

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

in the

STATE COLLEGE COMMUNITY

Robert H. Davage

1958

Distributed through the courtesy of the Center County Layman's League.

GVF/TVE - Racial Discrimination

Table of Contents

	Page
B. Attitude of Negroes toward the Existing Situation and toward Possible Corrective Programs	37
C. How do Negroes feel about their encounters with discrimination in the local community?	37
Part I: DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY	
A. Reasons for the Study	2
B. Basic Questions to be Answered by the Study	3
1. Incidence of discrimination in the local community	3
2. Attitude of Negroes toward discrimination problems and toward corrective programs	3
3. Summary	4
C. Structuring the Questionnaire to Provide Reliable Information	5
1. Bias in questionnaire data: overstatement and understatement	5
2. Minimizing the overstatement of racial discrimination.	6
3. Assessing the understatement of racial discrimination.	7
4. Summary	8
D. Administering the Questionnaire to a Sample of Negroes	9
1. Procedure.	9
2. The sample included in the analysis.	9
3. Representativeness of the sample	10

Part II: RESULTS

A. The Incidence of Racial Discrimination in the Local Community	13
1. What percentage of Negroes document experiences of racial discrimination in the local community?	13
2. What kinds of discrimination are most likely to be encountered by Negroes?	17
a. Housing	17
b. Tonsorial services.	24
c. Restaurant service.	26
d. University facilities and activities.	28
e. Summary	30
3. Are discriminatory experiences reported by Negroes an overstatement or understatement of the actual extent of discriminatory practices?	30
a. Overstatement	31
1. Additional check on overstatement.	31
2. Results.	33
3. Conclusion	33
b. Understatement.	33
1. Another check on understatement.	34
2. Results.	34
3. Conclusion	36

	Page
B. Attitude of Negroes toward the Existing Situation and toward Possible Corrective Programs	37
1. How do Negroes feel about their encounters with discrimination in the local community?	37
2. Can Negroes get help or counsel about problems of racial discrimination?	41
3. How sensitive would Negroes be to publicity about their experiences with discrimination in the local community?	43
4. How do Negroes evaluate the effectiveness of various programs that might be used in modifying discriminatory practices?	44
OVERALL SUMMARY	50

Part II: RESULTS	
A. The Incidence of Racial Discrimination in the Local Community	13
1. What percentage of Negroes document experiences of racial discrimination in the local community?	13
2. What kinds of discrimination are most likely to be encountered by Negroes?	17
a. Housing	17
b. Commercial services	24
c. Restaurant services	26
d. University facilities and activities	28
e. Summary	30
3. Are discriminatory experiences reported by Negroes an overstatement or understatement of the actual extent of discriminatory practices?	30
a. Overstatement	31
1. Additional check on overstatement	31
2. Results	32
3. Conclusion	33
b. Understatement	33
1. Another check on understatement	34
2. Results	34
3. Conclusion	36

Reasons for the Study

Early in 1955, a member of the Carter County Layman's League discussed with the writer the interest that some League members had in doing something

Part I

about problem of racial discrimination in the State College community. The writer suggested that the choice of an action program aimed at modifying or

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

correcting discriminatory practices should be based on a clear knowledge of the extent and nature of the problem. The information available, it was

agreed, was scattered and in many cases could be classified as hearsay evidence. Several techniques of securing reliable information (for example, sys-

Purpose..Method..Sample

tematic investigations of the test-retest type) were suggested but judged to be beyond the resources of the League. Finally, it was decided that a questionnaire administered to Negroes, the people who were most likely to have experienced some racial discrimination, would be feasible and could provide information more substantial than that presently available.

A questionnaire was developed by the writer, administered to a sample of Negroes, and an analysis of the results are reported in this paper.

Reasons for the Study

Early in 1958, a member of the Center County Layman's League discussed with the writer the interest that some League members had in doing something about problems of racial discrimination in the State College community. The writer suggested that the choice of an action program aimed at modifying or correcting discriminatory practices should be based on a clear knowledge of the extent and nature of the problem. The information available, it was agreed, was scattered and in many cases could be classified as hearsay evidence. Several techniques offering reliable information (for example, systematic investigations of the test-case type) were suggested but judged to be beyond the resources of the League. Finally, it was decided that a questionnaire administered to Negroes, the people who were most likely to have experienced some racial discrimination, would be feasible and could provide information more substantial than that presently available.

A questionnaire was developed by the writer, administered to a sample of Negroes, and an analysis of the results are reported in this paper.

Basic Questions to be Answered by the Study

The two basic kinds of information sought are (1) the incidence of racial discrimination in the local community, and (2) the attitudes of Negroes toward discrimination problems and toward possible action programs.

Incidence of Discrimination in the Local Community

Primarily, this questionnaire should answer the question: how much and what kind of racial discrimination is practiced in the State College community? Actually, a questionnaire administered to Negroes can be expected to answer directly only the question of how much and what kind of racial discrimination has been experienced by a sample of Negroes. If the sample of people given the questionnaire is representative of the local Negro population, then some generalization may be made about the total local population of Negroes. And if the questionnaire can tap information of sufficient depth and detail, it may also be possible to draw reasonable inferences about the actual extent and nature of discriminatory practices in the local community.

Attitudes of Negroes toward Discrimination Problems and toward Possible Corrective Programs

As a second basic goal, this questionnaire should determine both the attitudes that Negroes have toward problems of racial discrimination and the attitudes they have about different action programs which might be directed toward correcting or modifying discriminatory practices.

First, if the frequency counts of discriminatory incidents are to be meaningful to the reader, he will need some understanding of the effects that racial dis-

crimination has on Negroes. It is possible, for example, that an infrequent occurrence of one kind of discrimination may be more damaging to Negroes than a frequent occurrence of another kind of discrimination. Knowledge of any such findings will help the reader to put into perspective the data he obtains from this report.

Secondly, inasmuch as some corrective programs would involve the implicit or active cooperation of Negroes themselves, any organization planning to select or sponsor a program ought to have some prior information about Negroes' evaluations of different action programs, even though the organization's decisions need not be bound by this information.

Summary

Two basic goals (determining the incidence of racial discrimination in the local community and determining the attitudes of Negroes toward discrimination problems and toward possible corrective programs), the writer felt, could be reasonably managed in a questionnaire and were used as a framework for developing the questionnaire.

Structuring the Questionnaire to Provide Reliable Information

Inasmuch as the technique used in this study--responses from people who personally have experienced racial discrimination--is to be used for making estimates of the actual extent of discriminatory practices, we must be reasonably certain that the information obtained is of sufficient depth, detail, and reliability to justify such estimates.

Bias in Questionnaire Data: Overstatement and Understatement

It is well known that questionnaire data may be biased or misleading if conclusions are not tailored to the kind of data collected. For example, questionnaire information about the real extent of discrimination collected from people who practice racial discrimination is likely to be biased (and biased in the direction of understatement) if the community ethic and verbalized mores do not support discriminatory practices.

Likewise, questionnaire information about discrimination collected from people who have been objects of discrimination may also be biased. Such self-reports may be biased in the direction either of overstating or understating the actual incidence of discriminatory practices. For example, persons who have been discriminated against may overstate the actual case because of a heightened sensitivity that causes them to misperceive situations. They may overstate the actual case because of cumulative emotional reactions to some real situations that cause them to exaggerate other situations. But also, Negroes may understate the actual incidence of discriminatory practices because of embarrassment, because of a wish to avoid facing painful memories or unpleasant realities, or because they have simply "succeeded" in avoiding actual contact with discrimination problems and thus have none to report.

For these reasons, any attempt to gather information about the extent of discriminatory practices from the persons who have met racial discrimination must include some check on the possible tendency of respondents' reports to overstate or understate the real incidence of racial discrimination.

Minimizing the Overstatement of Racial Discrimination

To minimize, if not completely eliminate, the possibility that reported experiences of racial discrimination would overstate the incidence of discriminatory practices, respondents were requested to document their reports in enough detail to provide substantial evidence of discrimination. First, respondents were asked to check any of eleven areas (tensorial services, housing, medical services, etc.) in which they had personally experienced racial discrimination. However, this check-off list was used solely to orient the respondent to the possible range of relevant areas. It was the next item that provided the basic information on discrimination problems.

In this next item, the respondent was requested to document instances of personally-experienced discrimination by using the following outline for detailing each incident:

1. Describe the incident briefly.
2. Tell when and where it occurred.
3. State your reasons for feeling that the discrimination was based on race or color.
4. Indicate what you did about it.
5. State how satisfied you felt with the adjustment or solution you made to the problem.

