

**THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN EXPOSURE TO
MULTICULTURAL COURSE CONTENT
AND RACIAL ATTITUDES**

THESIS

**Presented to the Graduate Council
of Texas State University-San Marcos
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements**

for the Degree

Master of ARTS

by

Claude Bonazzo, B.S.A.S.

**San Marcos, Texas
August 2004**

COPYRIGHT ©

By Claude Bonazzo

2004

DEDICATION

For the Sociology Department

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to first acknowledge my primary source of inspiration and support, Norma. I have learned a great deal from you about what it is like to have a true friend and partner. You have been with me through the good and the bad. My love for you grows stronger every day and I appreciate every moment I spend with you.

I would also like to acknowledge my family. Mom and Dad, thank you for the life you have given me. You have both played a big part in who I am today. Mom, you have taught me to be compassionate and to focus on the important things in life. Dad, you have taught me that I can achieve anything with hard work and determination. As for my siblings, you have both been excellent role models. Isabel, you have taught me that even through hard times, one can still overcome and become a better person. James, you always pushed me to excel in my studies and set an example on how to develop self discipline.

This thesis is dedicated to the Sociology Department and all of the people who I have encountered throughout my experience at Texas State University-San Marcos. I truly believe that who I am today is a reflection of the experience that I have had with other people in the department and the knowledge I have acquired through the program. Thanks to you Dr. Barbara Trepagnier for all the time and effort you put into this thesis. With your constructive feedback I learned how to become a better writer. Thank you Dr. Caldwell for your patience in helping me with the methodology and understand the

statistical data. Thank you Dr. Deanna Mercer for your patience and support. Your words of encouragement truly helped me finish this thesis. Thanks are due to Dr. Audwin Anderson for inspiring me to write this thesis and for providing me the fire to make a difference in the world of race/ethnic relations.

Finally, I would like to thank my fellow graduate students and graduate assistants. Each of you, in some way or another, helped me understand and learn more about the world of sociology and life. Also, thanks to all the volunteers who helped me distribute the survey throughout the entire college. Without your help I would have not been able to complete this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
 CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY.....	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
<i>Racism</i>	8
<i>Prejudice</i>	13
<i>Social Distance</i>	16
<i>Quick Discrimination Index</i>	20
<i>Influence of the College and University Experience</i>	22
<i>Multicultural Education</i>	25
<i>Hypotheses</i>	32
III. METHODOLOGY	34
<i>Sample</i>	34
<i>Variable Identification and Definition</i>	36
<i>Survey Instrument</i>	37
<i>Data Collection</i>	43
<i>Statistical Analysis</i>	43
IV. FINDINGS.....	45
<i>Characteristics of the Sample</i>	45
<i>Test of Hypotheses</i>	46
<i>Other Analyses</i>	48
V. CONCLUSIONS.....	50
<i>Discussion of Findings</i>	50
<i>Limitations</i>	53
<i>Recommendations for Further Research</i>	55

APPENDIX A 57

APPENDIX B 70

REFERENCES..... 79

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Distribution of Population and Sample Results, by Sex	58
2	Distribution of Population and Sample Results, by Race/Ethnicity	59
3	Distribution of Population and Sample Results, by Student Classification	60
4	Distribution of Population and Sample Results, Academic College	61
5	Independent Samples t Test, Scores by Exposure (All Respondents, Whites, Blacks, Hispanics)	62
6	Chi-Square, Exposure by Sex	63
7	Chi-Square, Exposure by Race/Ethnicity	64
8	Chi-Square, Exposure by Student Classification	65
9	Independent Samples t Test, Scores by Sex (All Respondents)	66
10	Independent Samples t Test, Scores by Student Classification (All Respondent)	67
11	One-way ANOVA, Scores by Race/Ethnicity (Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics)	68
12	Independent Samples t Test, Specific Social Distance Scores by Race/Ethnicity (Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics)	69

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

As the United States becomes increasingly diverse in its racial and ethnic composition (Riche 2000), many individuals lack the knowledge of the racial/ethnic groups necessary for constructive interactions (Ehrlich 1997; Loewen 1995, 2001). The idea of distinct racial/ethnic groups has been a part of the United States even before the establishment of the colonies in North America. The “first” ethnic minority, Native Americans, holds one of the longest standing histories in the Americas. This ethnic group is composed of a vast array of cultures and languages which indicate that the racial category used today—Native Americans—was actually composed of numerous tribes and societies (Marger 2000). This early heterogeneity within the larger group meant that racial/ethnic interactions between the tribes ranged from conflict to collaboration. These interactions among the tribes indicate that racial/ethnic relations had a history previous to the conquest and settlement of Europeans in North America. Moreover, racial/ethnic relations became an even more visible concept when Europeans began to identify physical and cultural differences in other groups, in particular between themselves and Native Americans, relegating a subordinate status to Native Americans, as a group.

Many people distance themselves from other racial/ethnic groups because of the lack of understanding they have of those groups, or because of prejudices they hold about them. This lack of understanding or prejudice has been called social distance (Park 1924). Social distance refers to “the grades or degrees of understanding and intimacy which characterize pre-social and social relations generally” (Park 1924:339). In other words, it is the degree of intimacy or closeness that a person is willing to establish with an out-group member in social interaction. Out-group members are individuals who do not share the same common group identity that in-group members do in a given social setting (Johnson 1995). People generally tend to have lower levels of social distance towards individuals who are somewhat similar to their own group. As the level of difference increases, there is a greater likelihood of a desire for more social distance; historically in the U.S., the most apparent race difference associated with social distance is skin color (Marger 2000).

Today most of the immigrants who come to the U.S. do not reflect the homogeneity of the immigrants who came from Southern and Eastern Europe in the early 1900s. European immigrants assimilated relatively rapidly into the American culture compared to those who would come later. Immigrants of today are mainly people of color from nations in Latin America and Asia who primarily practice aspects of cultural and structural pluralism in order to maintain ties to their motherland (Marger 2000; Riche 2000). That is, immigrants attempt to preserve their original identity by maintaining a cultural system much like that of their homeland. Structurally, immigrants to some degree maintain residence in a segregated community, fostering interactions within the ethnic context.

As the level of diversity increases in this country, everyone becomes more likely to interact with people from different backgrounds. At times, a lack of understanding of particular racial/ethnic groups causes people to come to these interactions with stereotypes, prejudice, and misunderstandings, which may prompt unwanted conflict, including physical and psychological harm. According to the National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence, “one out of every four or five adult Americans is harassed, intimidated, insulted, or assaulted for reasons of prejudice ... [that] is intended to cause physical or psychological injury” (The Prejudice Institute 1997:1). This behavior is defined as ethnoviolence. Studies performed by the Institute reveal that the majority of ethnoviolent behavior is committed by ordinary people and the foundation for these behaviors are in large part due to a misunderstanding of other racial/ethnic groups and learned prejudices.

Ethnoviolent behavior is increasingly taking place on college campuses within the United States (Ehrlich 1997; Sowell 1993). Ehrlich, in a study of campus ethnoviolence, reveals that minorities are experiencing ethnoviolent behavior at an alarming rate. Here are some of Ehrlich’s (1997) findings:

The Sigma Chi fraternity was found burning crosses and wearing Confederate uniforms. This was part of their ritual celebrating the founding of the fraternity.

Two organizations representing minority students, the United Coalition Against Racism and Latin American Solidarity Committee, received a flier that said, “Faggots, Niggers and Spic Lovers—BEWARE! You have gone beyond acceptable criticism. Never again will you go unpunished.” The fliers were slipped under their office doors.

Racial epithets were written on the walls and mirror of a residence hall room assigned to a Latino student.

A fraternity held a “border party.” In order to gain entrance, guests had to crawl under a barbed wire barrier.

A black columnist on a student newspaper depicted white people as “irredeemable racists” and called blacks to “unite, organize and execute” whites who pose a threat. (P.279-281)

Ehrlich attributes the ethnoviolent behavior to students' lack of knowledge or experience of different racial/ethnic groups. Many white and minority college students come from segregated neighborhoods and schools that do not allow a great deal of intergroup experiences to take place (Ehrlich 1997). When white students go to college, many encounter minority students for the first time. The same goes for minority students in college; they encounter white students uncommon in their school or neighborhood. These circumstances have the potential of creating a hostile environment. Sowell (1993) sees the growing hostility on college campuses as part of "the new racism" developing between whites and racial minorities, such as blacks, Asians, and Hispanics (p.291). Sowell (1993) describes the situation as the "unprecedented escalation of overt racial hostility among middle-class young people, on predominantly liberal or radical campuses" (p. 291).

A growing number of social scientists believe that infusing a multicultural perspective into education may improve students' understanding of the many racial/ethnic groups that exist in the United States (Banks 2001; Chang 2002; Clavijo 1984; Heard 1990; Kershaw 1989; Kranz and Lund 1998; Pence and Fields 1999; Sparrow and Chretien 1993). However, there has been limited research focusing on the influence of multicultural education on people's perceptions of other racial/ethnic groups. Schools and universities are in the beginning stages of infusing multiculturalism into the curricula and are increasingly discovering the potential of this type of pedagogy. The increased focus on incorporating multiculturalism in the school curricula has largely been a response to the historical practices of overt racism that did not permit people of color to learn or understand aspects of their own cultures (Goldberg 1994).

In the late nineteenth century, the position of the United States was one of monoculturalism (Goldberg 1994). The goal was to create a European-American society and history reflecting the account of a dominant white culture. This historical model left out the contributions of minorities, portraying the U.S. in a manner that omitted other groups' versions of events (Goldberg 1994). Moreover, the white American attitude towards immigrants and people of color has historically been one of cultural, structural, and psychological assimilation (Marger 2000). Many government policies were utilized to enforce an assimilationist ideology onto minorities that mainly reflected an Anglo-conformist mentality (Marger 2000).

In a study of American history books used in junior high, high school, and college, Loewen (1995) found that many of them leave out or distort events that are pivotal to understanding the life and world of race relations in U.S. history. Loewen (2001) states, "More factually wrong material is 'learned' in social studies and history than in any other K-12 subject area" (p.21). Therefore, if students are being taught erroneous information about American history and race relations, how can they be expected to have meaningful relations with people from different racial/ethnic groups? This study concentrates on whether there is an association between exposure to multicultural course content and racial prejudice, specifically social distance and racial attitudes.

The following chapter covers the evolution of racism in the U.S., the dimensions of prejudice and how it is measured in this study, the influence of the college/university experience, and the development of multiculturalism in American society. The review of

literature based on the abovementioned elements will aid in understanding how this study was developed.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

To get a clear picture of the focus of this study, a review of the literature pertaining to the theoretical perspectives and research of racism, prejudice, the college experience, and multiculturalism is in order. The literature relevant to this study can be divided into six sections. The first section focuses on the history of racism in the United States. Examining the history of racism will aid in understanding how the idea of multiculturalism developed. The second section covers the theoretical aspects of prejudice and how it relates to race/ethnic relations today. The third section involves the concept of social distance and how it applies to the study of prejudice. Furthermore, this section will examine previous studies conducted at colleges and universities and how they apply to the current study. The fourth section is an overview of the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI), an index that measures cognitive and affective racial attitudes. The fifth section covers research on the influence that college and university experience has on the attitudes of students. The final section focuses on the emergence of multiculturalism, the reasoning behind incorporating multicultural curricula in education, and its effects on attitudes toward racial/ethnic groups.

Racism

At the heart of multiculturalism is the issue of historical and present-day racism in the United States. Racism is an ideology based on the notion that “humans are subdivided into distinct hereditary groups that are innately different in their social behavior and mental capacities and that can therefore be ranked as superior or inferior” (Marger 2000:27). Ultimately, the belief is used to legitimize the unequal distribution of and access to society’s valued resources. The failures of groups at the bottom of the social hierarchy, mainly minorities, are presumed to be inferior and are deemed undeserving of the fruits of society. The United States has a longstanding history of racism that has created a sense of nihilism towards different ethnicities and cultures (West 1993).

Racism emerged when Europeans began to frequently interact with people in North and South America, as well as Africa, who had culturally and physically distinct characteristics uncommon in Europe at the time (Marger 2000). These individuals were mainly non-white peoples from various indigenous American Indian and African tribes. Europeans saw the non-white populations as culturally primitive, lacking Christian values (Marger 2000). As contact increased, white scholars from different disciplines embarked on a discussion of the origin of the human species. From those debates, the ideas of social Darwinism, sociobiology, eugenics, and apartheid emerged, creating a rationalization for racists, to establish and implement exclusionary policies (Goldberg 1993). A concept of major influence was social Darwinism. Social Darwinism applied the principle that human societies undergo a process of natural selection where only the fittest of human societies would survive (Marger 2000). Europeans saw themselves at the

top of the evolutionary process and non-whites at the bottom. With this “scientifically” based justification of innate differences between whites and non-whites, the European colonists created racist policies and practices towards non-whites.

Since the inception of the colonies in the Americas, racial/ethnic groups have been subjected to different forms of racism (Marger 2000). Native Americans were seen as a conquered group faced with genocide and forced to assimilate into Anglo-American culture. Although Native Americans reside in reservations today that help preserve their cultural background, from the late 1800s to the 1950s Native Americans were subjected to assimilationist policies designed to wipe out their political and cultural heritage (Marger 2000). The General Allotment Act of 1887 scattered the Indian tribes into different parts of the country in hopes of accelerating the assimilation process. By separating the communities, politicians believed the Indians would more likely incorporate American customs and values. Additionally, the Bureau of Indian Affairs forced Indian children to attend boarding schools; Christian churches were also built to further the process of stripping Native Americans of their language and customs.

Mexican Americans were initially incorporated into the U.S. as a conquered group and many Anglos imposed a subordinate ethnic status to the group (Marger 2000). Although Mexicans were given American citizenship and property rights under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, slowly thereafter, they were stripped of their lands and forced to work on the land they once owned. Subsequently, Mexicans have steadily entered the U. S. as voluntary immigrants for employment, legally and illegally. From the beginning, many whites saw Mexicans as a threat to the American job market. Mexicans were a source of cheap labor and given the least desirable jobs. Whenever

there was a shortage of labor in the U.S., Mexicans were encouraged to migrate. Conversely, whenever there was a surplus of labor, they were deported. The discriminatory practices against Mexicans in the 1950s were so extreme that any person who “‘looked Mexican’ [was] stopped and required to present evidence of their legal status” (Marger 2000:288). Although this discriminatory practice of citizenship identification is not readily accepted today, many Mexicans and Mexican Americans still encounter this type of discrimination.

