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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this pilot study is to investigate the relationship between degree of verbal stereotyping toward Negroes and level of familiarity with that group. Intensity of stereotypes and social distance as a measure of familiarity are the principle elements of the study but other variables are also examined in an attempt to determine their effects on stereotyping. These variables include sex, educational level, socioeconomic classification, and age. There has been some research in this area but most of it deals with the patterning of stereotypes rather than the degree to which the individual holds his belief.

The problem of the interrelationships between familiarity and the verbal reporting of intensity of stereotypes is an important one. Its most immediate significance relates to the theory of stereotyping. Many definitions of stereotype include elements which have not as yet been sufficiently tested in order to make their acceptance warranted. Intensity is one such component of stereotypes which has been hypothesized but seldom tested. Yet, the attitude of an individual who believes that certain negative traits are held by all Negroes is certainly different from that of an individual who would attribute the negative traits to only forty percent of the group. It is
possible, however, that both individuals might respond posi-
tively to a question asking whether the trait was characteris-
tic of the group. Both would have stereotypes but the behav-
ior dictated by the strength of the attitude would almost cer-
tainly be different.

A second characteristic which has often been attributed
to stereotypes might be examined. Rigidity is often connected
with stereotypes in the literature but, again, little research
has involved variables which might actually influence rigidity.
Familiarity has been hypothesized as an important factor in
determining the degree to which traits are assigned to groups.
If stereotypes are in fact characterized by rigidity and sub-
ject to little change, degrees of verbal stereotyping should
not vary significantly with increased or decreased familiarity.
If degree of stereotyping and familiarity vary inversely, it
would indicate that stereotyping expressions are subject to
change as a result of experience.

There is also a practical consideration involved in the
relationship between familiarity and the incidence of stereo-
typing. The movement twoard racial integration seems to have
been initiated and continued on the assumption that decreasing
the distance between groups would result in a corresponding
decrease in both inequalities and intergroup hostilities. "Lib-
eral" whites and middle-class Negroes have not objected to the
basic underlying assumption but militant blacks and the whites
who tend to favor segregation have objected violently to the
assumption. The objectors maintain that decreasing social
distance will do little to actually change deeply entrenched attitudes. Policies such as busing and open housing therefore are related very closely to research on the relationships between familiarity and stereotyping.

The variables involved in this research are important in several ways both theoretical and pragmatic. Individual research projects cannot resolve all the issues involved in the variables of familiarity and degree of stereotyping but each research can make contributions.

The term stereotype was introduced by Walter Lippmann in 1922. He stated that the characteristics of stereotypes were that they were factually incorrect, produced through illogical reasoning and rigid. According to Lippmann's original explanation, the process of stereotyping "imposes a certain character on the data of our senses before the data reach the intelligence." (1922, p. 81) Since the time of Lippmann's work a great deal of research and theorizing has been done which has resulted in some modifications of the term.

The concept of stereotype is somewhat difficult to work with because so many different definitions and criteria have been used and suggested by various theorists. Some authors (Abate and Berrien, 1967; Blake and Dennis, 1943; Diab, 1962 and Sherif and Sherif, 1969) have tried to define stereotype as any generalization about a group. It is generally agreed at this point that all stereotypes are generalizations but that this is insufficient for a determination of stereotype. Another view has been to regard stereotypes as incorrect general-
izations. This idea was proposed first by Lippmann and has been considered for many years. Many problems are posed by using the incorrectness of an attitude as a criterion. There is very little information available with which to check the validity of stereotypes so that it is virtually impossible to determine whether stereotypes do in fact have any basis in reality. While it can be generally assumed that any ethnic generalization which is to apply to all members is wrong because of individual differences, incorrectness is still not very useful in determining the nature of stereotypes. If incorrectness is to be used as a criterion, it is agreed that it cannot be the defining characteristic.

Another popular viewpoint is to examine stereotypes as generalizations which are characterized by rigidity (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson and Sanford, 1950; Katz and Braly, 1935, and Rokeach, 1960). Rigidity can be implied only if certain characteristics apply to the attitude in question (Fishman, 1956). A stereotype could be considered rigid only if the attitudes do not change when new information is presented, when there are changed in the individual's needs or motives, or when there are changes in the focus of interaction. There is evidence that manipulation of some of these variables may change stereotypes, so the value of characterizing stereotypes as rigid seems to be questionable. The familiarity (or contact) research which will be discussed later in this section would indicate that increasing the amount
of contact between the stereotyping and the stereotyped groups tends to change stereotypes. This study also investigates that possibility. If familiarity, which in effect introduces new information and a new focus of interaction, does result in changed stereotypes, rigidity as a characteristic of stereotypes could not be maintained in theory.

