278-75

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON POVERTY DISCUSSION PAPERS

REGIONAL DIFFERENCES IN PREJUDICE:

SUBCULTURAL VS. PERSONALITY EXPLANATIONS

Russell Middleton

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - MADISON

REGIONAL DIFFERENCES IN PREJUDICE: SUBCULTURAL VS. PERSONALITY EXPLANATIONS

Russell Middleton

June 1975

I am indebted to Robert M. Hauser, H. H. Winsborough, Charles E. Susmilch, David Elesh, and David L. Featherman for a number of helpful suggestions. The research reported here was supported by funds granted to the Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin-Madison by the Office of Economic Opportunity pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The opinions expressed are solely those of the author.

ABSTRACT

Analysis of a 1964 national survey reveals that residents of the South display a much higher level of anti-black prejudice than residents of the Nonsouth, but the regions differ only slightly on measures of anti-Semitism and anti-Catholic and anti-immigrant prejudice and on certain psychological measures--authoritarianism, anomia, and psychic inadequacy. This pattern persists even after introducing controls for degree of urbanization, education, income, and occupational status. Those who spent most of their childhood in one region but later moved to the other have tended to assume attitudes toward blacks that are intermediate between the views of those who remained in the South and those who remained in the Nonsouth. All of this evidence tends to support a subcultural rather than a psychological or personality interpretation of the higher levels of anti-black prejudice in the South. The analysis shows, however, that the variation of individuals around the mean could be explained in virtually the same way in both the South and the Nonsouth. Similar factors appear to predispose individuals to accept prejudiced beliefs, norms, and values in both regions, but the anti-black prejudices that they are socialized to accept tend to be more extreme in the South.

REGIONAL DIFFERENCES IN PREJUDICE: SUBCULTURAL VS. PERSONALITY EXPLANATIONS

I. Introduction

It is conventional wisdom that the South is becoming "Americanized"--that it is losing its cultural distinctiveness as a consequence of urbanization, industrialization, rising levels of education, and the impact of the national mass media. This assumption has been challenged, at least in part, by a few sociologists. Reed (1972) utilized national poll data to demonstrate that, even after controlling on differences in education, occupation, and urbanization, southerners still tended to differ substantially from nonsoutherners in their sense of attachment to the local community, in their attitudes toward the private use of force and violence, and in their religious beliefs and practices. Glenn and Simmons (1967) examined an even wider variety of attitudes and beliefs and also found large differences between the South and Nonsouth on most questions. They found in addition that the regional differentials tended to be more pronounced among the younger than the older respondents, which suggests that many of the regional differences in attitudes are not disappearing. In a more recent analysis, Glenn (1974) confirmed that the differentials between South and Nonsouth on most questions were as great in the 1960s as they had been in the 1950s. There was a substantial reduction in regional differences only on some questions regarding minority groups.

Reed (1972) chose not to examine racial attitudes on the ground that, although a regional difference persists, there has been

a dramatic reduction in anti-black prejudice in the South since the early 1940s and a convergence with the racial views of whites in other regions. He preferred to focus on aspects of the southern subculture that have not been considered so "important" that there have been concentrated efforts to eradicate them. Yet it is the greater level of anti-black prejudice in the South that is widely regarded as one of the most distinctive qualities of the South (cf. Ferguson, 1972). As Reed himself points out (1972:25), a 1957 Gallup Poll found that nonsoutherners stereotyped southerners as "intolerant," "bigoted," and "segregationist." Liberal-minded southerners who have moved to other sections of the country find to their consternation that nonsoutherners sometimes assume, on the basis of their southern accents, that they are bigots and attribute to them racist beliefs that they abhor (cf. Killian, 1970: 33, 114; Morris, 1967:404, 1971:170). In a 1960 survey Middleton (1961) found that most doctoral candidates at leading American universities were reluctant to consider any teaching positions in the South, primarily because of their image of the South as a stronghold of racial bigotry and their fear that the southern culture would have an undesirable influence on their children's character and ideals.

In this paper I shall examine the question of whether the South differs from other regions of the country in levels of prejudice toward four groups: blacks, Jews, Roman Catholics, and immigrants. I shall be concerned not only with the simple empirical generalizations but more importantly with the implications of the regional patterns for theories about the nature and causes of racial, ethnic, and religious prejudice.

One of the central issues in the study of prejudice is the extent to which prejudice may be explained as a consequence of personality and psychological factors or as the result of socialization to cultural norms of prejudice. Psychological explanations of prejudice have been very popular since the publication of The Authoritarian Personality (Adorno et al., 1950), but many sociologists (e.g., Rose, 1956; Pettigrew, 1958, 1959; Rhyne, 1962) have insisted that cultural or subcultural norms are a major source of at least some types of prejudice. Pettigrew (1958) and Rhyne (1962) carried out small studies that suggested that anti-black prejudice was greater in the South than in other regions of the U.S. and that the regional difference could not be attributed to psychological factors. They concluded that the greater anti-black prejudice in the South was probably due to a special set of norms embedded in the southern subculture. Building on the work of Pettigrew and Rhyne, I shall argue along the same lines in this paper, though I shall employ a national sample, a greater variety of measures of prejudice and psychological characteristics, and more complex analytic techniques. I shall also consider a number of important related questions that the earlier authors touched on only briefly or not at all. More specifically, I shall attempt to answer the following questions:

1. Is there a higher level of prejudice toward blacks, Jews, Roman Catholics, and immigrants in the South than in the Nonsouth?

2. If prejudice toward a given minority is higher in the South, can this be attributed to the lower educational levels and lesser degree of urbanization and economic development in the South? Can we expect that prejudice in the South will decline as the South becomes

more like the Nonsouth with respect to education, urbanization, income, and occupational structure?

3. What can regional differences in the different types of prejudice tell us about the relative merits of personality vs. subcultural explanations of prejudice? Here I shall consider regional variations in different types of prejudice and in measures of psychological characteristics. I shall also consider the attitudes of those who have migrated from one region to another.

4. Can variations in prejudice within the South be accounted for in the same way as variations in prejudice within the Nonsouth?

II. Previous Research on Regional Differences in Prejudice

Before describing the analysis carried out in this study, I shall summarize the findings of previous research on differences between the South and Nonsouth in levels of prejudice toward blacks, Jews, Roman Catholics, and immigrants. The data on regional differences have not, for the most part, been subjected to refined analyses, and many of these findings are based on crude cross tabulations by region.

From the great volume of previous surveys and research on anti-black prejudice, there can be little doubt that overt expressions of anti-black prejudice are substantially higher in the South (Bureau of Intelligence, 1942; Knapp, 1944; Roper, 1947; Stouffer et al., 1949; Hyman and Sheatsley, 1956, 1964; Erskine, 1962, 1967, 1967-68, 1968a, 1968b, 1968-69; Brink and Harris, 1963, 1967; Gallup Opinion Index, Nos. 1, 3, 7, 12, 14, 16, 24, 35, 37, 40, 41, 46, 51, 58, 59, 62, 75 77; Sheatsley, 1966; Glenn and Simmons, 1967; Schwartz, 1967; Selznick

and Steinberg, 1969; The Harris Survey Yearbook of Public Opinion 1970, 1971; Greeley and Sheatsley, 1971; Campbell, 1971). As several investigators have commented, region of residence appears to be the most important correlate of anti-black prejudice; the differences between South and Nonsouth are generally greater than the differences between various population groups within the same region (J. Noel, 1971:62; Schwartz, 1967:48; Sheatsley, 1966:311-2).

Some authors (for example, Lyman, 1973:90-95) suggest that the differences between the South and Nonsouth are not as pronounced as earlier scholars have assumed. Institutionalized racism may operate in the Nonsouth in more subtle and less overt ways. In this analysis, however, I do not have the data to consider the more subtle types of racism; I am limited to examining only those overt statements elicited during a formal interview. It may also be true, as southerners often claim, that whites outside the South are actually just as negative toward blacks as white southerners are, but they are more circumspect and tend not to admit their prejudices publicly. I am inclined to agree that there probably is more hypocrisy in the Nonsouth, with private bigots sometimes presenting themselves publicly as tolerant, broadminded citizens. Yet, the very fact that they feel it necessary to assume this mask--whereas white southerners generally do not--suggests that the norms of the regional subculture in the Nonsouth are less supportive of anti-black prejudice than in the South. We should bear in mind, however, that the figures from surveys may overstate somewhat the regional difference in true feelings toward blacks.

If previous research on regional differences in anti-black prejudice is relatively clear, the same is not true with regard to anti-Semitism. There is some evidence that does tend to support the popular notion that anti-Semitism has been particularly intense in the South. In the early years of this century there were strains of anti-Semitism and nativism in the Populist movement, which was strong primarily in the South and Midwest. Tom Watson, the most important of the southern Populist leaders, carried out an unremitting anti-Semitic propaganda campaign in the 1910s, and in Georgia his incitement of popular feeling against the Jews led to the lynching of Leo Frank--America's "Captain Dreyfus." Watson was able to capitalize on the popular anti-Semitism to increase the circulation of his newspaper and magazine and to revilatize his flagging political career in Georgia (Roche, 1963:88-91; Golden, 1965; Lipset and Raab, 1970:97-99). The resurgent Ku Klux Klan of the 1920s also employed anti-Semitic appeals. The Ku Klux Klan of this period was actually a national phenomenon, but it had its origin and initial successes in the South. Between 1915 and 1944 it drew approximately 36 percent of its two million or more members from the South--as compared with 31 percent of the total population living in the South (Jackson, 1967:237, 21; Chalmers, 1965). In the 1950s and 1960s the much reduced Ku Klux Klan became once more a largely southern organization, like the original Ku Klux Klan of Reconstruction. In this recent period the activities of the Klan organizations have been directed primarily against blacks, but anti-Semitism has continued to be a strong Klan theme (Chalmers, 1965: 351-2).

A number of surveys have also shown that southerners are somewhat more likely to accept anti-Jewish stereotypes, to say they would reject a qualified Jewish candidate for President, and to disapprove of intermarriage between Jews and non-Jews (Glenn and Simmons, 1967; Selznick and Steinberg, 1969; Gallup Opinion Index, Nos. 4, 24, 41, 46; R. Williams, 1964; Hoge and Carroll, 1973). Selznick and Steinberg, however, found that anti-Semitism was higher in the South only among rural residents--not among those living in urban areas.

Evans (1973) believes that these surveys have failed to grasp the complexity of the attitudes of southerners, and he questions whether the results are meaningful. He maintains that the survey findings are at variance with the subjective experience of most southern Jews, who do not feel that they are living in a particularly threatening environment. Perhaps the reason for this is that Jews constitute less than 1 percent of the population in the South, as compared with 8 percent in the Northeast, and hence have low social visibility in the South. (See Table 1.) McWilliams (1947:112) has suggested that stereotypes may be accepted almost everywhere, but discrimination tends to be greatest in those areas where there are sufficient numbers of Jews for them to be regarded as serious group competitors. Killian (1970:77) has also expressed the view that anti-Semitism in the South has a somewhat different character from that found in northeastern cities. In most parts of the South, Jews have been simply abstract, symbolic objects of prejudice--not flesh-and-blood people encountered in daily life. Evans (1973) also suggests that a higher level of anti-black and anti-Catholic

feeling in the South may serve to reduce anti-Semitism: the more numerous and visible blacks and Catholics serve as "lightening rods" for prejudice, deflecting antagonism away from the Jews.

