Southeastern University

FireScholars

Selected Honors Theses

Spring 2020

EXPLORING PERCEPTIONS OF ANTI-RACISM INTERVENTIONS AND POSSIBLE CORRELATES

Marena L. McLeod
Southeastern University - Lakeland

Follow this and additional works at: https://firescholars.seu.edu/honors

Part of the Community Psychology Commons, Multicultural Psychology Commons, and the Social Psychology Commons

EXPLORING PERCEPTIONS OF ANTI-RACISM
INTERVENTIONS AND POSSIBLE CORRELATES

by

Marena L. McLeod

Submitted to the School of Honors Committee

in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for University Honors Scholars

Southeastern University

2020

Acknowledgment

Abstract

Although there is a large body of research on anti-racism interventions, little research has been done on participant perceptions of anti-racism interventions or the relationship between certain perceptions and other factors. This study addresses perceptions of anti-racism interventions among college students and how perceptions relate to willingness to attend interventions, aspects of religiousness, identification with all of humanity, and factors such as gender and race. The sample includes 69 undergraduate students, all of whom self-identified as Christian. Results indicate that perceptions were generally positive. It was found that reported importance of interventions, agreement with reasons for positive attitudes, and willingness to attend interventions were all positively related to each other. Reported importance of interventions was also positively related to organizational religiousness, private religious practices, and intrinsic religious orientation, while willingness was only related to intrinsic religious orientation. These results suggest a link between positive perceptions and willingness to attend interventions, as well as a distinction between measures of religiousness and their implications for perceptions and behavior. These results suggest a need for further research on how perceptions of interventions impact their effectiveness and the specific factors that lead to specific perceptions.

KEY WORDS: anti-racism interventions, perceptions, attitudes, religiousness, identification with all humanity

Table of Contents

Exploring Perceptions of Anti-Racism Interventions and Possible Correlates

Chapter One: Introduction

Even decades after the civil rights movement, racial prejudice has remained an important and polarizing topic in the United States. Although the general attitudes of Americans towards racial issues have changed significantly, the call for legal and social responses to prejudice, such as affirmative action and sensitivity training, continues to be prevalent (Krysan & Moberg, 2016; Zuriff, 2002). Several responses have arisen from this call for action, including anti-racism interventions.

Anti-racism interventions aim to counter racism and encourage racial tolerance on the group and individual level using a variety of different methods and formats (Oxford University Press, 2019a; Paluck & Green, 2009). They have garnered a great deal of interest from researchers. Hundreds of studies have been done on the many kinds of anti-racism interventions, mostly in an attempt to ascertain their effectiveness, as well as why, how, and under what conditions interventions accomplish their goals (Paluck & Green, 2009).

One possible factor in the effectiveness of interventions is how they are perceived by their target demographic and how important the goals of interventions are to participants. Although the perceived importance of the issues discussed in interventions has been shown to have implications for their outcomes (Devine, Forscher, Austin, & Cox, 2012), and despite the great volume of literature on these interventions and the factors that affect them, very little work has been done to understand the impact of participants' perceptions on the success of interventions and the variables which might impact those perceptions.

Previous studies have looked at participants' concern about the issues dealt with in the interventions as it relates to the effectiveness of an intervention on that individual (Devine et al.,

2012; Forscher, Mitamura, Dix, Cox & Devine, 2017), but perceptions of and attitudes towards the interventions themselves have not been addressed. The purpose of this thesis is to begin to address this gap in the research by exploring student's perceptions of anti-racism interventions and how their perceptions relate to willingness to attend interventions, aspects of religiousness, identification with all of humanity, and factors such as gender and race.

A grasp of several important terms is necessary in order to fully understand this study. These terms include:

- Prejudice – "a negative bias toward a social category of people, with cognitive, affective, and behavioral components", specifically racial minorities such as Black people (Paluck & Green, 2009, p. 340).

- Anti-racism – "The policy or practice of opposing racism and promoting racial tolerance" (OUP, 2019a).

- Anti-racism interventions – efforts to decrease racist attitudes in a group; may also be referred to as prejudice-reducing interventions (Paluck & Green, 2009).

- Perceptions – "The way in which something is regarded, understood, or interpreted" (Oxford University Press, 2019b)

- Attitudes – "a relatively enduring tendency to respond to someone or something in a way that reflects a positive or negative evaluation of that person or thing" (p. 3), understood to be expressed cognitively, affectively and behaviorally (Manstead, 1996)

- Religious orientation – general ways of being religious, as distinguished by motivation for being religious; may be either intrinsic or extrinsic, being religious for the sake of religion itself or being religious primarily for some other social or psychological benefit, respectively (Batson, Flink, Schoenrade, Fultz, & Pych, 1986)

- Christian orthodoxy – internalization of established traditional, generally accepted Christian beliefs (Johnathan, 2008)

- Identification with all humanity – a sense of oneness with humanity, having a broad identity that includes more distant or different groups in one's ingroup (McFarland, Webb, & Brown, 2012)

The following questions will guide this study:

1. What are college students' typical perceptions of or attitudes toward anti-prejudice interventions?

2. How are students' attitudes toward interventions correlated with their willingness to attend interventions?

3. How are different measures of religiousness correlated with perceptions of and willingness to attend interventions?

4. How are race, gender, and identification with all humanity correlated with perceptions of and willingness to attend interventions?

Students' perceptions of or attitudes toward interventions are expected to be generally positive, although the representation of some more negative responses is also expected. I hypothesize that positive perceptions will be positively correlated with willingness to attend interventions, as well as intrinsic religious orientation, Christian orthodoxy, and identification with all humanity.

The next chapter of this thesis will provide a review of the current literature regarding anti-racism interventions and prejudice, as well as the various concepts which may be related to perceptions of and attitudes towards anti-racism interventions. It will also outline why these factors might be expected to be related to perceptions. In the third chapter, the methodology used

to explore the leading questions of this study will be described. The fourth chapter will detail the results of this study, and the fifth chapter will discuss those findings, as well as their relationship with previous findings and implications for future research.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Very little research has been done on participant perceptions of anti-racism interventions directly, and there is an apparent gap in the literature on what factors are related to certain perceptions of interventions. However, looking at the existing literature, there are several factors that have been found to be related to prejudice, which is understood to be the focus of anti-racism interventions. It is probable that these factors may also be related to how participants perceive antiracism interventions. To understand how each of these concepts overlaps, they must first be understood individually. With that in mind, this literature review will first discuss prejudice and how the concept has evolved over time. It will then explore anti-racism interventions, the mechanisms through which they are theorized to work, and the contradictory evidence concerning their effects. Next, it will focus on the possible implications of participant perceptions, as well as the existing research on perceptions of antiracism as they are related to interventions. It will then examine the possible correlates, several aspects of religiousness and identification with all humanity.

Understanding Prejudice

An understanding of prejudice is necessary when discussing anti-racism interventions, namely because these interventions first originated as a response to changing views of prejudice. To understand the response, it is beneficial to first understand that which it is responding to and the conditions under which the response arose. It is relevant then to define prejudice within the context of anti-racism interventions and discuss the societal shifts that brought about these interventions.

Paluck and Green (2008) define prejudice as "a negative bias toward a social category of

people, with cognitive, affective, and behavioral components" (p. 340). Within the context of anti-racism interventions, prejudice refers to racial prejudice in particular. Racial prejudice can be understood as the opposite of the "racial tolerance" that anti-racism is characterized by. In order to fully grasp current thinking about prejudice and the mechanisms at work in anti-racism interventions, some historical and cultural context is needed.

Prejudice is a complex concept, and it is often divided into covert or overt, which refer to how blatantly the bias is expressed, and implicit and explicit, which describe the degree to which people are consciously aware of their own bias (Hogan & Mallott, 2005; Akrami & Ekehammar, 2005). Ezorsky (1991) asserts that overt racism occurs when "harm is inflicted or a benefit withheld […] because of the perpetrator's racial bias against the victim" (p. 9). Before the civil rights movement, overt prejudice was considered socially acceptable and was expressed through public support for segregation practices and the belief that Black people are inherently inferior to White people (Hogan & Mallott, 2005). One historical example of overt racism is the segregation of buses (Zuriff, 2002). The assertion that White people ought to be given better seats and be able to take seats designated for Black people is race-based and the prejudice is clearly seen. Contemporary examples of overt racism may include the use of racial slurs and police violence (Saucier, Miller, Martens, & O'Dea, 2017).

Since the 1960s, research has documented a significant decline in this form of racism, which researchers generally term old-fashioned or overt prejudice, suggesting that prejudice is seriously diminished, if not gone altogether (Hogan & Mallott, 2005). Krysan and Moberg (2016) point out several notable changes in American's racial attitudes, as tracked by several national surveys. For example, the percentage of White Americans that agree that schools should not be racially segregated increased from 32 percent to 96 percent from 1942 to 1995 (Krysan &

Moberg, 2016). Similar increases in agreement were observed for the statement that people ought to have the same opportunity to get a job regardless of race (Krysan & Moberg, 2016). In 1944, 45 percent of people agreed and 28 years later agreement was almost universal (97%). It is particularly telling that many questions meant to track racial attitudes are no longer asked on major national surveys because people agree almost universally (Krysan & Moberg, 2016).

