

STUDENTS' ANTICIPATIONS OF PERSONS AND  
ARGUMENTS OPPOSING INTERRACIAL DATING

by

LARRY DAVID BARNETT

A THESIS

submitted to

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the  
degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

June 1962

APPROVED:

**Redacted for Privacy**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Professor of Family Life

In Charge of Major

**Redacted for Privacy**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Head of Department of Family Life and Home  
Administration

**Redacted for Privacy**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman of School Graduate Committee

**Redacted for Privacy**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented: May 9, 1962

Typed by Almae Law

To Lester Kirkendall and Del Schalock

"Thou wert my guide, philosopher, and friend."

-- Pope, Essay on Man, IV

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction . . . . .	1
	Purposes of and Reasons for the Study . . . . .	1
	Review of the Literature in a Theoretical Framework for the Study . . . . .	3
	Design and Sample . . . . .	19
	Analysis . . . . .	24
	Limitations of the Study . . . . .	24
II.	Respondents Not Anticipating Opposition . . . . .	26
	Conclusion . . . . .	28
III.	Persons Anticipated as Opposing Interracial Dating and Their Anticipated Influence . . . . .	29
	Persons Opposing Oriental-White Dating and Their Influence . . . . .	29
	Persons Opposing Negro-White Dating and Their Influence . . . . .	38
	Conclusion . . . . .	46
IV.	Arguments Anticipated as Opposing Interracial Dating and Their Anticipated Influence . . . . .	48
	Arguments Opposing Oriental-White Dating and Their Influence . . . . .	48
	Arguments Opposing Negro-White Dating and Their Influence . . . . .	56
	Conclusion . . . . .	64
V.	Summary and Observations . . . . .	67
	Summary . . . . .	67
	Observations . . . . .	68
	Factors Discouraging Interracial Dating . . . . .	72
	A Projection . . . . .	74
	Bibliography . . . . .	77
	Appendix . . . . .	80



## LIST OF TABLES

I.	Respondents Not Anticipating Opposition to Dates with Orientals and Negroes . . . . .	26
II.	Persons Opposing the Dating of Orientals as Anticipated by Males and Females . . . . .	32
III.	The Influence of Persons Opposing the Dating of Orientals as Anticipated by Males and Females . . . . .	33
IV.	Persons Opposing the Dating of Orientals as Anticipated by Lower Division and Upper Division Students . . . . .	34
V.	The Influence of Persons Opposing the Dating of Orientals as Anticipated by Lower Division and Upper Division Students . . .	35
VI.	Persons Opposing the Dating of Orientals as Anticipated by Respondents Having Little Contact and Respondents Having Much Contact with Orientals . . . . .	36
VII.	The Influence of Persons Opposing the Dating of Orientals as Anticipated by Respondents Having Little Contact and Respondents Having Much Contact with Orientals . . . . .	37
VIII.	Persons Opposing the Dating of Negroes as Anticipated by Males and Females . . . . .	40
IX.	The Influence of Persons Opposing the Dating of Negroes as Anticipated by Males and Females . . . . .	41
X.	Persons Opposing the Dating of Negroes as Anticipated by Lower Division and Upper Division Students . . . . .	42
XI.	The Influence of Persons Opposing the Dating of Negroes as Anticipated by Lower Division and Upper Division Students . . .	43
XII.	Persons Opposing the Dating of Negroes as Anticipated by Respondents Having Little Contact and Respondents Having Much Contact with Negroes . . . . .	44

XIII.	The Influence of Persons Opposing the Dating of Negroes as Anticipated by Respondents Having Little Contact and Respondents Having Much Contact with Negroes . . . . .	45
XIV.	Arguments Opposing the Dating of Orientals as Anticipated by Males and Females . . . . .	50
XV.	The Influence of Arguments Opposing the Dating of Orientals as Anticipated by Males and Females . . . . .	51
XVI.	Arguments Opposing the Dating of Orientals as Anticipated by Lower Division and Upper Division Students . . . . .	52
XVII.	The Influence of Arguments Opposing the Dating of Orientals as Anticipated by Lower Division and Upper Division Students . . . . .	53
XVIII.	Arguments Opposing the Dating of Orientals as Anticipated by Respondents Having Little Contact and Respondents Having Much Contact with Orientals . . . . .	54
XIX.	The Influence of Arguments Opposing the Dating of Orientals as Anticipated by Respondents Having Little Contact and Respondents Having Much Contact with Orientals . . . . .	55
XX.	Arguments Opposing the Dating of Negroes as Anticipated by Males and Females . . . . .	58
XXI.	The Influence of Arguments Opposing the Dating of Negroes as Anticipated by Males and Females . . . . .	59
XXII.	Arguments Opposing the Dating of Negroes as Anticipated by Lower Division and Upper Division Students . . . . .	60
XXIII.	The Influence of Arguments Opposing the Dating of Negroes as Anticipated by Lower Division and Upper Division Students . . . . .	61
XXIV.	Arguments Opposing the Dating of Negroes as Anticipated by Respondents Having Little Contact and Respondents Having Much Contact with Negroes . . . . .	62

XXV.	The Influence of Arguments Opposing the Dating of Negroes as Anticipated by Respondents Having Little Contact and Respondents Having Much Contact with Negroes . . . . .	63
------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

# STUDENTS' ANTICIPATIONS OF PERSONS AND ARGUMENTS OPPOSING INTERRACIAL DATING

## Chapter I. Introduction

### Purposes of and Reasons for the Study

The purposes of this study are to investigate:

1) the persons who and the arguments which Caucasian young adults anticipate would most strongly oppose their engaging in interracial dates; 2) the influence which the respondents expect the persons and arguments would have on them if they were to undertake interracial dates. There are, then, two goals to the present study. The first is to distinguish the people and arguments expected by Caucasians of dating age to be most in opposition to their dating Negroes or Orientals. The second goal is to determine the influence that these people and arguments are expected to have.

There are two reasons for the study. First, there is little systematic research on interracial marriage, and most of that which is available concentrates on the conditions associated with the occurrence of such marriages, e.g., religious affiliation and class standing of the spouses. There is no research whatsoever on dating in which both persons are Americans and of different races. Thus, the present study is definitely an exploratory one.

Second, there is a great deal of attention being devoted at the present time to the race relations problem

in the United States. This attention arises concurrently with the many changes now occurring in relations between the races. Changes are especially pressing as they relate to the position of the Negro in American society, as evidenced by the "sit-ins" and public school integration, but changes have also occurred which are affecting Oriental-white relations, for example, the marriage of American soldiers to Japanese women. One of the results of these changes--some of which are in the relationships of Negro, Oriental, and white young adults to each other--will doubtless be a demand for knowledge by parents, teachers, counselors, and others of the various aspects of interracial associations among adolescents. Interracial dates, though apparently decreasing in rate,\* are one aspect of interracial relationships among young adults.

---

\*The statement that interracial dates are "apparently decreasing in rate" rests on the assumption of a direct relation between frequency of interracial marriages and frequency of interracial dates. There is a good deal of evidence suggesting that interracial marriages have decreased in rate during the twentieth century, at least prior to the 1954 federal Supreme Court decision declaring laws segregating public schools to be unconstitutional.

In Los Angeles County during the period 1924-1933, 1.2 per cent of all marriages were interracial (26, p. 699), but in the years 1948-1951, only .65 per cent were interracial marriages (4, p. 588). Decreasing rates have also been reported for Washington, D. C., during the period 1923 to 1947 (21, p. 63) and for Boston and New York during the first half of the twentieth century (36, p. 276-280).

From this evidence, one may conclude that the rate of occurrence of interracial dates is less than it was a generation or two ago.

Review of the Literature in a  
Theoretical Framework for the Study

The extent and significance of interracial associations are determined by many factors, and no one study can encompass all of them. What are these factors? So far as lessening the frequency of interracial marriages is concerned, Golden (14, p. 269) lists five interacting factors:\*

1. Segregated social structure
2. Cultural system of attitudes, beliefs, and myths
3. Laws
4. Institutional functionaries
5. Family

It should be emphasized that these factors do not work independently of one another. Rather, they are interacting. That is, an increase or a decrease in the rate of interracial marriages will be the consequence of the separate forces influencing each other in a variety of ways. For example, the existence of the segregated

---

\*This list should not be accepted as unchanging. For example, the states now having laws upholding discrimination may repeal them or find them declared unconstitutional in the future. Thus, the list may change with time.

That the list is capable of changing, furthermore, indicates that there are forces at work in the American society which are breaking down the barriers to interracial associations. For example, growing trade and economic interdependence will result in increased interaction between the races in the business world; an increased number of associations in the economic sphere may lead to an increase in the number of relationships in social-recreational activities such as dating.

social structure rests to a great extent on the cultural system of attitudes, beliefs, and myths. Further, the family members and institutional functionaries keep alive the attitudes, beliefs, and myths in order to discourage any who might be tempted to date and marry a member of the minority races.

Golden's framework has been utilized in this study in two different ways. First, the questionnaire falls within his framework. To the extent that the anticipations of the respondents are correct as to what would happen if they actually dated a member of another race, this study will suggest the importance of three of the factors in discouraging interracial dates: family members, institutional functionaries, and the cultural system of attitudes, beliefs, and myths. The persons listed in the questionnaire (see Appendix) for the respondents to evaluate will suggest the importance of institutional functionaries and family members. The arguments (see Appendix), by embodying the attitudes, beliefs, and myths which exist in the American culture, will suggest their importance.

The second way in which Golden's set of factors has been utilized is as a framework for the following review of the literature.

Segregated social structure. Such features of the social structure as segregated schools, churches, travel

facilities, etc., result in both physical and social separation between the white race, on the one hand, and the Negro and Oriental races, on the other. By discouraging such contacts between the races as may lead to marriage, Golden believes that the segregated social structure is the primary force inhibiting interracial marriages.

One aspect of segregation receiving a great deal of attention at the present time is the integration of Negroes into the public schools. The focus of this attention is on the South, since it is there that the use of segregated school facilities has been most widespread and has affected the greatest proportions of both the Negro and white populations (25, p. 52). If Golden is correct in saying that segregation is the main factor limiting the amount of interracial marriage, one development arising from increased school integration might be a rise in the rate of such marriages.

In the 1961-1962 school year, however, only 7 per cent of all Negro pupils will attend integrated public schools in the 17 Southern states and the District of Columbia. Of the 215,000 or so Negroes attending schools with whites during the 1961-1962 school year in this area, nearly 210,000 are in the District of Columbia and the six states on the fringe of the South. In other words,



there is very little public school integration in the Deep South (31, p. 46).

