boston, 1957.
- Hyman, Herbert. Survey Design and Analysis - Principles, Cases and Procedures. Glencoe, Ill., 1955.

- Johnson, James Weldon. Negro Americans, What Now? New York, 1938.
- Klineberg, Otto. Social Psychology. New York, 1940.
- Klineberg, Otto. Characteristics of The American Negro. New York, 1944.
- LaFarge, John, S. J. The Race Question And The Negro - A Study of The Catholic Doctrine on Interracial Justice. New York, 1943.
- Lazarsfeld, P. The Language of Social Research. Glencoe, Ill., 1955.
- Lindsey, Gardner. Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge, Mass., 1954.
- Madge, J. H. The Tools of Social Science. London, 1953.
- Mills, C. W. White Collar. New York, 1951.
- MacIver, R. M. Social Causation. Boston, 1942.
- Odum, Howard W. and Jocher, Katharine. An Introduction to Social Research. New York, 1929.
- Palfrey, Thomas R. and Coleman, Henry E. Guide to Bibliographies of Theses. United States and Canada, 1936.
- Riley, Matilda, Riley, John and Toby, Jackson. Sociological Studies in Scale Analysis. New Brunswick, N. J., 1954.
- Rose, Arnold M. Race Prejudice and Discrimination. New York, 1951.
- Saenger, Gerhart. The Social Psychology of Prejudice. New York, 1953.
- Spahr, Walter E. Methods and Status of Scientific Research With Particular Application to The Social Sciences. New York, 1930.
- Tenenbaum, Samuel. Why Men Hate. New York, 1947.
- Thomas, W. I. and Znaniecki, F. The Polish Peasant in Europe and America. Boston, 1918.
- Thurstone, L. L. and Chave E. J. The Measurement of Attitude - A Psychological Method and Some Experiments With a Scale For Measuring Attitude Toward The Church. Chicago, 1937.
- Walter, Paul A. F. Race and Culture Relations. New York, 1952.
- Williams, Robin M. Jr., The Reducation of Intergroup Tensions. New York, 1947.

B. ARTICLES

- Bain, Read. "An Attitude on Attitude Research," American Journal of Sociology, XXXIII (January 1928), 940-957.
- Bogardus, Emory S. "A Social Distance Scale," Sociology and Social Research, XVII (1933), 265-271.
- Bolton, Euri Bell. "Effect of Knowledge Upon Attitudes Toward The Negro," Journal of Social Psychology, I (February 1935), 68-90.
- Ferguson, L. W. "A Study of The Likert Technique of Attitude Scale Construction," Journal of Social Psychology, XIII (1941), 51-57.
- Ford, Robert N. "Scaling Experience by a Multiple Response Technique: A Study of White - Negro Contacts," American Sociological Review, VI (1941), 9-23.
- Garrison, K. C. and Burch, J.S. "A Study of Racial Attitudes of College Students," Journal of Social Psychology, IV (1933), 230-235.
- Guttman, Louis, "A Basis For Scaling Qualitative Data," American Sociological Review, IX (1944), 139-150.
- Reuss, Carl F. "Differences Between Persons Responding And Not Responding to a Mailed Questionnaire," American Sociological Review, VIII, 433-438.
- Seashore, R. H. and Heuner, K.A. "A Time Saving Device For The Construction of Attitude Scales," Journal of Social Psychology, IV (1933), 366-372.
- Smith, Mapheus. "A Study of Change of Attitudes Toward The Negro," Journal of Negro Education, VIII (1939), 64-70.
- Telford, C. W. "An Experimental Study of Some Factors Influencing The Social Attitudes of College Students," Journal of Social Psychology V (August 1943), 421-428.
- Thurstone, L. L. "Attitudes Can Be Measured," American Journal of Sociology, XXXIII (January 1928), 529.

APPENDIX I

COVER LETTER

October 19, 1957

Dear Madam:

THIS IS NOT AN ADVERTISEMENT!

I am presently working on my master's thesis at a Chicago university.

The enclosed questionnaire is necessary for the successful completion of my work. I will be very grateful if you can spare me one minute of your valuable time for the completion of this questionnaire. Do not sign this card, your answer will remain anonymous.

Your sincerity and cooperation will be much appreciated.