However, despite this apparent decline, the media continues to display narratives contrary to such findings (McConahay, Hardee, & Batts, 1981; Zuriff, 2002). The assumption that various interventions are still needed, and that further action is still required to combat disparity between races both imply that racism still exists and causes problems (Zuriff, 2002). Although support for the abstract principle of racial equality is essentially universal, support is notably lower for the implementation of policies and actions such as affirmative action (Krysan & Moberg, 2016). These trends are thought to reveal a more hidden form of prejudice, often called covert prejudice or modern racism (McConahay et al., 1981). Where overt prejudice is thought to be easily identified, covert prejudice is thought to occur primarily through resistance to actions meant to enforce equality and unexamined learned racial bias.

The distinction between implicit and explicit prejudice becomes especially relevant in the discussion of covert prejudice. Since covert racism is hidden or obscured, it is generally thought to be more difficult for people to identify their own prejudice, making it somewhat difficult to define and measure, given the prevalence of self-report measures in prejudice research (Son Hing, Li, & Zanna, 2002; Perry, Murphy, & Dovidio, 2015. Despite the unclear nature of covert and implicit prejudice, it is not uncommon for the gap between implicit and explicit racism to be used to measure how prejudiced one is and to what extent they have a correct view of themselves (Son Hing et al., 2002).

The rise in covert prejudice can be explained by changes in the perception of prejudice. As McConahay et al. (1981) explain it, the civil rights movement spurred a change in public opinion, and overt displays of racism were no longer an acceptable social norm, becoming increasingly undesirable. Social pressure to be unprejudiced resulted in new, more covert forms of prejudice that were not immediately recognizable as prejudice (McConahay et al., 1981).

These social shifts were reinforced by changes in the law. Legislation mandating equal treatment and opportunity regardless of race strongly discouraged the expression of overt prejudice (Rudman, Ashmore, & Gary, 2001). As Rudman et al. (2001) so aptly put it, discriminating based on race is now "illegal as well as immoral" (p. 856). Franco & Maass (1999) agree, suggesting that the legislative and social protection given to certain racial minorities makes the expression of negative attitudes towards them less acceptable. Prejudice against "normatively protected" groups is regarded as negative, and significant effort has been made to curb prejudice and create more equal treatment (Franco & Maass, 1999). One response to the changing view of prejudice was the development of interventions to decrease prejudice, broadly termed anti-racism interventions.

Anti-racism Interventions

Anti-racism is defined as "The policy or practice of opposing racism and promoting racial tolerance" (OUP, 2019a). Anti-racism interventions, also called prejudice reduction interventions, attempt to increase anti-racist attitudes in a group through a variety of means (Paluck & Green, 2008). Inherent within the goal of increasing anti-racist attitudes, as well as the term "prejudice reduction", is the implication that prejudice is undesirable and ought to be reduced or opposed.

Interventions come in many forms. They may be single organized events, or they may occur over a period of time. They may take the form of sensitivity training and media campaigns. They appear in education at all levels and may even include peer influence (Paluck & Green, 2008). At the time of Paluck & Green's meta-analysis, which concluded in the spring of 2008, the researchers found an impressive 985 published and unpublished reports related to these kinds of interventions (2008). More than ten years later, interest in the topic has not abated, and the number of existing reports has certainly grown, with new articles continuing to be published.

Although the statistics are now dated, reports from 2000 found that 81% of U.S. colleges and universities use interventions for combating racism (McCauley, Wright, & Harris, 2000) and nearly 60% of over 500 schools included required diversity courses specifically (Hogan & Mallott, 2005). Despite the absence of more recent statistics regarding the prevalence of interventions and the limited nature of such statistics since they often only report interventions done in the academic environment, there is little evidence that the use of these interventions has decreased significantly since 2000. It is clear that anti-racism interventions have garnered considerable academic and social interest, and that they seem to be common among places of higher education specifically.

How Interventions Work

Because being unprejudiced is socially desirable and people generally assess themselves in a socially desirable way, being confronted with evidence to the contrary is disconcerting for most (Case, 2007; Plant & Devine, 1998). People also may not perceive more covert, modern forms of prejudice as prejudice (McConahay et al., 1981). Interestingly, race is cognitively processed before most other data, and, along with gender and age, it is one of three primary dimensions used to categorize others (Nai, Narayanan, Hernandez, Savani, 2018). Judgements

based on race may occur somewhat subconsciously or automatically (Devine, 1989; Akrami &

Ekehammar, 2005).

Interventions take advantage of the possible incongruence between implicit bias, biases

not recognized as prejudice, and social pressure to be unprejudiced by creating cognitive

dissonance, an awareness of incongruence between people's attitudes and their perceptions of

themselves (Case, 2007). When people become aware of their hypocrisy, as Son Hing, Li, and

Zanna (2002) describe it, they often adjust the attitudes or behaviors that are causing dissonance.

Perry, Murphy, and Dovidio (2015) agree, stating that as biases and goals to be non-prejudiced

become salient, people tend to "adjust their attitudes and behavior to be more egalitarian" and

"work harder to compensate for prejudiced behavior" (p. 64). In contrast, "when bias is cloaked

in ways that people do not recognize, they are likely to continue to perpetuate their biased

behaviors and unlikely to change their negative attitudes." (2015, p. 64). Interventions are the

agent through which attitudes are made salient, and the resulting adjustments to attitudes and

behaviors tend to result in lower scores on measures of prejudice (Son Hing et al., 2002).

Intervention Outcomes

Some interventions seem to be more effective than others, and although Paluck and

Green (2008) conclude that it remains unclear what works best, there is evidence that the

particular strategy or focus of an intervention may influence its effectiveness. For example,

colorblindness—which involves "not seeing color" or ignoring race—has been found to be

generally ineffective in interventions, while a focus on appreciation of group differences seems

to be related to more successful outcomes (Rudman et al., 2001). Much of the current knowledge

on the effectiveness of particular types of interventions, as well as interventions in general, is not

based on interventions conducted in the real world, but rather laboratory simulations of them. A

mere eleven percent of studies, both published and unpublished, were found to test the effect of real-world interventions (Paluck & Green, 2008). Ultimately, Paluck and Green (2008) came to the conclusion that despite promising appearances, the effects of many widespread interventions are still unknown.

Results do seem generally positive. Many studies found prejudice to be significantly lowered after participation in an intervention (Paluck & Green, 2008). However, not all the findings have been positive. Some evidence has been found that effects may not be long-lasting (Hogan & Mallott, 2005), and that there may actually be backfire effects that result in an increase in prejudice (Case, 2007). In one study, awareness was raised in all areas, but prejudice remained constant and even increased against Latinos (Case, 2007).

The way in which studies are done may also lead to differences in participant experience, which has been shown to influence how much prejudiced behavior they display. For example, in one study, participants who were told to "relax and enjoy" interactions had a more positive experience, a more positive view of the individual they were interacting with, and displayed fewer prejudiced attitudes, while the opposite was found for those told to avoid discrimination (Greenland, Xenias, & Maio, 2017).

Perceptions of Anti-racism Interventions

As seen in Greenland, Xenias, and Maio's (2017) study, participants' perception of interventions has implications for the success of interventions in achieving their goals. Positive experiences were associated with more positive outcomes and increased interest in future interactions, while negative experiences were associated with negative outcomes, poorer ratings of the contact partner, and heightened anxiety (Greenland et al., 2017). Another study found that participants' self-reported concern about discrimination was correlated with their prejudice

outcomes (Devine et al., 2012). The degree to which participants felt discrimination was an important and relevant topic predicted their scores on prejudice measures. The more concerned participants were, the lower their prejudice tended to be. Although research on perceptions of anti-racism interventions is sparse, these studies imply that how participants perceive their experiences with interventions and how salient they find the topic and goals of interventions to be both have some implication for intervention outcomes.

Religiousness, Prejudice, and Interventions

Religiousness may also be connected to intervention outcomes. Several aspects of religiousness have been found to be related to prejudice, a central concept of anti-racism interventions. The first of these aspects of religiousness is religious orthodoxy.

Religious orthodoxy deals with Christianity in particular and can be understood as the "internalization of Christian beliefs" (Johnathan, 2008). Several studies have found religious orthodoxy to be negatively related or unrelated to prejudice and discriminatory attitudes (Kirkpatrick, 1993; Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). Johnathan (2008) found religious orthodoxy to be a significant predictor of more positive attitudes toward discriminated groups, and high scores in orthodoxy were associated with fewer negative attitudes. The same researcher also noted those high in orthodoxy were conscious of their lack of negative attitudes concerning race and exhibited consistent implicit attitudes, confirming the finding that orthodoxy affects both implicit and explicit attitudes in the same manner (Johnathan, 2008).

Considering the definition "internalization of Christian beliefs" these patterns are to be expected. Many Christian teachings assume the value of human life and instruct believers to treat others well. Biblically, equality is based on the shared quality of being made in God's image, and the internal "heart" is prioritized over external characteristics. Jesus is often seen with less

desirable groups of people, such as the Samaritan woman in John 4. The internalization of these beliefs would likely lead to a view that all humans are equal and valuable, and that Christians have a duty to treat people from a variety of backgrounds with kindness and respect.

