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The Effect of Inequality Framing on Academic Disengagement, Persistence, and Racial Attitudes among European American College Students

Recently, many higher education institutions have recognized the importance of exposing students to issues of diversity and thus have offered diversity courses in their curricula (McIntosh, 2012). Currently, however, there is limited research examining whether the way instructors discuss structural forms of racial/ethnic group inequality (White privilege versus minority discrimination) influence how students process the inequality information. While individual acts of prejudice, stereotypes, and discrimination are important to discuss in the classroom, the focus of the present study will be on how instructors might want to frame information as they educate students about the societal inequalities (e.g., standardized tests and college admissions inequities, Lowery & Wout, 2010) that different racial/ethnic group members experience.

The literature shows that when racial/ethnic minority students are presented with inequality information framed as a minority disadvantage, and when racial/ethnic majority students are presented with inequality information framed as a majority advantage, they experience academic disengagement (Lowery & Wout, 2010). Psychological disengagement is the elimination of contingency between self-esteem and success or failure in a threatening domain. For example, when Black students are told that colleges and universities have admissions policies that disadvantage Black applicants, participants’ self-esteem becomes unrelated to their academic performance (Lowery & Wout, 2010). Throughout the inequality framing research, there is a lack of consensus regarding what terms should be used to refer to various racial/ethnic groups (e.g., Black vs. African American, White vs. European American).
will use the terms interchangeably, but will use the racial/ethnic labels used by prior researchers when referring to specific studies.

What is currently not known is if the effects of inequality framing extend to European American students’ academic persistence and racial attitudes. It is also not known how European American students would react to frames that include both minority disadvantage and majority advantage (e.g., White privilege and anti-Black discrimination statements presented simultaneously). These questions are important to address because researchers need to identify the most effective way to present racial inequality information to majority group members who may not have had as much experience with racial inequality as minority group members. The proposed study will examine the way inequality is discussed, and how it affects White students’ racial attitudes. Additionally, the proposed study will contribute to the understanding of how to minimize White students’ academic disengagement and negative racial attitudes, and maintain their academic persistence.

**Empirical Research on Racial/Ethnic Inequality Framing**

In her influential essay which discussed the advantages of being White, Peggy McIntosh (1998) described White privilege as “an invisible weightless knapsack of special provisions, maps, passports, codebooks, visas, clothes, tools and black checks” (p. 148). McIntosh went further and provided a list of 26 statements that demonstrated the daily effects of White privilege, including but not limited to, “I can go shopping alone most of the time, pretty well assured that I will not be followed or harassed” and “Whether I use check, credit cards, or cash, I can count on my skin color not to work against the appearance of financial reliability” (p. 148). The most significant aspect of Peggy McIntosh’s work was her development of a White advantage framework for interpreting and understanding racial inequality. Prior to McIntosh’s
insightful work, the research literature focused largely on the oppression of individuals with marginalized identities, rather than the privileges received by White individuals (McIntosh, 2012). Following McIntosh’s influential piece, however, there has been an outpouring of work on privilege which has infiltrated articles, books, college courses and degree programs (McIntosh, 2012). Most privilege research seeks to investigate the impact of privilege information on majority group members (McIntosh, 2012). For example, Stewart, Latu, Branscombe, Philips, and Denny (2012) randomly assigned to either a heightened White Privilege Awareness (WPA) or a control (No WPA). Participants in the control condition completed racial attitudes and perceived efficacy measures. Participants assigned to the White privilege condition read a fictional passage about racial inequality at their university and were then asked to write statements in support of hiring more African American professors. Following the manipulation, participants assigned to the heightened WPA condition completed an adaptive version of the Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1925) to measure prejudice against African Americans. Participants assigned to the heightened WPA manipulation reported less prejudice than did the control group.

Soble, Spanierman, and Hsin-Liao (2011) also assessed how White students’ racial attitudes are affected by White privilege information. However, rather than having students read a passage about racial inequality, Soble et al. used a video intervention to present White privilege information to self-identified White students. Each student was randomly assigned to watch either a video documenting the pervasiveness of White privilege in the United States (experimental condition) or one exploring the process of career exploration among college students (control condition). Compared to those assigned to the control condition, participants in
the White privilege condition showed significant increases in racial awareness (i.e. decrease in racial color-blindness), White empathy, and White guilt.

Some researchers have compared how White participants’ racial attitudes and collective guilt are affected by different inequality framing (Powell, Branscombe, & Schmitt, 2005; Lowery & Wout, 2010; Lowery, Knowles, & Unzueta, 2007). In these studies, researchers presented inequality information as either a minority disadvantage or a White privilege. Specifically, in a minority disadvantage framing, participants were presented with inequality information in terms of how members of oppressed or marginalized groups experienced structural discrimination. For example, in one of two studies reported by Powell et al. (2005), the researchers randomly assigned White participants to read statements that framed inequality as either a White privilege or a Black disadvantage. The 24 statements were adapted from group privileges described by Peggy McIntosh (1998). Each original privilege statement had a parallel disadvantage statement. For example, in the White privilege condition, participants read “White Americans can easily rent or purchase housing in any area where they can afford to live” while those in the Black disadvantage condition read “Black Americans often have difficulty renting or purchasing housing, even in areas where they can afford to live” (p. 511). Powell et al. (2005) found that different inequality frames have important psychological and social implications among White participants. Participants who read statements about White privilege had greater collective guilt, which caused them to report lower racism, compared to participants who read about Black disadvantages.

Rather than asking participants to read about privileges and disadvantages that Whites and Blacks, respectively, generally experience, Powell et al. (2005, study 2) asked participants either to reflect on their personal experiences with privileges as White individuals or to surmise
the disadvantages that Blacks might experience. In addition, the researchers explored how
Whites’ racial identity related to inequality framing and racial attitudes. To test their idea, White
participants generated their own examples of either White privileges or Black disadvantages.
Specifically, those randomly assigned to the White privilege condition read a paragraph asking
them to consider the ways that they have personally experienced privileges, whereas those in the
Black disadvantage condition considered the ways that African Americans have been
disadvantaged by their race. All participants were told to consider “employment, finances,
education, social life, organizational memberships, romantic relationships, housing, safety, day-
to-day living, treatment by authorities, health care, shopping, or acceptance by others” (p. 514).
The results revealed that White students who thought about how they had personally been
advantaged because of their race identified less with their racial group and reported lower racism
compared to those who had thought about how Blacks had been disadvantaged.