Sincerely,

LOTTIE M. VIGIL

APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Would you be willing to work next to a desk occupied by a Negro woman? Yes _____ No _____
2. Would you be willing to invite a Negro woman working in the same office with you on the same job to go to dinner with you? Yes _____ No _____
3. Would you be reluctant to work in a building where other offices employed Negro women? Yes _____ No _____
4. Would you be reluctant to work under the immediate supervision of a Negro woman? Yes _____ No _____
5. Would you agree that Negro women are less capable of doing efficient office work than White women? Yes _____ No _____
6. Would you be willing to work in a large office that employed Negro women if you did not have to be closely associated with them? Yes _____ No _____
7. Would you be willing to take your coffee break with a Negro woman who does the same work as you? Yes _____ No _____

APPENDIX III

Three questionnaires were received that had "Yes" for an answer to all seven questions. Presumably, the girls read the first question and meant to give a positive reply. One card was received with all "NO's" and again it can be assumed that the intensity of her racial attitudes made her answer the questionnaire in a negative way without even reading them. Occurences such as the above could very well influence the findings of a small group and the right solution cannot always be found. However, here again, may be a note such as "please read carefully", in the cover letter might have helped.

Twenty-five cards were received with different remarks which if this study could have been made on a larger scale might have been helpful for further research.

Reference to question number one: Would you be willing to work next to a desk occupied by a Negro woman? Remark: Not with every Negro, any more than with every white person and only congenial and equal ones of both colors.

Question number two: Would you be willing to invite a Negro woman working in the same office with you on the same job to dinner with you? Remark: Depends on other circumstances.

Question number three: Would you be reluctant to work in a building where other offices employed Negro women? Remark: Not mine?

Question number four: Would you be reluctant to work under the immediate supervision of a Negro woman? Remarks: If qualified. -- Two question marks. -- Depends on job and education. - May be, depends. -- I prefer men supervisors. -- Any woman. --

Question number five: Would you agree that Negro women are less capable of doing efficient office work than white women? Remarks: Don't know. -- Question mark. -- Another question mark.

Question number six: Would you be willing to work in a large office that employed Negro women if you did not have to be closely associated with them? Remarks: I have no fear that even close proximity would be "poisonous." -- I had the pleasure to work hand in hand with a Negro girl and she was great. -- Would not like to be closely associated with Negro women. -- Working closely makes no difference. -- I have done same. -- Badly worded. -- This question is out of line and contradictory. - The majority objected to the last part of the question, but it is not always easy to make everybody happy in a questionnaire of this sort.

Question number seven: Would you be willing to take your coffee break with a Negro woman who does the same work as you? Remark: The above true of the office in which I work. -- Discrimination not based on color, same standards for white workers and Negro. -- The writer felt that these remarks were rather interesting in giving a sort of sideline picture of the group studied.

A letter was also received which read as follows: "I cannot answer your postcard truthfully by just a few check marks. My feelings are that it is not the color of a person that should make or break him. It's his thoughts, ambitions, and his cleanliness of body and mind. Everyone should at least have one opportunity to improve themselves. There are some colored people I would prefer to associate with rather than their white neighbors, but in my case, it should be a matter of individual choice rather than taking color or creed as a mass."

Finally, here are some of the answers that were received from girls that removed the number from the questionnaire: Three girls returned the cards unanswered with such statements as: Anonymous! -- Do not question my intelligence. -- You ask for my sincerity (and cooperation) but where is your sincerity when you say that my reply will be anonymous and then you put an identification number on the card? -- Three girls answered all the seven questions in a positive way; they merely objected to the number. Of the other twenty-two, four would be willing to work next to a desk occupied by a Negro woman, one made the stipulation if she was a nice person, and the rest of them (six) answered with "no". All of them, except two, one of them who stated that she was not sure and the other who again stipulated if she were a nice person, would not be willing to invite a Negro woman working in the same office with them on the same job to go to dinner with them. The majority of these girls would not be reluctant to work in a building where other offices employed Negro women. Interestingly, the majority of the sample neither would be reluctant to work under the immediate supervision of a Negro woman. Again, in this instance there was one "not sure" and one "if she was a fine person" and only one "no". All except one woman agree that Negro women are just as capable of doing efficient office work than white women, and another girl made a question mark. On the coffee break the number of returns are equal.

It was not the intention of the writer to come to any conclusion from analysis of this group but it is interesting to note that this group does not show any great difference in prejudicial attitudes or social characteristics from the sample used in this study.

Approval Sheet

The thesis submitted by Lottie Maria Vigil has been read and approved by three members of the Department of Sociology.

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 with reference to content, form, and mechanical accuracy.

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

May 23, 1961

Date

Francis A. Cizon
Signature of Adviser