These figures indicate that up to this point the progress of integration in the public schools has been slow, though recent developments suggest that the rate with which integration proceeds in the future may be altered. Thus in the Fall of 1961, resistance appeared to be crumbling, as pointed out by U. S. News & World Report (23, p. 124):

"A new pattern for integration took place as public schools opened early this month [September, 1961] for their eighth school year since the U. S. Supreme Court outlawed classroom segregation.

"The pattern was one of quiet--though slow and reluctant--lowering of racial barriers in the South under federal-court pressure.

"Gone was the militant resistance of former years. There was no violence this year like that in the past."

The extent of integration in the South's colleges and universities appears to be greater than in the public schools. There is "broad integration, with all or many public institutions of higher learning open to both races" in Delaware, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, and West Virginia. However, there is only "token" integration in Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and Virginia, and there is complete segregation in Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina (25, p. 52-53).

If resistance to integration continues to crumble, the question of interracial dating will likely assume an increased importance.

That segregation exists in varying degrees is obvious, but what sustains it? Lawrence (19, p. 1) states, "Behind every social structure there is some philosophical and psychological thinking which may help to clarify the reasons for the structure's existence." The question that must be asked, therefore, is: Why does segregation exist?

Observers are generally agreed on the answer to this question. In the words of Myrdal (24, p. 606): "No excuse for...social segregation and discrimination is so potent as the one that sociable relations on an equal basis between members of the...races may possibly lead to intermarriage." Robert M. MacIver, of Columbia University, also believes that "...the main fear [of integration] is the mixed relations between the two races, especially relations that might lead to sex affairs or marriage" (20, p. 77). And Guy B. Johnson, Professor of Sociology at the University of North Carolina, thinks that "...the average Southerner feels it [fear of intermarriage] plays a very great part [in the South's opposition to integration]" (20, p. 78).

A somewhat different view is held by Preston Valien, a Negro and Professor of Sociology at Fisk University. In Dr. Valien's words:

"I would say that the fear of intermarriage, which is, I suppose, an extension of the sex fear, is used as the basis for opposition to the desegregation of schools, but I would also say that, to a great extent, this may not be the real reason but merely one that is easily understood and useful for the opposition.

"For example, the white politician may fear the consequences of a wider suffrage for Negroes, or of a better-educated Negro electorate, and a white worker may fear the competition of better-trained and educated Negroes. But it would be self-deprecatory for these reasons to be given. On the other hand, it is usually easier and more effective to make the emotional appeal of fear of intermarriage.

"And the same way with respect to the schools. The white parent may fear the loss of social prestige or of economic status from having his or her child attend a school with Negroes but would be reluctant to say this. They would rather place it on the matter of fear of intermarriage, which is an emotional reason and can be more easily understood by others than these other reasons." (20, p. 84)

Thus, the fear of interracial marriage appears to be most often expressed as the basis for maintaining the segregated social structure. The segregated structure minimizes interracial contacts between young adults and therefore reduces the chances of interracial dating which might be followed by interracial marriages.

System of attitudes, beliefs, and myths. The American culture contains attitudes, beliefs, and myths (the validity of which is irrelevant) which function to strengthen the societal prohibition against interracial dates and marriages and which, therefore, support the system of segregation. Or, as Lawrence (19, p. 1) puts

it, the "Various arguments...used to protect the 'integrity' of the [white] race..." must be distinguished.

The arguments used in the questionnaire (see Appendix) will be discussed here to give the reader knowledge of the research applying to each of the arguments. In this way, the reader will have a clearer insight into the significance of the arguments which the respondents were asked to evaluate in this study.

Reputation and status are among the variables most highly correlated with class membership (33, p. 82). Consequently, the argument, "You will lose reputation and status," leads to the assumption that the non-white person comes from a lower social class than the white person. However, evidence from research studies neither consistently supports nor refutes this assumption.

Wirth and Goldhamer (36, p. 289-292) summarize the results of a number of studies on Negro-white marriages. They report that, in most marriages, the non-white male has a higher-than-average socio-economic level, while the white male and female and the non-white female generally come from a lower-than-average standing. Thus, it appears that the white female raises her class standing, and the white male remains on the same class level, by marrying a person of a different race.

However, these findings are contradicted by those of Lynn (21, p. 47-48), who studied both Oriental-white

and Negro-white marriages in Washington, D. C., in the early 1950's. Lynn reports that nearly three out of four of the persons in her sample belonged to the same social class at the time of marriage. Thus, there was not much changing of class standing for the majority of partners in an interracial marriage.

In short, the research evidence is contradictory as to whether there is no change, a gain, or a loss in status and reputation for whites as the result of dating and marrying a member of the Negro or Oriental races.

The argument, "Dating may lead to marriage, and racially-crossed children should not be produced since such children are biologically inferior," has not been proven valid. Most researchers find either no effect or positive results. Boas (2, p. 761-763) found that the offspring of Indians and whites are more fertile and are taller than pure Indians. For example, a total of 577 Indian women had an average of 5.9 children, while 41 "half-blood" women had an average of 7.9 children. Krauss (17, p. 375-377), after six years of research on the children of mixed-racial parents, reached the following conclusions:

1. There is no increase in hereditary disturbances due to race crossing.
2. The children were neither biologically inferior nor biologically superior to either of the parental races in terms of intellectual level or physical make-up.

George Simpson and J. Milton Yinger, well-known students of minority groups, summarize these and other scientific findings (29, p. 57):

1. "Race mixture does not produce biologically or mentally inferior offspring."
2. "Race mixture tends to produce offspring which exceed their parental groups in vitality, stature, and fertility."

Apparently, then, the children of a mixed racial marriage are generally not biologically inferior, and are possibly superior, to the children of a family in which the parents are of the same race.

Assuming that intergroup breeding tends to increase the variability and vigor of the offspring, the reason offered is that "...each parent supplies dominant genes for which the other parent is recessive [and it is generally the recessive genes which produce deleterious effects]. In other words, characters or qualities which would not normally be expressed or come into being were each of the parents to breed within their own groups, are newly created when there is cross-breeding between the members of different groups" (22, p. 105).

If the argument that "God never meant the races to mix in dating or marrying; if He had, He would not have made separate races" is valid, it would be expected that all religions would prohibit interracial marriages. However, not all faiths have this prohibition. The Catholic Church (9, p. 582-583) and at least two Protestant

denominations--the Presbyterians (7, p. 13) and the Congregationalists (37, p. 63)--have declared that an interracial marriage does not violate the tenets of religion.

This leads to the question of from which religion those engaging in an interracial marriage tend to come. Two studies, one of Negro-white marriages (12, p. 183) and one of Philippine-white marriages (15, p. 226), found that members of the Protestant denominations undertake mixed racial marriages in greater numbers than Catholics. This finding of a higher frequency for Protestants than for Catholics is supported by an attitudinal survey of high school students; the responses showed that a greater proportion of Jews than of Catholics and a greater proportion of Catholics than of Protestants would not marry Negroes or Chinese (5, p. 431).

It is unfortunate that the three studies referred to in the preceding paragraph did not present the data for each of the Protestant denominations. It would then have been possible to see if there was any relationship between church approval of interracial marriage and the frequency of intermarriage of the church members.

Since it is psychological and/or interpersonal conflict that dissolves marriages, the argument, "Dating may lead to marriage, and interracial marriage will result in many personality conflicts between you and your spouse due to differences in background," leads to a discussion of



the degree of success attained by interracial marriages. Here the evidence is contradictory, possibly because it is based on marriages occurring in what may be non-comparable situations. Lynn (21, p. 75), in her study of interracial marriages in Washington, D. C., concluded that the divorce rate was not "greater-than-chance," that is, higher than the ratio of one divorce for every four marriages. Schnepf and Yui (28, p. 50), studying families in the United States which resulted from the war marriages of American soldiers to Japanese women, reported the marriages to be "highly successful and stable." On the other hand, a study of interracial marriages in Hawaii by Cheng and Yamamura (6, p. 82) found that there were 20.4 divorces per 100 marriages when the spouses were of the same race and 29.8 divorces per 100 marriages when the spouses were members of different racial groups.

In any case, these studies demonstrate that interracial marriages are not doomed to failure, as so many people believe.

Most of the arguments listed in the questionnaire were based on possible problems the white spouse would face in an interracial date and, if the dating continued to marriage, in a mixed racial family. One study of Negro-white marriages (11, p. 140-145) and another study of American-Japanese marriages (30, p. 102-105) found the



following to be the main special problems for whites in an interracial marriage:

1. Discrimination in the economic and business world. Not only may obtaining and holding a job be difficult, but career and mobility aspirations may be frustrated for both spouses. Too, securing desired housing often proves hard.
2. Social ostracism. The couple frequently finds its former friends and relatives breaking off relations with them, or strain may be introduced into the relationships. Further, the white female is often not considered respectable, especially in Negro-white marriages.

Social ostracism, of course, is a possible consequence in varying degrees in all dates and marriages in which the backgrounds of the partners are not homogamous. Thus, Blood and Nicholson (3, p. 38), in a study of cross-national dating on a university campus, found that "Loss of the privilege of dating American males is the most tangible penalty which could befall a coed." However, the researchers add that "...this penalty is rarely encountered."

If the conclusions of Drake and Cayton (11) and Strauss (30) are correct, the most serious problems of an interracial relationship are embodied in the following arguments: "Dating may lead to marriage, and you will meet discrimination before and after marriage in social activities," "Dating may lead to marriage, and you'll run into discrimination in the economic and business world," and "Dating may lead to marriage, and relations with your

in-laws and/or relatives will be a problem, both before and after marriage."

The argument, "Dating may lead to marriage, and your children will suffer from discrimination," is apparently valid. Drake and Cayton (11, p. 154-159), in studying Negro-white marriages, found that the children of such marriages are considered by the white community to be Negroes and are thus subjected to the prejudice and discrimination experienced by Negroes in general. However, the children usually make an adequate adjustment to the Negro community. Consequently, they are no more of a problem than the children of a marriage in which both parents are members of the minority race.

Laws. The existence of laws prohibiting interracial marriages in many states undoubtedly helps to create an atmosphere which discourages the occurrence of interracial dates among adolescents in those states. As of 1957, the following twenty-four states had statutes prohibiting interracial marriages: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wyoming (35, p. 110).

The trend appears to be toward abolishing such laws. Between 1951 and 1957, six states--all in the North--

rescinded their laws prohibiting interracial marriages (35, p. 112). The impetus for this movement probably stems from the 1948 decision of the California Supreme Court declaring unconstitutional the state's law prohibiting interracial marriages. The bases of the court's decision were (18, p. 90):

1. "A marriage contract is a fundamental right of free men."
2. "Marriage is the right of individuals and not of special groups."
3. "Legislative control of marriages must be based on proved peril to the parties involved or to the state."
4. "The law discriminates because of race or color."
5. "The law is not meeting a definite need."

