Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies

Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies
Collection

2017

An Empirical Assessment of Multicultural Education Programs in Reducing Islamophobia on a College Campus

Amin Asfari
Walden University

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Amin Asfari

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Ron Hirschbein, Committee Chairperson,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. George Larkin, Committee Member,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Tanya Settles, University Reviewer,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2017

Abstract

An Empirical Assessment of Multicultural Education Programs in Reducing

Islamophobia on a College Campus

by

Amin Asfari

MS, East Carolina University, 2010

BS, Campbell University, 2005

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

January 2017

Abstract

Anti-Muslim prejudice has increased precipitously since the attacks of September 11, 2001, including prejudicial effects related to socio-cultural differences on college campuses. The purpose of this quasi-experimental exploratory research was to understand the effectiveness of multicultural education programs (MEPs) in reducing anti-Muslim prejudice in higher education. Grounded in intergroup threat theory and frame analysis, it was hypothesized that students who are not engaged in multicultural affairs will perceive Muslims as more threatening and will therefore hold more prejudiced views than would students who active in multicultural affairs. The sample consisted of 125 respondents ($N = 51$ from a group participating in an MEP; and $N = 74$ from a control group of students who did not participate in an MEP) from a large research university in the Southeastern United States. Data were collected through a survey to measure symbolic threat, realistic threat, and Islamophobia. An independent group-posttest design was used to explore the effectiveness of MEPs and the independent groups' t test was performed to examine differences in the respondents' attitudes toward Muslims. Moderate yet significant differences were present between groups, suggesting that the effects of the MEP were positive. Respondents engaged in multicultural programs were less likely to perceive Muslims as threats and were less likely to hold Islamophobic views of Muslims than were their peers from the control group. Results indicate positive social change implications for the integration of American Muslims as well as the development of more comprehensive programs for educators and policy makers.

An Empirical Assessment of Multicultural Education Programs in Reducing

Islamophobia on a College Campus

By

Amin Asfari

MS, East Carolina University, 2010

BS, Campbell University, 2005

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

May 2017

Dedication

I dedicate this work to my parents Najdat and Soraya Asfari. Mom, I wish that you were around to see the fruit of your labor and sacrifice. To my father, this endeavor would not have been possible without your constant support in everything I have chosen to do. You raised this family alone as a stranger in a new land, you overcame many hurdles as the 'other' and you faced the challenges alone, just to see us succeed. Know that your work was not in vain. Also, I dedicate this work to my beautiful wife Vasilica and our wonderful children—Yusuf, Ayah, and Adam. Know, my children, that the world is filled with hope and goodness, but it is also filled with marginalization and oppression; it is your obligation to speak truth to power and to never neglect your duties to your fellow human beings—no matter how different they are from you.

"What actions are most excellent? To gladden the heart of a human being, to feed the hungry, to help the afflicted, to lighten the sorrow of the sorrowful, and to remove the wrongs of the injured" ~ Prophet Muhammad

Acknowledgements

My sincerest and most heartfelt gratitude goes to my chair, Dr. Hirschbein for supporting me in my journey, and guiding me every step of the way. Dr. H is more than a chair, he is a close friend and an exemplary human being; his kindness, wisdom, and whit are unmatched—thank you! Through this journey, Dr. H and I have experienced personal tragedy, and his unwavering resolve to do good in the face of hardship, was all the more inspiring. I would also like to thank my committee member, Dr. Larkin for the continued encouragement and support. Dr. Larkin's support and encouragement are a testament to his wonderful character as a human being. I cannot thank Dr. Larkin enough and I consider him a mentor and a friend. Last, but certainly not least, I want to thank Dr. Tanya Settles, a passionate advocate for her students, and an excellent mentor. Dr. Settles, I cannot thank you enough.

A special thanks to those who made my field research possible—you know who you are. To the program director of the multicultural education program on the university campus, keep up the good work—your efforts are not in vain. To my family members, I thank you for your understanding when I couldn't join in the fun, and for your encouragement and support; I love you all!

Table of Contents

ii

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Introduction

One way to counter anti-Muslim rhetoric is to focus on education policy, specifically, higher education. While academics and politicians often tout multiculturalism as a solution to the struggles of heterogeneous societies, little attention is given to the implementation of empirically supported multiculturalism policies as a countermeasure to increased intergroup hostilities (Edgberg, 2004). While the development of multicultural programs has shown some measure of success in the public school system, there is a dearth of substantive literature on anti-Muslim prejudice in postsecondary educational institutions; to the contrary, there is evidence to suggest that abstract applications of multiculturalism, even in higher education, have little effect on anti-Muslim prejudice (Ari & Laron, 2014). Thus, some have suggested that a veneer of multiculturalism is not sufficient in reducing prejudice; rather, a more comprehensive curriculum, embedded within college programs of study, is needed to ameliorate the collateral consequences of heterogeneous societies (Ari & Laron, 2014).

Multiculturalism models peaceful coexistence among different cultural, ethnic, and religious backgrounds. Some have used the multicultural paradigm as a conflict-resolution tool (Pedreny & Radazzo, 2012), a way to enhance academic achievement of underrepresented groups (Hanley, 2012), to challenge racism through antiracist education (Naseem, 2011), and to increase pluralism through higher education policies (Henderson-King & Kaleta, 2000). Historically, research on multiculturalism has focused on race and

ethnicity, especially in the United States. In Europe, however, multiculturalism

scholarship has included religious differences. The European experiment derives from

closer geographical ties with different racial and religious groups. Multicultural societies

experience intergroup conflict at a rate higher than homogeneous societies (Akbarzadeh

& Roose, 2011; Coenders & Scheepers, 2003; Yazdiha, 2014; Sidanius, Bobo, & Pratto,

1996). Since the attacks of 9/11, American Muslims have been largely singled-out as the

new "other" in the United States (Akbarzadeh & Roose, 2011; Jung, 2012). The singling

out and mistreatment of American Muslims has taken on several forms, from overt acts

of discrimination; to covert institutionalized homeland security policies that

overwhelmingly target Muslims. Both of these types of discrimination are considered

new manifestations of xenophobic attitudes in the multicultural landscape. Indeed,

scholars have coined the term "Islamophobia" in reference to this new fear of Islam and

Muslims.

Recent political events have ushered in a rise in anti-Muslim prejudice at a scale

that is only comparable to the current anti-Semitism of Europe. Moving from society's

fringe groups and into mainstream political dialogue, the current wave of anti-Muslim

prejudice suggests a paradigm shift in multicultural discourse in the United States and

Western Europe. However, the sudden and sharp increase in anti-Muslim prejudice leads

me to ascertain origins. In a report by the Center for American Progress, titled *Fear, Inc.*

2.0, Duss, Taeb, Gude, and Sofer (2015) describe a meticulous, well-connected group of

pseudo-experts who have worked to establish a deeply penetrating Islamophobia

network. Duss et al. (2015) estimated the funding of Islamophobia to be around $57 million in the United States. Such aggressive tactics are amplified by a media apparatus; that often frames Muslims as distinctly different from the indigenous citizenry (Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011). Yazhiha (2014) expanded upon the findings of Duss et al. (2015) by investigating the institutionalization of Islamophobia by framing anti-Muslim sentiment in the law. This attempt to legitimize Islamophobia has seen some success by the introduction of 78 anti-Sharia bills in multiple states—with some successfully passing (Yazdiha, 2014).

Unlike classical forms of prejudice, Islamophobia is different because it is based largely—if not solely—on religion. Indeed, the American Muslim population is not a monolithic group. Adherents to the Islamic faith are represented in nearly all countries around the globe, including native-born Americans. In his seminal work, Gordon Allport (1954) discussed the relationship between race and prejudice as a recent phenomenon. In discourse on prejudice, race is currently viewed as the indicator of prejudice because it is visible; and therefore requires minimal effort for the racist individual to distinguish between his or her race and that of the "other." Religion, however, is less prominent and tends to require more effort on the part of the individual racist to know the other persons' religious (or non-religious) affiliation; this in turn, leads to fewer incidents of religiously based discrimination in contrast to racially based prejudice. Moreover, among different religious groups, there is less prejudice between members of different religious groups towards each other than there is towards non-religious individuals (Jackson &

Hunsberger, 1999). However, Cullingford (2000) suggested that religiously motivated prejudice is more potent because of the perception that only one religion can be the "true" religion.

Research suggested that an inverse relationship exists between educational attainment and prejudice (Coenders & Scheepers, 2003; Sidanius et al., 1996). According to Coenders and Scheepers (2003) formal education allows individuals to see the world in more complex ways than those lacking a formal education; therefore, educated individuals are less likely to engage in broad generalizations about individuals based on a few experiences. Tajfel (1981) discussed this process of categorization as a necessary human behavior rooted in survival. Indeed, humans resort to categorization of events because the mind is incapable of resorting to individual scrutiny of each event—an overwhelming endeavor. Thus, it is easier for humans to generalize or categorize people based on a few interactions with them in the past (Tajfel, 1981).

This research sought to identify the benefits of multicultural diversity programs on the reduction of anti-Muslim prejudice. Given the likelihood that students engaged in diversity initiatives on campus are racially diverse, I anticipated less prejudiced attitudes toward Muslims than students from the general student body. Prior research demonstrates that racial group dominance—which is more likely to exist in the general student body—leads to increased prejudice (Sidanius et al., 1996). Moreover, multiculturalism has been viewed by majority in-group members in college settings (i.e. White students) as a form of exclusion because of the heavy emphasis on the promotion

of "other" cultures (Plaut et al., 2011). There are certain contingencies upon which the relationship between education and prejudice rest. Specifically, the academic discipline to which a student belongs may be related to their level of prejudice. A study by Gassner and McGuigan (2014) revealed that students enrolled in Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) showed less prejudice as seniors than those enrolled in Business Administration (BA). As a result, it is anticipated that there may be discipline—specific differences when measuring anti-Muslim attitudes.

Problem Statement

This study is intended to fill the gap in the literature on the relationship between multicultural programs on college campuses and anti-Muslim attitudes by testing for differences in attitudes between students engaged in diversity programs and those from the general student body. While a growing body of literature on anti-Muslim prejudice is surfacing, there is little research into the effects of cultural pluralism on anti-Muslim attitudes in colleges and universities. The sharp increase in anti-Muslim prejudice post-9/11 has followed by a corresponding increase in discrimination and criminal acts against American Muslims (Ogan, Willnat, Pennington, & Bashir, 2013; Savelkoul, Scheepers, Tolsma, & Hagendoorn, 2011). Recently, three Muslim students were killed in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, by a neighbor who was a college student (Katz, 2015; Talbot, 2015). Some see this as a hate crime motivated by the victims' Islamic faith.

Nature of the Study

Participants in this study were drawn from a local research university population. The first group ($N = 51$) consisted of a convenience sample drawn from the Multicultural Student Association (MSA), an organization dedicated to fostering and showcasing the diversity of the university's student body. The second group of participants were chosen from the general student body ($N = 74$). Students who indicate that they were Muslim or whose family members were Muslims were eliminated from the sample to avoid bias.

Questionnaires were transmitted with the required informed consent document. At the end of the survey, participants were fully debriefed. No identifying information was placed on the surveys other than numbers for ease of analysis. After the surveys were completed, they were coded. All study will be retained at the researchers' residence, in hard copy format, for five years and then destroyed. In this research, the quasi-experimental design was the independent group posttest. Although a true experiment would have been the ideal design, time constraints did not permit such an undertaking. Experimental designs allow for random assignment, better control for validity; and reliability, as well as increased generalizability of findings. However, such designs are rarely used in prejudice reduction research because they cannot be easily undertaken in the field; instead, they are carried out in laboratory settings. Chapter 3 will contain a more thorough discussion of the research design and justification for its use.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study sought to answer the following overarching research question: How effective is the multicultural student association at reducing anti-Muslim prejudice? To properly answer this question, the following sub-questions were addressed:

1. Are there significant differences between the MSA and non-MSA groups in anti-Muslim prejudice?

2. Does the type of news about Muslims and Islam impact a student's attitude toward Muslims; and does the participation in the MSA mitigate anti-Muslim prejudice?

3. Does a student's declared major affect his or her attitudes toward Muslims?

Several hypotheses were assessed in this research. First, I hypothesized that participation in the MSA would lead to reduced levels of anti-Muslim attitudes (H_1). There is an abundance of literature which supports the hypothesis that exposure to people of different racial backgrounds significantly reduces prejudice (Rattan & Ambady, 2014; Triandis & Trafimow, 2001; Zebrowitz, White, & Wieneke, 2008). Second, I hypothesized that exposure to negative images of Muslims in the media increases anti-Muslim attitudes in college students (H_2). However, I also hypothesized that anti-Muslim prejudice would be mitigated by participation in the MSA. Third, I hypothesized that respondents who majored in a natural science would display significantly more anti-Muslim attitudes than students enrolled in the social sciences (H_3). Previous research suggested that college students enrolled as natural science or business majors showed no

significant reduction in prejudice; while students in the social sciences did show significant reduction in prejudice.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the efficacy of diversity programs on college campuses as way to counter anti-Muslim prejudice. The study also sought to empirically examine the ways in which anti-Muslim prejudice manifests itself through the use of mass media and the lack of interaction with people of different racial groups. Additionally, this research documented the attitudinal differences between those exposed to multicultural diversity programs and those who were not exposed. The between-group difference that could become apparent suggests that multicultural programs on college campuses are easy ways to mitigate anti-Muslim prejudice. Given the possible effectiveness of the MSA; including incentive-based motivations for multicultural engagement on college campuses may be a simple solution to increasing awareness of Islamophobia and reducing anti-Muslim victimization.

Theoretical Framework

This study was grounded in two theoretical frameworks: framing theory and integrated threat theory. Framing theory suggests that the social world consists of purposeful attempts at defining reality (Goffman, 1974). That is, reality is a social construct, an abstraction which is malleable and apt to change with time. Moreover, framing theory suggests that humans interpret the world through a "primary frame", whereby they recognize particular events. This primary frame is divided into natural and

social frames. The former refers to a naturally occurring event (e.g. sunset) from which the observer derives no hidden meaning or implication. The latter, however, is a socially constructed frame; that is guided by intentional, purposeful actors or agents. The media's use of social frames in its coverage of Muslims may be seen as the mechanism of perpetuating misinformation about a social group (Morey & Yaqin, 2011), which in turn aggravated anti-Muslim attitudes (Ogan, Willnat, Pennington, & Bashir, 2013; Simut, 2016). Due to the subtle messages presented in the media, anti-Muslim attitudes may be implicit and thus require priming in order to become apparent.

Framing theory can be used to explain aversion to members of the out-group, in this case Muslims, because they are framed as distinctly different from members of the in-group. Media framing is used to construct issues for an audience in certain ways. Since students are now more "connected" than ever to the 24-hour media cycle, they are likely to be the group most exposed to the imagery of Muslims. Media coverage of Muslims has been historically inaccurate and misleading; this group has often been portrayed as incongruent with Western democratic society, even more so immediately following the attacks of 9/11.

