

# **Examining the Existence and Extent of Anti-intellectual Attitudes and Behaviors among University Students**

*Robert S. Balough and Robert B. Girvan  
Clarion University of Pennsylvania*

## **Abstract**

*The existence of social forces on students to perform below one's academic potential in order to be socially accepted has been recognized for some time. Previous studies have found attitudes and behaviors of what we call anti-intellectualism to exist to varying extents among students of all racial/ethnic backgrounds. However, this phenomenon seems particularly problematic for African American, Native American and Latino students attempting to achieve upward social mobility through educational credentials. This experience is known as "acting white" and, in certain circumstances, can have a significant negative impact on effort and attainment behavior because of social/external costs of performing well academically. Unlike previous studies that have focused on this problem in the behavior of secondary school students, this paper examines the extent to which anti-intellectual attitudes and behaviors exist among university students as a major explanation to the achievement and employment gaps that exist.*

*The extent of the phenomenon is measured over various strata of the university student population using survey data. Differences in identified anti-intellectual attitudes and behavior are estimated across ethnic and racial categories as well as such characteristics as sex, family income, fraternity/sorority membership, economic background, and sports participation. Our findings are significantly at odds in some respects with previous studies of high school students. While racial differences in these attitudes are not as evident at the university level compared to previous studies at the secondary level, there are significant differences present among other variables examined.*

## **Background Material and Literature Review**

Sociologists have long known that behavior of individuals is often influenced both by the norms of the groups with which they associate and by dominant societal norms. Similarly, economists view behavior and changes in behavior as economic situational responses, that is, as a rational response to costs and benefits of that behavior toward the achievement of some objective. These costs and benefits are often determined to greater or lesser extent by the groups with which individuals associate. Relatively inexperienced or less knowledgeable individuals in an area of life will often seek advice prior to making decisions about appropriate behavior in certain situations. Households and individuals accumulating savings, for example, will seek advice on how to invest those funds in order to earn a satisfactory return given their preference toward risk and their long-term financial objectives. These decision-makers will generally have some ability to correctly assess the information given to them prior to making decisions. Younger and least experienced individuals seeking cultural and social capital also seek guidance from others. They may seek advice, however, from peers who often are no more experienced or knowledgeable than they. These peers are most often no more able to assess information about behavioral costs and benefits due to their own lack of experience and knowledge than those seeking counsel. These peers may assume those seeking counsel possess the same objectives as themselves, and those seeking counsel generally do not have the ability determine the quality of the advice they receive relative to their situation; the advice-seekers often do not, therefore, discount this information at an appropriate rate when making behavioral decisions.

Anti-intellectual, anti-achievement orientation can have many connotations in American society. At an aggregate level, the concept was well defined by Richard Hofstadter in his 1964 Pulitzer Prize-winning book entitled *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*, as “national disrespect for [the] mind...vulgarization...a resentment and suspicion of the life of the mind and those who are considered to represent it.” [1963] The phrase “dumbing down” [Washburn & Thornton, eds., 1966] is a more recent descriptor. During at least the past eight years, anti-intellectualism has been represented for many by President George H. W. Bush. Statements attributed to President Bush about not having read a book since graduating from college, his assertion at the Yale 2001 commencement regarding his success in spite of being a “C” student, and his many public misstatements over the years has made, one could argue, anti-intellectualism seem a normal element characteristic of white [male] privilege. [Rothenberg, ed., 2008] These are types of data that behavioralists call choice architecture or nudges, the social/psychological context for life decisions [Thaler & Sunstein 2008] that often lead us to make choices contrary our best interests.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find anti-intellectual and anti-achievement sentiments among young students. Anti-intellectual and anti-achievement student orientation has been observed to be prevalent, however, at all schooling levels including higher education (Trout, 1997). The gap between professed academic goals and the actual performance of many students is well documented. Achievement differences are also well pronounced between extant racial categories. A popular explanation of the racial performance disparity is the phenomenon often referred to as “acting white.” Even though professed academic goals are quite similar across racial categories, Ogbu and Fordham discovered in a seminal study in 1986 of a Washington D.C. high school that many black students shunned high academic performance and earning good grades because their peers considered such behavior as “selling out” or “acting white.” Being a high achiever, combined with other behaviors such as speaking/writing “standard” [middle-class] English, dressing “preppy,” and certain musical inauthentic tastes, therefore, carried a high price tag; that of not being accepted socially by ones same-race peers. Horvat and Lewis [2003] suggested that an ‘oppositional culture’ exists among some students of color that denigrates certain social interactions thus influencing the manner in which individuals assimilate into the dominant culture. The “oppositional culture” orientation dictates that these and other selected characteristics of the dominant culture must be disavowed in order to maintain authentic cultural identity by “keeping it real” as the hip hoppers say. Further, what is identified as flaunted intellectual/scholarly interest and high academic achievement became associated with the white, dominant culture and, therefore, should be shunned by the minority youths in favor of pursuits perceived to be more likely to yield high material reward, such as professional sports and musical entertainment.