There is, indeed, some evidence that does support the view that there is a somewhat lower level of anti-Semitic prejudice and discrimination in the South. A Fortune survey in 1936 found that residents in the Southeast were less likely than those in other regions to agree that Germany would be better off if it drove out the Jews (Erskine, 1965-66:662-3). A smaller proportion of the rumors that circulated during the early days of World War II were anti-Semitic in the South than in other regions (Knapp, 1944). A 1946 Fortune survey found that the South was lower in anti-Semitism than the Northeast or Middle West but higher than the Far West (Roper, 1964). Still another Fortune survey the following year, using a confidential "secret ballot" technique, showed that Southerners were less likely than those in other regions to say that Jews were getting too much economic and political power in the United States (Roper, 1947). Crespi (1964) found that the Eichmann war-crimes trial in Israel had a more favorable impact on attitudes toward the Jewish people in the South than in other regions. Finally, Anti-Defamation League studies have shown that country and city clubs are less likely to discriminate against Jews in the South than in any other region except the Far West (Anti-Defamation League, 1962), and that anti-Semitic incidents have not been more prevalent in the South than in other regions (Evans, 1973). Some of these bits of evidence relate more to discrimination than to prejudice, but it is likely that discrimination has a reciprocal causal

relationship with prejudice, and both represent aspects of anti-Semitism.

The South, as the heartland of Protestant fundamentalism, has a popular reputation for anti-Catholicism. Evidence from the historical record, however, is mixed. Nineteenth century anti-Catholic movements were strongest outside the South, particularly in those areas with large concentrations of Catholic immigrants. The anti-Catholic and nativist American Party--the "Know Nothings"--was most successful in Massachusetts, though it also gained victories in other northern states and even in some parts of the South that had large Catholic populations, such as New Orleans and Baltimore (Lipset and Raab, 1970:52-61). The largest anti-Catholic organization of the late nineteenth century was the American Protective Association, with almost 2.5 million supporters in the 1890s. Yet this organization operated largely outside the South and was strongest in states that had large Catholic populations. It is estimated that less than 14 percent of the American Protective Association's members lived in the South, whereas 32 percent of the total U.S. population at the time lived in the South (Kinzer, 1964:178-80).

Anti-Catholicism was probably the most important element in the ideology of the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s, since Klan leaders generally considered Catholics to be a greater "threat" than the relatively unorganized and quiescent blacks (Chalmers, 1965:32-3; Jackson, 1967:20-6). Though Southerners were somewhat more likely than non-Southerners to join the Ku Klux Klan, the largest part of the Klan's membership in the 1920s was recruited outside

the South. In fact, the very success of the Klan outside the South was probably due to its anti-Catholic emphasis. Popular feeling against Catholics was exacerbated during the 1928 Presidential campaign of Alfred E. Smith, the first Catholic to be nominated by a major party. Anti-Catholicism played a significant part in the campaign against Smith, particularly in the South, and it is generally considered that religious prejudice was one of the principal reasons for his defeat. Smith lost half of the hitherto "Solid South," but even so, he gained most of his electoral votes in the South (Killian, 1970:75-7; Moore, 1956:145-200; Maddox and Fichter, 1966:53).

In the 1960 Presidential campaign there was also some opposition to John F. Kennedy on the grounds of his religion, with the most vocal anti-Catholic appeals once again being expressed in the South. Though the anti-Catholic feeling probably never reached the intensity that it did in 1928, Kennedy found it necessary to confront the religious issue directly, beginning with the West Virginia primary. Later, in one of the pivotal episodes of the campaign, he spoke before the Greater Ministerial Association of Houston, where he affirmed his belief in the absolute separation of church and state. He asked the Protestant ministers to judge him on the basis of his record and his stands on the issues--not "on the basis of these pamphlets and publications we have all seen that carefully select quotations out of context from the statements of Catholic Church leaders, usually in other countries, frequently in other centuries, and rarely relevant to any situation here. . . ." (White, 1961: 392, 101-108, 251-262).

The popular image of the South as a stronghold of anti-Catholicism is at least partially supported by most surveys that have sampled opinion in this area. The public has been asked repeatedly by the Gallup and Harris polls since 1937 whether they would be willing to vote for a well-qualified Catholic for President. Though opposition toward a Catholic candidate has substantially decreased over the years, there has consistently been a greater amount of opposition among those living in the South than in other regions (Erskine, 1965:495-6; Gallup Opinion Index, Nos. 4, 24, 41, 46). The published figures must be interpreted cautiously, since Catholics are included in these tabulations, and there are fewer Catholics in the South than in other areas. (See Table 1.) Reanalyzing one of the 1961 surveys, however, Glenn and Simmons (1967:185) found that even if one takes only Protestants, the South still shows less support for a Catholic Presidential candidate. A Gallup Poll in 1968 found that people in the South were more likely than those in other regions to disapprove of marriage between Catholics and Protestants, but again we must interpret the figures cautiously, since Catholics were included in the sample and Catholics are much more likely to appove of intermarriage (Gallup Opinion Index, No. 41). In a general study of tolerance and attitudes toward civil liberties, Stouffer (1955) also found a higher level of anti-Catholicism in the South. Selznick and Steinberg (1969:116) reported that rural southerners were more likely to agree that Catholics are getting too much power in the United States than those living in rural areas in other regions, but this was not the case among those living in urban areas. The 1947 "secret ballot" Fortune survey, on the other hand,

TABLE 1

Percent of Population in Selected Minority Groups, by Region, United States, 1970

Region†	Percent Black*	Percent Jewish**	Percent Roman Catholic**	Percent Foreign-born*
South	19.0	1	11	2.1
North Central or Midwest	8.1	1	26	3.3
Northeast or East	8.8	8	42	8.4
West	4.9	1	21	6.6
Total U.S.	11.1	3	26	4.7

†Gallup regions defined somewhat differently from Census regions.

*Source: 1970 Census of Population: General Social and Economic Characteristics, U.S. Summary, PC(1)-C1.

**Source: George Gallup, Jr. and John L. Davies III, eds., "Religion in America, 1971," Gallup Opinion Index, No. 70, April, 1971, p. 70.

found that the Southeast and Southwest did not differ from other regions in the percent who said that Catholics were getting too much economic and political power (Roper, 1947). Since Catholics were included in these tabulations, it is possible that the South might actually have emerged with lower levels of anti-Catholicism if the views of non-Catholics alone were considered. In general, however, the survey evidence points to a somewhat greater amount of anti-Catholic feeling in the South.

There is only meager evidence available regarding regional differences in attitudes toward immigrants, but is commonly assumed that a kind of xenophobia, insularity, and distrust of foreigners and outsiders characterizes the South. Historically, nativist movements have probably been stronger outside the South especially in those areas where large numbers of immigrants settled. Surveys in recent years tend to show, however, a somewhat higher level of anti-immigrant feeling among southerners. R. Williams (1964:74) found that non-Jewish whites in Savannah, Georgia, were far more likely to agree that "this country would be better off if there were not so many foreigners here" than those living in Bakersfield, California, Elmira, New York, and Steubenville, Ohio. A Gallup poll in 1965 showed that people in the South were somewhat more opposed than those in other regions to abolition of the discriminatory national quota system of the immigration law, but there was little regional difference in views regarding whether immigration should be increased, decreased, or kept at the present level (Gallup Opinion Index, No. 3).

III. Methods

The data analyzed in this paper come from a nationwide survey of 1,975 adults conducted by NORC in October, 1964.[1] Although the survey focused primarily on the topic of anti-Semitism, it included many questions on anti-black prejudice and a few scattered questions on other types of prejudice. It is, in fact, probably the richest source of data on prejudice for a national sample of adults in the United States that is currently available. It is valuable not only for the large number of questions dealing directly with prejudice but also for the wealth of background and associated variables. The basic analysis of the survey appears in Selznick and Steinberg (1969), but that report gives only brief and passing attention to regional differences in prejudice.

NORC utilized probability methods in the sample selection down to the block level. Within blocks the interviewers were instructed to follow a prescribed travel route from a random start to fill quotas based on age, sex, and employment status. The use of a block quota sample may have introduced some bias in the sample, but probably not a great deal (Sudman, 1966). Key variables, such as education, religion, age, and sex, have highly similar distributions in the 1964 NORC survey and in the 1964 Population Survey of the Bureau of the Census (Selznick and Steinberg, 1969:xvi).

The boundaries of the South and other regions of the United States have been defined in various ways by different investigators. In this analysis I have followed the Census definitions for the four major regions: South, Northeast, North Central, and West. This is also the regional classification routinely used by NORC. According

to this classification the South is comprised of the eleven states that made up the Confederacy during the Civil War (Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas) plus a number of Border states (Oklahoma, Kentucky, West Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, District of Columbia). Few disagree over the inclusion of the Confederate states in the "South," with the possible exception of Texas. The Border states are more problematic. Yet Reed (1972: 15-19) has shown that both of these groups of states tend to have higher scores on his Index of Southern Preference, calculated from a set of questions asked by the Gallup Poll in 1957. In terms of people's sense of identification with the South, then, the Census categorization appears to be meaningful.

The total number of interviews from the NORC survey in each region is as follows: South, 613; Northeast, 474; North Central, 575; and West, 313. Within the southern region, there are 458 from the former Confederate states and 155 from the Border states. When I examined prejudice toward a particular group, I excluded members of that group from the sample. There are 244 blacks, 61 Jews, 511 Roman Catholics, and 152 foreign-born persons in the total sample of 1975. Hence, in most cases in the analysis, the sample size was somewhat reduced. I employed the entire sample, however, in determining whether or not there were regional differences in the personality variables.

To measure personality variables and the various types of prejudice toward minorities, I constructed a number of scales. My first step in the construction of a scale was to carry out a

factor analysis of those items from the survey that appeared to me to be substantively relevant. I employed Rao's canonical factor analysis (Rao, 1955) and examined the resulting factor loadings both before and after a varimax rotation. I then selected those items that appeared to be clustered together and subjected them to item analysis procedures. I examined item to total correlations with a Cureton correction (Cureton, 1966) and calculated alpha reliability coefficients (Cronbach, 1951) for different combinations of items. Generally, I selected the combination of items that yielded the highest alpha for the final scale. I also employed Heise and Bohrnstedt's factor analytic approach to calculate validity (ρ_{ts}), invalidity (Ψ^2), and reliability (Ω) coefficients (Heise and Bohrnstedt, 1970; Smith, 1974). These calculations were based on separate factor analyses (Rao's canonical) for the items of each scale. The number of factors extracted in each case was equal to the number of eigenvalues greater than one (up to a maximum of nine factors). The coefficients were calculated from the loadings on the first unrotated factor.