It was believed that if respondents faithfully followed such an outline, most of them would feel obligated to list only incidents that might objectively be judged as valid instances of racial discrimination, and any tendency to overstate the case of discrimination should be accordingly reduced.

On the other hand, the presence of such specific directions does not guarantee that they will be followed. When people try to recollect events in which they have been emotionally involved, their responses will range greatly in the amount of detail that is either recalled or reported. Indeed, the greater the detail that respondents are asked to supply, the greater the probability that their reports will not meet all of the requirements specified. Thus, during the analysis, the investigator must expect to have to decide what constitutes an adequate report, and he will therefore be obligated to specify to the reader what criteria were used in making such judgments. (See pages 13-16.)

Assessing the Understatement of Racial Discrimination

To check the possibility that responses to the questionnaire might understate the incidence of discriminatory practices, several questions were asked to determine whether Negroes sought and received information which would permit them to avoid situations where they might meet racial discrimination. If, indeed, Negroes as a group have developed ways of avoiding actual contact with discrimination problems and therefore have practically no personal experiences of discrimination to report, then the basic data collected by this kind of questionnaire will necessarily underestimate the actual incidence of discriminatory practices.

In anticipation of such a possibility, the questionnaire should contain some provision for determining whether or not Negroes do systematically avoid situations of possible discrimination. Some questions seeking this type of information were included in the questionnaire, and it was hypothesized that respondents' answers would confirm both of the following conditions:

1. That, before initially seeking some service in the local community, Negroes either ask for information or receive unsolicited information about where Negroes have to go to get services without being embarrassed or discriminated against because of their color;
2. That once warned to expect discrimination in getting some kind of service or in going to a particular place, Negroes do not seek such services or go to those places.

If both of the above conditions hold true, and it can be shown that the avoidance behavior of Negroes is predicated upon fact rather than hearsay evidence, then these findings will provide independent confirmation of any other information which suggests that discriminatory practices are more widespread than the actual experiences reported by Negroes.

Summary

Thus, the technique used in this study--documented reports of discrimination experienced personally by Negroes---will certainly tell us something about the Negro's side of the problem and, with sufficient checks against overstatement and understatement built into the questionnaire, should also permit reasonable inferences about the actual extent of discriminatory practices in the local community. Other investigations, using other techniques, will still need to be carried out, both to check the findings of this study and to keep pace with ever-occurring changes in discriminatory practices.

Administering the Questionnaire to a Sample of Negroes

Procedure

The questionnaire was administered to a predominantly undergraduate group of 60 Negro students in a university meeting hall on a Sunday afternoon in March of 1958.

Directions on the cover sheet of the questionnaire were read aloud to the students and all questions answered by the writer. It was emphasized that respondents should record only discriminatory incidents that they themselves had personally experienced in the local community and not hearsay recounts of other people's experiences, no matter how valid the experiences of others were thought to be. Although there was no time limit, most respondents completed the questionnaire in 30 minutes.

During the following weeks 10 questionnaires were given to other Negroes, in order to increase the graduate student representation in the sample. Thus, a total of 70 questionnaires were distributed and made available for analysis.

The Sample Included in the Analysis

Of the 60 questionnaires filled out at the initial setting, 57 were usable. Three could not be included in the analysis because the respondents failed to complete the data, particularly the data that were to be used in classifying the sample (educational level at the university and residency status). Of the 57 questionnaires included in the analysis, 2 were from graduate students and 55 from undergraduates. Only 2 of the undergraduates were not United States residents.

Of the 10 questionnaires turned in later, all of which were included in the analysis, 4 were from undergraduates (one of whom was not a U.S. resident) and 6 were from graduate students.

Thus, the total sample of usable questionnaires was 67. This can be seen in Table 1, where the number of respondents whose data were included in the analysis are classified in terms of their residency status and their educational level at the university.

Table 1

THE SAMPLE INCLUDED IN THE ANALYSIS: NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
CLASSIFIED BY RESIDENCY STATUS AND EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

		Educational Level		Total
		Undergraduate	Graduate	
Residency	U. S.	56	8	64
	Foreign	3	0	3
TOTAL		59	8	67

Representativeness of the Sample

Since the population of Negroes in State College is comprised almost exclusively of university students, the sample planned for this study was a group of Negro students. It was expected that only a few, if any, foreign Negro students would be among the group sampled and, as it turned out, more than 95% of the Negro sample was American.

The singularly striking thing about the population of American Negro students in the State College community is that it is extremely small. This is one reason why block sampling or quota sampling techniques are certainly not as practicable and may not be as meaningful as an attempt simply to get as many Negro students as possible into the sample. In such a case, a reasonable though only a partial check on

the representativeness of the sample would be some indication of the percentage of the total population that is included in this study.

Census data available to the writer, unfortunately, do not permit a precise specification of the total number of American Negro students in the State College population. There is enough scattered information, however, to permit some reasonable estimates. The best estimates the writer can make are based on the 1957 census figure for the local non-white population with an adjustment for the number of non-whites who are not Negro, an adjustment derived in part from a listing of non-residents studying or working at the university. Both high and low estimates were made, and they lead to the conclusion that the American Negro students in this sample represent from 40% to 47% of the total Negro population (including townspeople and children) in State College, and from 45% to 54% of the total population of American Negro students at the university.

Thus, our sample seems to include a fairly large proportion of the total relevant population, permitting us some confidence in any results we obtain.

The Incidence of Racial Discrimination in the Local Community

What Percentage of Negroes Document Experiences of Racial Discrimination in the Local Community?

Before answering this question, we must first state the criteria that were used in deciding whether experiences reported by respondents were to be accepted or rejected as evidence of racial discrimination.

Part II

Some respondents failed to write a separate report, as requested, for each incident of discrimination they had experienced. For example, when a respondent had two or three incidents of housing discrimination to relate he would place them all together in a report, giving full information on at least one of the incidents and less information on the others. Therefore, in the analysis, everything a respondent said about a specific area of discrimination (such as housing or commercial service or service in restaurants, etc.) was counted only as a single report for that person, regardless of how many separate incidents he may have documented in that report. Thus, an "accepted report" contains acceptable evidence of one or more instances of racial discrimination in some area such as housing, commercial service, etc.

The reader will recall that respondents were requested to document 5 aspects of each discriminatory incident he reported:

- Describe the incident briefly.
- Tell when and where it occurred.
- State your reasons for feeling that the discrimination was based on race or color.
- Indicate what you did about it.
- State how satisfied you felt about the adjustment or solution you made to the problem.

In judging whether a report met minimum requirements for inclusion as reasonably valid evidence of discrimination, the respondent's replies to "a," "b," and

The Incidence of Racial Discrimination in the Local Community

What Percentage of Negroes Document Experiences of Racial Discrimination in the Local Community?

Before answering this question, we must first state the criteria that were used in deciding whether experiences reported by respondents were to be accepted or rejected as evidence of racial discrimination.

Some respondents failed to write a separate report, as requested, for each incident of discrimination they had experienced. For example, when a respondent had two or three incidents of housing discrimination to relate he would place them all together in a report, giving full information on at least one of the incidents and less information on the others. Therefore, in the analysis, everything a respondent said about a specific area of discrimination (such as housing or tonsorial service or service in restaurants, etc.) was counted only as a single report for that person, regardless of how many separate incidents he may have documented in that report. Thus, an "accepted report" contains acceptable evidence of one or more instances of racial discrimination in some area such as housing, tonsorial service, etc.

The reader will recall that respondents were requested to document 5 aspects of each discriminatory incident he reported:

- a. Describe the incident briefly.
- b. Tell when and where it occurred.
- c. State your reasons for feeling that the discrimination was based on race or color.
- d. Indicate what you did about it.
- e. State how satisfied you felt about the adjustment or solution you made to the problem.

In judging whether a report met minimum requirements for inclusion as reasonably valid evidence of discrimination, the respondent's replies to "a," "b," and

"c" above were the crucial factors. Of these 3 factors, the respondent's reason for defining the incident as discriminatory ("c" above) was initially thought to be the most important factor, yet it was not always necessary for the respondent to answer even this part of the item since, sometimes, his description of the incident ("a" above) clearly indicated that he had been told by the discriminating person that the action directed toward him was based solely on color.

Perhaps the best way of informing the reader of the kind of judgments made is to cite examples of reports that were rejected and accepted.

The basic reason for rejecting a report of discrimination was the failure of the respondent to describe the incident adequately. For example, one report that was rejected went as follows:

In my classroom I experienced discrimination. My teacher deliberately called someone else in the class and gave (him) an opportunity that (he) would not give me because of my color. I became quite angry about the whole affair and did not enjoy the class for the rest of the semester.