One of the most generally accepted and most feasible views about stereotypes is that they are the result of a faulty thought process. Examined from this point of view, the incorrectness or content of the stereotype becomes relatively unimportant and the process becomes the identifying element of the attitude. Bogardus (1950), in describing the process, lists several elements which include the notions that stereotyping requires little thought, works quickly, is formed on the basis of little experience, is dogmatic and is subjectively based rather than objectively based. Fishman's (1956) analysis of the process of stereotyping emphasizes the ideas that the generalizations are made too rapidly, conclusions are originally made from an inadequate sample and then further information is disregarded, reactions are not made to specific cases but to associations surrounding it, and the process looks for meaning through simplification. Fishman contrasts the stereotyping processes with other types of reasoning very well:

"There seems to be a real difference between analytic, differentiated, and directed thinking or reasoning on the one hand, and the autistic, emotional, uncritical, memory-and-recognition thinking of stereotyping on the other. In stereotyping it almost seems as though the individual either judges not at all or
does so only via well-worn, dependable, swiftly traversable channels which require a bare minimum of defining, distinguishing, inducing, weighing of evidence or any other of the so-called higher mental processes." (1956, pp. 34-5)

If stereotyping is approached from a process point of view, the aspects of content which are important change. It is not necessary to determine the incorrectness of an attitude because an inferior process does not necessarily lead to incorrect generalizations (Brigham, 1971). The aspects which become important are those which reflect faulty processes, such as evidences of conclusions based on hearsay and an unquestioning attitude. If process is at fault, the content will be based on insufficient evidence (Klineberg, 1951). Another characteristic of the content which is the result of the stereotyping process is that the generalizations are not only descriptive but also evaluative and further they imply that characteristics are inborn and not subject to change (Brown, 1965).

The amount of contact that the individual has with the stereotyped group does seem to influence the stereotyping process in some situations. There has not been enough research as yet to determine the exact relationship between familiarity and stereotyping but research trends seem to support the general hypothesis that increased contact among groups leads to less stereotyping. It has been demonstrated more than once that individuals do not hesitate to stereotype groups with whom they have not had contact, whereas individuals who have had contact either have different stereotypes or do not stereotype the
groups at all (Brown, 1958). Generally, studies have shown that increased familiarity leads to friendlier inter-group relations and more favorable stereotyping. This type of research fails to explain the friction that is often caused or increased as interracial contacts increase and that often results in open hostility. In order to explain situations of this sort, Allport and Kramer (1946) have hypothesized that contact between members of groups which have about the same economic and social status makes relations friendlier but that contacts between members of very different status groups or equally deprived groups intensifies hostilities. This hypothesis was partially validated in their study of college students. The results suggested that increases in equal status contacts decreased prejudice. The Allport and Kramer hypothesis is the most precisely stated of a number of hypotheses which center around the idea that the quality and type of contacts are more important than the sheer number of contacts in determining stereotypes.

Taft (1959) found that familiarity with groups and preference for those groups intercorrelate highly. In a study of Americans and Greeks who were brought into a high contact situation, Triandis and Vassilou (1967) found conflicting results. Maximum contact Americans had less favorable stereotypes of Greeks than did minimum contact Americans. These results at first seem to conflict with the general familiarity-stereotyping hypotheses but the experimenters explained that the results may have been due to the fact that originally there was
an extremely positive stereotype of Greeks by the Americans and that contact may have resulted in disappointment. In support of the general hypotheses in the same study, Triandis and Vassilou found that maximum contact Greeks had more favorable stereotypes of Americans than did minimum contact Greeks. In another cross-cultural study Hofman and Zak (1969) observed and tested American secondary students who were at summer camp in an Israeli youth village. The study revealed that high contact students' attitudes became more favorable toward the Israelis while the low contact students' attitudes either did not change or became less favorable.