The items included in each of the personality and prejudice measures and the validity, invalidity, and reliability coefficients for the scales are shown below.[2] The items were scored by assigning numbers in serial order to the responses, logically ordered. The item scores were then transformed to standard scores with a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one. The standard scores for all the items constituting a scale were summed, and then the total scale scores were converted to transformed standard scores with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation

of 15. As a consequence of these operations, each item in a scale is equally weighted, regardless of its standard deviation. Furthermore, each of the measures of personality and prejudice has the same mean (50) and standard deviation (15), which facilitates comparisons by inspection.

I have used the analysis three personality variables theoretically related to prejudice: the F Scale, anomia, and psychic inadequacy. The F Scale is composed of five items taken from Forms 40 or 45 of the original scale developed by Adorno et al. (1950), and is designed to measure authoritarian or anti-democratic tendencies. The Anomia Scale, purportedly measuring a subjective sense of normlessness, consists of three items taken from the Srole (1956) scale. Actually, the factor analysis revealed that all of the F Scale and Anomia items had high loadings on the same rotated factor, which raises the question whether they are really tapping different dimensions of attitudes or personality. Because there is a substantial theoretical and research tradition behind each of these concepts, however, I have retained them as separate variables. The other personality variable, Psychic Inadequacy, is distinct in the factor analysis. I have included in the measure the five items employed by Selznick and Steinberg (1969:163) plus one other. The variable is intended as a measure of general psychological distress, since it is sometimes contended that prejudice serves as a crutch for "crippled" personalities. Types of distress included in the measure are general worry, finding oneself unable to solve problems that come up, feeling lonely, tending to go to pieces in a crisis, feeling unhappy, and worrying quite a bit about what other people think of one.

To measure Anti-Black Prejudice, I constructed a scale consisting of ten items dealing with the acceptance of stereotyped beliefs about blacks and support for discriminatory practices toward blacks. In a factor analysis all ten items had high loadings on the first unrotated factor. Selznick and Steinberg (1969:175) used only five of these items for their Index of Anti-Negro Prejudice, but the reliability of the scale is improved by the inclusion of the other five available items as well. Unfortunately, eight of the ten items are worded in such a way that an "agree" or "yes" answer indicates prejudice. Thus, it is possible that the measure may be contaminated to some degree by an acquiescence response bias.

Since the survey was primarily concerned with anti-Semitism, a great many items were available for the construction of measures of this type of prejudice. A factor analysis of these items revealed that most of them had high loadings on the first unrotated factor. For both theoretical and methodological reasons, however, I chose to construct two different scales to measure anti-Semitism rather than one. The first is an Anti-Semitic Beliefs Scale consisting of 23 items that appear to measure primarily the cognitive dimension of prejudice--the acceptance of negative beliefs and stereotypes about Jews. The scale is similar in nature to the 11-item Index of Anti-Semitic Belief utilized by Selznick and Steinberg (1969:22), but the longer scale has a somewhat higher reliability (Ω = .897). Jackman (1973) points out, however, that all of the items in the Selznick and Steinberg scale are in the same "direction"--that is, a "yes" or "true" answer indicates prejudice--and she maintains that the scale is heavily confounded with an education-related

acquiescence response bias. Since 19 of the 23 items in the longer scale are also in the same "direction," acquiescence response bias is also a possibility here.

Fortunately, the survey contains a number of other questions about Jews that are not in an "agree-disagree" format and thus are not subject to "yeasaying" tendencies. These questions reflect primarily the affective and conative dimensions of prejudice--expressions of hostility toward Jews and support for discriminatory treatment of Jews. Jackman (1973), in her analysis of the data, used three of these items to construct an Anti-Semitism Scale of Social Distance Feelings. I have constructed a similar Hostility Toward Jews Scale that includes Jackman's three items plus six others. All nine items have reasonably high loadings on the first unrotated factor in a factor analysis, and the nine-item scale has a reliability (Ω) of .696 (as compared with .489 for Jackman's three-item scale). The Hostility Toward Jews Scale, then, differs from the Anti-Semitic Beliefs Scale in two ways: it taps primarily the affective and conative rather than the cognitive dimensions of anti-Semitism, and it is clearly not subject to an acquiescence response bias.

Actually, I do not believe that acquiescence bias is as serious a problem with the Anti-Semitic Beliefs Scale as Jackman (1973) suggests. She reported a correlation of -.367 between education and Selznick and Steinberg's Index of Anti-Semitic Belief (vulnerable to acquiescence bias) and a correlation of only -.099 between education and her own Scale of Social Distance Feelings (not vulnerable to Acquiescence bias). On the basis of a path analysis utilizing unobserved variables for "method" and "anti-Semitism," she concluded

that the higher correlation in the former instance was probably due to an education-related acquiescence tendency. The measure that I constructed, however, yielded markedly different results. With nonwhites and Jews excluded (as in Jackman's analysis), education was correlated with the Anti-Semitic Beliefs Scale at -.241 and with the Hostility Toward Jews Scale at -.284.[3] Thus, I found that education was more highly correlated with the measure that is not vulnerable to acquiescence tendencies. Substituting my coefficients in Jackman's equations for the solution of her path model, the model breaks down and thus appears to be misspecified.[4]

There appear to be two principal reasons why my results differ from those of Jackman. First, for the anti-Semitic belief items Jackman treated "don't know" responses as a positive indication of prejudice and assigned them a weight intermediate between the weights for prejudiced and nonprejudiced responses. I tend to regard "don't know" responses as more problematic and prefer to treat them as "missing data." Hence, I substituted the integer value nearest the mean. For most of the items there were substantial numbers of "don't know" responses--generally at least 200. Because people with less education have a greater general tendency to answer "don't know," Jackman's approach resulted in a somewhat higher negative correlation between education and scores on the Selznick and Steinberg Index of Anti-Semitic Belief. She found a correlation of -.367, whereas the alternate method of scoring "don't know" responses would have yielded a correlation of -.286 for the same 11-item scale. My own 23-item scale had a correlation of -.241.

Second, Jackman's three-item Anti-Semitism Scale of Social Distance and my nine-item Hostility Toward Jews Scale differ in the size of their correlations with education primarily because of their different substantive content. Jackman selected the three items out of the total of nine that happened to have the lowest correlation with education. Hence, her scale is correlated with education at only -.099, whereas the total nine-item scale has a correlation of -.282.

The final two measures of prejudice are based on single questions. Those who agreed that "Catholics are getting too much power in the United States" were coded as anti-Catholic. If they answered "Yes-True" to the statement, "It bothers me to see immigrants succeeding more than Americans who were born here," they were considered to be anti-immigrant. These two measures have obvious limitations. Their variance is limited by their dichotomous nature, they are subject to acquiescence response bias, and their reliability is unknown. More adequate measures cannot be constructed, however, from the items that were included in the survey.

In attempting to answer the questions posed in this article, I have depended largely on multiple linear regression analysis. Throughout the analysis I have employed the .05 criterion level (two-tailed) in tests of statistical significance. To determine whether there were problems of multicollinearity in the sets of variables utilized, I calculated Haitovsky's heuristic chi square statistic (Haitovsky, 1969; Rockwell, 1975) for the models employed in Tables 2 through 4. In each case the chi square value was

sufficiently large to reject the null hypothesis that the determinant of the matrix was zero--that is, that the matrix was singular.

IV. Regional Differences in Prejudice and Personality

Mean scores for the various types of prejudice and personality characteristics are presented in the upper half of Table 2 for each of the major regions of the U.S. The South is further subdivided into a "Confederate" group of states that are unambiguously "southern" in culture and a "Border" group of states that appear to be marginal culturally as well as geographically.

Although the South had significantly higher means for all types of prejudice except Anti-Catholic Prejudice, the regional differences were generally small. It is only in the case of Anti-Black Prejudice that the South had a substantially higher mean score than the Nonsouth. The Confederate states had the highest level of Anti-Black Prejudice, the Border states were second, and the three Nonsouth regions ranged much lower, with the West being particularly low. For the other types of prejudice there were only slight regional variations. The Confederate and Border states had slightly higher means than the other regions for the two measures of anti-Semitism and for Anti-Immigrant Prejudice. It is noteworthy, however, that the Border states were slightly higher than the Confederate states on Hostility Toward Jews. In the case of Anti-Catholic Prejudice both the Border states and the North Central region had higher means than the Confederate states. Except in the case of Anti-Black Prejudice, then, the differences between the South and Nonsouth were

TABLE 2

MEAN AND ADJUSTED MEAN SCORES ON PREJUDICE AND OTHER SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL VARIABLES, BY REGION, FOR THE UNITED STATES, 1964

Region	Anti-Black Prejudice*	Anti-Semitic Beliefs**	Hostility Toward Jews**	Anti-Catholic Prejudice***	Anti-Immigrant Prejudice†	F Scale††	Anomia††	Psychic Inadequacy††
	Mean Scores							
South	60.35	51.51	52.72	50.50	51.98	51.60	52.55	51.71
Confederate	61.85	51.75	52.43	50.11	52.43	52.17	53.00	51.63
Border	56.58	50.77	53.63	51.68	50.62	49.90	51.24	51.96
Nonsouth	46.20	49.31	48.74	49.64	49.00	49.27	48.86	49.21
North Central	47.89	49.86	51.02	50.29	49.29	49.48	49.45	49.29
Northeast	45.69	48.46	46.81	49.40	49.18	49.71	48.94	49.60
West	43.79	49.48	47.26	48.78	48.23	48.23	47.64	48.49
	Adjusted Mean Scores#							
South	59.80	50.87	51.66	49.51	51.33	50.63	51.35	50.90
Confederate	61.56	51.14	51.64	49.25	51.71	51.10	51.85	50.82
Border	55.22	50.00	51.74	50.27	50.14	49.21	49.84	51.12
Nonsouth	46.43	49.61	49.24	50.27	49.32	49.71	49.40	49.58
North Central	47.75	49.86	50.96	50.29	49.35	49.53	49.46	49.35
Northeast	46.29	49.06	47.84	50.83	49.84	50.63	50.10	50.32
West	44.01	49.88	47.99	49.66	48.56	48.63	48.23	48.90

#Means adjusted through regression analysis to be those for persons at the mean on the following variables: size of community, years of education, white collar vs. blue collar occupation of head, farm vs. nonfarm occupation of head, family income

*Blacks excluded from sample (N = 1731)

**Jews excluded from sample (N = 1914)

***Roman Catholics excluded from sample (N = 1464)

†Foreign-born excluded from sample (N = 1823)

††Includes total sample (N = 1975)

very small, and for two of the measures--Hostility Toward Jews and Anti-Catholic Prejudice--the Confederate states did not have the highest means.