Muslims and Muslim related crimes are rarely portrayed through an objective lens. According to Rane and Ewart (2012) the "media coverage of terrorism in the United States…feeds Orientalism and a culture of fear of Islam, while heightening the United States as a good Christian nation" (p. 105). Iyengar (1991) suggested that acts of violence perpetrated by Muslims are not treated in the same way as acts of violence

perpetrated by non-Muslims; furthermore, coverage of terrorism is often episodic rather than thematic. According to Iyengar (1991) episodic frames are used to depict issues as singular incidents, not connected to a historical timeline; whereas thematic frames are those that are grounded in context. In this fashion, viewers of violence perpetrated by Muslims fail to understand historical events which lead to acts. In contrast to the continued framing of Muslims and Islam in the United States as the perpetrators of terror, Ewart and Rane (2013) found that the coverage of the tenth anniversary of 9/11 in Australia across five television channels did not conflate Islam and terrorism, nor was the religion or its adherents blamed for the event; instead, religion was referred to as a the mechanism of social reconciliation and positive force for moving forward.

This study also relied upon intergroup threat theory—originally called integrated threat theory (ITT, Stephen & Stephen, 2000) which suggests that two types of threats lead to prejudice toward out-group members: (a) symbolic threat, and (b) realistic threat. In this study, the two types of threats proposed by ITT were used as antecedents to attitudes about Islam and Muslims. That is their existence; predicted the direction of the respondents' attitude toward Islam and Muslims. The first version of ITT-- integrated threat theory; was used to explain perceptions of White exclusion (Plaut et al., 2011), the effect of education on ethnic exclusionism, as well as studies of intergroup attitudes, including attitudes towards Moroccan immigrants in Spain and Russian and Ethiopian immigrants in Israel.

Because Muslims are a racially heterogeneous group (Meer, 2008), consisting largely of first generation immigrants and immigrants may be seen to pose a threat to in-group values and culture, ITT will be used to understand American students' attitudes toward the group. Further, ITT was used because of the negative portrayal of Muslims in the media (negative stereotypes), and because the terrorists who carried out the attacks of 9/11 and San Bernardino, California were Muslims (realistic threats), as well as the lack of interaction between in-group members and American Muslims (intergroup contacts). Lastly, Muslim Americans are often visibly different than members of the in-group (e.g., bearded men in religious garments or women who wear the headscarf) and may therefore pose a threat to the dominant culture or values (symbolic threat).

Operational Definitions

Framing: "To delineate other people's reality, highlighting one interpretation while de-emphasizing a less favoured one" (Papacharissi & Oliveira, 2008, as cited in Rane & Ewart, 2012; p. 311).

In-group: A group of individuals who share a similar racial, religious, and cultural heritage, and who compose the largest segment of a society. In-group members are said to have high power (i.e. legislative power)

Islamophobia: A general fear and hatred of Islam and Muslims.

Multiculturalism: "Culture as a shared way of life among people, and how to accommodate differences among them"

Out-group: A group of individuals who share a similar racial, religious, and cultural heritage, and who compose a minority group in society. Out-group members are said to have low power (i.e. legislative power) (Stephan, Ybarra, & Morrison, 2009)

Prejudice: "A *preconceived* judgement or opinion held my members of a group; most commonly it is an irrational attitude of hostility directed against an individual, a group, a race, or their supposed characteristics" (Barak, 2009, p. 242, emphasis in original).

Stereotype: "A standardized, oversimplified, and typically negative mental picture held by a person or persons about members of another group and sometimes about their own group as well" (Barak, 2009, p. 242, emphasis in original).

Assumptions

The study used a survey instrument to measure participants' attitudes toward American Muslims and Islam. The instrument was developed using preexisting scales that measure (a) constructs related to ITT and (b) the participants perception of the depiction of Muslims and Islam. Since participants were drawn from a university, it was assumed that negative attitudes toward Islam and Muslims would be low, as demonstrated by prior studies that examined the relationship between ethnocentrism and educational attainment (see for example Engberg, 2004).

Limitations

This study was subject to several limitations. First, the research design was not optimal. The ideal research design would be a longitudinal pre-test--posttest design;

however, since the experimental group of participants had already been exposed to the treatment (MSA), a longitudinal approach was not feasible. Second, the distribution of a survey instrument in a face-to-face fashion meant that only a convenience sample could be collected, potentially missing other participants. Third, it was expected that Muslim students or students who may have Muslim family members would eliminate themselves from the survey during the informed consent process; thus, any respondents who were Muslims or had Muslim relatives were removed from the sample to avoid skewed findings.

Scope and Delimitations

This study sought to understand the effect of college diversity programs on anti-Muslim attitudes. However, because of the sample population, the size of the sample, and the research design, the findings are not generalizable to all diversity programs. Regional differences in attitudes toward Muslims and Islam may be confounding variables that are not accounted for in this study. While education is seen as inversely related to prejudice, the composition of the population as well as the geographic location of the university from which the sample was take may have affected the findings. As a major research institution, many of the students and faculty were foreign-born. The university is near a large Islamic center, which could precipitate interaction between in-group and out-group members. Lastly, the recent shooting of two former Muslim alumni led to much positive publicity about American Muslims at the university and beyond. Therefore, generalizability of the findings is difficult.

Significance

This study constitutes an important empirical assessment of the factors that lead to increased Islamophobia and anti-Muslim hate crimes in the current socio-political climate. There is a burgeoning body of literature on anti-Muslim sentiment (Akbarzadeh & Roose, 2011; Ciftci, 2012; Ewart & Rane, 2013; Jung, 2012; Morey & Yaqin, 2011; Ogan et al. 2013; Powell, 2011). This study is sought to ameliorate the collateral consequences of Islamophobia by examining the effect of college diversity programs as potential tools to be used. College and university administrators may find the results of this study useful in combating anti-Muslim prejudice within their institutions and in the broader society.

Summary

Prejudice is said to be formed at an early age, according to some accounts, children are able to distinguish between in-group and out-group as early as age three. While multicultural education permeates the public education sector from Kindergarten to the twelfth grade, there is little aspiration to continue this process in the college years. The formative years of children's lives are not the times when they are exposed, per se, to other racial, religious, or cultural groups. In fact, a child's social world generally consists of a home environment, a school environment, and in both of these, the child is typically exposed to members of the in-group at a much higher rate than when he or she enter college and become independent adults. From this standpoint, the inclusion of diversity programs in colleges allows students to engage *positively* with members of the out-group.

In Chapter 2, I review the literature which was examined as a way of developing the hypotheses and methods of the study. In Chapter 3, I describe the sample population, the survey instrument, and the data collection procedures. In Chapter 4, I present the findings of the data analysis and describe the effects between variables. In Chapter 5 I offer an interpretation of the findings and elaborate on the social change implications for American Muslims; I also provide recommendations for policy changes and continued study.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

The current study was designed to evaluate the efficacy of multicultural education programs (MEPs) on a university campus to reduce anti-Muslim prejudice. This was done by (a) gathering information about anti-Muslim attitudes, and (b) comparing the differences between two groups of students at a local research university; those who were actively engaged in the MSA and those from the control group.

I conducted an extensive review of the literature to address the current gap. In the review, I sought to:

1. Addressed methodological procedures for measuring attitudes and levels of prejudice;

2. Discuss the background of multicultural education;

3. Provide an account of MEPs in postsecondary education, and a review of evaluations focusing on their effectiveness;

4. Include a discussion of frame analysis and intergroup threat theory, which underlie the outcome variable—anti-Muslim prejudice;

5. Summarize of ways to improve intergroup relations by discussing previous studies which reported statistically significant reductions in prejudice;

6. Review recent research which sought to examine anti-Muslim prejudice; this further informs the methodological procedures described in more detail in Chapter 3.

The literature review consisted of searching the following databases: Sociological Abstracts, PsycARTICLES, Ethnic newswatch, Academic Search Complete, PsycINFO, ERIC, SocINDEX, and AnthroSource. I researched the following topics for the years 2011-2016: multiculturalism, cognitive processes of prejudice, multicultural education programs, social-psychological theories of prejudice, anti-Muslim prejudice, Islamophobia, intergroup threat, and framing theories. The keywords used in the search were as follows: *ethnic diversity, intergroup contact, attitudes and Muslims, prejudice, anti-Muslim hate, religious minorities, Islamophobia, Islamoprejudice, anti-Muslim prejudice, media frames, framing Islam, multicultural learning, intercultural learning, intergroup threat theories,* and *integrated threat.* Note that relevant research older than 5 years was used, specifically, seminal works in the field as well as experimental research relating to multicultural diversity programs on colleges and universities.

Multicultural Education

A cursory historical analysis of MEPs reveals stark differences in their adoption in colleges. Initially, MEPs were promoted as a way of assimilating students of color into the economic mainstream of American society. The proponents of such programs today envision a different purpose. They conceive of a society that is tolerant, respectful of difference, and overall pluralistic in nature. Such a position views diversity as a strength to be used for social enhancement. Conservative critics of MEPs cite the need to protect Western values; they readily argue that emphasis on foreign cultures, religions, and customs detracts from Western ideals upon which America (and other Western nations—

e.g. England, Canada, Australia, etc.) were founded. Indeed, conservatives view multiculturalism through the prism of assimilation, preferring to promote such programs as means to an end—melting pots where differences give way to absolute assimilation over time.

In sharp contrast, leftist critics of MEPs argue that such programs do not go far enough in challenging structural problems that exist in capitalist societies, preferring instead to focus on individual differences as a means of maintaining the status quo. Further, those on the left criticize the application of MEPs in largely all-White institutions, as well as institutions that are more authoritarian; and, to resolve such inequities, leftists argue that institutional change is required if MEPs are to be effective. Namely, leftists argue for an egalitarian approach to MEPs and one that promotes democratic values.. Proponents of multicultural education, however, believe that such programs enhance the students' learning by contextualizing Western civilization as being driven by cultural and scientific contributions of other societies (Stephen & Stephen, 2001).

Multicultural Education Programs in Postsecondary Education

Since the landmark Supreme Court case of Brown v. Board of Education Topeka (1954), emphasis was placed on improving intergroup relations. Anecdotally, multiculturalism was considered the new social paradigm to reduce the ethnic tensions that became manifest during the social upheaval of the 1960's civil rights movement. However, the implementation of multiculturalism required structural changes to take

place, and one way of doing so was the promotion of educational programs as the panacea for America's divided society. One way to implement more equitable social programs was to adopt MEPs in schools and colleges. By doing so, it was assumed that as students left the schools and entered the workforce, they would carry with them the benefits of these multicultural programs. However, research into the effectiveness of MEPs has been scarce until the 1990's, when systematic program evaluations began to appear in the literature, documenting both positive and negative outcomes (Stephen & Stephen, 2001). Today, there is a burgeoning body of literature which examines MEPs efficacy, with mixed but largely positive results.

Multicultural education studies may be divided into two categories, short-term and long-term. The former consist of brief exposure to multicultural programs in college settings, typically ranging from several hours to a few weeks; whereas the latter refer to studies ranging from one semester to a year. A myriad of approaches to multicultural education have been utilized since their inception. Some programs focused on the exposure of students to other cultures by introducing them to different perspectives via literature, and the arts. Other programs emphasize contact between groups as a means of reducing prejudice and enhancing relationships. Strategies vary within each program with some preferring to use exemplars such as workshops and required coursework to address issues of diversity and racism. Other programs focus on pedagogical approaches such as didactic instruction or experiential learning and facilitated workshops. The MSA that was studied for the current project utilized a multifaceted approach to multiculturalism.

Students attend events, participate in discussions, as well as participate in peer mentoring programs aimed at increasing retention and success of ethnic and religious minority students.

Defining Racial Bias

Bias can be understood as a "systematic tendency to evaluate one's own membership group (the in-group) or its members more favorably than a nonmembership [sic] group (the out-group) or its members" (Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002, P. 576, as cited in Edgberg, 2004). Prejudice is a characteristic of racial bias. Prejudice is also a component in anti-Muslim bias because most Muslims are also part of a racial minority. Other components of bias are: stereotypes, affective reactions, and discrimination. Stereotypes are beliefs about a particular group which result from a broad generalization of out-group member traits to the entire group as a way of simplifying one's environment (Allport, 1954). Stereotypes are usually inflamed as a result of phenotypical traits such as race, age, and sex (Stephen & Stephen, 2001). Affective reactions refer to emotional responses by members of the out-group, which may be negative, or positive (e.g. Indians are hard-working) but still result in social distance, Stephen and Stephen (2001) called this, avoidance behavior. Lastly, discrimination consists of unequal treatment of certain groups (Allport, 1954). Unequal treatment may manifest itself in governmental or institutional policies of exclusion, as well as individual mistreatment of others based on the aforementioned prejudice. The current research focused on assessing attitudes toward Muslims and Islam because attitudes underlie prejudices.

Historical Account of Racial Bias Theories

Research concerning racial bias has developed slowly in the past century. Beginning in the 1930's, researchers relied heavily upon psychoanalytic theories to explain racial bias. Bias was considered a manifestation of deep-seated "intrapsychic conflict" and became manifest as a self-defense mechanism. Much of the work during this time focused on individuals as units of analysis, without proper consideration for social or socio-political context. Indeed, the individuals' personality traits were considered the root cause of racial bias. Traits such as authoritarianism and dogmatism, as well as right-wing authoritarianism were used as explanatory mechanisms in addressing racial bias.

In 1954, Gordon Allport relied more broadly on social and cultural explanations of racial bias, without neglecting individual factors. He rightly recognized that an emphasis on personality alone cannot explain institutional bias, nor can it provide sufficient explanations for the historical evolution of bias. During the 1960's and 1970's, greater emphasis was placed on group conflict and social identity theories. Group conflict theory assumes that social groups are in constant competition with each other resulting in conflict and threat. Social identity theory explains racial bias as a manifestation of group membership; those who belong to the in-group will naturally identify with that group and see its culture as superior to that of the out-group.

More recent attempts to understand racial bias have focused on institutional racism with a recognition that institutional racism stems from a more dormant, yet still

existing form of individual and group forms of prejudice. Engberg (2004) delineates the four most prominent theories used in contemporary scholarship on racial bias: symbolic racism, aversive racism, laissez-faire racism, and social dominance (Sidanius, 1993). The preceding theories inform the current study by embedding it in a larger historical context, a progressively better and more nuanced understanding of racial bias and its causal mechanisms.

Frame Analysis

First expanded by Erving Goffman (1974), frame analysis has been used in sociology, communication studies, as well as psychology and other sciences to understand how people view the world and how those views shape attitudes and behaviors. The framing of Muslims and Islam is critical to understanding how students' views and attitudes of Muslims are shaped. As discussed in Chapter 1, the era of mass communication, coupled with ever-increasing accessibility to news, may be seen as an aggravating factor in the negative attitudes toward Muslims. Research suggests that prejudice can manifest itself explicitly (i.e. through discriminatory behavior), or implicitly (i.e. through the formation of negative attitudes or beliefs). The current research sought to investigate latent forms of prejudice by measuring the type of media content participants consume regarding Islam and Muslims.

An understanding of social frames is an important precursor to understanding the media's effect on attitude development. According to Goffman (1974),

Social frameworks…provide background understanding for events that

incorporate the will, aim, and controlling effort of an intelligence, a live agency,

the chief one being the human being. Such an agency is anything but implacable;

it can be coaxed, flattered, affronted, and threatened. What is does can be

described as "guided doings." (p. 22)

These 'guided doings' are important because they set the media frame from which most

Americans learn about daily events. Further, media consumption plays a critical role in

shaping people's attitudes; the media sets political agendas and shapes the world while

preparing it for mass consumption. This is important because the media's ability to shape

attitudes may also translate into action vis-à-vis behavioral changes.

The powerful force of the media's agenda setting and shaping of public attitudes

is largely responsible for the increased victimization of American Muslims post-9/11.

