

THE EFFECT OF STATUS FRAMING ON STUDENT INTEREST AND RECALL
REGARDING MINORITY FIGURES

by

Crystal N. Steltenpohl

B.A., University of Southern Indiana, 2011

A Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Master of Arts Degree

Department of Psychology
in the Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
August 2013

UMI Number: 1549030

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI 1549030

Published by ProQuest LLC (2013). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

THESIS APPROVAL

THE EFFECT OF STATUS FRAMING ON STUDENT INTEREST AND RECALL
REGARDING MINORITY FIGURES

By

Crystal N. Steltenpohl

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Masters of Art

in the field of Psychology

Approved by:

Dr. Meera Komarraju, Chair

Dr. Paul Etcheverry

Dr. Ann Fischer

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
May 8, 2013

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

CRYSTAL STELTENPOHL, for the Master of Arts degree in PSYCHOLOGY, presented on May 8, 2013, at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

TITLE: THE EFFECT OF STATUS FRAMING ON STUDENT INTEREST AND RECALL REGARDING MINORITY FIGURES

MAJOR PROFESSOR: Dr. Meera Komarraju

This study examined the effects of framing on participant interest and retention of diversity-related material. In this study, 204 students from undergraduate psychology courses across two universities read a vignette about Kenneth and Mamie Clark. The vignette was presented in the context of one of four frames that either highlighted or did not highlight their minority status and/or their status as leaders in their field. After reading the vignette, students responded to 13 items measuring recall of the material figures and 11 items assessing their interest in these figures. Participants also responded to the Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE), Modern Racism Scale (MRS), and Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). The data found in the present study provided varying levels of support for the hypotheses. The effects were stronger for Illinois participants, which may be due to the larger sample size collected and/or the greater diversity of the school population. These results bring to light an interesting potential area of future research that could eventually impact school curricula. It is possible that a better understanding of effective methods for engaging students in discussions of diversity may be around the corner. Participant race, gender, location, and major all had varying degrees of an effect on the results, indicating that, like many other topics in psychology, understanding how people react to diversity discussions is not simply black and white.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to my mentors, Drs. Amie McKibban, Garret Merriam, Sunny Hawkins, and Michael Kearns, and their undying support of my personal and professional development; to my parents, who have taught me the meaning of dedication; and to my grandparents, who have each given me at least one lesson to learn about life, hard work, loyalty, and respect.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the following people:

Dr. Meera Komarraju, for chairing my thesis, and Drs. Paul Etcheverry and Ann Fischer, for agreeing to serve on my committee. Their guidance helped me to create the best possible study and document.

Megan Morrison, Yossett Droz, Tiffany Conner, Heather Jaffe, and Rachel Hamel, for their assistance with data collection and/or entry at the Illinois location, which helped me to complete this thesis on time.

Dr. Julie Evey and Sarah Lemp, for their assistance in obtaining IRB approval, and for collecting and entering data at the Indiana location, which helped me to complete this thesis on time.

Drs. Meera Komarraju and Amie McKibban, Mark Belcher, Mahlon Powell, and Dale Johnson, for their assistance in reviewing and providing suggestions for the improvement of this document.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
ABSTRACT.....	i
DEDICATION.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CHAPTERS	
CHAPTER 1 – Introduction.....	1
CHAPTER 2 – Literature Review.....	5
CHAPTER 3 – Methods.....	25
CHAPTER 4 – Results.....	33
CHAPTER 5 – Discussion.....	39
CHAPTER 6 – Conclusion.....	45
REFERENCES.....	86
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A – Consent Forms.....	93
APPENDIX B – Vignette.....	96
APPENDIX C – Recall Measure.....	101
APPENDIX D – Interest Measure.....	103
APPENDIX E – Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy.....	104
APPENDIX F – Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale.....	107
APPENDIX G – Modern Racism Scale.....	109
APPENDIX H – Manipulation Checks.....	110

APPENDIX I – Demographic Survey	111
VITA	113

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Table 1.....	47
Table 2.....	48
Table 3.....	49
Table 4.....	50
Table 5.....	51
Table 6.....	52
Table 7.....	53
Table 8.....	55
Table 9.....	56
Table 10.....	57
Table 11.....	59
Table 12.....	60
Table 13.....	61
Table 14.....	65

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

I refuse to accept the view that mankind is so tragically bound to the starless midnight of racism and war that the bright daybreak of peace and brotherhood can never become a reality.

—Martin Luther King, Jr.

Between 1980 and 2008, the makeup of the U.S. population has changed drastically: Whites have declined from 80 percent of the total population to 66 percent; Hispanics increased from 6 to 15 percent; African Americans remained at about 12 percent; and Asian/Pacific Islanders increased from less than 2 percent to 4 percent (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). Diversity, which is now recognized as more than simply race/ethnicity, is a topic that citizens constantly deal with, whether it is in a local community center or on the political pulpit. In the recent 2012 presidential election, the Latino vote was considered to be crucial to President Barack Obama's reelection by helping him win battleground states; Latinos made up ten percent of the electorate for the first time ever (Rodriguez, 2012). Additionally, some pundits have speculated that part of the reason Latinos voted for candidate Mitt Romney at a far lower rate was that the Republican Party was not able to connect with them or reach out to them. Interest in issues of immigration, race, disability, sexuality, feminism, and religiosity has rapidly grown. Education is no exception: from debates over how to create racially diverse classrooms (Holding, 2007) to growing concern about the bullying of students who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans*, or queer (LGBTQ) (Presgraves, 2010), educators, parents, politicians, and students are searching for answers on how to address the need for discussion on diversity matters. The demography of the United States is, and will continue to, change rapidly, and this demands that institutions respond accordingly.

The students within these institutions tend to be proud of their country, but also tend to view their obligations to the United States as "paying taxes, obeying the law, and voting" (Avery & Simmons, 2001) and little more. In 2010, less than one-quarter of fourth-, eighth-, and twelfth-grade students performed at or above the Proficient level in a test of mastery of knowledge and skill in U.S. History (Institute of Education Sciences, 2010). This suggests that their knowledge of racial history is spotty, and their understanding of many civil rights movements is questionable at best. All students have something to gain from effective diversity education, whether or not they identify with the majority on a given identity dimension. Specifically, Curtis-Boles and Bourg (2010) have shown that minority students benefit from multicultural education. Their research illustrated that students sometimes experience strong emotions when referring to personal experiences with racism. However, their research also demonstrated that inclusive curricula may provide the opportunity to learn about other groups and assist students in building their own sense of ethnic identity. Moreover, minority students, within the aforementioned context, tend to move from feeling victimized to feeling empowered, depending on how inequality is discussed. Lastly, inclusive curricula can help those who have not had, and likely will never have similar experiences, understand these issues better.

Despite publicity surrounding proficiency in history scores and the addition of inclusive student groups across school campuses, current education often reinforces inequity while at the same time attempting to support equity. To illustrate this point, one only needs to evaluate the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. The program has been marketed as a way to help end the "soft racism of low expectations;" however, segregation has been found to be related to lower pass rates on state tests for Florida and similar problems have been found in other states (Orfield & Lee, 2005). By punishing schools whose students are failing, NCLB unwittingly damages

poorer schools, schools whose students are often of minority-status, teachers are least experienced, have the highest rates of teachers instructing outside of their fields, and have the highest student-to-teacher ratios (National Urban League, 2007). As such, while Black and Hispanic students made greater gains from 2006 to 2010 in the National Assessment of Educational Progress with regards to U.S. History, these scores are still behind those of White and Asian/Pacific Islander students, despite a higher access to Advanced Placement (AP) U.S. History courses for those in schools with high concentrations of minority students (Institute of Education Sciences, 2010).

It may be possible to alleviate some of the problems of gaps in achievement by (1) helping students understand how their knowledge and culture are similar to and different from other students' knowledge and culture, and (2) having teachers bring their own knowledge and culture to the table (Banks, 1998). Teachers also need to challenge the curriculum, practices and values of the institution to promote support of diversity. One way to promote such support may reside in the revision of curriculum that reflects increasing diversity and describes the process of becoming an American. Further, teachers need to be encouraged to provide a safe experience for students to learn by providing educational materials students can identify with and find relevant to their lives; by engaging students so that they may relate to the material in more intimate ways (Chin, 2002).

Research on framing holds the potential to bridge the gap in understanding how to encourage those who are not intrinsically motivated to engage in discussions related to diversity to do so. Tversky and Kahneman (1981) found that people's perceptions of a problem, and by extension the decisions they make, can be manipulated by altering the context in which those problems are described. Later research expanded upon this idea and looked at the influence of

framing on decision making under various circumstances. One study found that when a story covering a Klu Klux Klan rally was framed as an issue of free speech rather than disruption of public order, participants were more tolerant of the KKK rally (Nelson, Clawson, & Oxley, 1997). Shafir, Simonson, and Tversky (1993) outline several reason-based methods people often employ in order to make decisions, including assigning values to different outcomes, examining pros and cons, seeking relevant reasons for choosing one option over another and adding options. Manipulating the contexts for these reasons has been shown to change the decisions that are made.

Current research does not adequately address the effects of the context of learning on student interest and recall, particularly regarding material related to diversity issues. Possibly, the way the education system frames the reasons for learning about diversity topics might affect students' interest and recall of diversity-related material. This study aims to investigate how framing might affect student interest and recall of minority figures and offer suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Benefits of Diversity

All students have something to gain from effective diversity education, whether or not they identify with the majority on a given identity dimension. Specifically, Curtis-Botes and Bourg (2010) have shown that minority students benefit from multicultural education. Their research illustrated that students sometimes experience strong emotions when referring to personal experiences with racism. However, their research also demonstrated that inclusive curricula may provide the opportunity to learn about other groups and assist students in building their own sense of ethnic identity. Moreover, minority students, within the aforementioned context, tend to move from feeling victimized to feeling empowered, depending on how inequality is discussed. Lastly, inclusive curricula can help those who have not had, and likely will never have similar experiences, understand these issues better.

In a briefing before the United States Commission on Civil Rights in 2006, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Education for Civil Rights Arthur Coleman argued that research has revealed three benefits to racial and ethnic diversity in elementary and secondary education: the promotion of cross-racial understanding, the breaking down of stereotypes, and the enabling of students to better understand persons of a different race (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 2006). To this list, Dr. Michal Kurlaender added increased interaction with members of other racial groups, greater stability of interracial friendships, and a greater desire to live and work in multiracial settings. However, the Commission also noted large gaps in knowledge, especially when it comes to empirical studies on the effects of desegregation on academic performance.

Quite a few studies have methodological weaknesses or report varied results, making it difficult to draw cause-effect relationships.

Ukpokodu (2010) found that universities that value diversity tend to have better student retention rates, college satisfaction, GPA, and intellectual and social self-confidence. Current efforts, including cultural festivals, minority scholars in residence, diversity sensitivity training, and lecture series are a necessary component to diversity; however, such efforts are not sufficient. Also needed are high-quality curriculum offerings, a healthy classroom environment, and pedagogy. This needs to happen at all levels of the educational process. This extends beyond the addition of course materials. Specifically, Sciamè-Giesecke, Roden, and Parkinson (2009) found that if teachers simply add content, they are likely to continue to add content, but ignore pedagogical development, building interrelationships, and encouraging self-discovery of both students and teachers (Sciamè-Giesecke, Roden, & Parkinson, 2009).

Perhaps a school's racial composition is not the only important factor to be considered in determining the benefits of diversity. It may also be important to look at the context for discussions of diversity-related topics. Some researchers argue that current conversations on inequality focus on the disadvantages of the minority group (Lowery & Wout, 2010), so members of the majority group fail to realize that they are benefiting from inequality in important ways. It is also possible to show that there are psychosocial costs to racism, in that those in a position of privilege often have to deal with guilt, shame, irrational fears of others, distorted beliefs regarding race and racism, and limited exposure to people of different races (Spanierman, Poteat, Beer, & Armstrong, 2006). Showing that majority group members unfairly gain from social inequities in some instances and suffer negative consequences in others may

influence them to commit to remedy inequity. This result, however, depends upon the framing of the discussion.

Diversity and Educational Attainment

If a more effective method of teaching diversity can be found, students might see improvements in achievement. This could be true for both students who identify as a part of the majority and students who identify as minorities. Martell and Hashimoto-Martell (2011) illustrated this by inserting personal narratives from people who lived within a certain era in U.S. history into a course curriculum. This was done in addition to, or instead of, using the standard textbook. Using survey and interview data, they found students were better able to do homework and recall information in classrooms that replaced the corporate-produced textbook with teacher-created reading packets and questions that asked students to take a critical stance on historical US events. Further, students better illustrated their understanding that history is comprised of interpreted events; with minority students better able to identify with people in history. This study challenges traditional ideas of teaching history and encourages students to think for themselves, resulting in active engagement with the material. Although some students preferred the textbook, Martell and Hashimoto-Martell found largely positive results. In summary, those positive findings include: a positive influence on students' perception of learning of and engagement with the material; positive results in students' perceptions of interest, recall, understanding, and identification with people discussed in class, though non-White students had more positive perceptions than White students; and homework completion across all races. It remains uncertain whether these results were lasting; future research should look at longitudinal effects of this teaching methodology.

Recall that Martell and Hashimoto-Martell found that students of a minority status were more likely to see themselves in the personal narratives they included in their coursework, rather than standard textbook descriptions. Given that these personal narratives are often written by individuals who are not in an advantaged position and more likely to be of minority status, this finding comes as no surprise. Textbooks, they point out, are often mass-produced by an elite group of corporate educational publishers, portray the dominant narrative of those who hold power in society, and often marginalize non-Whites, women, the poor and working classes, among others. Additional critiques of textbooks, particularly history textbooks, are that they are dull, erroneous (particularly in regard to errors of omission), overly broad with regard to coverage, are difficult to understand, and are written in an anonymous, authoritative style, all of which may play important roles in creating the impoverished conception of history outlined here and in other education research (Paxton, 1999). Therefore, using personal narratives and framing the subjects as integral parts of history may help to include minority students as a part of American history; the textbook alone often does not offer this experience. In the end, these results suggest that asking students to take a stance on history and including counter narratives may help students become better citizens. However, such a conclusion remains difficult to verify.

Research within the teaching of psychology has shown promise for improving diversity outcomes. In one such study, 131 White students' responses to a White privilege scale and items from the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale were analyzed (Case, 2007). Using a pretest-posttest design, identical surveys were administered during the first and last weeks of a college-level race and gender course. The results suggested that as students developed an increased awareness of White privilege and racism through the course material, they showed increased support for affirmative action and reduced prejudice. This may be because the course made them more

aware of differential treatment and increased their questioning of what they had previously been taught to believe. Interestingly, an increased awareness of White privilege also predicted a greater fear of other races; the researchers found that this change might have been due to one item about the number of cross-race friendships; possibly, the item accurately reflected a decrease in cross-race friendships, but perhaps students were less likely to identify their friendships as cross-race due to the nature of the course. The results from this study also showed an increase in White guilt, which was attributed to cognitive dissonance: the idea of racial disparity goes directly against the idea of a meritocracy, a common theme in American identity. The results also suggested that more racial fear predicted more prejudice. It is important that students examine their privilege and where they may unfairly gain due to status; depending on how this issue is tackled, it may lead to a stronger commitment to remedying that injustice. Thus, instructors should welcome dialogue about emotional reactions to course materials, perhaps in the form of weekly journals or classroom discussions.

Other research has shown similar results. One quasi-experimental study compared two sections of a college course, one that taught diversity content and one that did not, examining attitude change and content knowledge (Hussey, Fleck, & Warner, 2010). Using pre- and post-tests, Hussey, Fleck, and Warner found that there was a significant decrease in prejudice in regards to race and class (but not sexism, heterosexism, or ageism) for the students in the diversity-infused section, but no significant difference in content knowledge between the two sections. While this does not show that diversity aids in teaching *more* material to students, it does pose a problem to critiques that infusing diversity into the curriculum results in *less* knowledge attained. Other research has suggested that it is possible to increase recall through the manipulation of mood and framing (Kuvaas & Kaufman, 2004), so perhaps there exists a method

of including diversity capable of increasing recall for students. Kuvaas and Kaufman had participants read a story with either a negative or positive psychological effect on the reader and either a positively-framed or negatively-framed business scenario in which a decision had to be made. They then tested for recall, confidence of recall, and need for cognition. They found that the main effect of mood did not affect recall or level of confidence, but those that read mood-congruent framing were better at recalling information and less overconfident. Need for cognition served as a moderator; those with lower cognitive processing requirements showed these effects.

However, students' perceptions of diversity emphasis can influence how much information they *perceive* they are learning (Elicker, Snell, & O'Malley, 2010). Students filled out a survey late in the semester that asked them about their perception of diversity emphasis and perceived learning and found that student perceptions of diversity significantly predicted reported understanding of course concepts and reported ability to apply course content to life experiences, even when controlling for contextual characteristics such as course section and expected grade and for demographic information. Additionally, their perception of diversity emphasis was actually the largest predictor for the extent to which they felt the material was applicable to their lives, while expected grade—followed by diversity perceptions—was the largest predictor for understanding course concepts. Students appear to be aware of classroom efforts to increase knowledge of diversity topics, and it does seem to affect their perception of their courses. Elicker, Snell, and O'Malley do note that two underrepresented groups in their sample, non-European Americans and students identifying as homosexual, reported less understanding of course concepts than those in the majority, which suggests that they may have had different experiences within the classroom based on their diverse backgrounds. This is

important to recognize as our classrooms become more diverse; we will need to arm our future instructors with teaching strategies that can reach students with varied backgrounds.