Most previous investigators have reported that residents of the South tend to have somewhat higher scores on the F scale measure of authoritarianism. These findings have generally been based on studies of a limited number of communities (Noel and Pinkney, 1964) or of nonprobability samples of college students (Christie and Garcia, 1951; Milton, 1952; Smith and Prothro, 1957). On the other hand, Pettigrew (1959) found no difference in F Scale scores for white adults living in a number of small towns in the South and in New England. Five F Scale items were included in an NORC national survey in 1953, however, and J. Williams (1966) found that persons in the South more often gave authoritarian answers than did those in other regions, even after introducing controls for age and education.

The higher level of F Scale scores in the South is confirmed by the data presented in the upper part of Table 2. Those living in the South had significantly higher means not only on the F Scale, but also on Anomia and Psychic Inadequacy. The regional differences, however, were small and did not appear to be sufficiently large to explain the higher level of Anti-Black Prejudice in the South. The very fact that there was a large South-Nonsouth difference for Anti-Black Prejudice but not for the other types of prejudice is also an embarrassment to most personality theories of prejudice. These theories tend to emphasize individual personality predispositions to prejudice and do not give adequate attention to the question of why

certain minorities may be singled out as targets for prejudice. If prejudice were a simple function of personality predispositions, one would expect essentially the same regional patterns for each type of prejudice. That is clearly not the case here. The patterns of the data tend rather to support a subcultural view. A special regional subculture appears to be responsible for the substantially higher level of Anti-Black Prejudice among those living in the South--particularly those in the states of the old Confederacy.

What is the nature of this distinctive anti-Black Southern subculture? Numerous studies of racist attitudes, segregationist voting, lynchings, and school desegregation in the South have shown that hostility toward blacks tends to be inversely related to urbanism, education, occupational status, income, and economic prosperity (Pettigrew and Cramer, 1952; Sheatsley, 1966; Matthews and Prothro, 1966; Schwartz, 1967). The South has for a long period been less urbanized, less industrialized, and less prosperous than other regions. Can the higher levels of anti-black prejudice in the South thus be attributed to the rural character and educational and economic backwardness of the whites in the region? This indeed has been a popular argument among social scientists (Myrdal, 1944:462-6; Key, 1949:673; Rose, 1956:175; Spengler, 1963; Mayo, 1964; Nicholls, 1964:40; Reissman, 1966). They have pointed out that the South is changing rapidly and is becoming more like the rest of the United States in terms of urbanization, industrialization, occupational composition, and levels of income and education. They have suggested that this "Americanization" of the South will bring a moderation of anti-black prejudice, eventually leading to a disappearance of the South-Nonsouth differential.

Thompson (1963) and Blumer (1965) have voiced some skepticism about this argument. Both have maintained that urbanization, education, and economic development are by themselves unlikely to bring a fundamental alteration in the structural position of blacks in the South. Blumer has written that in the transformation of the South "the color line was carried over from the old situations to the new situations--from the plantation to the factory, from the rural area to the city, from the old institutional settings to the new institutional settings" (Blumer, 1965:325). In a study of a related topic Stouffer (1955) found that there were much lower levels of tolerance for the civil liberties of Communists, socialists, and atheists in the South than in other regions of the country. Rural people and the less well educated tended to be less tolerant, but the level of tolerance in the South presisted even after controlling for degree of urbanization and educational level. The data reported in the upper part of Table 2 also raise some question about the moderating effect of the general social and economic trends. If the high level of Anti-Black Prejudice can be attributed to the rural character and economic and educational backwardness of the region, why is it that southerners do not also show substantially higher levels of prejudice toward Jews, Catholics, and immigrants?

To see whether the regional patterns of prejudice and personality are simply a function of regional differences in urbanization, education, and economic development, I calculated adjusted means with controls for size of community, years of education, white collar vs. blue collar occupation of head, farm vs. nonfarm occupation of head, and family income. The means were adjusted through regression

procedures so that they are the values that would be expected for persons at the grand mean on each of the control variables.[5] The adjusted means for each type of prejudice and each personality variable for each region are presented in the lower half of Table 2.

In general the adjusted means revealed patterns that were very little different from those of the original means. The South-Nonsouth differential was slightly reduced for each variable and was not statistically significant for anti-Semitic Beliefs, Anti-Catholic Prejudice, the F Scale, and Psychic Inadequacy. The South-Nonsouth difference remained significant for Anti-Black Prejudice, Hostility Toward Jews, Anti-Immigrant Prejudice, and Anomia, but it was only in the case of Anti-Black Prejudice that there was a major difference. Thus, even after controlling for urbanization, education, and economic variables, there was a substantially higher level of Anti-Black Prejudice in the South than in other regions, but there was very little regional variation in the other types of prejudice or the psychological measures.

The effect of the progressive addition of controls is presented in Table 3. The zero-order correlations between residence in the South and the measures of prejudice and personality appear in the first row. Then the standardized regression coefficients for the same relation net of the effects of the control variables appear in the other rows. The control variables were introduced in progressive cumulative fashion in the following arbitrary order: size of community, the socioeconomic status variables, the minority group membership variables, and the psychological variables.

TABLE 3

STANDARDIZED REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS FOR THE RELATION OF RESIDENCE IN THE SOUTH TO MEASURES OF PREJUDICE AND OTHER SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL VARIABLES, U.S., 1964#

	Anti-Black Prejudice	Anti-Semitic Beliefs	Hostility Toward Jews	Anti-Catholic Prejudice	Anti-Immigrant Prejudice	F Scale	Anomia	Psychic Inadequacy
Zero-order r with residence in the South	.370*	.068*	.124*	.028	.093*	.072*	.114*	.077*
Beta net of:								
Size of Community	.368*	.068*	.106*	.018	.096*	.078*	.112*	.074*
Education + Above	.350*	.042	.077*	-.015	.068*	.039	.076*	.053*
White Collar vs. Blue Collar Occupation of Head + Above	.349*	.042	.077*	-.015	.069*	.040	.077*	.054*
Farm vs. Nonfarm Occupation of Head + Above	.349*	.041	.074*	-.017	.072*	.042	.076*	.054*
Family Income + Above	.350*	.039	.074*	-.025	.063*	.029	.060*	.041
Black vs. White + Above		.041	.103*	.009	.038	.012	.042	.030
Jewish vs. Non-Jewish + Above	.345*			.009	.037	.010	.042	.030
Catholic vs. Non-Catholic + Above	.335*	.031	.086*		.037	.006	.023	.039
Foreign-born vs. Native-born + Above	.334*	.039	.087*	.013		.005	.024	.033
F-Scale + Above	.327*	.037	.086*	.012	.037			
Anomia + Above	.323*	.034	.084*	.010	.035			
Psychic Inadequacy + Above	.323*	.034	.084*	.009	.032			

*p < .05

#See footnotes to Table 2 for sample exclusions and sample size for each of the types of prejudice or other social psychological variables.

Except in the case of Anti-Black Prejudice, the zero-order correlations with residence in the South were small, but they were even further reduced after a number of controls were introduced. Controlling on size of community alone had little effect on the coefficients, though there was some reduction in the size of the coefficients for Hostility Toward Jews and Anti-Catholic Prejudice. Adding a control for years of education of the respondent brought a much more substantial reduction. The reduction was smallest, however, in the case of Anti-Black Prejudice, even though it had the largest coefficient to begin with. Adding further controls for socioeconomic status (white collar vs. blue collar, farm vs. nonfarm, family income) had very little effect on the coefficients. Adding still furhter controls for minority status (dummy variables for black, Jewish, Catholic, and foreign-born) raised the coefficients somewhat for Hostility Toward Jews and Anti-Catholic Prejudice, had no effect on the coefficients for Anti-Semitic Beliefs and Psychic Inadequacy, and slightly reduced the coefficients for Anti-Black Prejudice, Anti-Immigrant Prejudice, the F Scale, and Anomia. At this step the only standardized regression coefficients for South-Nonsouth residence that were significant were those for Anti-Black Prejudice and Hostility Toward Jews, and only the former was substantial. None of the other types of prejudice nor any of the personality measures had a significant coefficient. It is clear, then, that the higher levels of Anti-Black Prejudice--and to a much lesser extent, Hostility Toward Jews--in the South cannot be explained simply in terms of the rural and small town character of the South or the socioeconomic and ethnic composition of the southern population.

The data in Table 3 also make it clear that regional differences in the F Scale, Anomia, and Psychic Inadequacy were not responsible for the higher level of Anti-Black Prejudice in the South. After controlling on the size of community, the various socioeconomic status measures, and the various minority status measures, none of the three personality measures was significantly related to residence in the South. Hence, adding the personality measures as additional control variables had almost no effect on the coefficients for the various measures of prejudice. The personality variables are largely irrelevant for an understanding of the regional differences in prejudice.

V. Interregional Migration and Prejudice

Another strand of evidence that tends to support the subcultural rather than the personality interpretation of regional differences in Anti-Black Prejudice comes from the data on interregional migration patterns. The authoritarian personality theory and, to some extent, other personality theories tend to emphasize tendencies that develop in childhood and thereafter remain fairly stable. Thus, if prejudice toward a particular group is largely a function of a basic authoritarian outlook on life, a person's movement to a different section of the country should have relatively little effect on his prejudice. If, on the other hand, prejudice is in large part a matter of socialization to a regional complex of prejudiced beliefs and norms, an individual's racial attitudes will tend to reflect the prevailing views in the area in which he lives. People who, through geographic mobility, shift from one cultural system to another usually neither abandon the first

nor absorb the second completely. There is in most cases a partial acculturation. Thus, if the subcultural interpretation is correct, we would generally expect persons who were reared and currently live in the South to be much more prejudiced against blacks than those who were reared and currently live in the Nonsouth. Those who were reared in the South but who now live in the Nonsouth and those who were reared in the Nonsouth but now live in the South should tend to show intermediate levels of prejudice toward blacks. If there are regional subcultural differences for other types of prejudice, we would expect a similar pattern for them also.

An early study by Sims and Patrick (1936) did find some limited evidence to support this view for anti-black prejudice. Southern students attending a southern university--the University of Alabama--showed much greater prejudice toward blacks than did students attending Ohio State University, a northern institution. Students from northern homes attending the University of Alabama showed an intermediate level of prejudice toward blacks, with a mean almost exactly halfway between those of the other two groups. Sims and Patrick did not, however, have a comparable group of students from southern homes attending Ohio State University.