Another aspect of religiousness understood to be associated with prejudice is religious orthodoxy. Religious orientation is one's motivation for being religious, which may be intrinsic or extrinsic (Allport & Ross, 1967). These orientations can be understood as general ways of being religious and have been described as "religion as a means" and "religion as an end" (Batson et al., 1986). In this understanding of religious identity, an extrinsic religious orientation would be a means to an end. This means that people who are extrinsically religious participate in religion predominately for some reason other than religion itself, be it for a sense of security or social benefits (Allport & Ross, 1967). In contrast, an intrinsic orientation does not view religion primarily as a way to attain something else. Religion, rather than related benefits, is the main thing an intrinsically oriented person seeks to gain from religion. Intrinsically religious people are religious mainly for the sake of religion—because it is meaningful to them and they truly believe in its principles (Allport & Ross, 1967).

Allport and Ross (1967) first proposed the concept of religious orientation as a way of explaining religiousness' complex relationship with prejudice. The researchers found that the relationship between church attendance and prejudice to be curvilinear. They reported that church attendance did predict higher levels of prejudice, but only up to a certain frequency of attendance. They found that past that point, increases in attendance were negatively correlated with prejudice, and nonattendance was correlated with lower levels of prejudice (Allport & Ross, 1967). More simply, just attending church did not predict lower prejudice. There seemed to be a divide between general churchgoers and churchgoers with especially high attendance. The

decreases in prejudice that might be expected of church attendees were more likely among those with especially high attendance, and the opposite true for those who attended church less. Allport and Ross (1967) concluded that church attendance as a measure of religiousness does not account for motivations for attending church. They proposed that motivation for being religious is the deciding factor in how religiousness relates to prejudice. The majority of church attendees represent more casual, occasional attendees whose motivations for being religious are external, and the minority are devout attendees who are internally motivated to be religious (Allport & Ross, 1967). It is the externally motivated majority who tend to be high in prejudice, and the internally motivated minority that tends to be lowest in prejudice (Allport & Ross, 1967).

In both orientations, the patterns found in research make sense in light of how orientations impact a person's beliefs and actions. Intrinsic religiousness is not far removed from orthodoxy, and intrinsic religiousness has similar consequences for one's beliefs as orthodoxy, at least theoretically. For example, strongly identifying with the tenants and teachings of one's faith is likely to lead to actions and beliefs that are in line with one's faith. Just as the internalization of Christian beliefs in orthodoxy is likely to lead to a belief in human value and standards for the treatment of others, intrinsic religiousness is likely to bring a religious person's beliefs into alignment with their faith. In contrast, a person who is more extrinsically oriented may be more likely to agree with the tradition of their place of worship, even if tradition diverges from the teachings found in that religion's sacred texts.

Identification with all Humanity

Identification with all humanity (IWAH), the sense that "we are all one" regardless of differences in race, religion, location, and other factors, is conceptually contradictory to the concept of prejudice (McFarland et al., 2012). Although it is distinct from other concepts, IWAH

is a relatively new concept that was developed out of previously existing concepts (McFarland et al., 2012). For instance, IWAH shares some qualities with moral identity (Reed & Aquino, 2003), dispositional empathy (Davis, 1983), and a previous attempt to conceptualize closeness to all people around the world (Jackson, 2001). IWAH is expected to yield similar, and in some cases, superior findings to these related concepts (McFarland et al., 2012).

Similar to moral identity, IWAH is expected to correlate with a positive view and treatment of out-groups (Reed & Aquino, 2003; McFarland et al., 2012). It is also expected to be positively associated with egalitarianism (Jackson, 2001) and dispositional empathy (Davis, 1983), and negatively correlated with ethnocentrism and the "major roots" of ethnocentrism, authoritarianism, and social dominance orientation (McFarland et al., 2012, p. 832; Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Altemeyer, 1996; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). The concepts that IWAH is positively associated with have been found to negatively predict prejudice, and IWAH is expected to be similarly related. On the other hand, ethnocentrism, authoritarianism, and social dominance orientation have been found to have a positive association with prejudice, and since IWAH is expected to correlate negatively with these concepts, it should also correlate negatively with prejudice. As McFarland, Brown, and Webb state in a later article, "Identification with All Humanity predicts concern for human suffering and human rights" (p. 196), which would possibly lead individuals high in IWAH to be more aligned with the core ideas of anti-racism (2013).

Conclusions

It is plausible that particular perceptions of anti-racism interventions may have implications for intervention outcomes, and that positive experiences, personal salience of

interventions, certain aspects of religiousness, and identity with broader groups of people may be

associated with different perceptions. The specific relationships that might exist remain unclear.

Chapter Three: Methodology

Participants

For this study, participants were drawn from the population of undergraduate students at Southeastern University, a faith-based institution in central Florida. Of the 69 total participants, 55 (79.7%) of the sample was female. Students were required to be 18 years of age or older to participate, and the sample ranged in age from 18 to 23 years old. The students represented 34 different majors at the university. Psychology was the most represented with 14 participants. Fifty-seven (82.6%) of the participants identified as White, 12 (17.39%) participants said that they were of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin, 7 (10.14%) said that they were Black or African American, and the remaining participants said that they were American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Other, or preferred not to answer. Participants were allowed to select more than one category, and 11 participants chose two or more categories, which resulted in a cumulative percent higher than 100 percent. All participants identified as Christian, with one participant also identifying as spiritual but not religious.

Participants were selected using convenience sampling. Participants gained access to the study in one of two ways. The study was made available through the Sona participant pool system and shared by email. Many participants chose to participate as a way of earning research credit required in their courses, but the decision to take part in a study and which studies to participate in was entirely voluntary. The study was conducted in the fall semester of 2019.

Materials

An online questionnaire was used to collect data. The questionnaire assessed attitudes towards racial issues, exposure to and perceptions of anti-racism interventions, religious orientation, religious orthodoxy, religious practices, and identification with all humanity. Both

closed and open-ended questions were used. Of the 80 total questions, ten were open-ended.

Demographic information, including gender identity, age, major, race, and religious affiliation,

was also collected.

Two measures were used to assess attitudes towards racial issues (see Appendix A). Five

items were taken from the pretest and post-test of a survey of Millennials, which was conducted

by the Applied Research Center in 2011 (Apollon, 2011). The first four questions use a five-

point scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree" to assess the extent to which

participants agree that people in the United States who work hard generally succeed, regardless

of other factors, and whether all groups are given fair treatment and equal opportunity. The fifth

question assesses whether participants think racism remains a significant problem in specific

areas of society, including education, employment, and housing. The fifth question allowed

participants to select as many of the areas that they felt applied, as well as allowing participants

to select "other" and elaborate if they felt that the options available excluded a significant area of

society.

The second group of items was questions pulled from a poll of American's racial

attitudes in 2016, which were selected based on their relevance to this study (Pew Social Trends,

2016). Five questions were selected from the Pew Social Trends database, all of which were

multiple-choice. The questions were selected because they were aimed at general perceptions of

race relations, specifically whether or not they are improving and whether sufficient change has

been made. The selected questions also asked about the frequency with which the participants

come into contact with people of a different race and to what extent they think that their race

affects their success in life. Other questions were excluded because they related to the specific

political climate in 2016 or because they assessed an aspect of racial attitudes that another

question sufficiently covered. The wording of the second question, which assesses whether participants think that change is still needed in order to achieve equality, was altered slightly. The original question used the word "blacks", which was substituted with "racial minorities" in order to not exclude other minority groups.

The use of Pew Research Center's questions allowed comparison with other, much larger samples. Both measures of attitudes towards racial issues were intended to gauge the general views of the sample, since they may have implications for how necessary a participant perceives anti-racism interventions to be. For example, if a participant answers that the United States has made changes necessary to give racial minorities equal rights, they may not see a need for further changes.

Religious orientation was measured using the Revised Religious Orientation Scale (Gorsuch & McPherson, 1989). The 14-item scale ranges from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree". Gorsuch and McPherson (1989) revised a preexisting revision of the original Allport-Ross I-E scale, which was done in order to remain consistent with the concepts developed by Allport and Ross and in the hopes of being able to use the same scale with groups of varying education levels. The researchers analyzed the questions to ensure that they were conceptually consistent and reliable. The revised scale, while less reliable than the 20-item scale it is derived from, has been determined to be sufficiently reliable and has been widely used.

The Short Christian Orthodoxy scale (SCO), as well as the second and fourteenth items from the previous version of the scale (see Appendix B), were used to measure religious orthodoxy (Hunsberger, 1989; Fullerton & Hunsberger, 1982). The Christian Orthodoxy scale (CO) has 24 items, while the shortened version of the scale only has six. Both scales use the same answer and scoring format, a seven-point scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to

"Strongly Agree". Some items are reverse scored so that in the end a high score indicates an orthodox belief. The items from the older version of the scale were included because they pertained to an orthodox Christian view of humanity, which is not addressed by any of the items in the shorter scale. They also served as "buffer" questions to allow participants to get used to the format of the scale, as suggested by Hunsberger (1989) when the abridged scale was made. The shortened scale maintains similar internal validity and correlates with related concepts with similar significance and strength when compared to the original scale. These results remained similar among different samples, and even among smaller samples. For example, a sample of 72 participants in 1988 showed similarly strong psychometric properties to a larger sample of 669 participants in 1987. Both orthodoxy scales seem to be relatively robust, internally consistent, and distinct from related concepts.