There is also a less noticed aspect of this phenomenon representing class tensions among and between racial categories in the USA. What Cloward and Piven called the “hidden injuries of class” among whites was identified in a popular 1981 song by Ricky Skaggs warning his listeners not to “get above their raising” and to “stay down to earth with me...don’t high hat me.”

Anti-intellectualism or academic disengagement among black and Latino students is, in this perspective, a result of the wealthy white persons’ historical domination in major social institutions: education, economics and politics, so an oppositional cultural frame of reference creates an accordant oppositional identity that is implicated in poor school performance. Consequently, Black, Native American and Latino students are disillusioned about the instrumental value of schooling and thus distrust educators, a combination of factors that together suppress student commitment to dominant cultural school norms [Horvat & O’Connor, 2006]. However, McWhorter [2000] argues that black students have sabotaged themselves with what he calls “victimology;” self-sabotage results from being a victim of past discrimination about educational opportunity combined with the attitude that education and academic achievement, or intellectualism, is for whites only. This attitude has left many Black and Latino students unwilling to successfully compete academically with whites and

Asian-Americans. Such behavior, McWhorter argues, has resulted in the persistence of an achievement gap between Black, Latino and white/ Asian American students even in the face of greatly improved educational opportunities for racial minority students. Elementary and Secondary “school choice” advocates [primarily through tuition vouchers, homeschooling and charter schools] like the Thernstroms [2003], maintain that “pessimism is a self-fulfilling prophecy... You can become the master of your own destiny,” applies to all students in the USA; the further hold that there should be “no excuses” for academic disengagement.

Other studies have examined the racial learning gap that exists “in sharp contrast to abundant evidence that black youth articulate high aspirations for their own educational and social mobility— aspirations that actually exceed those articulated by their white counterparts.” [Hrovat & O’Connor, 2006] Ronald Ferguson examined public high school students in Shaker Heights, Ohio and identified a strong anti-intellectual attitude among black students even in this integrated upper-class Cleveland suburb. Instead of exploiting the social class advantage black students seemed to have had in such a situation, they shunned learning and achievement to act as expected by the persons of the majority culture [2001]. In addition, the College Board found that the achievement gap between blacks/Latinos and Whites/Asians widens as one moves up the social-class hierarchy [1999].