Blacks were primarily slaves when brought to the U.S. and subjected to extreme practices of racism (Marger 2000). Originally, blacks were considered indentured servants, working for a master for a number of years to pay for their passage to the colonies. Gradually in the mid-1600s, the Southern states began enacting laws to identify blacks as slaves. Identifying blacks as slaves was primarily a result of a labor shortage and white ethnocentrism. Blacks were forced into bondage for an undetermined amount of time and stripped of all legal rights. For 200 years, blacks were owned and controlled by plantation owners. After the abolition of slavery, the Jim Crow system was employed to segregate blacks from almost every aspect of social life: public facilities, housing, work, education, restaurants, etc. During the Jim Crow period, blacks were considered competition to white workers in the economic system. Accordingly, whites used Jim Crow to put themselves at a social economic advantage. It was not until the civil rights movement of the 1960s that blacks gained equal opportunity under the law. Never has any other group entered into American society with such a system of institutionalized racism and degradation.

As minorities began to acquire jobs previously held by whites, many of them also began to challenge the discriminatory practices established in the institutions of American society (Marger 2000). Blacks especially, questioned these discriminatory practices and embarked on a quest to seek justice. Blacks began to participate in labor unions and protest against discrimination in the workplace. During World War II, white political leaders began to tackle the dilemma: “[H]ow could the United States support a racist system at home while it was at war abroad with the most flagrantly racist regime, Nazi Germany?” (Marger 2000:240). In 1954, the Supreme Court in *Brown v. Board of Education* ruled that the “separate but equal” doctrine was invalid. This decision marked the decline of the Jim Crow system and provided optimism for improvement in the lives of all minorities. Blacks continued to pursue equal rights with nonviolent protests and opposition to unjust discriminatory practices. Many encountered antagonism by whites with police brutality, bombings, and murders. In the mid-1960s, the civil right acts of 1964 and 1965 were finally ratified, banning racial segregation and discriminatory practices in the United States. This signaled a turning point in race/ethnic relations but did not eliminate racism, prejudice, and discrimination. Since then, racism has shifted from overt racist policies to covert and residual racist practices (Bonilla-Silva 1999).

When considering contemporary racism, some social scientists claim that the importance of race and racism has decreased considerably in the United States (Wilson 1978). On the other hand, some social scientists have moved from explanations of overt practices of racism to more hidden, structural explanations of racism (Bonilla-Silva 1999; Dovidio and Gaertner 1986; Marger 2000). Bonilla-Silva (1999) regards contemporary racism as “a network of social relations at social, political, economic, and ideological

levels that shapes the life chances of various races” (p.56). This closely resembles indirect institutional discrimination, a hidden structure of racism that is a consequence of past discriminatory practices and attitudes that have an effect on the current societal structure and its institutions (Marger 2000).

Since War World II racism has changed considerably from an open expression of prejudice and discrimination to a more hidden structure where people who are prejudiced behave as if they are not prejudiced (Dovidio and Gaertner 1986). Dovidio and Gaertner describe this as aversive racism. An aversive racist is someone who:

...sympathize[s] with the victims of past injustice; support[s] public policies that, in principle, promote racial equality and ameliorate the consequences of racism; identify more generally with a liberal political agenda; regard themselves as nonprejudiced and nondiscriminatory; but, almost unavoidably, possess negative feelings and beliefs about blacks. (Dovidio and Gaertner 1986:62)

This perspective assumes that, because of racial biases in information about different racial/ethnic minorities and the historical racist culture of the United States, white Americans develop “antipathy toward blacks and other minorities” (Dovidio and Gaertner 1986:63). When this antipathy presents itself in a social situation, aversive racists tend to avoid their feelings and beliefs altogether. Dovidio and Gaertner attribute this avoidance as a product of the historical racial connotations still influencing peoples’ perspectives of other racial/ethnic groups and the continuous identification of out-group members based on physical appearance. Some other factors that contribute to these aversive feelings are cultural and social issues. For instance, the black culture does not always coincide with the values of the dominant white culture. Furthermore, some whites are socialized within their culture to possess certain antagonistic beliefs toward blacks. This clash in culture and antagonistic socialization can cause further disaffection

in whites toward blacks. From above explanations of how racism has evolved, it is apparent that prejudice remains a feature of American society.

Prejudice

Prejudice, in contrast to racism, has been a longstanding phenomenon with its own history, even before the “racist culture” of North America developed (Allport 1954; Goldberg 1993). However, the origins of prejudice remain in dispute. Marxist theorists stress that economic determinants and exploitation are the elements that developed prejudicial attitudes (see Allport 1954). Some believe that class itself is the root of all prejudice (see Allport 1954). Other social scientists argue that prejudice began in the age of European migration when colonists needed a justification for imperial expansion (see Allport 1954).

For this study, the focus is on the prejudice against racial/ethnic minorities in the United States. Levin (1975) defines prejudice as:

...interpersonal hostility which is directed against individuals based on their membership in a minority group. This conception of prejudice is meant to focus our attention on negative feelings, beliefs, and action-tendencies that arise against human beings by virtue of the status they occupy or are perceived to occupy as members of a minority group (P.35).

The nature of racial/ethnic prejudice is best described by Allport (1954) as “an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization” and are “not prejudices unless they serve a private, self-gratifying purpose for the person who has them” (p. 9 and 12). From a sociological viewpoint, prejudice is a product of culture that is found to be a part of the normal functions of society. It is transmitted through socialization and becomes firmly incorporated into many of the social interactions throughout an individual’s life.

Although there has been a decline in prejudice in American society (Wilson 1978), prejudice still plays a role in peoples' lives (Dovidio and Gaertner 1986; Marger 2000).

The nature of prejudice is generally considered an attitude with three basic components: cognitive (beliefs), affective (feelings), and conative (behavioral predisposition) (Ponterotto, Potere, and Johansen 2002; Dovidio and Gaertner 1986; Levin 1975; Ehrlich 1973; Allport 1954). According to Ponterotto et al. (2002), the three dimensions are described as follows:

The *cognitive* component of an attitude consists of beliefs held toward the object. The *affective* component of an attitude consists of the emotional feelings stimulated by thought about the object. Finally, the *behavioral* component refers to predispositions to act in certain ways toward the object (see also Weiten 2001). (P.193)

Ehrlich's (1973) view of prejudice has similarities to the psychological perspective described above even though he is a social psychologist. He describes the three dimensions as:

The cognitive dimensions of beliefs is...when a person asserts [a] belief, he is implicitly asserting that he believes that statement to be true or probably true. The second major analytic dimension of an attitude is behavioral...All beliefs have a behaviorally associative or dissociative component ...The proposition, "I would be willing to marry a Negro," is not only a belief-statement, but it is also a direct statement of a behavioral intention...The affective dimension of attitudes is...here considered one that identifies the valence between a person and an object or class or objects. Affect represents the set of feelings experienced by a person about, or directed toward an attitude object. (P.4-7)

It is important to examine how psychologists and social psychologist view prejudice because it will aid in understanding why two different scales were utilized in this study. Further explanation of this matter will be clarified in the methods chapter.

Several theoretical approaches have developed over the years to assist social scientists in explaining and understanding prejudice. Allport (1954) identified six approaches to explain the phenomenon: (1) historical approach, (2) sociocultural approach, (3) situational approach, (4) personality structure and dynamics approach, (5)

phenomenological approach, and (6) stimulus-object approach. Ashmore and Del Boca (1976) developed a two level approach that explains prejudice at the societal-level and the individual-level. Chesler (1976) explains prejudice as having two dimensions, focusing on the responsibility of the victim and the extent to which prejudice is embedded in society. Although these theoretical approaches hold merit in the study of prejudice, the phenomenological approach appears to better explain how students today develop prejudice towards other racial /ethnic groups.

The phenomenological approach describes a person's reaction to the world as a product of how that person defines that world (Allport 1954). People are generally shaped through their society's historical, cultural, social, and immediate framework, which influences their attitude and behavior (Allport 1954). This approach takes into account every social aspect of the human experience and uses it to help define how a person develops prejudice towards members of another group. Some examples of how this applies to students' development of prejudice towards other groups will further explain the theoretical approach. As stated in the introduction, many students who go to college come from segregated neighborhoods and schools where a limited number of experiences with different racial/ethnic groups take place (Ehrlich 1997). These experiences aid in shaping students' social definition of the world. Once white students get to college many are not prepared to handle a multi-ethnic campus environment and consequently define the atmosphere differently from minorities. Ehrlich (1997) states, "whereas white students perceive the campus atmosphere as friendly and accepting of minority students, minority students are often twice as likely to perceive the climate as unfriendly and not accepting" (p.286). These two different definitions of the campus

environment may be a product of the experiences that white and minority students' have in high school. Another factor influencing students' definition of the world is the incorrect information they learn about race relations in school textbooks (Loewen 1995), which shapes the students' historical definition of the world. These social and historical accounts of American history in textbooks influence students' perceptions and possibly foster negative prejudices in them. These examples demonstrate that contemporary prejudice is embedded in the cultural norms, belief systems, and social structure of American society. Moreover, if these experiences are shaping prejudices about other racial/ethnic groups, a multicultural curriculum may have the reverse effect on students' prejudices. The following section covers how the social distance scale assists in measuring prejudicial attitudes toward racial/ethnic groups.

Social Distance

Social distance is the degree of intimacy or closeness that a person is willing to establish with an out-group member in social interaction. Many people separate (distance) themselves from out-groups presumably because of the lack of understanding or stereotypes they have of the other groups (Bogardus 1925a). Stereotypes play an important part in social distance because they primarily form the basis of prejudice toward other racial/ethnic groups. Similarly, people tend to desire less social distance towards individuals who are similar to their own group. As the level of differences increase, there is a greater likelihood of a higher degree of social distance. Skin color has often been used as a method for identifying differences in group membership. Once an out-group member is identified as such, stereotypes are used to further identify that

individual, which may invoke negative prejudices (Allport 1954). Stereotypes are shorthand depictions used to identify character and behavioral traits of a particular group and are the images that typically support the fostering of negative prejudices (Marger 2000). As a result of that prejudice, people may behave in a negative fashion toward out-group members. The idea of social distance primarily falls under this behavioral aspect of prejudice (Ehrlich 1973). That is, prejudice has the potential of influencing personal and social behaviors that can be identified through one's desire for social distance in an interaction. This focus on the behavioral (conative) dimensions of prejudice will complement the use of the QDI, which focuses on the other two attitudinal components of prejudice (discussed later).

According to Bogardus (1960), there are two kinds of social distance. One is the social distance between racial/ethnic groups that can be created from inaccurate perceptions and misunderstandings often referred to as stereotypes. When a lack of knowledge of the other group occurs, differences tend to cause conflict because of misunderstandings and prejudice. The other type of social distance results from a past, personal experience the person may have had with an out-group member. For example, if a black individual experienced extreme discrimination from white students in high school, that person may develop an unwillingness to have a white girlfriend/boyfriend in college, signifying the person has a high level of social distance toward whites. These experiences also focus on differences in attitudes, sentiments, and beliefs. Originally, Bogardus developed a social distance scale in 1925 that measures the level of racial/ethnic prejudice individuals have toward other groups. Through his subsequent work, the scale has proven to be reliable over time (Bogardus 1959). The scale involves

the measurement of prejudice with respect to seven degrees of intimacy people are willing to experience in varying social contexts, from racial/ethnic exogamy (marrying someone from another race) to excluding an out-group from the country. The scale is viewed “as a means for securing adequate interpretations of the varying degrees and grades of understanding and feeling that exist in social situations” (Bogardus 1925:299). For example, a person who is willing to marry someone from a different race would indicate that person has an extremely low degree of social distance. On the other hand, if that person does not want a specific racial/ethnic group to reside in this country, this would indicate the person has a high degree of social distance.

The Bogardus scale has proven to be an important measure of the attitudes toward race on college campuses (Morrissey 1992; Muir 1990, 1991; Sparrow and Chretien 1993). Muir (1990) studied 10 percent of the University of Alabama population using the scale to measure the social distance of 222 black students and 1,710 white students, seeking to observe whether a desegregated campus fosters an increase in interracial acceptance. He found that whites are less socially accepting of blacks than blacks are of whites in campus interactions. The level of willingness to interact decreased substantially in whites’ responses when asked if they would room with a black student. Seniors and freshmen were also compared to see if the students became more tolerant over time. It was concluded that seniors were more accepting of interracial interactions than freshmen. The present study examines the relationship of multicultural curricula on students’ attitudes regarding social distance. If a desegregated university generates acceptance of interracial interactions, a multicultural curriculum may go further in reducing social distance between racial/ethnic groups.

In an additional study, Muir (1991) examined the racial attitudes of white Greek affiliated students at the same university. He wanted to see if there was a difference in attitudes between Greeks and non-Greeks. Ten percent of the student population was administered a questionnaire with the social distance scale, as well as additional questions that measure related attitudes. The attitudes measured included questions about equality, desegregation and stereotypes. Muir found that members of white Greek fraternities and sororities were considerably more racist than non-Greek students. This suggests that social fraternities and sororities recruit prejudiced students and/or provide environments that reinforce practices of discrimination.

In a different study, researchers administered the social distance scale to blacks and whites at a predominantly white campus in the South (Sparrow and Chretien 1993). Students' were asked to identify their level of social distance toward 31 racial/ethnic groups. Sparrow and Chretien explored the social distance attitudes of 415 undergraduate students in order to demonstrate the importance of multicultural curricula in higher education. Respondents included 132 blacks, 271 whites, and 12 others (Asians and Hispanics). Whites are found to be more willing to admit other groups (English, French, Canadians, Cajuns, and other whites) to close kinship by marriage, whereas blacks would only admit their own group to close kinship by marriage. On each level of social distance, whites consistently included more racial/ethnic groups than blacks. The whites' tendency to include more groups in each level of intimacy was mainly explained through the similarities in phenotype and cultures that whites had toward the 31 racial/ethnic groups. As for the social distance between whites and blacks, both groups were willing to accept each other to their clubs

Sparrow and Chretien assert that, since schools are considered one of the main foundations of socialization, the education system should introduce students to multicultural curricula to transmit positive understandings of other racial/ethnic groups. Although Sparrow and Chretien make a good case for infusing multicultural curricula, they did not include it as a measure in the study. Overall, the aforementioned studies have primarily used sex, student classification, race/ethnicity, and Greek affiliation as independent variables. The present study uses exposure to courses with multicultural content as its independent variable to examine the difference in social distance attitudes of those students who have and have not taken such courses.