Boysen (2011) examined coverage of diversity and classroom bias in teaching of psychology courses, courses that prepare graduate students in pedagogy, and made a few key findings: 87% of teaching of psychology instructors covered diversity issues, and 78% covered bias that occurs in the classroom. Of those who covered diversity issues, 92% covered race, 83% covered disability, 80% covered gender, 71% covered sexual orientation, 59% covered socioeconomic status, 55% covered age, 50% covered nationality, 49% covered religion, and 2% covered other forms of diversity. Of those who covered classroom bias, 85% covered inappropriate classroom comments by students, 79% covered teacher stereotypes about students, 70% covered teacher bias in grading, 63% covered student bias toward other students, 58% covered student bias toward teachers, and 22% covered other forms of bias. Those who covered these topics devoted 3-5 hours of the course to the material and primarily used traditional teaching methods to do so. Finally, Boysen found that older instructors tended to cover fewer topics than younger instructors. Clearly, current teaching of pedagogy leaves much to be desired, especially if we are to expect these graduate students, some of whom may be future instructors, to teach courses with diversity in mind.

Another study examined heterosexual privilege awareness, support for same-sex marriage, and prejudice against lesbians and gay men expressed by heterosexual female students in psychology of women, introduction to women's studies, and psychology courses without a focus in diversity (Case & Stewart, 2010). Case and Stewart found that students enrolled in diversity courses showed increased heterosexual privilege awareness and support for same-sex marriage across the semester, while students in psychology courses without a focus in diversity

showed no changes. All students showed reduced prejudice against lesbians and gay men, with degree of changes between the courses not being significant.

Few studies have looked at the long-term effects of diversity-infused courses on students. One study that has broken ground on such a question has found that students' awareness and attitudes plateaued or even waned in the year after taking a diversity course in psychology; however, students also reported more comfort with dealing with racial issues and an increase in interaction with those of other races (Kernahan & Davis, 2010). Students who had taken a prejudice and racism course were compared to students who had taken a behavioral statistics course among the dimensions of awareness and understanding, action and responsibility, and comfort and interaction. Students in the prejudice and racism course became more aware of racism and white privilege and became more action-oriented, but did not significantly change their level of comfort with race or interaction with racial "others" over the course of the semester. After a year, there was either no change or slight drops in racial awareness and an orientation toward action; however, there was an increase in comfort with race and interaction with racial "others."

Measuring Racism

One of the major goals for diversity-related education is a decrease in racism, defined as the practice of racial discrimination, segregation, etc. (Agnes, 2002). However, measuring such attitudes is difficult, especially when the measurement is done overtly as individuals might feel pressure to provide socially desirable answers. Public opinion polls show that public support for familiar negative stereotypes, private and government discrimination, and *de jure* segregation dropped dramatically in the 1970s, though race relations did not necessarily improve during that time (McConahay, 1986). Much of this can be attributed to the fact that White Americans knew

the socially desirable answers and how they should react to current measures. There was a push, then, for updated racism measures that would more accurately show what the modern individual believed regarding race, measures that could correlate with racially relevant behavior. According to McConahay, the principle tenets of "modern racism" are these: (1) Discrimination is a thing of the past, (2) African Americans are pushing too hard and too fast and into places they are not wanted, (3) these tactics and demands are unfair, and (4) therefore, recent gains are undeserved. People who subscribe to these beliefs also believe that racism is bad and that beliefs about differences between races (e.g. Black intelligence, honesty, etc.) are not racist because they are empirical facts.

The Modern Racism Scale (MRS) intends to measure such racism. It has been used in numerous studies to evaluate self-reported attitudes toward African Americans. The Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS) measures a similar construct: beliefs in a just world, or a world where race does not matter. To that end, it is often used to measure levels of unawareness of social privilege. Both the MRS and the CoBRAS have been used to evaluate changes in racial attitudes in training programs and other contexts where the goal is to reduce prejudice. As such, they are particularly useful for the present study as potential tools for understanding any changes in attitudes due to the effects of various frames.

In one study, the MRS was used alongside another self-report inventory in order to test whether racist beliefs and in-group preferences changed among Whites after a prejudice-reduction strategy that involved participants reading a paragraph designed to prime cooperation, political tolerance, or respect (Blincoe & Harris, 2009). Using these scales, the researchers were able to determine that those primed with cooperation showed less automatic preference for

Whites and those primed with respect showed lower levels of prejudice toward African Americans compared with control group participants.

Researchers have also found that after controlling for racial/ethnic minority status, perceptions of general campus climate and specifically racial-ethnic campus climate can be predicted by color-blind racial attitudes (Worthington, Navarro, Loewy, & Hart, 2008). Further, color-blind racial attitudes partially mediated the relationship between race and racial-ethnic campus climate perceptions and fully mediated the relationship between race and general campus climate perceptions. According to this study, those who have higher levels of color-blind racial attitudes will perceive the campus climate more positively. This suggests that it may be difficult to get those who believe in a just world to support equity efforts and the implementation of prejudice-reduction strategies. Another study used an adapted version of the MRS (using "racial minorities" instead of "Blacks") to test whether social dominance orientation, right-wing authoritarianism, and racial color-blindness affected modern racism attitudes (Poteat & Spanierman, 2012). These researchers found that individuals with high dominance orientation and authoritarianism tend to endorse color-blind racial attitudes, which predicts modern racism attitudes. Both of the previously mentioned studies have important implications for the future of prejudice-reduction strategies, as it may be that people with higher levels of social dominance orientation, authoritarianism, and/or color-blind racial attitudes will be most difficult to persuade to work toward equity.

Ethnocultural Empathy

Psychological research may potentially help to shed light on such issues by investigating the cognitions and behaviors associated with various teaching methods. Not only will these types of investigations move scientific understanding forward, applying such findings can assist

educators in constructing curricula that represent the vast array of groups that are currently underrepresented while motivating students to broaden their knowledge of these groups. It almost goes without saying that one way to help create a supportive environment for those of minority status is to motivate those in privileged groups (e.g. Whites, males, heterosexuals, cisgendered individuals, etc.) to be active allies. For example, research has shown that heterosexual allies who work for equality for members of LGBTQ communities may be motivated by fundamental principles—such as justice or civil rights—or by personal experiences, such as professional roles or transforming guilt (Russell, 2011). As suggested by Russell, allies appear to be intrinsically motivated, sometimes beyond even connections to any particular LGBTQ community or individual. Other research, however, has shown that it is not always easy to intrinsically motivate people to be active in diversity efforts. One possible problem with introducing people to these issues is the manner in which they are framed; for example, using a multicultural perspective, a perspective that appreciates group differences, tends to lead to stronger stereotypes, and greater use of category information in judgments of individuals relative to a color-blind (e.g. “melting pot”) perspective (Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2000).

Scales such as the Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE) (Wang, et al., 2003) have shed light on the multifaceted nature of ethnocultural empathy, defined as the understanding of feelings of individuals that are ethnically and/or culturally different from ones’ self (Rasoal, Jungert, Stiivne, & Andersson, 2009). Specifically, the SEE analyzes ethnocultural empathy along four factors: Empathic Feeling and Expression, Empathic Perspective Taking, Acceptance of Cultural Differences, and Empathic Awareness. Scales such as these can change the way racism and multicultural efforts are currently being studied and discussed.

Indeed, using the Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites Scale (PCRWS), a scale which has established convergent validity with the SEE, Spanierman et al. (2006) found that those who scored as unempathic and unaware on the PCRWS tended to earn the lowest empathy score, and those who scored as insensitive and afraid scored low on low empathy and guilt and had the highest score on fear. Participants with fearful guilt classification showed high scores on guilt and fear; those who scored as empathic but unaccountable aptly reflected scores high in empathy and low in guilt and fear; and participants in the informed empathy and guilt cluster scored high on empathy and guilt, as well as low in fear.

Research studies in which these scales have been utilized offer insights for potential implications. For instance, Lloyd and Härtel's (2009) findings suggest that managers need to address the level of intercultural competence each individual employee possesses in order to develop positive team climates in culturally diverse teams. Further research has found that though ethnocultural empathy acts as a mediator for positive attitudes toward diversity, it potentially does not work as a mediator for negative attitudes toward diversity (Brouwer & Boroş, 2010); subsequently, ethnocultural empathy can lead to more positive feelings but not necessarily prevent stereotyping and related behavior. Recall that Case and Stewart (2010) found that students did not differ in amount of prejudice against lesbians and gay men, regardless of which course they took. Brouwer and Boroş also found that intergroup contact influences empathic perspective taking and acceptance of cultural difference more than empathic feeling and expression or empathic awareness. These results suggest that multicultural directives may not work across all groups of people, and it is important to note these differences while developing such directives.

Framing Diversity

Research on framing holds the potential to bridge the gap in understanding how to encourage those who are not intrinsically motivated to engage in discussions related to diversity to do so. Tversky and Kahneman (1981) found that people's perceptions of a problem, and by extension the decisions they make, can be manipulated by altering the context in which those problems are described. Later research expanded upon this idea and looked at the influence of framing on decision making under various circumstances. For example, some researchers found that when a story regarding a Klu Klux Klan rally was framed as a free speech story rather than a story about the disruption of public order, participants expressed more tolerance for the activities of the KKK (Nelson, Clawson, & Oxley, 1997). Shafir, Simonson, and Tversky (1993) outline several reason-based methods people often employ in order to make decisions, including assigning values to different outcomes, examining pros and cons, seeking relevant reasons for choosing one option over another and adding options. Manipulating the contexts for these reasons has been shown to change the decisions that are made.

Framing has been used to change attitudes and behaviors almost as long as it has been studied. One longitudinal study examined media framing and racial policy preferences, such as bussing students in order to aid in desegregation and affirmative action (Kellstedt, 2000). Kellstedt found that when the media framed racial policy discussions through an individualistic lens, which argues for "picking oneself up by his/her own bootstraps," racial policies were less likely to be supported by the general population; on the other hand, when the media portrayed racial policy discussions through the lens of egalitarianism, which argue for a level playing field, the general population was more likely to support these racial policies. Additionally, it was suggested that increased discussion of states' rights nudges racial policy preferences in the

conservative direction. Obviously, more than one factor determines how a populace feels about political matters, but the role of the media and how issues are framed should not be understated.

It is possible not only to change explicit attitudes through framing, but also implicit ones. In a quasi-experiment measuring both external and internal racial biases, researchers found that participation in a seminar concerned with race-related issues, led by a Black professor, may produce positive effects on both implicit and explicit prejudice and stereotypes, despite the popular belief that implicit attitudes are resistant to change (Rudman, Ashmore, & Gary, 2001). They found that explicit attitude changes were associated with cognitive variables (increased awareness of and motives to counteract own biases), whereas implicit attitude changes were associated with affective variables (favorable attitudes toward the professor, pro-social contact with out-group members, and perceptions of threat by out-group members as a result of participating in the course). The researchers hypothesized that the content of the prejudice and conflict seminar and a relatively intimate atmosphere may have fostered openness and appreciation for diversity, aiding in the unlearning of implicit and explicit biases.

Not everyone can effectively frame discussions in such a way that changes opinions, however (Druckman, 2001). In an experiment measuring the effect of framing on participants' support of increased government expenditures, Druckman found that if participants were informed that a statement on increased assistance was written by Colin Powell, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, they were more likely to support the increased expenditures if the statement framed the expenditures as for humanitarian causes. If, however, Colin Powell's statement focused on the monetary aspects of the situations, participants were less likely to support the same expenditures. In this situation, the difference in frame also influenced participants' overall opinions about assistance, with importance being attributed to beliefs about

those in poverty's well-being and the need to fend for oneself, but did not affect beliefs about humanitarianism or government spending. However, if the participants believed the statement came from Jerry Springer, a talk show host, there was no significant difference between the two frames on any dimension measured. Druckman also essentially replicated Nelson, Clawson, and Oxley's 1997 study mentioned above regarding acceptance of a KKK rally, adding the dimension of source credibility; in this case, he used *The New York Times* and *The National Enquirer* as a credible and non-credible source, respectively. As expected based on the previous results, participants who read *The New York Times* differed significantly on acceptance of the KKK rally when framed as a safety issue and as a free speech issue. Additionally, those who read the public safety article rated opposing racism and prejudice as significantly more important—and free speech as significantly less important—than those who read the free speech article. Those who read *The National Enquirer* did not differ significantly on any of the previously mentioned dimensions. Thus, it remains important that frames come from people who have been deemed as experts or have some other method of impact; in the field of education, we can presume that students would react better to teachers, administrators, and other students, than from people removed from the field of education or the community itself.

Contextual frames can also inhibit the kinds of discussions that can occur. Despite the increased need for AIDS awareness education, some researchers find themselves in positions where those educational initiatives are getting shut down. The stated reason is usually concern for students, despite evidence suggesting religious attitudes play a large part as well (Gesch, 2003). When working in a context where issues and people are demonized and silenced, effective conversations are difficult to foster. With this in mind, it is important to understand how every "side" or perspective of conversations that are meant to foster change may be reacting.

One obstacle to using a multicultural approach in education is that Whites tend to be faster to pair multiculturalism with exclusion rather than inclusion. However, this effect can be diminished if diversity efforts are framed as being targeted towards *all* groups (Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011). For example, if the goal is to improve attitudes toward diversity training, diversity initiatives should be framed in terms of a broad focus and advanced assignment (for example, “After benchmarking with other companies in our industry, it has become apparent that our company is well above the average in turning individual differences into opportunities”) instead of narrow focused remedial assignments (for example, “After benchmarking with other companies in our industry, it has become apparent that our company is well below the average in turning individual differences into opportunities”) (Holladay, Knight, Paige, & Quiñones, 2003). Holladay and colleagues (2003) investigated how framing of diversity training (via changes in the title, stated focus of content, and assignment) and gender influenced participants’ attitudes. Participants were given a diversity course description and asked for their opinions on it. Framing the diversity course with a traditional title (e.g. “Building Human Relations”) and a broad focus led to more favorable responses from women and men alike, while men reacted more negatively than women to a frame with a narrow focus and remedial assignment (e.g. “Diversity Training”).

Additionally, it has been found that if Whites felt included in diversity efforts, they were more likely to endorse those efforts (Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011). Over the course of five studies, Plaut et al. measured reactions of dominant group members to diversity initiatives. They found that Whites were faster than racial minorities to link multiculturalism with exclusion rather than with inclusion in an implicit association task (IAT); this effect disappeared in a second study through subtle reframing of diversity effort as inclusive of

European Americans. Through “Me/Not Me” tasks, they also found that Whites were less likely than minorities to pair multiculturalism with the self and were slower when responding to multicultural concepts. A third study showed that if Whites associated multiculturalism with the self, they were more likely to endorse diversity and diversity issues; a fourth study found similar results when analyzing Whites’ feeling included in organizational diversity. Finally, Plaut et al.’s fifth study showed that individual differences in need moderated Whites’ interest in working for organizations that espouse a multicultural versus a color-blind approach to diversity: those with a higher need to belong were less attracted to organizations espousing a multicultural approach. Overall, Plaut et al. concluded that “inclusive” ideology of multiculturalism was not perceived as such by Whites, which may, in part, account for their lower support for diversity efforts in education and work settings.

Further research has shown that racial inequity, when framed as White privilege, threatens Whites’ self-image; however, racial inequity framed as anti-Black discrimination does not threaten their self-image (Lowery, Knowles, & Unzueta, 2007). In the first of three experiments, Lowery et al. manipulated the type of feedback (threatening vs. affirming) feedback on either an intelligence or personality test, which caused Whites to report less privilege, yet perceptions of anti-Black discrimination were unaffected. In the second experiment, threatening feedback on a personality test resulted in lower reported privilege only among Whites who reported high racial identity. The third and last experiment provided evidence that self-concerns influenced perceived privilege, which in turn influenced Whites’ support for redistributive social policies. This research may help to explain why many are opposed to the idea of affirmative action, bringing lawsuits and organizing anti-affirmative action referenda, which in turn has

pressured an increasing number of universities and other public institutions to re-brand their efforts as “inclusive excellence” (Williams, Berger, & McClendon, 2005).

For those who are predisposed to holding beliefs that are less favorable about diversity, increased intergroup contact most strongly predicts reduced prejudice (Adesokan, Ullrich, van Dick, & Tropp, 2011). Adesokan et al. surveyed 255 university students in the United States and found that the relationship between contact and reduced prejudice is stronger for those who, prior to contact, hold less favorable beliefs about diversity, than those who hold more favorable beliefs before contact. They also found that those with less favorable diversity beliefs also showed a stronger relationship between contact and perceived importance of contact. To that end, interacting with those from minority groups may help people who are more likely to be prejudiced to reframe diversity issues in more personal terms. However, not every community has easy access to groups of people who are different from themselves; many communities in America are still rather isolated in terms of race, religion, and even socioeconomic status and political affiliation.

Summary

The United States has an increasingly diverse population, and whitewashing history is becoming less and less acceptable. Efforts toward improving both the quality of education for minority students and improving the school curriculum have had mixed results; the current system still leaves much to be desired. Students who receive a well-rounded, diverse education have a better opportunity to gain interpersonal understanding, break down stereotypes, and understand people with different backgrounds. In general, students have responded favorably to curricula featuring topics related to diversity.

Ethnocultural empathy may help to break down some of the differences in student reaction to diversity topics. Working with students to build better ethnocultural empathy may lead to more positive feelings, but research shows that it may not necessarily prevent stereotyping. Educators creating curricula should take into account that students have different experiences with—and therefore will have different reactions to—diversity-related topics.