Myrdal maintained that the effect of migration on anti-black prejudice was asymmetric. Those who migrated from the Nonsouth to the South, he believed, tended to become more prejudiced toward blacks, but southerners who migrated to the Nonsouth did not necessarily become less prejudiced:

> It is a common observation that the white Northerner who settles in the South will rapidly take on the stronger race prejudice of the new surroundings; while the Southerner going North is likely to keep his race prejudice rather unchanged and perhaps even to communicate it to those he meets. The Northerner in the South will find the whole community intent upon his conforming to local patterns. The Southerner in the North will not meet such concerted action, but will feel, rather, that others are adjusting toward him wherever he goes. (Myrdal, 1944: vol. 1, p. 79)

In an analysis of attitudes toward racial integration from a 1963 NORC national survey, however, Human and Sheatsley (1964) and Sheatsley (1966) found that almost the reverse was true. Persons who had always lived in the North were much more favorable toward integration than those who had always lived in the South, but northerners who had formerly lived in the South were only slightly less prointegration than their neighbors who had always lived in the North. Southerners who had previously lived in the North, on the other hand, were substantially more favorable to integration than those who had never lived in the North but much less favorable than either group currently living in the North. Thus, contrary to Myrdal, Hyman and Sheatsley argued that the net effect of interregional migration was to strengthen prointegration sentiment.

The Hyman and Sheatsley (1964) and Sheatsley (1966) studies are suggestive, but unfortunately they do not permit us to determine whether the differences they found are due to the experiences entailed by migration or are due simply to the different characteristics of those who migrate. Are the differences due to a differential selectivity, or does migration and exposure to a new subculture play a causal role in producing attitude change? We know that migrants tend to differ from nonmigrants on a host of characteristics--age, sex, socioeconomic

status, size of community, race, ethnicity, etc. Many of these same characteristics are also related to prejudice. Thus, we need to control on as many of these characteristics as possible in order to determine whether or not exposure to a new regional subculture has a significant effect on prejudice.

One of the questions in the 1964 NORC survey asked "In what state did you spend most of your childhood?" Using the replies to this question plus current residence, I constructed four migration categories:

Childhood Residence	Current Residence	Number of Persons
South	South	520
South	Nonsouth	114
Nonsouth	South	93
Nonsouth	Nonsouth	1248

Then I calculated the mean and adjusted mean scores of each group for each of the measures of prejudice and personality. The adjusted means are net of the effects of sex, age, size of community, years of education, white collar vs. blue collar occupation of head, farm vs. nonfarm occupation of head, family income, and ethnic status (black, Jewish, Catholic, foreign-born). The results are displayed in Table 4.

If there is a southern subculture of prejudice, those who were reared in the South and who currently live there should be most highly prejudiced; those who were reared anc currently live outside the South should be least prejudiced; and those who have migrated between the regions should be intermediate. This pattern emerged very clearly for Anti-Black Prejudice, both for the original means and the adjusted means, but it was not present for the other measures. In the case of

TABLE 4

MEAN AND ADJUSTED MEAN SCORES ON PREJUDICE AND OTHER SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL VARIABLES, BY REGIONAL MIGRATION, FOR THE UNITED STATES, 1964*

Region of Residence		Mean Scores							
Child	Current	Anti-Black Prejudice	Anti-Semitic Beliefs	Hostility Toward Jews	Anti-Catholic Prejudice	Anti-Immigrant Prejudice	F Scale	Anomia	Psychic Inadequacy
South	South	62.35	51.80	53.14	50.94	52.16	52.37	53.52	51.57
South	Non-south	54.88	50.78	48.76	49.20	54.58	55.80	53.41	50.40
Non-south	South	52.09	49.80	50.28	47.52	50.84	47.31	47.15	52.48
Non-south	Non-south	45.77	49.17	48.73	49.69	48.43	48.68	48.44	49.11
		Adjusted Mean Scores#							
South	South	61.48	51.28	52.47	50.95	50.68	50.54	50.77	49.68
South	Non-south	52.31	49.17	49.37	50.97	51.50	51.53	49.26	48.49
Non-south	South	52.56	49.74	50.19	46.64	51.97	48.58	48.52	54.10
Non-south	Non-south	46.13	49.55	48.97	49.55	49.36	49.73	49.87	49.95

#Means adjusted through regression analysis to be those for persons at the mean on the following variables: size of community, years of education, white collar vs. blue collar occupation of head, farm vs. nonfarm occupation of head, family income, age, sex, and minority status (black, Jewish, Catholic, foreign-born).

*See footnotes to Table 2 for sample exclusions and sample size for each of the types of prejudice or other social psychological variables.

the latter either the means were out of the expected order, or there was very little difference among the means. The one possible exception might be Hostility toward Jews. There the adjusted means appeared in the expected order, but the differences among them were slight.

The residents of the South who were reared in the South were significantly more anti-black than any of the other three groups, and the residents of the Nonsouth who were reared in the Nonsouth were significantly less anti-black than any of the other three groups. This was true in the case of both the original and the adjusted means. There was, however, no significant difference between those who were reared in the South but now live in the Nonsouth and those who were reared in the Nonsouth but now live in the South. Indeed, the adjusted means for the two migrant groups were almost identical. Thus, it appears that for these data the predictions of both Myrdal (1944) and Hyman and Sheatsley (1964) are wrong. The effects of migration between the South and Nonsouth on anti-black prejudice were symmetric. A southerner who migrated to the Nonsouth was as likely to become less hostile to blacks as a northerner who migrated to the South was to become more hostile.

For the other measures of prejudice and personality there were a number of significant differences between pairs of groups for the original means but very few for the adjusted means. The few differences that were significant were scattered, and they did not constitute a meaningful pattern.

Overall, the data relating to migration status thus support the view that there are regional subcultures that differ with regard to anti-black prejudice but not with regard to the other types of prejudice

or personality characteristics. Those who have moved from South to Nonsouth or from Nonsouth to South tended to have intermediate scores only on Anti-Black Prejudice--not on the other scales. Furthermore, the regional acculturation process appears to be symmetric, with migrants to each region equally likely to accept--at least partially--the norms and beliefs dominant in their new locale.

VI. Determinants of Prejudice in the South and Nonsouth

The final question that I wish to address is whether the determinants of each type of prejudice are different in the South and the Nonsouth. It is often argued that where there is a strong cultural tradition of prejudice toward a particular group, authoritarianism and other personality factors should play a lesser causal role than in those areas where the tradition is absent or is less deeply entrenched. According to this view people may acquire prejudice through the normal process of socialization without necessarily having personality predispositions. Attempts to show that the F Scale and similar personality measures have lower correlations with anti-black prejudice in the South than in the Nonsouth, however, have generally failed. Siegman (1958) did find a correlation between anti-black prejudice and the F Scale of .41 for a small sample of college students in North Carolina. He argued that this was substantially lower than the corresponding average correlation in the original authoritarianism studies (Adorno et al., 1950) conducted outside the South and concluded that "the negative correlates of ethnocentric attitudes tend to decrease as the culture countenances these attitudes." Most studies, however, have found little

or no difference in the personality and prejudice correlations in the different regions (Christie and Garcia, 1951; Pettigrew, 1958, 1959; Rhyne, 1962; Hoge and Carroll, 1973).

There have been a number of similar studies of white attitudes toward black Africans in South Africa (Pettigrew, 1958; Lever et al., 1968; Colman and Lambley, 1970; Orpen, 1970, 1971a, 1971b, 1971c; Orpen and Rookledge, 1972). The authors have generally suggested that the correlations of authoritarianism or dogmatism with anti-African prejudice were not very high, but in the absence of an appropriate comparison group, the significance of these findings remains in doubt. Some of the studies did find that measures of general social conformity and of general agreement with South African values in a variety of other areas were moderately correlated with anti-African prejudice (Pettigrew, 1958; Orpen, 1971b, 1971c). Pettigrew (1958) concluded that personality factors appeared to be as important as determinants of prejudice in South Africa as in other areas but that personality factors did not in themselves account for the high level of prejudice in the sample. Social conformity, he believed, was the key.

Many studies have found that attitudes toward one minority group tend to be highly correlated with attitudes toward other minority groups (Harding et al., 1969:15-17), and this is usually taken as evidence in support of a personality explanation of prejudice. It is sometimes argued, therefore, that measures of prejudice toward two groups should be less highly correlated in those areas where there is a strong cultural tradition of prejudice toward one of the groups but not toward the other. In two early studies Prothro and Jensen (1950) and Prothro (1952) found that in various samples of college students

and middle-class adults in Louisiana the correlations between anti-Semitism and anti-black prejudice were lower than in most of the samples in the original authoritarianism studies (Adorno et al., 1950). Selznick and Steinberg (1969:182) also reported that in the South 35 percent of the people were "high" on anti-black prejudice without being "high" on anti-Semitism, whereas in the North only 18 percent showed this pattern. Other studies (Pettigrew, 1958, 1959; Rhyne, 1962; Maranell, 1967), however, have found that anti-Semitism and anti-black prejudice were not more highly correlated in the North than in the South.

Most of the studies mentioned in the preceding paragraphs are seriously flawed by their dependence on nonprobability convenience samples--most often of college or high school students. Most of them also simply compared correlation coefficients in different samples. This is a risky procedure in view of the fact that correlation coefficients may vary between samples because of such things as differences in variance and reliability even when the true underlying substantive relation is the same in each sample. The best previous research on this topic is probably Pettigrew's (1959) study of white adults randomly chosen in four small cities in New England and four small cities in the South (New England and Georgia). Although his hypothesis that anti-black prejudice and authoritarianism would be more highly correlated in the North than in the South was not supported, he did find evidence that he believed supported a sociocultural interpretation of the high levels of anti-black prejudice in the South. He argued that women are the "carriers of culture" and reflect the mores of a group more directly than men. Hence, in the South women

should be more anti-black than men, but in the North men and women should not differ significantly. This proved to be the case, though the differences were not great in the South. Frequent church attenders (vs. nonattenders) and political party identifiers (vs. independents) also proved to be more prejudiced toward blacks in the South but not in the North. Thus, he concluded that those whose positions in the social structure should be most associated with conformity did tend to be more anti-black, but only in the region where there was the strongest embedded historical tradition of anti-black prejudice. There are problems, however, even with the Pettigrew study. In making these comparisons he was able to control only on education, age, and sex, and the comparisons were made one at a time. To accomplish this he employed a matching process between comparison groups within regions, but this also substantially reduced his sample size for each comparison and impaired the representativeness of his samples.

I believe that the hypothesis that anti-black prejudice has different determinants in the South and the Nonsouth but that other types of prejudice do not can best be tested in a multiple regression framework utilizing interaction terms for region. In the regressions for each type of prejudice I included dummy variables for Southern residence and rural vs. urban residence, plus the same SES variables and ethnicity dummy variables that were employed in Table 3. I also included each of the personality variables and each of the other prejudice variables to test whether it was really true that these were less highly associated with anti-black prejudice in the South. Furthermore, I included some of the measures that Pettigrew suggested were associated with social conformity: female status, being a political

party identifier (vs. independent), and attendance at religious services (9-point scale of frequency). If Pettigrew is correct, then each of these variables should be more highly related to anti-black prejudice in the South than in the Nonsouth. I added a dummy variable for age status (40 and over vs. under 40), since one could argue that the cultural norms for anti-black prejudice have changed more rapidly in the South than in the Nonsouth, and hence age should be more highly associated with prejudice in the South than in the Nonsouth.