Powell et al. (2005) concluded that thinking about White privilege induced participants to
focus on themselves and their in-group more than on the out-group. The researchers reported that
those who thought about their White privileges reported more guilt, which caused them to report
less negative racial attitudes toward Blacks. In contrast, those who read about Black
disadvantages (inequality framed in terms of the out-group) were able to avoid the negative
psychological implications of inequality and thus were able to continue to hold prejudicial
attitudes.

Similar to Powell et al. (2005), Branscombe et al. (2007) asked some of their White
participants to write about the participant’s personal experiences with White privileges.
However, instead of asking participants to think about how Blacks are disadvantaged,
Branscombe and colleagues (2007) had a third of the participants write about their personal
experiences with White disadvantages. Participants in the control condition wrote about their life experiences. Following the writing activity, the researchers also assessed participants’ racial identity and modern racism (McConahay, 1986’s Modern Racism Scale) which included sample items, “Discrimination against Blacks is no longer a problem in the United States” and “Over the past few years Blacks have gotten more economically than they deserve” (p. 206). Results showed that participants who wrote about their White privilege experience reported higher modern racism than those in the White disadvantage or control conditions. Thus, those who thought about how they had been advantaged because they were White had more negative attitudes toward Blacks than those who thought about how they were disadvantaged because they were White. The researchers asserted that reflecting on one’s groups’ higher status position, attained merely because of one’s racial membership, can be threatening.

To reduce the threat and to justify the in-group’s position, participants hold more negative attitudes toward the out-group. Branscombe et al. (2007) found support for this assertion in their second study. Using the same method, the researchers found that making White privilege salient increased racial prejudice only among Whites who were highly identified with their racial group. Thus, White students who did not identify highly with being White did not experience group threat when they thought about their own personal experiences with White privilege. Consequently, they reported more positive attitudes toward Blacks compared to Whites who identified highly with their White group.

Although the effects of inequality framing on students’ racial attitudes are important to assess, researchers should also examine how exposure to inequality information in the classroom affects students academically. Given that White students feel threatened when they think about White privilege, whether the threat extends to their perceptions of their academic
accomplishments should be explored. Only one known study (Lowery & Wout, 2010) has assessed the impact of inequality framing on academic disengagement and racial identity. Lowery and Wout (2010) asked self-identified White undergraduates to read about college admissions policies that either disadvantaged Black applications or advantaged White applicants. The researchers then assessed participants’ academic engagement and racial identity. Academic disengagement is a defensive detachment of self-esteem from academic domains; eliminating the contingency between self-esteem and success or failure in academic performance (Major & Schmader, 1998). In other words, for students who are academically disengaged, how they perform in school does not influence how they feel about themselves. Results showed that White participants who highly identified with their race were less likely to tie their self-esteem with their academic outcomes when inequality was framed as a White advantage but not when it was framed as a Black disadvantage.

Lowery and Wout (2010) posited that attributional ambiguity is the mechanism that causes White students to disengage academically when presented with White privilege information but not when shown Black disadvantages. Attributional ambiguity is defined as “the uncertainty about whether the outcomes you receive are indicators of something about you as an individual or indicators of social prejudices” (Major, Quinton, & Shmader, 2003, p. 220). Major et al., (2003) investigated the relationship between attributions to discrimination and self-esteem following negative feedback among high gender-identified females. Participants were told to complete a creativity test and that their answers would be evaluated by a graduate student. Following the test, participants were either told that the evaluator would grade males and females differently (ambiguous prejudice condition) or that the evaluator was prejudiced towards females (overtly prejudice condition), or they were given feedback with no mention of the evaluator’s
attitude toward males or females (no prejudice cues condition). All participants were told that they received a “D” on the test. Consistent with the researchers’ predictions, women who were told that the evaluator was prejudiced towards women had significantly higher self-esteem following the negative feedback than those in the control and ambiguous prejudice condition. Thus, when there are multiple possible explanations for outcomes that people experience, those who believe that their outcomes are influenced by prejudice, rather than internal attributes, did not tie their self-esteem to their outcomes.

According to Lowery and Wout (2010) attributional ambiguity is also found among racial/ethnic groups. Specifically, when advantaged group members are made aware of their racial privilege they cannot be sure if their outcomes are the result of their internal attributes or undeserved privilege. Thus, inequality framed in terms of the in-group (i.e., White students read about White privilege) obscures the relationship between internal attributes and the groups’ outcomes, causing White students to disengage. Psychological disengagement has protective benefits as it allows individuals to protect their self-esteem when presented with personal outcomes that are negative (Major et al., 2003). However, in the academic arena, those who do not tie their self-esteem to their academic performance may come to devalue academic success or discount the validity of academic outcomes (Schmader, Major, and Gramzow, 2011). The current study predicts that White students exposed to inequality framed as a White advantage will experience academic disengagement. Academic disengagement is a negative outcome for White students, as it may lead to the discounting of both positive and negative constructive feedback about students’ actual academic performance and the devaluing of academics.

In summary, there are positive outcomes associated with exposing White students to White privilege information. In particular, White students’ attitudes towards African Americans
were more positive when they read about White privilege information (Stewart et al. 2012; Powell et al., 2005), except when they highly identified with their racial group (Branscombe et al., 2007). However, there are also negative outcomes associated with having White students learn about White privileges. They reported more collective guilt and academic disengagement compared to when they learned about Black disadvantages (Powell et al., 2005; Lowery & Wout, 2010).