Similar results have been found in studies with American Negroes and whites. One study found that the belief that Negroes are unclean was stronger in residential areas which were distant from Negroes than in areas adjoining Negro dwellings (Kramer, 1951). This would support the notion that increasing contact brings about more favorable impressions. A study carried out during World War II by the Information and Education Division of the U. S. War Department compared the attitudes of white men in companies both with and without Negro platoons. Of the white men in companies which did not have Negro platoons in white companies, 62 percent disliked very much the idea of combining Negro and white platoons. Of the white men who were in a company which had a Negro platoon only seven percent said that they would dislike combining Negro and white platoons very much. This again supported the idea that hostilities are decreased by increased familiarity.
Deutsch and Collins (1951) have done one of the most thorough studies involving familiarity and stereotypes. In-depth interviews were carried out with women in both bi-racial segregated housing projects where Negroes and whites lived in the same project but in separate areas and with women in integrated housing projects where the races were mixed. The women in the integrated projects had significantly more positive feelings toward Negro people in general as well as Negroes in the project than did women in the bi-racial segregated projects. The positive feelings toward Negroes in general were not as great as those toward Negroes in the project but there was still a significant difference. Political attitude, education and religion made little difference in the amount of neighborly contact with Negroes. The significant variable was the community situation—integrated interracial projects vs. segregated bi-racial projects. The evidence indicated, as did the Allport and Kramer study, that contact under favorable, equal status conditions tends to reduce prejudice and stereotyping in whites. The experimenters were led to believe that attitudes did not change unless intense experiences occurred with which the stereotypes could not be reconciled. This indicates that stereotypes are perhaps not rigid if the proper circumstances and contacts to introduce new information are available.

One of the problems with much of the stereotype research at this point is that it has used the Katz and Braly technique which was first used in 1933. The adjective checklist method does not permit the strength of stereotypes to be displayed.
The subject is asked whether a trait is typical without first having been told the extent of "typical." Over the years, increasing numbers of subjects have refused to even generalize to such an extent (Eysenck and Crown, 1948). Partially as a result of the techniques employed in the past many theorists appear to have assumed that generalizations arrived at through the process of stereotyping were exceptionless. Two separate studies by Mann (1967) and Brigham (1971) which provided opportunities for subjects to indicate the extent of their stereotypes have shown that most stereotypes are not exceptionless, but few studies have actually worked with the strength of stereotypes. One study (Ehrlich and Van Tubergen, 1971) was done which concerned the stereotyping of Jews and atheists and its results demonstrated that the strength of stereotypes was independent of the direction of the stereotype. Very little other research has been done on the intensity of stereotypes.

This study is different from the studies which have been cited in several ways. The most obvious one is that it is one of the few studies that explores the relationship between familiarity and the strength of stereotypes. Other studies involving stereotyping and familiarity have used as indicators of stereotypes the consistency with which the stereotyping group assigned traits and not the degree to which the traits were assigned. Also, few research efforts have been performed involving contact and stereotyping in the context of American society between the American black and white. Many of these previous studies
have been cross cultural rather than within the society. Another differentiating aspect is that this study attempts to deal with a random sample of people rather than selecting only people who would have a particular relationship with the stereotyped group. It is the belief of the experimenter that by selecting only those who have special relationships with the stereotyped group, such as situations in which familiarity is almost required as are found in many of the previously discussed studies, a selection factor is in operation which might not be found in the general population whose distance from blacks is often a matter of choice rather than necessity. There should be some difference in the attitudes of people who have relationships with those of another race out of choice rather than because of a forced situation.
METHOD

Subjects

The sample in this study consisted of randomly selected white Muncie residents. Six sections of a Muncie map were chosen at random and enlarged photocopies of the areas were made. From each section one block was selected and an attempt was made to reach each house on the block. A total of 61 individuals were contacted and 43 agreed to participate in the study. The subjects included nineteen males and twenty-four females ranging in age from eighteen to seventy-four. The educational levels varied from fifth grade to advanced graduate work.