After running regressions for each type of prejudice with these additive terms, I ran a second set of regressions including a complete set of regional interaction terms, created by multiplying each of the original terms by the dummy variable for southern residence. The regression coefficients for the interaction models are displayed in Table 5. In reading the table, one should keep in mind that the effect of a given independent variable in the Nonsouth may be read directly from the table as the coefficient for the original variable (unmultiplied by southern residence). To find the effect in the South one must add together the coefficients for the original variable and the corresponding interaction variable. For example, in the Nonsouth, rural residents are .523 points higher on the Anti-Black Prejudice scale than are urban residents. In the South, rural residents are .604 points higher than urban residents. If an interaction term is statistically significant ($P<.05$), it means that the South and the Nonsouth differ significantly in the extent to which the independent variable is related to the measure of prejudice.

At the bottom of Table 5 the values of the coefficient of determination ($\underline{R}^2$) are shown for both the additive and the interaction

TABLE 5

REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS FOR THE REGRESSION OF MEASURES OF PREJUDICE ON SOUTHERN RESIDENCE, OTHER SELECTED SOCIAL AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS, AND INTERACTIONS BETWEEN SOUTHERN RESIDENCE AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS, U.S., 1964#

Independent Variables	Anti-Black Prejudice	Anti-Semitic Beliefs	Hostility Toward Jews	Anti-Catholic Prejudice	Anti-Immigrant Prejudice
Constant	5.257	12.293*	23.575*	23.705*	23.163*
Residence in South = 1, Nonsouth = 0	31.135*	-11.164*	-9.351	3.797	-8.584
Rural = 1, Urban = 0	.523	-1.067	2.662*	.932	1.735
X South	.081	.526	-1.768	-.128	-.440
Years of Education	-.369*	-.109	-.367*	-.271	-.154
X South	-.483	.050	.018	.013	.489
Head in White Collar Occupation = 1, Other = 0	-.189	.817	-.227	.726	-.872
X South	.324	.424	.020	-1.054	-.915
Head in Farm Occupation = 1, Other = 0	-2.770	2.943*	4.105*	1.356	-3.406*
X South	2.212	-4.808*	-5.185*	.488	1.028
Family Income	.457*	-.053	-.170	-.250	.010
X South	-.512*	.462*	.445	-.260	-.172
Black = 1, Other = 0		2.809	-.082	-4.178*	7.378*
X South		2.343	.869	-4.736	-2.885
Jewish = 1, Other = 0	-5.016*			4.215	2.409
X South	-2.819			-1.305	-3.503
Roman Catholic = 1, Other = 0	.739	.213	-1.162		1.602
X South	-7.386*	-1.016	-2.221		.440
Foreign-born = 1, Native-born = 0	.414	4.004*	.162	2.398	
X South	-11.061*	.252	-.846	4.206	
Age 40 and Over = 1, Under 40 = 0	.768	1.025	2.228*	1.040	-1.318
X South	-2.037	-.615	-.908	-2.122	2.128
Female = 1, Male = 0	.766	-2.986*	.322	.986	-1.122
X South	-3.244*	-.798	-2.092	-1.085	.837
Political Independent = 1, Other = 0	-.678	.415	-1.198	-.927	.237
X South	-1.292	-2.191	.670	.007	-1.037
Attendance at Religious Services	-.203	.107	.337*	.280	-.240
X South	.454	-.223	-.323	.639	-.104
F Scale	.218*	.076*	.031	.077*	.137*
X South	-.076	.192*	.070	-.090	.008
Anomia	.160*	.191*	.083*	.102*	.054
X South	-.050	-.015	.006	.034	-.010
Psychic Inadequacy	.041	.001	-.050	.049	.078*
X South	.035	.005	.068	-.057	-.029
Anti-Black Prejudice		.245*	.303*	.057	.027
X South		-.056	-.061	.010	-.034
Anti-Semitic Beliefs	.152*			.146*	.157*
X South	-.039			-.014	.007
Hostility Toward Jews	.255*			.049	.056
X South	-.100			.055	.102
Anti-Catholic Prejudice	.031	.127*	.093*		.093*
X South	.004	.048	.063		-.014
Anti-Immigrant Prejudice	.024	.155*	.105*	.090*	
X South	.034	.003	.063	-.021	
R^2 without interaction terms	.4372*	.3168*	.2966*	.2050*	.2041*
R^2 with interaction terms	.4517*	.3302*	.3098*	.2151*	.2093*
Increments to R^2 from interactions	.0145*	.0134*	.0132*	.0101	.0052

*$p < .05$

#See footnotes to Table 2 for sample exclusions and sample size for each of the types of prejudice.

models, plus the increments to $\underline{R}^2$ as a consequence of including the interaction terms. It may be seen that the increments to $\underline{R}^2$ were quite small in the case of each type of prejudice. The increments were statistically significant for Anti-Black Prejudice, Anti-Semitic Beliefs, and Hostility Toward Jews, but in no case did the increment exceed .0145. The increment was greatest for Anti-Black Prejudice, as previous theory would predict, but the figure was only a tiny fraction higher than it was for the two measures of anti-Semitism. Thus, even before examining the individual coefficients and determining whether the effects were in the theoretically expected direction, the overall results would lead one to conclude that there are not very major differences between South and Nonsouth in the causal antecedents of any of the types of prejudice.

In the case of Anti-Black Prejudice, none of the individual regional interaction terms for any of the measures of personality or prejudice was significant. The interaction term for sex was significant but not in the direction hypothesized by Pettigrew. Women in the South were <u>less</u> prejudiced than men toward blacks, but women and men differed very little in the Nonsouth. The regional interaction terms for age, political independence, and attendance at religious services all failed to reach statistical significance. Thus, none of the hypotheses that have sometimes been advanced about the differences in the causal antecedents of anti-black prejudice in the South and Nonsouth received any support. The only regional interaction terms that proved to be significant--apart from the one for sex--were those for family income, Roman Catholic status, and foreign-born status. Income proved

to be positively related to Anti-Black Prejudice in the Nonsouth (net of the other independent variables) but was only very slightly negatively related in the South. The foreign-born and Roman Catholics tended to be less anti-black than the native-born and non-Catholics in the South, but there was little difference in the Nonsouth. This latter finding is of some interest, since it runs counter to the suggestions of several authors that Roman Catholics in the South, perhaps because of their marginal status, tend to assume the predominant racial views of the non-Catholics in the area (Fichter, 1951; Liu, 1960; Killian, 1970: 78-83).

According to theoretical expectations, there should have been no significant regional interaction terms for the other measures of prejudice, and indeed there were only three for Anti-Semitic Beliefs, one for Hostility Toward Jews, and none at all for Anti-Catholic and Anti-Immigrant Prejudice. Farm individuals tended to be less anti-Semitic than nonfarm individuals in the South (net of all the other independent variables), but they tended to be more anti-Semitic on both measures in the Nonsouth. Income was positively associated with Anti-Semitic Beliefs in the South but not in the Nonsouth. The F Scale was more strongly related to Anti-Semitic Beliefs in the South than in the Nonsouth.

Because of the need to test a large number of related hypotheses, Table 5 is necessarily large and complex. In Table 6, I present a simpler, clearer, and more economical model of the determinants of Anti-Black Prejudice, first for the U.S. and then separately for the South and the Nonsouth. This model accounts for 44 percent of the variance in Anti-Black Prejudice, as compared with 45 percent for the

model in Table 5. I arrived at the abbreviated model by first including all those independent variables that had significant coefficients in the first column of Table 5, plus the variables paired with significant interaction terms. With the dropping of other variables, however, the regional interaction term for sex no longer had a significant coefficient. Hence this variable and the variable for sex were also dropped for the final model. The asterisks for the regional interaction terms in the first column of Table 6 indicate that the South and the Nonsouth differed significantly in the extent to which the variable was related to Anti-Black Prejudice. The asterisks in the second and third columns indicate that the coefficients were significantly different from zero within a given region.

The data presented in Table 6 reveal that the South differed from the Nonsouth significantly with regard to the effects of three variables--family income, Roman Catholic status, and foreign-born status. In the Nonsouth, family income (net of education and the other variables) was positively associated with Anti-Black Prejudice, but in the South family income was not significantly related. In the South, Roman Catholics and the foreign-born were significantly less prejudiced than non-Catholics or the native-born, but in the Nonsouth these characteristics were not significantly related to Anti-Black Prejudice. Jewish status also had a substantially larger negative coefficient in the South than in the Nonsouth, but there were too few Jews in the sample for the South for the regional difference to be significant. The other variables in the model--education, Jewish status, F Scale, Anomia, Anti-Semitic Beliefs, and Hostility Toward Jews--had significant effects on prejudice in both the South and

TABLE 6

REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS FOR THE REGRESSION OF ANTI-BLACK PREJUDICE ON SELECTED SOCIAL AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS, BY REGION#

Independent Variables	Total U.S.	South	Nonsouth
Constant	13.905*	41.017*	8.684*
Residence in South = 1, Nonsouth = 0	15.332*		
Years of Education	-.578*	-.845*	-.436*
Family Income	.438*	-.093	.434*
X South	-.497*		
Jewish = 1, Other = 0	-4.976*	-7.511*	-4.208*
Roman Catholic = 1, Other = 0	.313	-5.790*	.418
X South	-5.480*		
Foreign-born = 1, Native-born = 0	.258	-10.870*	.275
X South	-10.525*		
F Scale	.206*	.140*	.232*
Anomia	.165*	.125*	.176*
Anti-Semitic Beliefs	.145*	.137*	.156*
Hostility Toward Jews	.230*	.175*	.257*
R^2	.439*	.340*	.361*
Number of cases	1731	465	1266

*p < .05

#Blacks excluded from sample

Nonsouth. The coefficients for the four social psychological variables were slightly larger in the Nonsouth than in the South, but the differences between the regions were not significant. The two measures of anti-Semitism each had a significant independent effect on Anti-Black Prejudice in each region, even though the two measures undoubtedly overlap, with some partitioning of the variance.

In summary, the regression analyses with interaction terms for southern residence provided little evidence to support the hypotheses that have most often been advanced regarding the differences in the determinants of anti-black prejudice in the South and in other regions. There were a few significant regional interaction terms, but these were not the ones predicted by prior theory. Most importantly, adding a complete set of regional interaction terms to the simple additive model (first column of Table 5) resulted in an increment of only .0145 in the proportion of variance explained for Anti-Black Prejudice. Though the increment was statistically significant, I regard it as substantively trivial--particularly in light of the fact that the increment for Anti-Black Prejudice was only .0011 greater than the increment for Anti-Semitic Beliefs.