**Racial/ethnic Inequality Framing in the Classroom**

Similar to the empirical research on racial/ethnic inequality framing, instructors who teach diversity courses examine course effectiveness by measuring awareness of White privilege, racism, and racial guilt. Some instructors of diversity courses examine the impact of diversity information on both White and ethnic minority students. For example, Cole, Case, Rios and Curtain (2011) examined students’ race as a moderator of diversity course effectiveness among White and ethnic minority students. The researchers had White and ethnic minority students enrolled in either a diversity course or an introduction to psychology course complete surveys at the beginning and end of the semester. The diversity course included discussion of “the meaning of race, ethnicity, and racism; racial and ethnic intolerance and resulting inequality as it occurs in the United States and elsewhere, and comparisons of discrimination based on race, ethnicity, religion, social class, or gender” (p.399). The survey included measures of denial of blatant racial issues, White privilege awareness, intersectional consciousness, and Protestant work ethic ideology. Diversity courses increased understanding of White privilege, acknowledgement of blatant racism, and intersectional consciousness among both White and ethnic minority students. However, intersectional consciousness was greater among White students compared to ethnic
minority students. A reduction in Protestant work ethic was found among White students in the diversity course, but not among ethnic minority students.

Unfortunately, not all diversity course instructors examine the moderating role of students’ race on diversity course effectiveness. For example, Case (2007) examined the impact of a diversity course in raising awareness of White privilege and racism, increasing support for affirmative action, and reducing prejudice, guilt, and fear of other races among White and ethnic minority undergraduates. The course included lectures and readings which covered White privilege and ethnic minority disadvantage topics. Although the results indicated that the diversity course succeeded in raising awareness of White privilege and racism, and more support for affirmative action among all students, it failed to specify outcome differences between White and ethnic minority students. However, the researchers did report that White students reported greater guilt after completing the course.

Kernahan and Davis (2007) also failed to examine students’ race when assessing diversity course effectiveness. The researchers were interested in how a diversity course may influence student’s awareness of racism and White privilege. Undergraduates enrolled in either a behavioral statistics or a diversity course (48 White, 1 Hispanic/Latino) completed both pre and posttest measures of White privilege awareness, racism, racial attitudes, and White guilt. Students who were enrolled in the diversity course reported greater awareness of White privilege and racism. Unfortunately, the researchers chose to use the ethnic minority student as a control, and did not examine diversity course effectiveness for this student.

In summary, diversity courses increased White and ethnic minority students’ intersectional consciousness, and awareness of White privilege and racism (Cole et al., 2011). However, enrollment in a diversity course also led to negative outcomes, including increased
White guilt among White students (Cole et al., 2011; Case et al., 2007; Kernahan et al., 2007). Additionally, measures of diversity course effectiveness failed to examine the impact of framing diversity information as a White privilege or minority disadvantage.

When inequality was framed in the classroom, some instructors used a White privilege frame. For example, Ancis and Szymananski (2001) provided White counseling students with a list of McIntosh’s (1995) 46 experiences of White privilege. After reading the McIntosh privilege statements, students provided written reactions to the article and privilege statements. Although the instructors intended the exercise to increase individual and systematic White privilege awareness, there were various reactions to the White privilege material. Qualitative data analysis of the written reflections revealed three themes: A lack of awareness and denial of White privilege, awareness of White privilege and discrimination, and a higher order awareness and commitment to action. Gillespie (2003) also used a White privilege inequality frame to discuss racial inequality. The researcher used a case study to teach White privilege, specifically addressing White students’ struggle with the meaning of their White privilege. During their discussion of the case study, the students expressed their assumptions about Whiteness and privilege.

Some researchers used a minority disadvantage or mixed inequality frame to demonstrate racial inequality. Neihuis (2005) demonstrated minority disadvantage by having White students participate in an out-of-class activity. Students were told to go to a grocery store and find items for an African American single mother. Following the demonstration Neihuis asked her students about the difficulty involved in finding all of the items on the shopping list. Neihuis implemented a minority disadvantage framework “to make White privilege visible to White students” (p. 487). Lawrence (1998) had a similar goal when implementing a classroom exercise which
demonstrated both privilege and disadvantage. Female, White undergraduates were put into groups of four with unequal packets of material to build mobiles. This demonstration allowed students to be in a position of disadvantage or privilege. Following the in-class activity, students were asked to reflect on the privileged positions they hold in society. The results revealed that the students were able to understand their own race and class privilege.

A variety of inequality frameworks were used in the classroom to assist White students in recognizing their racial privilege and developing a greater understanding of institutional racism (Lawrence, 1998). However studies which examined the effect of racial inequality information in the classroom failed to compare the effectiveness of different inequality frames (White privilege, Black disadvantage, or mixed) on student outcomes.

**Overall Summary**

Throughout the social psychological literature it is clear that the goal of inequality framing and diversity courses effectiveness is measured by White students’ increased awareness of White privilege. This is an important measure of effectiveness, as understanding White privilege allows students to recognize the advantages and benefits afforded to White people because of their race (McIntosh, 1998). A few studies also examined the negative impact of inequality information (Lowery & Wout, 2010; Lowery et al., 2007), specifically academic disengagement. However, researchers have failed to examine the possible additional negative effects of learning about inequality, including decreased academic persistence, increased academic disengagement, and negative racial attitudes. Academic engagement is the only dependent variable examined in the current study that has been measured as an outcome of in-group inequality framing among ethnic minorities.
The Present Study