Instruments

A questionnaire (Appendix A) was designed to measure the extent to which individuals would express stereotypes toward Negroes. The questionnaire consisted in part of a list of fourteen adjectives which have been commonly employed in other studies of stereotypes and found to be frequently applied to Negroes (Asher and Allen, 1969; Brigham, 1971; Katz and Braly, 1933; and Mann, 1967). Following each adjective were ten percentage ratings—0 percent, 10 percent, 20 percent, 30 percent, 40 percent, 60 percent, 70 percent, 80 percent, 90 percent, and 100 percent. The directions instructed each respondent
to indicate the extent to which he felt each word applied to Negroes. The directions also specified that first feelings to the groups were to be given in every case. Scoring was determined so that extreme attitudes would be given the most weight. For positive words (intelligent, honest, proud, generous, and industrious) a response of 0 percent was scored as -5, 10 percent was -4, 20 percent was -3, 30 percent was -2, 40 percent was -1, 60 percent was 1, 70 percent was 2, 80 percent was 3, 90 percent was 4, and 100 percent was 5. Scoring for negative words (lazy, arrogant, vicious, superstitious, dirty, ignorant, and shiftless) was reversed so that 0 percent was scored as 5 and 100 percent was -5. Two neutral, but high stereotype, words (religious and musical) were scored so that a response at either extreme would be weighted -5 and scores became less negative as the percents became more moderate. This was done on the assumption that classification at either extreme on these words indicated negative opinions.

A data sheet (Appendix B) was also used to obtain information concerning the respondent including address, occupation, educational level, sex, age, and social distance from Negroes. Address was included to make it possible to check the sample for even geographic distribution. The remaining information was used to classify respondents into various groupings to be analyzed. Occupation was used in connection with the North-Hatt (1947) Ratings of Occupations as determinants of socio-economic class. One grouping included all the individuals in occupations which had rankings above the average on the North-
Hatt scale and the second included all those below that average. Educational level was determined by the last year of education completed. Categories into which the subjects were arranged were less than high school education, high school education, and more than high school education. The scores of men and women were also divided. Age groupings were set at 18 to 29, 30 to 49, and 50 to 74. The social distance measure was an adaptation of Bogardus's (1933) Social Distance Scale. The Social Distance Scale lists seven types of contact and the respondent indicates in which of the situations he would be willing to associate with members of various ethnic groups. This questionnaire used five of the seven categories from the Social Distance Scale as actual situations and the respondent was to indicate in which ones he had had contact with Negroes. The five levels of contact with Negroes were as speaking acquaintances only (contact level a), as co-workers in the same office or in the same job (contact level b), as next door neighbors (contact level c), as close friends (contact level d), and as relatives (contact level e). A sixth category, no direct contact (contact level f), was another choice. Contacts other than those listed were to be described on a space provided on the data sheet. The responses in this extra category could generally be placed by the experimenter into one of the given levels of contact.

**Procedures**

The experimenter went to each house in a block and
presented the questionnaire and data sheet to any adult who was present. The form was filled out in the presence of the experimenter who answered questions from the respondent. Before leaving, the experimenter examined the questions quickly to determine if they had been properly and completely filled out.

Treatment of data

The computed stereotype scores were recorded onto master data sheets for each variable. Educational level, sex, age and level of contact groupings each had a total of 43 subjects. Socio-economic classifications had a total of only 33 subjects. Ten of the original subjects had to be eliminated from analysis according to socio-economic class because their occupations could not be classified by the North-Hatt ratings. Means for each group and total means were computed and tested for significant differences with analysis of variance.
RESULTS

The analysis of the data did reveal some differences which would have been predicted by various stereotyping theories. None of the results, however, were significant at the .05 level.

The mean stereotype score of the 19 males in the study was .51. The 24 females in the sample had a mean stereotype score of 1.029. The tendency was for women to rate Negroes more positively than did men (see Figure 1). The F score was 2.691 which did not indicate a significant difference between the means at any level.

Classification according to educational level also failed to yield significant results. There were four individuals in the sample with less than a high school education. This group had a mean stereotype score of .462. The high school education group consisted of 18 individuals and had a mean of .478. The group with more than a high school education had 21 members and its mean was 1.139. The mean for the entire group was .8. The high school and less than high school groups fell below the total mean stereotype score and the more than high school education group was above the total mean (see Figure II). The resultant F score, however, was 2.271 and was not significant.
Figure I. - Stereotype Scores as Related to Sex
Figure II. - Mean Stereotype Scores as Related to Educational Level
Of the 33 subjects who could be classified according to the North-Hatt ratings for socio-economic class, 13 were above the occupational average and 20 were below it. The mean score of those in the above average group was .916 and the mean stereotype score of those below the average was .424 (see Figure III). The total mean for the group was .618. The above average group had a mean above the total mean and the below average group scored lower than the total mean. The F score which resulted from the comparison of the means was 1.652 and was not significant.