Quick Discrimination Index

The Quick Discrimination Index (QDI) is a fairly new measure used primarily to measure racial and gender attitudes. The index was initially developed by psychologists Ponterotto, Burkard, and Rieger (1995) using 30 questions answered in a Likert-scale with these choices: strongly agree, agree, not sure, disagree, and strongly disagree. The QDI is designed to “assess the cognitive component of attitudes directed toward racial minority groups and women and the affective component of attitudes as related to interpersonal comfort in interactions with racially diverse persons” (Ponterotto, Potere, and Johansen 2002:193). In simpler terms, the scale measures attitudes toward racial groups and gender equity along with the comfort level (affective) an individual has within interracial relations. Even though the QDI has not been widely used, Ponterotto conducted studies on university populations and established reliability and validity of the index in measuring attitudes toward race and gender. The index has two scoring

methods. The first method uses a total index score that determines the overall attitudes toward racial minorities and women. The second method, utilized in this study, uses three subscales in order to determine the attitudes toward cognitive racial and gender attitudes and affective racial attitudes. The rationale for using the second method is further explained in the methods chapter.

Two additional studies have used the QDI, furthering the validity of the index (Hansman, Jackson, Grant and Spencer 1999; Wade 2001). Hansman et al. examine the understanding of graduate students regarding issues of race and gender. The study reveals that graduate students have a moderate understanding of minority and women's issues; and, those who have completed two multicultural courses have higher scores than those who have not (Hansman et al. 1999). Although Hansman et al. found that the students who had taken multicultural courses had higher QDI scores, their sample size was very small; only nineteen percent of the total sample had taken multicultural courses. Hansman et al. study is similar to the present study. This study examines a much larger sample of students who have taken courses with multicultural course content. Additionally, the present study examines only juniors and seniors and does not include the subscale on gender as part of the analysis.

Wade (2001) also used the QDI to study the relationship of male identity statuses with the attitudes they hold toward race and gender issues. His findings suggest that men who are reference group nondependent, whom define themselves internally, are more likely to accept, and perhaps appreciate, differences in race issues and gender roles (Wade 2001). Although Wade's study is not related to the present study, his study brings further validity to the index.

Influence of the College and University Experience

There is extensive research on the aspects of the college experience having an influence on students' values and beliefs. Several studies have considered the overall experience of college on students (Funk and Willits 1987; Lottes and Kuriloff 1994), some have looked at students' majors as a source of influence (Dambrun, Guimond and Duarte 2002; Hopwood and Connors 2002; Reichel and Neumann 1988), and others have focused on the departments of specific disciplines (Vreeland and Bidwell 1966). These various factors are all significant in determining the influence on college experience on students.

In a study measuring the political and social attitudes of college students using the Liberalism and Social Conscience Scales, Lottes and Kuriloff (1994) surveyed 557 first-year students living in dormitories. The sample population reflected the gender and racial distribution of the entire first-year student population. In the students' senior year, an identical survey was sent to the sample population. Lottes and Kuriloff (1994) found that "seniors scored higher on measures of liberalism, social conscience, homosexuality tolerance and feminist attitudes and lower on male-dominant attitudes than they did as first year students" (p.31). This suggests that the college experience provides a liberalizing effect on students' attitudes toward feminism, politics, homosexuality, and male dominance. Would a multicultural curriculum add to this liberalization and provide a tool for better race relations? Lottes and Kuriloff do not consider the university's curricula in their analysis, which may facilitate the liberalization process. This study focuses on the relationship of the university curriculum on students' perceptions of different racial/ethnic groups and overall racial attitudes.

Funk and Willits (1987) in a longitudinal study measured differences in sex-role attitudes and religious orientation of individuals who had no college, some college, and a college degree. The authors drew their beginning sample from a population of 11,000 sophomores in 74 high school districts. A decade later they surveyed a random sample of 848 respondents from the original 11,000 in the study and found that college has a “liberalizing” effect on individual attitudes (Funk and Willits 1987:229). Those who had no college education were more likely to have traditional sex roles and possess a religious faith. Those who had graduated from college were more likely to shift from traditional sex roles and a religious ideology to a liberal view of sex roles and a more secular orientation.

While reviewing the literature on the overall college experience provides an understanding of how students’ attitudes are influenced, a review of the literature on the influence of specific majors and departments is also useful. The impact of college on business ethics was demonstrated in a study that surveyed students’ attitudes in two academic programs. Reichel and Neumann (1988) hypothesized that management students would exhibit more pragmatism (flexibility) towards business ethics than liberal arts students. They assert that the reasoning behind this hypothesis is the tendency of liberal art students having little occupational specificity and no concrete job expectations. This, in turn, would suggest liberal art students are less practical in their ethical attitudes. Reichel and Neumann selected a random sample of 286 Liberal Arts and 243 Management students. Using a value clarification exercise, the authors found that students in the liberal arts programs place more importance on business ethics than students in management programs (Reichel and Neumann 1988). This demonstrates that

if academic programs can influence students' principles of behavior in the business setting, they may also influence students' principles in racial/ethnic relations.

In a similar study, Hopwood and Connors (2002) found that individuals who major in Business are considerably more homophobic than individuals who major in the humanities. Hopwood and Connors attributed the difference in homophobic attitudes to the students' identification with and membership in an academic department such as, business majors. They assert that business programs tend to emphasize conservative values and a competitive nature that makes homophobia difficult to reduce in their students. If students have the opportunity to learn about and identify with multicultural values demonstrated by faculty and the curriculum, they may develop more tolerant attitudes toward different racial/ethnic groups.

The influence of majors on students was also examined by Dambrun et al. (2002) who found that law students have a higher level of stereotyping than do psychology majors. Social norms associated with the two fields of study were identified as hierarchy-enhancing or hierarchy-attenuating. The study of law and psychology provide occupations in which the respective social roles accentuate either a hierarchy-enhancing (law) or hierarchy-attenuating (psychology) position, the former emphasizing acceptance of inequality and the latter emphasizing decreasing inequality (Dambrun et al. 2002). The sample for the study was drawn exclusively from third year students, suggesting that the students would be well socialized into their fields of study. Similarly, the present study drew its sample from students enrolled in upper division courses, providing a higher probability of students who have taken multicultural courses.

Academic departments have also proven to influence students' attitudes in the college experience. Vreeland and Bidwell (1966) found that faculty in departments with a high level of interest in and interaction with undergraduate students exerted more influence on students' values and attitudes. The sample was randomly drawn from 127 faculty members who were proportionally stratified by their departments' possibility of influencing students. History, social relations (sociology), geology, and psychology proved to be the departments with the most influence on students because the faculty's values and attitudes coincide with the goals of the department to provide students with moral as well as technical instruction. The departments with the least level of influence on students are foreign languages, physics, chemistry, and architectural science, because the focus is more technical. The effect of academic departments influencing students' attitudes and values could be similar to a multicultural curriculum having an influence and potentially reducing social distance along with developing positive attitudes toward cognitive and affective aspects of racial attitudes.

Multicultural Education

Multiculturalism in education has become a common approach of educating students so that they gain a better understanding of the histories, realities, and cultural experiences of differing racial/ethnic groups in the United States (Banks 2001; Clavijo 1984; Kranz and Lund 1998). Multicultural theorists envision "an open society, in which individuals from diverse cultural, ethnic, and social-class groups have equal opportunity to function and participate" (Banks 2001:117). Giroux (1994) asserts that:

...a curriculum for a multicultural and multiracial society provides the conditions for students to imagine beyond the given and to embrace their identities critically as a source of agency and possibility...Developing a respect for cultures in the plural demands a reformulation of what it

means to be educated in the United States and what such an education implies for the creation of new cultural spaces that deepen and extend the possibility of democratic public life. (P. 341)

Takaki argues:

If “we” must be more inclusive, how do we “work it out”? One crucial way would be for us to learn more about each other—not only whites about people of color, but also blacks about Koreans, and Hispanics about blacks. Our very diversity offers an intellectual invitation to teachers and scholars to reach for a more comprehensive understanding of American society. (Pincus and Ehrlich 1999:307)

The above quotes address the ability of individuals being free to maintain their ethnic identities while respecting the differences of others and promoting harmony and unity in social life. Multiculturalists suggest that if every person is provided the opportunity to learn and express their ethnic identity, it will provide a better understanding on how to continue the improvement of American society. Now, it is important to review the history and origin of multiculturalism to understand why the idea has drawn a great deal of attention in American society.

Multiculturalism primarily arose as a response to the established belief in monoculturalism. Monoculturalism was largely a product of people in the colonies attempting to develop and maintain a single culture that would be used as a foundation for the creation of a republic in the Americas (Goldberg 1994). This is closely related to aspects of racism: European colonists came to the Americas with the idea that non-whites were culturally primitive. Alongside this belief, colonists held that non-whites should either assimilate into their (white) culture or be given a subordinate status in which non-whites would be under whites’ control in the political, economic, and social systems (Goldberg 1994). Soon, laws and policies were established to maintain an ethno-racialized, Eurocentric society that would justify the unequal treatment of non-whites in every area of society’s institutional system.

By the 1960s, the United States began to shift from an assimilationist perspective to a more integrationist perspective that encouraged non-whites to explore social aspects of their respective groups (Goldberg 1994). Previously, immigrants and minorities living in the U.S. were encouraged to adopt American values in order to become more like the dominant, larger society; an assimilationist ideology produced monoculturalism. The new focus on integration, marked by the civil rights movement, slowly opened the doors for minorities to gain control of their cultural expression and identities (Goldberg 1994). This cultural expression gave genesis to the multiculturalist perspective at odds with monoculturalism, which provided ethnic minorities the opportunity to explore their racial/ethnic heritage and histories previously excluded by monoculturalism.

There has been an ongoing debate over multiculturalism's advantages and disadvantages since it first began making an impact in American society. Seltzer, Frazier, and Ricks (1995) examined the debate by reviewing many of the arguments for and against a multicultural education. Proponents of multicultural curricula argue that teaching the histories, behaviors, and beliefs of a variety of racial/ethnic groups, as well as developing awareness of an increasingly diverse society, would reduce prejudice and prepare students to interact successfully with individuals from a variety of backgrounds (Heard 1990). Furthermore, Kershaw (1989) argues that a multicultural education would foster self-esteem in minority students and a willingness to learn; it would also provide positive role models for young people from previously excluded racial/ethnic groups.

Opponents of multiculturalism, on the other hand, believe that it will cause further division between groups and hinder the progress of the *melting pot* theory (see Seltzer et al. 1995). Advocates of the *melting pot* metaphor (assimilationists) argue that

racial/ethnic groups should join together by surrendering their cultural backgrounds and working to create a new national and cultural identity (Marger 2000). In addition, those who oppose multiculturalism believe that multicultural education will lead to the erosion of American solidarity and values (Seltzer et al. 1995). Herrnstein and Murray (1994) maintain that the use of multiculturalism in education to improve the self esteem of minorities will lower the performance measures used to assess intellectual ability generally. They argue that some ethnic groups are intellectually inferior and that changing the traditional curricula will put American education on a “downhill slide” academically (Herrnstein and Murray 1994:432). Hacker (1992) contends that, if schools begin to infuse a curriculum that reflects the histories of all the racial/ethnic groups present in a community, two things may happen. One, each history will only receive a small amount of time in the classroom; therefore, the value of inclusion is limited. Two, including the histories of every ethnic group and presenting them as if they have played equally important roles in the formation of this country, weakens students’ understanding of how power has operated in this country. Students will find it hard to understand how the country has evolved from a white dominant power structure to what it is today, a pluralistic power structure. Hacker also asserts that European Americans got to the Americas first and were the ones who held the influential social positions. Hacker’s argument does have merit but to assert that Europeans got here “first” fails to recognize the fact that Native Americans and Mexicans, in the South, were here before Europeans colonized North America.

Studies have shown that multiculturalism in education can affect students’ perceptions of other racial/ethnic groups. Kranz and Lund (1998) found that a race

relations course taught at University of North Florida in the Psychology Department significantly influenced how students view race relations. The course included “selected readings, speakers, experiential components, guided self examination, and small group, facilitated, intensive discussions of personal, regional and broader societal issues about race [sic]” (Kranz and Lund 1998:272). In addition, students were asked to keep a journal during the course to record reflections on the activities carried out during the semester. Near the end of the course, students were required to stay one week with a family of another race. The students were contacted 20 years later and the majority of them believed it to be one of the most meaningful classes in their educational careers. Kranz and Lund’s study closely resemble the current study however, Kranz and Lund utilize interviews to gain insight on the influence of the course in their lives. The present study utilizes survey methods to gain a general idea of whether a relationship exists between exposure to multicultural course content and students’ attitudes of racial/ethnic groups.

Another study reveals how graduate and undergraduate students were taught about white privilege in sociology courses (Pence and Fields 1999). Graduate students performed field experiments in which a white and a black student went out into their local community with others as observers and performed typical everyday tasks, from renting an apartment to buying consumer goods. For example, the black graduate student went to a car dealership and asked to test drive a new car. The salesperson informed the student that the car keys were unavailable and to come back later for a test drive. Five minutes later, the white graduate student came to the dealership and asked to drive the same car. The same salesperson gave the keys to the white student and told him to “come

back when you know the car” (Pence and Fields 1999:154). In another example, the two students went to an apartment manager separately and asked about an apartment for rent. The manager told the black student to call back in two days and then later informed the white student that the apartment was available immediately. The results of these experiments demonstrate the discrimination black individuals’ face routinely. The experiments successfully taught students about the privileges that come with being white in American society and they were able to relate it to their everyday lives.