Since Muslims make up roughly 1% of the American population, it is interesting to note

that they comprised 13% of religious-based victimization in 2010 (Gerhauser, 2014). The

way in which Muslims are framed in the news media is in stark contrast to how other

groups are portrayed, including criminal elements from other groups. Muslims and Islam

have long been portrayed by various media outlets, including Hollywood, as different,

violent, hypersexual, and fundamentally at opposition with American and Democratic

values (Douai & Lauricella, 2014; Ewart, 2012; Ewart & Rane, 2013; Gerhauser, 2014;

Ogan et al., 2013; Powell, 2011; Shaheen, 2014).

Because the news and entertainment media are seen as the prevailing source of public information, the way in which it constructs social and political issues, and frames certain groups, is important. As a result, it was anticipated that those exposed to right-wing media outlets will also express more negative attitudes of Muslims than those who do not. For example, during the early 1980s, when America and Iran were embroiled in conflict, a public poll of Americans concerning the political situation between the two nations demonstrated the attitudes that American's had concerning Iran. Americans who were polled used words such as "anger", "turmoil", and "hatred" to describe their feelings. Thus, successful framing is a *process* used effectively by the media in order to convey, interpret, and present information as well as give meaning to political issues. Indeed, the agenda setting power of the media can have negative implications for public policy. Dearing and Rogers (1996, p. 22; as cited in Atteveldt, Ruigrok, and Kleinnijenhuis, 2006) state that the agenda setting process "consists of (a) the media agenda, which influences (b) the public agenda, which in turn may influence (c) the policy agenda. This process of subtly conveying negative themes about Islam and Muslims works to reinforce the othering of these groups. Further, because the media are heavily controlled by private enterprise and function largely as a "propaganda" tool for elitist causes, any effort to re-frame Islam and Muslims or to redirect public discourse away from the current focus is often equated with anti-Americanism.

Intergroup Threat Theory

Intergroup threat theory has been used successfully to understand intergroup prejudice (Stephen & Stephen, 2001; Ciftci, 2012; Jackson & Hunsberger, 1999). Further, studies demonstrate a causal link between intergroup threat and negative attitudes towards outgroups. A historical understanding of ITT requires an appreciation for humans as tribal in nature. A tribe is by definition a collection of cultures, beliefs, myths, religion, as well as shared language. Stephen et al. (2009) remind us that tribes survive largely on their ability to retain their identity, as well as their ability to protect themselves from other tribes—those who may pose a threat to their way of life. It is from this anthropological understanding of group behavior that ITT stems. Stephen et al. (2009) also direct attention to the psychological functions of group attitudes; "people may be inclined to perceive threats where none exist…perceiving threats when none exist may be a less costly error than not perceiving threats when in fact they do exist" (p. 44). The perceived threat is further heightened by a negative media frame and may result in the anti-Muslim prejudice seen in contemporary times.

Intergroup threat may be either symbolic or realistic. Symbolic threat may be perceived as a threat to the group's religion, culture, language, belief system, or way of life. Realistic threats are actual threats to the group's physical, economic, personal well-being (Neuberg et al., 2014; Stephen & Stephen, 2001; Williams, 2015). It is important to note that both symbolic and realistic threats are considered as *perceived* and may not actually exist. This forms the basis for the antecedents of negative attitudes toward out-

group members (Stephen & Stephen, 2001). In a study of student attitudes toward immigrants, Stephen, Renfro, Esses, Stephan, and Marin (2005) found that the most negative attitudes were present when students perceived the immigrant group as posing both a realistic and symbolic threat to the in-group. Further, the antecedents of threat perception include: (a) the relative power of the group (i.e., high vs. low); (b) the history of group conflict (e.g., Israelis and Palestinians, Blacks and Whites, Catholics and Protestants), and (c) relative group size.

Groups with low power experience threat from the outgroup members at a higher rate than high power groups. However, when high power groups experience threat, they tend to act more strongly against such threats because they possess the resources to defend themselves. In a study of European Americans and their attitudes toward Mexican-Americans, Zarate, Garcia, Garza, and Hitlan (2004) found that when rating Mexican American's on their similarities on work-related characteristics to the in-group, European Americans demonstrated higher levels of threats than when they rated the same outgroup on differences in work-related characteristics, which suggests that a perceived threat to their economic well-being created more threat and therefore more negative attitudes.

A history of group conflict has also been found to predict threat to the in-group (Stephan et al., 2009; Shamir & Sagiv-Schifter, 2006). Hutchinson (2014) found evidence that suggests that civil conflict reduces the in-groups inclination to provide civil liberties protections to members of the outgroup. Naturally, then, group conflict represents an

impediment to good intergroup relations. Given the framing of Muslims as people prone to violence and as fundamentally opposed to American values, coupled with the active conflicts between America and Muslim-majority nations, it is likely that students' attitudes toward this group will be largely negative. Lastly, perceived group size has an effect on intergroup threat (Stephan et al., 2009). Ingroup members who perceive that the outgroup is larger also experience greater threat because the outgroup may pose both a realistic threat (e.g. economic competition), or a symbolic threat (e.g. speaking a different language or practicing a different religion). The current influx of refugees into Europe and to a lesser degree, the United States, makes this point more salient.

Education and Prejudice: Evaluation of MEPs

Education is widely considered as an ameliorating element for prejudice. The inverse relationship between education and prejudice has significant implications for social change when one considers the average number of students enrolled in colleges; between 2002 and 2012, an estimated 20 million people in the United States attended college as full-time students. Therefore, a sound education policy, focusing on multiculturalism and inclusion may result in significant reductions of prejudice generally, and anti-Muslim prejudice, specifically. In this section, I reviewed literature, which demonstrates positive results in the application of multicultural programs in postsecondary education. I turned my attention to the work of Engberg (2004), who compiled and reviewed studies in four areas of higher education seeking to find those most effective: (1) multicultural courses, (2) diversity workshops and training, (3) peer-

based interventions, and (4) service-based interventions. While the findings from these studies are mixed, I reviewed only those which showed positive outcomes in the reduction of student bias, stereotypes, and overall prejudice. Also, I focused only on quantitative studies because the nature of the current research is quantitative; however, it is important to note that Engberg (2004) found some positive results in his review of qualitative and mixed-methods studies.

Multicultural Course Interventions

In his systematic review of studies examining multicultural course interventions (4 quantitative, 1 qualitative, and 2 mixed-methods) to improve intergroup relations; Engberg (2004) revealed positive results for those quantitative studies (N=2) using pre-posttest designs Two studies used a modified Solomon four-group design and found no significant effect for the multicultural course interventions. In the latter studies, however, a convenience sample of 103 students from 12 different courses were selected for the experiment, and while no significance was reported, those students enrolled in women's studies courses showed slightly more positive results in prejudice reduction than others, which suggests that discipline-specific factors may account for some of the benefits of the multiculturalism courses.

Other studies relying on longitudinal data found discrepant results, however they were carried out in one institution. Further, these studies assessed the efficacy of non-required diversity courses (i.e., courses that were taken voluntarily by students). Of the five studies reviewed by Engberg (2004), four studies found positive results (Inkelas,

1998; Smith, 1993; Lopez, 1993; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002). Inkelas (1998) found that Asian Americans were more supportive of affirmative action policies after attending a class in their curriculum which focused on issues of race and gender. The Smith (1993) study examined only the attitudes of White students and found gender differences in prejudice reduction. Lastly, Gurin et al. (2002) and Lopez (1993) both examined the effects of diversity courses on White, Asian, and Black students. Their findings were slightly different; Lopez reported positive effects only for White students, while Gurin et al. (2002) found positive results for all three racial groups.

Diversity Workshop and Training Interventions

Diversity workshops and training interventions are often conducted by faculty members or students active within diversity initiatives on campus. Engberg (2004) reviewed 11 studies that examined diversity workshops and training interventions. Of the 11 studies reviewed, 8 quantitative studies demonstrated positive results in reducing student prejudice (Antony, 1993; Astin, 1993; Gurin et al., 2002; Hyun, 1994; Milem, 1994; Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn, & Terenzini, 1996; Springer, Palmer, Terenzini, Pascarella, & Nora, 1996; Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Nora, 2001). These studies relied on large national databases for information (Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) and the National Study for Student Learning). Results were varied with some findings suggesting that women had more positive results than their male counterparts (Milem et al., 1996); others cite stronger effects in prejudice reduction for White and African American students than their peers (Hyun, 1994). Still others cite

different factors that influence the impact of the workshops on students, such as socioeconomic status (SES), and levels of liberalism or conservatism (Springer et al., 1996). However, because these studies didn't rely on survey data, there are some issues with sampling and measurement errors, as well as confounding effects.

Peer-facilitated Training

Peer-facilitated training programs are often conducted by students who simply engage with other students in open discussions concerning issues of racism, exclusion, as well as class differences. A study conducted by Nelson, Johnson, Boyd, and Scott (1994) found very good results using a 2 x 2 design. Participants in the experimental group "were more optimistic about intergroup understanding, more comfortable interacting with minority students, and less likely to perceive minority students as unqualified to be at the university" (Edgberg, 2004, p. 492). However, the findings of this study should be considered cautiously because of the limited sample size, the research design, and the lack of consideration for other potential factors that may have influenced the students (i.e. their background).

Service-based Interventions

Lastly, Engberg (2004, p. 498) reviewed multiple studies that examined service-based interventions. These interventions do not explicitly address racial prejudice or bias; they do, however allow for increased interaction between in-group members and those from the out-group—often disenfranchised members in society. These types of events are important because they resemble the type of interaction examined in the current study.

The two studies using CIRP data identified four service experiences that were highly

correlated to the promotion of cultural and racial understanding: education, human needs,

public safety, and the environment. However, these studies failed to consider racial

differences in participants, nor did they account for differences in program types, rather,

the researchers merely aggregated the service opportunities (Engberg, 2004).

Media and Prejudice

News and popular media are instrumental in shaping public opinion; they

effectively portray members of the out-group as the 'other'. As a result, the formation of

attitudes can be considered partly dependent upon the consumption of mass media. To

better understand the way in which the media alters and shapes attitudes, I examined

some contemporary literature to shed light on this process. One study which sought to

examine the relationship between media and the rise of Islamophobia in the United States

and Europe found that conservatism across all countries under examination (United

States, France, Germany, Spain, and Great Britain) as well as the religious belief of

respondents (in France) were strong positive predictors of anti-Muslim attitudes (Ogan et

al., 2014). Specifically, the study used secondary data from the 2008 Pew Global

attitudes project and the 2010 Pew News Interest Index to understand the factors that

correlate with anti-Muslim sentiment. Researchers relied on secondary data of news

content analyses to examine the publics' perception of the so-called Ground Zero

mosque, otherwise known as a Park51 Islamic Community Center. Findings suggest that

during the week of September 6-12, 2010, conservative media coverage focused largely

on the Park51 Community center while liberal news sources focused largely on the Quran burning debacle that surfaced around that time. This suggests an intentional effort by conservative media outlets to focus on negative and controversial issues where Islam is concerned. Importantly, a link between negative portrayals of Muslims and Muslim-related issues can be made by examining opinion polls. According to Ogan et al. (2014) "conservative Fox News tended to report news about the Islamic Community Center with public opinion polls that showed that almost 3 of 4 Americans were against the Center" (p. 33).

The media are not merely responsible for anti-Muslim prejudice; they have been shown to predict people's attitudes about sexuality, racial prejudice between Jewish and Arab youth as well as legal prejudice, such as the media's influence on jury members. The strength of the Medias' role in shaping public opinion is unlikely to be a debated issue given the burgeoning literature on this issue. Indeed, research into the media-prejudice connection may be explained by the process of priming. According to Power, Murphy, and Coover (1996, p. 37),

Researchers interested in establishing the relationship between more mainstream representations and attitudes toward stereotyped groups is [*sic*] priming…the activation of one category or schema—for example a cultural stereotype—increases the likelihood that the same category will be used in subsequent judgments.

Anti-Muslim attitudes may be shaped to some extent by the negative media attention. It is important to note that the terms anti-Muslim and anti-Arab are often conflated. This too is largely the work of the misinformation campaign initiated by Western media from the onset of the 20th Century; that is, the conflation of Arabs and Islam through orientalist discourse (Said, 2003).

Because Muslims remain largely an empirically untapped group, literature concerning the effects of the media on the publics' views of this group remains inadequate. Though some research on the way in which this group is framed has begun to surface. As alluded to earlier in this work, Muslims are framed by the media as incompatible with Western ideals. The Muslim identity is seen as one which supersedes the interests of Western capitalist democracy. Consider a British newspaper, which reported on elections in England where one journalist wrote "Young Muslims…are encouraged to put loyalty to their faith above personal responsibility to the country of their birth." In response to this statement, Richardson concluded:

> Such journalistic discourse should be viewed pragmatically, as serving the important function of removing British Muslims from empowered positions in and affecting the public sphere by demanding either their cultural and political assimilation or expulsion. It should be viewed as an example of a 'discourse of spatial management', founded on the 'white fantasy' of journalists and readers, according to which they have the right and ability to regulate the ethnic and religious parameters of British society. (As quoted in Malik, 2009, p. 210)

Historical attempts to understand the Medias' impact on prejudice have focused on simple analytical techniques. However, recent attempts have been made to go beyond a simple content analysis; indeed, Mutz and Goldman (2010) explain three ways to understand the media and its impact on intergroup relations: First, they discuss intragroup comparisons, which consider how a member of a certain group is portrayed relative to other members of that group, for example, how often are Muslims characters seen as acting violently or applauding violence (consider the constant barrage of Muslims on television shown burning the American flag or dancing in celebratory fashion when American or Western interests are harmed). The second analytical strategy is intergroup comparisons which ask if some roles or behaviors of certain groups are more commonly depicted than members of other groups; here, it is important to consider the relative *frequency* of actions taken by members of one group versus those of another. In essence, relative to members of other groups, are Muslims more often depicted as engaging in violence, or more likely, in anti-Western violence? Lastly, television-reality comparisons are used to portray certain social groups in the media in comparison to real-world characteristics. For instance, the representation of Whites and Blacks as perpetrators of crime in local news shows demonstrates that Blacks are slightly overrepresented in violent crime than their White counterparts, leading the viewers to believe that Blacks are inherently more dangerous. Paluck (2009, p. 575) suggests that "theories of media persuasion claim that beliefs are influenced by media cultures and programs…media might communicate normative messages directly, or audiences may infer norms from the

behavior or real or fictional media personalities." Unfortunately, much of the research on the media's effect on prejudice fail to be conclusive, with many being short-term studies that are carried out in laboratories, limiting the generalizability of their findings to the real world (Paluck, 2009).

Reducing Prejudice

Increased ethnic diversity may reduce anti-Muslim prejudice. Much credit in prejudice reduction can be linked to Allport's (1954) contact theory. However, it is precisely the inability of the of America's Muslim community—given their small proportion—to make actual contact with members of the non-Muslim American community which limits their ability to reduce anti-Muslim prejudice. The media can also be used to reduce prejudice, however, just as it can be used to inflame it. While the media may play a critical role in reshaping national or global intergroup relations, the current study focused on multicultural diversity programs as a way of ameliorating prejudice. According to Stephen and Stephen (2001), multicultural diversity programs suffer from a lack of generalizability, and their effectiveness is therefore inconclusive, though many of the 30 or so studies that exist show positive effects for reducing prejudice, and few show no or negative effects; their flaw still remains in their inability to draw from large, representative samples. However, MEPs do create atmosphere's on college and university campuses that enable greater contact between members of the in-group and those of the out-group, and this has been shown to significantly reduce

prejudice, if the resulting contact between members is meaningful (i.e., if friendships, collaborative projects, and long-term contact is created and sustained).