The present analysis suggests, therefore, that the determinants of anti-black prejudice are very similar in the South and the Nonsouth. Yet other types of evidence discussed earlier in this paper point very clearly to the existence of a distinctive subculture in the South that is characterized by very high levels of prejudice toward blacks. How can this apparent discrepancy be reconciled? It seems to me that the problem lies in our habits of thought--in our traditional way of thinking about the causes of prejudice. Pettigrew (1958, 1959) is one

of the few authors who has recognized that the presence of a special subcultural emphasis on prejudice toward a particular group does not mean that psychological factors necessarily play a lesser role in explaining which individuals are likely to be prejudiced. He came to this view only after having to confront the negative empirical findings of his own research. In the regressions presented here what we find is that the regression coefficients or slopes for Anti-Black Prejudice are similar in the South and Nonsouth, but the constant term, the point of origin, is far higher in the South. Thus, the mean level of Anti-Black Prejudice is much higher in the South, reflecting the specific subculture of the area, but the variation of individuals around the mean in each region is explained by roughly the same variables operating for the most part in the same way. This means that one would explain which individuals would be most likely to subscribe to the norms of anti-black prejudice in about the same way in each region. The norms of anti-black prejudice are themselves, however, much more extreme in the South. Hence, if an individual is predisposed to become prejudiced at all, he is much more likely to acquire an extreme form in the South.

VII. Conclusions and Discussion

Residents of the South tend to show a much higher level of anti-black prejudice than residents of the Nonsouth, but the regions differ only slightly with regard to anti-Semitism and anti-Catholic and anti-immigrant prejudice. The two different measures of anti-Semitism give similar results, though Hostility Toward Jews is somewhat more strongly related to residence in the South. It appears to me that an education-related acquiescence bias in Anti-Semitic Beliefs is probably not

primarily responsible for the slight differences in the behavior of the two measures, for years of education shows a stronger inverse relation to Hostility Toward Jews than to Anti-Semitic Beliefs. The South and Nonsouth also differ very little on personality variables--authoritarianism, anomia, and psychic inadequacy--particularly after controlling for differences in SES and other basic social characteristics. If prejudice were primarily a function of personality characteristics, we would expect consistent regional differences in each type of prejudice. The fact that anti-black prejudice is far higher in the South but the other types of prejudice are not suggests that there is a special subcultural tradition of anti-black racism in the region.

The evidence regarding the attitudes of interregional migrants also supports the subcultural view. Those who spent most of their childhood in one region but later moved to the other tended to assume attitudinal positions with regard to blacks about at the midpoint between the views of those who have continued to live in the South and the views of those who have remained in the Nonsouth. The acculturation process appears to work symmetrically: those who have moved from South to Nonsouth apparently have altered their attitudes toward blacks as much as those who have moved from Nonsouth to South, both groups converging at an intermediate point. This pattern of differences between migrants and nonmigrants does not exist for attitudes toward Jews, Catholics, and immigrants.

The results of this study thus tend to support the argument that cultural factors and historical traditions rather than personality or psychological factors are responsible for the higher level of anti-black prejudice in the South. Of course, it is possible--and I would say

probable--that cultural norms, values, and ideologies are responsible not only for regional differences in anti-black prejudice but also for the general levels of prejudice toward each minority group. There are clearly norms for anti-black prejudice in the Nonsouth, and there are norms for prejudice toward Jews, Catholics, and foreigners in all sections. Thus, most of the prejudice toward minority groups may be due simply to the perpetuation of cultural beliefs, values, and norms through the normal socialization process. This point is difficult to demonstrate directly, however, and this paper has undertaken only the more limited task of showing that at least for one type of prejudice, a cultural explanation of regional differentials is much more compelling than a personality or psychological explanation.

Contrary to the expectations of most authors who have written on the topic, I found that the determinants of anti-black prejudice, as well as of the other types of prejudice, were basically similar in both the South and the Nonsouth. The mean score for Anti-Black Prejudice was far higher in the South, but the variation of individuals around the mean could be explained in roughly the same way in both regions. Thus, similar factors appear to predispose one to accept prejudiced beliefs, norms, and values in both regions. The large regional difference in anti-black prejudice apparently comes simply from the fact that the beliefs, norms, and values that one is socialized to accept tend to be much more extreme in the South.

Though cultural factors appear to be largely responsible for the regional differences in anti-black prejudice, one should not conclude that the psychological factors are unimportant in explaining the level of prejudice of individuals. As may be seen in Table 5, with the

exception of psychic inadequacy, the psychological measures are generally independently related to each of the measures of prejudice, and prejudice toward one group tends to be related to prejudice toward another group. One might argue, as Selznick and Steinberg (1969) do, that authoritarianism and anomia really constitute belief systems growing out of an unenlightened world view rather than true personality variables. These variables do, however, continue to play a significant independent role in prejudice even after one controls for education and various other SES indicators that we associate with cultural enlightenment.

I would like to caution that in arguing for a cultural explanation, I have merely labeled the observed regional difference in levels of anti-black prejudice; I have not truly explained it. In my analysis I have been able to rule out certain explanations of the differential. I have shown that it is not simply a compositional difference due to the things that are ordinarily thought to affect prejudice--notably socioeconomic status and certain psychological measures. The nature of the "cultural" difference, however, remains an open question. Further research of a substantially more imaginative and ingenious character will be required to make progress toward an explanation.

The great weakness of cultural or socialization theories of prejudice is that they do not tell us why the prejudiced norms developed toward a particular group in the first place. Why is it that the norms of prejudice toward blacks appear to be more extreme in the South than in other regions of the U.S.? The most likely answer is provided by another set of theories that focus on exploitation as the source of racism. Historians are still in disagreement over the question of whether the development of racism in the Americas preceded or followed

the enslavement of blacks (cf. Jordan, 1968; Noel, 1972). There is some evidence on both sides, and a definitive answer is not yet possible. Probably racism in a rudimentary form did precede slavery and even played a role in the enslavement of blacks rather than other groups. There can be little question, however, that slavery led to an elaboration and deepening of racist doctrine and that the extreme prejudice toward blacks that came to exist in the United States flowed largely from the institution of slavery and the subjugation of blacks. Moreover, the abolition of slavery at the end of the Civil War did not mean the end of the exploitation of blacks nor the end of those social conditions fostering racism. Indeed, as Myrdal (1944:88) has pointed out, racism probably intensified in the South in the years after the Civil War and served to bolster the developing caste system of social and economic relations between the races. Thus, I would suggest that the whites in the South may tend to be more strongly prejudiced against blacks than those in other regions not only because of the traditions stemming from the antebellum slave system but also from the continued greater social subordination of blacks in the South to this day.

Many authors believe that the regional difference in anti-black prejudice will decline and eventually disappear as the South catches up economically and educationally with the rest of the country. I found, however, that even after controlling for education, occupational status, income, and degree of urbanization, the difference between the South and Nonsouth in anti-black prejudice remained almost as great. This suggests that changes in the personal characteristics of whites alone may not be sufficient to reduce the regional differential. Even if

southern whites had the same educational and economic characteristics as those in other regions, they would still probably tend to be more prejudiced toward blacks. As long as blacks remain economically and socially subordinate to a greater degree in the South, the distinctive southern anti-black pattern of prejudice is likely to survive. If the position of blacks in southern society improves in relative terms and blacks come to participate more fully in the educational and economic development of the South, however, the level of anti-black prejudice in the South may subside to those levels found in other regions. The old subcultural norms may be perpetuated for a time by virtue of the socialization process, but without the continual reinforcement provided by the structural subordination of blacks, those norms can be expected in time to decay.

NOTES

[1]The original study was sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and was directed by the Survey Research Center, University of California, Berkeley. Sampling and interviewing were carried out by the National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago. The interview schedule, details about sampling procedures, and basic results are published in Selznick and Steinberg (1969). See also Middleton (1973). I am indebted to the International Data Library and Reference Service of the University of California, Berkeley, and the Social Science Data and Program Library Service of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, for making the data available to me.

[2]The items comprising each measure are identified below by their original interview question numbers. The interview schedule is reproduced in Appendix A of Selznick and Steinberg (1969).

	Validity ρ_{TS}	Invalidity ψ^2	Reliabilities Ω	α
F Scale: 51A through 51E	.742	.000	.550	.522
Anomia: 51J, 51K, 51M	.736	.000	.542	.536
Psychic Inadequacy: 68A, 68B, 68D, 68J, 68K, 75	.783	.000	.613	.582
Anti-Black Prejudice: 10, 13N through 13R, 14, 15, 16, 68F	.893	.015	.812	.779
Anti-Semitic Beliefs: 23 through 26, 27A through 27S	.944	.005	.897	.867
Hostility Toward Jews: 28 through 33, 37 through 39	.833	.002	.696	.620
Anti-Catholic Prejudice: 13I				
Anti-Immigrant Prejudice: 68E				

[3]With nonwhites retained in the sample, education was correlated with the Anti-Semitic Beliefs Scale at -.237 and with the Hostility Toward Jews Scale at -.276.

[4]I secured the following correlations for the sample with Jews and nonwhites excluded: $r_{12} = .607$; $r_{13} = -.344$; $r_{14} = -.241$; $r_{15} = -.282$; $r_{23} = -.334$; $r_{24} = -.208$; $r_{25} = -.344$; $r_{34} = .370$; $r_{35} = .306$; $r_{45} = .592$.

4 (cont.)

[X_1 = Education; X_2 = Knowledge of Writers; X_3 = F Scale; X_4 = Anti-Semitic Beliefs; X_5 = Hostility Toward Jews.]

[5]This procedure assumes, of course, that each of the control variables affects the dependent variables in the same way in each region. This assumption will be examined later in the paper, but I should like to note here that the South and the Nonsouth differ only slightly with regard to how these social variables affect the various types of prejudice.

REFERENCES

Adorno, T. W.; Else Frenkel-Brunswick; D. J. Levinson; and R. N. Sanford

1950 The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith

1962 "A study of religious discrimination by social clubs." Rights 4 (January).

Blumer, Herbert

1965 "The future of the color line." Pp. 322-36 in J. C. McKinney and E. T. Thompson (eds.), The South in Continuity and Change. Durham: Duke University Press.

Brink, William, and Louis Harris

1963 The Negro Revolution in America. New York: Simon and Schuster.

1967 Black and White. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Bureau of Intelligence, Office of War Information

1942 "White attitudes toward Negroes." Report No. 30 (July 28).

Campbell, Angus

1971 White Attitudes Toward Black People. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Chalmers, David M.

1965 Hooded Americanism: The First Century of the Ku Klux Klan, 1865-1965. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co.

Christie, Richard, and John Garcia

1951 "Subcultural variation in authoritarian personality." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 46 (October): 457-469.

Colman, Andrew M., and Peter Lambley

1970 "Authoritarianism and race attitudes in South Africa." Journal of Social Psychology 82 (December): 161-4.

Crespi, Irving

1964 "Public reaction to the Eichmann trial." Public Opinion Quarterly 28 (Spring): 90-103.

Cronbach, L. J.

1951 "Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests." Psychometrika 16: 297-334.