Age groupings were 18 to 29, 30 to 49, and 50 to 74. There were 22 individuals in the 18 to 29 group, 10 in the 30 to 49 group and 11 in the 50 to 74 group. The mean stereotype scores were .932 for the youngest group, .913 for the middle group and .432 for the older group (see Figure IV). The total group mean was .8. The young and middle groups had means above the group mean and the older group was below the total mean. The F score was .842 and not significant.

Responses were received for only four levels of contact therefore all six categories could not be analyzed. Level a, indicating contact with Negroes as speaking acquaintances only, had eight subjects and their mean was .312. There were 14 individuals who responded at level b which indicated contact as co-workers in the same office of the same job. The level b group had a stereotype score mean of .682. In level c, which indicated contact as next door neighbors, there were four individuals with a mean of .718. There were 16 respondents
Figure III. - Mean Stereotype Scores as Related to Socio-Economic Classifications
Figure IV. - Mean Stereotype Scores as Related to Age
Figure V. - Mean Stereotype Scores as Related to Various Levels of Contact
who reported being close friends with Negroes (contact level d) and their mean was 1.194 (see Figure V). The total mean was .8 so the only group above the total mean was the group at contact level d. The means became more positive with increased contact but the means did not vary significantly (the F score was 1.417).
DISCUSSION

The results of this study relate to many hypotheses concerning stereotypes. The strength of stereotypes, some of the characteristics of stereotypes, and factors which have been hypothesized as influencing stereotypes have also been considered. In this section the findings of this study will be discussed in relation to previously cited research and hypotheses.

The most obvious result of this study concerns the strength of stereotypes. Verbal stereotypes are not exceptionless. The mean stereotype score for the total group was .8 and individual scores fluctuated around this mean. Scores would have been much higher or much lower if responses had been at the extremes indicating exceptionless attitudes. This is also the result found by Mann (1967) in his research on stereotypes. If verbal stereotyping is an accurate expression of attitude, these results would suggest that people do not expect the same type of behavior from all Negroes nor do they attribute the same personality traits to all Negroes. How important this is in actual behavior has not as yet been established.

Allport and Kramer's hypothesis (1946) would lead to the prediction that the mean of those at the close friend level
of contact should be higher than the mean stereotype scores of those at less familiar levels. The difference in these means was in the direction which would have been predicted by this hypothesis with higher contact levels resulting in more positive means, but the means did not differ significantly. Deutsch and Collins (1951) may be of some assistance in explaining why contact at a close level does not result in changed stereotypes. In their study of interracial housing, Deutsch and Collins were led to believe that attitudes do not change unless intense experiences occur with which stereotypes cannot be reconciled. The relationship which individuals classified as being close friends in this study may in fact not have been of the intense type needed to change stereotypes.

A second explanation of the lack of significance might be that stereotypes are actually very rigid. It was previously mentioned that stereotypes could be classified as being rigid only if they did not change because of new information, or because of changes in the individual's needs, motives or interests, or because of changes in the focus of interaction. Changes in needs, motives or interests would be expected with changes in social class, age and educational level. The results of this study showed no significant difference in the degree of stereotyping between groups compared on these variables. New information and changes in the focus of interaction should result from increasing levels of contact. However, there were no significant differences among various levels of contact in this study. Therefore, the findings of this study would indicate that stereotypes are rigid and subject to little change.
Theories maintaining that stereotyping is a result of faulty thought processes also gain support from the results of this study. If stereotypes are the result of faulty thought processes, they should be unresponsive to reality and changing conditions. This in fact is what the findings of this study showed. There were no significant differences among the means regardless of the variables examined. If there were a rational thought process involved in stereotyping, one would expect differences in the variables studied to be reflected in the stereotype scores. However, this study found no significant differences in the stereotype scores.

One aspect of the study which should be considered is the feelings of the respondents toward the questionnaire. Most individuals in the process of filling out the questionnaire expressed doubt in their own ability to adequately complete the questionnaires. They generally said that they really did not know what percentage of any group of people (including therefore Negroes) had certain characteristics. They usually continued to fill it out but one man was so firm in his opinion that he did not mark any percentages and wrote across the front of his questionnaire "I do not believe that the distribution of these characteristics in in any way related to race." As it has become less socially acceptable to grossly stereotype groups people seem more reluctant to reveal their feelings. This could have affected very greatly the results of this study by encouraging people to be moderate in their responses.
Perhaps the social stigma which has become attached to the expression of stereotypes may eventually encourage people to examine their attitudes and make the process more rational.