Summary

Prejudice has been shown to develop in children between the ages of 5 and 7, decreasing slightly until late childhood, approximately 8 to 10 years of age. While the current multicultural education initiatives in K-12 education are necessary, they are not sufficient. Research into MEPs in colleges and universities is growing, and the research findings are promising. However, current models of multicultural education focus largely on the Black-White binary in terms of racial prejudice reduction. Those programs that go beyond this binary continue to emphasize racial tolerance. The current research sought to add to this literature by emphasizing the current gap in religious-based research into the efficacy of MEPs; specifically anti-Muslim prejudice.

This chapter includes discussion of MEPs in postsecondary education. These programs were spawned from the civil rights era and the racial unrest that consumed American society. To a larger extent, MEPs were instituted in postsecondary education after the Supreme Court decision of Brown v. Board of education Topeka (1954) as a way of integrating Blacks into America's economic mainstream. The premise behind this policy of integration was that Blacks could not successfully be incorporated into society if they were treated differently from other Americans. Here also is a similar objective of the current research. With growing Islamophobia in the West, specifically in the United States, Muslim integration into the economic and social mainstream is impeded. As with

most social groups, marginalization leads to hopelessness and potentially, crime. Using

frame analysis and intergroup threat theory to better understand the ways in which

Muslims are portrayed to the general public, as well as gaining insight into the process of

intergroup relations has shed light on the ways to ameliorate prejudice against American

Muslims. In Chapter 3, I address the research methods and discuss the research design

and sample collection methods; I briefly describe the data collection tools and discuss

ethical considerations for this study.

Chapter 3: Research Method

This study adds to the growing body of literature on prejudice reduction and intergroup relations by investigating the effectiveness of a multicultural diversity program on reducing anti-Muslim prejudice in a large research university. This chapter addresses the following topics: the research design, data collection, the setting, the sampling method and sample populations; the materials and data collection methods; ethical considerations related to the selection and surveying of respondents.

Research Design

As discussed in the previous chapter, this study used a quasi-experimental design to better understand the impact of MEPs on the attitudes of students at a large research university. The independent group posttest design was used for the current study. Prior inquiries into MEPs and prejudice reduction used experimental and quasi-experimental designs to allow for some control and increased validity. Respondents were selected from two groups: the experimental group was selected from the Multicultural Student Association (MSA); the control group was selected from the general student body. To determine their attitudes about American Muslims, respondents received a multiscale questionnaire. The independent variable was involvement in the MSA and the dependent variable was the level of anti-Muslim prejudice. Involvement in the MSA requires that the student was actively engaged in on-campus events sponsored by the organization. Engagement in events meant that students were ongoing participants in MSA programs, having attended at least one event during the past year. To assess the dependent variable,

I surveyed respondents using multiple scales used to measure anti-Muslim prejudice. I measured respondents' views on Muslims as a symbolic threat, as well as a realistic threat, to the in-group.

Respondents were asked for basic demographic information such as age, gender, basic household income, and academic discipline in which they were enrolled. For the academic discipline category, responses were categorized according to overall type (i.e. natural science, social science, or humanities) during the coding and analysis phase of the project. To understand the relationship between news coverage of Muslims and prejudice, respondents were asked to indicate which news source they preferred from a list of mainstream media outlets that I provided; they could also list other sources not contained in the survey.

Procedure

Upon obtaining approval from Walden University's Institutional Review Board (Approval number 09-16-16-0425936), I sent an e-mail containing the necessary approval documents to the director of the MSA for verification. To recruit students from the MSA, I attended some of the functions sponsored by the group in order to obtain necessary access. To recruit students from the general student body, I visited multiple campuses to ensure a diverse sample and survey participants. All participants were presented with the informed consent document and notified of the voluntariness of their participation in the research. Thereafter, students were issued a survey and I addressed any questions that may arise. Students were informed that there is no financial incentive

to participate; however, they were told that the study seeks to better understand prejudice on their college campus and proposals to reduce it. Prior to administering the survey there was no mention of anti-Muslim prejudice as potential participants may decline to take part due to the sensitivity of the issue at this time. Implicit prejudice may manifest if the subject is primed; therefore, I did mention the intended group behind the research.

Setting and Sample

Participants will be drawn from two populations from a large research university. The first sample—experimental group—will be drawn from an organization on campus which represents the following ethnic groups: Black, Hispanic/Latino, and Native Americans. The second sample—control group—will be drawn from the general student body, which consists of nearly 34,000 students. Sampling will be done by convenience at the events of the MSA as well as multiple campus visits to survey students from the general student body. Demographic information will be collected from the participants and includes information about age, gender, household income, current academic standing (i.e. freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior, or graduate student), and religious affiliation. Further, the declared discipline of study will also be solicited. Only college-aged students will be solicited and no children or other vulnerable populations will be surveyed. I expect no significant harm to come to any of the participants as a result of participating in the survey. In Chapter 4, I will analyze these descriptive statistics in more detail.

Any participants that were not enrolled in the university as students will be excluded from the sample. Also, any participant who declares that they are Muslim or have family members who are Muslim will be eliminated due to the potential for bias in the results. While many MEPs focus on the attitudes of white students toward minority groups ; this study does not exclude non-White students from the control group in an effort to closely match participants to the experimental group. By doing so, I aim to reduce differences between both samples, and thereby increase the validity of the findings.

To determine the number of participants, I utilized GPower3.1 software to conduct the necessary power analysis. Using a difference between two independent means statistical test, I selected an alpha level of .05. Further, prior literature suggests that $d = .51$ is a large effect size and a $d = .31$ considered moderate for measures of effectiveness of multicultural education on student attitudes and prejudice reduction. I will use a power of .80 and large effect size of $d = .5$ to generate a total sample size of $N = 102$; this means that each of my groups should contain a minimum of 52 respondents.

Materials and Data Collection

This research will use multiple software tools to collect and analyze the data. First, I used Microsoft Word to create the survey instrument. Once received, the respondents completed the necessary demographic information as discussed previously. Respondents were told not to include any identifying information (e.g., names) to ensure anonymity. Thereafter, respondents completed the remaining survey questions, composed

of several scales that assessed their attitudes toward Muslims and Islam. At the end of the survey, respondents saw a debriefing paragraph which explains the purpose of the research; included in this explanation is a message about the social change implications of the findings, namely, the reduction of anti-Muslim prejudice in college, and subsequently in the workplace. Responses will be saved for 5 year and will be retained in my home before being properly disposed.

The analysis of collected data will be done using SPSS 19.0 (Statistical Package for Social Science). The analysis will include descriptive statistics, as well as *t* tests to understand the mean differences between groups on measures of the dependent variable (i.e., anti-Muslim prejudice). Further, a Pearson correlation test will be conducted to understand the relationship between the type of media consumed by the respondents and their level of anti-Muslim prejudice; the same Pearson correlation will be used to understand the correlation between students' declared majors and anti-Muslim sentiment.

Survey Instrument

For the current research, I will use the three existing scales which measure realistic threat, and symbolic threat, as well as Islamophobia. Responses for all three scales consist of a 10-point Likert scale which ranged from 1 = (*strongly disagree)* to 10 = *(strongly agree)*. The symbolic threat scale uses 7 items which include, among others, perceived threats to in-group values and culture, for example "The values and beliefs of Muslim immigrants regarding moral and religious issues are not compatible with the beliefs and values of most Americans." The realistic threat scale consists of 8 items

which include measures of threat to the in-group's economic well-being, for example "Muslim immigration has increased the tax burden on Americans." In previous research using these two scales of intergroup threat, the Cronbach's alpha levels remained consistently high—ranging from .68 to .82—which suggests a reliable measure of realistic and symbolic threat.

The Islamophobia scale (IS) includes 16 items to measure anti-Muslim prejudice. The first 8-items are measures of behavioral prejudice while the second 8-items measure cognitive prejudice (Lee et al., 2009). The Islamophobia scale includes responses on a 10-point Likert scale with 1 = *(strongly disagree)* and 10 = (*strongly agree)*. The IS was created by compiling "a large number of items…based on theories of fear and the literature on Islamophobic sentiments" (Lee et al., 2009, p. 93). The IS was subjected to multiple statistical tests to determine validity and reliability of the measures, including factor analysis. Of the initial 41 items tested, the remaining 16 (used in this study) showed strong internal consistency .92 for the first 8-items and .94 for the second 8-items. There was no multicollinearity between item measures—with "squared multiple correlations ranging from .48-.84" (Lee et al., 2009, p. 97).

Along with basic demographic information—shown to be related to prejudice—(e.g. race, political orientation, gender, and religious affiliation; See, for example: Lee et al., 2009); I will collect information about media sources and types (i.e. political leaning of the media sources). The latter is also used to infer political orientation, especially for

respondents who do not complete the political orientation question in the demographics section.

Ethical Considerations

This study was designed to reduce potential harm to any of the participants involved. Participants are provided with informed consent in the early stages of the study before they are given the survey instrument to complete. Further, instructions on the completion of the survey will be discussed in person. Participants will also be informed of their confidentiality, they will be told that no identifying information should be included, nor will any be solicited at any time. Also, participants will be told that their participation in the research is voluntary and they are entitled to quit at any time if they feel that they do not wish to participate.

Since the participants in this study will be students, they will be informed that their participation is voluntary and does not jeopardize their academic career. Participants were told that there are no risks for participating in this study and will be given my contact information as well as that of a Walden University representative should they have any lingering questions or concerns. To confirm their voluntary participation, students will be allowed to mark the informed consent document as an affirmation of implied consent.

In Chapter 4, I will analyze the results of the collected surveys and present the analysis in light of the research questions and hypotheses put forth in the preceding chapters. An examination of the relationship between media and anti-Muslim prejudice

will be discussed. Further, I will discuss the relationship between students' academic discipline and anti-Muslim prejudice. I will provide a detailed discussion of the findings in relation to the main research question, namely, the effectiveness of MEPs on the reduction of anti-Muslim prejudice. I will also display graphics of the descriptive statistics relating to the demographics of the sampled group.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

The effectiveness of multicultural education programs in postsecondary education

has been established in a growing body of literature. However, much of the existing

literature on the effectiveness of multicultural education programs in reducing prejudice

has focused on Black-White binaries, with increasing interest in other racial and cultural

groups. This study sought to expand the scope of the literature by examining the

effectiveness of MEPs in reducing Islamophobia. Specifically, it sought to examine the

differences in anti-Muslim prejudice between two groups of students in a large research

university: students who participated in the MSA (experimental group) and students from

the general student body who did not participate in the MSA (control group). The null

hypothesis predicted that there would be no statistically significant difference between

the two groups (MSA and non-MSA). The alternative hypothesis predicted that there

would be a statistically significant difference between the two groups. I predicted that

students who participated in the MSA were less likely to hold prejudiced views toward

Muslims. This chapter begins with an examination of the descriptive statistics. Then, I

move to a discussion of the hypotheses that underlie the main research question.

Descriptive Statistics

The total sample included 127 participants drawn from a large research university

in the Southeastern portion of the United States. The groups were split between

respondents who participated in the MSA (N = 74, 59.2%) and those who did not

participate (N= 51, 40.8%). The respondents were relatively young with an average age

of 19.49 years (SD = 2.91). The sample consisted of the following racial makeup: 38.4%

White, 34.4% Black, 5.6% American Indian/Alaska native, .8% Native Hawaiian or other

Pacific Islander, 14.4% Hispanic or Latino, and 6.4% identified as other. Most of the

sample identified, as left-leaning/liberal/Democrats 38.4%, right-

leaning/conservative/Republicans constituted 14.4% of the sample, 16.8% were

independent, 19.2% unaffiliated, .8% libertarian, and 4% were moderate. A large

segment of the sample reported household incomes of more than $60,000 (40.8%). Over

half of respondents were Christian (69.6%), while 28% reported no religious affiliation.

Two respondents self-reported as Muslims and were subsequently removed from the

sample. The majority of respondents were female (63.2%) and the remaining were males

(36.8%). The majority of respondents were full time students (45.6%). The final analysis

was conducted on the remaining 125 respondents. Respondents completed a 46-item

survey instrument and I analyze the results in the statistical analysis section of this

chapter.

The survey consisted of five sections as follows (see Appendix A): section one

was used to collect demographic information about each respondent as well as their

involvement in the MSA—this was later used to identify and assign respondents to either

the control group or the experimental group (see table 1). Sections 2 and 3 consisted of a

6-item scale used to measure symbolic threat ($\alpha = .60$) and an 8-item scale to measure

realistic threat respectively ($\alpha = .81$). Section 4 utilized a 16-item Islamophobia scale ($\alpha =$

.92). Lastly, I included two items to solicit information about media consumption and political affiliation of media in the fifth section of the questionnaire. All items were 10-point Likert Scales where (1= strongly disagree) and (10= strongly agree). Items were recoded to compress the responses as follows: 1 through 2 were coded as 1, strongly disagree; 3 through 4 were coded as 2, agree; 5 through 6 were coded as 3, neither; 7 through 8 were coded as 4, agree; and 9 through 10 were coded as 5, strongly agree. For all items in the Islamophobia Scale, higher scores denote more prejudice. Reverse coding was carried out for items, 16, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26, and 27 to indicate that higher scores describe attitudes that are more prejudiced; these items were negative statements and therefore were reverse coded.

Table 1

Frequency and Percent of Participants in the Control and Experimental Groups

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Participate in the MSA?	yes	74	59.2
	no	51	40.8
	Total	125	100.0

Data were collected from participants throughout the university. To collect data from members of the experimental group, I attended two peer mentor programs where I disseminated the survey. While previous studies focused on the collection of data from certain racial groups—emphasis was placed on the manifestation of prejudice in white students towards Blacks for example (see for example: Edgberg, 2004)—I did not limit my sample to a racial category. Therefore, members of multiple racial groups were

surveyed and Muslim respondents ($N = 2$) were excluded from the analysis because they may skew into the findings.

Statistical Analysis

An independent group-posttest design was used to assess the mean differences between groups with relation to the outcome variable, anti-Muslim prejudice. The statistical test used to examine the groups for significant differences concerning Islamophobia was the independent samples t test. What follows is the analysis conducted concerning symbolic threat, realistic threat, Islamophobia scales, as well the differences in anti-Muslim prejudice as related to media political leaning. To determine if mean differences between groups exist; and whether such differences may lead to reduced anti-Muslim prejudice in the experimental group, I used an independent samples t test to compare the control and experimental groups on each of the three scales used in the survey (i.e., symbolic threat, realistic threat, and the Islamophobia scale respectively).

Hypothesis 1

Symbolic threat. Participation in the MSA leads to decreased anti-Muslim prejudice. Results of the analysis for symbolic threat (See Table 2) indicate that there is no significant difference between the experimental and control group regarding the level of perceived symbolic threat. It is important to note that the Levene's test for the equality of variances was significant ($P < .05$), thereby failing the assumption of homogeneity of variance. An examination of the results in Table 2 also demonstrates that no significant relationship exists for t-statistics even when equal variances are not assumed.