Cureton, E. E.

1966 "Corrected item-test correlations." Psychometrika 31: 93-6.

Erskine, Hazel Gaudet

1962 "The polls: race relations." Public Opinion Quarterly 26 (Spring): 137-48.

1965 "The polls: religious prejudice, part 1." Public Opinion Quarterly 29 (Fall): 486-96.

1965-66 "The polls: religious prejudice, part 2, anti-Semitism." Public Opinion Quarterly 29 (Winter): 649-664.

1967 "The polls: Negro housing." Public Opinion Quarterly 31 (Fall): 482-98.

1967-68 "The polls: demonstrations and race riots." Public Opinion Quarterly 31 (Winter): 655-677.

1968a "The polls: Negro employment." Public Opinion Quarterly 32 (Spring): 132-153.

1968b "The polls: speed of racial integration." Public Opinion Quarterly 32 (Fall): 513-24.

1968-69 "The polls: recent opinion on racial problems." Public Opinion Quarterly 32 (Winter): 696-703.

Evans, Eli N.

1973 "The Provincials: A Personal History of Jews in the South. New York: Atheneum.

Ferguson, James S.

1972 "The southern historical perspective." Pp. 287-98 in H. B. Ayers and T. H. Naylor (eds.), You Can't Eat Magnolias. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fichter, Joseph H.

1951 Southern Parish: Dynamics of a City Church. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gallup Opinion Index

1965-71 Nos. 1, 3, 7, 12, 14, 16, 24, 35, 37, 40, 41, 46, 51, 58, 59, 62, 75, 77.

Glenn, Norval D.

1974 "Recent trends in intercategory differences in attitudes." Social Forces 52 (March): 395-401.

Glenn, Norval D., and J. L. Simmons

1967 "Are regional cultural differences diminishing?" Public Opinion Quarterly 31 (Summer): 176-93.

Golden, Harry

1965 A Little Girl Is Dead. New York: World.

Greeley, Andrew M., and Paul B. Sheatsley

1971 "Attitudes toward racial integration." Scientific American 225 (December): 13-9.

Haitovsky, Y.

1969 "Multicollinearity in regression analysis: a comment." Review of Economics and Statistics 51: 486-9.

Harding, John; Harold Proshansky; Bernard Kutner; and Isidor Chein

1969 "Prejudice and ethnic relations." Pp. 1-76 in G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology, 2nd ed., vol. 5, Applied Social Psychology. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

The Harris Survey Yearbook of Public Opinion 1970

1971 New York: Louis Harris and Associates.

Heise, David R., and George W. Bohrnstedt

1970 "Validity, invalidity, and reliability." Pp. 104-29 in E. F. Borgatta and G. W. Bohrnstedt (eds.), Sociological Methodology 1970. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hoge, Dean R., and Jackson W. Carroll

1973 "Religiosity and prejudice in northern and southern churches." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 12 (June): 181-97.

Hyman, Herbert H., and Paul Sheatsley

1956 "Attitudes toward desegregation." Scientific American 195 (December): 35-9.

1964 "Attitudes toward desegregation." Scientific American 211 (July): 16-23.

Jackman, Mary R.

1973 "Education and prejudice or education and response-set?" American Sociological Review 38 (June): 327-39.

Jackson, Kenneth T.

1967 The Ku Klux Klan in the City, 1915-1930. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jordan, Winthrop D.

1968 White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Key, V. O.

1949 Southern Politics in State and Nation. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Killian, Lewis M.

1970 White Southerners. New York: Random House.

Kinzer, Donald L.

1964 An Episode in Anti-Catholicism: The American Protective Association. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1964.

Knapp, Robert H.

1944 "A psychology of rumor." Public Opinion Quarterly 8 (Spring): 22-37.

Lever, H.; L. Schlemmer; and O. J. M. Wagner

1968 "A factor analysis of authoritarianism." Journal for Social Research 16 (January): 41-8.

Lipset, Seymour Martin, and Earl Raab

1970 The Politics of Unreason: Right-Wing Extremism in America, 1790-1970. New York: Harper and Row.

Liu, William T.

1960 "The marginal Catholics in the South: a revision of concepts." American Journal of Sociology 65 (January): 383-390.

Lyman, Stanford M.

1973 The Black American in Sociological Thought: A Failure of Perspective. New York: Capricorn Books.

McWilliams, Carey

1947 A Mask for Privilege: Anti-Semitism in America. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Maddox, George L., and Joseph H. Fichter

1966 "Religion and social change in the South." Journal of Social Issues 22 (January): 44-58.

Maranell, Gary M.

1967 "An examination of some religious and political attitude correlates of bigotry." Social Forces 45 (March): 356-62.

Matthews, Donald R., and James W. Prothro

1966 Negroes and the New Southern Politics. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Mayo, Selz C.

1964 "Social change, social movements and the disappearing sectional South." Social Forces 43 (October): 1-10.

Middleton, Russell

1961 "Racial problems and the recruitment of academic staff at southern colleges and universities." American Sociological Review 26 (December): 960-70.

1973 "Do Christian beliefs cause anti-Semitism?" American Sociological Review 38 (February): 33-52.

Milton, Ohmer

1952 "Presidential choice and performance on a scale of authoritarianism." American Psychologist 7 (October): 597-8.

Moore, Edmund A.

1956 A Catholic Runs for President. New York: Ronald Press.

Morris, Willie

1967 North Toward Home. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

1971 Yazoo: Integration in a Deep-Southern Town. New York: Harper and Row.

Myrdal, Gunnar

1944 An American Dilemma. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nicholls, William H.

1964 "The South as a developing area." Pp. 22-40 in A. Leiserson (ed.), The American South in the 1960's. New York: Frederick A. Praeger.

Noel, Donald L. (ed.)

1972 The Origins of American Slavery and Racism. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.

Noel, Donald L., and Alphonso Pinkney

1964 "Correlates of prejudice: some racial differences and similarities." American Journal of Sociology 69 (May): 609-22.

Noel, Joseph Renny

1971 "White anti-black prejudice in the United States." International Journal of Group Tensions 1 (January): 59-76.

Orpen, Christopher

1970 "Authoritarianism in an 'authoritarian' culture: the case of Afrikaans-speaking South Africa." Journal of Social Psychology 81: 119-20.

1971a "Authoritarianism and racial attitudes among English-speaking South Africans." Journal of Social Psychology 84 (August): 301-2.

1971b "The effect of cultural factors on the relationship between prejudice and personality." Journal of Psychology 78: 73-9.

1971c "Prejudice and adjustment to cultural norms among English-speaking South Africans." Journal of Psychology 77: 217-8.

Orpen, Christopher, and Quentin Rookledge

1972 "Dogmatism and prejudice in white South Africa " Journal of Social Psychology 86: 151-3.

Pettigrew, Thomas F.

1958 "Personality and socio-cultural factors in intergroup attitudes: a cross-national comparison." Journal of Conflict Resolution 2: 29-42.

1959 "Regional differences in anti-Negro prejudice." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 59 (July): 28-36.

Pettigrew, Thomas F., and M. Richard Cramer

1959 "The demography of desegregation." Journal of Social Issues 15, no. 1: 61-71.

Prothro, E. Terry

1952 "Ethnocentrism and anti-Negro attitudes in the deep South." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 47 (January): 105-8.

Prothro, E. Terry, and John A. Jensen

1950 "Interrelations of religious and ethnic attitudes in selected southern populations." Journal of Social Psychology 32: 45-9.

Rao, C. R.

1955 "Estimation and tests of significance in factor analysis." Psychometrika 20: 93-111.

Reed, John Shelton

1972 The Enduring South: Subcultural Persistence in Mass Society. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, D. C. Heath and Co.

Reissman, Leonard

1966 "Social development and the American South." Journal of Social Issues 22, no. 1 (January): 101-116.

Rhyne, Edwin Hoffman

1962 "Racial prejudice and personality scales: an alternative approach." Social Forces 41 (October): 44-53.

Roche, John P.

1963 The Quest for the Dream. New York: Macmillan.

Rockwell, Richard C.

1975 "Assessment of multicollinearity: the Haitovsky test of the determinant." Sociological Methods and Research 3 (February): 308-20.

Roper, Elmo

1946 "The Fortune survey: U.S. anti-Semites." Fortune 33 (February): 257-60.

1947 "The Fortune survey, part 2: racial and religious intolerance." Fortune 36 (October): 5-6, 10.

Rose, Arnold M.

1956 "Intergroup relations vs. prejudice: pertinent theory for the study of social change." Social Problems 4: 173-6.

Schwartz, Mildred A.

1967 Trends in White Attitudes Toward Negroes. Chicago: NORC, University of Chicago.

Selznick, Gertrude J., and Stephen Steinberg

1969 The Tenacity of Prejudice: Anti-Semitism in Contemporary America. New York: Harper and Row.

Sheatsley, Paul B.

1966 "White attitudes toward the Negro." Pp. 303-24 in T. Parsons and K. B. Clark (eds.), The Negro American. Boston: Beacon Press.

Siegman, Aron Wolfe

1958 "The effect of cultural factors on the relationship between personality, intelligence, and ethnocentric attitudes." Journal of Consulting Psychology 22: 375-7.

Sims, Verner M., and James R. Patrick

1936 "Attitudes toward the Negro of northern and southern college students." Journal of Social Psychology 7 (May): 192-204.

Smith, Charles U., and James W. Prothro

1957 "Ethnic differences in authoritarian personality." Social Forces 35 (May): 334-8.

Smith, Kent W.

1974 "Forming composite scales and estimating their validity through factor analysis." Social Forces 53 (December): 168-80.

Spengler, Joseph J.

1963 "Demographic and economic change in the South, 1940-1960." Pp. 26-63 in A. P. Sindler (ed.), Change in the Contemporary South. Durham: Duke University Press.

Srole, Leo

1956 "Social integration and certain corollaries: an exploratory study." American Sociological Review 21 (December): 709-16.

Stouffer, Samuel A.

1955 Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties: A Cross-section of the Nation Speaks Its Mind. New York: Doubleday and Co.

Stouffer, Samuel A.; L. Guttman; E. A. Suchman; P. F. Lazarsfeld; S. A. Star, and J. A. Clausen

1949 Studies in Social Psychology in World War II. Vol. 1. The American Soldier: Adjustment During Army Life. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Sudman, Seymour

1966 "Probability sampling with quotas." Journal of the American Statistical Association 61 (September): 749-71.

Thompson, Edgar T.

1963 "The South and the second Emancipation." Pp. 93-118 in A. P. Sindler (ed.), Change in the Contemporary South. Durham: Duke University Press.

White, Theodore H.

1961 The Making of the President 1960. New York: Atheneum.

Williams, J. Allen, Jr.

1966 "Regional differences in authoritarianism." Social Forces 45 (December): 273-7.

Williams, Robin M., Jr.

1964 Strangers Next Door: Ethnic Relations in American Communities. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.