The goal of this study is to determine the most effective method for teaching racial inequality content to advantaged students. Although dominant advantage cannot exist without subordinate disadvantage, these two frames are psychologically separable (Powell et al., 2005; Lowery & Wout, 2010; Lowery et al., 2007). For example, presenting White privilege information to White participants caused academic disengagement while presenting Black disadvantage information had no effect (Lowery & Wout, 2010). As discussed earlier, inequality framed in terms of the in-group caused all group members to disengage academically (Lowery & Wout, 2010). It is imperative that educators begin to discuss inequality in a manner that does not cause academic disengagement among majority members. Prior research studies have manipulated inequality framing by using a White privilege, a minority disadvantage, and/or a control condition (no information about privilege or disadvantage). Yet none have included a mixed-condition (both Black disadvantage and White privilege information simultaneously) in their manipulation. The present study will present inequality using a mixed inequality frame to determine whether this will reduce disengagement among members from the advantaged group. Although she did not empirically test her assumptions, McIntosh (2012) proposed that to increase awareness, but diminish feelings of blame, shame, guilt or anger, White participants and students need to discuss both unearned disadvantage and unearned advantage. Thus, to effectively discuss inequality, individuals must address both unearned advantages and disadvantages because the study of power is not accurate unless it includes inequalities from both perspectives (McIntosh, 2012). The present study will examine whether presenting inequality information in terms of the in-group and the out-group simultaneously will reduce academic disengagement among majority group members.
Although Lowery and Wout (2010) reported that inequality framed in terms of the in-group caused psychological disengagement, they did not explore whether inequality framing may also cause behavioral disengagement. As stated earlier, academic disengagement is the separation of self-esteem from outcomes in threatening domains (Lowery & Wout, 2010). The present study will determine if racial inequality information influences participants’ academic persistence. Academic persistence is defined as the intent, or goal, to persist in college until degree completion (Ojedo, Navorro, & Marolles, 2011). Including a behavioral measure of persistence will determine if inequality framing influences participants’ future non-persistent decisions or intentions, cognitive engagement and academic performance. Although retention is understood as the actual behavior of persisting academically, the present research used the same behavioral measure of persistence employed by Aspinwall and Richter (1999): unsolvable anagrams. Unsolvable anagrams are often used in research to measure behavioral persistence (Aspinwall et al, 1999; Friedman & Elliot, 2008; Lench & Levine, 2008). There is no research which has examined the effect of inequality framing on academic persistence. This study will examine whether inequality framed in terms of the ingroup influences the cognitive processes involved in deciding to persist (Ojeda et al., 2011).

Hypotheses

The current study examined how White privilege, Black disadvantage, and mixed privilege/disadvantage frames affect European American students’ racial attitudes (semantic differential and Whites’ attitudes towards Blacks) and academic outcomes (academic engagement and academic persistence). The following hypotheses were tested:
1. Participants in the mixed condition will report more positive attitudes toward Blacks (higher scores on semantic differential and Whites attitudes towards Blacks) than those in the White privilege condition and Black disadvantage condition.

2. Participants in the mixed condition will report more positive academic outcomes (lower scores on academic disengagement and higher scores on persistence) than those in the White privilege condition and Black disadvantage condition.

Method

Participants

The sample was comprised of self-identified White undergraduates \( N = 97, 28 \text{ men} \) from Ball State University who were taking a psychology course and participating in the Ball State University Department of Psychological Science Human Subject Pool. A total of 20 White students were excluded from the study. Participants were excluded if they failed to answer the manipulation check correctly \( n = 7 \), if they did not complete the study in an acceptable amount of time (before 5 minutes or after 45 minutes; \( n = 4 \)), and if they did not fully complete the survey \( n = 9 \). Participants ranged in age from 18 to 29 years \( (M = 19.29, SD = 1.41) \). Most participants were female \( (71\%) \) and in the first year of their undergraduate degree \( (65\%) \). A majority of the participants identified as heterosexual \( (96\%) \) and middle class \( (61\%) \).

Using a sample of undergraduate college students was useful for testing the present study’s hypotheses because the study focused specifically on the effects of inequality framing on the pursuit of academic persistence in higher education. This college student sample represented individuals who are most often affected by inequality framing information in classroom settings.
Procedure

Data were collected for the actual survey anonymously on-line using Qualtrics. First, participants completed a demographic questionnaire. Second, participants were randomly assigned to read one of three sets of inequality framing statements: White privilege only (n=34), Black disadvantage only (n=32), and White privilege/Black disadvantage combined (n=29). Third, participants completed questionnaires that assessed their academic disengagement and racial attitudes. Next, participants completed two solvable and three unsolvable anagrams to measure persistence. Finally, participants completed the self-affirmation writing task. Because the inequality information I presented are issues that instructors often discuss in diversity-related courses, I did not anticipate that participants will experience long-term risks or discomfort. However, I did expect participants who viewed the advantaged framing information to experience temporarily decreased academic engagement, and persistence. To eliminate any long-term effects, all participants completed a self-affirmation writing task, which has been shown to help participants re-establish their baseline global self-esteem when they experience a threat to their self-concept (for a review, see McQueen & Klein, 2006).

Manipulation and Measures

Demographics. Participants completed a demographic questionnaire to assess their race/ethnicity, year in school, sex, and GPA (out of 4.0 range),

Academic Disengagement. Academic disengagement was assessed with three items used by Lowery and Wout (2010), adopted from Major and Schamder’s (1998) Intellectual Engagement Inventory. These items were be measured on a 7-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree). The sample items included, “I always feel good about myself when I do well on academic tests,” “Doing well on intellectual tasks is very important to me,” and “I
care a great deal about performing well on tests of my intellectual ability.” The scale was reverse coded, such that higher scores indicated greater disengagement. Major and Schmader (1998) reported that the scale had adequate reliability ($\alpha=.62$). In the current study, the internal reliability was $\alpha=.80$.

**Academic Persistence:** To assess persistence participants were told that the purpose of the study was to examine the maturation of verbal abilities and verbal intelligence in different age groups (Aspinwall & Richter, 1999). Participants were told that an anagram is a scrambled set of letters that can be rearranged to make a word and that they must use all letters when writing a solution (Friedman & Elliot, 2008). In all conditions, the computer presented participants with two easily solvable anagrams (‘WODN’ and ‘TOBOR’) followed by three unsolvable anagrams (‘OCHERSTE’, ‘ONECI’, and ‘ACELO’) (Aspinwall & Richter, 1999; Friedman & Elliot, 2008). The anagrams were displayed individually on the screen and participants could move to the next anagram any time by clicking a “next question” button; participants’ could not return to skipped questions (Lench & Levine, 2008). The amount of time (in minutes and seconds) participants spent on the anagrams was recorded by the computer. No feedback was provided during the anagram task.

**Racial Attitudes:** Racial Attitudes were assessed using Brigham’s (1993) Whites’ Attitudes towards Blacks (ATB). The ATB scale ($\alpha=.89$) yielded four factors: social distance, affective reactions, governmental policy, and personal worry. All items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree). In the current study, the internal reliability for the ATB scale was $\alpha=.86$. Bringham (1993) did not report the internal reliability for the four subscales of the ATB scale. However, in the current study the internal reliability was $\alpha=.69$ for the Social Distance subscale, $\alpha=.76$ for the Affective Reactions subscale, and $\alpha=.78$ for the
Governmental Policy subscale. The Personal Worry subscale contained only item, thus alpha could not be calculated.