The way diversity efforts are framed may also impact the amount of support they receive. Whites are faster to pair the idea of multiculturalism with exclusion; this can be counteracted by emphasizing that diversity includes individuals like themselves. A shift away from frames that threaten self-images and focus on self-affirmation may also affect how people perceive diversity training. We can possibly apply these same ideas of framing to educational efforts. When possible, it would also likely be helpful for students to learn from credible sources, as it is not enough to simply frame topics a certain way and assume they will work. With this in mind, a proposed solution is to frame educational efforts in a manner that is inclusive of those in advantaged groups and focuses on the achievements of historical figures of minority status as opposed to emphasizing how they fulfill multicultural initiatives. While this study will focus on college-aged students, it is suggested to find ways to make all students feel included at all levels of education.

The Current Study

The proposed study examined the effects of framing on participant interest and retention of diversity-related material. In this study, approximately 280 students from undergraduate psychology courses will read a vignette about Kenneth and Mamie Clark, who are two famous African American psychologists. The expert testimony from these two psychologists was responsible for helping overturn *Plessy v Ferguson*'s "Separate but Equal" ruling during *Brown v*

Board of Education, the Supreme Court case challenging it. The vignette will be presented in the context of one of four frames that highlights their minority status (replicating current depictions in standard textbooks), their status as leaders in their field, both their minority status and leader status, or neither minority status or leader status. After reading the vignette, students will then respond to 12 items assessing their interest in these figures and 14 items measuring recall of the material figures. Participants will also respond to the Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE) and scores on this scale will be used to control for ethnocultural empathy in predicting participants' interest and retention of information related to minority figures.

Hypotheses

H1: In this study it is expected that students who are primed to view Kenneth and Mamie Clark solely as minority figures will report lower interest in the study material and diversity-related material relative to all other groups.

H2: It is expected that those who are primed to view Kenneth and Mamie Clark solely as leaders will report higher interest in the study material and diversity-related material relative to all other groups.

H3: Recall scores will differ between the four groups. Because of mixed results in previous research, it is difficult to predict direction.

H4: Scores on the MRS, CoBRAS, and SEE will vary among groups. It is expected that those groups that are primed on race will report scores that more strongly represent prejudice in comparison to groups that do not receive the race prime.

Additionally, the effects of participants' race/ethnicity on interest ratings will be explored, as it is uncertain whether ratings will differ across these factors for this particular context.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Participants

Participants for this study were recruited from two universities. At an Illinois university, participants were recruited from the psychology department's introduction to psychology course subject pool using an online sign-up system, as well as through announcements in various undergraduate psychology courses. At an Indiana university, students were recruited the same way, except that the online sign-up system covers students in various psychology courses, as opposed to only introductory psychology students. Participants received class credit in exchange for participating in the study. In order to avoid coercion, participants were given full knowledge that they can drop out of the study at any time without penalty and that other opportunities for research credit existed if they did not wish to participate at all; these other opportunities were provided by instructors.

Subjects were recruited from undergraduate-level psychology courses at two Midwestern public four-year universities. This sample was sought for three reasons. First, the sample did not have many students who are already familiar with these particular highlighted profiles. Kenneth and Mamie Clark do not appear to be common profiles highlighted in secondary psychology courses and they are not covered in the introduction to psychology course. In fact, it appeared that other courses did not cover the Clarks in their courses, either, at least up until the point that the participants had taken part of the study. This is important because previous experience with the passages could have affected the results. Second, participants in this sample potentially differed in their declared major—this is more likely in the introduction to psychology courses and not the upper level courses—and hence initial interest to learn more about the topics

presented in the profiles can be identified if differences exist between psychology majors and other students. Third, having participants from multiple universities allowed the researcher to collect more data and to potentially compare and contrast two universities that have very different demographic makeup but are located in the same geographic area and can be argued to have similar political and social norms. This will provide variation appropriate for the statistical analyses chosen.

Materials and Measures

Consent Form. Students were given an informed consent form (Appendix A) prior to participating in the study. There are three forms of the consent form, due to the nature of various participants: one for the general populace of the Illinois university, one for participants who were currently students in a course for which the researcher was a Teaching Assistant, at the Illinois university, and one for participants at the Indiana university. All three forms are listed in the appendices.

Vignette. The vignette (Appendix B) is drawn from a History and Systems textbook (Goodwin, 2005) and participants were verbally directed to be sure to read the instructions carefully, as questions would be asked after they finished reading the material. The material from this book mimicked the level of detail expected by university-level coursework while also remaining accessible.

This particular vignette was chosen because its inclusion in psychology and history curricula is easily justifiable, regardless of desired diversity outcomes. The landmark case *Brown v. Board of Education*—and the case it overturned, *Plessy v. Ferguson*—are often a staple of secondary and postsecondary history courses, because of their implications on segregation and social policy following the cases. However, it does not seem that the psychological research that

backed the decision of this case is often discussed in such cases, and when “the doll study” is discussed in psychology courses, the researchers themselves seem to be often left out of the picture. In order to provide evidence for this claim, participants were asked if they had learned about the Clarks before reading this material (reference the section entitled “Manipulation Check” for more information). Using this vignette satisfied two desires: one, to use a vignette that can be framed according to leadership and/or race, and two, to provide students in current psychology courses exposure to two deserving psychologists who are often overlooked. This may be helpful especially to students who identify as a racial or ethnic minority, though there is no way in this current study to measure those effects, nor is it the current study’s primary goal.

The instructions for the vignettes were the same across all groups with the exception of the specific frame which made reference to the reason for studying the psychologists. One group received instructions stating that the profiles are being studied because the psychologists are African-American, one stated that the profiles are being studied because they are leaders in their field, one stated that they are African-American leaders in their field, and one had no such context.

Retention Measure. A twelve-item multiple-choice quiz measuring retention of relevant material was administered in order to ensure that participants have appropriately retained the information they had just read (Appendix C). Based on results from the pilot study (see below) eleven items were used in the analysis, while two served as "warm up" questions to acclimate students to the test.

Pilot study. A pilot study was conducted in order to examine the effectiveness of the questions created to assess retention. A sample of 30 students from an Introduction to Psychology course at an Illinois university were given the same material that the control group

would receive (e.g. the vignette sans frames) and 15 multiple choice questions. The results are listed in Table 1.

Questions 1 and 6 were the only questions that all participants answered correctly; since they were about two landmark Supreme Court decisions, it is possible that students had learned about them in a previous class, such as United States History, even if they had not previously heard about the Clarks. These questions were placed first in the pilot study in order to make participants feel at ease about the retention section, but were not included in the analysis due to potential confounds. Additionally, question 14 was dropped from the analysis due to poor correct response rate. It is possible this question was too difficult because it was very specific. Number of correct responses to the remaining 12 items was included in the analyses. The resulting Cronbach's alpha value was 0.48, which indicates poor reliability.

Interest survey. This survey (Appendix D) is an adapted attitude questionnaire originally developed by Holladay and colleagues (2003). The original measure was composed of twenty-three items designed to quantitatively assess attitudes to the course description. This modified measure used eleven of the original twenty-three items, rephrased in terms of the material and psychology courses/campus, rather than the course description and the participants' jobs. Participants rated each statement using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Sample items include, "I would be interested in learning more about Kenneth and Mamie Clark," "I would be motivated to attend courses about psychologists like the Clarks," and "Readings like this would increase my attraction to psychology courses." Scores will be summed and averaged and used as a criterion. The resulting Cronbach's alpha value was 0.85, which indicates good reliability.

Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE). A scale measuring ethnocultural empathy was administered in order to assess participants' feelings toward individuals who are ethnically different from themselves (Appendix E). This scale, the Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy, was developed by Wang and colleagues (2003). As reported by the authors, the scale has high internal consistency ($r = 0.91$); high test-retest reliability over two weeks ($r = 0.76$); good discriminant validity when compared against the BIDR Impression Management subscale ($r = 0.08$); good convergent validity with the BIDR Impression Management subscale ($r = 0.23$) among others; and differences in scores between participants with differing ethnic/racial backgrounds ($r = 0.23$), differing number of friends with different racial/ethnic backgrounds ($r = 0.30$), and different levels of exposure to diversity in high school/home neighborhoods ($r = -0.15$ and $r = -0.20$, respectively), which helps to establish criterion-related validity (Wang, et al., 2003). All tests were run at an alpha level of 0.01.

Participants rated each statement using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Sample items include, "I get impatient when communicating with people from other racial or ethnic backgrounds, regardless of how well they speak English," "I can relate to the frustration that some people feel about having fewer opportunities due to their racial or ethnic backgrounds," "I am aware of institutional barriers (e.g., restricted opportunities for job promotion) that discriminate against racial or ethnic groups other than my own," and, "I don't understand why people of different racial or ethnic backgrounds enjoy wearing traditional clothing." Although there are four number subscales, these were not used as they are not the main focus of this study; an overall score was calculated and used as a criterion. This consisted of summing the scores for the 31 items (with some reverse scored) and finding an average. The resulting Cronbach's alpha value was 0.90, which indicates excellent reliability.

Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). The Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS) (Appendix F) is a racial attitudes scale developed by Neville et al (2000). The scale has been found to have three factors (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000); however, for the purposes of this study, the total score was used. According to the same study, the reliability estimates range around .70. Concurrent validity was established by obtaining correlations with the Global Belief in a Just World Scale (GBJWS) and the Multidimensional Belief in a Just World Scale (Sociopolitical Subscales) (MBJWS-SS) which ranged between $r = .39$ and $.61$. The lack of significant correlations between the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS) and the CoBRAS factors suggest discriminant validity. The only significant correlation was between one factor of the CoBRAS (Blatant Racial Issues) and the MCSDS; this correlation only accounted for 4% of the variance.

Participants rated each statement using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Originally, the scale only went from 1-5, but the current study expanded the Likert scale to 1-6 in order to keep the scales consistent among measures and reduce confusion for participants. Sample items include, "Racial and ethnic minorities do not have the same opportunities as white people in the U.S.," "Social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against white people," and, "English should be the only official language in the U.S." Scores will be averaged and used as a criterion. The resulting Cronbach's alpha value was 0.84, which indicates good reliability.

Modern Racism Scale (MRS). The Modern Racism Scale (MRS) (Appendix G) was developed to accurately measure more modern manifestations of racism, as more traditional means of measuring racist attitudes were found to no longer correlate with racist behaviors. Validation efforts have shown that the Modern Racism Scale is not subject to context effects

(McConahay, 1986). Though the measure itself is not necessarily face valid, it has shown significant moderate positive correlations with political conservatism (.300-.318, depending on the study), strength of opposition to bussing (.391-.511, depending on the study), and anti-Black feeling as measured by the Feeling Thermometer (.383), as well as significant moderate negative correlation with measures like the Schuman and Harding Scale of Sympathetic Identification with the Underdog (-.299) (McConahay, 1986). Several other scales have been successfully correlated with the MRS.

Participants rated each statement using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Originally, the scale only went from 1-5, but the current study expanded the Likert scale to 1-6 in order to keep the scales consistent among measures and reduce confusion for participants. Sample items include, "Over the past few years, Blacks have gotten more economically than they deserve," "It is easy to understand the anger of Black people in America," and "Discrimination against Blacks is no longer a problem in the United States." Scores were summed and used as a criterion. The resulting Cronbach's alpha value was 0.82, which indicates good reliability.

Manipulation Check. Participants were asked one question to check if the manipulation of the frames was effective (Appendix H). The questions were, "What were Kenneth and Mamie Clark's profession?" followed by, "Kenneth and Mamie Clark were [Leaders, Kicked out of college, Unimportant, or Anthropologists]," and "What were Kenneth and Mamie's ethnicities?" Participants were also asked, "On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being not at all and 10 being very much so, how good of leaders do you think Kenneth and Mamie were?" as well as whether they were familiar with the Clarks before reading the material. If they answered yes to the last question, they were asked where they learned about the Clarks.

Demographic Information. Participants were given a short survey (Appendix I) in which they were asked to provide demographic information including age, gender, major, year in school, race, and the degree of exposure to diversity in various aspects of the participants' lives.

Procedures

Participants were divided into four randomly assigned groups, which differed in terms of the instructions that provided the frame justifying why the participants needed to learn about the psychologists. The four frames were: psychologists, leaders in psychology, African-American psychologists, and African-American leaders in psychology. In a classroom, participants were given a consent form. After this was completed, they were given one of the four vignettes. Once they completed the vignette, they were tested on their retention and asked about their interest in the material. Following this, they were asked to fill out the Modern Racism Scale, the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale, and Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy. These three measures were not labeled (their title was not shown) and they were counterbalanced, in order to reduce any carryover effects. Lastly, participants were asked to fill out the manipulation checks and to provide demographic information.

Multiple participants were asked to gather in the same room in order to replicate a classroom setting so as to facilitate an educational context; however, they were spaced so that they could not see one another's instructions or responses. Regardless of whether other participants were in the same room, the researcher sat away from the participants so as to not be able to see any of the participants' responses and appeared to be working on other material so the participants did not feel like they were being watched.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

At the university in Illinois, data was collected from 115 participants. The sample was relatively evenly split between two gender identifications: 49.6% of the sample (57 participants) identified as female; 50.4% (58 participants) identified as male. The age range was 18-34, with the average age being 20.3 years of age. The majority of participants were underclassmen: 52.2% of the sample (60 participants) was freshmen, 9.6% (11 participants) were sophomores, 18.3% (21 participants) were juniors, and 20.0% (23 participants) were seniors. Regarding majors, 17.4% of participants (20 total) were psychology majors; the rest were not. In terms of ethnic/racial identity, 41.7% of the participants (48 total) identified as African-American and 58.3% (67 participants) identified as White.

In terms of the diversity in their background, 98.3% (113 participants) of the sample identified themselves as U.S.-born citizens. Regarding school diversity, 42.6% identified their school demographic makeup as either mostly or extremely racially/ethnically diverse, while 36.5% identified their schools as somewhat racially/ethnically diverse, and 20.0% identified their schools as not at all racially/ethnically diverse. Regarding diversity in friendship, 60.9% of the participants stated they had several or mostly/primarily friends who are of a different racial or ethnic background than them, while 34.8% stated they had a few and 4.3% stated they had none. Regarding the diversity found in their families, 15.7% of the participants stated they had several or mostly/primarily family members who are of a different racial or ethnic background than them, while 41.7% stated they had a few and 42.6% stated they had none.

In terms of their backgrounds, 17.4% of the sample stated they had grown up in mostly or extremely racially/ethnically diverse neighborhoods, while 34.8% had grown up in somewhat racially/ethnically diverse neighborhoods and 47.8% had grown up in neighborhoods that were not at all racially/ethnically diverse. When asked about the ethnic/racial diversity of members of groups they are involved with, 41.7% intimated they had been involved in mostly or extremely racially/ethnically diverse activities, 43.5% were in somewhat diverse activities, and 16.5% were not at all involved in racially/ethnically diverse activities. Most participants spoke one language (70.4%), but several also spoke two (27.0%) or three (2.6%) languages. Table 2 outlines these demographic data.

At the university in Indiana, data was collected from 53 participants. In terms of gender, 64.2% of the sample (34 participants) identified as female; 35.8% (19 participants) identified as male. The age range was 18-31, with the average age being 20.45 years of age. Again, the majority of participants were underclassmen: 54.7% of the sample (29 participants) was freshmen, 9.4% (5 participants) were sophomores, 11.3% (6 participants) were juniors, and 24.5% (13 participants) were seniors. In terms of majors, 30.2% of participants (16 total) were psychology majors; the rest were not. All 53 participants were White.

The majority of the sample, 98.1% (52 participants), identified themselves as U.S.-born citizen; the other participant was a nationalized citizen. In terms of school demographics, 26.4% identified their school demographic makeup as either mostly or extremely racially/ethnically diverse, while 45.3% identified their schools as somewhat racially/ethnically diverse, and 28.3% identified their schools as not at all racially/ethnically diverse. In regard to friends, 47.2% of the participants stated they had several or mostly/primarily friends who are of a different racial or ethnic background than them, while 49.1% stated they had a few and 3.8% stated they had none.

In regard to family diversity, 5.7% of the participants stated they had several family members who are of a different racial or ethnic background than them (none chose mostly/primarily), while 28.3% stated they had a few and 66.0% stated they had none.

When asked about their backgrounds, 3.8% of the sample stated they had grown up in mostly or extremely racially/ethnically diverse neighborhoods, while 37.7% had grown up in somewhat racially/ethnically diverse neighborhoods and 56.6% had grown up in neighborhoods that were not at all racially/ethnically diverse. When asked about activities, 30.2% intimated they had been involved in mostly or extremely racially/ethnically diverse activities, 52.8% were in somewhat diverse activities, and 15.1% were not at all involved in racially/ethnically diverse activities. Most participants spoke one language (69.8%), but several also spoke two (28.3%) or three (1.9%) languages. Table 3 outlines these demographic data.

The sample from Illinois appeared to be more diverse. While the general age and gender makeup was roughly the same, there were not enough African-American-identifying participants for analysis in the Indiana sample and as such were left out. Furthermore, the Indiana sample consistently reported lower levels of diversity in experiences with school and family. While the sample from Indiana is certainly smaller, this would likely have been reflected in a larger sample size as well, for reasons that will be discussed in further depth in the discussion section.

Results

To test the hypotheses, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used for the main analysis. The predictor variables were race framing and leadership framing, with either the absence or presence of each factor being manipulated. The criteria being measured were: the summed score for the 11 items of interest and the number of correct items for the recall measure, and scores on the SEE, CoBRAS, and MRS.