Table 2

Symbolic Threat: Assessing Experimental and Control Group Mean Differences

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Muslim immigrants should learn to conform to the rules and norms of American society as soon as they arrive	Equal variances assumed	5.838	.017	-1.267	123	.208	-20.510	16.19	-52.56	11.54
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.050	50.002	.299	-20.510	19.54	-59.75	18.73
Immigration from Muslim countries is undermining American culture	Equal variances assumed	5.904	.017	-1.235	123	.219	-20.015	16.20	-52.09	12.06
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.024	50.002	.311	-20.015	19.55	-59.29	19.26
The values and beliefs of Muslim immigrants regarding work are basically quite similar to those of most Americans	Equal variances assumed	2.636	.107	.347	121	.729	.071	.203	-.332	.473
	Equal variances not assumed			.363	116.308	.718	.071	.195	-.315	.456
The values and beliefs of Muslim immigrants regarding moral and religious issues are not compatible with the beliefs and values of most Americans	Equal variances assumed	5.811	.017	-1.219	123	.225	-19.745	16.20	-51.81	12.32
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.010	50.004	.317	-19.745	19.55	-59.00	19.51
The values and beliefs of Muslim immigrants regarding family issues and socializing children are basically quite similar to those of most Americans	Equal variances assumed	1.946	.166	-.115	122	.908	-.022	.192	-.402	.358
	Equal variances not assumed			-.119	115.417	.905	-.022	.186	-.391	.346
The values and beliefs of Muslim immigrants regarding social relations are not compatible with the beliefs and values of most Americans	Equal variances assumed	5.686	.019	-1.199	122	.233	-19.559	16.31	-51.84	12.73
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.001	50.005	.322	-19.559	19.55	-58.82	19.70

Realistic threat. Analysis of realistic threat differences between the two groups suggests a significant difference between means on the following items: "Muslim immigrants are *not* displacing American workers from their jobs' as well as 'Muslim immigrants should be eligible to same health-care as Americans'. Both items were reverse coded such that a higher mean assumes an increase in the perception of realistic threat. Results of the *t* test revealed a significant difference between responses to the statements; the experimental group scored lower (M = 1.70, SD .982) than the control group (M = 2.27, SD 1.20), $t(88.6) = -2.74$, $p < .05$. Further, on the "Muslim immigrants should be eligible for the same health-care benefits received by Americans" item, the experimental group scored lower (M= 1.38, SD .656) than the control group (M =1.73, SD 1.11), $t(73.8) = -1.99$, $p < .05$. These findings suggest that the control group perceived a greater realistic threat than the experimental group on the aforementioned items.

Islamophobia scale. There were significant differences between the experimental and control groups in nine of the items included in the Islamophobia scale (See Table 3). Table 4 shows that the means for those in the control group were higher in all nine items, suggesting more anti-Muslim prejudice than the experimental group.

Table 3

Independent Samples Test for Islamophobia Scale: Assessing Experimental and Control Mean Differences

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% CI of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
If I could, I would live in a place where there were no Muslims	equal variances assumed	16.451	.000	-2.28	123	.024	-.206	.090	-.384	-.027
				-2.16	85.384	.034	-.206	.095	-.395	-.016
Islam is dangerous religion	equal variances assumed	40.106	.000	-3.94	123	.000	-.596	.151	-.896	-.297
				-3.43	60.501	.001	-.596	.174	-.944	-.249
Religion of Islam supports acts of violence	equal variances assumed	60.219	.000	-4.07	123	.000	-.603	.148	-.895	-.310
				-3.54	59.963	.001	-.603	.170	-.943	-.262
Islam supports terrorist acts	equal variances assumed	28.956	.000	-2.77	123	.006	-.329	.119	-.565	-.094
				-2.47	67.110	.016	-.329	.133	-.595	-.064
Islam is anti-American	equal variances assumed	46.009	.000	-3.55	123	.001	-.467	.132	-.727	-.206
				-3.18	68.341	.002	-.467	.147	-.759	-.174
Islam is evil religion	equal variances assumed	35.332	.000	-3.02	123	.003	-.325	.107	-.537	-.112
				-2.65	62.078	.010	-.325	.122	-.569	-.080
Islam is religion of hate	equal variances assumed	38.661	.000	-3.10	123	.002	-.325	.105	-.532	-.117
				-2.72	62.828	.008	-.325	.119	-.563	-.086
I believe that Muslims support the killings of all non-Muslims	equal variances assumed	40.415	.000	-3.15	123	.002	-.279	.089	-.455	-.104
				-2.82	67.338	.006	-.279	.099	-.477	-.082
Muslims want to take over the world	equal variances assumed	33.895	.000	-3.10	123	.002	-.364	.117	-.596	-.131
				-2.69	59.703	.009	-.364	.135	-.634	-.093

Table 3

Group Statistics for Islamophobia Scale

	Participated in the MSA?	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
If I could, I would live in a place where there were no Muslims	YES	74	1.11	.424	.049
	NO	51	1.31	.583	.082
Islam is dangerous religion	YES	74	1.15	.459	.053
	NO	51	1.75	1.181	.165
Religion of Islam supports acts of violence	YES	74	1.16	.439	.051
	NO	51	1.76	1.159	.162
Islam supports terrorist acts	YES	74	1.12	.436	.051
	NO	51	1.45	.879	.123
Islam is anti-American	YES	74	1.12	.495	.058
	NO	51	1.59	.963	.135
Islam is evil religion	YES	74	1.07	.344	.040
	NO	51	1.39	.827	.116
Islam is religion of hate	YES	74	1.07	.344	.040
	NO	51	1.39	.802	.112
I believe that Muslims support the killings of all non-Muslims	YES	74	1.05	.327	.038
	NO	51	1.33	.653	.091
Muslims want to take over the world	YES	74	1.07	.344	.040
	NO	51	1.43	.922	.129

Concerning the symbolic threat scale, there is insufficient significance in the difference between the two groups to reject the null hypothesis. There is significant difference however, between the two groups on the realistic and Islamophobia scales. Specifically, respondents in the control group seem to hold more Islamophobic views and seem to perceive more realistic threat than those in the experimental group. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis seems to be accurate and I can reject the null hypothesis.

I conducted an independent samples test on the mean differences between the two groups and their responses to the question "Do you have Muslim friends?" Results indicate no significant relationship; the experimental group had a lower mean (M = 1.30, SD .460) than the control group (M = 1.47, SD .504), $t(101.08) = -1.95$, $p > .05$. These findings may have some significance and will be discussed in detail in chapter 5.

Hypothesis 2

Exposure to negative images of Muslims in the media increases anti-Muslim attitudes in college students. However, anti-Muslim prejudice will be mitigated by participation in the MSA. Respondents were asked about their perception of the portrayal of Muslims in the media through the item 'Muslims are portrayed fairly in mainstream media'. The control group mean was higher (M = 1.69, SD .969) than the experimental group (M = 1.19, SD .515), $t(69.5) = -3.35$, $p < .05$. The presence of a higher mean suggests stronger agreement with the statement. Given that much of the portrayal of Muslims in the media is negative, a higher mean is assumed to demonstrate greater acceptance of the negative portrayal of Muslims in the media, and is therefore understood

as more prejudiced. Table 5 shows that respondents from the control group were more likely to classify their political affiliation as right-leaning, conservative, or republican; these labels were aggregated for ease of data collection and entry. In contrast, members of the experimental group were more likely to consider themselves leftists, liberal, and/or democratic. Table 6 shows the political affiliation of media consumed by members of the control and experimental groups. Participants in the control group were more likely to identify their media political affiliation as moderate/center. Comparatively, participants in the experimental group were more likely to report that the political affiliation of their media is liberal/left-leaning.

Table 4

Political Affiliation for the Control and Experimental Groups

Count

			Political Affiliation							
		Moderate	Right/Conservative/Republican	Left/Liberal/Democrat	Unaffiliated	Independent	Libertarian	NA	Missing	Total
Participated in the MSA?	yes	2	3	42	15	7	0	0	5	74
	no	3	15	6	9	14	1	2	1	51
Total		5	18	48	24	21	1	2	6	125

Table 5

Media Political Affiliation for the Control and Experimental Group

Count

		political leaning of media consumed				
		liberal/left-leaning	moderate/center	conservative/right-leaning	Missing	Total
Participated in the MSA?	yes	31	28	10	5	74
	no	21	23	7	0	51
Total		52	51	17	5	125

Symbolic threat and the media. There was a slight significance between the political affiliation of media and symbolic threat. Specifically, respondents who answered the following item, 'immigration from Muslim countries is undermining American culture' and who identified their media affiliation as moderate/center were more likely to experience symbolic threat attitudes (M = 1.69, SD .927) than those whose media consumption was liberal/left-leaning (M = 1.35, SD .789), $t(101)$ = -2.00, $p < .05$.

Realistic threat and the media. For the realistic threat scale, one item showed a significant difference between the two groups: 'Muslim immigrants are as entitled to subsidized utilities (water, sewage, electricity) as poor Americans are'. The moderate/center media group had a higher score on this reverse-coded item (M = 2.32, SD 1.285) than the liberal/left-leaning media group (M = 1.73, SD 1.069), $t(100)$ = -2.52, $p < .05$.

Islamophobia Scale. As for the Islamophobia scale, respondents whose media were moderate/center had higher mean scores on three items respectively than those whose media are considered liberal/left-leaning. Items with significant mean differences are as follows: 'I would support any policy that would stop the building of new mosques (Muslim place of worship) in the US'. The liberal/left-leaning group had a lower mean score (M = 1.17, SD .585) compared to the moderate/center group (M = 1.55, SD .856), $t(88.1)$ = -2.59, $p < .05$. The second item, 'If I could, I would live in a place where there were no Muslims' was also significant; members of the liberal/left-leaning group had a lower mean score (M = 1.04, SD .194) than members of the moderate/center group (M =

1.29, SD .610), $t(59.8) = -2.85$, $p < .05$). Lastly, respondents to the following item 'Islam is anti-American' who were from the liberal/left-leaning group had a lower mean score (M = 1.10, SD.409); while the moderate/center group mean score was higher (M = 1.39, SD .850), $t(71.6) = -2.24$, $p < .05$. These results are sufficient to reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3

Symbolic threat. Respondents who major in a natural science will display significantly more anti-Muslim attitudes than students enrolled in the social sciences. For the symbolic threat scale, no items were significant (see table 7). This suggests that there is no difference between students who are enrolled in social sciences and those enrolled in natural sciences regarding their perception of symbolic threat from American Muslims.

Table 6

College Major and Symbolic Threat: An Analysis of Mean Differences Using Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% CI of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Muslim immigrants should learn to conform to the rules and norms of American society as soon as they arrive	Equal variances assumed	.705	.403	-.448	89	.655	-13.675	30.502	-74.282	46.931
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.056	76.037	.294	-13.675	12.948	-39.464	12.113
Immigration from Muslim countries is undermining American culture	Equal variances assumed	.726	.397	-.440	89	.661	-13.442	30.517	-74.079	47.196
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.038	76.009	.303	-13.442	12.954	-39.241	12.358
The values and beliefs of Muslim immigrants regarding work are basically quite similar to those of most Americans	Equal variances assumed	.000	.999	.265	87	.792	.088	.331	-.570	.745
	Equal variances not assumed			.252	17.492	.804	.088	.347	-.643	.818
The values and beliefs of Muslim immigrants regarding moral and religious issues are not compatible with the beliefs and values of most Americans	Equal variances assumed	.698	.406	-.444	89	.658	-13.545	30.501	-74.151	47.060
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.046	76.047	.299	-13.545	12.948	-39.334	12.243
The values and beliefs of Muslim immigrants regarding family issues and socializing children are basically quite similar to those of most Americans	Equal variances assumed	5.043	.027	.499	88	.619	.150	.301	-.448	.749
	Equal variances not assumed			.727	30.665	.473	.150	.207	-.272	.572
The values and beliefs of Muslim immigrants regarding social relations are not compatible with the beliefs and values of most Americans	Equal variances assumed	.698	.406	-.451	89	.653	-13.766	30.495	-74.359	46.827
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.063	76.047	.291	-13.766	12.946	-39.549	12.017

Realistic threat. Two items reported significant results for the realistic threat scale, "The children of Muslim immigrants should have the same right to attend public schools in the United States as Americans do." Respondents who self-identified as natural science majors had a lower mean score (M = 1.07, SD .267) than those from the social sciences (M = 1.43, SD .957), t(74.6) = -2.77, p < .05. The second item which reported a significant difference is "Muslim immigrants should be eligible for the same health-care benefits received by Americans." Again, the natural science respondents had lower means (M = 1.14, SD .363) than the social science respondents (M = 1.58, SD .951) t(51.8) = -3.03, p <.05. These items were reverse coded and therefore a higher mean score denotes increased perception of realistic threat. Therefore, for the two significant items presented, those in the social sciences perceived more realistic threat from Muslim immigrants and Muslim Americans than their peers in from the natural sciences.

  Islamophobia scale. Respondents who self-identified as majoring in a social science were compared with those who identified as natural science majors. The independent samples *t* test was again used to compute sample means. On the Islamophobia scale, thirteen of the sixteen items were determined to be significant (see table 8). Calculated means for respondents majoring in the social sciences were higher than those from the natural sciences. While there was a significant difference between the groups, results indicate that social science respondents were more Islamophobic than their peers in the natural sciences. Therefore, I cannot reject the null hypothesis.

Table 7

Declared Major and Islamophobia: An Analysis of Mean Differences Using the Islamophobia Scale between Social and Natural Science Respondents.

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
							Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% CI of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)			Lower	Upper
If possible, I would avoid going to places where Muslims would be	equal variance assumed	22.101	.000	-1.897	89	.061	-.299	.157	-.612	.014
	equal variance not assumed			-4.470	76.000	.000	-.299	.067	-.432	-.166
I would become extremely uncomfortable speaking with a Muslim	equal variance assumed	12.494	.001	-1.562	89	.122	-.247	.158	-.561	.067
	equal variance not assumed			-3.680	76.000	.000	-.247	.067	-.380	-.113
Just to be safe, it is important to stay away from places where Muslims could be	equal variance assumed	11.587	.001	-1.484	89	.141	-.208	.140	-.486	.070
	equal variance not assumed			-3.496	76.000	.001	-.208	.059	-.326	-.089
I dread the thought of having a professor that is Muslim	equal variance assumed	10.395	.002	-1.440	89	.153	-.234	.162	-.556	.089
	equal variance not assumed			-3.392	76.000	.001	-.234	.069	-.371	-.097
If I could, I would avoid contact with Muslims	equal variance assumed	8.046	.006	-1.275	89	.206	-.182	.143	-.465	.102
	equal variance not assumed			-3.003	76.000	.004	-.182	.061	-.302	-.061
If I could, I would live in a place where there were no Muslims	equal variance assumed	13.088	.000	-1.556	89	.123	-.234	.150	-.532	.065
	equal variance not assumed			-3.666	76.000	.000	-.234	.064	-.361	-.107
Islam is dangerous religion	equal variance assumed	14.757	.000	-1.800	89	.075	-.494	.274	-1.038	.051
	equal variance not assumed			-4.241	76.000	.000	-.494	.116	-.725	-.262
Religion of Islam supports acts of violence	equal variance assumed	19.077	.000	-1.976	89	.051	-.506	.256	-1.016	.003
	equal variance not assumed			-4.656	76.000	.000	-.506	.109	-.723	-.290
Islam supports terrorist acts	equal variance assumed	15.242	.000	-1.668	89	.099	-.338	.202	-.740	.065
	equal variance not assumed			-3.929	76.000	.000	-.338	.086	-.509	-.166
Islam is evil religion	equal variance assumed	11.231	.001	-1.494	89	.139	-.299	.200	-.696	.098
	equal variance not assumed			-3.520	76.000	.001	-.299	.085	-.468	-.130
Islam is religion of hate	equal variance assumed	11.255	.001	-1.472	89	.145	-.286	.194	-.671	.100
	equal variance not assumed			-3.468	76.000	.001	-.286	.082	-.450	-.122
I believe that Muslims support the killings of all non-Muslims	equal variance assumed	12.241	.001	-1.506	89	.136	-.247	.164	-.572	.079
	equal variance not assumed			-3.548	76.000	.001	-.247	.070	-.385	-.108
Muslims want to take over the world	equal variance assumed	9.483	.003	-1.424	89	.158	-.312	.219	-.747	.123
	equal variance not assumed			-3.355	76.000	.001	-.312	.093	-.497	-.127

Summary

Previous research on the effectiveness of multicultural education programs has yielded conflicting, though mostly positive results. This study failed to produce sufficient evidence that these education programs are effective in ameliorating anti-Muslim prejudice. While some significant differences were present between the control and experimental groups concerning the Islamophobia measure, other measures of intergroup threat were not clearly apparent. The possible reasons for these results as well discussion of the research design will be addressed in Chapter 5. I will further interpret the findings, discuss the implications for social change, and make recommendations for further inquiry based on the analysis of results.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

Prejudice reduction is an elusive task. Literature that explored the nature of prejudice and ways to ameliorate it has flourished in the early 20th century because of increased migration patterns across the globe. Along with these migrations, came the need to "protect" the established cultural norms, leading to the creation of exclusionary policies aimed at out-group members (e.g., the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882). Indeed, American history is fraught with racial tensions. One of the ways to ameliorate the consequences of racial strife was developed after the Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka decision (1954). The use of multicultural education initiatives was a way of incorporating African Americans into the economic tapestry of American capitalism.