To measure attitudes toward African Americans and European Americans, participants completed Osgood, Suci, and Tannebaum (1957) five semantic differential scales for each group. They were 7 point scales (-3 to +3) are anchored at either end by polar opposite adjective pairs: ugly-beautiful, bad-good, pleasant-unpleasant, dishonest-honest, and awful-nice. Osgood et al. (1957) did not include the internal reliability for the European American or African American semantic differential scales. In the current study the internal reliability for the African American semantic differential scale was $\alpha=.96$ while the internal reliability for the European American semantic differential scale was $\alpha=.97$.

**Self-Affirmation:** Following the inequality frame manipulation, each student was given a self-affirmation task to ameliorate the possible negative effects of their frame. Self-affirmation strategies are used to reduce self-threat by maintaining or restoring an overall positive sense of the self (McQueen & Klein, 2006). Participants completed a self-affirmation essay (Blanton, Pelham, Dehart, & Carvallo, 2001) which asked them to “Write a short description of an area of your life that is both important to you and makes you feel proud. It can be an aspect of your identity, a talent, a relationship, or basic value.”

**Results**

The following dependent variables were analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA): Major and Schamder’s (1998) Intellectual Engagement Inventory, Bringham’s (1993) Whites’ Attitudes towards Blacks scale, Osgood et al.’s (1957) Semantic Differential scales, and total time participants’ spent persisting on unsolvable anagrams (Aspinwall et al.,
The statistical assumptions for ANOVA including scale of measurement, independence, normality, and homogeneity of variances were all met.

**Disengagement.** There was not a significant effect of inequality frame (disadvantaged, mixed, and advantaged conditions) on academic disengagement, $F(2, 97) = .003, p = .967$. Further, the effect size value ($\eta^2 = .001$) suggested extremely low practical significance. Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations of academic disengagement for participants in the disadvantaged, advantaged, and mixed conditions.

**Persistence.** The results indicated that there was not a significant effect of inequality frame on time spent attempting to solve individual unsolvable anagrams ($ps > .05$). There was not a significant difference on the average time spent solving the three unsolvable anagram among participants in the disadvantaged, mixed, or advantaged conditions $F(2, 97) = .983, p = .378$. Additionally, the effect size value ($\eta^2 = .020$) demonstrates low practical significance. Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations of the sum of the amount of time (in seconds) participants spent on the three unsolvable anagrams, a behavioral measure of persistence for participants in the disadvantaged, advantaged, and mixed conditions.

**Racial Attitudes.** There was not a significant effect of inequality frame on participants’ racial attitudes towards Blacks $F(2, 97) = .528, p = .592$. The effect size value was very low ($\eta^2 = .011$) indicating no practical significance. There was also no significant difference between groups on the social distance, affective reactions, governmental policy, and personal worry factors (all $ps > .05$). Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations of Whites’ Attitudes towards Blacks scale for participants in the three conditions. There was no significant effect of inequality frame on attitudes towards African Americans $F(2, 97) = .646, p = .527$. There was also no significant effect of inequality frame on participants’ attitudes towards European
Americans $F(2, 97) = .063, p = .939$. Table 3 provides the means and standard deviations of the African American and European American semantic differential scales.

**Follow-up Analysis.** I also conducted two separate Factorial ANOVAs to determine if participants’ gender or mean score on the endorsement of class topics moderated the relationship between inequality frame and the above listed dependent variables. There was a significant interaction between condition and gender on disengagement in the advantaged condition, $F(2, 97) = 3.75, p = .027$. The results demonstrated that men are significantly more likely to disengage from academics than are women when presented with an advantaged inequality frame. There was also a main effect of gender on the Worry factor of the Whites’ attitudes towards Blacks scale, $F(2, 97) = 7.208, p = .009$. Females demonstrated significantly greater worry than males in all three framing conditions.

There was also a significant main effect for the mean score of endorsement of inequality topics in the classroom $F(2, 97) = 2.032, p = .025$. Those who scored lower on endorsement of inequality topics demonstrated significantly lower scores on the Affective factor of the Whites’ attitudes towards Blacks scale.

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to identify the most effective method for teaching racial inequality content to European American students. The study assessed whether using a mixed inequality frame (discussing both Black disadvantage and White privilege) would reduce academic disengagement, increase persistence, and improve racial attitudes among White students. It was hypothesized that participants in the mixed condition would report more positive attitudes towards Blacks compared to participants who received racial inequality information framed as a White privilege or Black disadvantage. It was also hypothesized that participants in
the mixed condition would report more positive academic outcomes (greater persistence and lower academic disengagement) than participants in the White privilege and Black disadvantage conditions.

The results showed, however, that the type of inequality frame (White privilege, Black disadvantage, or mixed) has no statistically significant relation to academic disengagement, academic persistence, or racial attitudes among European American students. As such, the hypotheses were not supported for this sample. An alternative explanation for the non-significant relationship between inequality frame and the dependent variables could be that the inequality frame manipulation used in the study failed to make racial inequality information salient to the participants. Specifically, participants were asked to think about racial inequality in terms of a diversity class topic rather than to generate examples of their individual experiences with privilege or disadvantage. Thinking of racial inequality in terms of a diversity course curriculum may have made it easy for White participants to disregard the unearned advantage they receive in their own lives (Powell et al., 2005).

 Persistence

The results also indicated that racial inequality information framed as a White privilege, a Black disadvantaged, or as both a White privilege and a Black disadvantage did not have a significant effect on persistence among participants. These results did not support my hypothesis that participants in the mixed inequality condition will persist longer on unsolvable anagrams than those in the White privilege and Black disadvantage condition. Aspinwall and Richter (1999) found that participants high in optimism and self-mastery disengage from unsolvable tasks in order to allocate their attention to solvable tasks. An alternative explanation for the non-significant results is that participants may have concluded that the anagrams were unsolvable and
disengaged from the unsolvable task to avoid nonproductive persistence. It is possible that presenting participants with solvable anagrams followed by unsolvable anagrams caused all participants to disengage from the persistence task (Aspinwall & Richter, 1999).