Main Analyses

Recall scores were not correlated to scores on the interest scale, CoBRAS, MRS, or SEE. However, interest scores were negatively correlated to the CoBRAS ($r = -0.48$) and MRS ($r = -0.45$), while positively correlated with the SEE ($r = 0.57$), as shown in Table 4. This indicates that higher interest scores were associated with lower levels of color-blindness and modern racism and higher levels of ethnocultural empathy. Additionally, the CoBRAS was significantly positively correlated with the MRS ($r = 0.66$) and negatively correlated with the SEE ($r = -0.61$), meaning that lower scores of color-blindness being associated with lower levels of modern racism and higher levels of ethnocultural empathy. Finally, the MRS was significantly negatively correlated with the SEE ($r = -0.58$), meaning that lower levels of modern racism were associated with higher levels of ethnocultural empathy.

Because of the demographic differences between the two samples, they were analyzed separately. While analyzing the two samples together would provide the analysis with power, these differences separate these samples in important ways that are central to the study. Tables 5 and 6 outline the main test statistics for the Illinois university, and tables 8 and 9 outline the main test statistics for the Indiana university. Neither multivariate model showed significance.

Recall Scores. For the Illinois participants, there was not a statistically significant effect of leadership framing on participants' recall scores. There was, however, a statistically significant effect of race framing on participants' recall scores, $F(1, 111) = 6.44, p = 0.013; \eta^2 = 0.06, 1 - \beta = 0.71$, with participants scoring higher on average when race frames were not present ($M = 9.29$) than when they were ($M = 8.38$); more descriptive statistics for the Illinois conditions can be found in Table 7. There was not a significant effect of the interaction between race and leadership frames on recall scores.

For the Indiana participants, there was not a statistically significant effect of leadership framing, race framing, or of the interaction between race and leadership frames on recall scores. There were no interaction effects.

Interest Scores. For the Illinois participants, there was not a statistically significant effect of leadership framing, of race framing, or of the interaction between race and leadership frames on interest scores.

For the Indiana participants, there was not a statistically significant effect of leadership or race framing on participants' interest scores. There was, however, a significant effect of the interaction between race and leadership frames on interest scores, $F(1, 49) = 6.43, p = 0.014; \eta^2 = 0.12, 1 - \beta = 0.70$, with those primed only on race scoring higher ($M = 4.59$) than those who were primed on both race and leadership ($M = 3.79$). More descriptive statistics for Indiana participants can be found in Table 10.

SEE Scores. There were no significant differences due to leadership, race framing, or the interaction of the two for the Illinois and Indiana participants on the SEE scores.

CoBRAS Scores. There were no significant differences due to leadership, race framing, or the interaction of the two for the Illinois and Indiana participants on the CoBRAS scores.

MRS Scores. There were no significant differences due to leadership, race framing, or the interaction of the two for the Illinois and Indiana participants on the MRS scores.

Exploratory Analyses

Additional analyses were conducted for exploratory purposes. The effect of university was added to the original model to see if it would have any effect.

Effects of University. When the university the participant was enrolled in was added to the original model, the effect of university was significant, $F(5, 156) = 0.89, p = 0.003; \eta^2 =$

0.11, $1 - \beta = 0.94$, as shown in Table 11. Tests of between-subject effects (Table 12) showed a significant effect of university on CoBRAS scores, $F(1, 160) = 10.50, p = 0.01; \eta^2 = 0.06, 1 - \beta = 0.90$, with Illinois participants showing lower levels of color-blindness ($M = 61.63$) than Indiana participants ($M = 6.38$). There was also a significant effect of university on SEE scores, $F(1, 160) = 5.43, p = 0.02; \eta^2 = 0.03, 1 - \beta = 0.64$, with Illinois participants showing higher levels of ethnocultural empathy ($M = 4.23$) than Indiana participants ($M = 3.97$).

Additionally, an effect of the interaction between race frames and university on recall scores was found to be significant, $F(1, 160) = 5.36, p = 0.02; \eta^2 = 0.03, 1 - \beta = 0.64$. *Post hoc* comparisons using a LSD test showed that Illinois participants primed on race but not leadership ($M = 8.37$) and Illinois participants primed on both race and leadership ($M = 8.38$) both scored significantly lower than Illinois participants not primed on race or leadership ($M = 9.43$) and Indiana participants primed on race and leadership ($M = 9.64$).

Lastly, an effect for the interaction between leadership condition, race condition, and university was found on interest scores, $F(1, 160) = 5.17, p = 0.02; \eta^2 = 0.03, 1 - \beta = 0.62$. *Post hoc* comparisons using a LSD test showed that Indiana participants primed on race and leadership ($M = 3.79$) scored significantly lower than Illinois participants primed on race and leadership ($M = 4.50$), Illinois participants not primed on race or leadership ($M = 4.42$), Illinois participants primed on leadership but not race ($M = 4.45$), and Indiana participants primed only on race ($M = 4.59$).

More descriptive statistics for these analyses can be found in Table 13, and the results for the *post hoc* LSD comparison tests can be found in Table 14.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Hypotheses

Recall scores among conditions. Recall scores did differ among conditions, but only when looking at race framing. Illinois participants scored lower on average when the race frame (e.g. the term “African-American”) was present rather than absent, but no differences showed between leadership conditions. This goes against Hussey, Fleck, and Warner’s (2010) findings that recall/retention is not affected by diversity framework. It is important to note, however, that Hussey, Fleck, and Warner’s findings were from a longitudinal study; therefore, it is possible, that over time, these findings may disappear.

It is possible that presenting the vignette with the mention that the psychologists were African-American may have served as distracting information and prevented participants from fully attending to the information in the vignette. Participants may have been surprised to learn that there were famous psychologists who were African American and this may have temporarily disrupted their ability to fully focus on the material. In comparison, presenting the same vignette without mentioning the race of the psychologists seemed to help participants process and remember the information in the content of the vignette more effectively. It appears that the race frame was causal in their forgetting details of the information in the passage, suggesting that presenting famous psychologists as African-American had a distinct effect on recall. It is possible that over a sustained period of time with the material, this information may become less distracting. This would lead to a logical consistency between the results of this study and the results of Hussey, Fleck and Warner’s study (2010).

Lastly, it is possible that the inclusion of race as important information made participants more nervous during the course of the experiment. One non-White Illinois participant in a race-primed condition did comment as a side-note after he participated that the study made him “feel bad.” When asked why, he looked away and could not articulate it, but seemed nervous. It is possible that mentioning race may serve as a potential source of tension, and this tension may arise even in a school in which the student population is racially diverse. Again, it is possible that repeated exposure to positive materials such as the vignettes on the Clarks may help to alleviate any ill feelings from encountering material that may be racially sensitive.

Interest scores among conditions. Correlational analyses showed that in general, higher interest scores were associated with lower levels of color-blindness and modern racism and higher levels of ethnocultural empathy. It is not possible through this study to predict whether higher interest levels begot lower levels of color-blindness and modern racism and higher levels of ethnocultural empathy, or whether participants who were naturally less color-blind and racist and more ethnoculturally empathetic would find greater interest in the text. It is also possible that another variable or variables not measured, such as identification with the text or interest in diversity topics in general, could have predicted both. Still, it is interesting to note these correlations; perhaps later studies can tease apart these relationships to find possible causes.

The data provide mixed support for the hypothesis that participants who were primed to view Kenneth and Mamie Clark solely as minority figures would report lower interest in the study material and diversity-related material relative to all other groups. Only the Indiana participants showed significant differences, as they showed the lowest amount of interest for the Clarks when told they were African-American leaders in psychology and the highest amount of interest when told the Clarks were African-American psychologists. It is possible that the

inclusion of race sparked interest because it signified that the participants were reading something novel, while the inclusion of race and leadership cues may have turned these students off, perhaps interpreting the vignette as being overly “politically correct.” This would be understandable considering that the relative lack of diversity at the university (discussed below) and the fact that all of the participants used in analysis identified as White.

Other Factors

University differences. Illinois is a more ethnically diverse university than Indiana, with roughly 30% of its undergraduate population identifying as being a part of a minority racial/ethnic group (Institutional Research and Studies, 2012), compared to Indiana’s 9% (University of Southern Indiana, 2012). Furthermore, as shown in the demographic information, many of Indiana’s participants also come from less ethnically/racially diverse schools and have less racially/ethnically diverse families, which may at the very least partially account for the differences in CoBRAS and SEE scores, with Indiana participants showing greater color-blindness and lower levels of ethnocultural empathy than Illinois participants. Because the sample sizes were so different, this should be interpreted with caution, however it is possible that since Indiana participants have had and continue to have lower levels of interactions with racial and ethnic minorities that they have higher levels of color blindness.

Additionally, there was an effect of the interaction between race frames and university on recall scores. Illinois participants did better when race was not included, especially in comparison to Indiana students who were primed on both race and leadership. It is possible that including race increased the amount of perceived pressure for Illinois participants, as there were African Americans in the sample and because the school itself is more diverse in relation to the Indiana university.

Lastly, there were differences among Indiana and Illinois participants when looking at the interaction between race frames, leadership frames, and university. Illinois students did not differ significantly across groups, but Indiana participants primed on both race and leadership scored significantly lower than all Illinois groups sans those primed only on race, and lower than Indiana participants primed solely on race. It is possible that there is something about being a participant from that particular university that makes the marked decrease in interest for vignette subjects whose race and leadership skills are highlighted that are much more profound.

Limitations

Sample sizes. While there were some significant effects in both samples, it is possible—especially with the Indiana sample—that sample sizes were not adequate enough to tease apart influences of various potential factors such as race. Also, because the sample sizes differed on important demographic information between universities, they could not be combined to form a larger sample with more power and it is only with caution that we can compare them.

Strength/type of frame. It is also possible that different or stronger results may come from a different or stronger frame. Though there were some significant effects that could be attributed to the frames, a different tactic could produce different results.

Reliability of measures. For multivariate analyses of variance, reliability for measures is assumed to be over 0.80. While this was achieved for the interest scale and the SEE, CoBRAS, and MRS, the lowered reliability statistics of the recall measure could affect results. Because of this, some hesitation on the strength of these results is called for, regarding if nothing else the recall measures. It is possible that with a more reliable scale for retention, different results would be found.

Correlations among dependent variables. For the best results in multivariate analyses of variance, it is recommended that there be medium-strength correlation among dependent variables, close to $r = |0.60|$. The correlations among the SEE, MRS, and CoBRAS are at or near $|0.60|$; however, the correlations involving the interest scale and recall measure could be improved, especially in the latter case.

Multiculturalism and Color-Blind Frames. Multiculturalism and color-blind frames could have influenced the results and it is difficult to pin down exactly how and where they might have done so without having asked participants how they would have described their education on diversity topics thus far. Those who have been steeped in color-blind education may have reacted more negatively to race frames, for instance. There may also have been a difference between universities on how much of either type of frames with which participants had come into contact. With the current study, it is difficult to ascertain.

Covariates. It is possible that the SEE, MRS, and CoBRAS scores obtained from students could be used as covariates. Future research will look at this option in more detail.

Further Directions

Using better or different scales and different scenarios may aid researchers in understanding this obviously nuanced situation regarding how students respond to discussions of diversity in the classroom. For instance, students may respond differently toward material covering predominant Latina/o scientists or Asian government leaders than to African American psychologists. Students from varying age groups may also have varying perspectives on these materials.

Perhaps most helpful to studying attitude change due to framing in an educational context would be to situate the study in an actual classroom setting. While using a longitudinal design of

this nature would bring its own problems, it would better reflect the nature of the problem in question and perhaps give us more insight into the effects of framing with repeated exposure over time. It is possible that students who are repeatedly exposed to being primed to African American leaders in a given field may respond differently to those who are given a more color-blind exposure to these figures. It would be interesting to see if this is true, since attitude and behavioral change seem like a reasonable extension of studying this particular topic.

We may have to engage students from different backgrounds in a variety of manners. Because of how little time educators have to interact with each and every student on an individual level, it may behoove them to utilize a variety of strategies in order to reach the greatest number of students. Simply introducing a minority figure as such may help some students, but may turn others off. Additionally, leadership frames may not have the effect previously predicted. Further research should look into identifying the types of frames to which students might respond most positively, so that we may engage them and encourage them to appreciate diversity.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The data found in the present study provided varying levels of support for the hypothesis that race framing and leadership framing may have an effect on how students respond to material on diverse individuals. Thankfully, priming participants on race did not result in more strongly prejudiced responses, as hypothesized. Like interest, those responses were more heavily influenced by stable characteristics of the participant, such as university attended. It is possible that these frames may be more effective in a longitudinal study than in a cross-sectional study where participants have minimal contact with the frames.

The effects were stronger for Illinois participants, which may be due to the larger sample size collected and/or the greater diversity of the school population. Some of the results are difficult to understand without more information, but it is possible that in the future it may be possible to delineate some of the more complex interaction effects.

With a single phrase, African-American, it was possible to influence the amount of material students remembered and how interested they were in the material. These results bring to light an interesting potential area of future research that could eventually impact school curricula. More data is needed to provide a clearer picture of what is happening, but it is possible that a better understanding of effective methods for engaging students in discussions of diversity may be around the corner.

Highlighting race is not the only way to influence students' perceptions of the material they are learning. Leadership framing may be a less effective way of doing so, especially when paired with race frames. It is possible that other demographic information relating to the target of study may influence students' perspectives, such as a target's gender. (For instance, it is possible

that participants may have responded differently to Mamie Clark than Kenneth Clark.) It may also matter who is telling the students about these topics, though in the present study no such effects (at least regarding researcher race) were found. It is important to note further that other factors had an effect on how participants responded to the dependent variables. The participant's current university, for instance, had varying degrees of effect on the results, indicating that, like many other topics in psychology, understanding how people react to diversity discussions is not simply black and white.

Table 1

Pilot Study Results

Question	Number Answered Correctly	Number Responded	Percent Correct
1. What was the name of the United States Supreme Court's decision that the Clarks' research helped inform?	30	30	100
2. Where did Kenneth and Mamie earn their doctorates?	22	30	73.3
3. What did Mamie Clark's famous research study look at?	24	30	80.0
4. What position did Kenneth Clark hold in the American Psychological Association?	20	30	66.7
5. What is Division 45 of the APA?	20	30	66.7
6. What previous court case had ruled that it was legal for there to be separate public facilities (e.g. schools, restrooms) for whites and blacks, as long as the facilities reserved for blacks were of equal quality to those reserved for whites?	30	30	100
7. What were the results of one of Kenneth and Mamie Clark's doll studies?	29	30	96.7
8. When asked to color in dolls with crayons, what happened?	28	30	93.3
9. How did Thurgood Marshall feel about the doll studies?	23	30	76.7
10. In how many of the four cases leading up to the Supreme Court case did Kenneth Clark testify?	15	30	50.0
11. What did Chief Justice Earl Warren's decision make specific reference to?	15	30	50.0
12. What was the goal of Mamie Clark's Northside Center for Child Development in Harlem?	13	30	43.3
13. Why did the American Psychological Association move their meeting from Miami to New York in 1957?	21	29	72.4
14. What APA program began awarding financial aid for graduate study in 1974?	8	30	26.7
15. Why was Mamie Clark insulated from many of the daily indignities of being black and growing up in the South?	20	30	66.7

Table 2

Demographic Data for Illinois Sample

Category	Response	Frequency	Percent
Citizenship	US-born	113	98.3
	Naturalized	2	1.7
School diversity	Extremely/mostly diverse	49	42.6
	Somewhat diverse	42	36.5
	Not at all diverse	23	20.0
Friendship diversity	Several/mostly/primarily	70	60.9
	A few	40	34.8
	No	5	4.3
Family diversity	Several/mostly/primarily	18	15.7
	A few	48	41.7
	No	49	42.6
Neighborhood diversity	Extremely/mostly diverse	20	17.4
	Somewhat diverse	40	34.8
	Not at all diverse	55	47.8
Activity diversity	Extremely/mostly diverse	48	41.7
	Somewhat diverse	50	43.5
	Not at all diverse	17	14.8
Languages spoken	1	81	70.4
	2	31	27.0
	3	3	2.6

Table 3

Demographic Data for Indiana Sample

Category	Response	Frequency	Percent
Citizenship	US-born	52	98.1
	Naturalized	1	1.9
School diversity	Extremely/mostly diverse	14	26.4
	Somewhat diverse	24	45.3
	Not at all diverse	15	28.3
Friendship diversity	Several/mostly/primarily	25	47.2
	A few	26	49.1
	No	2	3.8
Family diversity	Several/mostly/primarily	3	5.7
	A few	15	28.3
	No	35	66.0
Neighborhood diversity	Extremely/mostly diverse	2	3.8
	Somewhat diverse	20	37.7
	Not at all diverse	30	56.6
Activity diversity	Extremely/mostly diverse	16	30.2
	Somewhat diverse	28	52.8
	Not at all diverse	8	15.1
Languages spoken	1	37	69.8
	2	15	28.3
	3	1	1.9

Table 4

Correlations Among Dependent Variables

		Recall	Interest	CoBRAS	MRS	SEE
Recall	Pearson Correlation	1	.132	-.019	-.034	.126
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.088	.803	.666	.104
Interest	Pearson Correlation	.132	1	-.483**	-.452**	.571**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.088		.000	.000	.000
CoBRAS	Pearson Correlation	-.019	-.483**	1	.662**	-.609**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.803	.000		.000	.000
MRS	Pearson Correlation	-.034	-.452**	.662**	1	-.578**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.666	.000	.000		.000
SEE	Pearson Correlation	.126	.571**	-.609**	-.578**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.104	.000	.000	.000	

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5

MANOVA results for Illinois Sample

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.006	3438.826	5.000	107.000	.000	.994	1.000
Leadership condition	Wilks' Lambda	.920	1.856	5.000	107.000	.108	.080	.613
Race condition	Wilks' Lambda	.934	1.509	5.000	107.000	.193	.066	.512
Leadership * Race condition interaction	Wilks' Lambda	.979	.469	5.000	107.000	.799	.021	.171