This may have been a genuine instance of racial discrimination, but no one can tell from the respondent's report what really happened.

Reports accepted as evidence of discrimination were not all equally undisputable as evidence of discrimination. For this reason, it may be more informative to the reader to see both a case of borderline acceptability and a case that posed no difficulty in judgment.

Obviously, the borderline cases provided the greatest difficulty in judgment.

One such case follows:

On going out to eat several times I have come in contact with incidents which seemed to me to be based solely on color alone. I'm sure I can't remember every incident but there are a few at least that stick

in my mind. I will proceed to describe two. First of all back in the Fall of 1956, I invited a young lady to go to dinner with me. The place we chose to eat was at the _____. When we went in, the place was only about 1/3 full. None of the waitresses seemed to be exceptionally busy; in fact, one waitress was simply standing talking to the cashier. Meanwhile several couples came in and were served before we were. After about a half hour a waitress approached our table and took our order. About 20 minutes later we finally got our meals.

Then another time it took about 40 minutes to be served in the _____ (a different restaurant) when I was with three of my colored friends.

This same respondent also described another time that he went back to the second-mentioned restaurant, this time by himself:

I went into the _____ but to my surprise everything went fine. I didn't even get a dirty look. When I told the fellow who informed me of the discrimination in this restaurant, he said the reason I had no trouble was probably because I was so light (complexioned), and looked as if I were white. All I could do was laugh at him.

In the report cited above, it is conceivable that restaurant service may be extremely unsatisfactory to many persons and not based solely on color. On the other hand, the service may be unsatisfactory and also (not solely) or occasionally based on color. Perhaps, too, we should not dismiss too lightly the fact that this respondent (who in another part of the questionnaire labels himself as light-skinned) reports discrimination when he is in the company of associates who morphologically are Negroid but apparently does not meet discrimination in the same place when by himself. We cannot tell on the basis of his last statement (his laughter) whether the respondent would agree that his own skin color made a difference, but we do know that he prefaces his entire report with the judgment that these seem to be incidents "based solely on color." Even ignoring the fact that other respondents report discrimination in the same places, we feel that the total description offered by this respondent justifies the placing of his report in the accepted rather than the rejected category.

The kind of case which was clearly acceptable as evidence of racial discrimination needs no explanation beyond the citing of an example:

I applied for a room in town with two friends of mine. The person representing the owner said he would rent rooms to my friends but he said that he had been instructed to rent rooms to no one except members of the white race. This took place in the Spring of 1957 and the house was owned by the same person who owns the _____ on _____ St. The rooming house is next to the _____

These three examples of a rejected report, a borderline but acceptable report and a clearly acceptable report should provide the reader with some understanding of the criteria used in deciding whether a report was accepted as evidence of racial discrimination.

All told, 37 reports of racial discrimination were written by respondents. Five of these reports were not accepted as evidence of discrimination, four because they contained inadequate information and one because it was the experience of another person rather than the personal experience of the respondent. Thus, 32 reports comprise the accepted evidence of racial discrimination. These 32 "accepted reports" were written by 27 persons, approximately 40% of the total sample of respondents included in this analysis. These results are shown in Table 2. From these results

Table 2

THE PERCENTAGE OF NEGROES DOCUMENTING EXPERIENCES
OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

		Educational Level		
		Undergraduate	Graduate	Total
Residency	United States	39.3%	50.0%	40.6%
	Foreign	33.3%		33.3%
TOTAL		39.0%	50.0%	40.3%

we see that 2 out of every 5 Negroes in this sample documented evidence of personal encounters with racial discrimination in the local community.

What KINDS of Discrimination Are Most Likely to be Encountered by Negroes?

Respondents produced 32 acceptably-documented reports of racial discrimination. These 32 reports were distributed in only four major areas, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3

PERCENTAGE OF DOCUMENTED REPORTS OF RACIAL
DISCRIMINATION IN EACH OF FOUR MAJOR AREAS

1. Housing	46.9%
2. Tonsorial Services (barberships, beauty salons)	28.1%
3. Eating Establishments	21.9%
4. University Facilities or Activities	3.1%

HOUSING. Table 3 reveals that nearly half of the reports of discrimination concerned the area of housing, and it should be added that the majority of these reports on housing discrimination cited more than one instance of such discrimination. Nearly all of the reported discrimination in housing occurred in State College rather than at the university. If those cases occurring at the university were transferred from category 1 to category 4 (see Table 3 above), housing discrimination in town would still represent more than 40% of all the reports accepted as evidence of racial discrimination.

More than 20% of our respondents documented personal experiences of housing discrimination in town, yet it is obvious that such a figure, based on the total sample, must be an underestimate of the actual extent of housing discrimination, because

some students are required to live on campus and therefore could not be seeking housing in State College.

In regard to women, for example, except for some female graduate students and female students living with parents or husbands, practically all university women live in campus dormitories. Our Negro sample, one-third of which is female, contains neither women graduate students nor women living with parents, so that none of our Negro women would be likely to seek housing in town.

In the case of university men, approximately 50% of the non-freshman male population lives in private housing off campus. If we assume that a comparable 50% of the Negro males in our sample might have sought private housing in town, we would have to conclude that approximately 70% of the Negroes seeking housing in State College have run into problems of racial discrimination. Male freshmen, of course, have been excluded from this analysis because they are required to live in campus dormitories and are unlikely to be seeking housing in town. Thus, it appears that at least 2 out of every 3 Negroes who might possibly have sought private housing in town have encountered problems of housing discrimination.

However, in view of (1) the widespread nature of housing discrimination, (2) the knowledge that Negroes have about these conditions, and (3) the tendency of Negroes in our sample to avoid direct encounters with situations threatening racial discrimination (see pp. 34-36), it seems more likely that fewer than 50% of our non-freshman Negro males would be likely to seek private housing in State College. If this is true, we could reasonably infer that from 70% to 100% of the Negro population would encounter racial discrimination in State College housing.

It would be a conservative statement to say that the Negro's housing problem is a serious one. Perhaps the severity of the situation can be described by spelling out some of the reactions of townspeople who are approached by Negroes seeking

a place to live.

The reactions of State College residents to Negroes who are seeking housing seem to run the gamut, from none-too-subtle evasions

I walked by a home on _____ Street and saw a sign which said room for rent. Curious, I stopped and inquired, and the lady said she had a double room, and I said that was fine because my friend and I needed one. Then the woman said actually she wanted 3 in the room, and when I said I could get another one she said she was not sure she actually wanted to rent. I said thank you and left. This was very amusing to me just watching her facial expressions. . . .

to outright and emphatic denials:

I called on the phone the lady who had advertised in The Collegian a room for rent. She said it was available and asked if I was a good roomer. I said I was. Then I told her I was a Negro. She became very indignant and a bit nasty and said she did not like mixing and hung up

Although respondents often wrote very lengthy descriptions, a few brief excerpts from their reports will demonstrate typical reactions of local residents who come face to face with prospective Negro roomers.

. . . received a listing for housing from an office on univ. campus. . . . called the resident property owner at _____ Avenue and asked him if he had a vacant apartment; he informed me that he had two and proceeded to describe them to me. After the brief description of the two apartments the owner invited me to come and look them over. I told him that I would be at his residence in 15 minutes. Twelve minutes after the telephone call I arrived at his residence. After greeting him, I told him that I was the person to whom he was talking concerning an apartment "a few minutes ago." He looked at me seriously and said, "I'm sorry, I can't help you! I have decided to rent to boys only; I hope you find a place to stay." I extended him an expression of gratitude and left. . . . later I discovered that two of my acquaintances, who were white, were living with their families at _____ Avenue (the same address). . . .

. . . when I went there immediately after I hung up, the man was shocked and dumbfounded; he finally said sorry the room has been rented a few minutes ago. . . .

. . . refused. . . because the landlord was uncertain about the attitude of (other) prospective roomers. . . .

. . . was told that the other roomers would object. . . . that the husband would not permit the wife to have Negro roomers. . . . other reasons for not renting to Negroes. . . .

. . . landlady told me that she was sorry and that she didn't rent to colored people. . . .

. . . if colored were to rent one of his rooms he would then have to rent all of his rooms (to colored) so there would be no integration among students renting his house. . . .

. . . lady told me each time that the neighbors might object. . . .

Without a question, the basic problem is one of getting a room or apartment.

Yet, even for Negroes who do manage to find a place in town their newly-found place is not always secure:

I was requested to move from my apartment located at _____ Street, on November 15, 1957. The owner had received a request from a neighbor. . . .