Recent studies by economists Fryer and Torelli and Fryer and Austen-Smith have made significant contributions to this research taking a more economic cost-benefit view of student academic behavior. Their research attempts to measure the cost to high school students in terms of social acceptance by same-race peers and the number of friends they would have based upon academic achievement. Their research indicated that white students earning higher grades more often resulted in greater in-group popularity yet for black and Latino students, higher grades led to only modestly higher peer popularity. They not only identified a diminishing return in terms of popularity to increased academic achievement, they also identified a saturation point, in that, black student popularity increased up to about a GPA of 3.5 but then began to decrease as the GPA approached the 4.0 mark. Hispanic student saturation point was even lower, at about a GPA of 2.5. This popularity saturation point did not exist for white students in the study. Another interesting finding of Fryer and Torelli was that this “acting white” stigma was virtually non-existent for black student who attended predominately black high schools, illustrating the power of the social context regarding individual attitudes and behaviors. Relatively scant higher education data affirm the academic effectiveness of HBCUs (historically black colleges and universities), “once admitted, academically underprepared students at HBUCS show disproportionate gains in academic performance, generally even higher GPAs than students at HWI (historically white institutions). [Palmer and Hilton, 2009]

## **Research Methodology**

The purpose of the present research effort is to attempt to measure the extent to which anti-intellectual attitudes and behaviors manifested by academic achievement gaps exist among university students. A survey instrument was created operationalizing crucial measures identified in Fryer’s research noted above. Using survey data, the extent of the phenomenon is measured over various strata of the university student population. Differences in identified anti-intellectual attitudes and behaviors are estimated across ethnic and racial categories as well as such characteristics as sex, family income, fraternity/sorority membership, economic background, and intercollegiate sport participation. The survey instrument used is presented in the Appendix A. The questionnaire asked 15 questions regarding demographics and thirty six questions answered on a five point Likert agreement scale. Appendix B presents the responses to the demographic questions. For this analysis sex, race, and intercollegiate sport participation will be examined. For ease of analysis, the response scale for the non-demographic questions was reduced to three levels; agree, neutral or no opinion, and disagree. The instrument was administered during the spring 2009 semester at Clarion University of

Pennsylvania. Sampling was conducted using a stratified cluster technique. Several highly populated courses at the university were selected to represent students from various colleges and class levels. The instrument was administered to randomly-selected individual sections of each of these courses. Student participation was voluntary and dependent upon attendance on the day the instrument was administered. Administration of the instrument was conducted by one of two faculty members, both reading the same script to student participants.

While the instrument included 36 experimental opinion questions, only fifteen of these questions are examined here as an indication of the respondent's anti-intellectual attitudes and behaviors and two are used as an indication of whether the student has observed anti-intellectualism on the part of others. Agreement with the statements in questions 18, 24, 27, 28, 33, 35, 43, and 44 were taken to indicate that the respondent displayed anti-intellectualism of some degree. Disagreement with question 21 indicated the same. Questions 19, 42, 45, 46, 47, and 50 ask the students if they have observed others being harassed, have been the perpetrators of harassment, or are sensitive to harassment by others.

Table One below reports the proportionate responses to the questions examined after reduction from a five to a three point scale. Questions where a significant degree of agreement would indicate an anti-intellectual behavior have been bolded.

	Proportionate Responses		
	A	N	D
<b>18. I do what I need to get by in my classes. Graduating is important, grades are not.</b>	9.7	12.3	78.0
19. I find that taking notes in class helps me do well in my classes.	83.4	13.7	2.9
21. A higher grade average helps you get a better paying job after graduation.	66.8	22.1	11.2
24. I could get better grades in some of my classes but it doesn't really pay to do the extra work.	15.2	17.5	67.2
27. Earning higher grades will not make it easier to find a job after graduation.	14.3	23.5	62.2
28. No one likes the students who study too much and hurt the grades of the rest of the class.	17.1	29.1	53.7
33. Students who participate in class cause problems by making the other students look dumb.	4.9	12.3	82.9
35. I don't like to have friends that put too much importance on studying and grades.	5.4	16.9	77.7
42. On at least one occasion I have harassed a friend for working too hard on school work.	35.7	18.0	46.3
43. I have friends who waste a lot of their time studying too much.	14.6	17.4	68.0
44. Working hard is not as important as having friends and looking good.	5.4	12.3	82.2
45. On at least one occasion I have been harassed by my friends for working too hard.	47.7	13.5	38.8
46. I am sensitive to criticism from my peers about trying to do too well.	22.9	25.8	51.3
47. In high school students who worked hard to get good grades were often chastised for trying to be something they are not, that is, trying to get above those with whom they were raised.	20.3	28.9	50.7