Institutional functionaries. The people who fill the positions in a society's institutions may be influential in guiding the behavior of others. However, the importance of officials in the institutions of the American society (e.g., army officers, clergymen) in dissuading persons from dates and marriages crossing race lines has not been determined by research.

Although research is lacking, reports in news media suggest that certain institutional functionaries do make some attempt to influence interracial relationships. The following passage is an illustration from the U. S. Armed Forces in Europe:

"When a Negro soldier applies for permission [to marry a white European girl]...service personnel try to explain to both of them the facts of life that they may have to face in some of the 48 States.

"The Air Force has a regulation on the reassignment of such men. The prospective bridegroom is required to read and sign it.

"The regulation makes clear that the airman will not always be able to move with his outfit [to States prohibiting interracial marriages]... If he still wants to go ahead, his application is accepted for further consideration.

"An Air Force chaplain next sees the Negro airman and offers marriage counsel. The serviceman does not have to listen to him, but most do.

"The chaplain suggests that the prospective bride be present to hear all the facts. Usually the airman brings her to the meeting, although he is not forced to. Most of the couples, particularly the women, have a good idea of the problems involved in living in the U. S., but in most cases their minds are made up and they want to go ahead.

"The chaplain then makes his report to the commanding officer. Unless there is a special reason, such as a security consideration, the chaplain usually recommends permission for the marriage. If the commanding officer disapproves, he must send the report all the way to the top troop command in Europe for final disposition."  
(35, p. 111)

In the questionnaire used in the present study, the only institutional functionaries included for the respondents to evaluate were religious leaders. (It might be added that, in developing the list of persons to be included in the questionnaire, religious leaders were the only institutional functionaries suggested.)

Family. As noted before, relations with one's relatives constitute a special problem for those marrying a person of another race. The family members included in this study's questionnaire for the respondents to

appraise were parents, brothers and sisters, and "other relatives."

Relations with parents, especially on the part of the white spouse, may be strained at best and be completely terminated at worst. In his study of Negro-white marriages, Golden (13, p. 145) reports that he found "many instances" when the white spouse's family refused to have contact with the Negro spouse. On the other hand, the Negro family was "usually" willing to meet the white spouse.

Collins (8, p. 798) found that the white female marrying a member of a non-white race "invariably" became estranged from her parents. In "most" cases, however, there ultimately was a partial or complete reconciliation of the girl and her parents.

The relationship with parents on the part of white young adults is apparently a problem in other dating situations in which the partners are of non-homogamous backgrounds. Thus, Blood and Nicholson, in a questionnaire study of international dating at the University of Michigan, found that "A considerable minority of peers and an even larger proportion of parents are seen as likely to disapprove of this cosmopolitan experience" (3, p. 41).

The extent and influence on the younger generation of the conflict with parents over the former's interracial associations are probably attenuated by the large amount

of disorganization which apparently characterizes the families from which persons crossing race lines in marriage come. Lynn (21, p. 71) reported that, among her sample of Negro-white marriages, the partners generally were raised in broken homes. Schnepf and Yui (28, p. 50) and Strauss (30, p. 101), in studying the war marriages of American soldiers to Japanese females, found that both partners came from families with little cohesion.

In concluding the review of the literature, it should be pointed out again that there are no studies on the persons and arguments opposing the dating of American Orientals and Negroes by American Caucasians and that the present study is, therefore, an exploratory one.

### Design and Sample

The study is based upon a questionnaire (see Appendix) which is divided into three main sections: 1) personal data on the respondent (e.g., sex, year in college, type and amount of contact with the Negro and Oriental race); 2) persons and arguments opposed to the dating of Orientals; 3) persons and arguments opposed to the dating of Negroes.

The list of persons and the list of arguments were compiled by asking the students in an introductory family life class to name the persons and arguments they believed would oppose their dating a person of another race. The

researcher added to the list those not named by the students but which he thought might be important.

Each of the last two sections allowed the respondent to indicate:

1. The numerical order of the three persons who and the three arguments which would most strongly oppose his dating members of each of the two minority races;
2. The extent of influence each of the three would have on him.

The questionnaire was pre-tested with approximately a dozen students from the upper division family relationships course (F.L. 422) in order to discover ambiguities. It was necessary only to make minor changes in the questionnaire.

The sample of respondents was secured during November, 1961, primarily (83 per cent) from the introductory sociology classes, with the remainder coming from the introductory English courses, the advanced child development courses, and the introductory marriage and family living courses.

The method of selection of the respondents and distribution and collection of the questionnaires was as follows: from the Registrar's lists of persons enrolled in each of the introductory sociology classes, the researcher selected by name twenty-five to thirty each of

males and females in the four undergraduate year levels. (The non-sociology classes were utilized when the number desired could not be procured from the sociology classes.) The names were placed on a sheet of paper and, with the necessary number of questionnaires, given to the appropriate instructor. The latter distributed the questionnaires to the persons listed by the researcher. The respondents were allowed to take the questionnaires with them to complete at their convenience. The questionnaires were returned to the instructor.

The sample was limited to American Caucasians who were between 17 and 29 years of age and who were from any state in the Union save Hawaii. (Respondents from Hawaii were eliminated because there is a much greater incidence of racial intermarriage there than on the mainland (6, p. 81; 29, p. 541), and it was felt that this would affect the responses to the questionnaire.) A total of 242 questionnaires was distributed; of these, 221 or 91.3 per cent were returned and 212 or 87.6 per cent were usable. The nine questionnaires which were returned but discarded were not included in the sample for the following reasons: three of the questionnaires indicated that the respondents were over 30 years of age; three questionnaires were so inadequately answered that they could not be coded; two of the questionnaires listed Hawaii as the home state of



the respondent; one questionnaire indicated that the respondent was a Buddhist.

The 212 usable questionnaires were distributed by sex in each year level as follows:

	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
Freshmen	26	26
Sophomores	25	26
Juniors	29	28
Seniors	<u>25</u>	<u>27</u>
	105	107

There were, then, approximately equal numbers of males and females in each class level and in the total sample.

The modal and mean age of the sample was 20 years, the median age was 19.8 years, and the range was from 17 to 29 years.

Breaking the sample down by religion, it was found that 79.6 per cent were Protestants, 9.5 per cent were Catholics, 4.3 per cent were Mormons, 0.4 per cent were Jews, and 6.2 per cent indicated no affiliation.

Other characteristics of the sample included the following: Ninety-one per cent were not and had never been married. Thirty-three per cent had fathers who were college graduates, 42 per cent had fathers who were high school graduates, and 25 per cent had fathers who did not graduate from high school. Nineteen per cent were raised in cities having a population over 50,000 persons, 37 per cent in cities of 2,500 to 50,000, 39 per cent on farms,

and 5 per cent had moved to such an extent that they could not specify any one type of area.

From the above two paragraphs, the following can be said about the sample. First, it included a slightly greater proportion of Protestants, a much greater proportion of Mormons, and a much smaller proportion of Catholics and Jews than in the general population (1, p. 311). Second, for the age group with which the study dealt, the sample contained a much smaller percentage of never-married persons than in the population as a whole (16, p. 331). Third, the respondents came from higher-than-average socioeconomic homes, at least as measured by father's education (32, p. 109). Fourth, the sample came from small cities and rural areas to a much greater extent than the total population (1, p. 136-137).

In concluding this section, one further characteristic of the sample will be noted; that is the proportion of the respondents who have engaged in interracial dating. Of the total sample, twenty, or 9.4 per cent, had dated Orientals and three, or 1.4 per cent, had dated Negroes. Of the twenty respondents who had dated Orientals, thirteen were females and seven were males. Of the three respondents who had dated Negroes, two were females and one was a male.

### Analysis

The data were coded, tabulated, and will be discussed by sex, year in college, and type and amount of contact with Negroes and Orientals.

Chi-square was employed to test the level of significance of the differences among those indicating no anticipated opposition to dating a Negro or an Oriental. However, chi-square was not used for testing the differences among the respondents expecting opposition to an interracial date, since the validity of using chi-square for this is open to question.\*

### Limitations of the Study

There are three limitations to this study. First, the sample is not representative of the population as a whole; indeed, there is no assurance that the sample is representative of college students. Second, the lack of statistical analysis means that one cannot say that the results differ or do not differ significantly from that

---

\*This is for three reasons (34, p. 164-165). First, the totals of the rows and columns differ greatly from one another. Second, each respondent falls into three cells, rather than one, in each table, for three persons and three arguments were marked. Third, rather than comparing males and females, for example, male freshmen with little contact with Negroes should be compared to female freshmen with little contact with Negroes; however, such matching would have necessitated a sample size running into the thousands.

which would be expected by chance. Third, the study is of "what people say" and not of what may actually happen if they engaged in an interracial date.

## Chapter II. Respondents Not Anticipating Opposition

It was expected that some respondents would believe that they would not meet opposition to dating Orientals or Negroes. Therefore, an opportunity to indicate this was provided on the questionnaire. Thirty-three respondents did not expect to meet opposition to dating an Oriental, but only two did not anticipate encountering opposition to dating a Negro. The distribution is given in the table below.

Table I. Respondents Not Anticipating Opposition to Dates with Orientals and Negroes.

	<u>Oriental</u>	<u>Negro</u>
Males	25	2
% of male respondents	22.7%	1.8%
Females	8	0
% of female respondents	7.2%	0%
Lower Division*	17	2
% of lower division respondents	16.5%	1.9%
Upper Division*	16	0
% of upper division respondents	14.7%	0%
Little Contact**	21	2
% of respondents with little contact	17.6%	1.1%
Much Contact**	12	0
% of respondents with much contact	22.2%	0%

---

\*Lower division students are freshmen and sophomores, and upper division students are juniors and seniors.

\*\*The analysis is made by each race in terms of the amount of contact the respondent has had with the race under discussion. Consequently, persons and arguments

With one exception, all categories of respondents were significantly more likely at the 1 per cent level of significance to expect no opposition to dating an Oriental than to dating a Negro. The one exception was females. Although they anticipated no opposition to dating Orientals to a greater extent than to dating Negroes, the data could not be tested by chi-square.\*\*\*

More males than females anticipated no opposition to dating members of the minority races. For dates with Orientals, the data are significant at the 1 per cent level, but for dates with Negroes, the data could not be tested by chi-square.

Approximately equal numbers and equal proportions of lower division and upper division students expected no opposition. That is, lower or upper division standing in the University is unrelated to anticipation of no opposition to an interracial date.

---

opposing the dating of Orientals will be discussed in terms of those having little and much contact with Orientals, and the persons and arguments opposing the dating of Negroes will be discussed in terms of those having little and much contact with Negroes.