With such poor prospects for housing in town, most Negroes can be expected to live on the university campus. There, of course, they are not refused a place to live because of their color. Yet, Negroes are still not completely secure about housing arrangements on campus, for they sometimes must face the more delicate problems of room assignments or room changes made on the basis of color. Whatever reasons may exist for putting or not putting certain students in the same dormitory room, the inclusion of skin color as a "reason" remains a problem:

At the start of the Spring term of 1958, a white student was assigned as my roommate in the _____ area. A few days after his arrival, my dormitory counselor called me to his room. I was then informed that my new roommate had requested a change because his parents objected to his living with a Negro. The university had given me the choice as to how the situation would be handled. I could either move to another dormitory where I would be rooming with another Negro, or I could remain in my present accommodations and the other student would move. I chose the

latter alternative. We shared the same room for two weeks more until the arrangements could be made. . . . we treated each other civilly. . . .

Of course, Negroes may be hurt by room changes on campus just as they may be hurt by denials, evasions, and requests for room changes in town. Another male student who experienced a dormitory room-change problem identical to the one described above reacted this way: "I felt bad but there was nothing I could do."

It cannot be denied, however, that the university's approach to the men's housing problem, at least as reflected in reports obtained in this study, stands in very sharp contrast to the prevailing practices of townspeople who have housing to offer to the public. It may very well be, then, that a few casualties (in emotional hurts) may really be a small price to pay for an increasing acceptance and practicing of integrated living on campus. Any technique of "random" or non-racial assignment of students to rooms will necessarily produce some casualties in emotional hurts, whether or not skin color can be pinpointed as the source of incompatibility. Unless the requests for room changes because of color are disproportionately high, we should examine alternative solutions to campus housing arrangements very carefully before deciding that the present approaches are fully unsatisfactory.

Furthermore, if the frequency counts in our data can be generalized, we seriously doubt if the Negro's personal experiences with color problems in university housing arrangements even approaches the frequency with which he will encounter and be hurt by housing problems in town. We have already seen that the tactics used by townspeople in refusing housing to Negroes range all the way from courteous subterfuge to outright hostility. But Negroes react to these events, too, and their reactions range all the way from the defensive indifference of an expected defeat to a feeling of being badly hurt:

. . . . My esteem of this town fell terrifically.

. . . . I felt slighted to say the least. . . .

. . . . How I felt: very badly.

. . . . felt that there was nothing that could be done about it but I did feel discriminated.

. . . . I had no response. . . because I had expected it. . . .

. . . . I had a rather low opinion of the man by the time we finished our conversation.

. . . . indifferent because it was a private home.

. . . . we were somewhat disturbed. . . .

. . . . immediately felt the impact of discrimination. . . .

. . . . I felt very bad about the whole thing.

On the basis of what we know about human behavior, it seems extremely unlikely that Negroes can experience frustrations and tensions arising from contact with racial discrimination without feeling a good deal of aggression and a desire to strike back. Yet, in the written responses of our respondents to housing discrimination it is impossible to find evidence of extreme bitterness and aggressiveness. Indeed, there are cases where Negroes specifically and intentionally avoid any display of obvious aggression:

. . . . I said nothing except, "Thank you," and tried until I finally located a place elsewhere. . . . I do not attempt to argue in such cases. If a landlord has a policy of discrimination, in view of the fact that I want to find a room where I can rest and sleep in peace, I do not wish to live in a place where I am not wanted. I simply try to find a place in more agreeable surroundings. . . .

If the above respondent felt any aggressiveness, it apparently was channeled into persistent and further effort to locate a place in which he could "rest and

sleep in peace." Note, however, that the respondent's reaction, while persistent in demanding more effort from himself, would not demand as much from prospective landlords. In one sense, this reaction is an accepting of defeat, a turning away from situations in which the respondent is not immediately or fully accepted. It would be a very different reaction if the respondent's persistence were directed toward holding forth for his rights, for he might then accept housing under less than ideal conditions (e.g., when he is not welcomed with open arms). Once in possession of housing, he might expect (or hope or behave in such a way) that the other people will change their attitudes toward accepting him. This latter kind of reaction--a persistence in regard to one's rights--is an infrequent reaction among our respondents, and is more likely to appear in the case of a respondent who already has obtained a place:

. . . . My response: determined to stay there anyway.
How I felt: indifferent to the attitude of neighbors.

Although this respondent does not say whether he expects a change in the attitude of his neighbors, we would hardly be surprised if their attitudes did become more favorable.

These last two reactions cited from respondents' reports suggest a basic difference between two possible approaches to discrimination problems, one approach recognizing that either the appropriate attitudes or the appropriate behavior may come first, the other approach assuming that, in the field of race relations, appropriate attitudes must precede appropriate behavior. Since social scientists have consistently shown that behavior (the presence and participation of Negroes) in the situation can modify attitudes (acceptance of or friendliness to Negroes), we surely are losing many opportunities for improving the situation as long as both whites and Negroes continue to believe that attitude change (love of Negroes) must come before discrimination can be reduced.

On the other hand, we know that most people tend to avoid entering situations where initially they would be rejected. Negroes are no different in this respect, so that many of them are more likely to keep walking and keep hunting (or to give up the effort) than to settle in a doubtful situation and impose on themselves the restricted, demanding, and circumspect behaviors needed to change the attitudes of their more resistant neighbors.

Yet, the problem is much greater than this, for Negroes are simply not accepted as roomers under any conditions by many local residents. Obviously, Negroes lose a lot of valuable time (in comparison with non-Negroes) when they have to try and try again to find a place in which to live. While any person may have housing difficulties because of children, smoking regulations, or other landlord-imposed restrictions, Negroes have one problem in addition to any of these--their skin color. As long as skin color poses as insurmountable a barrier as it now does in the minds of many townspeople who have rooms or apartments to rent, Negroes have an extremely serious problem of housing in State College. And perhaps it is a problem that will not be broken until we are willing to act first and worry about attitudes later, until we are willing and able to get Negroes into places without requiring that they first be welcomed with open arms by State College residents.

TONSorial SERVICES. Nearly all of the reports of racial discrimination in tonsorial services (barber shops, beauty salons) come from women rather than from men. The difficult situation for Negro women may be briefly summarized by quoting excerpts from the lengthy report of one respondent. Here, she describes the efforts of a group of Negro women to work out some kind of accommodation to the discriminatory practices of local beauty salons:

The (group) sponsored a project to secure a beautician from Pittsburg to come to State College periodically to dress the Negro girls' hair, since the beauticians here 'did not know how to do it'. In the process of trying to secure a beauty shop that would rent us space so that this licensed operator could do the girls' hair we came across discrimination--which could be none other than racial discrimination--in two establishments, the _____ Beauty Shop and _____ Beauty Shop. This occurred during the latter part of September 1957.

At first, the owner of the _____ (the first mentioned shop) consented to let us use her establishment in State College on a Saturday when she would regularly be closed. Then, she changed the place to her establishment in Boalsburg when (that place) would be closed and we could be there 'alone and undisturbed'. We were willing to pay the transportation costs and go to Boalsburg because we realized that even this would be cheaper than going all the way home to have our usual beautician do our hair. The day before we were to use her establishment, the chairman of the project dropped in to make a final check. The owner said that we could not use her establishment. I might add also that she hadn't even contacted the chairman, the advisor, (of the group), or any of the (group) members to tell them of her change in plans.

The owner of _____ Beauty Shop (the second-mentioned shop) wanted to know if there wasn't a room someplace in State College that the Negro girls could rent to fix their hair. He flatly refused to let us use his shop even after admitting that it was always closed on Saturday....

Perhaps the most striking thing about the women's problem is an implication that is only partially verbalized in most of the respondents' reports about beauty salons. This is that the possibility of getting equal access to local public facilities must appear so hopeless, non-discrimination laws notwithstanding, that Negro women have turned their efforts toward creating racially-segregated, expensive, and basically inconvenient arrangements, rather than continue the even more incredible practice of having to go out of town for beauty salon services. Since all available evidence indicates that discrimination in local beauty salons operates at a 100% level, the fact that only a third of the women in this study reported personal experiences of such discrimination forces us to the conclusion that this is another instance in which the reported experiences of

discrimination underestimate the actual extent of discriminatory practices.

For men, discrimination occurs not in all but in some barber shops. Writes one respondent:

I went in a barber shop to get a haircut and was told that they didn't cut Negroes' hair.....May 1957, at a barber shop on _____ Street, right below the _____

The overall situation for men, obviously, is not the same as it is for women.