Chang (2002), in his study of the impact of diversity courses on undergraduate students, did a comparative analysis of those who had completed their diversity requirement and those who had just started it. Chang sampled undergraduate students at a northeast University where students were required to take a diversity course in fulfillment of a campus-wide requirement. The courses included issues of diversity encompassing race, class, gender, culture, disability, etc. Chang utilized the Modern Racism Scale that measures people’s level of prejudice towards blacks. Those students who completed the requirements tended to be more favorable towards blacks than those who had just begun taking the requirements (Chang 2002). This study suggests that curricula including courses covering issues of diversity may improve race relations in American society. The current study intends to see if exposure to multicultural course content is associated with racial attitudes, similar to Chang’s findings.

Other studies have found that courses about race and ethnicity may serve as "a buffer against diminishing intergroup tolerance" for white students (Henderson-King and Kaleta 2000:53). In other words, the race and ethnicity courses may prevent students from developing further intolerance toward racial/ethnic groups. The white students who

were *not-enrolled* in any of the four race and ethnicity courses displayed a decrease in tolerance, exhibiting fewer positive attitudes toward social groups. Although the race and ethnicity courses did not diminish intolerant attitudes in white students, Henderson-King and Kaleta assert that the courses may have acted as a buffer in increasing negativity towards others racial/ethnic groups. Henderson-King and Kaleta sent questionnaires to students at the beginning and at the end a semester. The sample included those students who were taking a race and ethnicity course and those who were not-enrolled in any of the four race and ethnicity courses offered at the University. The authors point out that the students who were in the not enrolled sample may have taken a race and ethnicity course in a previous semester and were included in the sample simply because they were not *currently* enrolled. Because Henderson-King and Kaleta sampled the not-enrolled group in this fashion, their results may have been skewed by an over-representation of students who had taken a race and ethnicity course in a previous semester. The present study provides an exhaustive list of courses with multicultural content to students in order to ensure that the sample identified as, no exposure, will actually represent students who have not taken courses with multicultural content.

Furthermore, Henderson-King and Kaleta used a feelings thermometer that measures students' feelings toward social groups, including various racial and ethnic groups. Respondents indicated their feelings on a scale of 0 (negative) to 100 (positive), low scores signifying negative feelings and high scores signifying positive ones. While the scale is very similar to the social distance scale in terms of purpose, the underlying measurement is clearly different. Whereas the social distance utilizes seven degrees of

measurement, the feelings thermometer uses a wide range of measurement that demonstrates some difficulty when interpreting the results of the data.

Clavijo (1984) conducted an experiment on the effects of including aspects of South American culture while teaching a Spanish-language course. Four Spanish courses were randomly chosen for the study, two of which would provide instruction to students on aspects of Hispanic and Latino culture. Clavijo used the revised Bogardus Social Distance Scale to measure the attitudes of students toward 21 different racial/ethnic groups, seven of which were from South American countries. Clavijo also used the questionnaire, *How North Americans Perceive South Americans*, which includes questions regarding culture, similarities, and favorability. The study revealed a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in terms of social distance. The inclusion of information on the Latin culture considerably decreased the level of social distance students had toward South Americans (Clavijo 1984). The current study will expand on Clavijo's findings by examining the association between exposure to multicultural course content and racial attitudes.

Hypotheses

Many of the studies in the literature review suggest that there is a relationship between exposure to multicultural courses (i.e., exposure versus non exposure) and social distance and racial attitudes. The literature also demonstrates that the social distance scale and the QDI have not been used together in a study. This study investigates those relationships. First, it is hypothesized that students who have had exposure to courses with multicultural content would exhibit lower degrees of social distance than those who

have not had exposure. Secondly, it is hypothesized that students who have had exposure to courses with multicultural content would score higher in the QDI subscales than those who have not had exposure. Therefore, the formal hypotheses for this study are as follows:

- Students who have had exposure to courses with multicultural content exhibit higher scores in cognitive aspects of racial attitudes than those who had no exposure to courses with multicultural content.
- Students who have had exposure to courses with multicultural content exhibit higher scores in affective (interracial interaction) aspects of racial attitudes than those who had no exposure to courses with multicultural content.
- Students who have had exposure to courses with multicultural content exhibit lower degrees of social distance than those who had no exposure to courses with multicultural content.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Sample

The population selected for this study is defined as students enrolled in 3000 and 4000 level courses at Texas State University. The courses chosen are upper division and, therefore, are likely to produce a sample of junior and senior students. In turn, a sample of junior and senior students provided a higher probability of obtaining a sample of students who have had exposure to multicultural course content than sampling the entire student population. At the time of this study, 5443 juniors and 7402 seniors were enrolled for the Fall 2003 semester at Texas State, which consists about 49 percent of the student population. The University's racial/ethnic composition based on juniors and seniors was 74.4 percent white, 5.2 percent black¹, 20.4 percent Hispanic, and 5 percent other (Asian, American Indian, and international). The sex distribution based on juniors and seniors at the University is: 44.7 percent males and 55.3 percent females. Many of the juniors and seniors were enrolled in one of the eight colleges found at the University. For this study, seven out of the eight colleges at the University were included in this study (percentages are based on juniors and seniors): Applied Arts (13 percent), Business

¹ It should be noted that the proportion of blacks at the university is much lower than whites and Hispanics in terms of the general population.

Administration (16.5 percent), Education (16.8 percent), Fine Arts and Communication (18.1 percent), Health Professions (4.8 percent), Liberal Arts (20.2 percent), and Science (10.7 percent). The University College was not used to obtain the sample because this student population is relatively small and many are enrolled in one of the seven other colleges.

The purpose of this study was to examine the racial attitudes of juniors and seniors enrolled at Texas State. A representative sample of juniors and seniors was desired. A multistage sample design was employed to produce a sample of juniors and seniors. First, the researcher asked an employee at the Registrar's Office to compile a list that contained all 3000 and 4000 level courses offered on campus, divided by college. The list also provided pertinent information that facilitated the sampling process, such as: course section, days, times, building, room number, number of students enrolled, and instructors' emails. Second, the list was filtered to exclude those courses that contained fewer than 25 students or more than 98 students enrolled. This precaution was intended to prevent either an over-representation or an under-representation of a single course. Since the list was divided by college, the remaining courses were numbered as follows to aid in the sampling process: 1-60 for Applied Arts, 1-71 for Education, 1-158 for Liberal Arts, 1-53 for Science, 1-142 for Business Administration, 1-66 for Fine Arts and 1-26 for Health Professions. Keeping the courses separated by college, allowed the researcher to select the courses from each college independently from the other six colleges. Third, in order to maintain representativeness in each college, a goal of at least three courses from each college was pursued for a total of 21 courses. Fourth, from a table of random

numbers found in a social science research textbook (Babbie 1999:433-434), the courses chosen for the study were randomly selected.

Students in 25 classes throughout the seven colleges were administered the survey: three in Applied Arts, five in Business Administration, three in Education, four in Fine Arts, four in Health Professions, three in Liberal Arts, and three in Science. Two of the courses that in the sample were labs and the professors were asked if the survey could be administered to the core class; both accepted. A remainder of 36 courses were not included in the sample due to refusals or no response by instructors. This yielded an overall participation rate of about 41 percent.

The survey was administered to 688 undergraduate students enrolled in one of the 25 courses found within the seven colleges at Texas State. The sample included 140 juniors and 538 seniors. In terms of race/ethnicity, there were 484 whites, 30 blacks, and 120 Hispanics. In all three groups, approximately half of the respondents reported exposure to multicultural course content and half reported no exposure. Specifically, for whites, 233 reported exposure and 261 reported no exposure; for blacks, 16 reported exposure and 14 reported no exposure; and for Hispanics, 61 reported exposure and 60 reported no exposure.

Variable Identification and Definition

The independent variables utilized in this study are two: exposure to multicultural course content and race/ethnicity. In order to examine whether exposure to multicultural content is associated with social distance and racial attitudes, the respondents were divided into two groups: (1) *exposure* to courses with multicultural content and (2) *no*

exposure to courses with multicultural content. As for race/ethnicity, whites, blacks, and Hispanics were compared in order to examine how each group differed in their cognitive and affective racial attitudes and to gauge their level of intimacy toward the other two groups.

The dependent variables utilized in this study are three: cognitive racial attitudes (CRA), affective racial attitudes (ARA), and social distance. Cognitive racial attitudes are defined in this study as attitudes toward racial minorities and toward various issues regarding multiculturalism. Students answered questions relating their attitudes toward minorities in school, business, and society such as affirmative action programs and multiculturalism in education. Affective racial attitudes are defined as attitudes toward interracial interaction in a number of social situations. Here, students answered questions involving relationships and friendships with minorities. Finally, the social distance (conative attitudes) is defined as the degrees of intimacy a person is willing to establish with a person from another racial/ethnic group. Here, students identify the closest type of relationship they would have with a person from another racial/ethnic group.

Survey Instrument

The survey instrument used in this study consists of four main sections: (1) a list of courses with multicultural content, (2) the QDI developed by Ponterotto et al. (1995), (3) the social distance scale amended by Morrissey (1992), and (4) general demographic questions. In order to tap the three dimensions of prejudice, the QDI scale was used to measure cognitive and affective racial attitudes and the social distance scale was used to measure conative racial attitudes. A total of 48 questions were asked, which consisted of

45 closed-ended and three open-ended questions. In the first section, respondents were asked to look carefully through the list of courses with multicultural content offered at Texas State and to place a check next to those they have taken. Respondents were informed that if they had taken the course at another university they should check it; however, if they were currently taking the course, to leave it blank. For the purpose of this study, the researcher wanted to examine those students who had completed the courses to see if they displayed a difference compared to those with no exposure.

The list of courses with multicultural content used in the study was compiled with the help of a report obtained from the Center for Multicultural and Gender Studies at Texas State developed in February of 2003. The report provided two lists pertinent to the development of the list used in the survey: (1) multicultural courses required by degree programs and (2) other multicultural courses. The first list was developed by the Center using a specific set of criteria, primarily that the class “should have a minimum of 60 percent of the content with a focus on multicultural issues” (Center for Multicultural and Gender Studies 2003:1). The 54 courses found on the first list were included in the questionnaire. The second list had 93 possibilities of other courses with multicultural content. Because the second list was too long to add to the first list, it was narrowed down using course descriptions found in the undergraduate catalog and the criterion used for the multicultural courses required by the degree program. Fifty-nine additional courses were added to the original 54 for a total of 113 courses for respondents to choose from. Even though the second list was narrowed down, the final list for students to identify if they have taken any of the classes with multicultural content appeared overwhelming at first glance. It was suspected that some students may not carefully look

through the entire list. As a result of this presumption, three versions of the same list were made in order to prevent a large number of students who may have quickly looked through the list and not carefully identify which courses they have taken. Therefore, those students who did not take any of the courses were identified as “no exposure to multicultural course content.” Those students who took one or more courses were identified as “exposure to multicultural course content.”

The second section of the survey, the QDI, has a Likert-scale format. Respondents were prompted to choose from five possible responses (strongly agree, agree, not sure, disagree, and strongly disagree) gauging the intensity of their views on particular statements concerning matters of racial minorities, multiculturalism, and interracial interaction (Ponterotto et al. 2002). Apparent from the review of literature, the QDI provides an effective measure of cognitive and affective racial attitudes. The index contains 30 items, half of which are scored in a positive direction, and the other half in a negative direction. The items scored in a negative direction are statements that are negatively worded in order to prevent response bias (Ponterotto et al. 2002). After the data were collected, the 15 negative items were reversed scored to obtain total scores with all of the responses going in a positive direction. The specific items that were reversed scored are as follows²: 1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 23, 25, 29, and 30. As mentioned earlier in the literature review, the QDI has two scoring methods. The second method, the three subscales, was used to score the respondents' answers. In this study, only two of the subscales were used in the analysis, measuring cognitive racial attitudes and affective racial attitudes. The questions regarding gender issues were not utilized in the analysis because of the lack of association to courses with multicultural content.

² The following information on the subscales was provided by Ponterotto by email.

However, based on the recommendation of Ponterotto et al. (2002), the entire QDI scale was administered in the survey.

Below are the 16 items used in each subscale ³(those that are in parentheses were reverse scored)⁴:

- Subscale 1- Cognitive racial attitudes: (3), (9), (13), (18), (19), 22, (23), 26, 27. [Score range = 9 to 45]
- Subscale 2- Affective racial attitudes: 4, 8, 11, (15), 17, 24, (29). [Score range = 7 to 35]

As mentioned earlier, the variable for cognitive racial attitudes measures attitudes toward racial minorities and issues regarding multiculturalism. For example, attitudes toward racial minorities were measured in questions such as; “Overall, I think racial minorities in America complain too much about racial discrimination” (see questionnaire in Appendix B). The variable regarding attitudes toward issues of multiculturalism has questions such as, “I think the school system, from elementary school through college, should promote values representative of diverse cultures” (see questionnaire in Appendix B). The variable identified as affective racial attitudes, measures attitudes toward interracial interaction. An example of the questions used in this subscale is “My friendship network is very racially mixed” (see questionnaire in Appendix B). When scoring the respondents’ answers, all of the items within each subscale are added for a total score. High scores in each of the subscales indicate that the respondent holds positive attitudes toward racial minorities and interracial contact. Low scores indicate the respondent holds negative attitudes toward racial minorities and interracial contact (Ponterotto et al. 2002).

³ The following information on the subscales was provided by Ponterotto by email.

⁴ The specific items can be found in Appendix B.

The third section of the survey utilizes the social distance scale, which is a Guttman-type scale. Here, respondents chose from seven possible answers, each identifying the degree of closeness or social intimacy the respondent is willing to have with a person from a different racial/ethnic group. As mentioned previously, social distance focuses on the behavioral (conative) dimensions of prejudice (Ehrlich 1973). This scale assists in uncovering how an individual may behave in a given social setting with a person from a different racial/ethnic group. Although this scale was developed in 1925, many social scientists have used it as a method of uncovering conative dimensions of prejudice (Morrissey 1992; Muir 1990, 1991; Sparrow and Chretien 1993). The responses used in the original social distance scale pertained to the historical period and social environment of the 1920s. This researcher utilized the amended social distance scale by Morrissey (1992), which has responses more applicable to college students' interactions. The responses are as follows: (1) converse with, (2) attend the same party, (3) dine at family home, (4) have as roommate, (5) date, (6) engage in sexual relationship, and (7) establish long-term relationship (including marriage) (Morrissey 1992:121). Responses one and seven signify the two extremes of relationships most commonly found in the university setting appropriate for this study. Those respondents who have a high social distance *score* tend to have lower degrees of social distance as defined in the literature (Bogardus 1959, 1925a). That is, they are more comfortable in close relationships than those with a low score. Conversely, those respondents who have a low social distance score tend to prefer more social distance. A list of twelve racial/ethnic groups were listed for respondents to answer the degree of intimacy they

would have with someone from another group. The list of racial/ethnic groups is as follows:

- Jewish Americans
- African Americans
- Native Americans
- Mexican Americans
- Indian Americans
- Cuban Americans
- White Americans
- Japanese Americans
- Puerto Rican Americans
- Middle Eastern Americans
- Chinese Americans
- Korean Americans

Only three groups were used in the analysis of this study: White Americans, African Americans, and Mexican Americans. The rationale to analyze only three groups was based on the fact that only three of these groups are primarily seen in Texas and at the University⁵. In order to interpret students' social distance scores, the total scores included the means of only two of the three racial/ethnic groups under analysis (White Americans, African Americans, and Mexican Americans⁶). Respondents own racial ethnic group was not included in the analyses because the study concentrates on social distance toward other groups.