Since their inception, MEPs have shown mixed results in their effectiveness to reduce prejudice. To date, however, the studies compiled on the effectiveness of MEPs have focused largely on White/Black differences; more recently they have included other minority groups. The current study sought to examine the effectiveness of an MEP at a large research university in the Southeastern United States. I used a quasi-experimental design—independent samples post-test—to explore the differences in anti-Muslim prejudice between students from the MSA and those from the general student body. To analyze the data, I examined descriptive statistics as well as an independent samples t test. I interpret the findings in the following sections. I also discuss the theoretical background in light of the findings, the limitations of the research design, and the

implications for social change. I conclude with suggestions for future inquiry as well as a brief discussion of policy implications.

Interpretation of the Findings

Symbolic Threat Findings

Symbolic threat between groups. Symbolic threat is the perception held by majority in-group members that members of the outgroup pose a challenge to the accepted customs and culture. Results of the analysis showed no significant differences between experimental and control groups concerning perceived symbolic threat. This finding did not support the alternative hypothesis, which suggests that members of the MSA would be less likely to perceive American Muslims as a threat to American cultural values. Allport's 1954 contact theory may be used to understand the lack of significant differences concerning symbolic threats. Members of both groups indicated that they had Muslim friends, and those in the control group scored higher in this regard (M = 1.47, SD .504) than those in the experimental group (M = .504, SD .460). Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) conducted a meta-analysis of research examining intergroup contact theory; findings suggest that intergroup contact does have a significant effect on prejudice reduction, even for non-racial or ethnic encounters (i.e. intergroup relations that are not specifically defined by racial or ethnic differences).

Close interactions with members of the outgroup may alter perceptions of symbolic threat because members of the out-group, in this case American Muslims, are seen as humans with shared values and cultures, rather than being perceived as threats to the 'American way of life'. Close interactions can also be conceptualized as social

distance, a term which was developed by Bogardus (1926) to understand the degree of closeness that people of different groups have with one another. Recent attempts to understand the role of social distance on symbolic threats and stereotypes give credence to the findings presented here (see, for example, Wirtz, Plight, and Doosje, 2016). Further, while media coverage of Islam and Muslims may have alluded to the fact that there are cultural differences, and that 'they'—Al-Qaeda and their affiliates—hate our way of life; a statement repeated several times by former president George W. Bush; the current discussion around Islam and terrorism in the media has changed. Much of the news reports about ISIS (Islamic State of Iraq and Syria) seem focused on the realistic threats that this group and its supporters may pose to the average American (i.e. physical harm through acts of terrorism).

The current political climate may also account a reduction in the perceived threat that American Muslims may pose to American culture. Indeed, while recent acts of domestic terrorism perpetrated by American Muslims have received negative media attention from political candidates on the right; those on the left have tried to portray the American Muslim community as truly American. President Barack Obama visited an Islamic center and reiterated the need to accept Muslims as both fully American as well as fully Muslim by stating "let me say as clearly as I can as president of the United States: you fit right here" and he added "you're right where you belong. You're part of America too. You're not Muslim or American. You're Muslim and American." (Liptak, 2016).

The current findings differ from previous research on symbolic threat and prejudice (Stephan et al., 1999). However, this may also be due to the fact that the current study failed to examined other variables associated with symbolic threat, such as emotions, which have been shown to mediate the relationship between symbolic threats, stereotypes, and anti-Muslim prejudice (Wirtz, Plight, & Doosje, 2016).

Symbolic threat and media. Findings for the differences in the political leaning of the media consumed, symbolic threat suggest that a slight significance occurs when respondents were asked the following item 'immigration from Muslim countries is undermining American culture'. Those who consumed more moderate or centrist news tended to perceive the above statement as more accurate. Whereas left-leaning media tend to avoid the connection between immigration and threats to American culture, often focusing on the benefits of multiculturalism and its roots in America's immigrant past; media on the right (since moderate media is to the right of left-leaning media, I consider this as playing a role in shaping participant views on the perception of threat) tend to portray such immigrations as threats to American culture. A recent study sought to understand the reliance on media in shaping the views of college students concerning Muslim cultural practice and found that symbolic threat (i.e., the threat the Muslim culture is changing the dominant culture—in this case, Australia—is moderated by mass media. That is, the type of media consumed by participants may facilitate anti-Muslim prejudice and a perceived threat from this group on the dominant culture (White & Newcombe, 2012).

The results of this analysis are not sufficient however, to reject the null hypothesis. The current debate from the media, especially from moderate and right-wing sources has focused recently on the migration crises out of Syria and into Europe and the United States. This, coupled with the proposals by the right-wing presidential candidate to ban Muslims from entering the United States (Pilkington, 2015), may have led to the perception that this group poses a legitimate threat to America's culture and well-being. Populism is often if the result of political rhetoric and it has been shown to affect people's perceptions on many issues (Birks, 2011); when proclaimed by political figures, rhetoric is legitimized and creates distorted perceptions of reality.

Symbolic threat and declared major. Results of the analysis for the differences between respondents from the social science and natural sciences showed no significant differences. I hypothesized that those students who enroll as social science majors will be less prejudiced toward Muslims than their peers from the natural sciences. While overall results indicate that social science majors hold more significantly more Islamophobic views than natural science majors; there was no significant difference between the groups concerning their perceived symbolic threat scores. Previous research examining this difference demonstrated that social science majors were less prejudiced than those from the natural sciences (Gassner & McGuigan, 2014). However, beyond the Gassner and McGuigan (2014) study, there is an insufficient body of literature that explores the relationship between prejudice and declared college major. Beyond sufficient exploration of this topic, anything stated may well be in the realm of conjecture. However, social

science is seen as a discipline concerned with human nature and interaction; therefore, I hypothesized that those students enrolled in a social science will be more likely to have a broader, yet more nuanced understanding of human behavior and will therefore be less prejudiced than those in the natural sciences.

Realistic Threat

Realistic threat between groups. Results of the analysis of group means found significantly different results in two items of the 8-item scale. This finding did not provide sufficient support to reject the null hypothesis. Prior research on prejudice suggests that realistic threat may act as a mediator between intergroup contact and attitudes of outgroup members (Gonzalez, Verkuyten, Weesie, & Poppe, 2008). However, rigorous statistical analyses are required to explain such a relationship and go beyond the scope of this project. Significant differences may be related to increased political rhetoric on exclusionary policies put forth by political candidates. Some evidence exists for the role of the media in heightening perceived realistic threats as discussed in the next section.

Realistic threat and the media. Findings of significance for the reverse-coded item 'Muslim immigrants are as entitled to subsidized utilities (water, sewage, electricity) as poor Americans are' may be in part due to the role of the media in shaping public discourse. Recent media attention has focused on the scarcity of resources for Americans; thereby heightening fears that increased immigration will alter America's ability to provide necessities for its own citizens (Moyo, 2012). Indeed, there is an abundant body

of literature discussing the role of the media in shaping public opinion. One study demonstrated that interpersonal conversations between citizens further extend the reach of official media outlets (Iftikhar, Ullah, Naureen, & Ali, 2016). The finding here does not provide sufficient evidence that there are significant group differences—between left/liberal and moderate/center—respondents to reject the null hypothesis. Overall, there seems to be no significant difference between the two groups concerning a perceived realistic threat.

Realistic threat and declared major. Findings suggest that there are some significant differences between experimental and control group perceptions of a realistic threat. The two items that returned significant differences demonstrate that respondents who were enrolled in the social sciences were more likely to perceive a realistic threat than those from the hard sciences. Such a finding was surprising, yet insufficient to reject the null hypothesis. It may be possible that social science students are exposed to more news concerning social affairs than those in the natural sciences; and may have been impacted by the current rhetoric about Muslims and the influx of immigrants from Muslim-majority nations. In addition, more respondents from the control group were declared social science majors (N = 35) than were members of the experimental group (N = 42) as a percentage of the total sample which may explain the significant findings.

Islamophobia

Islamophobia between groups. Findings for the between group comparisons using the Islamophobia scale suggest significant differences between the control and

experimental groups. It appears that respondents from the control group hold more anti-Muslim views than their peers from the experimental group. These findings support the alternative hypothesis. This may be due to the lack of interaction with members of other racial groups, specifically Muslims. A lack of exposure to other groups tends to perpetuate stereotypes about out-group members. Conversely, research supports the idea of mere exposure to members of other racial groups as a way of ameliorating racial prejudice (Zebrowitz, White, & Wieneke, 2008).

Islamophobia and the media. Two items of the 16-item scale were found to be statistically significant when assessing the differences between those who consumed left-leaning media and those who consumed moderate/center media. This finding alone does not support the alternative hypothesis. However, it is important to note that nearly half (N=23) of the control group self-identified as consumers of moderate/center media. Media type may be a moderating or mediating variable and is insufficient, on its own, to determine causal links to attitude formation. Evidence of this may be found by examining the experimental group, which reported the consumption of conservative/right-leaning media, often affiliated with increased racial prejudice (Cullingford, 2000; Duckitt, 2006).

Islamophobia and declared major. Differences between the two groups were significant for 13 items of the 16-item Islamophobia scale. However, results show that those enrolled in social sciences were more Islamophobic than those in the natural sciences. This finding prevents me from rejecting the null hypothesis. However, many of the respondents whose major was a social science tended to belong to the control group,

which supports the hypothesis that those not engaged in multicultural activities, and not making meaningful contact with people from other cultures may be more prejudiced toward American Muslims than those who do participate in the MSA. A cross tabulation was analyzed and it revealed that those statements which contain agreement or strong agreement on the Islamophobia scale, where the responses of those students from the control group.

Limitations

Clear limitations exist in this study. First, this was an exploratory study given the non-existence of literature examining the efficacy of multicultural education programs in reducing anti-Muslim prejudice. Second, the sample size of 125, while larger than that recommended by a power analysis, is considerably small and therefore not representative of the target population from which it was drawn.

The selection method was carried out through convenience sampling and was not randomized, which limits the generalizability of the results. Specifically, sampling took place in two locations of a large research university. The experimental sample was collected during two nights at a peer-mentor meeting; this was done for convenience, but may have altered the findings. The MSA sponsors different events, which appeal to different groups throughout the university. The control group sample was largely collected from source, a student event held on the main campus; and most of those who responded were participating in students clubs or organizations. Further limitations include the demographic composition of the groups.

A significant limitation of this research was the research design. The independent group posttest design is insufficient to determine the effect of an intervention. While statistical significance was observed in some of the findings, it is difficult to pinpoint the causes of this significance. The design limitations include the possibility of confounding variables (i.e. antecedents) which are not controlled for, and thereby may be responsible for the effect. Worse yet, a spurious relationship may exist due to the presence of uncontrolled antecedents or intervening variables. Further, external validity may be compromised with this research design due to factors such as the "interaction of selection and X" or "reactive arrangements" (Campbell & Stanley, 1963, p. 8). Indeed, the presence of the researcher, who appears ethnically Arab, may have contributed to the reactivity of respondents and thereby altered the findings.

Implications for Social Change

Multiculturalism is a recent socio-political concept developed in the latter part of the 19th century and solidified in the 20th century. With the end of the two major world wars, global migrations changed the demographics of many nations, including the United States. Current events in the Middle East are ushering in mass migrations, diasporas not unlike those of previous decades from Europe. Current political discourse in the United States and throughout much of Europe has seized the topic of mass migration and framed it as a global threat. Indeed, in the United States, talk of mass immigration from Syria and other Muslim majority countries has polarized the polity. On one side, there are calls for closing America's borders to those 'who may do us harm' from abroad. On the opposing

side are calls for more humanitarianism and understanding, more inclusion of refugees and migrants who have suffered under the oppression of tyrannical regimes. While this rhetoric is aimed at multiple groups (e.g., Hispanics and others from Latin America writ large), the focus seems to be on Muslim immigrants and refugees.

As the newly arrived group, Muslims are being victimized at unprecedented rates through increasing hate crimes. In a recently published report, Levin (2016) indicates that anti-Islam related hate crimes increased more than 78.2% (N = 196) in 2015 from 110 in 2014. He also concludes that anti-Arab incidents rose from 21 in 2014 to 67 in 2015, an astonishing 219% increase. The preceding statistics do not include structural prejudice and discrimination, which include employment discrimination and other forms of exclusion through public and private means.

While the findings of this study are inconclusive, they do suggest that some benefit is derived from the implementation of multicultural education policies in higher education. Most notably, increased positive interactions between members of the out-group and those of the in-group have been shown to have significant results in reducing prejudice and stereotypes, as well as anxiety (Allport, 1954; Astin, 1993; Edgberg, 2004). This research demonstrates the need for further inquiry into the effectiveness of multicultural education on the reduction of anti-Muslim prejudice. Findings of significance demonstrate clear differences between students involved in MEPs and those that are not. This knowledge has clear implications for policy makers, educators, and researchers pursuing a truly multicultural and diverse future where racial, ethnic,

religious, and gender differences can be used as a source of strength and unity, not weakness and division.

Recommendations

The implementation of specific programs in postsecondary education focusing on the reduction of anti-Muslim prejudice is recommended for educators and policy makers. Similar to strategies used for other racial and religious groups (e.g. African Americans and people of Jewish faith), education policy can be effective if instituted properly. The institution of such policies and programs requires a multifaceted approach, which includes but is not limited to training and certification of educators through professional development opportunities. Increased scholarly interest and inquiry in these issues is necessary for the testing of these programs to ensure more reliable and generalizable results. Other recommendations include student orientations for all incoming freshmen on the effects of prejudice, specifically addressing anti-Muslim prejudice along with other forms of exclusion. The implementation of cultural sensitivity programs as options for students wishing to earn some incentive toward the completion of their academic goals is also recommended.