Religious practices were assessed using the Organizational Religiousness and Private Religious Practices scales of the Brief Multidimensional Measure of Religiousness/Spirituality, which will be referred to from here on as the BMMRS (Masters, 2013). The organizational religiousness scale has two items measured on a six-point scale. It assesses how frequently a participant attends religious services, as well as other activities in the place of worship. The private religious practices scale has a total of five items. The first four items are measured on an eight-point scale and the fifth is measured on a five-point scale. This scale assesses the frequency with which participants take part in religious activities outside of the public sphere, such as prayer, meditation, and reading religious literature. The BMMRS contains more than the two scales used for this study and has been tested in its entirety with a variety of samples, representing different ethnicities and nationalities, spanning adolescents to older adults, and with people who have a variety of physical and psychological issues (Bush et al., 2010; Harris et al,

2008; Johnstone, Yoon, Franklin, Schopp, & Hinkebein, 2009). It has been evaluated for internal consistency, construct validity, and test-retest reliability, and has generally shown moderate to good results. It seems to be relatively stable and has been heavily cited in a wide range of studies.

The Identification with All Humanity Scale (McFarland et al., 2012) was used to measure the extent to which participants considered broader groups to be part of their ingroup. The measure was developed fairly recently. Researchers McFarland, Webb, and Brown presented their finalized measure in 2012, although they reference previous studies of theirs in which they refined it and tested the validity and conceptual uniqueness of the construct. The measure consists of nine three-response items, which ask participants to report how much care they have for people in their community, in their country, and all over the world, as well as the extent to which they identify which each group. Responses are measured on a five-point scale ranging from "Not at all" to "Very much".

As a fairly new measure, reports on reliability and validity are somewhat limited. McFarland et al. (2012) report a series of 10 studies testing the validity of the Identification with All Humanity Scale (IWAH). The findings of these studies show the measure to correlate consistently with a variety of constructs that the researchers identified as conceptually contrary or similar to identification with all humanity. For example, McFarland et al. (2012) assert that any accurate measure of identification with humanity must correlate negatively with prejudice, and the researchers found that the IWAH was consistently negatively related to generalized prejudice. These studies also found the measure to be generally stable over ten weeks' time. Factor analysis showed it to be robust, and the researchers reported good internal consistency. There also seems to be a relationship between people's evaluation of themselves, and evaluations

of that person by someone who knows them well. In general, if someone knew a respondent well, they gave them scores similar to that person's self-report scores.

Due to a shortage of previously developed and tested measures addressing exposure to and perceptions of interventions, the measures for these concepts were researcher-developed (see Appendix C). All researcher-developed measures used in this study were based on the existing literature about prejudice, perceptions of racism interventions, factors that impact participants' perceptions, and the types of interventions used in the existing literature. Each group of items was developed with the assistance of two psychological research teams at the private university where the study took place.

The measure is divided into 6 sections. Throughout the survey, including the title, interventions were referred to as "anti-racism efforts" or "events" because both terms are neutral and are less likely to carry a negative connotation than "interventions". Some participants might feel that the term "interventions" implies that they are in some way in need of intervention. In the case of anti-racism interventions, it may imply that they possess racist ideas or beliefs, which most people are unlikely to say about themselves.

The first section of items asks participants to rate the importance of interventions of various forms and central ideas of interventions, such as hearing about minorities' experiences. This section has 13 items, which are measured on a six-point scale ranging from "Very important" to "Not at all important". These items were included to assess whether or not participants generally thought that anti-racism interventions and discussions about race are important. The items make a distinction between who is leading the event because it is plausible that participants may rate the importance of interventions differently based on who has organized it or who is speaking. The items also separate discrimination and racial stereotypes to avoid

double-barreled questions, although it was not expected that participants would have significantly different opinions about the two concepts.

The second section asked about participants' exposure to interventions. It consists of five free-response questions, which ask how many and what kind of events participants had been exposed to. The first three questions address interventions in the classroom specifically since much of the research on anti-racism interventions is based on in-class discussions of race. Because there are so many kinds of interventions, the remaining two questions simply ask about "other events … where racial issues were discussed". This was done to avoid asking about each specific type of intervention and making the survey longer than necessary, as well as to avoid excluding any intervention types or experiences particular to the individual.

The third section deals with participants' opinions of the interventions that they have attended. It contains three free-response questions about how they felt directly after the intervention and what they liked and disliked about the intervention. These questions were meant to assess participants' opinions of anti-racism interventions more specifically, as well as to see what factors might have contributed to their assessment of the events they have attended.

The fourth section is made up of a single item, which asks how willing participants are to attend an intervention "in the near future". This item is measured on a five-point scale ranging from "Very willing" to "Not at all willing". This item was included for several reasons. Most obviously, to see if people generally expressed willingness to attend events, but also to address the possibility that participants might say that interventions are important, but not express willingness to attend. It was expected that people with positive attitudes towards interventions would be more likely to express willingness to go.

Following up the willingness item, the fifth section assessed the importance of factors contributing to willingness to attend. Participants rated how important 15 different factors were for deciding whether or not to attend an event. This was measured on a six-point scale ranging from "Very important" to "Not at all important". This section also included two free-response questions about what might cause them not to attend and what would make events more appealing to them. These items were included to better understand what specific factors were important for participants. The fifteen factors measured using multiple-choice were decided upon based on discussions with the research team about what factors might be relevant, and the two follow-up questions were meant to allow participants to mention other factors not included in the fifteen.

The sixth and final section assesses the extent to which participants agree with several statements representing reasons for positive or negative attitudes toward interventions. The section contains 20 items measured on a five-point scale ranging from "To a great extent" to "Not at all". Positively and negatively leaning statements were mixed together. The items were more positive than negative, with 12 positively leaning items and eight negatively leaning items. The items were selected based on several brainstorming sessions with both the research team and the researchers. The items address the environment, usefulness, and impact of interventions.

Procedure

The questionnaire was made available to students on Sona and through a link shared by email (see Appendix D). Participants selected the study from the variety available and reviewed information about the study and the online consent form (see Appendix E). They completed the online Google Forms questionnaire, and their responses were anonymous and confidential. Only the researchers had access to the data.

Data Analysis

The data were grouped by scale, and qualitative and quantitative items were coded and analyzed separately. Qualitative items were assessed by identifying overarching themes and calculating the percentage of responses that shared a particular overarching theme. Quantitative data were coded numerically and then analyzed and interpreted using SPSS.

Because the first four questions of the Private Religious Practices scale are scored differently from the last question, z-scores were calculated for all of the items. Both BMMRS scales did not allow for missing responses.

The Intrinsic Religiousness Orientation and Extrinsic Religious Orientation subscales of the Revised Religious Orientation Scale were separated and scored separately, which is standard. Both scales allowed for one missing response. In the event of a missing response, the average of the participant's other answers was substituted.

The measures concerning reasons for positive and negative attitudes, as well as the Identification with All Humanity subscale of the IWAH measure, allowed for two missing responses, and the same procedure was used in the case of missing responses.

Pearson's product-moment correlation tests with an alpha of .05 was used to assess relationships between variables. Independent samples t-test were used to assess mean differences by race and gender. Race was dichotomized for the t-test by separating those who said that they were only white and those who gave responses other than only White, including responses where participants identified as White alongside another category.

.

Chapter Four: Results

Table 1 details the demographic composition of the sample. The sample was predominantly female, and all participants identified themselves as Christian. The majority of participants identified themselves as White, but eleven participants selected multiple races.

The majority of participants said that at least one of their classes had discussed issues related to anti-racism (82.61%), and most participants also said that they had experienced at least one other event where racial issues were discussed (69.57%).

On average, participants had high scores on both the Organizational Religiousness ($M =$ 5.01, $SD = 0.87$) and Private Religious Practices ($M = 25.6$, $SD = 5.15$) scales of the BMMRS. Participants also had a high mean score for Intrinsic Religious Orientation ($M = 4.31$, $SD =$ 0.53). Scores for Extrinsic Religious Orientation were lower ($M = 2.69$, $SD = 0.75$), with the average in the middle of the possible range. The sample had high mean scores for Orthodoxy ($M = 6.74$, $SD = 0.64$) as well, which was to be expected considering the uniformity of the sample. Orthodoxy scores for this sample are leptokurtic and skewed to the left. High levels of reported religiosity were to be expected because the sample was taken from a faith-based institution.

The following data are organized as they relate to the four questions that guided this study.

Question 1: What are college students' typical perceptions of or attitudes toward anti-prejudice interventions?

In general, participants seem to have more positive perceptions of interventions than negative ones. Participants reported that they felt that interventions were generally important, which is shown by the sample's high mean scores for reported importance of interventions ($M =$ 4.17, $SD = 0.89$). Participants were also generally willing to attend interventions ($M = 3.26$, $SD =$

0.79). In the same vein, they showed high levels of agreement with reasons for positive attitudes on average ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.59$) and scored lower on reasons for negative attitudes ($M = 2.44$, $SD = 0.63$).