More research does need to be done in this area. In the investigation of familiarity as it effects stereotyping, there needs to be a determination of the amount of contact necessary to produce the impact which could make the stereotypes irreconcilable with experience. It may be found that such a level is above that classified as close friends for most people. There also needs to be some research on the behavior which is associated with various levels of verbal stereotypes in order that meaningful behavioral predictions can be made from reports of attitudes. There also needs to be a determination of whether or not there are any factors which can influence stereotypes. Such research could be used in studying the theoretical as well as pragmatic implications of stereotyping more fully. Finally, before much more research can take place, the methodology of stereotype assessment needs to be thoroughly reexamined and redesigned in order that instruments are actually capable of accurately reporting stereotypes and changes in stereotypes.
SUMMARY

This study was designed to study the relationship between strength of stereotypes toward Negroes and familiarity with that group. Sex, age, socio-economic class and educational level were also examined to determine their effects on stereotyping. A total of 61 white residents of Muncie were contacted and 43 completed the questionnaire. Mean stereotype scores of the various groupings were computed and compared and none of the results were found to be significant at the .05 level. The results supported explanations that stereotypes are rigid and are the result of faulty thought processes. The results might have been influenced by social factors which discourage people from expressing extreme attitudes toward Negroes which would lessen the differences among the means.
APPENDIXES
Below you will find a list of adjectives which may or may not apply to any group or individual. Please specify the extent to which you feel the words apply to Negroes by circling the percentage closest to your opinion.

Remember to give your first feelings in every case. Give your reactions to the race as a group. Do not give your reactions to the best or the worst members that you have known.

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 0%</td>
<td>f. 60%</td>
<td>b. 10%</td>
<td>g. 70%</td>
<td>c. 20%</td>
<td>h. 80%</td>
<td>d. 30%</td>
<td>i. 90%</td>
<td>e. 40%</td>
<td>j. 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 10%</td>
<td>g. 70%</td>
<td>c. 20%</td>
<td>h. 80%</td>
<td>d. 30%</td>
<td>i. 90%</td>
<td>e. 40%</td>
<td>j. 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 20%</td>
<td>h. 80%</td>
<td>d. 30%</td>
<td>i. 90%</td>
<td>e. 40%</td>
<td>j. 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 30%</td>
<td>i. 90%</td>
<td>e. 40%</td>
<td>j. 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. 40%</td>
<td>j. 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| a. 0%  | f. 60%  | b. 10%  | g. 70%  | c. 20%  | h. 80%  | d. 30%  | i. 90%  | e. 40%  | j. 100%  |
| b. 10%  | g. 70%  | c. 20%  | h. 80%  | d. 30%  | i. 90%  | e. 40%  | j. 100%  |
| c. 20%  | h. 80%  | d. 30%  | i. 90%  | e. 40%  | j. 100%  |
| d. 30%  | i. 90%  | e. 40%  | j. 100%  |
| e. 40%  | j. 100%  |

| a. 0%  | f. 60%  | b. 10%  | g. 70%  | c. 20%  | h. 80%  | d. 30%  | i. 90%  | e. 40%  | j. 100%  |
| b. 10%  | g. 70%  | c. 20%  | h. 80%  | d. 30%  | i. 90%  | e. 40%  | j. 100%  |
| c. 20%  | h. 80%  | d. 30%  | i. 90%  | e. 40%  | j. 100%  |
| d. 30%  | i. 90%  | e. 40%  | j. 100%  |
| e. 40%  | j. 100%  |
APPENDIX B
DATA SHEET

Please answer the following questions.

Address___________________________________________________________

Occupation_________________________________________________________
(position & firm)

Circle the last year of school completed:
Elementary 1 2 3 4 5 6
Junior High 7 8 9
High school 10 11 12
College 1 2 3 4
Other post-high school education (specify)_____________________________

Sex (circle) M  F  Age__________

Did you attend school with Negroes?_______ If so, circle the appropriate grade levels:
Elementary 1 2 3 4 5 6
Junior High 7 8 9
High School 10 11 12
College 1 2 3 4

In which of the following situations have you had contact with Negroes?

a. as speaking acquaintances only
b. as co-workers in the same office or in the same job
c. as next door neighbors
d. as close friends
e. as relatives
f. no direct contact
g. contacts other than those listed (please describe)__________________________

______________________________________________________________
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