Limitations and Future Research

One limitation of the current study is that White Identity was not included as a possible moderating variable. An alternative explanation for the nonsignificant relationship between inequality frame and the dependent variables is that the participants who completed the current study do not identify highly with their racial group. Lowery and Wout (2010) found that only Whites who identified with their race experienced academic disengagement when presented with White privilege information. Additionally, Branscombe et al. (2007) found that White identification moderated the relationship between White privilege information and racist attitudes. Specifically, participants who identified with their race demonstrated higher modern racism than those who did not identify with their race, when asked to describe personal experiences with White privilege.

Including a measure of White Identification would have been beneficial to understanding the results found because it would have determined if the inequality frame manipulation only affected participants who strongly identify with their advantaged group membership. Future research examining the effect of inequality frames on White students should include a measure of White Identification to determine if participants’ level of racial identity moderates the relationship between inequality information and academic outcomes and racial attitudes.

Another possible limitation of this study is that I did not measure participants’ frequency of and comfort with interactions with African Americans. Because the study was conducted at a predominantly White university, it is possible that issues of racial inequality, African Americans’
experiences with disadvantages, and White privileges were not salient to some of the participants. Thus, future researchers should measure White participants’ frequency of and level of comfort with interactions with African Americans to determine if these factors may influence how participants process racial inequality information.

An additional limitation of the current study is that it was administered online, which could have lead participants to not pay adequate attention to the stimuli that were presented. Online administration was chosen because it yielded significant results for other studies on inequality framing conducted in my current research lab. However, it is possible that the online administration of the study allowed participants to quickly skim the instructions and to not fully consider their answers to the survey questions. Additionally, participants may have failed to engage in the unsolvable anagram task because they were not being monitored. Prior studies which used unsolvable anagrams to measure persistence did not use solely on-line administration. Friedman et al. (2008) asked participants to complete an unsolvable anagram booklet and were timed by an experimenter with a stopwatch in view of the participants. Aspinwall et al. (1999) administered unsolvable anagrams to participants on a computer. However, prior to, and following, the anagram task Aspinwall et al., (1999) gave face to face instructions and debriefing. Future research should examine the effect of inequality frame on White participants’ academic disengagement, persistence, and racial attitudes using monitored survey administration to ensure conscientious completion of the survey measures and tasks.

A final limitation of the study is that it failed to include ethnic minority participants in the sample. Including participants from a disadvantaged social group may have provided valuable information regarding the effect of inequality framing on academic disengagement, persistence, and racial attitudes. Specifically, including ethnic minority participants would have
determined if how racial inequality information is presented (as a White privilege, Black disadvantage, or a mixed privilege/disadvantage frame) differentially affects advantaged and disadvantaged group members. Future research should include an ethnic minority group to determine if using a mixed inequality frame results in lower academic disengagement and higher racial attitudes among those who hold disadvantaged group membership.

In conclusion, there were no statistically significant findings from this research. White participants did not report significantly different levels of academic disengagement, persistence, or racial attitudes when presented with racial inequality information framed as White privilege, Black disadvantage, or as both White privilege and Black disadvantage. Although the results of the data analysis did not support the study’s hypotheses, the results provide valuable information about the discussion of racial inequality to advantaged students. Specifically, the results suggest that discussing racial inequality as a White privilege, Black disadvantaged, or both may not cause academic disengagement, a decrease in academic persistence, or an increase in negative racial attitudes. These results suggest that racial inequality can be discussed using various frameworks without affecting students negatively. Additionally, these results provide additional support for continuing the discussion of racial inequality topics to advantaged students.

The results of this study suggest that the type of inequality frame (White advantage, Black disadvantage, or mixed) used to discuss racial inequality does not negatively affect advantaged students. However, previous research has found that discussing racial inequality can negatively affect those who present racial inequality information. Specifically, students are more likely to consider the messenger of racial inequality information as more biased when they are speaking in terms of their racial ingroup (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Priester & Petty, 1995). It is possible that students will consider the messenger of racial inequality information (e.g.,
instructors) as less biased when the messenger uses an inequality frame that focuses on members of the messengers’ racial out group, or on both the messengers’ racial in group and out group (mixed frame).

Future research should continue to examine the effect of inequality framing on advantaged students to determine if there are additional positive or negative effects related to receiving racial inequality information. Future researchers should also include a measure of White racial identity when investigating the effects of inequality framing to determine if an individual’s level of racial identity moderates the relationship between privilege information and disengagement, persistence, and racial attitudes. Future researchers should also conduct a monitored, off-line study when examining the effects of inequality frame to ensure that participants are paying attention to the framing manipulation. Additionally, it is imperative that future researchers provide a salient manipulation of racial inequality so that participants are forced to identify their individual privileges. Finally, future research which examines the effects of inequality framing should include ethnic minorities in their sample of participants to determine if mixed inequality framing differentially affects disadvantaged group members.
References


bring to the classroom: Moderators of the effects of diversity courses on student attitudes.

*Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17, 397-405.*


Appendix A: Informed Consent

ACADEMIC ISSUES

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to examine/test the effectiveness of various teaching materials and methods in social psychology courses.

Credit and Eligibility: You must be 18 years or older currently enrolled in PSYSC 100, and have not participated in the “Intergroup Relations” or “Intergroup Relations in the United States” study, to receive credit for participating in this study. This study is worth 1 credit.

Participation: If you participate in this study, you will be asked about your perceptions of a wide range of social issues. In addition, you will also be asked about your own background (e.g., age, gender, year in school, etc.). The survey will take about 45-60 minutes to complete. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time for any reason without penalty or prejudice from the investigator. You may skip items that you do not feel comfortable answering. Please feel free to e-mail the investigator your questions before beginning the study, and at any time during the study.

Anonymity: Although you were asked to enter your name to access this information page, your responses to the actual survey will be anonymous. No one, including the researchers, will be able to link your answers to you. Your name will be used only to ensure that you get credit for participating.