Table 6

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Illinois Participants

Source	Dependent Variable	Df	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Leadership condition	Recall	1	.181	.672	.002	.071
	Interest	1	.646	.423	.006	.125
	CoBRAS	1	.569	.452	.005	.116
	MRS	1	1.029	.313	.009	.171
	SEE	1	1.405	.238	.013	.217
Race condition	Recall	1	6.437	.013*	.055	.711
	Interest	1	.111	.740	.001	.063
	CoBRAS	1	.772	.381	.007	.140
	MRS	1	.288	.593	.003	.083
	SEE	1	.037	.848	.000	.054
Leadership * Race condition interaction	Recall	1	.203	.653	.002	.073
	Interest	1	.364	.548	.003	.092
	CoBRAS	1	.347	.557	.003	.090
	MRS	1	.044	.834	.000	.055
	SEE	1	1.769	.186	.016	.261

*. Significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for Main Analysis of Illinois Participants

	Leadership	Race	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Recall	Absent	Absent	9.42	1.904	33
		Present	8.37	2.436	27
		Total	8.95	2.205	60
	Present	Absent	9.12	1.306	26
		Present	8.38	1.699	29
		Total	8.73	1.557	55
	Total	Absent*	9.29	1.661	59
		Present*	8.38	2.068	56
		Total	8.84	1.918	115
Interest	Absent	Absent	4.42	.973	33
		Present	4.28	.712	27
		Total	4.36	.861	60
	Present	Absent	4.45	.737	26
		Present	4.50	.736	29
		Total	4.48	.730	55
	Total	Absent	4.44	.870	59
		Present	4.39	.726	56
		Total	4.42	.800	115
CoBRAS	Absent	Absent	60.64	15.068	33
		Present	64.93	13.465	27
		Total	62.57	14.411	60
	Present	Absent	60.15	17.957	26
		Present	61.00	15.793	29
		Total	60.60	16.697	55
	Total	Absent	60.42	16.258	59
		Present	62.89	14.718	56
		Total	61.63	15.509	115
MRS	Absent	Absent	12.33	5.633	33
		Present	13.19	5.485	27
		Total	12.72	5.536	60
	Present	Absent	13.73	6.181	26
		Present	14.10	6.997	29
		Total	13.93	6.565	55
	Total	Absent	12.95	5.871	59
		Present	13.66	6.273	56
		Total	13.30	6.054	115

Table 7 (continued)

Descriptive Statistics for Main Analysis of Illinois Participants

	Leadership	Race	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
SEE Score	Absent	Absent	4.25	.862	33
		Present	4.05	.607	27
		Total	4.16	.759	60
	Present	Absent	4.23	.693	26
		Present	4.38	.652	29
		Total	4.31	.670	55
	Total	Absent	4.24	.785	59
		Present	4.22	.648	56
		Total	4.23	.719	115

*. Indicates differences at the 0.05 level. Those primed with race scored lower than those not primed.

Table 8

MANOVA results for Indiana Sample

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.004	2539.904	5.000	45.000	.000	.996	1.000
Leadership condition	Wilks' Lambda	.905	.943	5.000	45.000	.462	.095	.305
Race condition	Wilks' Lambda	.929	.693	5.000	45.000	.632	.071	.227
Leadership * Race condition interaction	Wilks' Lambda	.822	1.954	5.000	45.000	.104	.178	.604

Table 9

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Indiana Participants

Source	Dependent Variable	Df	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Leadership condition	Recall	1	.852	.360	.017	.148
	Interest	1	2.236	.141	.044	.311
	CoBRAS	1	.028	.869	.001	.053
	MRS	1	.329	.569	.007	.087
	SEE	1	.360	.551	.007	.091
Race condition	Recall	1	1.182	.282	.024	.187
	Interest	1	.004	.948	.000	.050
	CoBRAS	1	1.365	.248	.027	.209
	MRS	1	1.322	.256	.026	.204
	SEE	1	1.785	.188	.035	.258
Leadership * Race condition interaction	Recall	1	.326	.570	.007	.087
	Interest	1	6.428	.014*	.116	.700
	CoBRAS	1	.263	.610	.005	.079
	MRS	1	.076	.784	.002	.058
	SEE	1	.515	.476	.010	.108

*. Significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 10 (continued)

Descriptive Statistics for Main Analysis of Indiana Participants

	Leadership	Race	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Recall	Absent	Absent	8.64	1.748	11
		Present	9.47	2.031	15
		Total	9.12	1.925	26
	Present	Absent	9.38	1.805	13
		Present	9.64	1.598	14
		Total	9.52	1.673	27
	Total	Absent	9.04	1.781	24
		Present	9.55	1.804	29
		Total	9.32	1.795	53
Interest	Absent	Absent	4.07	.844	11
		Present *	4.59	.546	15
		Total	4.37	.720	26
	Present	Absent	4.28	.412	13
		Present *	3.79	.946	14
		Total	4.03	.766	27
	Total	Absent	4.19	.640	24
		Present	4.20	.853	29
		Total	4.20	.757	53
CoBRAS	Absent	Absent	70.82	13.768	11
		Present	68.73	9.953	15
		Total	69.62	11.507	26
	Present	Absent	71.92	9.500	13
		Present	66.57	12.786	14
		Total	69.15	11.438	27
	Total	Absent	71.42	11.394	24
		Present	67.69	11.254	29
		Total	69.38	11.363	53
MRS	Absent	Absent	14.64	6.021	11
		Present	12.53	4.853	15
		Total	13.42	5.368	26
	Present	Absent	15.08	4.481	13
		Present	13.79	5.964	14
		Total	14.41	5.242	27
	Total	Absent	14.88	5.127	24
		Present	13.14	5.357	29
		Total	13.92	5.276	53

Table 10 (continued)

Descriptive Statistics for Main Analysis of Indiana Participants

	Leadership	Race	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
SEE	Absent	Absent	3.84	.571	11
		Present	4.18	.538	15
		Total	4.04	.567	26
	Present	Absent	3.86	.337	13
		Present	3.96	.822	14
		Total	3.91	.627	27
	Total	Absent	3.85	.448	24
		Present	4.08	.686	29
		Total	3.97	.596	53

*. Sig. Those primed with race and leadership scored lower than those primed with leadership.

Table 11

MANOVA Table for Original Model + University

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis		Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
				df	Error df			
Intercept	Wilks'	.006	4976.308	5.000	156.000	.000	.994	1.000
	Lambda							
Leadership condition	Wilks'	.967	1.061	5.000	156.000	.384	.033	.371
	Lambda							
Race condition	Wilks'	.989	.356	5.000	156.000	.878	.011	.140
	Lambda							
University	Wilks'	.890	3.857	5.000	156.000	.003*	.110	.936
	Lambda							
Leadership * Race	Wilks'	.964	1.179	5.000	156.000	.322	.036	.411
	Lambda							
Leadership * University	Wilks'	.962	1.221	5.000	156.000	.302	.038	.425
	Lambda							
Race * University	Wilks'	.953	1.541	5.000	156.000	.180	.047	.529
	Lambda							
Leadership * Race * University	Wilks'	.957	1.416	5.000	156.000	.221	.043	.490
	Lambda							

*. Significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 12

Tests of Between-Subject Effects for Original Model + University

Source	Dependent Variable	Df	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Leadership condition	Recall	1	.252	.616	.002	.079
	Interest	1	.446	.505	.003	.102
	CoBRAS	1	.320	.573	.002	.087
	MRS	1	1.044	.308	.006	.174
	SEE	1	.070	.792	.000	.058
Race condition	Recall	1	.318	.573	.002	.087
	Interest	1	.021	.886	.000	.052
	CoBRAS	1	.057	.812	.000	.056
	MRS	1	.306	.581	.002	.085
	SEE	1	.727	.395	.005	.135
University	Recall	1	2.193	.141	.014	.313
	Interest	1	3.142	.078	.019	.422
	CoBRAS	1	10.501	.001 *	.062	.896
	MRS	1	.467	.496	.003	.104
	SEE	1	5.430	.021 *	.033	.639
Leadership * Race	Recall	1	.042	.838	.000	.055
	Interest	1	2.475	.118	.015	.346
	CoBRAS	1	.482	.489	.003	.106
	MRS	1	.007	.933	.000	.051
	SEE	1	.070	.791	.000	.058
Leadership * University	Recall	1	.970	.326	.006	.165
	Interest	1	2.561	.111	.016	.356
	CoBRAS	1	.120	.729	.001	.064
	MRS	1	.025	.874	.000	.053
	SEE	1	1.283	.259	.008	.203
Race * University	Recall	1	5.359	.022 *	.032	.633
	Interest	1	.059	.808	.000	.057
	CoBRAS	1	1.691	.195	.010	.253
	MRS	1	1.386	.241	.009	.216
	SEE	1	1.166	.282	.007	.189
Leadership * Race * University	Recall	1	.512	.475	.003	.110
	Interest	1	5.166	.024 *	.031	.618
	CoBRAS	1	.000	.985	.000	.050
	MRS	1	.108	.743	.001	.062
	SEE	1	1.697	.194	.010	.254

*. Significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 13

Descriptive Statistics for Original Model + University

	Leadership	Race	University	Mean	SD	N		
Recall	Absent	Absent	Illino is	9.42	1.904	33		
			Indiana	8.64	1.748	11		
			Total	9.23	1.878	44		
		Present	Illino is ^a	Illino is ^a	8.37	2.436	27	
				Indiana ^a	9.47	2.031	15	
				Total	8.76	2.335	42	
			Total	Illino is	8.95	2.205	60	
				Indiana	9.12	1.925	26	
				Total	9.00	2.114	86	
	Present	Absent	Illino is	Illino is	9.12	1.306	26	
				Indiana	9.38	1.805	13	
				Total	9.21	1.472	39	
			Present	Illino is	8.38	1.699	29	
				Indiana	9.64	1.598	14	
				Total	8.79	1.753	43	
		Total	Illino is	Illino is	8.73	1.557	55	
				Indiana	9.52	1.673	27	
				Total	8.99	1.629	82	
			Total	Absent	Illino is	9.29	1.661	59
					Indiana	9.04	1.781	24
					Total	9.22	1.690	83
Present	Illino is	8.38		2.068	56			
	Indiana	9.55		1.804	29			
	Total	8.78		2.049	85			
Total	Illino is	Illino is	8.84	1.918	115			
		Indiana	9.32	1.795	53			
		Total	8.99	1.888	168			
Interest	Absent	Absent	Illino is	4.42	.973	33		
			Indiana	4.07	.844	11		
			Total	4.34	.945	44		
		Present	Illino is	Illino is	4.28	.712	27	
				Indiana ^b	4.59	.546	15	
				Total	4.39	.668	42	
			Total	Illino is	4.36	.861	60	
				Indiana	4.37	.720	26	
				Total	4.36	.817	86	
	Present	Absent	Illino is	4.45	.737	26		
			Indiana	4.28	.412	13		
			Total	4.40	.646	39		
		Present	Illino is ^b	4.50	.736	29		

Table 13 (continued)

Descriptive Statistics for Original Model + University

	Leadership	Race	University	Mean	SD	N
			Indiana ^b	3.79	.946	14
			Total	4.27	.865	43
		Total	Illino is	4.48	.730	55
			Indiana	4.03	.766	27
			Total	4.33	.767	82
	Total	Absent	Illino is	4.44	.870	59
			Indiana	4.19	.640	24
			Total	4.36	.814	83
		Present	Illino is	4.39	.726	56
			Indiana	4.20	.853	29
			Total	4.33	.772	85
		Total	Illino is	4.42	.800	115
			Indiana	4.20	.757	53
			Total	4.35	.791	168
CoBRAS	Absent	Absent	Illino is	60.64	15.068	33
			Indiana	70.82	13.768	11
			Total	63.18	15.262	44
		Present	Illino is	64.93	13.465	27
			Indiana	68.73	9.953	15
			Total	66.29	12.337	42
		Total	Illino is	62.57	14.411	60
			Indiana	69.62	11.507	26
			Total	64.70	13.917	86
	Present	Absent	Illino is	60.15	17.957	26
			Indiana	71.92	9.500	13
			Total	64.08	16.499	39
		Present	Illino is	61.00	15.793	29
			Indiana	66.57	12.786	14
			Total	62.81	14.962	43
		Total	Illino is	60.60	16.697	55
			Indiana	69.15	11.438	27
			Total	63.41	15.627	82
	Total	Absent	Illino is	60.42	16.258	59
			Indiana	71.42	11.394	24
			Total	63.60	15.764	83
		Present	Illino is	62.89	14.718	56
			Indiana	67.69	11.254	29
			Total	64.53	13.758	85
		Total	Illino is ^c	61.63	15.509	115
			Indiana ^c	69.38	11.363	53

Table 13 (continued)

Descriptive Statistics for Original Model + University

	Leadership	Race	University	Mean	SD	N		
			Total	64.07	14.746	168		
MRS	Absent	Absent	Illino is	12.33	5.633	33		
			Indiana	14.64	6.021	11		
			Total	12.91	5.750	44		
		Present	Illino is	Illino is	13.19	5.485	27	
				Indiana	12.53	4.853	15	
				Total	12.95	5.217	42	
			Total	Illino is	12.72	5.536	60	
				Indiana	13.42	5.368	26	
				Total	12.93	5.464	86	
	Present	Absent	Illino is	Illino is	13.73	6.181	26	
				Indiana	15.08	4.481	13	
				Total	14.18	5.647	39	
			Present	Illino is	14.10	6.997	29	
				Indiana	13.79	5.964	14	
				Total	14.00	6.608	43	
		Total	Illino is	Illino is	13.93	6.565	55	
				Indiana	14.41	5.242	27	
				Total	14.09	6.133	82	
			Total	Absent	Illino is	12.95	5.871	59
					Indiana	14.88	5.127	24
					Total	13.51	5.703	83
Present	Illino is	13.66		6.273	56			
	Indiana	13.14		5.357	29			
	Total	13.48		5.949	85			
Total	Illino is	Illino is	13.30	6.054	115			
		Indiana	13.92	5.276	53			
		Total	13.49	5.811	168			
SEE	Absent	Absent	Illino is	4.25	.862	33		
			Indiana	3.84	.571	11		
			Total	4.15	.813	44		
		Present	Illino is	Illino is	4.05	.607	27	
				Indiana	4.18	.538	15	
				Total	4.09	.580	42	
			Total	Illino is	4.16	.759	60	
				Indiana	4.04	.567	26	
				Total	4.12	.705	86	
	Present	Absent	Illino is	4.23	.693	26		
			Indiana	3.86	.337	13		

Table 13 (continued)

Descriptive Statistics for Original Model + University

Leadership	Race	University	Mean	SD	N	
Total	Present	Total	4.11	.619	39	
		Illinois	4.38	.652	29	
		Indiana	3.96	.822	14	
	Total	Total	4.25	.730	43	
		Illinois	4.31	.670	55	
		Indiana	3.91	.627	27	
	Absent	Total	Total	4.18	.679	82
			Illinois	4.24	.785	59
			Indiana	3.85	.448	24
		Present	Total	4.13	.724	83
			Illinois	4.22	.648	56
			Indiana	4.08	.686	29
		Total	Total	4.17	.661	85
			Illinois ^d	4.23	.719	115
			Indiana ^d	3.97	.596	53
Total	Total	4.15	.691	168		

^a. An effect of the interaction between race and university on recall scores was found to be significant.

^b. An effect for the interaction between leadership condition, race condition, and university was found on interest scores.

^c. Illinois participants showed lower levels of color-blindness than Indiana participants.

^d. Illinois participants showed higher levels of ethnocultural empathy than Indiana participants.