As can be seen in Table One, the level of agreement with the bolded questions varies and ranges from 4.9% to 17.1%. Roughly 5 to 20% of students indicated some degree of an anti-intellectual attitudes and behaviors in the application of the survey. While these numbers are significantly greater than zero, they do not indicate widespread or pervasive problem of anti-intellectualism at this university. If student attitudes at Clarion University are representative of university students in general, these results indicate the existence of, but not a pervasive problem with, anti-intellectual attitudes among students at the higher education level as was found with many studies at the secondary level.

The specific hypotheses to be tested are as follows: Student anti-intellectual attitudes as measured by the individual question examined are independent of the sex, race, and sports participation of

the respondent. Stated another way, the proportion of respondents expressing agreement, neutrality, and disagreement are the same for males and females and the same for all levels of race and sports participation. The test used is the Chi-square test of concordance. Table Two gives the Chi-square test statistic and the observed significance level (p-value) for each opinion question considered relative to sex. For those relationships found to be significant at the 5% level or better an agreement ratio, the ratio of males to females that agree with the question, is also reported. Males in the sample, for example, were 3.5 times more likely to agree with question 18 than females. As before, those questions where agreement is associated with anti-intellectualism are bolded.

<b>Table Two</b>			
<b>Anti-Intellectualism Attitudes by Sex</b>			
Selected Questions	Chi-Square	p-level	Agree-Ratio*
18. I do what I need to get by in my classes. Graduating is important, grades are not.	27.009	.001	3.5
19. I find that taking notes in class helps me do well in my classes.	20.068	.001	0.8
21. A higher grade average helps you get a better paying job after graduation.	2.731	.255	
24. I could get better grades in some of my classes but it doesn't pay to do the extra work.	.962	.618	
27. Earning higher grades will not make it easier to find a job after graduation.	4.771	.092	
28. No one likes the students who study too much hurt the grades of the rest of the class.	22.880	.001	2.5
33. Students who participate in class cause problems making other students look dumb.	13.858	.001	4.1
35. I don't like to have friends that put too much importance on studying and grades.	12.838	.002	4.7
42. On at least one occasion I have harassed a friend for working too hard on school work.	16.094	.001	1.7
43. I have friends who waste a lot of their time studying too much.	33.275	.001	0.3
44. Working hard is not as important as having friends and looking good.	19.008	.001	2.7
45. On at least one occasion I have been harassed by my friends for working too hard.	7.043	.030	0.9
46. I am sensitive to criticism from my peers about trying to do too well.	.101	.951	
47. In high school students who worked hard to get good grades were often chastised for trying to be something they are not, that is, trying to get above those with whom they were raised.	3.224	.199	
50. I often try to not let my friends know if I am working hard at something for fear they will ridicule my efforts.	10.601	.005	1.7
* Note: Agreement-Ratio is the ratio of males to females that agree with the question and is presented here for all questions significant at the 5% level. For example, males were 3.5 times more likely to agree with question 18 than females. A ratio less than one indicates that females were more likely to agree with the statement. For example, for question 19, females were (1 / 0.8 =) 1.25 times more likely to agree.			

The results here show that proportionate responses to several questions related to anti-intellectual attitudes and behaviors are significantly different based upon sex of the respondent. As the agreement ratios indicate males tend to show stronger anti-intellectual attitudes than females. Some of these results are striking such as questions 18, 34, and 35 where men are 3.5 to 4.7 times more likely to be in agreement with the anti-intellectual statement. Interestingly, however, males are 1.7 times more likely to agree with question 50; indicating males are more compelled to mask their academic effort than females. Males are significantly more likely to be harassers (question 42) than females and females are significantly more likely to have been harassed (question 45) than males.