Potential Risk: Mild risk of temporarily negatively influencing the academic self-efficacy, intrinsic value, and persistence of participants who view the disadvantage framing condition.

Benefit: One benefit you may gain from your participation in this study may be a better understanding of the perceptions people have about members of different social groups. For one's rights as a research subject, please contact the Office of Research Integrity, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, (765) 285-5070.

To begin the study and to receive credit for your participation in this survey, please click the "SUBMIT" button below. If you are not ready to complete the survey now, please close the browser. DO NOT click submit.

1. I am 18 years of age or older. If you select "No", please close the browser.
   Yes No

I, __________________, agree to participate in this research project entitled, “Academic Issues”. I have read the description of this project and give my consent to participate. I understand that I may request a copy of this informed consent form to keep for future reference.

Co-investigators:
R. Walker, B.S.
L. Littleford, Ph.D.
Department of Psychological Science
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
Telephone: (765) 285-1707
Email: lnlittleford@bsu.edu
Appendix B: Measures

Please answer a few questions about yourself:

1. What is your race/ethnicity?
   a. European American/Caucasian/White
   b. African American/Black
   c. American Indian/ Native American
   d. Asian or Pacific Islander American
   e. Hispanic/Latino/Latina American
   f. Multi-racial American

2. Your year in school:
   A. First Year
   B. Second Year
   C. Third Year
   D. Fourth Year
   E. Other

3. What is your major?

4. What is your gender?
   A. Male
   B. Female

5. Your age (in years):

6. Your sexual orientation
   A. Heterosexual/Straight
   B. Gay/Lesbian
   C. Bi-Sexual
   D. Other

7. Do you have any of the following disabilities (check all that apply)?
   A. Mental illness
   B. Physical Disability
   C. Learning Disability
   D. Other
   E. None

8. Your family's socioeconomic status?
   A. Upper Class
   B. High Middle Class
   C. Middle Class
   D. Low Middle Class
   E. Lower/Poor Class

9. What is your religious affiliation?
Framing Manipulation

1. Framing of Inequality

Letter head
Mixed Condition:

The Psychology department at Ball State University is considering including a diversity course (PSYSC 471) focused on the disadvantages faced by Black Americans and the privileges received by White Americans in the United States. We are seeking the input of current Ball State students to determine if this class should be included as an elective for the upcoming fall 2012 semester.

Would you be interested in taking this course?
Yes/No/Maybe

Please rate which discussion topics should be included in PSYSC 471
1 (Should not be included) to 7 (Should be included)

Racial inequality in the educational system

It is difficult for Black Americans to find academic institutions that do not give attention almost exclusively to people of a different race than their own.

White American middle and high school students have unlimited access to the courses they need and college guidance imperative for college acceptance.

The nationwide college graduation rate for Black students stands at a rate of 42%. The percentage is 20% less than that of the 62% rate for White students.

A key reason Black Americans are not persisting in academics is that they are simply running out of money.

Standardized tests (e.g., SAT, ACT, GRE, MCAT) inadvertently advantage White students.

Racial inequality in the work-place

Black Americans cannot accept a job with an affirmative action employer without having their co-workers suspect they got the job because of their race.

White Americans can count on their race being a positive factor in employment interviews and job appraisals

Black Americans are not well-represented in positions of power in the work place.

White Americans are identified by their profession or interests rather than their race.
Disadvantage Condition:

The Psychology department at Ball State University is considering including a diversity course (PSYSC 471) focused on the disadvantages faced by Black Americans in the United States. We are seeking the input of current Ball State students to determine if this class should be included as an elective for the upcoming fall 2012 semester.

Would you be interested in taking this course?
Yes/No/Maybe

Please rate which discussion topics should be included in PSYSC 471
1 (Should not be included) to 7 (Should be included)

Black American discrimination in the educational system

*It is difficult for Black Americans to find academic institutions that do not give attention almost exclusively to people of a different race than their own.*

Black American middle and high school students have limited access to the courses they need and college guidance imperative for college acceptance.

A *key reason* Black Americans are not persisting in academics *is that they are simply running out of money.*

*The nationwide college graduation rate for Black students stands at a rate of 42%. The percentage is 20% less than that of the 62% rate for White students.*

*Standardized tests (e.g., SAT, ACT, GRE, MCAT) inadvertently disadvantage Black American students.*

Black American discrimination in the work-place

*Black Americans cannot accept a job with an affirmative action employer without having their co-workers suspect they got the job because of their race.*

*Black Americans can’t be sure that being Black won’t work against them in employment interviews and job appraisals.*

*Black Americans are not well-represented in positions of power in the work place.*

*Black Americans are identified by their race rather than their profession or interests.*
Letter head

Advantage Condition:

The Psychology department at Ball State University is considering including a diversity course (PSYSC 471) focused on the privileges received by White Americans in the United States. We are seeking the input of current Ball State students to determine if this class should be included as an elective for the upcoming fall 2012 semester.

Would you be interested in taking this course?
Yes/No/Maybe

Please rate which discussion topics should be included in PSYSC 471
1 (Should not be included) to 7 (Should be included)

White privilege in the educational system

White Americans can easily find academic institutions that give attention almost exclusively to people of their race.

White American middle and high school students have unlimited access to the courses they need and college guidance imperative for college acceptance.

A key reason White Americans are persisting in academics is that they have the financial resources.

The nationwide college graduation rate for White students stands at a rate of 62%. The percentage is 20% more than that of the 42% rate for Black American students.

Standardized tests (e.g., SAT, ACT, GRE, MCAT) inadvertently advantage White students.

White privilege in the work-place

White Americans can accept a job with an affirmative action employer without having their co-workers suspect they got the job because of their race.

White Americans can count on their race being a positive factor in employment interviews and job appraisals.

White Americans are well-represented in positions of power in the work place.

White Americans are identified by their profession or interests rather than their race.