A reasonable summary of the men's problem can be found in the following excerpt from another respondent's report:

.....not serviced in this particular shop....probably because of the fact that the barber was unable to cut the type of hair that is characteristic of Negroes; however, I do not think it takes very much training to learn to service this type of hair. I think if more than one barber could give service to Negroes this would be a convenience to many male Negro students.

It should be pointed out that for the barber trained in a school that exposes him to a variety of hair characteristics, the hair of Negro males poses no problem. For barbers without such training, very little additional training is needed according to reports from barbers who practice no racial discrimination. Also, for the sake of accuracy, it should be pointed out that there is more than one State College barbershop that services Negroes, although it hardly needs saying that there are others that refuse service to Negroes.

If in evaluating the problem of tonsorial services for Negroes the situation for Negro women is given its appropriate weight, we would have to conclude that discrimination in tonsorial services approaches the seriousness of the Negro's housing problem.

RESTAURANT SERVICE. Respondents' reports about discrimination in eating establishments suggest a possible discrepancy between policy and practice in regard to Negro patrons. For example, not one of our respondents' reports

documents a policy statement from a restaurant proprietor that his establishment does not serve Negroes, so that even a direct refusal of service on one occasion may not represent a consistent policy of discrimination. In the following report it is difficult either to comprehend the restaurant's policy or to determine whether they have a policy in regard to Negro patrons:

....my father and I ate breakfast at the _____.
We were served very courteously so we decided to eat lunch there but they refused to serve us.....

Actually, most of the reports of discrimination in eating establishments involve service that is discourteous or is delayed much longer than it is for non-Negro patrons:

....Sept. 1957 at the _____ I, along with five other Negro students, was left waiting 20 minutes for service, even though the restaurant was not crowded. When we asked for service we were told that if we didn't like it leave, which we did. Later we were informed that the policy of the _____ was to discourage Negro patrons. If this was their point they were successful.

Or, as reflected in another report, the discouraging of Negro patronage may take the odd form of a ruse or, as the respondent described it, ".....a scheme to try to get us to leave." Writes this respondent:

.....accompanied by another Negro student I went to _____ and was serviced because we refused to believe the operator when he accused us of being with some fellows who at one time attended this place and left without paying their bill....

It is certainly true that some restaurant service is reported to be very discourteous:

....waitress.....got angry, grabbed the root beer up and brought the item I asked for and said, 'I hope you're satisfied.' I said, 'Thank you'.....

It is likewise true that a Negro may become very upset about restaurant service that appears patently discriminatory:

.....beyond a doubt an intentional slight. I, of course, left immediately and have made it a policy never to patronize these (2 different restaurants) establishments.

Yet, if Negroes' reports represent a reasonable coverage of discriminatory restaurant practices in State College, we would have to conclude that the extent of restaurant discrimination is not really comparable to the discrimination in housing and tonsorial services. We draw this conclusion because there is no evidence from the documented reports that any restaurant has a consistently-practiced policy of refusing service to Negroes. Rather, the discrimination is mostly one of inordinate delay (a consistent ignoring or overlooking of Negro patrons while others are served first) or discourtesy more intemperate than one may reasonably expect from people serving the public.

UNIVERSITY FACILITIES AND ACTIVITIES. There is very little to report in this category. Since the exclusionist policies of fraternities and sororities are well known, in practice, to extend to racial distinctions, it is not surprising that the only reports about such groups concerned some of their activities rather than their membership policies. However, even these cases were too inadequately documented to include in the analysis. It should also be pointed out that the category of University Facilities and Activities was largely denuded when cases of discrimination in dormitory housing were transferred to the general category of Housing. What remains, then, is this kind of case: the documented report of a student who, while representing the university as member of a minor athletic team, met discrimination in out-of-town eating establishments on three different occasions. The reaction of the student: ".....I chose to disregard the action. I felt hurt for the most

part - however, this, one in my position comes to expect."

In comparison with other areas in which racial discrimination occurs, the university setting does not pose the same kind of difficulty for the Negro student, for university policy seeks to achieve non-discriminatory practices on campus. Yet, because the Negro is first of all a student and pursues most of his activities on campus, anything that happens to him in the university setting is likely to carry a disproportionate significance to him.

Surely, it must be disheartening to a Negro student to get listings of available housing from a university office, then find that he is barred from living in these places because of his color. Apparently, despite the control it exercises over other non-university areas of the student's life, the university has not yet reached a point where it is ready to insist that non-university organizations and townspeople who capitalize upon student trade (and whose survival in business depends upon student patronage) must accept its students on a non-racial basis if they want any student patronage.

Nor can we ignore the fact that the university supports and encourages student participation in fraternities and sororities, almost all of which, in practice, exclude Negroes from membership and many of which are breeding grounds for contemptuous attitudes toward people of "other" ethnic backgrounds or people who are "different".

That there is room for improvement at the university is clearly evident. At the same time we do know that problems of racial discrimination are checked and reduced by university policies that are essentially non-discriminatory. But since nearly all of the Negroes living in the community are university students, it seems appropriate that the university, with its status and prestige and sanctions, should take the lead in extending its own equal-treatment policies

to some of the non-university areas that touch the lives of its Negro students. The consequent rewards should be great, not just to Negroes, but to the whole community.

Summary. The two areas of most severe racial discrimination in the local community are (1) housing and (2) tonsorial services (particularly for women).

Without considering the quality of housing available to Negroes but just making an allowance for the fact that only a limited number of Negroes seek housing in town, we can infer from the data that the actual level of discrimination in housing is extremely high.

Tonsorial services (beauty salons or barbershops) in the local community are not at all open to Negro women, and for men they are restricted.

Discrimination in restaurant services usually takes the form of discouragement rather than refusals of service and thus seems not to have the severity of housing or tonsorial problems.

The university, although relatively free of the more flagrant aspects of racial discrimination, is so central a factor in the lives of students that any racial discrimination on campus takes on added significance to Negro students. Further implementing of the university's non-discriminatory policies (e.g., assigning rooms non-racially in women's dormitories) and an extension of its policies to those non-university areas that affect Negro students would be major steps in modifying problems of racial discrimination.

Are Discriminatory Experiences Reported by Negroes
an Overstatement or Understatement of the
Actual Extent of Discriminatory Practices?

The reader will recall that in this study Negroes' reports of their personal encounters with discrimination are used as a basis for drawing inferences about the extent of discriminatory practices in the local community. Information

collected by such a self-report technique, we have pointed out, is normally subject both to overstatement and understatement of the actual situation.

OVERSTATEMENT. In an effort to minimize, if not completely eliminate any overstatement we have required respondents to meet certain criteria of documentation in their reports before their reports could be accepted as evidence of discrimination. The success of this attempt can be judged by the reader himself from an inspection of the criteria that are described on pages 13-16.

Additional Check on Overstatement. Still another check on possible overstatement was attempted by building into the questionnaire a section in which respondents filled out personal data about themselves and their backgrounds.

It was originally thought that if we could compare the people who reported discriminatory experiences with the people who did not, we could see if the background characteristics of these two groups were so different as to suggest that those reporting discrimination may have overstated the case. If, for example, the people who report experiences of discrimination are people whose background experiences make them extremely sensitive to imagined as well as real discrimination or if they are "aggressive agitators" who intentionally seek out possible situations of discrimination for personal publicity or other gain, then such differences ought to show up on any carefully-selected set of questions about respondents' personal characteristics and past history.

Unfortunately, the writer knows of no substantial theory or body of empirical findings upon which clear-cut hypotheses could be built. While it is reasonable to expect that membership in "race" organization or the reading of "race" publications may make a Negro more sensitive to racial problems, no available information will guide us in deciding whether the increased sensitivity

makes the Negro more or less realistic in perceiving situations of possible discrimination or whether it makes him more adventuresome or more cautious about any personal involvement in possible situations of discrimination. Likewise, parental socioeconomic level or past experiences with discrimination or countless other factors may affect the attitude and behavior of a Negro in possible situations of discrimination, but exactly which factors should lead him to overstating his experiences with discrimination cannot be predicted with confidence on the basis of available theory and fact.