In addition to sex of the respondent, race of the respondent is also examined here. As seen in Appendix B, the variable race has five levels of responses. Of the 350 total respondents, 302 were white, 28 black, and the remaining 20 spread over the other three categories. The lack of responses for these other categories made a five-level comparison impractical. Combining white with Hispanic and black with the others was considered, but the analysis provided here examines only the 330 observations of black and white students. Reducing the variable race improves the reliability of the statistics reported. The results for the three levels of agreement against the two levels of race are given in Table Three.

**Table Three**  
**Attitudes Toward Anti-Intellectualism by Race**

Selected Questions	Chi-Square	p-level Ratio	Agree- Ratio
18. I do what I need to get by in my classes. Graduating is important, grades are not.	4.765	.092	
19. I find that taking notes in class helps me do well in my classes.	9.259	.010	.750
21. A higher grade average helps you get a better paying job after graduation.	5.620	.060	
24. I could get better grades in some of my classes but it doesn't pay to do the extra work.	3.261	.196	
27. Earning higher grades will not make it easier to find a job after graduation.	14.522	.001	1.31
28. No one likes the students who study too much and hurt the grades of the rest of the class.	2.767	.251	
33. Students who participate in class cause problems by making the other students look dumb.	1.564	.457	
35. I don't like to have friends that put too much importance on studying and grades.	1.030	.597	
42. On at least one occasion I have harassed a friend for working too hard on school work.	4.547	.103	
43. I have friends who waste a lot of their time studying too much.	4.575	.101	
44. Working hard is not as important as having friends and looking good.	3.358	.187	
45. On at least one occasion I have been harassed by my friends for working too hard.	9.056	.011	2.00
46. I am sensitive to criticism from my peers about trying to do too well.	1.305	.521	
47. In high school students who worked hard to get good grades were often chastised for trying to be something they are not, that is, trying to get above those with whom they were raised.	2.023	.364	
50. I often try to not let my friends know if I am working hard at something for fear they will ridicule my efforts.	3.319	.190	

Note: Agreement-Ratio is the ratio of black students to white students that agree with the question. For example, black students were 1.31 times more likely to agree with question 27 than white students.  
Due to the small number of respondents in other categories, only two categories of Race are considered, Black and White.

Unlike sex, race of the respondent led to significantly different responses in only three questions, only one of which is used to measure anti-intellectualism. That question, number 27, states, "Earning higher grades will not make it easier to find a job after graduation." Blacks were 1.31 times more likely to agree with this statement than white students. This could be a reflection of black student perceptions of the impact of race in the job market as much as it is a reflection of an attitude toward anti-intellectualism.

Lastly, sports participation is examined. There is a common perception that athletes shun academic pursuits and attend college primarily for athletic opportunities. This perception is perhaps more common in NCAA Division I schools with large athletic programs, but is not non-existent in smaller schools. The results of the test of the hypotheses regarding sports participation are given below in Table Four.