This concludes our questions regarding the inclusion of the course PSYSC 471 at Ball State University. Please read and consider the following statements before responding.
2. **Intellectual EngagementInventory (Major & Schmader, 1998)**

1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree)
1. I always feel good about myself when I do well on academic tests
2. Doing well on intellectual tasks is very important to me
3. I care a great deal about performing well on tests of my intellectual ability

3. **Unsolvable Anagrams (Aspinwall & Ricther, 1999; Freidnman & Elliot, 2008)**

The purpose of this study is to examine the maturation of verbal abilities and verbal intelligence in different age groups.

Please complete the following five anagrams. An anagram is a scrambled set of letters that can be rearranged to make a world; you must use all letters when writing the solution. The anagrams will be displayed individually on the screen. You can move to the next anagram any time by clicking the “next question” button; you cannot return to skipped questions:

WODN
TOBOR
OCHERSTE
ONECI
ACELO

Please answer the following:

4. **Bringham’s (1993) ATB and ATW Scale**

1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree)

**Whites’ Attitudes Toward Blacks (ATB)**
1. If a black were put in charge of me, I would not mind taking advice and direction from him or her.
2. If I had a chance to introduce black visitors to my friends and neighbors, I would pleased to do so.
3. I would rather not have blacks live in the same apartment building I live in.
4. I would probably feel somewhat self-conscious dancing with a black in a public place.
5. I would not mind it at all if a black family with about the same income and education as me moved in next door.
6. I think that black people look more similar to each other than white people do.
7. Interracial marriage should be discouraged to avoid the “who-am-I?” confusion which the children feel.
8. I get very upset when I hear a white make a prejudicial remark about blacks.
9. I favor open housing laws that allow more racial integration of neighborhoods.
10. It would not bother me if my new roommate was black.
11. It is likely that blacks will bring violence to neighborhoods when they move in.
12. I enjoy a funny racial joke, even if some people might it offensive.
13. The federal government should take decisive stops to override the injustices blacks suffer at the hands of local authorities.
14. Black and white people are inherently equal.
15. Black people are demanding too much too fast in their push for equal rights.
16. Whites should support blacks in their struggle against discrimination and segregation.
17. Generally, blacks are not as smart as whites.
18. I worry that in the next few years I may be denied my application for a job or a promotion because of preferential treatment given to minority group members.
19. Racial integration (of schools, businesses, residences, etc.) has benefitted both whites and blacks.
20. Some blacks are so touchy about race that it is difficult to get along with them.

5. Semantic Differentials (Osgood, Suci, and Tannebaum, 1957)
7-point scales (-3 to +3)

Please rate Black/African Americans

1. Ugly-beautiful
2. Bad-good
3. Unplease-pleasant
4. Dishonest-honest
5. Awful-nice

Please rate White/European Americans

1. Ugly-beautiful
2. Bad-good
3. Unplease-pleasant
4. Dishonest-honest
5. Awful-nice

Please answer a few additional questions about the study you just completed:

1. What course is Ball State University interested in including as an elective?
2. What topics will the course include?
3. Please use the space below to write your comments and/or concerns about this survey that you'd like the researchers to know.

6. Self-affirmation Essay (Blanton et. al., 2001)

Write a short description of an area of your life that is both important to you and makes you feel proud. It can be an aspect of your identity, a talent, a relationship, or a basic value.

7. Please use the space below to write your comments and/or concerns about this survey that you'd like the researchers to know.
Appendix C: Debriefing

Your responses have been recorded.

You have completed the study. Thank you.

You have completed the study. Thank you.

The survey you just completed was designed to examine whether the way racial inequality is discussed (Ex: “Standardized tests advantage White students” vs. “Standardized tests disadvantage Black students”) influences college students’ academic engagement, academic persistence, and racial attitudes. Academic engagement is the extent to which how students feel about themselves depends on their academic performance. For example, a student who experiences academic engagement would experience low self-esteem if she/he failed an exam. Academic persistence is the intent, or goal, to remain in school until the student obtains his/her degree. We hope that this study will help instructors design more effective teaching strategies when they discuss racial/ethnic inequalities with their students.

IMPORTANT: To ensure that the results are valid, please do not discuss this study with people who have not yet completed it. Thank you.

Your 1 research credit for participation in this study will be updated within 48 hours.

If you have questions or are interested in obtaining a copy of the results of this study once it is completed, please contact the co-investigators:

R. Walker, B.S.
L. Littleford, PhD.

Department of Psychological Science
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
e-mail: lnlittleford@bsu.edu

Thank you for your help. Please close the browser.
Table 1

*Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Academic Disengagement and Persistence (n=96)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Disengagement M (SD)</th>
<th>Persistence M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>4.66 (1.75)</td>
<td>198.0 (176.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>4.67 (1.69)</td>
<td>138.0 (165.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantaged</td>
<td>4.77 (2.49)</td>
<td>238.2 (225.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Persistence scores reflect the sums of the amount of time (in seconds) participants spent on all three unsolvable anagrams.
Table 2

*Mean Scores on Whites’ Attitudes Toward Blacks Scale (n=97)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Social Distance</th>
<th>Affective Reactions</th>
<th>Governmental Policy</th>
<th>Personal Worry</th>
<th>ATB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.03 (3.81)</td>
<td>36.61 (6.24)</td>
<td>28.63 (4.65)</td>
<td>4.09 (2.02)</td>
<td>110.41 (14.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>30.50 (4.28)</td>
<td>36.68 (7.06)</td>
<td>29.38 (5.08)</td>
<td>4.13 (1.85)</td>
<td>109.83 (16.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantaged</td>
<td>30.35 (4.57)</td>
<td>35.26 (7.26)</td>
<td>27.57 (5.11)</td>
<td>4.20 (1.71)</td>
<td>106.74 (16.11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Mean Scores of Semantic Differentials (n=97)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>European American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$ ($SD$)</td>
<td>$M$ ($SD$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>25.09 (6.16)</td>
<td>25.10 (6.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>23.83 (5.47)</td>
<td>24.77 (5.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantaged</td>
<td>23.49 (6.35)</td>
<td>25.29 (6.02)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

*Correlations Between Dependent Measures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>ATB</th>
<th>AA Semantic Differential</th>
<th>EA Semantic Differential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATB</td>
<td></td>
<td>.475**</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA Semantic Differential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.716**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA Semantic Differential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* **p < .001