The fourth section of the survey consists of five demographic questions relative to sex, student classification, race/ethnicity, major, and college. Two close-ended questions ask for the student's sex and classification. The remaining three questions (race/ethnicity, major, what college are you enrolled in) were left as open-ended because of the variety of possible responses. The questions asking for students' major and college were utilized to identify in which college each respondent was enrolled. With the respondents' major, the researcher could identify the respondents' college enrollment.

⁵ It should be noted that originally the researcher intended to analyze all of the groups but due to methodological issues, only three were used. The limitations section of chapter five provides further explanation of these issues.

⁶ The groups White Americans, African Americans, and Mexican Americans were identified as whites, blacks, and Hispanics to provide consistency in the language throughout the rest of the document.

Data Collection

The instructors were contacted by email and notified that one of their specific classes was randomly selected to be included in the study. Each instructor was asked for permission to distribute the survey in his or her class for ten minutes within the next four weeks. If the instructors granted permission, they were asked to send an email back stating their acceptance to participate and to provide possible dates and times to distribute the survey. After waiting four days, those instructors who did not respond to the emails were then contacted by phone for a follow up of their status. For every refusal, a new course was randomly selected in the table of random numbers and the new instructor was contacted by email and given a follow-up phone call, if necessary.

The collection process took approximately three weeks. Seven volunteers were used to help administer the surveys to resolve time conflicts and to expedite the distribution and collection process. Many of the classes selected for the sample were taught at the same time and a few conflicted with the researcher's work schedule. Volunteers were given specific directions on how to administer the survey: to reiterate confidentiality and instructions, to shuffle students surveys to maintain anonymity, to refrain from discussing respondents' answers with other volunteers, to keep a record of those who have already taken the survey, and to debrief respondents on purpose of study.

Statistical Analysis

Primary analysis rested upon the t test for independent samples. In short, the t test was used to analyze any potential differences between those students who had exposure

to multicultural course content and those who did not have exposure with respect to the three measures, the two subscales and social distance scale. Specifically, the differences within each racial/ethnic group (whites, blacks, and Hispanics) of those students who have taken multicultural courses and those who have not were examined. Aside from testing each hypothesis, secondary analyses were performed on the three measures⁷ to uncover other findings in the data: Chi-square test to test the relationship between exposure and three of the demographic variables (sex, race/ethnicity, and student classification); independent samples *t* test to find differences based on sex and student classification in terms of the three measures; and one-way ANOVA to test the difference between race/ethnicity in terms of the three measures.

The null hypotheses tested are:

- There is no difference in the cognitive racial attitudes between students who have had exposure to courses with multicultural content and those who have had no exposure.
- There is no difference in the affective racial attitudes between students who have had exposure to courses with multicultural content and those who have had no exposure.
- There is no difference in the degrees of social distance between students who have had exposure to courses with multicultural content and those who have had no exposure.

⁷ In the testing of the differences based on sex, student classification, and race/ethnicity the total social distance score included all three racial/ethnic groups (whites, blacks, and Hispanics) to provide uniformity in the secondary analyses.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Characteristics of the Sample

Information regarding the demographic characteristics obtained through the survey is as follows: sex, race/ethnicity, student classification, and academic college. Frequency distributions were performed based on each demographic variable to determine the overall distribution of the sample⁸. Over 60.3 percent of the respondents were female with and 39.7 percent were male (see Table 1). The overall racial/ethnic distribution of the sample is as follows: 76.3 percent white, 4.7 percent black, and 18.9 percent Hispanic (see Table 2). The majority of the sample were seniors with 79.4 percent and 20.6 percent for juniors (see Table 3); 13 sophomores and 22 graduate students were excluded from the sample.

The distribution of respondents enrolled in the academic colleges are as follows: 9.6 percent from Applied Arts, 22.8 percent from Business Administration, 13.6 percent from Education, 15.1 percent from Fine Arts and Communications, 14.2 percent from Health Professions, 12.2 percent from Liberal Arts, and 12.5 percent from Science. (see

⁸ Chi-square goodness-of-fit tests were performed between the sample and the actual population of juniors and seniors based on all demographic variables (sex, race/ethnicity, student classification, and academic college). The sample proved to be representative of the larger population on all demographic variables.

Table 4). The large number of students from the Business College can be explained by the two additional surveys distributed in the college.

Test of Hypotheses

The first hypothesis stated that students who have had exposure to courses with multicultural content exhibit higher scores in cognitive aspects of racial attitudes than those who had no exposure to courses with multicultural content. Of the three racial/ethnic groups examined in this study, whites demonstrated a significant difference in cognitive racial attitudes between those who had exposure and those who did not. White students who responded that they had no exposure to courses with multicultural content had a mean score of 26.27, while those who reported exposure had a mean score of 27.47. The difference was significant at the .05 level. Significant differences were also observed when focusing on the differences between those with exposure and those with no exposure in terms of all the respondents. Those respondents with no exposure had a mean score of 27.87 and those with exposure had a mean score of 28.88. The difference was significant at the .05 level. This finding based on all the respondents may largely be a product of the differences found in whites, which constitute the majority of the sample. As for the cognitive racial attitudes of blacks and Hispanics, no significant differences were found between those who reported exposure and those who reported no exposure (see Table 5).

The second hypothesis stated students who have had exposure to courses with multicultural content exhibit higher scores in affective (interracial interaction) aspects of racial attitudes than those who had no exposure to courses with multicultural content. Of

the three racial/ethnic groups examined in this study, whites demonstrated a significant difference in affective racial attitudes between those who had exposure and those who did not. White students who reported no exposure to courses with multicultural content had a mean score of 24.16 while those who reported exposure had a mean score of 25.15. The difference was significant at the .05 level. As for the affective racial attitudes of blacks, Hispanics, and all respondents no significant differences were found between those who reported exposure and those who reported no exposure (see Table 5).

The third hypothesis stated that students who have had exposure to courses with multicultural content exhibit lower degrees of social distance than those who had no exposure to courses with multicultural content. Of the three racial/ethnic groups examined in this study, none of the groups demonstrated a significant difference in social distance related to exposure to multicultural course content. When focusing on all the respondents no significant differences were observed. Therefore, we can infer that there is no significant difference in the social distance of those who have had exposure to courses with multicultural content and those who have had no exposure (see Table 5).

The demographic variables relating to sex, student classification, and academic college were controlled to uncover any underlying relationships between those with no exposure and those with exposure. Introducing a third variable in the analysis helps further explain the relationship between two variables; exposure and the three measures. The data is split based on each demographic characteristic and then tested to identify if any differences exist in the sample. When controlling for sex, student classification, and academic college, no significant differences were identified in the sample with respect to exposure.

Other Analyses

In an effort to sort out and bring a better understanding to the above findings, additional tests were performed. A Chi-square analysis was performed to examine if any relationship existed between exposure to multicultural course content and three of the demographic variables: sex, race/ethnicity, and student classification. No significant associations were observed in exposure by sex (see Table 6) and in exposure by race/ethnicity (see Table 7), therefore no variations exist in the distributions by sex and by race/ethnicity. On the other hand, a significant association existed between exposure and student classification. The association was significant at the .05 level (see Table 8). The variation between juniors and seniors in terms of exposure may be a result of the fact that many juniors are in the beginning phases of taking 3000 and 4000 level courses where most of the courses with multicultural content are offered.

Independent samples *t* test was performed to test the differences based on sex and on student classification. In terms of males and females, significant differences were found in cognitive and affective racial attitudes but not in the total social distance score toward the three racial/ethnic groups (white, blacks, and Hispanics). Males had mean scores of 26.50 CRA and 24.86 ARA while females had mean scores of 29.45 CRA and 25.93 ARA. The difference was significant at the .05 level (see Table 9). As for juniors and seniors, no significant differences were found in any of the three measures (see Table 10).

A one-way ANOVA test was performed to test the differences based on race/ethnicity with respect to the three measures. In terms of whites, blacks, and Hispanics, significant differences were found in cognitive and affective racial attitudes

and total social distance score (toward all three racial/ethnic groups). In terms of the mean scores in CRA, whites had 26.82, blacks 34.67, and Hispanics 31.52. As for the mean score in ARA, whites had 24.61, blacks 25.77, and Hispanics 28.10. Finally, the mean scores for total social distance were 17.15 for whites, 16.64 for blacks, and 17.97 for Hispanics. The difference was significant at the .05 level (see Table 11). An additional independent samples *t* test was performed to examine if any differences existed between each racial/ethnic group in terms of social distance toward specific groups: blacks and Hispanics social distance toward whites, whites and blacks social distance toward Hispanics, and whites and Hispanics social distance toward blacks. Significant differences were found between blacks and Hispanics with respect to social distance toward whites (mean scores: blacks 5.24 and Hispanics 6.23, see Table 12) and between whites and blacks with respect to social distance toward Hispanics (mean scores: whites 5.48 and blacks 4.52, see Table 12). The differences were significant at the .05 level. As for whites and Hispanics social distance toward blacks, no significant differences were observed.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Discussion of Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between exposure to multicultural course content and racial attitudes. The literature demonstrated that a multicultural curriculum had significant effects how individuals perceive other racial/ethnic groups. The results of the primary analysis reported here suggest that certain aspects of racial attitudes may be related to exposure to multicultural course content, but the finding is limited. In short, the finding seems to apply to white students, but it does not apply to blacks or Hispanics. Although this finding within whites is significant, the design used in this study does not make it possible to infer any sort of causality. The difference may be a result of students' predisposition to enroll in courses with multicultural content. In other words, it is possible that students who enroll in courses with multicultural content may hold favorable attitudes towards racial minorities prior to taking the course. But, this explanation of students' predisposition is as valid as the explanation of exposure to multicultural course content causing the difference.

The results of the current study add to the findings of Hansman et al. in their study of graduate students' attitudes toward race and gender. Hansman et al. revealed that those who had completed multicultural courses had higher scores than those who had

not, similar to the results of this study in terms of whites. Additionally, the current study's results also resembled Chang's findings of the impact of diversity courses on undergraduate students. Chang (2002) revealed that significant differences exist between those who had nearly completed their diversity requirements and those who had just started them. White students in this study who had exposure to multicultural course content displayed had higher scores in terms of attitudes toward minorities, issues regarding multiculturalism, and interracial interaction than those with no exposure, much like Chang's study. Although Chang did not specifically examine whites, he did reveal that the multicultural courses influenced students' perceptions about blacks.

A conceivable explanation as to why blacks and Hispanics did not exhibit significant differences in cognitive and affective racial attitudes is the likelihood that the life experiences of minorities possibly give them exposure to much of the type of material that is traditionally associated with multicultural courses. Many blacks and Hispanics come from ethnic enclaves where people in the community express elements of their culture to help maintain ties to their motherland and ethnic identity (Marger 2000). Therefore, minorities who take these courses with multicultural content may not exhibit significant changes in their overall racial attitudes.

In terms of the social distance scale, there are two possible explanations as to why no significant differences were found between those who had exposure and those who did not. First, even though many social scientists have historically continued to rely upon the social distance scale to measure conative attitudes of prejudice, it may well be the case that the scale is becoming outdated. The second explanation pertains especially to whites. Since the overt expression of prejudice has become more of a socially

undesirable type of behavior, those white students who had no exposure might have responded differently in terms of the level of intimacy they would have with a black or Hispanic person. Dovidio and Gaertner (1986) revealed whites have the tendency to avoid their feelings about racial/ethnic groups in order not to appear racist. If this is the case, then the study may have not revealed the true attitudes whites had toward the two racial ethnic groups.

As for the secondary analyses performed, significant differences were observed in four of the tests. In terms of differences between males and females, females exhibited significantly higher scores in terms of cognitive racial attitudes and affective racial attitudes than males. Although this test is not directly related to the primary analysis, it does reveal that females may hold more positive attitudes toward minorities and multiculturalism. This may be a product of how women and racial minorities hold similar experiences with regards to prejudice and the resemblance in values with respect to equal rights under the law. In the one-way ANOVA test of the relationship between race/ethnicity and the three measures, significant differences were found between whites, blacks, and Hispanics with respect to cognitive racial attitudes, affective racial attitudes and social distance. Overall all three groups exhibited positive attitudes toward both subscales. Blacks had the highest scores with respect to cognitive racial attitudes. This may largely be explained by the fact that issues of affirmative action and multiculturalism is largely discussed amongst the black community and are practices commonly accepted by blacks. As for affective racial attitudes, Hispanics displayed the highest scores compared to whites and blacks. Hispanic students may find it more acceptable to interact with other racial minorities due to the fact that within their racial/ethnic category, the skin

color of many Hispanics can range from very light skinned to very dark skinned which in some aspects helps the group relate to the characteristics of other minorities.

Finally, significant differences were found between blacks and Hispanics with respect to the social distance toward whites. Hispanics displayed less social distance toward whites than blacks. This may be explained by the fact that many Hispanics do adopt many of the Western cultural ways that were created by whites which help establish similarities between the groups (Marger 2000). In terms of the differences between whites and blacks with respect to social distance toward Hispanics, significant differences were found between the two groups. Whites displayed less social distance toward Hispanics than blacks. This finding may be explained by the fact that historically, Hispanics have held an intermediate ethnic status between whites and blacks. This result is explained with much of the same reasoning used above, many Hispanics have adopted white American values and many are similar in terms of physical characteristics (Marger 2000).