For these reasons, no predictions were made. It was decided that a large number (28) of background variables would be examined to see if any consistent pattern of differences between people who experienced discrimination in the local community and those who did not could be found and interpreted. The 28 variables were as follows:

Hometown Background

1. State of residence
2. Size of hometown
3. Amount of residential segregation in hometown
4. Amount of racial discrimination in hometown

Family Background

5. Size of family
6. Condition of home
7. Mother's educational level
8. Father's occupational status
9. Occupational status of parents' 3 closest friends
10. Race of parents' 3 closest friends
11. Residential segregation of parental home
12. Parental membership in "race" organizations
13. Parental reading of "race" publications

Personal Characteristics

14. Age
15. Sex
16. Marital status
17. Skin color
18. Educational level
19. Academic field
20. Level of academic performance
21. Occupational aspirations, past and present
22. Religious preference
23. Religious behavior

24. Membership in "race" organizations
25. Reading of "race" publications
26. Political preference
27. Amount of personal contact with discrimination in hometown
28. Signing of name to questionnaire (although not required)

Results. For this analysis, only the 56 American Negro undergraduates were used, since the background of foreign students (and possibly graduate students) would have to be evaluated by different standards. The singularly striking finding is that not one of these 28 variables shows a significant difference between the people who reported personal encounters with racial discrimination in the local community and those who did not.* Thus, the fact that some Negroes reported discriminatory experiences in the local community while others did not cannot be accounted for by any of the respondents' personal and background characteristics examined in this study. That some of our respondents personally experienced and reported cases of racial discrimination seems to be due to the real nature of the situation rather than to anything peculiar about the respondents themselves.

Conclusion. Inasmuch as no evidence suggesting overstatement of the data on discrimination can be extracted from these comparisons of the personal and background characteristics of the people who reported discrimination and the people who did not, we must again conclude that the basic data collected in this study gives no indication of overstating the actual extent of racial discrimination in the local community.

UNDERSTATEMENT. Understatement, however, is a different situation. Already we have seen strong and obvious evidence that a simple count of the people

*

It is of course possible that a more refined analysis of these data, making second and third order comparisons or controlling for some variables while others are examined simultaneously may reveal consistent trends and stronger differences. The data on personal and background factors is presented in the appendix for the reader who wants a more detailed description of the sample participating in this study.

who report experiences of discrimination tends to underestimate the actual extent of discriminatory practices. For example, only 1/3 of the women in this study report actual encounters with discrimination in tonsorial services (beauty salons). Yet, those who do report discrimination indicate clearly that none of the local shops are open to Negro women. Apparently, the majority of Negro women, accepting the widespread and common knowledge about these discriminatory practices, simply have not risked the embarrassment, humiliation, or loss of time that would be involved in checking each beauty salon personally. Such a practice of using the knowledge and experience of others to spare oneself an inconvenience or a painful experience could hardly be considered an unusual practice for any person or group of people having a legitimate reason for anticipating fearful situations.

Another Check on Understatement. It was hypothesized that this kind of behavior would be characteristic of Negroes in the local community: that they would avoid many situations of possible discrimination by getting prior information about places to which they could "safely" go, and that once warned to expect discrimination in a place they would tend not to go there. Confirmation of this hypothesis that Negroes tend systematically to avoid situations of likely discrimination would then provide further evidence that data listing only the Negro's personal encounters with discrimination do underestimate the actual extent of discriminatory practices.

Results. Respondents were asked the following questions:

1. Before you came to State College or when you initially had to seek some service after being in town, did you ask anybody where Negroes have to go in town to get that service?

2. Did anybody ever volunteer to you (without your asking) information about where a colored person ought to go to get services without embarrassment or discrimination because of his color?

3. Have you ever sought some service or gone to a place in State College even though you had already been warned to expect some discrimination because of your color?

Answers to all of the above questions were Yes or No. In addition, the first two items were each followed by other items asking about the kind of service for which information was sought or received and the kind of people from whom the information was sought or received. The third item above was followed by a request that the respondent document in detail a description of his experience, using the same outline required in the first part of the questionnaire.

For the analysis of answers, the percentage of Negroes who sought or received prior information about "safe" and "unsafe" places for Negroes was derived from the number of respondents who replied Yes to either of the first two questions listed above. The percentage of Negroes who sought service at some place even though warned to expect discrimination there was derived from the number of respondents answering Yes to the third item listed above, whether or not he provided an adequate documentation of his experience. Table 4 shows that the majority of Negroes do seek information or receive unsolicited information about places that are "safe" or "unsafe"

Table 4

THE AVOIDANCE OF DISCRIMINATORY SITUATIONS BY NEGROES

- | | |
|--|-------|
| 1. Negroes who sought or received prior information about "safe" and "unsafe" places for Negroes | 75.0% |
| 2. Negroes who sought service at some place even though warned to expect discrimination there | 8.0% |

in regard to racial discrimination. Responses to related items reveal that the kind of service about which information is most often sought or received is ton-

social service. An overwhelming majority of this interchange of information concerns the beauty salons and barber shops; next in frequency is housing, then restaurants. These findings offer very neat confirmation of the assessments we have already made of the actual extent of discriminatory practices: (1) housing discrimination, which is the kind of discrimination most frequently reported by our respondents, is actually more extensive than reported; (2) tonsorial problems, which were less often reported as areas of discrimination, are much more extensive than reported and probably belong on a par with housing problems; and (3) restaurant discrimination, which was less frequently reported than housing or tonsorial discrimination, possibly is no more extensive than actually reported.

The final bit of information relevant to our hypotheses is strikingly confirmed by results reported in Table 4: the great majority of Negroes (more than 90%) do not go to the "unsafe" places once warned about them.

Conclusion. Clearly, these results offer strongly suggestive evidence that Negroes use the knowledge and experiences of others in avoiding the inconveniences and indignities they would encounter in situations of racial discrimination. Thus, since many Negroes are spared actual contact with racial discrimination, the personal experiences that they can report about discrimination must be fewer than what they could report if they had no such protective measures. These findings, taken altogether, seem to confirm the evidence already obtained that the data based on documented personal experiences of Negroes do underestimate the actual extent of discriminatory practices in the local community.

Attitude of Negroes Toward the Existing Situation
and Toward Possible Corrective Programs

How Do Negroes Feel about Their Encounters with
Discrimination in the Local Community?

Already, we have said a good deal about the reactions of Negroes to their experiences with discrimination in the local community. (See pages 21-23, 28-29.)

Is it possible for us to classify these reactions to see if there are characteristic effects that discriminatory experiences have on the respondents in our sample?

Some writers have tried to establish a few basic categories into which Negroes' responses to prejudice and discrimination may be placed. One writer, for example, uses a 3-category system: (1) aggression, (2) avoidance, and (3) acceptance. The interesting thing about this category system is the fact that the writer was obliged to recognize the extremely complicated nature of any response that a Negro may give to experiences of prejudice and discrimination; and very few responses, he decided, fitted easily into just one of these categories.

One illustration of how the response of a Negro may carry a meaning and intent very different from its appearance is the "exasperating" slowness and awkwardness with which some Southern Negroes have been observed to perform a job. The worker does only what he is told to do, no more than that; and what he does is so technically minimal or is performed so spiritlessly that his efforts may even subvert the purpose of the job. This kind of reaction has been defined by many writers as a clear case of aggression, even though there is not the slightest appearance of hostility in the surface demeanor of the Negro worker and even though he appears outwardly to accept his oppressive lot. To be sure, this reaction will be interpreted by the Negro's superior as proof of the Negro's stupidity or inferiority, but it

is a form of aggression that even the most powerless member of an oppressed group may express. Evidence that it is often a consciously-used tactic for expressing hostility without inviting severe retaliation can be overheard from private conversations among some Negroes. Admittedly, this kind of tactic can be used by anyone in an oppressive situation from which escape seems impossible, and in that sense it is not peculiar to the Southern Negro or to any Negro for that matter. But it is relevant in this discussion about Negroes because it has been in the past one of the few expressions of aggression directed at the superior group that was available to many oppressed Southern Negroes. At the least, such an example should clearly point up the dangers in trying to put anything as complicated as the response of a Negro to discrimination into a single category.

In view of these reservations, any attempt to classify the feelings that our respondents expressed about their experiences with discrimination in the local community cannot be undertaken with great confidence. Nevertheless, such an attempt has been made and is reported below in Table 5. As long as the reader interprets the data in Table 5 with appropriate caution, he may obtain a reasonable summary of the feelings that our respondents expressed about their experiences with discrimination in the local community.

Ideally, the data presented in Table 5 should not be too literal an interpretation of the words of our respondents, made without regard to the context in which they appeared or without regard to the personal and background data that we have about these people. For this reason, some additional comment is desirable.