\*\*\*The total of the column or row on which the chi-square is to be computed must be equal to at least 5 for each cell in the column or row. Therefore, it was not possible to determine the level of significance for the differences in cell frequencies between Orientals and Negroes in the "Females" row, between males and females in the "Negro" column, between lower division and upper division in the "Negro" column, and between those with little contact and those with much contact in the "Negro" column.

A somewhat higher proportion of persons with much contact than persons with little contact anticipated not meeting opposition to interracial dates. However, for dates with Orientals, the data were not significant at the 5 per cent level, and for dates with Negroes, the data could not be tested by chi-square.

### Conclusion

The respondents were more likely to anticipate no opposition to dating Orientals than to dating Negroes. This was significant at the 1 per cent level.

More males expected no opposition to an interracial date than females; this finding was significant at the 1 per cent level. However, there was no significant relationship between either lower division or upper division standing in the university or amount of contact with the minority races and anticipation of no opposition.

Of 212 respondents in the study, 33 did not anticipate opposition to dating Orientals and 2 did not expect to encounter opposition to dates with Negroes.

### Chapter III. Persons Anticipated as Opposing Interracial Dating and Their Anticipated Influence

If opposition was anticipated, the respondent was asked to indicate, in numerical order, the three persons who would most oppose his or her dating an Oriental or a Negro. The respondent was then to indicate the influence each of the three persons specified would have on him.

The persons listed in the questionnaire were classified into six categories: parents, brothers and sisters, other relatives, friends, living group members, and religious leaders.

#### Persons Opposing Oriental-White Dating and Their Influence

Tables II and III present the data by sex. Approximately two-thirds of the respondents, but the females (67 per cent) in greater proportion than males (62 per cent), anticipate their parents as the persons most likely to oppose their dating an Oriental. A majority of the females selecting parents (63 per cent) attributed "very great" influence to their parents, and a plurality of the males selecting parents (42 per cent) anticipated "some" influence.



There does not appear to be any single "second-most-opposing" person who can be clearly differentiated\* for either sex, but a plurality of both males (31 per cent) and females (33 per cent) selected friends as the anticipated "third-most-opposing" person. Equal proportions (39 per cent) of the males choosing friends attributed "some" or "very little" influence to them, and a plurality of the females choosing friends (44 per cent) anticipated "some" influence.

Tables IV and V present the data by lower and upper division standing in the university. A majority of both lower division students (65 per cent) and upper division students (64 per cent) selected parents as the anticipated "first-most-opposing" person. Somewhat over half of the lower division students (56 per cent) and somewhat less than half of the upper division students (46 per cent) choosing parents believed that their parents would have a "very great" influence.

No single "second-most-opposing" person can be distinguished for upper division students. A plurality of the lower division students (27 per cent) selected friends, and nearly half of those choosing friends (46 per cent) attached "some" influence to them.

---

\*In stating that one category of persons listed in the questionnaire was "clearly" chosen more frequently than another category, a 5 per cent difference was arbitrarily selected as the minimum.

For the "third-most-opposing" person, the most frequent choice of lower division students (31 per cent) was "other relatives," and the most frequent choice of upper division students (41 per cent) was friends. A plurality of lower division students selecting "other relatives" (35 per cent) and a plurality of upper division students choosing friends (39 per cent) attributed "some" influence to their choice.

Tables VI and VII present the data by the amount of contact with Orientals. Over two-thirds of those with little contact (68 per cent) and over half of those with much contact (55 per cent) anticipated that their parents would be the most opposing persons. "Very great" influence was anticipated by approximately one-half of the respondents in both groups.

No single "second-most-opposing" person can be distinguished for those with little contact. However, those with much contact most frequently (30 per cent) selected "other relatives." Of those choosing "other relatives," a plurality (36 per cent) attached "some" influence to them.

As the "third-most-opposing" persons, the plurality of both those with little contact (30 per cent) and those with much contact (36 per cent) chose friends. Of those selecting friends, a plurality with little contact (38 per

Table II. Persons Opposing the Dating of Orientals as Anticipated by Males (N=80) and Females (N=99).

<u>Persons</u>	<u>Anticipations of Respondents</u>					
	M	F	M	F	M	F
	1		2		3	
Parents	62%	67%	14%	18%	19%	10%
Brothers and sisters	5	1	25	20	17	17
Other relatives	18	8	25	23	20	19
Friends	10	8	22	24	31	33
Living group members	4	14	8	15	9	19
Religious leaders	1	2	6	0	4	2

M = males  
F = females

1 = most opposing  
2 = second-most-opposing  
3 = third-most-opposing

Table III. The Influence of Persons Opposing the Dating of Orientals as Anticipated by Males (N=80) and Females (N=99).

<u>Persons</u>	Anticipations of Respondents									
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
	VG		S		VL		N		DK	
Parents	37%	63%	42%	25%	18%	10%	0%	0%	3%	2%
Brothers and sisters	22	25	43	53	27	13	5	3	3	6
Other relatives	25	22	35	41	32	25	6	10	2	2
Friends	12	36	39	44	39	13	6	2	4	5
Living group members	14	20	22	43	50	24	14	0	0	13
Religious leaders	37	25	50	75	0	0	13	0	0	0

M = males  
F = females

VG = very great  
S = some  
VL = very little  
N = none  
DK = don't know

Table IV. Persons Opposing the Dating of  
Orientals as Anticipated by Lower Division (N=86) and  
Upper Division (N=93) Students.

<u>Persons</u>	<u>Anticipations of Respondents</u>					
	L	U	L	U	L	U
	1		2		3	
Parents	65%	64%	16%	17%	15%	13%
Brothers and sisters	2	3	20	26	14	19
Other relatives	11	14	22	25	31	10
Friends	12	7	27	20	22	41
Living group members	6	12	13	10	14	15
Religious leaders	4	0	2	2	4	2

L = lower division students  
U = upper division students

1 = most opposing  
2 = second-most-opposing  
3 = third-most-opposing

Table V. The Influence of Persons Opposing the Dating of Orientals  
as Anticipated by Lower Division (N=86) and Upper Division (N=93) Students.

Persons	Anticipations of Respondents									
	L	U	L	U	L	U	L	U	L	U
	VG		S		VL		N		DK	
Parents	56%	46%	28%	37%	12%	16%	0%	0%	4%	1%
Brothers and sisters	23	23	54	44	20	21	0	7	3	5
Other relatives	26	20	35	41	28	30	9	7	2	2
Friends	28	24	46	39	18	29	2	5	6	3
Living group members	12	25	42	33	27	33	4	3	15	6
Religious leaders	25	50	63	50	0	0	12	0	0	0

L = lower division students  
U = upper division students

VG = very great  
S = some  
VL = very little  
N = none  
DK = don't know

Table VI. Persons Opposing the Dating of  
Orientals as Anticipated by Respondents Having Little  
Contact (N=120) and Much Contact (N=59) with Orientals.

<u>Persons</u>	<u>Anticipations of Respondents</u>					
	L	M	L	M	L	M
	1		2		3	
Parents	68%	55%	14%	20%	15%	11%
Brothers and sisters	2	5	24	19	17	17
Other relatives	11	16	20	32	21	19
Friends	11	5	24	23	30	36
Living group members	6	16	14	6	13	17
Religious leaders	2	2	4	0	4	0

L = little contact  
M = much contact

1 = most opposing  
2 = second-most-opposing  
3 = third-most-opposing

Table VII. The Influence of Persons Opposing the Dating of Orientals as Anticipated by Respondents Having Little Contact (N=120) and Much Contact (N=59) with Orientals.

<u>Persons</u>	Anticipations of Respondents									
	L	M	L	M	L	M	L	M	L	M
	VG		S		VL		N		DK	
Parents	52%	49%	35%	28%	10%	21%	0%	0%	3%	2%
Brothers and sisters	21	28	51	41	20	23	4	4	4	4
Other relatives	24	22	39	36	28	31	6	11	3	0
Friends	31	12	38	52	23	27	3	6	5	3
Living group members	18	19	50	14	29	33	3	5	0	29
Religious leaders	36	0	55	100	0	0	9	0	0	0

L = little contact

M = much contact

VG = very great

S = some

VL = very little

N = none

DK = don't know



cent) and a majority with much contact (52 per cent) anticipated "some" influence.

Persons Opposing Negro-White Dating  
and Their Influence

Tables VIII and IX present the data by sex. Parents are foreseen by approximately three-fourths of the males and females as the persons most likely to oppose their dating a Negro. Approximately eight out of ten of both sexes selecting parents anticipate "very great" influence. Females proportionally more than males, however, believed that their parents would be the most strongly opposing persons and have "very great" influence.

No single person can be distinguished for males as the "second-most-opposing," but a plurality of females (29 per cent) selected brothers and sisters. Almost two-thirds of the females selecting brothers and sisters expected "very great" influence.

The female respondents did not clearly select any one person as the "third-most-strongly opposing." However, a plurality of the males (26 per cent) chose "other relatives, and more than half selecting other relatives (59 per cent) attributed "very great" influence to them.

Tables X and XI present the data by lower and upper division standing in the university. Roughly three-fourths of both lower and upper division students chose their

parents as the persons who would most strongly oppose their dating a Negro. Of those selecting parents, approximately eight out of ten anticipated "very great" influence. The proportions of lower division students with these expectations was larger than the proportions of upper division students.

No single "second-most-opposing" persons can be distinguished. For the "third-most-opposing" person, a plurality of the lower division students (36 per cent) selected "other relatives," while a plurality of the upper division students (33 per cent) chose friends. Slightly over half of each group thought that the persons selected would exert "very great" influence on them.

Tables XII and XIII present the data by amount of contact with Negroes. Both those with little contact (78 per cent) and those with much contact (65 per cent) anticipated that their parents would be the strongest opponents of their dating members of the Negro race. About three-fourths of the respondents selecting parents anticipate "very great" influence. It should be noted that the respondents with little contact selected parents and "very great" influence in larger proportions than the respondents with much contact.

A plurality (32 per cent) of those with little contact believed that their brothers and sisters would be the single "second-most-opposing" persons. Nearly two-thirds

Table VIII. Persons Opposing the Dating of Negroes as Anticipated by Males (N=103) and Females (N=107).

<u>Persons</u>	<u>Anticipations of Respondents</u>					
	M	F	M	F	M	F
	1		2		3	
Parents	74%	79%	12%	13%	8%	6%
Brothers and sisters	3	0	32	29	16	13
Other relatives	9	7	17	13	31	29
Friends	9	5	31	24	26	29
Living group members	4	10	6	18	14	21
Religious leaders	0	0	2	3	5	2

M = males  
F = females

1 = most opposing  
2 = second-most-opposing  
3 = third-most-opposing

Table IX. The Influence of Persons Opposing the Dating of Negroes as Anticipated by Males (N=103) and Females (N=107).