More specifically on the issue of the importance of interventions, the majority of students who responded said that they felt it was "very important" to learn about discrimination (75.36%) and racial stereotypes (59.70%), hear about minorities' experiences with discrimination (64.71%) and racial stereotypes (66.17%), and raise awareness about racial stereotypes (57.35%).

For the items concerning reasons for positive attitudes, 75 percent or more of the participants who responded reported agreement with 11 of the 12 statements. Only 41.54 percent agreed with the twelfth statement, "these kinds of events imply that each person must take responsibility for their own attitudes and actions". Agreement was more divided on the items dealing with reasons for negative attitudes. Of the eight items, the majority of participants agreed to the following four: "these kinds of events cover information you already know" (67.16%), "these kinds of events cover information you already agree with" (73.85%), "the kinds of events cause people to feel tense or uncomfortable" (64.18%), and "these kinds of events create situations in which you will be expected to support certain social or political views" (59.09%). Between 30 and 34 percent of respondents agreed with the other four statements.

One of the qualitative questions asked participants how they felt after the events that they have attended. Participants generally noted positive experiences. Of those who noted positive feelings, people's responses often fit within more than one theme.

Of the 52 total responses to this question, 18 (34.62%) respondents said that they felt more informed or aware. For example, one participant said they felt they had "[a] greater

understanding of race relations and approaches to employ" and another said that "they had a great impact on my understanding of other perspectives".

Eight (15.38%) people noted feelings of motivation, whether that was "more motivated to be conscious" or "motivated to talk to my friends in minorities about what I heard and their personal experiences".

Six (11.54%) people said that they felt inspired or touched by the events they had been to. They gave quotes like "I was reminded of the struggles of my dear friends to have the same rights I often take for granted. It truly touched my heart." and "I felt very solemn and [reminded] of how evil humans can become, but I was encouraged by how humans can recover through unity."

Three (5.77%) participants said that they were challenged by their experiences. One said that "It made me think about things I never thought about" and another said "I felt like I need to be more intentional with my thinking".

Two (3.85%) participants mentioned feeling "unified".

Another eight (15.38%) said that they felt these kinds of events were needed and addressed important things, giving statements like "a great injustice is still going on and more people need to hear about it" and "…they were necessary and thought provoking".

Of the 10 (19.23%) who noted more negative feelings, most said that they felt the events had little effect, were in some way lacking, or that they felt uncomfortable. One such person said "I did not feel like it really addressed any issues and more so blamed people for the "issues"" and another said "I felt topics could have been more thoroughly discussed and harder topics tackled". Even among the more negative responses, there was some ambivalence because two of the ten also said that they felt "very moved" and "educated" despite feelings of discomfort.

Question 2: How are students' attitudes toward interventions correlated with their willingness to attend interventions?

Table 2 presents the correlations between attitudes toward interventions and willingness to attend interventions. A Pearson's product-moment correlation with an alpha of .05 was conducted to assess the relationship between how important participants said interventions were and how willing participants are to attend interventions. Results revealed that reported importance of interventions had a significant positive relationship with willingness to attend interventions, $r(61) = .52$, $p < .001$.

Additionally, a Pearson's product-moment correlation with an alpha of .05 was conducted to assess the relationship between the extent of agreement with reasons for positive attitudes towards interventions and willingness to attend. Results indicated that agreement with reasons for positive attitudes also had a significant positive relationship with willingness to attend interventions, $r(60) = .50$, $p < .001$.

In contrast, no significant relationship was found between agreement with reasons for negative attitudes and willingness to attend interventions.

It is worthwhile to note that reported importance of interventions and agreement with reasons for positive attitudes, both of which represent participants' attitudes towards interventions, were also found to have a significant positive relationship when assessed with a Pearson's product-moment correlation with an alpha of .05, $r(60) = .43$, $p = .001$.

Question 3: How are different measures of religiousness correlated with perceptions of and willingness to attend interventions?

The findings related to this question have been further divided by the variable concerned with perceptions of interventions and willingness to attend interventions. The correlations between religiousness, perceptions, and willingness are presented in Table 3.

Reported importance of interventions.

A Pearson's product-moment correlation with an alpha of .05 was conducted to assess the relationship between reported importance of interventions and organizational religiousness. Results indicated that reported importance of interventions was positively correlated with organizational religiousness, $r(62) = .32, p = .01$.

The same test was used to assess the relationship between reported importance of interventions and private religious practices. The two variables were also found to be positively related, $r(62) = .28, p = .03$.

The relationship between reported importance of interventions and intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientation scores were each assessed, once again using Pearson's product-moment correlation with an alpha of .05. Reported importance of interventions and intrinsic religious orientation scores were found to be positively related, $r(62) = .38, p = .002$. Extrinsic religious orientation scores were unrelated to reported importance of interventions.

The relationship between orthodoxy and reported importance of interventions was also assessed, but no significant relationship was found.

Willingness to attend interventions.

A Pearson's product-moment correlation with an alpha of .05 was conducted to assess the relationship between willingness and the various measures of religiousness. Unlike reported importance of interventions, organizational religiousness and private religious practices were not found to be significantly related to willingness. However, results did show that intrinsic

religiousness scores were significantly positively related to willingness, $r(64) = .28$, $p = .024$. No significant relationship was found between orthodoxy and willingness.

Reasons for positive attitudes.

Additionally, although agreement with reasons for positive attitudes is reflective of participant's attitudes towards interventions, no significant relationship with any measures of religiousness were found.

Reasons for negative attitudes.

Similarly, no significant relationship was found between any measures of religiousness and reasons for negative attitudes.

Question 4: What other factors are correlated with perceptions of and willingness to attend interventions?

The findings relevant to this question have been further divided by the following variables: Identification with All Humanity (IWAH), Gender, and Race.

Identification with all humanity.

A Pearson's product-moment correlation with an alpha of .05 was conducted to assess the relationship between IWAH scores and the reported importance of interventions. Results showed that a significant positive correlation exists between the two variables, $r(59) = .29$, $p = .03$.

The same test was used to assess the relationship between IWAH scores and willingness to attend interventions. IWAH scores and willingness to attend were found to have a significant positive relationship, $r(60) = .27$, $p = .032$.

The test was also used to assess the relationship between IWAH scores and agreement with reasons for positive attitudes towards interventions. According to the results, IWAH had a significant positive relationship with reasons for positive attitudes, $r(60) = .31$, $p = .013$.

No significant relationship was found between IWAH scores and agreement with reasons for negative attitudes.

Gender.

Table 4 details the mean differences relevant to gender. Results from an independent samples *t*-test indicated that the females, on average, rated interventions as more significantly important ($M = 4.39$, $SD = 0.75$) than males did ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 0.87$), $t(62) = 4.59$, $p < .001$, two-tailed. There was a difference of 1.14 scale points (scale range: 0 to 5, $\eta^2 = .25$), but the 95% confidence interval around the difference between the estimated population means was relatively precise [0.64, 1.64].

An independent samples *t*-test was also used to assess the difference between females and males' mean scores for agreement with reasons for positive attitudes. The test revealed that the females, on average, scored higher in agreement with reasons for positive attitudes ($M = 3.34$, $SD = 0.57$) than males did ($M = 2.87$, $SD = 0.53$), $t(63) = 2.75$, $p = .008$, two-tailed. There was a difference of 0.46 scale points (scale range: 0 to 4, $\eta^2 = .11$.), but the 95% confidence interval around the difference between the estimated population means was relatively precise [0.13, 0.80].

The differences between females' ($M = 32.82$, $SD = 5.12$) and males' ($M = 29$, $SD = 6.77$) scores on the IWAH scale were assessed using a independent samples *t*-test. The results showed females' scores to be significantly higher than males', $t(63) = 2.30$, $p = .03$, two-tailed. The difference of 3 scale points is small (scale range: 9 to 45, $\eta^2 = .08$), but the 95% confidence interval around the difference between the estimated population means was relatively imprecise [.51, 7.14].

Race.

No significant differences were found between the scores of participants who reported being White and those who reported other ethnicities.

Chapter Five: Discussion

Because it explores the intersection of anti-racism interventions and the perceptions of participants differently from previous research, this study offers some interesting insights into students' perceptions of and attitudes towards interventions, as well as the ways they might impact willingness to attend. It also sheds light on how certain qualities of participants, including aspects of religiousness and identification with all humanity, might have implications for both perceptions and willingness.

The results for Question 1 suggest that students' perceptions are generally more positive than negative. The majority of students in the sample reported that interventions were important, agreed that they accomplish positive things, and said that they were willing to attend interventions. While it is possible that the finding that perceptions were generally positive was influenced by a self-selecting sample who were previously interested in the topic, it may simply describe the general perception of students. Assuming it does accurately portray the general population, it seems that anti-racism interventions are still relevant and important to college students, that interventions generally achieve their main goals, and that interventions generally cause people to feel welcomed. It is likely important to ensure that interventions accomplish the things addresses in the positive attitudes scale, creating an environment that is positive and conducive to conversation and change rather than tension and judgement.

Of the negative attitudes, these statements seemed to garner the most agreement: interventions cover information you already know or agree with, interventions cause a person to feel tense or uncomfortable, and interventions create situations in which you will be expected to support certain social or political views.