The reader can readily see from Table 5 that the more obviously aggressive responses to discrimination occur very infrequently. Is it possible that the aggression which most theorists feel is the normal response to such experiences has been genuinely washed out of our respondents? Or could it be--and this seems the more

Table 5

A 5-CATEGORY CLASSIFICATION OF
FEELINGS AND REACTIONS EXPRESSED BY NEGROES ABOUT THEIR
ENCOUNTERS WITH DISCRIMINATION IN THE LOCAL COMMUNITY
The Percentage of Reactions in Each Category

1. Hurt, tension, despair	51.6%
2. Non-emotional interpretation of own views and reasons of discriminator	16.1%
3. Persistence in standing for rights	12.9%
4. Humor or satire	9.7%
5. Anger	9.7%

likely alternative--that the aggression is masked by and submerged beneath those middle-class values which, reinforced in a college atmosphere, tend to discourage outward expressions of aggression?

At least, we have some evidence that our respondents do possess (or are striving to acquire) strong middle-class values. Their occupational aspirations are overwhelmingly middle-class. Moreover, their backgrounds suggest strong upward mobility on the part of their parents. For example, even though the majority of our respondents' fathers have unskilled and blue-collar occupations, the occupations of their parents' three closest friends are almost completely professional, business, and white-collar. Although the parents themselves have had to settle for lower-class occupations, they seem to have reached out, to have found, and to have surrounded themselves with close associates who represent higher levels of occupational status. It is not hard to imagine that the environmental proximity of these parental friends may have provided not only identification models for our respondents but much of the specific encouragement and stimulation that directed our respondents to college rather than to work. But it is also not hard to imagine that a family background characterized by strong upward mobility may be presenting our respondents with some of the conflicts of what sociologically has been labeled the "marginal man."

Table 2

If so, our respondents can be expected to have strong desires to escape from all signs and reminders of a lower-class status which, to Negroes, is characterized by racial discrimination more oppressive and flagrant than the discrimination encountered by upper-class Negroes. If so, our respondents would want to be accepted by the larger world, which at present is the local community and includes whites as well as Negroes. Yet, they are prevented from participating fully in this larger world, receiving from every act of racial discrimination another sign and another reminder of their implied inferiority. Perhaps the surest and easiest way of not having to accept the notion of inferiority is to avoid all situations of possible discrimination. Indeed, we have already seen that the majority of our respondents do tend to avoid situations of possible discrimination. But avoidance can almost never be complete for the Negro because of his skin color. Moreover, even the act of avoiding must make a Negro aware that he is limiting and circumscribing his activities because of possible prejudice and discrimination. Thus, the conflict for many of our respondents might be: to participate or not to participate, to chance the possibility of being rejected or not to chance it. But some of our respondents, despite their avoidance techniques, run headlong into discrimination in the local community. Is it likely that these people would express their aggression openly, if to do so would mean accepting consciously the fact that they have been rejected by the people who represent that larger world to which their middle-class aspirations are still driving them?

Whatever may be the facts, the data show that the majority of our respondents do not react to discriminatory experiences in the local community with forthright and open aggression. It is only in the background data on our respondents that we find suggestions that (1) the aggression may exist but be contained, (2) our respondents may be in conflict, and (3) their uneasiness may focus on the relation between

their aspirations and the opportunities they have for realizing them in a setting of racial discrimination.

Can Negroes Get Help or Counsel about Problems of Racial Discrimination?

Is there, then, any place or anyone to whom Negroes can turn for wise counsel about problems arising from racial discrimination? Or are our respondents' difficulties compounded by having to work out discrimination problems as best they can by themselves or with the "assistance" of peers no more knowledgeable than they themselves? Respondents were asked the following question:

Where and to whom in the local community (including the university) can you confidently go to get help or wise counsel about personal problems of racial discrimination?

In answering this question, respondents were directed to list all places and persons they considered sources of help and to write in "none" if there were no one who could serve such a role to them.

The major finding: more than a third (34.4%) of all respondents report that they have no one in the local community (including the university) to whom they can confidently go for help or wise counsel about personal problems of racial discrimination.

An additional finding that deserves further investigation is that the respondents who personally encountered discrimination in the local community are more likely to say that they have no source of help than are the respondents who did not report discriminatory experiences: 42.3% of the discrimination-encountering people report no source of help, while only 28.9% of the people who report no discrimination claim that they have no source of help.

The fact that more than a third of our total sample of Negroes have no one to

whom they can confidently go for help or wise counsel about personal problems of racial discrimination points up another problem in the local community that needs attention, especially since the people who have come face to face with discriminatory situations are less likely than the people who have not encountered problems to have such sources of help.

We suspect, of course, that the apparently more serious plight of the people who personally encountered discrimination cannot be explained in terms of their not having access to as many different sources of help as the people who did not encounter discrimination. Nor do we believe that these people met discrimination in the first place simply because they did not know or have contact with enough other people who might have given them information or warnings that could have helped them to avoid discriminatory experiences. Our data clearly refute both of these explanations because (1) the variety (the number of different sources) of sources of help is just as frequent among respondents who met discrimination as among those who did not, and (2) the interchange of information about "safe" and "unsafe" places for Negroes occurs just as frequently with those who met discrimination as with those who did not.

Instead, we suspect that the apparently more serious plight of the people who personally encountered discrimination is due to their feeling that the kind of help they want is less likely to be found among the people they know. The kind of help they want is help that will change the basic discriminatory situation--help that will change the practices and policies of those who have discriminated against them. These suspicions of ours are suggested by two strands of evidence:

1. The kind of help they want is less likely to be found among people they know. Personal encounters with discrimination undoubtedly impress our respondents with the extreme importance that a single feature--skin color--takes on for the people who discriminate against them. Thus, people who experienced discrimination, when compared with those who did not, ought to be more doubtful that other Negroes who face the same skin color problem can be of significant help to them in correcting the situation. What is the evidence? The people who met discrimination listed other Negroes as sources of help much less often (26.1% of their listings) than the people who did not meet discrimination (60.5% of their listings).
2. The help they want is help that will change those who discriminate against them. Personal encounters with discrimination undoubtedly make our respondents more concerned about changing the basic sources of their difficulties. Thus, people who met discrimination, when compared with those who did not, should show a greater preference for corrective programs that require other people (the discriminators), and not themselves, to be changed. What is the evidence? In 15 out of 16 programs, the people who met discrimination, when compared with those who did not, gave higher ratings to programs requiring discriminators to change and lower ratings to programs requiring Negroes to change. (See page 46.)

It seems, then, that there is a need for some source of help to which Negroes can turn with confidence in tackling their problems of racial discrimination. But the kind of help desired, at least by the people who have had to live through personal experiences of discrimination in the local community, seems not to be the consoling or sympathetic counsel, the platitudes or righteousness and democracy, the pleas for patience, or information about how to avoid discriminatory situations, but rather a kind of help that actively aims at correcting the basic situation by changing the practices of the discriminator.

How Sensitive Would Negroes Be to Publicity about their Experiences with Discrimination in the Local Community?

If some of our respondents do want the basic discriminatory situation corrected, would they be willing to have wide publicity given to the actual incidents of discrimination? Would any of our respondents, being embarrassed, balk at such publicity? Respondents were asked the following question:

Sometimes an effective way to modify racial discrimination involves giving wide publicity to the actual incidents of discrimination, since some people who might work toward correcting the situation would not know of the problem without the publicity. Suppose color discrimination were found to be more extensive than generally suspected in State College and these conditions were widely publicized without singling out any particular Negro. Would you be embarrassed if this were done in State College?

Results: 94% of our respondents replied "no" to this question. Thus, the overwhelming majority of all of our respondents have, in effect, given a "go-ahead" signal to the publicizing of the data collected in this study. But does this willingness for publicity extend as far as singling out individuals?

Respondents were asked:

Would you be embarrassed by any publicity that singled YOU out as a victim of racial discrimination?

More than a quarter of our respondents would be embarrassed by such publicity. The more accurate conclusion to draw, therefore, is that nearly all of our respondents will go along with wide publicity about actual incidents of discrimination, as long as individual Negroes are not singled out. It should hardly be surprising that some people would be embarrassed by publicity that pointed the finger to them as individuals. Furthermore, it is inconceivable that any organization working toward the modification of discriminatory practices would ever want to single out individual Negroes in this way if it could possibly avoid doing so. What is important--and a hopeful sign--is that most Negroes in this sample are willing to have the discriminatory incidents publicized, if this will help to modify the existing situation.

How Do Negroes Evaluate the Effectiveness of
Various Programs that Might Be Used in
Modifying Discriminatory Practices?

On the assumption that any organization planning programs to modify existing discriminatory practices would want to know how Negroes judge the possible effectiveness of various action programs, an assessment was made of Negro attitudes to a num-

ber of programs. Such information might prove particularly valuable if any of the programs considered should require the active cooperation or support of Negroes themselves.