Persons	Anticipations of Respondents									
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
	VG		S		VL		N		DK	
Parents	77%	81%	19%	15%	2%	3%	1%	0%	1%	1%
Brothers and sisters	60	63	30	32	6	5	4	0	0	0
Other relatives	59	47	23	31	11	14	7	4	0	4
Friends	54	65	32	32	8	3	6	0	0	0
Living group members	46	50	29	31	8	15	17	2	0	2
Religious leaders	58	80	14	0	14	20	14	0	0	0

M = males  
F = females

VG = very great  
S = some  
VL = very little  
N = none  
DK = don't know

Table X. Persons Opposing the Dating of  
Negroes as Anticipated by Lower Division (N=101) and  
Upper Division (N=109) Students.

<u>Persons</u>	<u>Anticipations of Respondents</u>					
	L	U	L	U	L	U
	1		2		3	
Parents	81%	72%	9%	16%	7%	7%
Brothers and sisters	1	2	32	28	13	16
Other relatives	7	9	12	18	36	24
Friends	7	7	30	25	22	33
Living group members	4	10	15	10	18	17
Religious leaders	0	0	2	3	4	3

L = lower division students  
U = upper division students

1 = most opposing  
2 = second-most-opposing  
3 = third-most-opposing

Table XI. The Influence of Persons Opposing the Dating of Negroes  
as Anticipated by Lower Division (N=101) and Upper Division (N=109) Students.

Persons	Anticipations of Respondents									
	L	U	L	U	L	U	L	U	L	U
	VG		S		VL		N		DK	
Parents	82%	77%	13%	20%	2%	3%	1%	0%	2%	0%
Brothers and sisters	60	63	38	25	2	8	0	4	0	0
Other relatives	58	49	24	30	9	15	7	4	2	2
Friends	62	55	32	32	4	8	2	5	0	0
Living group members	58	41	27	33	6	18	6	8	3	0
Religious leaders	50	83	17	0	17	17	17	0	0	0

L = lower division students

U = upper division students

VG = very great

S = some

VL = very little

N = none

DK = don't know

Table XII. Persons Opposing the Dating of Negroes  
as Anticipated by Respondents Having Little Contact (N=187)  
and Much Contact (N=23) with Negroes.

Persons	Anticipations of Respondents					
	L	M	L	M	L	M
	1		2		3	
Parents	78%	65%	12%	18%	6%	9%
Brothers and sisters	2	0	32	18	14	19
Other relatives	8	0	16	9	31	24
Friends	6	20	25	41	28	24
Living group members	6	15	13	9	17	24
Religious leaders	0	0	2	5	4	0

L = little contact

M = much contact

1 = most opposing

2 = second-most-opposing

3 = third-most-opposing

Table XIII. The Influence of Persons Opposing the Dating of Negroes as Anticipated by Respondents Having Little Contact (N=187) and Much Contact (N=23) with Negroes.

Persons	Anticipations of Respondents									
	L	M	L	M	L	M	L	M	L	M
	VG		S		VL		N		DK	
Parents	80%	74%	17%	21%	2%	5%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Brothers and sisters	62	50	32	25	5	12	1	12	0	0
Other relatives	54	43	26	43	12	14	6	0	2	0
Friends	60	50	32	33	6	6	2	11	0	0
Living group members	52	30	34	10	8	40	6	10	0	10
Religious leaders	64	100	9	0	18	0	9	0	0	0

L = little contact

M = much contact

VG = very great

S = some

VL = very little

N = none

DK = don't know



of those selecting brothers and sisters attached "very great" influence to them. A plurality of those with much contact (41 per cent) chose friends, and one-half of those choosing friends anticipated "very great" influence.

No single "third-most-opposing" persons can be clearly distinguished for either group of respondents.

### Conclusion

In concluding the chapter, some general observations may be drawn from the data.

First, the respondents were less inclined to anticipate opposition from persons to dating Orientals than to dating Negroes. When anticipating opposition, the respondents expected to be less influenced when the hypothetical date was with an Oriental. The support for the foregoing statements can be found by comparing the tables on Orientals and on Negroes in which equivalent data from the respondents have been assembled. The following comparisons will reveal these data: Table II with Table VIII, III with IX, IV with X, V with XI, VI with XII, and VII with XIII. For example, parents were anticipated by 62 per cent of the males and 67 per cent of the females as being the strongest opponents of their dating an Oriental (Table II). On the other hand, parents were expected by 74 per cent of the males and 79 per cent of the females to be the strongest opponents to dating a Negro (Table VIII).

Second, fewer males than females, fewer upper division students than lower division students, and fewer respondents with much contact than respondents with little contact, anticipated opposition from persons to dating members of the minority racial groups. When opposition was foreseen, males anticipated being less influenced than females, upper division students anticipated being less influenced than lower division students, and those with much contact anticipated being less influenced than those with little contact.

Third, parents were seen by the respondents as being the strongest opponents of an interracial date. There was no consistent choice of a second- and third-most-strongly opposing person.

Fourth, the respondents almost always indicated that the persons most opposing their dating a member of the Oriental or Negro races would have either "very great" or "some" influence upon them.

Chapter IV. Arguments Anticipated as Opposing Interracial  
Dating and Their Anticipated Influence

Arguments Opposing Oriental-White Dating  
and Their Influence

Tables XIV and XV present the data by sex. Nearly half of the males (47 per cent) and exactly three-fifths of the females expected the argument, "Dating may lead to marriage, and your children will suffer from discrimination," to be advanced most strongly. Slightly over half of the males (53 per cent) and approximately three-fourths of the females (74 per cent) selecting this argument anticipated "very great" influence.

A single "second-most-strongly advanced" argument cannot be clearly distinguished" for the males. A plurality of the females (26 per cent) selected the argument, "Dating may lead to marriage, and interracial marriage will result in many personality conflicts between you and your spouse due to differences in background." The females selecting this argument expected either "very great" (43 per cent) or "some" influence (47 per cent).

For both sexes, it is not possible to find a clear distinction between the arguments for the "third-most-

---

\*In stating that one category of arguments listed in the questionnaire was "clearly" chosen more frequently than another category, a 5 per cent difference was arbitrarily selected as the minimum.

strongly advanced" argument.

Tables XVI and XVII present the data by lower and upper division standing in the university. Slightly over half of the lower division and upper division students, though the latter to a greater extent than the former, expected that the argument, "Dating may lead to marriage, and your children will suffer from discrimination," would be the one most strongly advanced. The majority of the lower division students (59 per cent) and upper division students (69 per cent) selecting this argument expected it to have "very great" influence.

As to the "second-most-strongly advanced" argument, a plurality of lower division students (27 per cent) selected the "personality conflict" argument. The majority (54 per cent) selecting this argument believed that it would have "some" influence. A plurality of upper division students (24 per cent) chose the "child discrimination" argument.

No single argument can be distinguished among lower division or upper division students as the "third-most-strongly advanced" argument in opposing the dating of Orientals.

Tables XVIII and XIX present the data by amount of contact. The "child discrimination" argument was selected by somewhat over half of the respondents in both the categories of little and much contact with Orientals as

Table XIV. Arguments Opposing the Dating of Orientals as Anticipated by Males (N=80) and Females (N=99).

<u>Arguments</u>	<u>Anticipations of Respondents</u>					
	M	F	M	F	M	F
	1		2		3	
Loss of status	23%	10%	5%	12%	8%	6%
Social discrimination	13	10	26	14	23	22
Inferior children	0	0	4	3	0	5
Against religion	1	2	0	1	3	0
Personality conflict	6	10	15	26	6	14
Child discrimination	47	60	25	18	15	9
Relatives	6	5	13	14	20	24
Economic discrimination	4	3	12	12	25	20

M = males

F = females

1 = most opposing

2 = second-most-opposing

3 = third-most-opposing

Table XV. The Influence of Arguments Opposing the Dating of Orientals as Anticipated by Males (N=80) and Females (N=99).

<u>Arguments</u>	Anticipations of Respondents									
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
	VG		S		VL		N		DK	
Loss of status	43%	43%	47%	43%	10%	6%	0%	4%	0%	4%
Social discrimination	31	47	37	34	22	12	8	5	2	2
Inferior children	33	72	34	14	0	0	0	14	33	0
Against religion	33	50	67	25	0	0	0	25	0	0
Personality conflict	24	43	57	47	15	2	0	2	4	6
Child discrimination	53	74	31	16	12	8	1	1	3	1
Relatives	30	45	52	38	9	8	3	3	6	6
Economic discrimination	22	28	53	63	13	3	6	6	6	0

M = males  
F = females

VG = very great  
S = some  
VL = very little  
N = none  
DK = don't know

Table XVI. Arguments Opposing the Dating of  
Orientals as Anticipated by Lower Division (N=86)  
and Upper Division (N=93) Students.

<u>Arguments</u>	<u>Anticipations of Respondents</u>					
	L	U	L	U	L	U
	1		2		3	
Loss of status	12%	19%	7%	10%	10%	4%
Social discrimination	10	11	22	18	19	25
Inferior children	0	0	5	2	5	0
Against religion	2	1	1	0	4	0
Personality conflict	11	8	27	16	9	12
Child discrimination	51	56	19	24	15	10
Relatives	10	2	6	20	17	26
Economic discrimination	4	3	13	10	21	23

L = lower division students  
U = upper division students

1 = most opposing  
2 = second-most-opposing  
3 = third-most-opposing

Table XVII. The Influence of Arguments Opposing the Dating of Orientals as Anticipated by Lower Division (N=86) and Upper Division (N=93) Students.

<u>Arguments</u>	Anticipations of Respondents									
	L	U	L	U	L	U	L	U	L	U
	VG		S		VL		N		DK	
Loss of status	46%	41%	42%	47%	8%	9%	0%	3%	4%	0%
Social discrimination	34	42	39	32	17	18	7	6	3	2
Inferior children	75	0	12	50	0	0	12	0	0	50
Against religion	50	0	50	0	0	0	0	100	0	0
Personality conflict	38	36	54	46	0	12	0	3	8	3
Child discrimination	59	69	24	22	14	6	0	2	3	1
Relatives	41	38	44	44	4	12	4	2	7	4
Economic discrimination	10	38	70	47	10	6	3	9	7	0

L = lower division students  
U = upper division students

VG = very great  
S = some  
VL = very little  
N = none  
DK = don't know



Table XVIII. Arguments Opposing the Dating of Orientals as Anticipated by Respondents Having Little Contact (N=120) and Much Contact (N=59) with Orientals.