Limitations

In this study, a number of limitations were encountered throughout the operationalization, data collection, and writing of this thesis. First, during the construction of the list of courses with multicultural content offered at Texas State University, 59 of the courses were selected by the author according to the main criteria used by Center for Multicultural and Gender Studies. Although this researcher used this criterion to narrow down the list of other possible multicultural courses, possible biases may have influenced the selection of courses considered to have 60 percent of the content

with a focus on multicultural issues. The courses that were not selected may have provided some students with an experience conducive to enhancing understandings of multicultural issues and racial/ethnic relations not evident to this researcher. Another problem of the list of courses is that some students may have taken a course with multicultural content at another college that is not offered at Texas State or may have had a different course title. Finally, the researcher realized that some students may not remember all of the courses they have taken throughout their entire college experience. Many students may not have checked some of the courses because they did not remember taking them. If this was the case, then those who did have exposure but did not report it may have influenced the results of the analysis.

A second limitation to the study is that multicultural courses may reflect aspects of minority students' own racial/ethnic group. The purpose of this study was to observe whether learning and understanding the experiences about different racial/ethnic groups has an influence on racial attitudes and social distance. If some students have taken classes that reflect aspects of their own racial/ethnic group, they may not be learning much about other racial/ethnic groups. For example, if a black student is taking a course on African American history, he/she may not be learning much about the Hispanic culture and way of life.

A third limitation became apparent during the data collection. Married respondents may have had difficulties in responding to the social distance scale index. That is, many of the married respondents may have answered differently because of the fact that they are already involved in a relationship that pertains to three of the measures

used in the scale: date, engage in sexual relationship, and long term relationship. If this was the case then this may have also influenced the results of this study.

Finally, this study originally intended to measure the twelve racial/ethnic groups listed in the social distance scale. But since many of these groups are not found at the University and in Texas, it was not reasonable to include them in the analysis. It was recognized that many students would find it hard to relate to these groups because several of them do not reside within Texas or attend the University. Furthermore, many of these groups are not a part of students' usual realm of interaction.

In addition, it was recognized that most people would not be able distinguish between many of the groups listed such as, Chinese Americans, Korean Americans, and Japanese Americans or Puerto Rican Americans, Mexican Americans, and Cuban Americans. To make the assumption that students can identify these specific groups in social interactions would be false. Since this was the case, in the final analysis only White Americans, African Americans, and Mexican Americans were used. Due to the above-mentioned problems, it is possible that students may have answered differently on the social distance scale. Because respondents had to identify their attitudes toward several groups, many may have selected answers that did not portray themselves as prejudiced.

Recommendations for Further Research

The present study reveals significant differences in whites' cognitive and affective attitudes relating to those with exposure to multicultural course content compared to those who have not. It is recommended that future studies examine the literature on

minority's attitudes toward whites and other minorities. This may assist future researchers in understanding their results and uncover subtleties in the data.

Additionally, future researchers may want to include questions relating to students' experience in high school and their respective neighborhoods in order to understand their definition of the world prior to coming to college. Furthermore, a question asking students marital status may aid in uncovering if respondents answer differently in the social distance scale.

Some other recommendations are researchers should set time limits for respondents to answer quickly and to perform the same study but with an experimental design. Ponterotto and Bogardus both mention that the time it takes respondents to fill out the survey is crucial. Researchers will want the respondents to answer with their first impression and to give little time for respondents to think about their answers so that they do not answer according to what is socially desirable. Finally, a before/after study of exposure to multicultural courses may provide a better perspective of how multicultural course content influences students' racial attitudes and social distance. The current study compared the responses of those who had exposure and those who did not, which do not illustrate how the attitudes might have changed according to exposure. A before/after study would uncover how exposure to multicultural course content influences students' understanding of different racial/ethnic groups and how it might change students' definition of race relations in this world.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

Table 1. Distribution of Population and Sample Results by Sex

Sex	N	Sample (%)	N	Population (%)
Males	269	39.7	5,746	44.7
Females	409	60.3	7,099	55.3
Total	678	100	12,845	100

Table 2. Distribution of Population and Sample Results by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	N	Sample (%)	N	Population (%)
Whites	484	76.3	9,232	74.4
Blacks	30	4.7	647	5.2
Hispanics	120	18.9	2,528	20.4
Total	634	100	12,407	100

Table 3. Distribution of Population and Sample Results by Student Classification

Student Classification	N	Sample (%)	N	Population (%)
Juniors	140	20.6	5,443	42.4
Seniors	538	79.4	7,402	57.6
Total	678	100	12,845	100

Table 4. Distribution of Population and Sample Results by Academic College

Academic College	N	Sample (%)	N	Population (%)
Applied Arts	65	9.6	1,623	13
Business Administration	154	22.8	2,066	16.5
Education	92	13.6	2,097	16.8
Fine Arts and Communication	102	15.1	2,256	18.1
Health Professions	96	14.2	593	4.8
Liberal Arts	82	12.2	2,521	20.2
Science	84	12.5	1,333	10.7
Total	675	100	12,489	100

Table 5. Independent Samples t Test, Scores by Exposure
(All Respondents, Whites, Blacks, Hispanics)

Race/ Ethnicity	Measures	Mean Scores		Std. Error of the Differ. of means	df	<i>t</i> computed	<i>t</i> critical	Sign. At the .05 level
		No exposure	Exposure					
All Respondents	Cognitive racial attitudes	27.87	28.88	.488	681	2.062	1.96	.040
	Affective racial attitudes	25.20	25.87	.406	681	1.660	1.96	.097
	Total social distance on three groups	17.13	17.26	.265	663	.482	1.96	.630
Whites	Cognitive racial attitudes	26.27	27.47	.554	479	2.169	1.96	.031
	Affective racial attitudes	24.16	25.15	.494	478	2.012	1.96	.045
	Social distance toward blacks and Hispanics	10.14	10.40	.296	473	.870	1.96	.385
Blacks	Cognitive racial attitudes	35.14	34.25	1.996	28	.447	1.96	.658
	Affective racial attitudes	26.00	25.56	1.613	28	.271	1.96	.788
	Social distance toward white and Hispanics	9.83	10.00	1.493	26	.112	1.96	.912
Hispanics	Cognitive racial attitudes	31.17	31.85	1.032	118	.662	1.96	.510
	Affective racial attitudes	28.29	27.92	.750	118	.493	1.96	.623
	Social distance toward whites and blacks	11.14	11.27	.530	115	.251	1.96	.802

Table 6. Chi-square, Exposure by Sex

Count		Sex		
		Male	Female	Total
Students exposure to multicultural course content	no exposure to multicultural courses	144	213	357
	exposure to multicultural courses	125	196	321
Total		269	409	678

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.137 ^b	1	.711		
Continuity Correction ^a	.085	1	.770		
Likelihood Ratio	.138	1	.711		
Fisher's Exact Test				.753	.385
Linear-by-Linear Association	.137	1	.711		
N of Valid Cases	678				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 127.36.

Table 7. Chi-Square, Exposure by Race/Ethnicity

Count		Race/Ethnicity			Total
		White	Black	Hispanic	
Students exposure to multicultural course content	no exposure to multicultural courses	261	14	59	334
	exposure to multicultural courses	223	16	61	300
Total		484	30	120	634

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.331 ^a	2	.514
Continuity Correction			
Likelihood Ratio	1.329	2	.515
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.063	1	.303
N of Valid Cases	634		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.20.

Table 8. Chi-Square, Exposure by Student Classification

Count		Student Classification		
		Junior	Senior	Total
Students exposure to multicultural course content	no exposure to multicultural courses	91	267	358
	exposure to multicultural courses	49	271	320
Total		140	538	678

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.533 ^b	1	.001		
Continuity Correction ^a	9.925	1	.002		
Likelihood Ratio	10.695	1	.001		
Fisher's Exact Test				.001	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.517	1	.001		
N of Valid Cases	678				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 66.08.

Table 9. Independent Samples t Test, Scores by Sex
(All Respondents)

	Measures	<u>Mean Scores</u>		Std. Error of the Differ. of means	df	<i>t</i> computed	<i>t</i> critical	Sign. At the .05 level
		Male	Female					
All Respondents	Cognitive racial attitudes	26.50	29.45	.487	672	6.045	1.96	.000
	Affective racial attitudes	24.86	25.93	.414	672	2.589	1.96	.010
	Total social distance on three groups	17.48	17.01	.271	659	1.726	1.96	.085

Table 10. Independent Samples t Test, Scores by Student Classification
(All Respondents)

	Measures	<u>Mean Scores</u>		Std. Error of the Differ. of means	df	<i>t</i> computed	<i>t</i> critical	Sign. At the .05 level
		Juniors	Seniors					
All Respondents	Cognitive racial attitudes	28.20	28.29	.605	672	.140	1.96	.889
	Affective racial attitudes	26.04	25.37	.506	672	1.313	1.96	.190
	Total social distance on three groups	17.55	17.09	.329	659	1.400	1.96	.162

Table 11. One-way ANOVA, Scores by Race/Ethnicity
(All Respondents)

	Measures	<u>Mean Scores</u>			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance at .05 level
		Whites	Blacks	Hispanics					
All Respondents	Cognitive racial attitudes	26.82	34.67	31.52	3480.949	2	1740.474	48.976	.000
	Affective racial attitudes	24.61	25.77	28.10	1175.012	2	587.506	22.282	.000
	Total social distance on three groups	17.15	16.64	17.97	74.751	2	37.376	3.413	.034

Table 12. Independent Samples t Test, Specific Social Distance Scores by Race/Ethnicity
(All Respondents)

	Measures	<u>Mean Scores</u>			Std. Error of the Differ. of means	df	<i>t</i> computed	<i>t</i> critical	Sign. At the .05 level
		Whites	Blacks	Hispanics					
All Respondents	Social distance toward whites	.	5.24	6.23	.336	145	2.935	1.96	.004
	Social distance toward blacks	4.78	.	4.97	.188	592	1.005	1.96	.315
	Social distance toward Hispanics	5.48	4.52	.	.337	502	2.870	1.96	.004

APPENDIX B
QUESTIONNAIRES

Questionnaire (List 1)

These questionnaires will remain strictly confidential and you may refuse to take the survey.

List of Courses

Below is a list of courses offered at Texas State University. Please look carefully for those courses that you have taken and place a check mark next to it (if you have taken it at another college or university, check it). If you are currently taking the class, leave it blank.

- ☐ AG 3310-Diversity Issues in Agriculture
- ☐ ANTH 1312-Cultural Anthropology
- ☐ ANTH 3305-Magic, Ritual and Religion
- ☐ ANTH 3309-Cultures Through Film
- ☐ ANTH 3314-Latin American Cultures
- ☐ ANTH 3315-Archaeology of the Southwest
- ☐ ANTH 3316-Archelogy of Europe, Asia, and Africa
- ☐ ANTH 3322-Peoples and Cultures of Africa
- ☐ ANTH 3323-Cultures of the Middle East
- ☐ ANTH 3324-Mexican American Culture
- ☐ ANTH 3331A-North American Indians
- ☐ ANTH 3331C-Indians of the Southwest
- ☐ ANTH 3332-Myths and Moundbuilders
- ☐ ANTH 3343-Human Variation and Adaptation
- ☐ ANTH 3347-Archeology of North America
- ☐ ANTH 3345-Archeology of Mexico
- ☐ ANTH 3370-Culture and Personality
- ☐ ANTH 3375C-Selected Topics in Anthropology
- ☐ ANTH 4320-Rise of Civilization
- ☐ ARTH 4301-Issues in Contemporary Art
- ☐ ARTH 4302-Latin American Art
- ☐ ARTH 4303-Pre-Columbian Art
- ☐ ARTH 4308-Asian Art
- ☐ CI 3332-Introduction to Bilingual Education
- ☐ CI 4360-Teaching the Bilingual Content Areas
- ☐ CI 4361-Psychological Foundations of Bilingual Education
- ☐ CI 4362-The Elementary Bilingual Content Areas
- ☐ COMM 3329-Intercultural Communication
- ☐ COMM 4322-Rhetoric of Protest Movements
- ☐ ECO 3320-Latin American Economics
- ☐ ENG 3344-Chicano/a Narrative and Social History
- ☐ ENG 3309-The Southwest in Film
- ☐ ENG 3345-Southwestern Studies I: Defining the Region
- ☐ ENG 3346-Southwestern Studies II: Consequences of Region
- ☐ ETHS 3301-Introduction to US Ethnic Studies
- ☐ FCS 4302D-International Family and Consumer Science
- ☐ FCS 4351-Cultural Diversity of Families
- ☐ FR 4370-French Civilization
- ☐ FR 4390-Studies in French Culture, Language, or Literature
- ☐ GER 3370-German Civilization
- ☐ GER 4390- Studies in German Culture, Language, or Literature
- ☐ GEO 1309-Cultural Environment
- ☐ GEO 3306-Geography of the American South
- ☐ GEO 3308-Latin America
- ☐ GEO 3328-Geography of North Africa and the Middle East
- ☐ GEO 3329-Geography of Texas
- ☐ GEO 3332-Geography of South and Southeast Asia
- ☐ GEO 3333-Geography of China and Japan
- ☐ GEO 3353-American Ethnic Geography
- ☐ GEO 4328-Geography of the Russian Realm
- ☐ HA 4303-International Health
- ☐ HIST 3319-Colonial History of Brazil
- ☐ HIST 3322-Colonial History of Latin America to 1828