Table 14

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval		
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Recall	Illinois * Psychologists	Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	.31	.488	.528	-.66	1.27	
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	1.05*	.483	.031	.10	2.01	
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	1.04*	.474	.029	.11	1.98	
		Indiana * Psychologists	.79	.648	.226	-.49	2.07	
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	.04	.610	.948	-1.16	1.24	
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-.04	.580	.942	-1.19	1.10	
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.22	.594	.713	-1.39	.95	
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	Illinois * Psychologists	-.31	.488	.528	-1.27	.66
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	Illinois * African American Psychologists	.75	.511	.147	-.27	1.76
	Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	.74	.503	.145	-.26	1.73	
	Indiana * Psychologists	Indiana * Psychologists	.48	.670	.475	-.84	1.80	
	Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-.27	.632	.671	-1.52	.98	
	Indiana * African American Psychologists	Indiana * African American Psychologists	-.35	.604	.561	-1.54	.84	

Table 14 (continued)

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.53	.617	.394	-1.75	.69
	Illinois * African American Psychologists	Illinois * Psychologists	-1.05*	.483	.031	-2.01	-.10
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	-.75	.511	.147	-1.76	.27
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.01	.498	.986	-.99	.97
		Indiana * Psychologists	-.27	.666	.690	-1.58	1.05
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-1.01	.628	.108	-2.26	.23
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-1.10	.599	.069	-2.28	.09
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	-1.27*	.613	.040	-2.48	-.06
	Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	Illinois * Psychologists	-1.04*	.474	.029	-1.98	-.11
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	-.74	.503	.145	-1.73	.26
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	.01	.498	.986	-.97	.99
		Indiana * Psychologists	-.26	.659	.697	-1.56	1.04
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-1.01	.621	.108	-2.23	.22
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-1.09	.592	.068	-2.26	.08

Table 14 (continued)

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	-1.26*	.606	.039	-2.46	-.07
	Indiana * Psychologists	Illinois * Psychologists	-.79	.648	.226	-2.07	.49
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	-.48	.670	.475	-1.80	.84
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	.27	.666	.690	-1.05	1.58
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	.26	.659	.697	-1.04	1.56
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-.75	.763	.328	-2.25	.76
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-.83	.739	.263	-2.29	.63
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	-1.01	.750	.182	-2.49	.47
	Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	Illinois * Psychologists	-.04	.610	.948	-1.24	1.16
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	.27	.632	.671	-.98	1.52
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	1.01	.628	.108	-.23	2.26
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	1.01	.621	.108	-.22	2.23
		Indiana * Psychologists	.75	.763	.328	-.76	2.25
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-.08	.705	.908	-1.48	1.31

Table 14 (continued)

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.26	.717	.719	-1.67	1.16
	Indiana * African American Psychologists	Illinois * Psychologists	.04	.580	.942	-1.10	1.19
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	.35	.604	.561	-.84	1.54
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	1.10	.599	.069	-.09	2.28
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	1.09	.592	.068	-.08	2.26
		Indiana * Psychologists	.83	.739	.263	-.63	2.29
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	.08	.705	.908	-1.31	1.48
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.18	.692	.799	-1.54	1.19
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology					
	Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	Illinois * Psychologists	.22	.594	.713	-.95	1.39
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	.53	.617	.394	-.69	1.75
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	1.27*	.613	.040	.06	2.48
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	1.26*	.606	.039	.07	2.46
		Indiana * Psychologists	1.01	.750	.182	-.47	2.49
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	.26	.717	.719	-1.16	1.67

Table 14 (continued)

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	.18	.692	.799	-1.19	1.54
Interest	Illinois * Psychologists	Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	-.03	.204	.882	-.43	.37
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	.14	.202	.485	-.26	.54
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.07	.198	.721	-.46	.32
		Indiana * Psychologists	.35	.271	.199	-.19	.89
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	.14	.255	.572	-.36	.65
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-.16	.243	.501	-.64	.32
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	.63*	.249	.012	.14	1.12
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	.03	.204	.882	-.37	.43
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	.17	.214	.424	-.25	.59
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.04	.210	.847	-.46	.37
		Indiana * Psychologists	.38	.280	.177	-.17	.93
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	.17	.265	.510	-.35	.70
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-.13	.253	.598	-.63	.37

Table 14 (continued)

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	.66*	.258	.011	.15	1.17
	Illinois * African American Psychologists	Illinois * Psychologists	-.14	.202	.485	-.54	.26
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	-.17	.214	.424	-.59	.25
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.21	.208	.309	-.62	.20
		Indiana * Psychologists	.21	.279	.456	-.34	.76
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	.00	.263	.991	-.52	.52
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-.31	.251	.226	-.80	.19
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	.49	.257	.058	-.02	1.00
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	Illinois * Psychologists	.07	.198	.721	-.32
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	.04	.210	.847	-.37	.46
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	.21	.208	.309	-.20	.62
		Indiana * Psychologists	.42	.276	.129	-.12	.97
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	.22	.260	.408	-.30	.73
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-.09	.248	.709	-.58	.40

Table 14 (continued)

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	.70*	.254	.006	.20	1.20
	Indiana * Psychologists	Illinois * Psychologists	-.35	.271	.199	-.89	.19
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	-.38	.280	.177	-.93	.17
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	-.21	.279	.456	-.76	.34
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.42	.276	.129	-.97	.12
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-.21	.319	.521	-.84	.43
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-.51	.309	.099	-1.12	.10
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	.28	.314	.370	-.34	.90
	Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	Illinois * Psychologists	-.14	.255	.572	-.65	.36
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	-.17	.265	.510	-.70	.35
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	.00	.263	.991	-.52	.52
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.22	.260	.408	-.73	.30
		Indiana * Psychologists	.21	.319	.521	-.43	.84
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-.31	.295	.298	-.89	.28

Table 14 (continued)

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	.49	.300	.106	-.11	1.08
	Indiana * African American Psychologists	Illinois * Psychologists	.16	.243	.501	-.32	.64
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	.13	.253	.598	-.37	.63
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	.31	.251	.226	-.19	.80
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	.09	.248	.709	-.40	.58
		Indiana * Psychologists	.51	.309	.099	-.10	1.12
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	.31	.295	.298	-.28	.89
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	.80*	.290	.007	.22	1.37
	Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	Illinois * Psychologists	-.63*	.249	.012	-1.12	-.14
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	-.66*	.258	.011	-1.17	-.15
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	-.49	.257	.058	-1.00	.02
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.70*	.254	.006	-1.20	-.20
		Indiana * Psychologists	-.28	.314	.370	-.90	.34
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-.49	.300	.106	-1.08	.11

Table 14 (continued)

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-.80*	.290	.007	-1.37	-.22
CoBRAS	Illinois * Psychologists	Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	.48	3.795	.899	-7.01	7.98
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	-4.29	3.756	.255	-11.71	3.13
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.36	3.684	.921	-7.64	6.91
		Indiana * Psychologists	-10.18*	5.039	.045	-20.13	-.23
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-11.29*	4.739	.018	-20.65	-1.93
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-8.10	4.507	.074	-17.00	.80
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	-5.94	4.616	.200	-15.05	3.18
	Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	Illinois * Psychologists	-.48	3.795	.899	-7.98	7.01
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	-4.77	3.977	.232	-12.63	3.08
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.85	3.909	.829	-8.57	6.87
		Indiana * Psychologists	-10.66*	5.206	.042	-20.95	-.38
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-11.77*	4.916	.018	-21.48	-2.06
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-8.58	4.693	.069	-17.85	.69

Table 14 (continued)

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	-6.42	4.798	.183	-15.89	3.06
	Illinois * African American Psychologists	Illinois * Psychologists	4.29	3.756	.255	-3.13	11.71
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	4.77	3.977	.232	-3.08	12.63
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	3.93	3.871	.312	-3.72	11.57
		Indiana * Psychologists	-5.89	5.177	.257	-16.12	4.33
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-7.00	4.886	.154	-16.65	2.65
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-3.81	4.661	.415	-13.01	5.40
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	-1.65	4.767	.730	-11.06	7.77
	Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	Illinois * Psychologists	.36	3.684	.921	-6.91	7.64
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	.85	3.909	.829	-6.87	8.57
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	-3.93	3.871	.312	-11.57	3.72
		Indiana * Psychologists	-9.82	5.125	.057	-19.94	.30
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-10.92*	4.831	.025	-20.46	-1.38
	Indiana * African American Psychologists	-7.73	4.603	.095	-16.82	1.36	

Table 14 (continued)

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	-5.57	4.710	.239	-14.87	3.73
	Indiana * Psychologists	Illinois * Psychologists	10.18*	5.039	.045	.23	20.13
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	10.66*	5.206	.042	.38	20.95
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	5.89	5.177	.257	-4.33	16.12
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	9.82	5.125	.057	-.30	19.94
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-1.10	5.929	.852	-12.81	10.60
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	2.08	5.745	.717	-9.26	13.43
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	4.25	5.831	.468	-7.27	15.76
	Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	Illinois * Psychologists	11.29*	4.739	.018	1.93	20.65
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	11.77*	4.916	.018	2.06	21.48
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	7.00	4.886	.154	-2.65	16.65
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	10.92*	4.831	.025	1.38	20.46
		Indiana * Psychologists	1.10	5.929	.852	-10.60	12.81
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	3.19	5.484	.562	-7.64	14.02

Table 14 (continued)

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	5.35	5.575	.338	-5.66	16.36
	Indiana * African American Psychologists	Illinois * Psychologists	8.10	4.507	.074	-.80	17.00
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	8.58	4.693	.069	-.69	17.85
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	3.81	4.661	.415	-5.40	13.01
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	7.73	4.603	.095	-1.36	16.82
		Indiana * Psychologists	-2.08	5.745	.717	-13.43	9.26
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-3.19	5.484	.562	-14.02	7.64
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	2.16	5.378	.688	-8.46	12.78
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	Illinois * Psychologists	5.94	4.616	.200	-3.18
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	6.42	4.798	.183	-3.06	15.89
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	1.65	4.767	.730	-7.77	11.06
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	5.57	4.710	.239	-3.73	14.87
		Indiana * Psychologists	-4.25	5.831	.468	-15.76	7.27
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-5.35	5.575	.338	-16.36	5.66

Table 14 (continued)

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval		
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-2.16	5.378	.688	-12.78	8.46	
MRS	Illinois * Psychologists	Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	-1.40	1.540	.366	-4.44	1.64	
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	-.85	1.524	.577	-3.86	2.16	
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	-1.77	1.495	.238	-4.72	1.18	
		Indiana * Psychologists	-2.30	2.045	.262	-6.34	1.74	
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-2.74	1.923	.156	-6.54	1.05	
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-.20	1.829	.913	-3.81	3.41	
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	-1.45	1.873	.439	-5.15	2.25	
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	Illinois * Psychologists	1.40	1.540	.366	-1.64	4.44
			Illinois * African American Psychologists	.55	1.614	.736	-2.64	3.73
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.37	1.586	.815	-3.51	2.76	
		Indiana * Psychologists	-.91	2.112	.669	-5.08	3.27	
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-1.35	1.995	.501	-5.29	2.59	
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	1.20	1.904	.530	-2.56	4.96	

Table 14 (continued)

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.05	1.947	.978	-3.90	3.79
	Illinois * African American Psychologists	Illinois * Psychologists	.85	1.524	.577	-2.16	3.86
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	-.55	1.614	.736	-3.73	2.64
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.92	1.571	.560	-4.02	2.18
		Indiana * Psychologists	-1.45	2.101	.491	-5.60	2.70
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-1.89	1.983	.341	-5.81	2.02
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	.65	1.891	.731	-3.08	4.39
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.60	1.934	.757	-4.42	3.22
	Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	Illinois * Psychologists	1.77	1.495	.238	-1.18	4.72
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	.37	1.586	.815	-2.76	3.51
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	.92	1.571	.560	-2.18	4.02
		Indiana * Psychologists	-.53	2.080	.798	-4.64	3.57
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-.97	1.960	.620	-4.84	2.90
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	1.57	1.868	.402	-2.12	5.26

Table 14 (continued)

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	.32	1.911	.868	-3.46	4.09
	Indiana * Psychologists	Illinois * Psychologists	2.30	2.045	.262	-1.74	6.34
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	.91	2.112	.669	-3.27	5.08
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	1.45	2.101	.491	-2.70	5.60
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	.53	2.080	.798	-3.57	4.64
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-.44	2.406	.855	-5.19	4.31
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	2.10	2.331	.368	-2.50	6.71
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	.85	2.366	.720	-3.82	5.52
	Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	Illinois * Psychologists	2.74	1.923	.156	-1.05	6.54
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	1.35	1.995	.501	-2.59	5.29
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	1.89	1.983	.341	-2.02	5.81
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	.97	1.960	.620	-2.90	4.84
		Indiana * Psychologists	.44	2.406	.855	-4.31	5.19
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	2.54	2.225	.255	-1.85	6.94

Table 14 (continued)

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	1.29	2.262	.569	-3.18	5.76
	Indiana * African American Psychologists	Illinois * Psychologists	.20	1.829	.913	-3.41	3.81
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	-1.20	1.904	.530	-4.96	2.56
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	-.65	1.891	.731	-4.39	3.08
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	-1.57	1.868	.402	-5.26	2.12
		Indiana * Psychologists	-2.10	2.331	.368	-6.71	2.50
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-2.54	2.225	.255	-6.94	1.85
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	-1.25	2.182	.567	-5.56	3.06
	Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	Illinois * Psychologists	1.45	1.873	.439	-2.25	5.15
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	.05	1.947	.978	-3.79	3.90
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	.60	1.934	.757	-3.22	4.42
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.32	1.911	.868	-4.09	3.46
		Indiana * Psychologists	-.85	2.366	.720	-5.52	3.82
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-1.29	2.262	.569	-5.76	3.18

Table 14 (continued)

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval		
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	1.25	2.182	.567	-3.06	5.56	
SEE	Illinois * Psychologists	Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	.02	.179	.914	-.33	.37	
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	.20	.177	.250	-.15	.56	
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.13	.174	.444	-.48	.21	
		Indiana * Psychologists	.41	.238	.088	-.06	.88	
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	.39	.224	.084	-.05	.83	
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	.07	.213	.744	-.35	.49	
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	.29	.218	.190	-.14	.72	
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	Illinois * Psychologists	-.02	.179	.914	-.37	.33
			Illinois * African American Psychologists	.19	.188	.325	-.19	.56
	Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology		-.15	.185	.408	-.52	.21	
	Indiana * Psychologists		.39	.246	.115	-.10	.87	
	Indiana * Leaders in Psychology		.37	.232	.113	-.09	.83	
	Indiana * African American Psychologists		.05	.222	.821	-.39	.49	

Table 14 (continued)

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	.27	.227	.239	-.18	.72
	Illinois * African American Psychologists	Illinois * Psychologists	-.20	.177	.250	-.56	.15
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	-.19	.188	.325	-.56	.19
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.34	.183	.066	-.70	.02
		Indiana * Psychologists	.20	.244	.406	-.28	.69
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	.18	.231	.425	-.27	.64
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-.14	.220	.540	-.57	.30
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	.08	.225	.715	-.36	.53
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	Illinois * Psychologists	.13	.174	.444	-.21
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	.15	.185	.408	-.21	.52
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	.34	.183	.066	-.02	.70
		Indiana * Psychologists	.54*	.242	.026	.06	1.02
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	.52*	.228	.023	.07	.97
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	.20	.217	.351	-.23	.63

Table 14 (continued)

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	.42	.222	.060	-.02	.86
	Indiana * Psychologists	Illinois * Psychologists	-.41	.238	.088	-.88	.06
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	-.39	.246	.115	-.87	.10
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	-.20	.244	.406	-.69	.28
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.54*	.242	.026	-1.02	-.06
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	-.02	.280	.945	-.57	.53
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-.34	.271	.213	-.87	.20
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.12	.275	.660	-.67	.42
	Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	Illinois * Psychologists	-.39	.224	.084	-.83	.05
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	-.37	.232	.113	-.83	.09
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	-.18	.231	.425	-.64	.27
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.52*	.228	.023	-.97	-.07
		Indiana * Psychologists	.02	.280	.945	-.53	.57
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-.32	.259	.219	-.83	.19

Table 14 (continued)

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.10	.263	.699	-.62	.42
	Indiana * African American Psychologists	Illinois * Psychologists	-.07	.213	.744	-.49	.35
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	-.05	.222	.821	-.49	.39
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	.14	.220	.540	-.30	.57
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.20	.217	.351	-.63	.23
		Indiana * Psychologists	.34	.271	.213	-.20	.87
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	.32	.259	.219	-.19	.83
		Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	.22	.254	.393	-.28	.72
	Indiana * African American Leaders in Psychology	Illinois * Psychologists	-.29	.218	.190	-.72	.14
		Illinois * Leaders in Psychology	-.27	.227	.239	-.72	.18
		Illinois * African American Psychologists	-.08	.225	.715	-.53	.36
		Illinois * African American Leaders in Psychology	-.42	.222	.060	-.86	.02
		Indiana * Psychologists	.12	.275	.660	-.42	.67
		Indiana * Leaders in Psychology	.10	.263	.699	-.42	.62

Table 14 (continued)

*LSD Table for University * Condition Interaction*

DV	(I) University * Condition	(J) University * Condition	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		Indiana * African American Psychologists	-.22	.254	.393	-.72	.28

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

REFERENCES

- Adesokan, A. A., Ullrich, J., van Dick, R., & Tropp, L. R. (2011). Diversity beliefs as moderator of the contact-prejudice relationship. *Social Psychology, 42*(4), 271-278.
- Agnes, M. (Ed.). (2002). *Webster's new world dictionary and thesaurus* (2nd ed.). New York, New York, United States of America: Hungry Minds, Inc.
- Avery, P., & Simmons, A. (2001). Civic life as conveyed in United States civic and history textbooks. *International Journal of Social Education, 15*(2), 105-130.
- Banks, J. (1998). The lives and values of researchers: Implications of educating citizens in a multicultural society. *Educational Researcher, 27*(7), 4-17.
- Blincoe, S., & Harris, M. J. (2009). Prejudice reduction in white students: Comparing three conceptual approaches. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 2*(4), 232-242.
- Boysen, G. A. (2011). Diversity topics covered in teaching of psychology courses. *Teaching of Psychology, 38*(2), 89-93. doi:10.1177/0098628311401593
- Brouwer, M. A., & Boros, S. (2010). The influence of intergroup contact and ethnocultural empathy on employees' attitudes toward diversity. *Cognition, Brain, Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 14*(3), 243-260.
- Case, K. A. (2007). Raising white privilege awareness and reducing racial prejudice: Assessing diversity course effectiveness. *Teaching of Psychology, 34*(4), 231-235.
- Case, K. A., & Stewart, B. (2010). Changes in diversity course student prejudice and attitudes toward heterosexual privilege and gay marriage. *Teaching of Psychology, 37*, 172-177. doi:10.1080/00986283.2010.488555
- Chin, J. (2002). (Re)Framing the issues -- Changing pedagogy, not students: A conversation with Mark Chesler. In J. Chin, C. W. Berheide, & D. Rome, *Included in Sociology: Learning*

- Climates that Cultivate Racial and Ethnic Diversity* (pp. 21-25). Washington, DC, USA: American Sociological Association.
- Curtis-Boles, H., & Bourg, E. (2010). Experiences of students of color in a graduate-level diversity course. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 4*(3), 204-212.
- Druckman, J. N. (2001, November). On the limits of framing effects: Who can frame? *The Journal of Politics, 63*(4), 1041-1066.
- Elicker, J. D., Snell, A. F., & O'Malley, A. L. (2010). Do student perceptions of diversity emphasis relate to perceived learning of psychology? *Teaching of Psychology, 37*, 36-40. doi:10.1080/00986280903425706
- Gesch, M. J. (2003). Research and activism: The fluid role of the partisan participatory observer. *American Sociological Association*.
- Goodwin, C. J. (2005). *A history of modern psychology* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Holding, R. (2007, June 28). Can schools still achieve diversity? *TIME*. Retrieved from <http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1638595,00.html>
- Holladay, C. L., Knight, J. L., Paige, D. L., & Quiñones, M. A. (2003). The influence of framing on attitudes toward diversity training. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 14*(3), 245-263.
- Hussey, H. D., Fleck, B. K., & Warner, R. M. (2010). Reducing student prejudice in diversity-infused core psychology classes. *College Teaching, 58*, 85-92.
- Institute of Education Sciences. (2010). *The nation's report card: U.S. history 2010 - National assessment of educational progress at grades 4, 8, and 12*. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

- Institutional Research and Studies. (2012). *Enrollments by ethnicity and race within education level - Fall semesters 2008-2012*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Carbondale. Retrieved from http://www.irs.siu.edu/quickfacts/students/students_by_race.php
- Kellstedt, P. M. (2000, April). Media framing and the dynamics of racial policy preferences. *American Journal of Political Science*, 44(2), 239-255.
- Kernahan, C., & Davis, T. (2010). What are the long-term effects of learning about racism? *Teaching of Psychology*, 37, 41-45. doi:10.1080/00986280903425748
- Kuvaas, B., & Kaufman, G. (2004). Impact of mood, framing, and need for cognition on decision makers' recall and confidence. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 17, 59-74. doi:10.1002/bdm.461
- Lloyd, S., & Härtel, C. (2010). Intercultural competencies for culturally diverse work teams. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(8), 845-875. doi:10.1108/02683941011089125
- Lowery, B. S., Knowles, E. D., & Unzueta, M. M. (2007, June 7). Framing inequality safely: Whites' motivated perceptions of racial privilege. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33(9), 1237-1250. doi:10.1177/0146167207303016
- Lowery, B., & Wout, D. (2010). When inequality matters: The effect of inequality frames on academic engagement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(6), 956-966.
- Martell, C., & Hashimoto-Martell, E. (2011). Throwing out the history textbook: Changing social studies texts and the impact on students. *Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*. New Orleans: American Educational Research Association.
- McCarthy, C., Rezai-Rashti, G. M., & Teasley, C. (2009). Race, diversity, and curriculum in the era of globalization. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 39(1), 76-96.

- McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. *Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism*, 92-125.
- Neville, H. A., Lilly, R. L., Duran, G., Lee, R. M., & Browne, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 47(1), 59-70.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2010). *Status and trends in the education of racial and ethnic groups*. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Urban League. (2007). Still Ssgregated, still unequal: Analyzing the impact of No Child Left Behind on African American students. In C. Knaus, *The State of Black America 2007: Portrait of the Black Male*. Beckham Publications Group.
- Nelson, T. E., Clawson, R. A., & Oxley, Z. M. (1997, September). Media framing of a civil liberties conflict and its effect on tolerance. *American Political Science Review*, 91(3), 567-583.
- Orfield, G., & Lee, C. (2005). *Why segregation matters: Poverty and educational inequality*. Harvard University. Cambridge: The Civil Rights Project.
- Paxton, R. J. (1999). A deafening silence: History textbooks and the students who read them. *Review of Educational Research*, 69(3), 315-339. doi:10.3102/00346543069003315
- Plaut, V. C., Garnett, F. G., Buffardi, L. E., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2011). "What about me?" Perceptions of exclusion and whites' reactions to multiculturalism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(2), 337-353.

- Poteat, V. P., & Spanierman, L. B. (2012). Modern racism attitudes among white students: The role of dominance and authoritarianism and the mediating effects of racial color-blindness. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 152*(6), 758-774.
- Presgraves, D. (2010, September 14). *2009 National school climate survey: Nearly 9 out of 10 LGBT students experience harassment in school*. Retrieved from Gay, Lesbian, & Straight Education Network: <http://www.glsen.org/cgi-bin/iowa/all/library/record/2624.html?state=research&type=antibullying>
- Rasoal, C., Jungert, T., Stiwne, E. E., & Andersson, G. (2009). Ethnocultural empathy among students in health care education. *Evaluation and the Health Professions, 32*(3), 300-313. doi:10.1177/0163278709338569
- Rodriguez, C. Y. (2012, November 9). *Latino vote key to Obama's re-election*. Retrieved from CNN: <http://www.cnn.com/2012/11/09/politics/latino-vote-key-election/index.html>
- Rudman, L. A., Ashmore, R. D., & Gary, M. L. (2001). "Unlearning" automatic biases: The malleability of implicit prejudice and stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*(5), 856-868. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.81.5.856
- Russell, G. M. (2011). Motives of heterosexual allies in collective action for equality. *Journal of Social Issues, 376-393*.
- Sciame-Giesecke, S., Roden, D., & Parkinson, K. (2009). Infusing diversity into the curriculum: What are faculty members actually doing? *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 2*(3), 156-165.
- Shafir, E., Simonson, I., & Tversky, A. (1993). Reason-based choice. *Cognition, 49*, 11-36.

- Spanierman, L. B., Poteat, V. P., Beer, A. M., & Armstrong, P. I. (2006). Psychosocial costs of racism to whites: Exploring patterns through cluster analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(4), 434-441.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1981, January 30). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science, 211*(4481), 453-458. doi:10.1126/science.7455683
- U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (2006). *The benefits of racial and ethnic diversity in elementary and secondary education*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.
- Ukpokodu, O. (2010). How a sustainable campus-wide diversity curriculum fosters academic success. *Multicultural Education, 17*(2), 27-36.
- University of Southern Indiana. (2012). *Official university head count enrollment by race/ethnicity - fall semester*. Evansville: University of Southern Indiana. Retrieved from <http://www.usi.edu/opra/pdfs/factbook/2012/PDFs-no%20pics/Revised/Enrollment%20by%20Race-Ethnicity.pdf>
- Wang, Y. W., Davidson, M. M., Yakushko, O. F., Savoy, H. B., Tan, J. A., & Bleier, J. K. (2003). The scale of ethnocultural empathy: Development, validation, and reliability. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 50*(2), 221-234.
- Williams, D. A., Berger, J. B., & McClendon, S. A. (2005). *Toward a model of inclusive excellence and change in postsecondary institutions*. Retrieved from Association of American Colleges and Universities: http://www.aacu.org/inclusive_excellence/documents/williams_et_al.pdf

Wolsko, C., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2000). Framing interethnic ideology: Effects of multicultural and color-blind perspectives on judgments of groups and individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*(4), 635-654.

Worthington, R. L., Navarro, R. L., Loewy, M., & Hart, J. (2008). Color-blind racial attitudes, social dominance orientation, racial-ethnic group membership, and college students' perceptions of campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1*(1), 8-19.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Consent Form for Southern Illinois University Carbondale

I consent to participate in this investigation on retention of information. This research is sponsored by Southern Illinois University-Carbondale and conducted under the supervision of Dr. Meera Komarraju of Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois, USA.

The purpose of this study is to evaluate teaching methods involving psychological history. I understand that the experiment will take about 30-45 minutes to complete, in which I will be asked to read a vignette and answer questions.

I understand that my participation is anonymous. The information I provide will be used for research purposes only, and my name and other identifying information will NOT be link to my responses.

Although there may be no direct benefits associated with participation in this study, my participation can help increase our understanding of students' interest in academic matters. In addition, I understand that there are no known risks associated with participation in this study and I may skip any questions that I feel uncomfortable answering.

I understand that my participation is voluntary, that there is not a penalty for refusal to participate and that I may stop the experiment at any time. I understand that in the event that I elect to discontinue participation, I may request any information I have contributed to be destroyed.

If I have questions about this survey or the procedures in this project, I may contact the project researchers, Crystal Steltenpohl, M.A., Department of Psychology, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, 62901-6502, cnsteltenp@siu.edu, or Meera Komarraju, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Psychology, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, 62901-6502, meerak@siu.edu <mailto:pstock@siu.edu>, 618-453-8331

By signing below, I agree to participate in this survey with my informed consent.

Name

Date

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu.

Consent Form for Researcher's Own Students

I consent to participate in this investigation on retention of information. This research is sponsored by Southern Illinois University-Carbondale and conducted under the supervision of Dr. Meera Komaraju of Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois, USA.

The purpose of this study is to evaluate teaching methods involving psychological history. I understand that the experiment will take about 30-45 minutes to complete, in which I will be asked to read a vignette and answer questions.

I understand that my participation is anonymous. The information I provide will be used for research purposes only, and my name and other identifying information will NOT be linked to my responses. Though the primary researcher is my teaching assistant, she will not have access to **any** information regarding my participation in this study until after final grades are turned in. If I have any concerns about this, I know that I may contact the primary researcher's advisor, whose information is listed below.

Although there may be no direct benefits associated with participation in this study, my participation can help increase our understanding of students' interest in academic matters. In addition, I understand that there are no known risks associated with participation in this study and I may skip any questions that I feel uncomfortable answering.

I understand that my participation is voluntary, that there is not a penalty for refusal to participate and that I may stop the experiment at any time. I understand that in the event that I elect to discontinue participation, I may request any information I have contributed to be destroyed.

If I have questions about this survey or the procedures in this project, I may contact the project researchers, Crystal Steltenpohl, M.A., Department of Psychology, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, 62901-6502, cnsteltenp@siu.edu, or Meera Komaraju, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Psychology, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, 62901-6502, meerak@siu.edu <mailto:pstock@siu.edu>, 618-453-8331

By signing below, I agree to participate in this survey with my informed consent.

Name

Date

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu.

Consent Form for University of Southern Indiana
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN INDIANA
The Effect of Status Framing on Student Interest and Recall
Informed Consent Document

You are invited to participate in a research study evaluating the effectiveness of teaching methods. This study is being conducted by Crystal Steltenpohl, Graduate Assistant at Southern Illinois University Carbondale, under the supervision of Dr. Julie Evey. Crystal Steltenpohl can be reached by email via cnsteltenp@siu.edu. For questions about your rights as a research participant or to discuss problems, complaints or concerns about a research study, or to obtain information, or offer input, contact the University of Southern Indiana Office of Sponsored Projects and Research Administration, 8600 University Blvd., Wright Administration Rm. 104, Evansville, IN 47712-3596, 812-228-5149 or by email at rcr@usi.edu. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be a part of the study.

PURPOSE: The purpose of this study is to evaluate teaching methods involving psychological history.

PROCEDURES: If you agree to be in the study, you will do the following things: read a vignette and answer measures regarding interest and recall.

TIME COMMITMENT: Your participation in this study will take approximately 30-45 minutes but not likely more than an hour.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: There are no known direct risks or benefits to the participant in this study. However, this research may help inform teaching methods.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Efforts will be made to keep your personal information confidential. Absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed. Your identity will be held in confidence in the event that the study may be published and databases in which your information may be stored. Only researchers working directly with the data will have access to it. It will be kept in a locked room until it is destroyed five years from now.

COMPENSATION: If your professor is offering class credit for participating in this research study, please inform the researcher so that they may inform your professor that you participated in a study.

VOLUNTEERING FOR THE STUDY: Taking part in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to take part or may leave the study at any time. Leaving the study will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled. Your decision whether or not to participate in this study will not affect your current or future relations with the investigator(s).

ALTERNATIVES TO TAKING PART IN THE STUDY: Instead of being part of the study, you have these options: do not participate in the study. If your professor is offering class credit for participating in research studies, s/he is required to offer alternatives for said credit.

PARTICIPANT'S CONSENT: I have read the information provided to me. I have had all of my questions answered. Based on the statements listed above, I give my consent to participate in this research study. I agree to take part in this study.

Participant's Name: _____
Participant's Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Researcher's Name: _____
Researcher's Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

APPENDIX B

Vignette

Instructions (control group): Below you will find a sample reading from a history book on psychology. The section covers **two famous psychologists**. Please read the section carefully, as you will be asked questions on the material once you've finished.

Instructions ("African-American" group): Below you will find a sample reading from a history book on psychology. The section covers **two famous African-American psychologists**. Please read the section carefully, as you will be asked questions on the material once you've finished.

Instructions ("African-American + Leaders" group): Below you will find a sample reading from a history book on psychology. The section covers **two famous African-American leaders in psychology**. Please read the section carefully, as you will be asked questions on the material once you've finished.

Instructions ("Leaders" group): Below you will find a sample reading from a history book on psychology. The section covers **two famous leaders in psychology**. Please read the section carefully, as you will be asked questions on the material once you've finished.

Text:

Psychologists/Leaders in Psychology/African American Psychologists/African American Leaders in Psychology

Kenneth B. (1914-2005) and Mamie Phipps (1917-1983) Clark

On May 17, 1954, the United States Supreme Court issued a ruling that has come to be recognized as one of the most important court decisions of the twentieth century. Concerning a suit brought against the Board of Education in Topeka, Kansas, the Court declared, by a unanimous 7-0 vote, that "in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal." The *Brown v. Board of Education* ruling reversed an earlier decision from another time; in 1896, the Court, in *Plessy v. Ferguson*, had ruled that it was legal for there to be separate public facilities (e.g. schools, restrooms) for whites and blacks, as long as the facilities reserved for blacks were of equal quality to those reserved for whites. By declaring the doctrine of "separate but equal" unconstitutional, the Brown decision helped pave the way for the civil rights movement of the 1960s and 1970s. Of importance for psychology's history, the Brown decision was notable because the Court's decision was influenced by, and made specific reference to, research by psychologists demonstrating the adverse effects of segregation on young African Americans. Although it was not the only research that contributed to the decision, studies on the self-esteem of black children, completed by psychologists Kenneth and Mamie Phipps Clark, have come to symbolize the contribution of psychology to a watershed moment in American history.

Kenneth B. Clark was an African American born in the Panama Canal Zone, educated in the public school system of New York City, and went to college at Howard University in Washington, D.C. Mamie Phipps was a rarity—an African American raised in a comparatively affluent environment. Her father was a physician in Hot Springs, Arkansas, and although she "learned the things not to do" when growing up, she was insulated from many of the daily indignities of being black and growing up in the South. Mamie also found her way to Howard University, where she planned to study math. That plan changed, however, when she met her future husband, who

convinced her to join him as a psychology major. Together, they came under Sumner's influence. Kenneth and Mamie both completed bachelor's and master's degrees at Howard (1935 and 1936 for Kenneth; 1938 and 1939 for Mamie), and both went on to earn doctorates from Columbia (1940 and 1943). They eloped a few months before Mamie's 1938 graduation from Howard.

The research for which the Clarks, psychologists, are best known originated in and grew out of Mamie's master's thesis in the late 1930s and was summarized later as "Racial identification and preference in Negro children" "Eventually known as the "doll studies," the procedure involved early school age black and white children from both the North and the South. They were shown four dolls, a female and a male with light-colored skin, and asked a series of questions, including, "Show me the doll that you would like to play with," "Show me the doll that looks bad," and "Show me the doll that looks like you." What they found was that black children showed a preference for the white dolls and tended to consider the black dolls "bad." In some cases, the children even thought they looked more like the white dolls. In a slightly different procedure, children were given dolls and crayons and told to color in the dolls. Black children consistently colored the skins of the dolls lighter than their own. The Clarks concluded that one insidious effect of segregation was that that self-esteem of black children suffered. And if childhood shapes the adult, these effects would have lasting deleterious effects.



The legal strategy in *Brown v. Board of Education* evolved out of four different state court fights over the same basic issue—reversing the separate but equal doctrine. An architect of the legal strategy was Thurgood Marshall, who later became the first African American named to the Supreme Court. He explained it his way:

If your car ran over my client, you'd have to pay up, and my function as an attorney would be to put experts on the stand to testify to how much damage was done. We needed exactly that kind of evidence in the school cases. When Bob Carter came to me with Ken Clark's doll test, I thought it was a promising way of showing injury to these segregated youngsters.

Kenneth Clark testified in three of the four cases leading up to the Supreme Court case, even bringing the dolls with him to show jurors. These cases culminated in the Brown decision, and although the "doll studies" were not cited in the text of the decision, Chief Justice Earl Warren's decision made specific reference to the importance of the expert testimony of social scientists that testified to the effects of segregation on black children. Thus, these two psychologists were responsible for helping to inform this important Supreme Court case.

After earning her doctorate in 1943, Mamie Clark took a position at the Riverdale Home for children, providing psychological services for homeless black children. In 1946, with her husband's support and some funds from her father, she established and became the executive director for the Northside Center for Child Development in Harlem. The center provided counseling and therapy for the youth of Harlem and their families and was a model of an interdisciplinary team approach to treatment—Clark's staff included "psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, case workers, teachers, and consulting pediatricians." During this same time, Kenneth joined the faculty of City College of New York and began a distinguished academic career that culminated in his election to the presidency of the American Psychological Association in 1970. He was the first, and so far the only, African American to hold the office.

As noted earlier, minority group members are not well represented in psychology today. Nonetheless, the APA has made a few organizational efforts over the years to create a climate of inclusiveness. In 1950, for example, the APA Council passed a resolution that it would only hold its annual meetings in cities free from overt discriminatory practices. The 1957 meeting, for instance, was moved from Miami to New York, after it was learned that some hotels would not register blacks. Mainly through the efforts of Kenneth Clark during his APA presidency,



the APA also created the Board of Social and Ethical Responsibility for Psychology in 1972; it in turn spawned today's Board of Ethnic Minority Affairs. The APA's Minority Fellows Program began awarding financial aid for graduate study in 1974, and in 1987, Division 45, the Society for the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Issues, was created.