<u>Arguments</u>	<u>Anticipations of Respondents</u>					
	L	M	L	M	L	M
	1		2		3	
Loss of status	13%	21%	10%	8%	8%	5%
Social discrimination	12	7	19	21	19	28
Inferior children	0	0	2	6	2	4
Against religion	3	0	1	0	3	0
Personality conflict	8	11	22	19	10	11
Child discrimination	55	52	20	26	13	9
Relatives	6	5	13	13	24	18
Economic discrimination	3	4	13	7	21	25

L = little contact

M = much contact

1 = most opposing

2 = second-most-opposing

3 = third-most-opposing

Table XIX. The Influence of Arguments Opposing the Dating of Orientals as Anticipated by Respondents Having Little Contact (N=120) and Much Contact (N=59) with Orientals.

<u>Arguments</u>	Anticipations of Respondents									
	L VG	M	L S	M	L VL	M	L N	M	L DK	M
Loss of status	46%	37%	40%	53%	8%	10%	3%	0%	3%	0%
Social discrimination	48	19	33	39	12	29	5	10	2	3
Inferior children	80	40	0	40	0	0	0	20	20	0
Against religion	43	0	43	0	0	0	14	0	0	0
Personality conflict	38	36	48	54	6	5	2	0	6	5
Child discrimination	65	63	22	25	10	8	1	2	2	2
Relatives	38	40	42	50	10	5	4	0	6	5
Economic discrimination	29	15	56	63	7	11	4	11	4	0

L = little contact

M = much contact

VG = very great

S = some

VL = very little

N = none

DK = don't know

the one argument they anticipated would be advanced most strongly in opposing their dating an Oriental. About two-thirds of the respondents in both groups believed the argument would be of "very great" influence. Approximately equal proportions of those with little contact and those with much contact had these expectations.

As to the "second- and third-most-strongly advanced" arguments, none can be clearly distinguished for those with little and much contact with Orientals.

Arguments Opposing Negro-White Dating  
and Their Influence

Tables XX and XXI present the data by sex. The "child discrimination" argument is selected by a plurality of the males (42 per cent) and a majority of the females (60 per cent) as the argument that they expected would be advanced most strongly in opposing their dating a Negro. Almost nine out of ten males and females selecting this argument believe it would have a "very great" influence on them, but there is a slightly higher proportion of females anticipating this than males.

No "second-most-strongly advanced" argument can readily be distinguished for either sex.

A plurality of both sexes (nearly one-third) anticipated that the "third-most-strongly advanced" argument would be that "Dating may lead to marriage, and you'll run

into discrimination in the economic and business world." Approximately two-thirds of the males and females selecting this argument anticipated "very great" influence.

Tables XXII and XXIII present the data by lower and upper division standing in the university. Almost half of the lower division students (49 per cent) and slightly over half of the upper division students (55 per cent) believed that the "child discrimination" argument would be the one most strongly advanced in opposing their dating a Negro. Almost nine out of ten in both groups believed that this argument would be of "very great" influence on them.

A single "second-most-strongly advanced" argument cannot be distinguished for the upper division students. However, a plurality of the lower division students (23 per cent) selected the "child discrimination" argument.

For the lower division students, no one "third-most-strongly advanced" argument may be clearly distinguished. However, a plurality of the upper division students (38 per cent) chose the "economic discrimination" argument, and a majority of those selecting the argument (64 per cent) felt that it would have "very great" influence.

Tables XXIV and XXV present the data by amount of contact with Negroes. Half of the respondents with little contact and seven-tenths of those having much contact

Table XX. Arguments Opposing the Dating of Negroes as Anticipated by Males (N=103) and Females (N=107).

Arguments	Anticipations of Respondents					
	M	F	M	F	M	F
	1		2		3	
Loss of status	34%	20%	6%	15%	6%	8%
Social discrimination	9	4	21	16	25	21
Inferior children	1	0	2	3	1	0
Against religion	2	3	0	0	4	1
Personality conflict	2	7	12	10	4	14
Child discrimination	42	60	22	22	13	9
Relatives	8	3	18	19	16	17
Economic discrimination	2	3	19	15	31	30

M = males  
F = females

1 = most opposing  
2 = second-most-opposing  
3 = third-most-opposing

Table XXI. The Influence of Arguments Opposing the Dating of Negroes as Anticipated by Males (N=103) and Females (N=107).

<u>Arguments</u>	Anticipations of Respondents									
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
	VG		S		VL		N		DK	
Loss of status	82%	77%	11%	14%	2%	5%	0%	2%	5%	2%
Social discrimination	63	72	25	28	8	0	4	0	0	0
Inferior children	75	100	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0
Against religion	33	75	33	0	0	0	33	25	0	0
Personality conflict	44	55	50	39	6	0	0	3	0	3
Child discrimination	86	89	11	9	1	1	1	1	1	0
Relatives	58	65	40	30	2	2	0	2	0	0
Economic discrimination	67	61	27	31	4	6	2	2	0	0

M = males  
F = females

VG = very great  
S = some  
VL = very little  
N = none  
DK = don't know

Table XXII. Arguments Opposing the Dating of  
Negroes as Anticipated by Lower Division (N=101) and  
Upper Division (N=109) Students.

<u>Arguments</u>	<u>Anticipations of Respondents</u>					
	L	U	L	U	L	U
	1		2		3	
Loss of status	28%	26%	9%	12%	10%	5%
Social discrimination	8	5	17	20	20	25
Inferior children	1	0	5	0	1	0
Against religion	4	1	0	0	3	2
Personality conflict	5	4	14	8	14	5
Child discrimination	49	55	23	22	12	10
Relatives	3	6	15	22	20	15
Economic discrimination	2	3	17	16	20	38

L = lower division students

U = upper division students

1 = most opposing

2 = second-most-opposing

3 = third-most-opposing

Table XXIII. The Influence of Arguments Opposing the Dating of Negroes as Anticipated by Lower Division (N=101) and Upper Division (N=109) Students.

<u>Arguments</u>	Anticipations of Respondents									
	L	U	L	U	L	U	L	U	L	U
	VG		S		VL		N		DK	
Loss of status	75%	85%	14%	11%	7%	0%	0%	2%	4%	2%
Social discrimination	56	75	37	19	5	4	2	2	0	0
Inferior children	86	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0
Against religion	71	0	29	0	0	0	0	100	0	0
Personality conflict	54	47	43	41	0	6	0	6	3	0
Child discrimination	87	88	9	10	3	0	0	2	1	0
Relatives	66	58	34	36	0	4	0	2	0	0
Economic discrimination	65	64	27	29	5	5	3	2	0	0

L = lower division students  
U = upper division students

VG = very great  
S = some  
VL = very little  
N = none  
DK = don't know



Table XXIV. Arguments Opposing the Dating of Negroes as Anticipated by Respondents Having Little Contact (N=187) and Much Contact (N=23) with Negroes.

<u>Arguments</u>	<u>Anticipations of Respondents</u>					
	L	M	L	M	L	M
	1		2		3	
Loss of status	28%	15%	9%	23%	6%	14%
Social discrimination	6	5	20	9	22	33
Inferior children	1	0	3	0	1	0
Against religion	3	0	0	0	2	5
Personality conflict	5	0	10	18	10	0
Child discrimination	50	70	22	18	11	5
Relatives	4	10	20	9	17	19
Economic discrimination	3	0	16	23	31	24

L = little contact

M = much contact

1 = most opposing

2 = second-most-opposing

3 = third-most-opposing

Table XXV. The Influence of Arguments Opposing the Dating of Negroes as Anticipated by Respondents Having Little Contact (N=187) and Much Contact (N=23) with Negroes.

<u>Arguments</u>	Anticipations of Respondents									
	L	M	L	M	L	M	L	M	L	M
	VG		S		VL		N		DK	
Loss of status	81%	73%	13%	9%	1%	18%	1%	0%	4%	0%
Social discrimination	68	60	26	30	4	10	2	0	0	0
Inferior children	86	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0
Against religion	56	0	22	0	0	0	22	100	0	0
Personality conflict	52	50	44	25	2	0	2	0	0	25
Child discrimination	86	100	11	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Relatives	61	63	35	37	3	0	1	0	0	0
Economic discrimination	63	70	29	30	6	0	2	0	0	0

L = little contact  
M = much contact

VG = very great  
S = some  
VL = very little  
N = none  
DK = don't know

with Negroes chose the "child discrimination" argument as the one they anticipated would be advanced most strongly. Almost nine-tenths (86 per cent) of the former and all of the latter selecting this argument attached "very great" influence to it.

No single argument can be distinguished for the "second-most-strongly advanced" among either group of respondents.

A plurality of persons with little contact (31 per cent) anticipated that the "economic discrimination" argument would be the "third-most-strongly advanced" in opposing their dating Negroes. The majority (63 per cent) selecting this argument felt that its influence would be "very great." A plurality of those with much contact (33 per cent) selected the "social discrimination" argument, and a majority (60 per cent) selecting this argument expected that it would have "very great" influence.

### Conclusion

A number of general observations will conclude the chapter.

First, all of the respondents anticipated being less influenced by arguments opposing the dating of Orientals than of arguments opposing the dating of Negroes. However, the proportions expecting arguments to be advanced in opposition to dating Orientals and to dating Negroes were

approximately equal. The support for the foregoing statements is found by comparing the tables on Orientals and on Negroes in which equivalent data from the respondents have been assembled. Compare Table XIV with Table XX, XV with XXI, XVI with XXII, XVII with XXIII, XVIII with XXIV, and XIX with XXV. For example, "very great" influence was attributed to the "child discrimination" argument by 53 per cent of the males and 74 per cent of the females when the date was with an Oriental (Table XV). However, when the date was with a Negro 86 per cent of the males and 89 per cent of the females believed the argument would be of "very great" influence (Table XXI).

Second, fewer males than females and fewer lower division students than upper division students anticipated opposition to dating members of the other racial groups. When opposition was expected, males anticipated being less influenced than females and lower division students anticipated being less influenced than upper division students. There was no consistent relationship between anticipation of arguments opposing an interracial date and amount of contact.

Third, the respondents consistently selected the argument, "Dating may lead to marriage, and your children will suffer from discrimination," as the one they anticipated would be advanced most strongly.

Fourth, the respondents usually indicated that the arguments most opposing their dating a member of the Oriental or Negro races would have a "very great" influence upon them.