- ___ HIST 3324-Latin America from Independence to the Present
- ___ HIST 3325-Selected Topics in Latin American History
- ___ HIST 3326-The Southern Cone of Latin America
- ___ HIST 3320-History of Mexico, Independence to the Present
- ___ HIST 3327-History of Mexico to 1848
- ___ HIST 3329-Spanish Borderlands, 1521-1821
- ___ HIST 3353-The Greater Southwest
- ___ HIST 3359-African American History
- ___ HIST 3368C-Introduction to American Indian History
- ___ HIST 3369I-History of Texas Music
- ___ HIST 3369Z-Immigration and Ethnicity
- ___ HIST 3372-Texas History: A Survey
- ___ HIST 3375A-American Labor History, 1877-1945
- ___ HIST 3380-The Desegregation of the South
- ___ HIST 4325-Islamic History to 1798
- ___ HIST 4326-The Modern Middle East
- ___ HIST 4327-The Problem of Palestine
- ___ HIST 4333-History of Russia and Eurasia to 1917
- ___ HIST 4334- History of Russia and Eurasia from 1917 to present
- ___ HIST 4336-Germany from 1815 to the Present
- ___ HIST 4337-Germany and National Socialism, 1918-1945
- ___ HIST 4343-Modern China, 1600-Present
- ___ HIST 4344-Modern Japan, 1600-Present
- ___ HIST 4368-War and Society
- ___ HIST 4372-Mexican American History
- ___ HON 3392E-Silver Screen Texas
- ___ IS 4380-International Studies Seminar
- ___ MC 4382C-Women and Minorities in the Media
- ___ MC 4316A-International Advertising
- ___ MC 4382A-Multiculturalism
- ___ MC 4382B-International Communication
- ___ MGT 3375-International Business - Latin America
- ___ MU 3375-Jazz, Pop, and Rock
- ___ MU 3318-World Musics
- ___ PHIL 3471-Asian Philosophy
- ___ POSI 3312-Constitutional Law: Civil Rights
- ___ POSI 3319-Metropolitan Politics
- ___ POSI 3395-Ethnicity and Nation Building
- ___ POSI 4313-Islamic Law and Politics
- ___ POSI 4314-Middle East Revolution and Nationalism
- ___ POSI 4315-Arab-Israeli Conflict
- ___ POSI 4326-Issues in World Politics
- ___ POSI 4338-Government and Politics of Latin America
- ___ POSI 4340-Government and Politics of Russia
- ___ POSI 4331-Minority Politics (General)
- ___ POSI 4331B-Minority Politics (Hispanic)
- ___ POSI 4331C-Minority Politics (African American)
- ___ POSI 4349-Topics in Comparative Politics
- ___ POSI 4350-Government and Politics of Asia
- ___ POSI 4358-United States-Latin American Relations
- ___ PSY 3334-Psychology of Human Diversity
- ___ RDG 4320-Literacy Education for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Children
- ___ REL 3360-World Religion
- ___ SOCI 3327-Multicultural Relations
- ___ SOCI 3366-Folkways and Folklore: An Introduction
- ___ SOCI 3375-Selected Topics in Sociology
- ___ SOWK 4310-Social Services to Minorities
- ___ SPAN 3370-Spanish Civilization
- ___ SPAN 3371-Spanish-American Civilization
- ___ SPAN 4370-Hispanic Literature of the Southwest: Space and Images
- ___ SPAN 4390-Studies in Spanish Culture, Language, or Literature

Questionnaire (List 2)

These questionnaires will remain strictly confidential and you may refuse to take the survey.

List of Courses

Below is a list of courses offered at Texas State University. Please look carefully for those courses that you have taken and place a check mark next to it (if you have taken it at another college or university, check it). If you are currently taking the class, leave it blank.

- ☐ CI 3332-Introduction to Bilingual Education
- ☐ CI 4360-Teaching the Bilingual Content Areas
- ☐ CI 4361-Psychological Foundations of Bilingual Education
- ☐ CI 4362-The Elementary Bilingual Content Areas
- ☐ COMM 3329-Intercultural Communication
- ☐ COMM 4322-Rhetoric of Protest Movements
- ☐ ECO 3320-Latin American Economics
- ☐ ENG 3344-Chicano/a Narrative and Social History
- ☐ ENG 3309-The Southwest in Film
- ☐ ENG 3345-Southwestern Studies I: Defining the Region
- ☐ ENG 3346-Southwestern Studies II: Consequences of Region
- ☐ ETHS 3301-Introduction to US Ethnic Studies
- ☐ FCS 4302D-International Family and Consumer Science
- ☐ FCS 4351-Cultural Diversity of Families
- ☐ FR 4370-French Civilization
- ☐ FR 4390-Studies in French Culture, Language, or Literature
- ☐ HA 4303-International Health
- ☐ RDG 4320-Literacy Education for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Children
- ☐ REL 3360-World Religion
- ☐ SOCI 3327-Multicultural Relations
- ☐ SOCI 3366-Folkways and Folklore: An Introduction
- ☐ SOCI 3375-Selected Topics in Sociology
- ☐ SOWK 4310-Social Services to Minorities
- ☐ SPAN 3370-Spanish Civilization
- ☐ SPAN 3371-Spanish-American Civilization
- ☐ SPAN 4370-Hispanic Literature of the Southwest: Space and Images
- ☐ SPAN 4390-Studies in Spanish Culture, Language, or Literature
- ☐ HIST 3319-Colonial History of Brazil
- ☐ HIST 3322-Colonial History of Latin America to 1828
- ☐ HIST 3324-Latin America from Independence to the Present
- ☐ HIST 3325-Selected Topics in Latin American History
- ☐ HIST 3326-The Southern Cone of Latin America
- ☐ HIST 3320-History of Mexico, Independence to the Present
- ☐ HIST 3327-History of Mexico to 1848
- ☐ HIST 3329-Spanish Borderlands, 1521-1821
- ☐ HIST 3353-The Greater Southwest
- ☐ HIST 3359-African American History
- ☐ HIST 3368C-Introduction to American Indian History
- ☐ HIST 3369I-History of Texas Music
- ☐ HIST 3369Z-Immigration and Ethnicity
- ☐ HIST 3372-Texas History: A Survey
- ☐ HIST 3375A-American Labor History, 1877-1945
- ☐ HIST 3380-The Desegregation of the South
- ☐ HIST 4325-Islamic History to 1798
- ☐ HIST 4326-The Modern Middle East
- ☐ HIST 4327-The Problem of Palestine
- ☐ HIST 4333-History of Russia and Eurasia to 1917
- ☐ HIST 4334- History of Russia and Eurasia from 1917 to present
- ☐ HIST 4336-Germany from 1815 to the Present
- ☐ HIST 4337-Germany and National Socialism, 1918-1945
- ☐ HIST 4343-Modern China, 1600-Present
- ☐ HIST 4344-Modern Japan, 1600-Present
- ☐ HIST 4368-War and Society
- ☐ HIST 4372-Mexican American History

- ___ HON 3392E-Silver Screen Texas
- ___ IS 4380-International Studies Seminar
- ___ MC 4382C-Women and Minorities in the Media
- ___ MC 4316A-International Advertising
- ___ MC 4382A-Multiculturalism
- ___ MC 4382B-International Communication
- ___ MGT 3375-International Business - Latin America
- ___ MU 3375-Jazz, Pop, and Rock
- ___ MU 3318-World Musics
- ___ GER 3370-German Civilization
- ___ GER 4390- Studies in German Culture, Language, or Literature
- ___ GEO 1309-Cultural Environment
- ___ GEO 3306-Geography of the American South
- ___ GEO 3308-Latin America
- ___ GEO 3328-Geography of North Africa and the Middle East
- ___ GEO 3329-Geography of Texas
- ___ GEO 3332-Geography of South and Southeast Asia
- ___ GEO 3333-Geography of China and Japan
- ___ GEO 3353-American Ethnic Geography
- ___ GEO 4328-Geography of the Russian Realm
- ___ PHIL 3471-Asian Philosophy
- ___ POSI 3312-Constitutional Law: Civil Rights
- ___ POSI 3319-Metropolitan Politics
- ___ POSI 3395-Ethnicity and Nation Building
- ___ POSI 4313-Islamic Law and Politics
- ___ POSI 4314-Middle East Revolution and Nationalism
- ___ POSI 4315-Arab-Israeli Conflict
- ___ POSI 4326-Issues in World Politics
- ___ POSI 4338-Government and Politics of Latin America
- ___ POSI 4340-Government and Politics of Russia
- ___ POSI 4331-Minority Politics (General)
- ___ POSI 4331B-Minority Politics (Hispanic)
- ___ POSI 4331C-Minority Politics (African American)
- ___ POSI 4349-Topics in Comparative Politics
- ___ POSI 4350-Government and Politics of Asia
- ___ POSI 4358-United States-Latin American Relations
- ___ AG 3310-Diversity Issues in Agriculture
- ___ ANTH 1312-Cultural Anthropology
- ___ ANTH 3305-Magic, Ritual and Religion
- ___ ANTH 3309-Cultures Through Film
- ___ ANTH 3314-Latin American Cultures
- ___ ANTH 3315-Archaeology of the Southwest
- ___ ANTH 3316-Archelogy of Europe, Asia, and Africa
- ___ ANTH 3322-Peoples and Cultures of Africa
- ___ ANTH 3323-Cultures of the Middle East
- ___ ANTH 3324-Mexican American Culture
- ___ ANTH 3331A-North American Indians
- ___ ANTH 3331C-Indians of the Southwest
- ___ ANTH 3332-Myths and Moundbuilders
- ___ ANTH 3343-Human Variation and Adaptation
- ___ ANTH 3347-Archeology of North America
- ___ ANTH 3345-Archeology of Mexico
- ___ ANTH 3370-Culture and Personality
- ___ ANTH 3375C-Selected Topics in Anthropology
- ___ ANTH 4320-Rise of Civilization
- ___ ARTH 4301-Issues in Contemporary Art
- ___ ARTH 4302-Latin American Art
- ___ ARTH 4303-Pre-Columbian Art
- ___ ARTH 4308-Asian Art
- ___ PSY 3334-Psychology of Human Diversity

Questionnaire (List 3)

These questionnaires will remain strictly confidential and you may refuse to take the survey.

List of Courses

Below is a list of courses offered at Texas State University. Please look carefully for those courses that you have taken and place a check mark next to it (if you have taken it at another college or university check, it). If you are currently taking the class, leave it blank.

- ☐ PHIL 3471-Asian Philosophy
- ☐ PSY 3334-Psychology of Human Diversity
- ☐ RDG 4320-Literacy Education for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Children
- ☐ REL 3360-World Religion
- ☐ SOCI 3327-Multicultural Relations
- ☐ SOCI 3366-Folkways and Folklore: An Introduction
- ☐ SOCI 3375-Selected Topics in Sociology
- ☐ SOWK 4310-Social Services to Minorities
- ☐ SPAN 3370-Spanish Civilization
- ☐ SPAN 3371-Spanish-American Civilization
- ☐ SPAN 4370-Hispanic Literature of the Southwest: Space and Images
- ☐ SPAN 4390-Studies in Spanish Culture, Language, or Literature
- ☐ ENG 3344-Chicano/a Narrative and Social History
- ☐ ENG 3309-The Southwest in Film
- ☐ ENG 3345-Southwestern Studies I: Defining the Region
- ☐ ENG 3346-Southwestern Studies II: Consequences of Region
- ☐ ETHS 3301-Introduction to US Ethnic Studies
- ☐ AG 3310-Diversity Issues in Agriculture
- ☐ ARTH 4301-Issues in Contemporary Art
- ☐ ARTH 4302-Latin American Art
- ☐ ARTH 4303-Pre-Columbian Art
- ☐ ARTH 4308-Asian Art
- ☐ IS 4380-International Studies Seminar
- ☐ MC 4382C-Women and Minorities in the Media
- ☐ MC 4316A-International Advertising
- ☐ MC 4382A-Multiculturalism
- ☐ MC 4382B-International Communication
- ☐ MGT 3375-International Business - Latin America
- ☐ MU 3375-Jazz, Pop, and Rock
- ☐ MU 3318-World Musics
- ☐ CI 3332-Introduction to Bilingual Education
- ☐ CI 4360-Teaching the Bilingual Content Areas
- ☐ CI 4361-Psychological Foundations of Bilingual Education
- ☐ CI 4362-The Elementary Bilingual Content Areas
- ☐ COMM 3329-Intercultural Communication
- ☐ COMM 4322-Rhetoric of Protest Movements
- ☐ ECO 3320-Latin American Economics
- ☐ FCS 4302D-International Family and Consumer Science
- ☐ FCS 4351-Cultural Diversity of Families
- ☐ FR 4370-French Civilization
- ☐ FR 4390-Studies in French Culture, Language, or Literature
- ☐ GER 3370-German Civilization
- ☐ GER 4390- Studies in German Culture, Language, or Literature
- ☐ HA 4303-International Health
- ☐ POSI 3312-Constitutional Law: Civil Rights
- ☐ POSI 3319-Metropolitan Politics
- ☐ POSI 3395-Ethnicity and Nation Building
- ☐ POSI 4313-Islamic Law and Politics
- ☐ POSI 4314-Middle East Revolution and Nationalism
- ☐ POSI 4315-Arab-Israeli Conflict
- ☐ POSI 4326-Issues in World Politics
- ☐ POSI 4338-Government and Politics of Latin America
- ☐ POSI 4340-Government and Politics of Russia
- ☐ POSI 4331-Minority Politics (General)

- ___ POSI 4331B-Minority Politics (Hispanic)
- ___ POSI 4331C-Minority Politics (African American)
- ___ POSI 4349-Topics in Comparative Politics
- ___ POSI 4350-Government and Politics of Asia
- ___ POSI 4358-United States-Latin American Relations
- ___ HIST 3319-Colonial History of Brazil
- ___ HIST 3322-Colonial History of Latin America to 1828
- ___ HIST 3324-Latin America from Independence to the Present
- ___ HIST 3325-Selected Topics in Latin American History
- ___ HIST 3326-The Southern Cone of Latin America
- ___ HIST 3320-History of Mexico, Independence to the Present
- ___ HIST 3327-History of Mexico to 1848
- ___ HIST 3329-Spanish Borderlands, 1521-1821
- ___ HIST 3353-The Greater Southwest
- ___ HIST 3359-African American History
- ___ HIST 3368C-Introduction to American Indian History
- ___ HIST 3369I-History of Texas Music
- ___ HIST 3369Z-Immigration and Ethnicity
- ___ HIST 3372-Texas History: A Survey
- ___ HIST 3375A-American Labor History, 1877-1945
- ___ HIST 3380-The Desegregation of the South
- ___ HIST 4325-Islamic History to 1798
- ___ HIST 4326-The Modern Middle East
- ___ HIST 4327-The Problem of Palestine
- ___ HIST 4333-History of Russia and Eurasia to 1917
- ___ HIST 4334- History of Russia and Eurasia from 1917 to present
- ___ HIST 4336-Germany from 1815 to the Present
- ___ HIST 4337-Germany and National Socialism, 1918-1945
- ___ HIST 4343-Modern China, 1600-Present
- ___ HIST 4344-Modern Japan, 1600-Present
- ___ HIST 4368-War and Society
- ___ HIST 4372-Mexican American History
- ___ HON 3392E-Silver Screen Texas
- ___ GEO 1309-Cultural Environment
- ___ GEO 3306-Geography of the American South
- ___ GEO 3308-Latin America
- ___ GEO 3328-Geography of North Africa and the Middle East
- ___ GEO 3329-Geography of Texas
- ___ GEO 3332-Geography of South and Southeast Asia
- ___ GEO 3333-Geography of China and Japan
- ___ GEO 3353-American Ethnic Geography
- ___ GEO 4328-Geography of the Russian Realm
- ___ ANTH 1312-Cultural Anthropology
- ___ ANTH 3305-Magic, Ritual and Religion
- ___ ANTH 3309-Cultures Through Film
- ___ ANTH 3314-Latin American Cultures
- ___ ANTH 3315-Archaeology of the Southwest
- ___ ANTH 3316-Archelogy of Europe, Asia, and Africa
- ___ ANTH 3322-Peoples and Cultures of Africa
- ___ ANTH 3323-Cultures of the Middle East
- ___ ANTH 3324-Mexican American Culture
- ___ ANTH 3331A-North American Indians
- ___ ANTH 3331C-Indians of the Southwest
- ___ ANTH 3332-Myths and Moundbuilders
- ___ ANTH 3343-Human Variation and Adaptation
- ___ ANTH 3347-Archeology of North America
- ___ ANTH 3345-Archeology of Mexico
- ___ ANTH 3370-Culture and Personality
- ___ ANTH 3375C-Selected Topics in Anthropology
- ___ ANTH 4320-Rise of Civilization

Attitude Index

Below is a series of statements concerning multicultural issues. There are no right or wrong answers. Please answer quickly and record your first impression by indicating the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statement. Thank you.