Agreement with the idea that interventions cover information that participants either already know or agree with, which was separated into two statements in the survey to ensure it

was not double-barreled, may lead participants to view interventions as irrelevant to them and

therefore not necessary to attend. Believing that interventions cause people to feel tense or

uncomfortable may discourage people from attending. Participants' agreement with this

statement seems to be consistent with some of the responses given for the qualitative question

"How did you feel about the events after they ended?" As previously noted, there was some

ambivalence among the responses to that question since some respondents said that they felt

uncomfortable, but also felt moved or inspired, which have more positive connotations. It is also

worth noting that discomfort is understood to be important for change in anti-racism

interventions. As described by Son Hing et al. (2002), discomfort caused by cognitive dissonance

leads people to adjust their attitudes. The relevance of discomfort for anti-racism interventions

may explain why the majority said that interventions cause people to feel tense or uncomfortable,

but still had positive attitudes towards interventions in general.

The way to address people who feel that interventions are not relevant to them or will

cause them discomfort is still unclear. The way that events are advertised may have some

implications for who feels welcome to attend. For example, if an event is titled in such a way that

it singles out a particular ethnicity, people who belong to other ethnicities may not think that the

event is meant for them. Beyond advertising, the level of effort to invite people of all kinds may

also impact whether people think the event is for them and whether they expect to feel singled

out or in the minority at an event, which would likely lead to discomfort. More information is

needed to know the specific things that lead people to perceive events as irrelevant and

uncomfortable and to draw further conclusions about how this barrier can be addressed.

The results for Question 2 indicated that both positive attitudes and reported importance

of interventions were positively correlated with willingness to attend interventions, which seems

to support the notion that one's attitudes toward and perceptions of anti-racism interventions are related to their likeliness of attending. Practically, this could likely be used to increase attendance. If a university or other establishment finds themselves wanting to have a larger turnout for anti-racism events, it would be helpful to get a sense of the population's perceptions of such events and work to improve them if necessary. Additionally, this may mean that the people who interventions seek to target may not be the most likely to attend. To avoid an echo chamber, event planners ought to think carefully about how to attract people who might not typically attend events concerned with anti-racism.

Agreement with reasons for negative attitudes was not significantly related to willingness, but the weak negative relationship that did exist might prove to be significant in a sample with more diverse attitudes. Results also suggest that higher agreement with reasons for positive attitudes was related to saying interventions were more important.

For Question 3, intervention importance was positively related to organizational religiousness, private religious practices, and intrinsic religious orientation, while willingness was only related to intrinsic religious orientation. This implies that there is a distinction between saying interventions are important and being willing to attend them. This may be because the individual does not think that the information will be beneficial to them personally, despite thinking it is beneficial to others in general. To refer back to the negative attitude items, believing that interventions cover information that the participant already knows or agrees with might contribute to this distinction.

This finding also suggests that something about intrinsic religious orientation is different from the other measures of religiousness. Although religiousness in general seems to promote the perception that interventions are important, religious practices alone seem to predict belief more

reliably than action. Intrinsic religious orientation may have more impact on behavior, such as

attending interventions, than organizational religiousness and private religious practices do. This

is not too different from Allport and Ross'(1967) finding that church attendance alone was not a

reliable predictor of behavior, which led them to conceptualize religious orientation in the first

place.

In contrast, agreement with reasons for positive attitudes towards interventions was not

related to measures of religiousness.

Orthodoxy was also found to be unrelated to all measures of perceptions of and attitudes

towards interventions, although its relationship with reported intervention importance

approached significance. It is possible that this was impacted by the range restriction of

participants' responses, which can be explained by the highly religious nature of the sample

Concerning Question 4, identification with all humanity was positively correlated with

intervention importance, willingness to attend, and positive attitudes. This seems aligned with

the assertion that identification with all humanity serves as a predictor of concern for issues

relevant to anti-racism, namely the suffering and rights of racial minorities and humans in

general (McFarland et al., 2013).

The finding that females generally reported interventions to be more important, expressed

more positive attitudes, and scored higher in identification with all humanity is consistent with

several gender norms, including the prevalence of women in helper professions and women

being less aggressive and more caring than men on average.

Scores for intervention importance, positive and negative attitudes, and identification

with all humanity were not significantly different by race. These results seem to suggest that,

regardless of race, students seem to rate interventions as important, agree that interventions

accomplish mostly positive things, and identify themselves with "all humanity" not just people within smaller, more similar communities. Although the sample was predominantly White, this does not necessarily negate such conclusions.

Several limitations to this study must be noted. First, by virtue of the sampling method and the polarizing nature or the topic, it is likely that the participants chose to participate because of their interest in or concern for anti-racism. This means that the sample was likely self-selecting and not necessarily representative of the student body as a whole. The self-selection of the sample may have resulted in more neutral or negative opinions being underrepresented in this study. The sample was also predominantly female, White, and highly religious, although denominations varied. The results may not generalize to other demographic groups or samples from universities that are not faith-based institutions. Another limitation is that the researcher-created measures have not been validated with other samples or tested for internal consistency. More research is needed to test the reliability of these measures and develop more reliable and valid versions of the scales. Additionally, more thorough analysis of the qualitative data would likely have been beneficial.

The findings of this study suggest some directions for future research. It would be beneficial to conduct similar studies at other universities to see if they yield similar results. It would be interesting see if results differ in more racially diverse samples or among samples other than college students, such as at a workplace where employees are required to take part in sensitivity training. Other questions include what specific aspects of interventions lead to positive or negative attitudes and the extent to which positive and negative attitudes towards interventions affect actual attendance and experience of interventions.

We recommend that future studies use more representative sampling method rather than using convenience sampling. It might also be beneficial to make the survey briefer, to prevent survey fatigue. In order to get a more detailed understanding of qualitative responses, the use of structured interviews is recommended. It would also be interesting to see how specific negative perceptions impact willingness to attend interventions, for example, whether feeling that you already know the information presented in interventions is more related than discomfort to willingness.

Overall, the findings of this study show the relevance of student perceptions for the study of anti-racism interventions and the value of continuing to examine the relationship, as well as the value of examining the correlates of particular perceptions. Further study may add to a better and more nuanced understanding of the factors that contribute to the effectiveness of interventions. This study represents an initial exploration of a topic with great potential, as well as another layer of complexity in the study of anti-racism interventions.

References

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality.* New York, NY: Harper.

Akrami, N., & Ekehammar, B. (2005). The association between implicit and explicit prejudice: The moderating role of motivation to control prejudiced reactions. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *46*(4), 361–366. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9450.2005.00466.x

Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *5*(4), 432–443. doi:10.1037/h0021212

Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest, and prejudice. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, *2*(2), 113–133. doi:10.1207/s15327582ijpr0202_5

Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The authoritarian specter.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Apollon, D. (2011). *Don't call them post-racial: Millennials' attitudes on race, racism and key systems in our society*. Applied Research Center. https://www.racialequitytools.org /resourcefiles/ARC_Millennials_Report_June_2011.pdf

Batson, C. D., Flink, C. H., Schoenrade, P. A., Fultz, J., & Pych, V. (1986). Religious orientation and overt versus covert racial prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *50*(1), 175–181. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.50.1.175

Bush, A. L., Jameson, J. P., Barrera, T., Phillips, L. L., Lachner, N., Evans, G., Jackson, A. D., & Stanley, M. A. (2012). An evaluation of the brief multidimensional measure of religiousness/spirituality in older patients with prior depression or anxiety. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, *15*(2), 191–203. doi:10.1080/13674676.2011.566263

Case, K. A. (2007). Raising white privilege awareness and reducing racial prejudice: Assessing

    diversity course effectiveness. *Teaching of Psychology*, *34*(4), 231–235.

    doi:10.1080/00986280701700250

Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a

    multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *44*(1), 113–

    126. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.44.1.113

Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components.

    Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *56*(1), 5–18. doi:10.1037/0022-

    3514.56.1.5

Devine, P. G., Forscher, P. S., Austin, A. J., & Cox, W. T. L. (2012). Long-term reduction in

    implicit race bias: A prejudice habit-breaking intervention. *Journal of Experimental*

    Social Psychology, *48*(6), 1267–1278. Scopus. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2012.06.003

Ezorsky, G. (1991). *Racism and justice: The case for affirmative action*. Ithaca; London: Cornell

    University Press. Retrieved March 29, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591

    /j.ctv3mtczg

Forscher, P. S., Mitamura, C., Dix, E. L., Cox, W. T. L., & Devine, P. G. (2017). Breaking the

    prejudice habit: Mechanisms, timecourse, and longevity. *Journal of Experimental Social*

    Psychology, 72, 133–146. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2017.04.009

Franco, F. M., & Maass, A. (1999). Intentional control over prejudice: When the choice of the

    measure matters. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *29*(4), 469–477. doi:

    10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199906)29:4<469::AID-EJSP938>3.0.CO;2-S

Fullerton, J. T., & Hunsberger, B. (1982). A unidimensional measure of christian orthodoxy.

   Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, *21*(4), 317–326. JSTOR. doi:10.2307

   /1385521

Gorsuch, R. L., & McPherson, S. E. (1989). Intrinsic/extrinsic measurement: I/E-revised and

   single-item scales. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *28*(3), 348–354. JSTOR.

   doi:10.2307/1386745

Greenland, K., Xenias, D., & Maio, G. R. (2017). Effects of promotion and compunction

   interventions on real intergroup interactions: Promotion helps but high compunction

   hurts. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00528

Harris, S. K., Sherritt, L. R., Holder, D. W., Kulig, J., Shrier, L. A., & Knight, J. R. (2008).

   Reliability and validity of the brief multidimensional measure of religiousness/spirituality

   among adolescents. *Journal of Religion and Health*, *47*(4), 438–457.

   doi:10.1007/s10943-007-9154-x

Hogan, D. E., & Mallott, M. (2005). Changing racial prejudice through diversity education.

   Journal of College Student Development, *46*(2), 115–125. doi:10.1353/csd.2005.0015

Hunsberger, B. (1989). A short version of the christian orthodoxy scale. *Journal for the Scientific

   Study of Religion*, *28*(3), 360–365. JSTOR. doi:10.2307/1386747

Jackson, M. S. (2001, July). *Can humanity constitute an ingroup? An exploratory analysis of

   global identification and attitudes toward social groups.* Paper presented at the meeting

   of the International Society of Political Psychology, Cuernavaca, Mexico.

Jonathan, E. (2008). The influence of religious fundamentalism, right-wing authoritarianism, and

   Christian orthodoxy on explicit and implicit measures of attitudes toward homosexuals.

International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 18, 316 –329.

doi:10.1080/10508610802229262

Johnstone, B., Yoon, D. P., Franklin, K. L., Schopp, L., & Hinkebein, J. (2008). Re-

conceptualizing the factor structure of the brief multidimensional measure of

religiousness/spirituality. *Journal of Religion and Health*, *48*(2), 146.

doi:10.1007/s10943-008-9179-9

Kirkpatrick, L. A. (1993). Fundamentalism, christian orthodoxy, and intrinsic religious

orientation as predictors of discriminatory attitudes. *Journal for the Scientific Study of

Religion*, *32*(3), 256–268. JSTOR. doi:10.2307/1386664

Krysan, M., & Moberg, S. (2016, August 25). Trends in racial attitudes. University of Illinois

Institute of Government and Public Affairs. Retrieved from http://igpa.uillinois.edu

/programs/racial-attitudes

Manstead, A. S. R. (1996). Attitudes and behavior. In *Applied social psychology* (pp. 3–29).

SAGE.

Masters, K. S. (2013). Brief multidimensional measure of religiousness/spirituality (BMMRS).

In M. D. Gellman & J. R. Turner (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Behavioral Medicine* (pp. 267–

269). Springer New York. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-1005-9_1577

McCauley, C., Wright, M., & Harris, M. E. (2000). Diversity workshops on campus: A survey of

current practice at u.s. colleges and universities. *College Student Journal*, *34*(1), 100.

McConahay, J. B., Hardee, B. B., & Batts, V. (1981). Has racism declined in america? It

depends on who is asking and what is asked. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution (Pre-

1986); Beverly Hills*, *25*(4), 563.

McFarland, S., Webb, M., & Brown, D. (2012). All humanity is my ingroup: A measure and

      studies of identification with all humanity. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*,

      103(5), 830–853. doi:10.1037/a0028724

Nai, J., Narayanan, J., Hernandez, I., & Savani, K. (2018). People in more racially diverse

      neighborhoods are more prosocial. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *114*(4),

      497–515. doi:10.1037/pspa0000103

Oxford University Press. (2019a). Anti-racism. In *Lexico.com*. Lexico.com.

Oxford University Press. (2019b). Perception. In *Lexico.com*. Lexico.com.

Paluck, E. L., & Green, D. P. (2009). Prejudice reduction: What works? A review and

      assessment of research and practice. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*(1), 339–367.

      doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163607

Perry, S. P., Murphy, M. C., & Dovidio, J. F. (2015). Modern prejudice: Subtle, but

      unconscious? The role of bias awareness in whites' perceptions of personal and others'

      biases. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *61*, 64–78. doi:10.1016/j.jesp

      .2015.06.007

Pew Social Trends. (2016). *2016 racial attitudes in america survey* [Data file and code book].

      Retrieved from https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/datasets/

Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (1998). Internal and external motivation to respond without

      prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*(3), 811–832.

      doi:10.1037/0022-3514.75.3.811

Reed II, A., & Aquino, K. F. (2003). Moral identity and the expanding circle of moral regard

      toward out-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*(6), 1270–1286.

      doi:10.1037/0022-3514.84.6.1270

Rudman, L. A., Ashmore, R. D., & Gary, M. L. (2001). "Unlearning" automatic biases: The

    malleability of implicit prejudice and stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social*

    Psychology, *81*(5), 856–868. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.81.5.856

Saucier, D. A., Miller, S. S., Martens, A. L., & O'Dea, C. J. (2017). Overt racism. In A. M.

    Czopp & A. W. Blume (Eds.), *Social issues in living color: Challenges and solutions*

    from the perspective of ethnic minority psychology: Societal and global issues., Vol. 2.

    (pp. 77–102). Praeger/ABC-CLIO.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press

Son Hing, L. S., Li, W., & Zanna, M. P. (2002). Inducing hypocrisy to reduce prejudicial

    responses among aversive racists. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *38*(1), 71–

    78. doi:10.1006/jesp.2001.1484

Zuriff, G. E. (2002). Inventing racism. *Public Interest*, *146*, 114.

Table 1
Demographic Composition of the Sample (*N*=69)[1]

Mean Age (*SD*)	19.64 (1.38)
Gender	
Male	14 (20.3%)
Female	55 (79.7%)
Race[2]	
American Indian or Alaska Native	2 (2.9%)
Asian	1 (1.4%)
Black or African American	3 (4.3%)
Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin	5 (7.2%)
White	45 (65.2%)
I prefer not to answer	1 (1.4%))
Other	1 (1.4%))
Religion	
Christian	69 (100%)
Organizational Religiousness (*SD*)	5.01 (.87)
Private Religious Practices (*SD*)	25.6 (5.15)
Intrinsic Religious Orientation (*SD*)	4.31 (.53)
Extrinsic Religious Orientation (*SD*)	2.69 (.75)
Christian Orthodoxy (*SD*)	6.74 (.64)
Intervention Importance (*SD*)	4.17 (.89)
Willingness to Attend (*SD*)	3.26 (.79)
Reasons for Positive Attitudes (*SD*)	3.24 (.59)
Reasons for Negative Attitudes (*SD*)	2.44 (.63)
Identification with All Humanity (*SD*)	32 (5.68)
Intervention Exposure	
At least 1 Class	57 (82.6%)
At least 1 other event	48 (69.6%)

[1]Figures represent numbers of participants in each category, followed by
percentages in parentheses, except where stated otherwise.
[2]Cumulative percent is higher than 100 percent because 11 participants selected multiple
categories.

Table 2

Correlations between Attitudes and Willingness ($N = 69$)

	Int. Importance	Pos. Attitude	Neg. Attitude
Positive Attitude Reasons	.43**		
Negative Attitude Reasons	-.11	-.36**	
Willingness	.52**	.50**	-.15

$* p < .05, **p < .01$

Table 3

Correlations between Religiousness, Perceptions, and Willingness ($N = 69$)

	Org. Relig.	PRP	IRO	ERO	Orthodoxy
Int. Importance	.32**	.28*	.38**	.12	.24
Willingness	.17	.18	.28*	-.11	.19

$* \, p < .05, \, **p < .01$

Table 4

Gender Differences using *t*-test for Equality of Means

	Male		Female		*t*-test	*p*
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*		
Int. Importance	3.25	0.87	4.39	0.75	4.59	<.001
Pos. Attitude	2.87	0.53	3.34	0.57	2.75	.008
IWAH	29	6.77	32.82	5.12	2.30	.025

Appendix A

Selected Racial Attitude Questions

Questions from Applied Research Center (Apollon, 2011).

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the government and American society?

1. In the United States, people who work hard generally succeed in life.

   Mark only one.

   - o   Strongly Agree

   - o   Agree

   - o   Neither Agree nor Disagree

   - o   Disagree

   - o   Strongly Disagree

2. Generally, the American legal system treats all groups with fairness.

   Mark only one.

   - o   Strongly Agree

   - o   Agree

   - o   Neither Agree nor Disagree

   - o   Disagree

   - o   Strongly Disagree

3. The American economic system creates a fair distribution of good job opportunities for all racial/ethnic groups in our society.

   Mark only one.

   - o   Strongly Agree

    o Agree

    o Neither Agree nor Disagree

    o Disagree

    o Strongly Disagree

4. In the United States, people who have not succeeded in life generally failed to work hard

    enough and/or failed to take advantage of opportunities to better themselves.

    Mark only one.

    o Strongly Agree

    o Agree

    o Neither Agree nor Disagree

    o Disagree

    o Strongly Disagree

Answer the Following:

5. In which of the following areas of society, if any, do you think racism still remains a

    significant problem?

    Check all that apply.

    o Educational system

    o Employment Housing

    o Criminal justice system

    o Health system

    o None of these

    o Other:

Questions from Racial Attitudes in America. (Pew Social Trends, 2016).