The preceding recommendations are largely one-sided. Other recommendations are directed at the American Muslim community. It is in the interest of the American Muslim community to engage more broadly in civic discourse, to participate in local government, and to organize alongside other marginalized groups in an effort to bring awareness to the struggles they face in an increasingly intolerant social climate. They

must learn from those groups who have preceded them, such as the Japanese, Catholics, and Jews, and must work to develop institutions that bring awareness to the American public about their plight and that of other marginalized groups. This research acts only as a starting point; a conversation about these issues must become public. This research attempts to understand merely one aspect of the problem or prejudice, it seeks to problematize these contentious social issues and to advance the existing knowledge about prejudice, Islamophobia, and ways to ameliorate both.

Conclusion

I found some evidence supporting the first and second alternative hypotheses; H_1, participation in the MSA leads to decreased anti-Muslim prejudice, and H_2, exposure to negative images of Muslims in the media increases anti-Muslim attitudes in college students. However, anti-Muslim prejudice will be mitigated by participation in the MSA. There was strong evidence for my failure to reject the null hypothesis H_{o3}; respondents who major in a natural science will display significantly more anti-Muslim attitudes than students enrolled in the social sciences. Overall results confirm that multicultural education programs on a college campus are worthwhile endeavors at ameliorating prejudice. However, understanding the causal mechanisms of prejudice require more sophisticated analyses than those provided here.

Future research requires a better understanding of the relationships between variables. A consideration of the findings of the third hypothesis suggests that mere enrollment in an academic major may not be sufficient to reduce prejudice; there are

intervening variables which must be considered. For the purpose of this research, I merely expounded upon the finding that more of the social science majors were also members of the control group. This suggests that something about the control group may increase anti-Muslim prejudice, but this relationship is not explored here.

Additionally, it is important to consider other theoretical frameworks in future empirical assessments, beyond the theories which guide this project. Dixon (2006) suggests that theories of intergroup threat and contact theories of prejudice can be used to better inform the process of prejudice; these integrated threats go beyond ad hoc explanations of prejudice and have stronger causal mechanisms with increased explanatory power.

This research began with a personal experience of loss, a family member, his wife and his sister-in-law were gunned down in an act of sheer brutality—all of the victims and the assailant were college students. Islamophobia suddenly became manifest in its most animalistic sense. I became curious as to the lack of substantive literature on ways of reducing this irrational fear of Muslims, and that curiosity gave rise to this project. Islamophobia has become institutionalized and mainstream in the media. Political pundits and politicians use anti-Muslim prejudice to score points and appeal to their constituents; the politics of fear have become a mainstay in American socio-political discourse. Therefore, there is no better time to try to understand and deconstruct this new hate of the other. To challenge institutionalized racism and prejudice of any kind, it is best to do so

by institutionalizing solutions in higher education; to educate a generation about the

collateral consequences of hate and prejudice.

References

Aboud, F. E., & Doyle, A. B. (1996). Does talk of race foster prejudice or tolerance in children? *Candian Journal of Behavioral Science, 28*, 161-170.

About us. (2016, April 15). Retrieved from NC State multicultural student affairs. https://oied.ncsu.edu/MSA/about-us/

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

Akbarzadeh, S., & Roose, J. M. (2011). Muslims, multiculturalism and the question of the silent majority. *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs, 31*(3), 309-325.

Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* New York: Perseus Books .

Antony, J. (1993). Can we all get along? How college impacts students' sense of the importance of promoting racial understanding. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education.* Pittsburgh, PA.

Ari, L. L., & Laron, D. (2014). Intercultural learning in graduate studies at an Israeli college of education: Attitudes toward multiculturalism among Jewish and Arab students. *Journal of Higher Education, 68*, 243-262. doi:10.1007/s10734-013-9706-9

Astin, A. W. (1993). Diversity and multiculturalism on the campus. How are students affected? *Change, 23*, 44-49.

Astin, A. W., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development, 39*(3), 251-263.

Astin, A. W., Sax, L. J., & Avalos, J. (1999). Long-term effects of volunteerism during the undergraduate years. *Review of Higher Education, 22*(2), 187-202.

Atteveldt, W. V., Ruigrok, N., & Kleinnijenhuis, J. (2006). Associative framing: A unified method for measuring media frames and the media agenda. *International Communication Association*, (pp. 1-21). Dresden.

Aviram, R. B. (2009). *The relational origins of prejudice: A convergence of psychoanalytic and social cognitive perspectives.* Plymoth, United Kingdom: Jason Aronson.

Banks, J. A. (2001). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Barak, M. M. (2009). Social psychological perspectives of workforce diversity and inclusion in national and global contexts. In R. J. Patti, *The Handbook of Human Service Management* (pp. 239-254). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Birks, J. (2011). The politics of protest in newspaper campaigns: Dissent, populism and the rhetoric of authenticity. *British Politics, 6*(2), 128-154.

Bissell, K., & Parrott, S. (2013). Prejudice: The role of the media in the development of social bias. *Journalism and Communication Monographs, 15*(4), 219-270. doi:10.1177/1522637913504401

Bobo, L., Kluegel, J. R., & Smith, R. A. (1997). Laissez-faire racism: The crystalization of a kinder, gentler, antiblack ideology. In S. A. Tuch, & J. K. Martin (Eds.),

Racial attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and change (pp. 15-42). Wesport: Praeger.

Bogardus, E. S. (1926). Social distance in the city. *Proceedings and Publications of the American Sociological Society, 20*, 40-46.

Brehm, C. J. (1998). *Stereotypes, tolerance, and the classroom.* Boston: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. doi:http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED426927.pdf

Brooks, G. S., & Kahn, S. E. (1990). Evaluation of a course in gender and cultural issues. *Cultural Education and Supervision, 30*, 66-76.

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 (U.S. 483 1954).

Brown, S. P., Parham, T. A., & Yonker, R. (1996). Influence of cross-cultural training course on racial identity attitudes of White women and men: Preliminary perspectives. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 74*, 510-516.

Campbell, D., & Stanley, J. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Chang, M. J. (2002). The impact of an undergraduate diversity course requirement on students' racial views and attitudes. *Journal of General Education, 51*(1), 21-42.

Ciftci, S. (2012). Islamophobia and threat perceptions: Explaining anti-Muslim sentiment in the West. *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs, 32*(3), 293-309.

Coenders, M., & Scheepers, P. (2003). The effect of education on nationalism and ethnic exclusionism: An international comparison. *Political Psychology, 24*(2), 313-343.

Cole, E. R., Case, K. A., Rios, D., & Curtin, N. (2011). Understanding what students bring to the classroom: Moderators of the effects of diversity courses on student attitudes. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17*(4), 397-405. doi:10.1037/a0025433

Cullingford, C. (2000). *Prejudice: From individual identity to nationalism in young people.* London: Kogan Page.

Dearing, J., & Rogers, E. (1996). *Agenda setting.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Dixon, J. C. (2006). The ties that bind and those that don't: Toward reconciling group threat and contact threories of prejudice. *Social Forces, 84*(4), 2179-2204.

Douai, A., & Lauricella, S. (2014). The 'terrorism' frame in 'neo-orientalism': Western news and the Sunni-Shia Muslim sectarian relations after 9/11. *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics, 10*(1), 7-24. doi:10.1386/macp.10.17-1

Duckitt, J. (2006). Differential effects of right wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation on outgroup attitudes and their mediation by threat from and competitiveness to outgroups. *Society for Personality and Social Psychology, 32*(5), 684-696. doi:10.1177/0146167205284282

Edgberg, M. (2004). Improving intergroup relations in higher education: A critical examination of the influence of educational interventions on racial bias. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(4), 437-524.

Ewart, J. (2012). Framing an alleged terrorist: How four Australian news media

organizations framed the Dr. Mohamed Haneef case. *Journal of Media and*

Religion, 11, 91-106. doi:10.1080/15348423.2012.688667

Ewart, J., & Rane, H. (2013). Talking about 9/11: The influence of media images on

Australian Muslims' and non-Muslims' recollections of 9/11. *Australian Journal*

of Communication, 40(1), 137-151.

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible

statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical

sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*(2), 175-191.

Fetzer, J. S., & Soper, J. C. (2003). The roots of public attitudes toward state

accomodation of European Muslims' religious practices before and after

September 11. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 42*(2), 247-258.

Frost, D. (2008). Islamophobia: Examining causal links between the media and "race

hate" from "below". *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 28*(12),

564-578. doi:10.1108/01443330810915251

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J. F. Dovidio, &

S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 61-89). Orlando:

Academic Press.

Garcia, A. (2016, February 03). *New Hampshire Repub's anti-Islam rant: Offering public*

assistance to Muslims is 'treason'. Retrieved from Raw Story:

https://www.rawstory.com/2016/02/new-hampshire-repubs-anti-islam-rant-
offering-public-assistance-to-muslims-is-treason/

Gassner, B., & McGuigan, W. (2014). Racial prejudice in college students: A cross-
cultural examination. *College Student Journal, 48*(2), 249-256.

Gerges, F. A. (2013). The Islamist moment: From Islamic state to civil Islam? *The
Journal of Public and International Affairs, 128*(3), 389-426.

Gerhauser, P. T. (2014). Framing arab-americans and muslims in U.S. media.
Sociological Viewpoints, 30(1), 7-35. Retrieved from
http://proxying.lib.ncsu.edu/index.php?url=http://search.proquest.com.prox.lib.nc
su.edu/docview/1707097888?accountid=12725

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience.* Boston:
Northeastern University Press.

Gonzalez, K. V., Verkuyten, M., Weesie, J., & Poppe, E. (2008). Prejudice towards
Muslims in the Netherlands: Testing integrated threat theory. *British Journal of
Social Psychology, 47*, 667-685.

Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education:
Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(3),
330-367.

Hanley, M. S. (2012). *School of education at Johns Hopkins University: The scope of
muticultural education.* Retrieved from Johns Hopkins School of Education:

http://education.jhu.edu/PD/newhorizons/strategies/topics/multicultural-education/the-scope-of-multicultural-education/

Henderson-King, D., & Kaleta, A. (2000). Learning about social diversity: The undergraduate experience and intergroup tolerance. *Journal of Higher Education, 71*(2), 142-164.

Herman, E. S., & Chomsky, N. (1988). *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of the mass media.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Hewstone, M., & Schmid, K. (2014). Neighborhood ethnic diversity and orientations toward Muslims in Britain: The role of intergroup contact. *The Political Quarterly, 85*(3), 320-325.

Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup bias. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 575-604.

Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup bias. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 575-604.

Hirschman, C. (2006, July 28). *The impact of immigration on American society: Looking backward to the future*. Retrieved from Border Battles: The US immigration debates: http://borderbattles.ssrc.org/Hirschman/printable.html

Hutchinson, M. L. (2014). Tolerating threat? The independent effects of civil conflict on domestic polititcal tolerance. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution, 58*(5), 796-824. doi:10.1177/0022002713478566

Hyun, M. (1994). Helping to promote racial understanding: Does it matter if you're Balck or White? *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education.* Tuscon.

Iftikhar, I., Ullah, R., Naureen, N., & Ali, H. (2016). Deliberative democracy: Effect of news media and interpersonal conversation on quality of public opinion. *South Asian Studies, 31*(1), 43-56.

Imhoff, R., & Recker, J. (2012). Differentiating Islamophobia: Introducing a new scale to measure Islamoprejudice and secular Islam critique. *Political Psychology, 33*(6), 811-824.

Inkelas, K. K. (1998). Increasing visibility: The racial attitudes of Asian Pacific American students. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education.* Miami.

Iyengar, S. (1991). *Is anyone responsible?: How television frames political issues.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jackson, L. M., & Hunsberger, B. (1999). An intergroup perspective on religion and prejudice. *Journal for the scientific study of religion*, 509-523.

Jung, J. H. (2012). Islamophobia? Religion, contact with Muslims, and the respect for Islam. *Review of Religious Research, 54*, 113-126. doi:10.1007/s13644-011-0033-2

Kamans, E., Otten, S., & Gordijn, E. H. (2010). Power and threat in intergroup conflict: How emotional and behavioral responses depend on amoung and content of threat. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 14*(3), 293-310.

Katz, J. M. (2015, March 3). *In Chapel Hill, suspect's rage went beyond a parking dispute*. Retrieved from The New York Times: http://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/04/us/chapel-hill-muslim-student-shootings-north-carolina.html?_r=0

Lee, S. A., Gibbons, J. A., Thompson, J. M., & Timani, H. S. (2009). The Islamophobia scale: Instrument development and initial validation. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 19*, 92-105. doi:10.1080/10508610802711137

Levin, B. (2016). *Special status report: Hate crimes in the United States*. Retrieved from Center for the study of hate crime and extremism: https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/3110202-SPECIAL-STATUS-REPORT-v5-9-16-16.html

Liptak, K. (2016, February 3). *Obama rebutes anti-Muslim rhetoric in first U.S. mosque visit*. Retrieved from CNN Politics: http://www.cnn.com/2016/02/03/politics/obama-mosque-visit-muslim-rhetoric/index.html

Mackie, D. M., Devos, T., & Smith, E. R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(4), 602-616.

Malik, M. (2009). Anti-Muslim prejudice in the West, past and present: An introduction. *Patterns of Prejudice, 43*(3/4), 207-212. doi:10.1080/00313220903109144

Mayo, A. (2010). "Non-media" jury prejudice and rule 21(a): Lessons from Enron. *The Review of Litigation*, 133-158.

Meer, N. (2008). The politics of voluntary and involuntary identities: Are Muslims in Britain an ethnic, racial or religious minority? *Patterns of Prejudice, 42*(1), 61-81. doi:10.1080/00313220701805901

Milem, J. F. (1994). College, students, and racial understanding. *Thought and Action, 9*(2), 51-92.

Morey, P., & Yaqin, A. (2011). *Framing Muslims: Stereotyping and representation after 9/11*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Moyo, D. (2012, June 8). *The resource shortage is real*. Retrieved from Time: http://ideas.time.com/2012/06/08/the-resource-shortage-is-real/

Mutz, D. C., & Goldman, S. K. (2010). Mass Media. In J. F. Dovidio, M. Hewstone, P. Glick, & V. M. Esses (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination* (pp. 241-258). London: SAGE Publications.

Naseem, A. M. (2011). Conceptual perspectives on multiculturalism and multicultural education: A survey of the field. *Canadian Issues*, 9-14.

Nelson, L., Johnson, C., Boyd, J., & Scott, T. (1994). Effects of participation in an intergroup communication program: An assessment of Shippenburg University's

Building Bridges program. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association.* Providence .

Neuberg, S. L., Warner, C. M., Mistler, S. A., Berlin, A., Hill, E. D., Johnson, J. D., . . . Schober, J. (2014). Religion and intergroup conflict: Findings from the global group relations project. *Psychological Science, 25*(1), 198-206. doi:10.1177/0956797613504303

Ogan, C., Willnat, L., Pennington, R., & Bashir, M. (2013). The rise of anti-Muslim prejudice: Media and Islamophobia in Europe and the United States. *The International Communication Gazette, 76*(1), 27-46. doi:10.1177/1748048513504048

Palmer, B. (2000). *The impact of diversity courses: Research from Pennsylvania State University*. Retrieved May 1, 2016, from Diversity Digest (Winter): http://www.diversityweb.org/digest/W00/research.html

Paluck, E. L. (2009). Reducing intergroup prejudice and conflict using the media: A field experiment in Rwanda. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*(3), 574-587. doi:10.1037/a0011989

Paluck, E. L., & Green, D. P. (2009). Prejudice reduction: What works? A review and assessment of research and practice. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*, 339-367. doi:10.1146/annurev.psch.60.110707.163607

Papacharissi, Z., & Oliveira, M. d. (2008). News frames terrorism: A comparative

    analysis of frames employed in terrorism coverage in U.S. and U.K. newspapers.