## Chapter V. Summary and Observations

### Summary

The conclusions drawn from the data in the previous three chapters may be summarized as follows:

1. Parents were expected to be the strongest opponents of the respondents' interracial dating.
2. The argument, "Dating may lead to marriage, and your children will suffer from discrimination," was believed by the respondents to be the one that would be advanced most strongly in opposition to their interracial dating.
3. The respondents did not consistently agree on the persons who and arguments which would be the second- and third-strongest in opposing interracial dating by the respondents.
4. The respondents felt that the persons and arguments most opposed to their dating an Oriental or a Negro would have either "very great" or "some" influence upon them, though mainly the former.
5. The anticipation of opposition was less to dating Orientals than to dating Negroes.
6. When opposition was anticipated, the respondents expected to be less influenced by it if the

hypothetical date was with an Oriental than if the date was with a Negro.

7. Proportionally fewer males than females anticipated opposition to dating members of the two minority races, and males expected to be less influenced than the females by the anticipated opposition.
8. The respondents' anticipations of opposition or influence by the various persons and arguments was not consistently related to lower or upper division standing in the university or the amount of contact they had had with Orientals or Negroes.

### Observations

From these conclusions, a number of observations can be made. Certain of these observations are in the nature of speculation. However, being speculative, they offer ideas for further research.

The writer does not consider the selection of parents as the persons anticipated to be the most opposing to an interracial date as a particularly surprising finding. Parents are the persons most emotionally involved with the young adults, having had the longest period of time to establish a pattern of emotional interdependence with them. As a result, parents are logically the most

concerned that the young adults marry members of their own race.

This is not to say that the finding is unimportant. It is important, for it identifies parents as the persons anticipated as most opposing, and most influential in opposing, an interracial date.

Moreover, there is evidence that parents might be even more influential had the study involved younger subjects who were living at home. (Virtually all of this study's respondents were living away from home.) Dow, in her study of 50 college men and 50 college women, found that her "...data suggest, but do not prove, that leaving home to enter college aids in the process of emancipation" (10, p. 63). Thus, one might predict that, if the same questionnaire used in this study was administered to high school students living at home, even larger proportions of the respondents would anticipate their parents as having a "very great" influence in opposing an interracial date.

From the point of view of the writer, the most noteworthy finding of this study is that the "child discrimination" argument was anticipated as the one that would be advanced most strongly in opposition to interracial dating by Caucasians. In light of this choice, it should be recalled from Chapter I that, although the children of an interracial marriage suffer from discrimination as members of a minority racial group, they do not constitute a special



problem in the marriage. This is because the offspring make an adequate adjustment to the non-white community. They have, therefore, the same problems as other non-white children (11, p. 154-159).

On the basis of these facts, the writer suggests that, in choosing the "child discrimination" argument, the respondents had in essence selected the argument that "Dating may lead to marriage, and your children will be members of a minority racial group."

It was also pointed out in Chapter I that the main problems which would face whites undertaking an interracial marriage were social ostracism and discrimination in the economic and business world (11, p. 140-145; 30, p. 102-105). Thus, the actual problems of an interracial relationship are embodied in the "social discrimination," "relatives," and "economic discrimination" arguments. Yet these arguments were not consistently expected to be even the second- or third-most opposing arguments. On the other hand, the "child discrimination" argument--which, according to the authorities cited, does not represent the most serious problem in an interracial marriage--was consistently expected to be the most strongly advanced argument. Why? The writer suggests that this argument is expected to be advanced most strongly because of the social-cultural emphasis on giving a better "start" in life to one's children than one had for oneself. If a white intermarries

and has children, the offspring, being considered by the white community to be members of the minority races, have "taken a step backward." The respondents did not, then, expect arguments to be advanced on the basis of the problems which they would face in an interracial relationship. Rather, the expectation was based on the idea that a person should give his or her children a better "start" in life than he or she had.

Just as interesting as the persons and arguments most often selected are the persons and arguments selected least often by the respondents. Religious leaders were the least-chosen persons. "Dating may lead to marriage, and racially-crossed children should not be produced since such children are biologically inferior," and "God never meant the races to mix in dating and marrying; if He had, He would not have made separate races," were the least-chosen arguments.

The respondents were instructed to specify the three persons who and the three arguments which would most strongly oppose their dating a member of the Negro or Oriental races. Under this arrangement for making responses, religious leaders, the "inferior children" argument, and the "against religion" argument did not appear among the three most opposing persons or arguments.

Why?

As brought out in Chapter I, the argument is fallacious that the children of an interracial marriage are biologically inferior to children of same-race parents (2, p. 761-763; 17, p. 375-377; 29, p. 57). The writer suggests that the respondents are aware of the fact that the "inferior children" argument is invalid. As a result of this awareness, they did not anticipate that the argument would be advanced very strongly.

The writer further suggests that the respondents did not anticipate religious leaders and the "against religion" argument to be strongly opposed to an interracial date because, in reality, religion is only a minor force affecting dating behavior. That is, the religious factor was not anticipated because the respondents realized it would not be very strong, if it occurred at all. (In addition, the reader will recall from Chapter I that some religious denominations do not oppose interracial marriage (7, p. 13; 9, p. 582-583; 37, p. 63).)

#### Factors Discouraging Interracial Dating

The results of this study help to suggest the factors which are operating to discourage interracial dates. An outline of these factors will be attempted in this section.

In Chapter I, the set of factors listed by Golden (14, p. 269) which discourage interracial marriages was

presented: segregated social structure; cultural system of attitudes, beliefs, and myths; laws; institutional functionaries; family. The persons in the questionnaire represented the institutional functionaries and family members, and the arguments represented the cultural factor. The results of the study suggest that institutional functionaries are not of much importance. (It should be noted that only one institutional functionary--religious leaders--was listed in the questionnaire. However, in compiling the list of persons to be included in the questionnaire, the only institutional functionary suggested was religious leaders.) Members of the nuclear family, especially parents, appear to be very important in discouraging interracial dating by their young adult sons and daughters. The most potent cultural factor is the discrimination directed at the children of an interracial marriage.

From these findings, the writer would like to modify Golden's list and propose the following four interacting factors or agents through which interracial dates are discouraged:

1. Segregated social structure. By keeping the races apart, the segregated social structure prevents contacts which may possibly lead to interracial dates.
2. Discrimination against the children of an interracial marriage. The fear of the consequences for their children if they marry a Negro or an Oriental cause white young adults to shy away from dates which may lead to an interracial marriage.

3. Laws. The legal prohibition of interracial marriage in many states undoubtedly helps to create an atmosphere which discourages the occurrence of interracial dates among adolescents in those states.
4. Parents. Because of the emotional attachment of adolescents to their families, parents are able to exert much influence on the dating behavior of young adults.

At the basis of these factors is the prejudice which exists in the American society against Negroes and Orientals. If such prejudice did not exist, there would be only voluntary segregation and thus probably less segregation. Further, the children of an interracial marriage would not suffer from discrimination based on their parents being members of different races. Without such prejudice, laws prohibiting interracial marriages would not exist, and parents would use their influence to guide their adolescents' dating relationships to people with desirable personality attributes rather than desirable racial characteristics.

In brief, interracial dating is opposed because of the prejudice which exists in the American society against the Negro and Oriental. If interracial dates are to increase in number and rate, this prejudice must be decreased or eliminated.

#### A Projection

Predictions about what the future holds are always precarious when one is dealing with human behavior. In

Chapter I, it was pointed out that interracial marriages seem to have decreased in rate during the first half of the twentieth century (4, p. 588; 21, p. 63; 26, p. 699; 36, p. 276-280). The future of the rate of racial inter-marriage is of sufficient importance to social scientists and the general public to attempt a prediction.\*

It is the opinion of this writer that the rate of interracial marriage will decrease for the next fifteen to twenty-five years and then will increase. The increase will take place gradually over a period of centuries, the final outcome being that the United States will not have physically distinguishable minority races.

The prediction is based on three assumptions. First, the integration presently occurring will create hostility between the races, leading to further decrease in the rate of intermarriage. Hostility will arise because the integration is "forced," e.g., by court order, rather than voluntary on the part of the majority of whites. The second assumption is that integration will take up to a quarter-century. Third, once members of the three races are living physically near each other without hostility, relationships will come to be based on personality attributes rather than

---

\*In the late 1940's and early 1950's, approximately one-half of one per cent of all marriages were interracial (4, p. 588; 21, p. 21; 27, p. 93).

on physical characteristics. Intermarriage will then begin to occur on an ever-increasing scale.

In conclusion, it should be reiterated that this study is the first to be done on any aspect of interracial dating between Americans. If interracial dates become more prevalent in the future, as this writer has predicted, such relationships will be increasingly important to parents, teachers, and counselors and will lead to a demand for knowledge on the subject. It is the writer's opinion, therefore, that this study is the predecessor of many others on interracial dating.

## Bibliography

1. Bergel, Egon E. Urban sociology. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1955. 558 p.
2. Boas, Franz. The half-blood Indian: An anthropometric study. Popular Science Monthly 45:761-770. 1894.
3. Blood, Robert O., Jr. and Samuel O. Nicholson. Attitudes toward international dating. Marriage and Family Living 24:35-41. 1962.
4. Burma, John H. Research note on the measurement of interracial marriage. American Journal of Sociology 57:587-589. 1952.
5. Cantril, Hadley (ed.) Public opinion, 1935-1946. Princeton, Princeton University, 1951. 1191 p.
6. Cheng, C. K. and Douglas S. Yamamura. Interracial marriage and divorce in Hawaii. Social Forces 36: 77-84. 1957.
7. Church group accepts inter-racial marriage. Oregon Journal (Portland, Oregon) p. 13, col. 5-6. Feb. 8, 1960.
8. Collins, Sidney F. The social position of white and "half-caste" women in colored groupings in Britain. American Sociological Review 16:796-802. 1951.
9. Doherty, Joseph F. Moral problems of interracial marriage. Commonweal 52:582-583. Sept. 22, 1950.
10. Dow, Evangalyn Ropp. Changes in the parent-adolescent relationships as perceived by one hundred college students. Master's paper. Corvallis, Oregon State University, 1962. 74 p.
11. Drake, St. Clair and Horace R. Cayton. Black metropolis. New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1945. 809 p.
12. Golden, Joseph. Characteristics of the Negro-white intermarried in Philadelphia. American Sociological Review 18:177-183. 1953.
13. Golden, Joseph. Patterns of Negro-white intermarriage. American Sociological Review 19:144-147. 1954.