1. Do you think race relations in the United States are getting better, getting worse or staying about the same?

    Mark only one.

    o   Getting Better

    o   Getting Worse

    o   Staying about the same

    o   I don't know

2. Which of these two statements comes closer to your own views -- even if neither is exactly right.

    Mark only one.

    o   Our country has made the changes needed to give racial minorities equal rights with whites.

    o   Our country needs to continue making changes to give racial minorities equal rights with whites.

    o   Neither

    o   Both Equally

    o   I don't know

3. In your daily life, how much contact do you, personally, have with people who are a different race than you?

    Mark only one.

    o   A lot of contact

    o   Some contact

- o   Only a little contact

- o   No contact at all

- o   I don't know

4. Overall, do you think your race or ethnicity has:

Mark only one.

- o   Made it harder for you to succeed in life

- o   Made it easier for you to succeed in life

- o   Not made much difference/Neither

- o   Both

- o   I don't know

5. In general, do you think there is too much, too little, or about the right amount of

attention paid to race and racial issues in our country these days?

Mark only one.

- o   Too much attention

- o   Too little attention

- o   About the right amount

- o   I don't know

Appendix B

Short Christian Orthodoxy Scale

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

This section includes a number of statements related to specific religious beliefs. You will probably find that you agree with some of the statements, and disagree with others, to varying extents.

For all: (Strongly agree (3), Moderately agree (2), Slightly agree (1), Neutral (0), Slightly disagree (-1), Moderately disagree (-2), Strongly disagree(-3))

1. Jesus Christ was the divine Son of God.

2.* The Bible may be an important book of moral teachings, but it was no more inspired by God than were many other such books in human history.

3.* The concept of God is an old superstition that is no longer needed to explain things in the modern era.

4. Through the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, God provided a way for the forgiveness of people's sins.

5.* Despite what many people believe, there is no such thing as a God who is aware of our actions.

6. Jesus was crucified, died, and was buried but on the third day He arose from the dead.

Note: No response is scored as "O" on the (-3 to +3) response scale for each item. It is suggested that a participant's data be discarded if he/she does not answer four or more items. Data can easily be prepared for analysis by rescaling responses such that -3 = 1; -2 = 2; -1 = 3; 0 (or no response) = 4; +1 = 5; +2 = 6; and +3 = 7. The keying of all negatively worded items -

indicated above by an asterisk (*) - is reversed so that for all items a low score indicates an

unorthodox belief and a high score indicates an orthodox belief. The SCO score is then computed

for each participant by summing over the six items. Finally, it is recommended that one or two

"buffer items" be inserted before the first item above, so that participants will feel comfortable

with both the content of the survey and its format before completing the SCO scale. It is

suggested that these items be two of the original CO scale items not included in the SCO scale,

such as "God exists as: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit" and "Those who feel that God answers

prayers are just deceiving themselves" (a reversed item).

Selected Questions from the Christian Orthodoxy Scale

Note: These particular questions were chosen for two purposes. Firstly, to serve as two

"buffer items", as suggested by the author of the shortened scale, and secondly, to specifically

address orthodox beliefs about humans. The number by the items correlate to their original

numbering on the Christian Orthodoxy Scale.

2. * Man is not a special creature made in the image of God, he is simply a recent
    development in the process of animal evolution.

14. God made man of dust in His own image and breathed life into him.

Appendix C

Researcher-Created Items

How important is it to:

For 1-13: (Very Important, Fairly Important, Important, Somewhat Important, Not at all Important, I'm not sure)

1. Learn about discrimination?

2. Learn about racial stereotypes?

3. Have discussions about race and diversity led by a professor?

4. Have discussions about race and diversity led by a guest speaker?

5. Have discussions about race and diversity led by a student?

6. Have discussions about race and diversity led by an SEU staff member

7. Have discussions about race and diversity led by a spiritual leader (e.g., pastor)?

8. Have discussions about race and diversity led by people belonging to a racial minority?

9. Have discussions about race and diversity led by people belonging to a racial majority?

10. Hear about minorities' experiences with discrimination?

11. Hear about minorities' experiences racial stereotypes?

12. Raise awareness about racial stereotypes?

13. Have informal discussions about race and diversity with peers?

14. How many of your classes have discussed racial stereotypes, prejudice, discrimination, or related topics? ___

15. Which class(es) have discussed these topics? ___

16. How long was the topic discussed? ___

17. How many other events have you attended where racial issues were discussed? ___

18. If you have attended one or more events, briefly describe them. ___

Taking into consideration the kinds of events you have attended, answer the following questions:

19. How did you feel about the events after they ended? ___

20. What did you like about the events you have attended? ___

21. What did you dislike about the events you have attended? ___

Answer the following:

22. How willing would you be to attend an event discussing racial issues in the near future?

    Mark only one oval.

    o   Very Willing

    o   Fairly Willing

    o   Somewhat Willing

    o   Not at all Willing

    o   I'm not sure

23. How important are these factors for deciding whether or not to attend an event discussing racial issues?

    Mark only one oval per row.

    (Very Important, Fairly Important, Important, Somewhat Important, Not at all Important, I'm not sure)

    o   Personal importance of the issue

    o   Convenience

    o   Location

    o   Duration

    o   Time of event

    o   Type of event

    o   Advertisement

    o   Knowing about the event in advance

    o   Host of event

    o   Name of event

    o   Topic of the event

    o   A guest speaker

    o   Knowing the speaker

       o   Getting credit for attending (chapel credit, class credit)

       o   Knowing other attendees

24. What might cause you to not attend? ___

25. What do you think could be done to make these kinds of events appeal more to you? ___

26. To what extent do you think these kinds of events:

Mark only one oval per row.

(To a Great Extent, Somewhat, Very Little, Not at All, I'm not sure)

       o   Encourage people to treat each other well

       o   Are too brief or superficial to have a meaningful benefit

       o   Create situations in which you will be blamed or expected to apologize

       o   Address the possibility that people may disagree or feel offended

       o   Promote empathy for negative experiences (e.g., feeling left out)

       o   Cause people to feel tense or uncomfortable

       o   Are relevant to you or people you know

       o   Dismiss or deny your concerns or experiences

       o   Cover information you already know

       o   Create space for people to share a variety of perspectives

       o   Foster the feeling that "we are all one"

       o   Create situations in which you will be expected to support certain social or political views

       o   Prompt people to be patient and try to understand each other

       o   Help people work together as partners with shared goals

       o   Foster resolution of tension

       o   Cover information you already agree with

       o   Imply that each person must take responsibility for their own attitudes and actions

       o   Create a sense of shared, unifying identity

       o   Encourage people to forgive each other

       o   Do not encourage others to listen to what you have to say

Appendix D

Hello,

I am writing a thesis for my Honors requirement and distributing a survey as part of that

project. The survey aims to assess students' general opinions and perceptions of anti-racism

efforts. Any participation would be greatly appreciated!

Click here for the survey.

Thank you,

Marena McLeod

Appendix E

Title: Perceptions of Anti-racism Efforts

Investigator: Jeremy Cummings, Ph. D., and Marena McLeod

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to assess students' general opinions and perceptions of anti-racism efforts. You must be 18 or older to participate.

What to Expect: This research study is administered online. Participation in this research will involve completion of a questionnaire. The questionnaire will ask for students' opinions on several types of events and the importance of relevant issues and factors, as well as some information on personal religious practice and beliefs and attitudes towards social issues. You may skip any questions that you do not wish to answer. You will be expected to complete the questionnaire once. It should take you about 20 minutes to complete.

Risks: There are no risks associated with this project which are expected to be greater than those ordinarily encountered in daily life.

Benefits: There are no direct benefits to you. However, you may gain an appreciation and understanding of how research is conducted.

Compensation: You will receive one unit of course credit for your participation. You may also write a 3-page summary of a scientific research article, or complete other alternatives at your specific professor's discretion.

Your Rights and Confidentiality: Your participation in this research is voluntary. There is no penalty for refusal to participate, and you are free to withdraw you consent and participation in this project at any time.

Confidentiality: The records of this study will be kept private. Any written results will discuss group findings and will not include information that will identify you. Research records will be stored on a password protected computer in a locked office and only researchers and individuals responsible for

research oversight will have access to the records. Data will be destroyed five years after the study has been completed.

Contacts: You may contact any of the researchers at the following addresses and phone numbers, should you desire to discuss your participation in the study and/or request information about the

results of the study:

Dr. Jeremy Cummings – jpcummings@seu.edu

Marena McLeod – mlmcleod1@seu.edu

If you have questions about your rights as a research volunteer, you may contact the IRB Office IRB@seu.edu

In SONA:

If you choose to participate: Please, click NEXT if you choose to participate. By clicking NEXT, you are indicating that you freely and voluntarily and agree to participate in this study and you also acknowledge that you are at least 18 years of age.

It is recommended that you print a copy of this consent page for your records before you begin

the study by clicking below.

In Google Forms:

If you choose to participate, please continue. By continuing to answer the survey you are indicating that you freely and voluntarily agree to participate in this study, and you also acknowledge that you are at least 18 years of age. It is recommended that you print a copy of this consent page for your records before you begin the study.)