5=Strongly agree 4=Agree 3=not sure 2=Disagree 1=Strongly Disagree

- ___ 1. I do not think it is more appropriate for the mother of a newborn baby, rather than the father, to stay home with the baby (not work) during the first year.
- ___ 2. It is easy for women to succeed in business as it is for men.
- ___ 3. I really think affirmative action programs on college campuses constitute reverse discrimination.
- ___ 4. I feel I could develop an intimate relationship with someone from a different race.
- ___ 5. All Americans should learn to speak two languages.
- ___ 6. It upsets (or angers) me that a woman has never been President of the United States.
- ___ 7. Generally speaking, men work harder than women.
- ___ 8. My friendship network is very racially mixed.
- ___ 9. I am against affirmative action programs in business.
- ___ 10. Generally, men seem less concerned with building relationships than women.
- ___ 11. I would feel O.K. about my son/daughter dating someone from a different racial group.
- ___ 12. It upsets (or angers) me that a racial minority person has never been president of the United States.
- ___ 13. In the past few years there has been too much attention directed toward multicultural or minority issues in education.
- ___ 14. I think feminist perspectives should be an integral part of the higher education curriculum.
- ___ 15. Most of my close friends are from my own racial group.
- ___ 16. I feel somewhat more secure that a man rather than a woman is currently president of the United States.
- ___ 17. I think that it is (or would be) important for my children to attend schools that are racially mixed.
- ___ 18. In the past few Years there has been too much attention directed toward multicultural or minority issues business.
- ___ 19. Overall, I think racial minorities in America complain too much about racial discrimination.
- ___ 20. I feel (or would feel) very comfortable having a woman as my primary physician.
- ___ 21. I think the president of the United States should make a concerted effort to appoint more women and racial minorities to the country's Supreme Court.
- ___ 22. I think White people's racism toward racial minority groups still constitutes a major problem in America.
- ___ 23. I think the school system, from elementary school through college, should encourage minority and immigrant children to learn and fully adopt traditional American values.
- ___ 24. If I were to adopt a child, I would be happy to adopt a child of any race.
- ___ 25. I think there is as much female physical violence toward men as there is male violence toward women.
- ___ 26. I think the school system, from elementary school through college, should promote values representative of diverse cultures.
- ___ 27. I believe that reading the autobiography of Malcolm X would be of value.
- ___ 28. I would enjoy living in a neighborhood consisting of a racially diverse population (i.e., African American, Asian American, Hispanic, White).
- ___ 29. I think it is better if people marry within their own race.
- ___ 30. Women make too big of a deal out of sexual harassment issues in the workplace.

Social Relations

Here is a list of different race/ethnicity's. Circle the number that best describes the closest relationship that you would be willing to have with a person from that racial/ethnic group. Go with your first impression.

1. Converse with
2. Attend the same party
3. Dine at family home
4. Have as roommate

5. Date
6. Engage in sexual relationship
7. Establish long-term relationship (including marriage)

1.Jewish Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.African Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.Native Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.Mexican Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.Indian Americans (from India)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.Cuban Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.White Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.Japanese Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.Puerto Rican Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.Middle Eastern Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.Chinese Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.Korean Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Demographic questions

1. Sex: Male Female
2. Race/Ethnicity: _____
3. Student Classification: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior
4. Major: _____
6. What College are you enrolled in?: _____

REFERENCES

- Allport, Gordon W. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- Ashmore, R. D. and F. K. Del Boca. 1976. "Psychological Approaches to Understanding Intergroup Conflicts." Pp. 73-123 in *Towards the Elimination of Racism*, edited by P. A. Katz. New York, NY: Pergamon.
- Babbie, Earl. 1999. *The Basics of Social Research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Banks, James A. 2001. *Cultural Diversity and Education: Foundations, Curriculum, and Teaching*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bogardus, Emory. 1925a. "Social Distance and Its Origins." *Journal of Applied Sociology* 9:216-226.
- . 1925b. "Measuring Social Distances." *Journal of Applied Sociology* 10:299-308.
- . 1959. *Social Distance*. Yellow Springs, OH: The Antioch Press.
- . 1960. *The Development of Social Thought*. New York, NY: D. McKay.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1999. "The New Racism: Racial Structure in the United States, 1960s-1990s." Pp. 55-101 in *Race, Ethnicity, and Nationality in the United States*, edited by Paul Wong. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.
- Caldwell, Sally. 2004. *Statistics Unplugged*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Center for Multicultural and Gender Studies. 2003. *Report on Multicultural Courses*. San Marcos, TX: Southwest Texas State University.
- Chang, Mitchell J. 2002. "The Impact of an Undergraduate Diversity Course Requirement on Students' Racial Views and Attitudes." *The Journal of General Education* 51:21-42.

- Chesler, M. A. 1976. "Contemporary Sociological Theories of Racism." Pp. 21-71 in *Towards the Elimination of Racism*, edited by P. A. Katz. New York, NY: Pergamon.
- Clavijo, Fabio J. 1984. "Effects of Teaching Culture on Attitude Change." *Hispania* 67:88-91.
- Dambrun, Michael, Serge Guimond, and Sandra Duarte. 2002. "The Impact of Hierarchy-enhancing vs. Attenuating Academic Major on Stereotyping: The Mediating Role of Perceived Social Norm." *Current Research in Social Psychology* 7:114-137.
- Dovidio, John F. and Samuel L. Gaertner. 1986. *Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Ehrlich, Howard J. 1973. *The Social Psychology of Prejudice*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- . [1997] 1999. "Campus Ethnoviolence." Pp. 277-290 in *Race and Ethnic Conflict: Contending Views on Prejudice, Discrimination, and Ethnoviolence* edited by Fred L. Pincus and Howard J. Ehrlich. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Funk, Richard B. and Fern K. Willits. 1987. "College Attendance and Attitude Change: A Panel Study, 1970-81." *Sociology of Education* 60:224-231.
- Goldberg, David T. 1993. *Racist Culture: Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- . 1994. *Multiculturalism: A Critical Reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Giroux, Henry E. 1994. "Insurgent Multiculturalism and the Promise of Pedagogy" Pp. 325-343 in *Multiculturalism: A Critical Reader* edited by David T. Goldberg. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Hacker, Andrew. 1992. *Two Nations: Black and White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal*. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Hansman, Catherine A., Mary H. Jackson, Dale F. Grant, and Leon E. Spencer. 1999. "Assessing Graduate Students Sensitivity to Gender, Race, Equality and Diversity: Implications for Curriculum Development." *College Student Journal* 33:261-268.

- Heard, D. 1990. "How do Teachers identify Multicultural and Cross-Cultural Pedagogical Phenomena In and Out of Arts Classrooms?" *Educational Review* 42:303-318.
- Henderson-King, Donna and Audra Kaleta. 2000. "Learning About Social Diversity: The Undergraduate Experience and Intergroup Tolerance." *The Journal of Higher Education* 71:142-64.
- Herrnstein, Richard J. and Charles Murray. 1994. *The Bell Curve*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Hopwood, Max and John Connors. 2002. "Heterosexual Attitudes to Homosexuality: Homophobia at a Rural Australian University." *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services* 14:79-94.
- Johnson, Allan G. 1995. *The Blackwell Dictionary of Sociology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Kershaw, T. 1989. "The Emerging Paradigm in Black Studies." *Western Journal of Black Studies* 13:45-51.
- Kranz, Peter L. and Nick L. Lund. 1998. "Design of a Race Relations Course." *Journal of Instructional Psychology* 25:271-276.
- Levin, Jack. 1975. *The Functions of Prejudice*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Loewen, James W. 1995. *Lies My Teacher Told Me*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Loewen, James W. 2001. "The Content Crisis in K-12 Social Studies and History." *Educational Horizons* 5:20-23.
- Lottes, Ilsa L. and Peter J. Kuriloff. 1994. "The Impact of College Experience on Political and Social Attitudes." *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research* 31:31-54.
- Marger, Martin N. 2000. *Race and Ethnic Relations: American and Global Perspectives*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Morrissey, Marietta. 1992. "Exploring Social Distance in Race and Ethnic Relations Courses." *Teaching Sociology* 20:121-124.
- Muir, Donal E. 1990. "A Comparison of 'Black' and 'White' Integration Attitudes on a Deep-South Campus: A Research Note." *Sociological Spectrum* 10:143-153.
- Muir, Donal E. 1991. "'White' Fraternity and Sorority Attitudes Toward 'Blacks' on a Deep-South Campus." *Sociological Spectrum* 11:93-103.

- Park, Robert. 1924. "The Concept of Social Distance." *Journal of Applied Sociology* 8:339-344.
- Pence, Dan J. and J. Arthur Fields. 1999. "Teaching About Race and Ethnicity: Trying to Uncover White Privilege for a White Audience." *Teaching Sociology* 27:150-158.
- Pincus, Fred L. and Howard J. Ehrlich. 1999. *Race and Ethnic Conflict: Contending views on prejudice, discrimination, and ethnoviolence*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Ponterotto, Joseph G. "The Quick Discrimination Index (QDI)." *Scoring Directions* 1-7. Provided by Ponterotto by email.
- Ponterotto, Joseph G., Alan Burkard, Brian P. Rieger, Ingrid Grieger, Amelio D'Onofrio, Anne Dubuisson, Margaret Heenehan, Beth Milstein, Melinda Parisi, Joseph F. Rath, and Garrin Sax. 1995. "Development and the Initial Validation of the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI)." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 55:1016-1031.
- Ponterotto, Joseph G., Jodi C. Potere, and Scott A. Johansen. 2002. "The Quick Discrimination Index: Normative data and user guidelines for counseling researchers." *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development* 30:192-207.
- Prejudice Institute, The. 1997. "What is Ethnoviolence?" *Factsheet on Ethnoviolence*. Number 1:1-3. <http://www.prejudiceinstitute.org/ethnoviolenceFS.html>
- Reichel, Arie and Yoram Neumann. 1988. "Students Attitudes Toward Business Ethics: Differences Between Liberal Arts and Management." *Journal of Instructional Psychology* 15:25-33.
- Riche, Martha F. 2000. "America's Diversity and Growth: Signposts for the 21st Century." www.census.gov
- Seltzer, Richard, Michael Frazier, and Irelene Ricks. 1995. "Multiculturalism, Race, and Education." *Journal of Negro Education* 64:124-140.
- Sowell, Thomas. [1993] 1999. "'New Racism' and Old Dogmatism." Pp. 291-304 in *Race and Ethnic Conflict: Contending Views on Prejudice, Discrimination, and Ethnoviolence* edited by Fred L. Pincus and Howard J. Ehrlich. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

- Sparrow, Kathleen H. and David M. Chretien. 1993. "The Social Distance Perceptions of Racial and Ethnic Groups by College Students: A Research Note." *Sociological Spectrum* 13:277-288.
- Takaki, Ronald. [1993] 1999. "Multiculturalism: Battleground or Meeting Ground?" Pp. 305-316 in *Race and Ethnic Conflict: Contending Views on Prejudice, Discrimination, and Ethnviolence* edited by Fred L. Pincus and Howard J. Ehrlich. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.
- Vreeland, Rebecca S. and Charles E. Bidwell. 1966. "Classifying University Departments: An Approach to the Analysis of their Effects Upon Undergraduates' Values and Attitudes." *Sociology of Education* 39:237-254.
- Wade, Jay C. 2001. "Professional Men's Attitudes Toward Race and Gender Equity." *Journal of Men's Studies* 10:73-88.
- Weiten, W. 2001. *Psychology: Themes and Variations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Brooks/Cole.
- West, Cornel. 1993. *Race Matters*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Wilson, William J. [1978]1999. "The Declining Significance of Race." Pp. 188-208 in *Racism: Essential Readings* edited by Ellis Cashmore and James Jennings. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

VITA

Claude Marcel Bonazzo, Jr. was born in San Juan, Puerto Rico, on April 15, 1976, the son of Isabel Mariana Bonazzo and Claude Marcel Bonazzo, Sr. After completing his work at Robinson High School, San Juan, Puerto Rico, in 1995, he later entered Texas State University-San Marcos. He received the degree of Bachelor of Science and Applied Sociology in December 2001. In January 2002 he entered the Graduate College of Texas State University- San Marcos. Along with his coursework, he was employed as a graduate student for the Sociology Department.

Permanent Address: 500 East Stassney Lane Apt. 1427

Austin, Texas 78745

This thesis was typed by Claude Marcel Bonazzo, Jr.