The inclusion of such an assessment in this study is not predicated upon the assumption that Negroes because they are Negroes must be better judges than whites about what constitutes an effective program. It is possible that Negro students because they are students may be no better judges than white students. It is also possible that many Negroes, absorbing the values of a predominantly white culture, may be no more informed or realistic about judging action programs than many whites who absorb the values of a predominantly white culture. It is altogether possible that the wisest decisions about the choice of action programs need to come from experts in the area of intergroup relations--experts whose decisions or suggestions are based on a thorough examination of the peculiarities of the local situation.

Perhaps the most important thing we might expect to show about Negro attitudes is the kind of differences, if any, between the people who personally encountered racial discrimination in the local community and those who did not report discriminatory experiences. Already, we have seen evidence (pp. 38-42) that the reactions of our respondents to specific incidents of discrimination could not be considered particularly aggressive. Yet, even if personal encounters with discrimination do not tear away our respondents' patience, their tolerance, and their middle-class values, and even if these experiences do not lay bare an underlying bitterness, resentment, and militancy, it does seem reasonable that first-hand encounters with discrimination ought at least to make the people who experience them more likely to place the responsibility and the burden of changing on the discriminators rather than on themselves.

Respondents were requested to rate the effectiveness of 16 different courses of action aimed at improving group relations. Directions were as follows:

Suppose that discrimination and prejudice were practiced toward certain minority groups in your community, and that you and several interested persons wanted to improve these conditions. How effective do you think each of the following courses of action would be if you undertook them?

We have suggested that the respondents who personally encountered discrimination in the local community should be more likely than the people who did not meet discrimination to place the responsibility and the burden of changing on the discriminator than on themselves. This hypothesis can be checked by dividing the 16 action programs into two categories: (1) those programs that place the burden of changing on the discriminators, and (2) those programs that place the burden of changing on the Negro himself. We would expect our respondents who experienced discrimination, when compared with those who did not, to give higher ratings of effectiveness to the 14 programs that place the responsibility on the discriminator and lower ratings of effectiveness to the 2 programs that place the responsibility on the Negro. Are these expectations confirmed?

The findings are almost perfectly in line with expectations. Of the 14 discriminator-is-responsible programs, 13 are rated higher in effectiveness by the people who personally encountered discrimination in the local community. Of the 2 Negro-is-responsible programs, both are rated lower in effectiveness by the people who encountered discrimination. Thus, 15 of the 16 corrective programs are evaluated by respondents in the way predicted. These findings seem also to support an earlier contention (see page 43) that the kind of help desired by the people who personally encountered discrimination was not just something that would enable them to "adjust" but something that would change the basic discriminatory situation by changing the discriminators.

It is very interesting, however, that the two programs placing the responsibility and the burden of changing on Negroes rather than the discriminators were ranked first and second in a list of 16 by the people who did not report personal experiences of discrimination. Indeed, it even begins to seem that were it not for personal encounters with discrimination in the local community, the remaining respondents might also have rated these two programs at the top. As it was, the people who encountered discrimination ranked the two Negro-is-responsible programs second and fifth, respectively, out of 16. The relatively high ratings given by all of our respondents to these two courses of action strongly suggest that when a Negro lives in a world continually threatening him with prejudice and discrimination and continually requiring him to defend against prejudice and discrimination, he can hardly avoid accepting the notion of inferiority that is implied and often made real by the discriminatory situation itself. Thus, even though the people who encountered discrimination in the local community do take a somewhat stronger, and apparently more realistic, stand on the kinds of action programs that would be effective, it is clearly evident that our respondents as a group seem to be pointing the accusing finger inward rather than outward. The reader will wonder if this is an especially healthy or realistic reaction and, if he is disturbed, may recall a quotation from the writer who said, "When one is abused or insulted and forces oneself to react passively, the hatred that would normally be directed toward the abusing or insulting person is instead turned inward."

If, now, we try to summarize the kinds of ratings that all of our respondents gave to the 16 corrective programs, can we find any consistent trends? In general, the programs emphasizing the educational, persuasive approach were ranked highest, those emphasizing legal action and behind-the-scenes maneuvering ranked near the middle, and those emphasizing the more obviously aggressive courses of action (protests, petition, boycotts, etc.) ranked lowest.

Perhaps we should not be surprised at the high ratings given by our respondents to educational or persuasive programs such as:

Organize intergroup workshops for specific groups such as foremen, teachers, playground supervisors, etc., that are handling intergroup situations in their work.

Arrange forums, lectures, and other public meetings where the social contributions and ways of life of different minority groups are interpreted to the community.

Apart from the fact that such programs may be significantly helpful in certain localities and under certain conditions, it is also very likely that their persuasive, educational nature give them a special appeal to the educated, middle-class person.

Perhaps, too, we should not be surprised that our respondents place at the bottom of the list the conspicuously aggressive action of boycotting and mass picketing of firms that practice discrimination. We have several times pointed out the absence of very aggressive responses from our respondents about discrimination problems, and we have sought to explain this in part as a reflection of their middle-class orientation. If this is a reasonable explanation, then it might be that they would perceive the act of picketing as a lower, working-class reaction. Or picketing may represent an admission that persuasive educational measures, so highly valued by the educated middle class, have failed. Or perhaps the act of picketing would have the unfortunate disadvantage of conspicuously identifying our respondents to the world as people who, despite their self-deceiving pretensions of being fully accepted, are really at the bottom of the status ladder.

On the other hand, it is not inconceivable that our respondents have realistically evaluated the boycott technique in relation to the local scene and deemed it inadvisable, fearing that the Negro's normal contribution (and that of his supporters) to the boycotted organization might not really be essential to the organi-

2

zation's welfare or survival, or fearing that the boycotting group might not have sufficient time and economic resource to maintain an extended action, or fearing that the boycotting group might lack the necessary morale, cohesiveness, and willingness to be exposed to public scrutiny, criticism, or possibly abuse, or fearing that the boycotting group might not be able to obtain legal protection (support instead of harassment) for its activities, etc.

On still the other hand, our respondents' lower ratings of the more aggressive courses of action may simply reflect the spirit of the times--if there is such a thing. A greater need for conformity or inconspicuousness may be ascendant in American culture, so that it is becoming harder and harder to find people who are willing to take strong stands and forthright action on the basis of principle.

Whatever the reasons--our respondents' middle-class orientation, their realistic assessment of the probable success of various courses of action in the local setting, or their conformity to the spirit of the times--it is a fact that the kind of action programs rated higher in effectiveness by our respondents seem to reflect both their faith in persuasive educational methods and their apparent acceptance of an often-heard premise that the responsibility and the burden of change lies with the Negro rather than with the discriminator.

Since our respondents are still striving to reach future goals--as are most college students--it will be interesting to see if, after they have "arrived" and attained some status, their preferences for action programs will become more militant and less self-accepting of blame. It will be interesting, too, to compare our respondents' evaluations of the different courses of action with those of experts who may be called on to appraise the local situation.

Overall Summary

This study of racial discrimination in the State College community was based on an analysis of questionnaires administered to a sample of 67 Negro students in the Spring of 1958. The two major objectives of the study were (1) to obtain estimates of the extent and nature of discriminatory practices in the local community, and (2) to determine the attitudes of Negroes toward discrimination problems and toward possible corrective programs.

Estimates of the actual extent of discriminatory practices were derived from reports of discriminatory experiences personally encountered by Negroes. Overstatement of the extent of discrimination was prevented by requiring extensive documentation from the respondents and by providing internal checks in the data. Understatement of the actual extent of racial discrimination could not be eliminated from the basic data but was systematically assessed.

Major findings were as follows:

1. Two out of every five Negroes have personally encountered racial discrimination in the local community. Further analysis of the data reveals that this figure would be much higher were it not for (a) the confinement of some Negro activity to the campus, and (b) the protective measures that Negroes use to avoid direct encounters with discrimination.
2. It is assumed that the task of getting services which are rarely or not at all available is more basic than the task of improving the range and quality of available services. On the basis of this assumption, it is judged that the State College community has some severe problems of racial discrimination. Areas of most severe discrimination are (a) housing, and (b) tonsorial services (in particular, beauty salons for women). Other areas of discrimination problems are fully discussed and evaluated.
3. Reactions of Negroes to discriminatory experiences are intense and varied but much more likely to be despairing than aggressive. The kinds of corrective programs judged to be most effective by Negroes are those that emphasize persuasive, educational techniques. Other attitudes of Negroes are discussed.