    The International Journal of Press/Politics, 13(1), 52-74.

Pascarella, E. T., Edison, M., Nora, A., Hagedorn, L. S., & Terenzini, P. T. (1996).

    Influence on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the first year of

    college. *Journal of Higher Education, 67*(2), 174-195.

Pedreny, P. B., & Radazzo, E. (2012). Multiculturalism and ethnic conflic management

    in Kosovo: The process of decentralisation. *Journal of Global Intelligence and*

    Policy, 5(8), 15-34.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory.

    Journal of personality and social psychology, 90(5), 751-783. doi:10.1037/0022-

    3514.90.5.751

Pilkington, E. (2015, December 7). *Donald Trump: Ban all Muslims entering US.*

    Retrieved from The guardian: https://www.theguardian.com/us-

    news/2015/dec/07/donald-trump-ban-all-muslims-entering-us-san-bernardino-

    shooting

Plaut, V. C., Garnett, F. G., Buffardi, L. E., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2011). "What about

    me?" Perceptions of exclusion and White's reactions to multiculturalism. *Journal*

    of Personality and Social Psychology, 101(2), 337-353. doi:10.1037/a0022832

Powell, K. A. (2011). Framing Islam: An analysis of U.S. media coverage of terrorism since 9/11. *Communication Studies, 62*(1), 90-112. doi:10.1080/10510974.2011.533599

Power, G. J., Murphy, S. T., & Coover, G. (1996). Priming prejudice: How stereotypes and counter-stereotypes influence attribution of responsibility and credibility among ingroups and outgroups. *Human Communication Research, 23*(1), 36-58.

Programs overview. (2016 йил 15-June). From NC State Multicultural Student Association: https://oied.ncsu.edu/MSA/programs/

Raabe, T., & Beelmann, A. (2011). Development of ethnic, racial, and national prejudice in childhood and adolescence: A multinational meta-analysis of age differences. *Child Development, 82*(6), 1715-1737. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01668.x.

Rane, H., & Ewart, J. (2012). The framing of Islam and Muslims in the tenth anniversary coverage of 9/11: Implications for reconciliation and moving on. *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs, 32*(3), 310-322. doi:10.1080/13602004.2012.727292

Rattan, A., & Ambady, N. (2014). How "it gets better": Effectively communicating support to targets of prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 40*(5), 555-566. doi:10.1177/0146167213519480

Riek, B. M., Mania, E. W., & Gaertner, S. L. (2006). Intergroup threat and outgroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*(4), 336-353.

Said, E. W. (2003). *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage Books.

Savelkoul, M., Scheepers, P., Tolsma, J., & Hagendoorn, L. (2011). Anti-Muslim attitudes in the Netherlands: Tests of contradictory hypotheses derived from ethnic competition theory and intergroup contact theory. *European Sociological Review, 27*(6), 741-758. doi:10.1093/esr/jcq035

Shaheen, J. (2014). *Reel bad Arabs: How hollywood vilifies a people.* Northampton, MA: Olive Branch Press.

Shamir, M., & Sagiv-Schifter, T. (2006). Conflict, identity, and tolerance: Israel in the Al-Aqsa intifada. *Political Psychology, 27*(4), 569-595. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2006.00523.x

Shaver, J. H., Troughton, G., Sibley, C. G., & Bulbulia, J. A. (2016). Religion and the unmaking of prejudice toward Muslims: Evidence from a large national sample: e0150209. *PLos One, 11*(3), 1-25. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0150209

Sidanius, J. (1993). The psychology of group conflict and the dynamics of oppression: A social dominance perspective. In S. Iyengar, & W. J. McGuire (Eds.), *Explorations in political psychology* (pp. 183-219). Durham: Duke University Press. North Carolina

Sidanius, J., Bobo, L., & Pratto, F. (1996). Racism, conservatism, affirmative action, and intellectual sophistication: A matter of principled conservatism or group dominance? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(3), 476-490.

Sidanius, J., Devereux, E., & Pratto, F. (1992). A comparison of symbolic racism theory and social dominance theory as explanations for racial policy attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology, 132*(3), 377-395.

Simut, C. C. (2016). Negative ecodomy in Romanian politics and religion: Anti-Muslim attitudes in the Bucharest mosque scandal during the summer of 2015. *Religions, 6*, 1368-1390. doi:10.3390/rel6041368

Smith, K. M. (1993). The impact of college on White students' racial attitudes. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Institutional Reserach.* Chicago.

Springer, L., Palmer, B., Terenzini, P. T., Pascarella, E. T., & Nora, A. (1996). Attitudes toward campus diversity: Participation in a racial or cultural awareness workshop. *Review of Higher Education, 20*(1), 53-68.

Staurowsky, E. (2012). Sexual prejudice and sport media coverage. *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education, 6*(1), 121-140.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing Prejudice and Discrimination* (pp. 23-45). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2001). *Improving Intergroup Relations.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Stephan, W. G., Renfro, C. L., Esses, V. M., Stephan, C. W., & Martin, T. (2005). The effects of feeling threatened on attitudes toward immigrants. *International Journal inf Intercultural Relations, 29*, 1-19.

Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., & Bachman, G. (1999). Prejudice toward immigrants. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 29*(11), 2221-2237.

Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., & Morrison, K. R. (2009). Intergroup threat theory. In T. D. Nelson (Ed.), *Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination* (pp. 43-60). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., Martinez, C. M., Schwarzwald, J., & Tur-Kaspa, M. (1998). Prejudice toward immigrants to Spain and Israel: An integrated threaty theory analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29*(4), 559-576.

Strabac, Z., Aalberg, T., & Valenta, M. (2014). Attitudes towards Muslim immigrants: Evidence from survey experiments across four countries. *Journal of Ethinic and Migration Studies, 40*(1), 100-118.

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Talbot, M. (2015, June 22). *The story of a hate crime: What led to the murder of three Muslim students in Chapel Hill?* Retrieved from The New Yorker: http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2015/06/22/the-story-of-a-hate-crime

Taylor, S. H. (1994). Enhancing tolerance: The confluence of moral development with the college experience. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 56*(01).

Triandis, H. C., & Trafimow, D. (2001). Culture and its implications for intergroup behavior. In R. Brown, & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes* (pp. 367-385). Malden: Blackwell Publishers.

Turner, J. C., & Reynolds, K. J. (2001). The social identity perspective in intergroup relations: Theories, themes, and controversies. In R. Brown, & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes* (pp. 133-152). Malden: Blackwell Publishers.

U.S. Department of Education. (2015). Retrieved May 1, 2016, from National Center for Education Statistics: http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/ch_3.asp

Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2013). Multicultural education and inter-ethnic attitudes: An intergroup perspective. *European Psychologist, 18*(3), 179-190. doi:10.1027/1016-9040/a000152

White, C. D., & Newcombe, P. A. (2012). The impact of media reliance on the role of perceived threat in predicting tolerance of Muslim cultural practice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42*(12), 3051-3082. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00973.x

Whitt, E. J., Edison, M. I., Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P. T., & Nora, A. (2001). Influences on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the second and third years of college. *Journal of Higher Education, 72*(2), 172-204.

Williams, R. H. (2015). Religion and multiculturalism: A web of legal, institutional, and cultural connections. *The Sociological Quarterly, 56*, 607-622. doi:10.1111/tsq.12094

Wirtz, C., Plight, J. V., & Doosje, B. (2016). Negative attitudes toward Muslims in the Netherlands: The role of symbolic threat, stereotypes, and moral emotions. *Journal of Peace Psychology, 22*(1), 75-83.

Woods, J. (2011). Framing terror: An experimental framing effects study of the perceived threat of terrorism. *Critical Studies on Terrorism, 4*(2), 199-217.

Yazdiha, H. (2014). Law as a movement strategy: How the Islamophobia movement institutionalizes fear through legislation. *Social Movement Studies, 13*(2), 267-274. doi:10.1080/14742837.2013.807730

Zarate, M. A., Garcia, B., Garza, A. A., & Hitlan, R. T. (2004). Cultural threat and perceived realistic group conflict as dual predictors of prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40*, 99-105.

Zebrowitz, L. A., White, B., & Wieneke, K. (2008). Mere exposure and racial prejudice: Exposure to other-race faces increases liking for strangers of that race. *Social Cognition, 26*(3), 259-275.

Zebrowitz, L. A., White, B., & Wieneke, K. (2008). Mere exposure and racial prejudice: Exposure to other-race faces increases liking for strangers of that race. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience, 26*(3), 259-275. doi:10.1521/soco.2008.26.3.259

Zuniga, X., & Nagda, B. A. (2002). Intergroup dialogues: An educational model for cultivating engagement across differences. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 35*(1), 7-17.

Appendix A: Survey Instrument

SURVEY-- PREJUDICE #: 20160625
COLLEGE STUDENT ATTITUDES

I am a doctoral candidate at Walden University's School of Public Policy and Administration. I am interested in conducting research on prejudice reduction on college campuses. The objectives of this study are to determine the effectiveness of Multicultural Education programs in reducing prejudice on college campuses. Through your participation, I hope that this study will provide useful information to researchers, policy makers, and practitioners in better addressing the problems and concerns that minority groups may experience in college. It also seeks to build a stronger and mutually beneficial relationship between the native population and minority groups on college campus and throughout the greater community. This questionnaire asks a variety of questions about your attitudes and perceptions toward racial and religious minority groups. This survey is completely anonymous and voluntary. Do not write your name or other identifying information on this questionnaire as this is neither required, nor necessary. If you have any concerns or questions about this study kindly feel free to contact me, Amin Asfari at (919-427-2008); or email me at amin.asfari@waldenu.edu. Please take a moment to give honest replies to the questions below. All responses to the questions will be confidential and your responses will be coded to ensure confidentiality. Thank you for your time.

Part I (DEM)

1. What is your age? |__|__|

2. Please specify your gender: |___|Male |___| Female

3. Marital Status: (   ) Single (   ) Married (   ) Divorced (   ) Widowed (   ) Separated

4. Education: ( ) Freshman ( ) Sophomore ( ) Junior ( ) Senior ( ) Graduate Student – Master's ( ) Post-Graduate--PhD ( ) Graduate/Professional Student.

5. What is your current major of study or anticipated declared major?
_____

6. Current Employment Status: ( ) Full Time ( ) Self Employed ( ) Part time ( ) Unemployed ( ) Full time Student ( ) Retired ( ) Home-maker ( ) Other.

7. What is your political affiliation?_____

8. Total Annual Household Income:
( ) Less than $5,000 ( ) Less than $10,000 ( ) Less than $15,000 ( ) Less than $20,000
( ) Less than $25,000 ( ) Less than $30,000 ( ) Less than $35,000 ( ) Less than $40,000
( ) Less than $45,000 ( ) Less than $50,000 ( ) Less than $55,000 ( ) Less than $60,000
( ) More than $60,000.

9. What is your race? If the answer is not listed, please write it next to 'other': ( ) White ( ) Black or African American ( ) American Indian and Alaska Native ( ) Asian ( ) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander ( ) Hispanic or Latino
( ) Other race:_____

10. Do you practice any religion? |____| Yes |____| No: if no, please move to question 12.

11. Which religion do you practice? _____

12. Do you have any Muslim friends? |____| Yes |____| No

13. Are you now or have you in the past been involved with the Multicultural Student Affairs program on campus? |_____| Yes |_____| No

Part II (ST)

Instructions: Please indicate your agreement with each of the following statements by marking the appropriate number on the scale below.

14. Muslim immigrants should learn to conform to the rules and norms of American Society as soon as they arrive.

Strongly Disagree					Neither			Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

15. Immigration from Muslim countries is undermining American culture.

Strongly Disagree					Neither			Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

16. The values and beliefs of Muslim immigrants regarding work are basically quite similar to those of most Americans.

Strongly Disagree					Neither			Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

17. The values and beliefs of Muslim immigrants regarding moral and religious issues are _not_ compatible with the beliefs and values of most Americans.

Strongly Disagree					Neither			Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

18. The values and beliefs of Muslim immigrants regarding family issues and socializing children are basically quite similar to those of most Americans.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | Neither | | | | Strongly Agree | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

19. The values and beliefs of Muslim immigrants regarding social relations are *not* compatible with the beliefs and values of most Americans.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | Neither | | | | Strongly Agree | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

Part III (RT)

Instructions: Please indicate your agreement with each of the following statements by marking the appropriate number on the scale below.

20. Muslim immigrants get more from this country than they contribute.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | Neither | | | | Strongly Agree | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

21. The children of Muslim immigrants should have the same right to attend public schools in the United States as Americans do.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | Neither | | | | Strongly Agree | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

22. Muslim immigration has increased the tax burden on Americans.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | Neither | | | | Strongly Agree | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

23. Muslim Americans are <u>not</u> displacing American workers from their jobs.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | Neither | | | | Strongly Agree | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

24. Muslim immigrants should be eligible for the same health-care benefits received by Americans.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | Neither | | | | Strongly Agree | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

25. Social services have become less available to Americans because of Muslim immigration.

Strongly Disagree   Neither   Strongly Agree

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

26. The quality of social services available to Americans has remained the same, despite Muslim Immigration.

Strongly Disagree   Neither   Strongly Agree

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

27. Muslim immigrants are as entitled to subsidized housing or subsidized utilities (water, sewage, electricity) as poor Americans are.

Strongly Disagree   Neither   Strongly Agree

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Part IV (IS)

Instructions: Using the scale below, please select the number that best describes to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following items. There is no right or wrong answer. Please do not leave any item blank.

28. I would support any policy that would stop the building of new mosques (Muslim place of worship) in the U.S.

Strongly Disagree   Neither   Strongly Agree

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

29. If possible, I would avoid going to places where Muslims would be.

Strongly Disagree   Neither   Strongly Agree

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

30. I would become extremely uncomfortable speaking with a Muslim.

Strongly Disagree   Neither   Strongly Agree

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

31. Just to be safe, it is important to stay away from places where Muslims could be.

Strongly Disagree				Neither				Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

32. I dread the thought of having a professor that is Muslim.

Strongly Disagree				Neither				Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

33. If I could, I would avoid contact with Muslims.

Strongly Disagree				Neither				Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

34. If I could, I would live in a place where there were no Muslims.

Strongly Disagree				Neither				Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

35. Muslims should not be allowed to work in places where many Americans gather such as airports.

Strongly Disagree				Neither				Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

36. Islam is a dangerous religion.

Strongly Disagree				Neither				Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

37. The religion of Islam supports acts of violence.

Strongly Disagree				Neither				Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

38. Islam supports terrorist acts.

Strongly Disagree				Neither				Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

39. Islam is anti-American.

Strongly Disagree				Neither				Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

40. Islam is an evil religion.

Strongly Disagree				Neither				Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

41. Islam is a religion of hate.

Strongly Disagree				Neither				Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

42. I believe that Muslims support the killings of all non-Muslims.

Strongly Disagree				Neither				Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

43. Muslims want to take over the world.

Strongly Disagree				Neither				Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

44. Muslims are portrayed fairly in mainstream media.

Strongly Disagree				Neither				Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Part V (M)

45. Which of the following media do you consume the MOST in your daily life?
( ) Newspapers
( ) T.V.
( ) Radio
( ) Magazine
( ) Internet
( ) Other (please list):_____

For question 45, please mark the option that best describes your media of choice:

46. Would you describe the political leaning of the media that you consume as:
( ) liberal/left-leaning ( ) moderate/center ( ) conservative/right-leaning

Thank you very much for taking the time to answer these questions.