We hope you will learn more about these two psychologists.

Example Vignette

Instructions: Below you will find a sample reading from a history book on psychology. The section covers two psychologists. Please read the section carefully, as you will be asked questions on the material once you've finished.

Psychologists

Kenneth B. (1914-2005) and Mamie Phipps (1917-1983) Clark

On May 17, 1954, the United States Supreme Court issued a ruling that has come to be recognized as one of the most important court decisions of the twentieth century. Concerning a suit brought against the Board of Education in Topeka, Kansas, the Court declared, by a unanimous 7-0 vote, that “in the field of public education the doctrine of ‘separate but equal’ has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal.” The *Brown v. Board of Education* ruling reversed an earlier decision from another time; in 1896, the Court, in *Plessy v. Ferguson*, had ruled that it was legal for there to be separate public facilities (e.g. schools, restrooms) for whites and blacks, as long as the facilities reserved for blacks were of equal quality to those reserved for whites. By declaring the doctrine of “separate but equal” unconstitutional, the Brown decision helped pave the way for the civil rights movement of the 1960s and 1970s. Of importance for psychology’s history, the Brown decision was notable because the Court’s decision was influenced by, and made specific reference to, research by psychologists demonstrating the adverse effects of segregation on young African Americans. Although it was not the only research that contributed to the decision, studies on the self-esteem of black children, completed by psychologists Kenneth and Mamie Phipps Clark, have come to symbolize the contribution of psychology to a watershed moment in American history.

Kenneth B. Clark was an African American born in the Panama Canal Zone, educated in the public school system of New York City, and went to college at Howard University in Washington, D.C. Mamie Phipps was a rarity—an African American raised in a comparatively affluent environment. Her father was a physician in Hot Springs, Arkansas, and although she “learned the things not to do” when growing up, she was insulated from many of the daily indignities of being black and growing up in the South. Mamie also found her way to Howard University, where she planned to study math. That plan changed, however, when she met her future husband, who convinced her to join him as a psychology major. Together, they came under Sumner’s influence. Kenneth and Mamie both completed bachelor’s and master’s degrees at Howard (1935 and 1936 for Kenneth; 1938 and 1939 for Mamie), and both went on to earn doctorates from Columbia (1940 and 1943). They eloped a few months before Mamie’s 1938 graduation from Howard.

The research for which the Clarks, psychologists, are best known originated in and grew out of Mamie’s master’s thesis in the late 1930s and was summarized later as “Racial identification and preference in Negro children” “Eventually known as the “doll studies,” the procedure involved early school age black and white children from both the North and the South. They were shown four dolls, a female and a male with light-colored skin, and asked a series of questions, including, “Show me the doll that you would like to play with,” “Show me the doll that looks bad,” and “Show me the doll that looks like you.” What they found was that black children showed a preference for the white dolls and tended to consider the black dolls “bad.” In some cases, the children even thought they looked more like the white dolls. In a slightly different procedure, children were given dolls and crayons and told to color in the dolls. Black children consistently colored the skins of the dolls lighter than their own. The Clarks concluded that one insidious effect of segregation was that that self-esteem of black children suffered. And if childhood shapes the adult, these effects would have lasting deleterious effects.





The legal strategy in *Brown v. Board of Education* evolved out of four different state court fights over the same basic issue—reversing the separate but equal doctrine. An architect of the legal strategy was Thurgood Marshall, who later became the first African American named to the Supreme Court. He explained it his way:

If your car ran over my client, you'd have to pay up, and my function as an attorney would be to put experts on the stand to testify to how much damage was done. We needed exactly that kind of evidence in the school cases. When Bob Carter came to me with Ken Clark's doll test, I thought it was a promising way of showing injury to these segregated youngsters.

Kenneth Clark testified in three of the four cases leading up to the Supreme Court case, even bringing the dolls with him to show jurors. These cases culminated in the Brown decision, and although the “doll studies” were not cited in the text of the decision, Chief Justice Earl Warren's decision made specific reference to the importance of the expert testimony of social scientists that testified to the effects of segregation on black children. Thus, these two psychologists were responsible for helping to inform this important Supreme Court case.

After earning her doctorate in 1943, Mamie Clark took a position at the Riverdale Home for children, providing psychological services for homeless black children. In 1946, with her husband's support and some funds from her father, she established and became the executive director for the Northside Center for Child Development in Harlem. The center provided counseling and therapy for the youth of Harlem and their families and was a model of an interdisciplinary team approach to treatment—Clark's staff included “psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, case workers, teachers, and consulting pediatricians.” During this same time, Kenneth joined the faculty of City College of New York and began a distinguished academic career that culminated in his election to the presidency of the American Psychological Association in 1970. He was the first, and so far the only, African American to hold the office.



As noted earlier, minority group members are not well represented in psychology today. Nonetheless, the APA has made a few organizational efforts over the years to create a climate of inclusiveness. In 1950, for example, the APA Council passed a resolution that it would only hold its annual meetings in cities free from overt discriminatory practices. The 1957 meeting, for instance, was moved from Miami to New York, after it was learned that some hotels would not register blacks. Mainly through the efforts of Kenneth Clark during his APA presidency, the APA also created the Board of Social and Ethical Responsibility for Psychology in 1972; it in turn spawned today's Board of Ethnic Minority Affairs. The APA's Minority Fellows Program began awarding financial aid for graduate study in 1974, and in 1987, Division 45, the Society for the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Issues, was created.

We hope you will learn more about these two psychologists.

APPENDIX C

Recall Measure

To ensure that you read the passage, you will now be asked a few questions regarding the material. Please circle the correct answer.

1. What was the name of the United States Supreme Court's decision that the Clarks' research helped inform?

- a. *Miranda v. Arizona*
- b. *Brown v. Board of Education*
- c. *McCulloch v. Maryland*
- d. *Gibbons v. Ogden*

2. Where did Kenneth and Mamie earn their doctorates?

- a. Columbia University
- b. Northeastern University
- c. University of Washington
- d. Southern Illinois University

3. What did Mamie Clark's famous research study look at?

- a. IQ
- b. Black children's socialization
- c. Policy creation
- d. Black children's self-esteem

4. What position did Kenneth Clark hold in the American Psychological Association?

- a. President
- b. Vice President
- c. CEO
- d. Chancellor

5. What is Division 45 of the APA?

- a. Society for General Psychology
- b. Society for Personality and Social Psychology
- c. Society for the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Issues
- d. Society of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology

6. What previous court case had ruled that it was legal for there to be separate public facilities (e.g. schools, restrooms) for whites and blacks, as long as the facilities reserved for blacks were of equal quality to those reserved for whites?

- a. *Plessy v. Ferguson*
- b. *Zelman v. Simmons-Harris*
- c. *Williams v. California*
- d. *Engel v. Vitale*

7. What were the results of one of Kenneth and Mamie Clark's doll studies?

- a. Black children showed no preference for either black or white dolls.
- b. Black children showed a preference for the white dolls and considered the black dolls "bad."
- c. Black children showed a preference for the black dolls and considered the white dolls "bad."

- d. Black children considered both black and white dolls “bad.”
8. When asked to color in dolls with crayons, what happened?
- White children consistently colored the skins of the dolls darker than their own.
 - White children consistently colored the skins of the dolls lighter than their own.
 - Black children consistently colored the skins of the dolls darker than their own.
 - Black children consistently colored the skins of the dolls lighter than their own.
9. How did Thurgood Marshall feel about the doll studies?
- He thought it was the most important research of this century.
 - He thought it was a promising way of showing injury to segregated children.
 - He thought the research, while promising, would not influence the court’s opinion.
 - He thought the research wasn’t strong enough.
10. In how many of the four cases leading up to the Supreme Court case did Kenneth Clark testify?
- Four
 - Three
 - Two
 - One
11. What did Chief Justice Earl Warren’s decision make specific reference to?
- Kenneth and Mamie Clark’s research.
 - The previous court decision to uphold segregation.
 - The importance of expert testimony that testified to the effects of segregation on black children.
 - The strength of local and national leaders in attempting to change the educational system.
12. What was the goal of Mamie Clark’s Northside Center for Child Development in Harlem?
- To provide counseling and therapy for the youth of Harlem and their families.
 - To boost the self-esteem of black children in segregated schools in Harlem.
 - To produce research showing that black children were negatively affected by segregation in Harlem.
 - To lobby Congress for better protections for children in Harlem.
13. Why did the American Psychological Association move their meeting from Miami to New York in 1957?
- A hurricane was due to hit Florida at the time of the meeting.
 - Miami was too expensive for their needs.
 - There were race riots happening in Miami at the time.
 - Some hotels would not register blacks.
14. What APA program began awarding financial aid for graduate study in 1974?
- Diversity Education Program
 - General Psychology Program
 - Minority Fellows Program
 - Ethnic Studies Program
15. Why was Mamie Clark insulated from many of the daily indignities of being black and growing up in the South?
- She lived in the northern area of the South.
 - She was not allowed to leave the house for extended periods of time.
 - Her father was a physician and she was raised in a comparatively affluent environment.
 - Her school was one of the most progressive in the nation.

APPENDIX D

Interest Survey

Please circle the number that best reflects the extent to which you agree with each statement. Respond to each item using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

I would be interested in learning more about Kenneth and Mamie Clark.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I would be motivated to attend courses about psychologists like the Clarks.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Readings like this would increase my attraction to psychology courses.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I would be motivated to read other readings like this.	1	2	3	4	5	6
This course would be useful to psychology majors.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I feel that reading this would change my attitudes toward others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
This reading would motivate me to find more information on similar topics.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I would use the knowledge learned from this reading in my life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
This reading would create too much of a “politically correct” atmosphere in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I feel personally threatened by this reading.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I feel this reading would create a backlash against diverse groups.	1	2	3	4	5	6

APPENDIX E

Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy

Please circle the number that best reflects the extent to which you agree with each statement. Respond to each item using the following scale:

	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I feel annoyed when people do not speak standard English.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I don't know a lot of information about important social and political events of racial and ethnic groups other than my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. I am touched by movies or books about discrimination issues faced by racial or ethnic groups other than my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I know what it feels like to be the only person of a certain race or ethnicity in a group of people.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I get impatient when communicating with people from other racial or ethnic backgrounds, regardless of how well they speak English.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I can relate to the frustration that some people feel about having fewer opportunities due to their racial or ethnic backgrounds.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. I am aware of institutional barriers (e.g., restricted opportunities for job promotion) that discriminate against racial or ethnic groups other than my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. I don't understand why people of different racial or ethnic backgrounds enjoy wearing traditional clothing.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. I seek opportunities to speak with individuals of other racial or ethnic backgrounds about their experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. I feel irritated when people of different racial or ethnic background speak their language around me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. When I know my friends are treated unfairly because of their racial or ethnic backgrounds, I speak up for them.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Please circle the number that best reflects the extent to which you agree with each statement. Respond to each item using the following scale:

	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
12. I share the anger of those who face injustice because of their racial and ethnic backgrounds.					1	2 3 4 5 6
13. When I interact with people from other racial or ethnic backgrounds, I show my appreciation of their cultural norms.					1	2 3 4 5 6
14. I feel supportive of people of other racial and ethnic groups, if I think they are being taken advantage of.					1	2 3 4 5 6
15. I get disturbed when other people experience misfortunes due to their racial or ethnic background.					1	2 3 4 5 6
16. I rarely think about the impact of a racist or ethnic joke on the feelings of people who are targeted.					1	2 3 4 5 6
17. I am not likely to participate in events that promote equal rights for people of all racial and ethnic backgrounds.					1	2 3 4 5 6
18. I express my concern about discrimination to people from other racial or ethnic groups.					1	2 3 4 5 6
19. It is easy for me to understand what it would feel like to be a person of another racial or ethnic background other than my own.					1	2 3 4 5 6
20. I can see how other racial or ethnic groups are systematically oppressed in our society.					1	2 3 4 5 6
21. I don't care if people make racists statements against other racial or ethnic groups.					1	2 3 4 5 6
22. When I see people who come from a different racial or ethnic background succeed in the public arena, I share their pride.					1	2 3 4 5 6
23. When other people struggle with racial or ethnic oppression, I share their frustration.					1	2 3 4 5 6

Please circle the number that best reflects the extent to which you agree with each statement. Respond to each item using the following scale:

	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
24. I recognize that the media often portrays people based on racial or ethnic stereotypes.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. I am aware of how society differentially treats racial or ethnic groups other than my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. I share the anger of people who are victims of hate crimes (e.g., intentional violence because of race or ethnicity).	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. I do not understand why people want to keep their indigenous racial or ethnic cultural traditions instead of trying to fit into the mainstream.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. It is difficult for me to put myself in the shoes of someone who is racially and/or ethnically different from me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. I feel uncomfortable when I am around a significant number of people who are racially/ethnically different than me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. When I hear people make racist jokes, I tell them I am offended even though they are not referring to my racial or ethnic group.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. It is difficult for me to relate to stories in which people talk about racial or ethnic discrimination they experience in their day to day lives.	1	2	3	4	5	6

APPENDIX F

Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale

Please circle the number that best reflects the extent to which you agree with each statement. Respond to each item using the following scale:

	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
1. White people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.					1	2 3 4 5 6
2. Race is very important in determining who is successful and who is not.					1	2 3 4 5 6
3. Race plays an important role in who gets sent to prison.					1	2 3 4 5 6
4. Race plays a major role in the type of social services (such as type of health care or day care) that people receive in the U.S.					1	2 3 4 5 6
5. Racial and ethnic minorities do not have the same opportunities as white people in the U.S.					1	2 3 4 5 6
6. Everyone who works hard, no matter what race they are, has an equal chance to become rich.					1	2 3 4 5 6
7. White people are more to blame for racial discrimination than racial and ethnic minorities.					1	2 3 4 5 6
8. Social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against white people.					1	2 3 4 5 6
9. White people in the U.S. are discriminated against because of the color of their skin.					1	2 3 4 5 6
10. English should be the only official language in the U.S.					1	2 3 4 5 6
11. Due to racial discrimination, programs such as affirmative action are necessary to create equality.					1	2 3 4 5 6
12. Racial and ethnic minorities in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.					1	2 3 4 5 6

Please circle the number that best reflects the extent to which you agree with each statement. Respond to each item using the following scale:

	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
13. It is important that people begin to think of themselves as American and not African American, Mexican American, or Italian American.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Immigrants should try to fit into the culture and values of the U.S.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. Talking about racial issues causes unnecessary tension.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Racism is a major problem in the U.S.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. It is important for public schools to teach about the history and contributions of racial and ethnic minorities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. It is important for political leaders to talk about racism to help work through or solve society's problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. Racism may have been a problem in the past, it is not an important problem today.	1	2	3	4	5	6

APPENDIX G

Modern Racism Scale

Please circle the number that best reflects the extent to which you agree with each statement. Respond to each item using the following scale:

	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly
	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
1. Over the past few years, Blacks have gotten more economically than they deserve.					1	2 3 4 5 6
2. Over the past few years, the government and news media have shown more respect for Blacks than they deserve.					1	2 3 4 5 6
3. It is easy to understand the anger of Black people in America.					1	2 3 4 5 6
4. Discrimination against Blacks is no longer a problem in the United States.					1	2 3 4 5 6
5. Blacks are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights.					1	2 3 4 5 6
6. Blacks should not push themselves where they are not wanted.					1	2 3 4 5 6

APPENDIX H

Manipulation Checks

1. What were Kenneth and Mamie Clark's profession?
 - a. Sociologists
 - b. Psychologists
 - c. Historians
 - d. Anthropologists

2. Kenneth and Mamie Clark were:
 - a. Leaders
 - b. Kicked out of college
 - c. Unimportant
 - d. Anthropologists

3. What were Kenneth and Mamie's ethnicities?
 - a. Both were African American
 - b. Mamie was White and Kenneth was African American
 - c. Kenneth was White and Mamie was African American
 - d. Both were White

4. On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being not at all and 10 being very much so, how good of leaders do you think Kenneth and Mamie were? _____

5. Were you familiar with the Clarks before reading this material? Yes No
If yes, where did you learn about the Clarks? _____

APPENDIX I

Demographic Survey

My age is: _____

My gender identity is: _____

My declared major is: _____

I am a:

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior

My race/ethnicity is: _____

I am:

- a U.S.-born citizen
- a naturalized citizen (born outside of the United States in _____)
- a U.S. permanent resident, but a citizen of _____
- not a U.S. citizen or permanent resident, but a citizen of _____

The schools I have attended have been:

- Extremely racially/ethnically diverse
- Mostly racially/ethnically diverse
- Somewhat racially/ethnically diverse
- Not at all racially/ethnically diverse

I have ___ friends who are of a different racial or ethnic background than me.

- No
- A few
- Several
- Mostly/Primarily

I have ___ members of my family (immediate and extended family) who are of a different racial or ethnic background than me.

- No
- A few
- Several
- Mostly/Primarily

The neighborhoods in which I grew up were

- Extremely racially/ethnically diverse
- Mostly racially/ethnically diverse
- Somewhat racially/ethnically diverse
- Not at all racially/ethnically diverse

I have been involved in activities (such as sports, camp, religious service, social) that were/are:

- Extremely racially/ethnically diverse
- Mostly racially/ethnically diverse
- Somewhat racially/ethnically diverse
- Not at all racially/ethnically diverse

I speak _____ (number) of different languages.

VITA

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University

Crystal N. Steltenpohl

cnsteltenp@gmail.com

University of Southern Indiana
Bachelor of Arts, Psychology, English, May 2011

Thesis Title:

The Effect of Status Framing on Student Interest and Recall

Major Professor: Dr. Meera Komarraju