14. Golden, Joseph. Social control of Negro-white intermarriage. *Social Forces* 36:267-269. 1958.
15. Hunt, Chester L. and Richard W. Collier. Intermarriage and cultural change: A study of Philippine-American marriages. *Social Forces* 35:223-230. 1957.
16. Information please almanac. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1960. 895 p.
17. Krauss, William W. Race crossing in Hawaii. *Journal of Heredity* 32:371-378. 1941.
18. Landis, Judson T. and Mary G. Landis. Mixed marriages--research findings. In: Evelyn M. Duvall's and Sylvanus M. Duvall's Sex ways--in fact and faith. New York, Association, 1961. pp. 84-92.
19. Lawrence, Richard. Interracial marriage in the United States: A provocative survey of the literature. Chicago, 1961. 28 p. (Mimeographed)
20. Leading sociologists discuss sex fears and integration. *U. S. News & World Report* 45:77-90. Sept. 19, 1958.
21. Lynn, Sister Annella. Interracial marriages in Washington, D. C. Washington, Catholic University of America, 1953. 117 p.
22. Montagu, M. F. Ashley. Man's most dangerous myth: The fallacy of race. 2d ed. New York, Columbia University, 1945. 304 p.
23. More integration in more places, but --. *U. S. News & World Report* 51:124-128. Sept. 18, 1961.
24. Myrdal, Gunnar. An American dilemma. New York, Harper & Brothers, 1944. 1483 p.
25. Next: A crackdown on segregated colleges? *U. S. News & World Report* 50:52-53. Jan. 30, 1961.
26. Panunzio, Constantine. Intermarriage in Los Angeles. *American Journal of Sociology* 47:690-701. 1942.
27. Risdon, Randall. A study of interracial marriages based on data for Los Angeles county. *Sociology and Social Research* 39:92-95. 1954.

28. Schnepf, Gerald J. and Agnes M. Yui. Cultural and marital adjustment of Japanese war brides. *American Journal of Sociology* 61:48-50. 1955.
29. Simpson, George E. and J. Milton Yinger. *Racial and cultural minorities*. New York, Harper, 1958. 881 p.
30. Strauss, Anselm L. Strain and harmony in American-Japanese war-bride marriages. *Marriage and Family Living* 16:99-106. 1954.
31. The slow march of integration: After 7 years, 7 per cent. *U. S. News & World Report* 51:46. Aug. 28, 1961.
32. U. S. Bureau of the Census. *Statistical abstract of the United States, 1961*. Washington, 1961. 1037 p.
33. Warner, W. Lloyd and Paul S. Lunt. *The social life of a modern community*. New Haven, Yale University, 1941. 460 p.
34. Wert, James E., Charles O. Neidt and J. Stanley Ahmann. *Statistical methods in educational and psychological research*. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954. 435 p.
35. When Negro servicemen bring home white brides. *U. S. News & World Report* 43:110-112. Oct. 11, 1957.
36. Wirth, Louis and Herbert Goldhamer. Negro-white marriage in recent times. In: Otto Klineberg's *Characteristics of the American Negro*. New York, Harper, 1944. pp. 276-300.
37. Wynn, John C. What churches say today. In: Evelyn M. Duvall's and Sylvanus M. Duvall's *Sex ways--in fact and faith*. New York, Association, 1961. pp. 41-66.

## APPENDIX

## Appendix

The questionnaire utilized in this study is presented on this and the following several pages. (As shown here, each of the lists of persons and arguments extends over more than one page; in the actual questionnaire as given to the respondents, each of the four lists, two of persons and two of arguments, appeared on a single page.)

## FACTORS INFLUENCING INTERRACIAL DATING

Instructions for filling out the questionnaire:

1. Do not discuss your answers with other persons; fill the items in by yourself. We are interested in your responses, although you will remain anonymous.
2. Please return the completed questionnaire at the next class meeting.

If you wish to receive a summary of the results of the study, a form has been provided your instructor for you to note your name and address. (Since the summary will not be ready until approximately May of the coming year, you should specify your address -- and preferably your campus address -- as it will be at that time.)

Part I. Please fill in or check the correct answer to the following items. Be certain to answer every question.

1. Sex:        \_\_\_\_\_ Male        \_\_\_\_\_ Female
2. Age:        \_\_\_\_\_
3. What is your home State? \_\_\_\_\_  
(If you are a student from another country, please indicate by checking here: \_\_\_\_\_.)

4. Year in college:        ☐ Freshman    ☐ Sophomore  
                              ☐ Junior       ☐ Senior       ☐ Graduate
5. Have you ever been married?    ☐ Yes    ☐ No
6. What is your religion? ☐ Protestant    ☐ Catholic  
                              ☐ Jewish       ☐ Mormon       ☐ None  
                              Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
7. What is your race?  
                              ☐ White        ☐ Negro        ☐ Oriental
8. What level of education did your father (or male guardian) obtain?  
                              ☐ College graduation (Bachelor's, Master's, or Doctoral degrees)  
                              ☐ High school graduation  
                              ☐ Did not graduate from high school
9. Type of area in which you were raised, in which you have spent most of your life:  
                              ☐ Rural--lived on farm or in town up to 2,500 persons  
                              ☐ City of 2,500 to 50,000 persons  
                              ☐ City over 50,000 persons  
                              ☐ Cannot answer; moved around too much
10. Where are you presently living?  
                              ☐ Dorm                    ☐ Fraternity       ☐ Sorority  
                              ☐ Other (e.g., rooming house, apartment, trailer)
11. Indicate the nature of the contacts you have had with members of the Oriental race.

☐ I have had practically no contacts.

☐ I have had several casual friendships.

☐ I have had close friendships.

☐ I have had one or more dates with Orientals.

12. Indicate the nature of the contacts you have had with members of the Negro race.

☐ I have had practically no contacts.

☐ I have had several casual friendships.

☐ I have had close friendships.

☐ I have had one or more dates with Negroes.

Part II. We wish to learn about (1) the arguments against interracial dating, and (2) the sources from which they are likely to come. Each of these (1 and 2) has two aspects: first, the extent to which you anticipate they would occur; second, the extent to which you think they would be important in influencing your behavior. (You will note that there is one section for dates with Negroes and another for dates with Orientals.)

Circle your desired answer to the statements below, using this scale:

VG = Very great

S = Some

VL = Very little

N = None; not at all

DK = Don't know

1. Assume that you began to date a person of the ORIENTAL race.

Do you think that you would probably experience

opposition to dating an Oriental? ☐ Yes ☐ No

(If you think that you would, answer the following.)

Pick the three persons in the following list who would most strongly oppose your dating an Oriental by assigning the numbers 1,2,3. (1 = most strongly; 2 = next most strongly; 3 = next most) Be certain that you assign each number only once.

To what extent would each of the three you have selected influence you?

- |                                                   |              |
|---------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| _____ 1. Parents                                  | VG S VL N DK |
| _____ 2. Brothers and sisters                     | VG S VL N DK |
| _____ 3. Other relatives<br>(e.g., uncles, aunts) | VG S VL N DK |
| _____ 4. Friends                                  | VG S VL N DK |
| _____ 5. Members of your college living group     | VG S VL N DK |
| _____ 6. Religious leaders                        | VG S VL N DK |

Pick the three arguments in the following list which would be advanced most strongly in opposing your dating an Oriental by assigning the numbers 1,2,3. (1 = most strongly; 2 = next most strongly; 3 = next most) Be certain that you assign each number only once.

As you think about each of the three arguments, indicate to what extent each would influence you. Be certain to mark each argument.

- |                                                                                                                                                                    |              |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| _____ 1. You will lose reputation and status.                                                                                                                      | VG S VL N DK |
| _____ 2. Dating may lead to marriage, and you will meet discrimination before and after marriage in social activities --for example, from friends, at restaurants. | VG S VL N DK |

- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Dating may lead to marriage, VG S VL N DK  
and racially-crossed children  
should not be produced since  
such children are biologi-  
cally inferior.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. God never meant the races VG S VL N DK  
to mix in dating or marry-  
ing; if He had, He would  
not have made separate  
races.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Dating may lead to marriage, VG S VL N DK  
and interracial marriage  
will result in many person-  
ality conflicts between you  
and your spouse due to  
differences in background.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Dating may lead to marriage, VG S VL N DK  
and your children will suf-  
fer from discrimination --  
for example, they may not be  
accepted by either Oriental  
or White communities.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Dating may lead to marriage, VG S VL N DK  
and relations with your in-  
laws and/or relatives will  
be a problem, both before  
and after marriage.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. Dating may lead to marriage, VG S VL N DK  
and you'll run into discrim-  
ination in the economic and  
business world--e.g., in  
housing or in getting a job.

2. Assume that you began to date a person of the NEGRO  
race.

Do you think that you would probably experience  
opposition to dating a Negro? \_\_\_\_Yes \_\_\_\_No  
(If you think that you would, answer the following.)



Pick the three persons  
in the following list  
who would most strongly  
oppose your dating a  
Negro by assigning the  
numbers 1,2,3. (1=most  
strongly; 2=next most  
strongly; 3=next most)  
Be certain that you  
assign each number  
only once.

To what extent  
would each of  
the three you  
have selected  
influence you?

- |                                                    |              |
|----------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| _____ 1. Parents                                   | VG S VL N DK |
| _____ 2. Brothers and sisters                      | VG S VL N DK |
| _____ 3. Other relatives<br>(e.g., uncles, aunts)  | VG S VL N DK |
| _____ 4. Friends                                   | VG S VL N DK |
| _____ 5. Members of your col-<br>lege living group | VG S VL N DK |
| _____ 6. Religious leaders                         | VG S VL N DK |

Pick the three arguments  
in the following list  
which would be advanced  
most strongly in opposing  
your dating a Negro by  
assigning the numbers  
1,2,3. (1=most strongly;  
2=next most strongly; 3=  
next most) Be certain  
that you assign each  
number only once.

As you think  
about each of  
the three argu-  
ments, indicate  
to what extent  
each would influ-  
ence you. Be  
certain to mark  
each argument.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                       |              |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| _____ 1. You will lose reputation<br>and status.                                                                                                                                      | VG S VL N DK |
| _____ 2. Dating may lead to marriage,<br>and you will meet discrimi-<br>nation before and after mar-<br>riage in social activities<br>--for example, from friends,<br>at restaurants. | VG S VL N DK |

- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Dating may lead to marriage, VG S VL N DK  
and racially-crossed children should not be produced since such children are biologically inferior.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. God never meant the races VG S VL N DK  
to mix in dating or marrying; if He had, He would not have made separate races.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Dating may lead to marriage, VG S VL N DK  
and interracial marriage will result in many personality conflicts between you and your spouse due to differences in background.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Dating may lead to marriage, VG S VL N DK  
and your children will suffer from discrimination -- for example, they may not be accepted by either Negro or White communities.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Dating may lead to marriage, VG S VL N DK  
and relations with your in-laws and/or relatives will be a problem, both before and after marriage.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. Dating may lead to marriage, VG S VL N DK  
and you'll run into discrimination in the economic and business world--e.g., in housing or in getting a job.