**Table Four**  
**Attitudes Toward Anti-Intellectualism by Sports Participation**

Selected Questions	Chi-Square	p-level	Agree- Ratio
18. I do what I need to get by in my classes. Graduating is important, grades are not.	5.081	.079	
19. I find that taking notes in class helps me do well in my classes.	1.511	.470	
21. A higher grade average helps you get a better paying job after graduation.	2.238	.327	
24. I could get better grades in some of my classes but it doesn't pay to do the extra work.	3.309	.191	
27. Earning higher grades will not make it easier to find a job after graduation.	3.186	.203	
28. No one likes the students who study too much and hurt the grades of the rest of the class.	6.588	.038	1.47
33. Students who participate in class cause problems by making the other students look dumb.	8.274	.016	3.56
35. I don't like to have friends that put too much importance on studying and grades.	12.60	.002	2.45
42. On at least one occasion I have harassed a friend for working too hard on school work.	1.575	.455	
43. I have friends who waste a lot of their time studying too much.	6.092	.048	1.88
44. Working hard is not as important as having friends and looking good.	6.189	.045	2.84
45. On at least one occasion I have been harassed by my friends for working too hard.	3.189	.203	
46. I am sensitive to criticism from my peers about trying to do too well.	0.239	.887	
47. In high school students who worked hard to get good grades were often chastised for trying to be something they are not, that is, trying to get above those with whom they were raised.	4.063	.131	
50. I often try to not let my friends know if I am working hard at something for fear they will ridicule my efforts.	3.044	.218	

Note: Agreement-Ratio is the ratio of sports participants to non-participants that agree with the question. For example, sports participants were 1.47 times more likely to agree with question 28 than non-participants.

While the results here are not as pronounced as for the variable sex, there are several questions that are significant. Athletes are significantly more likely to respond in agreement with 28, 33, 35, 43, and 44. All of these questions were among those used to indicate an attitude of anti-intellectualism. Athletes were 3.5 times more likely to disapprove of class participation than non-athletes (question 33), were 1.5 times more likely to believe high-achieving students hurt the grades of other students (question 28), 2.5 times more likely to disapprove of friends that work hard academically (question 35), and 2.8 times more likely to agree that having friends and looking good is more important than working hard (question 44).

To further investigate the impact of these various factors on anti-intellectual attitudes a composite factor-based score is created for each respondent. This anti-intellectual, or AI, score is constructed from the responses to questions 18, 21, 28, 33, 35, and 44. The selection of these questions is based on an analysis the component structure of questions included in the instrument. The response given to the selected questions give an unambiguous indication of the existence of an anti-intellectual attitude. A simple scoring method is used to create the AI score. For questions 18, 28, 33, 35, and 44 a score of 5 was assigned for a response of strongly agree, four for agree, three for neutral/no opinion, two for disagree, and one for strongly disagree. Scoring was reversed for question 21 as a score of 5 was assigned for a response of strongly disagree, four for disagree, three for neutral/no opinion, two for agree, and one for strongly agree. In each of these cases, a higher score is assigned for the response indicating a stronger anti-intellectual attitude. The AI factor-based score is the sum of the point scores for these six questions for each respondent. The AI Score can range from 6 to 30 with a higher score indicating a stronger anti-intellectual attitude. Tests for significance are conducted for differences in mean AI scores in the presence of all factors under the assumption that no interaction is present among the explanatory factors. The null hypothesis tested is that the factor being considered has no impact on mean

Anti-Intellectual Score, that is, the mean AI Score is the same at each level of the factor in question. The rejection of this hypothesis supports the research hypothesis that the different levels of the factor under consideration does lead to different mean AI score. Table Five presents the results of these tests.

Source	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Class Standing	3	19.78035836	6.59345279	0.65	0.5819
SEX	1	512.89480595	512.89480595	50.75	0.0001
RACEBW	1	5.83507694	5.83507694	0.58	0.4479
SPORTS	1	67.62634758	67.62634758	6.69	0.0101
WORK	2	2.21525946	1.10762973	0.11	0.8962
FAMINC	4	81.73785028	20.43446257	2.02	0.0912

The results clearly indicate that Sex and Sports participation are significant determinant of AI Score at the 5% level or better. Some weak evidence of a difference in mean AI Score at different levels of Family income exists, but only at the 9.12% level. The results for Sex and Sports participation are expected from the earlier results examining individual question responses. The variable included to capture the effect of race, RACEBW, is the two level indicator including only Black and White respondents, as described earlier. As can be seen, no support for the hypothesis that a difference exists in mean Anti-Intellectual score for black and white students.

## Discussion and Conclusion

This research sought to determine the extent to which anti-intellectual attitudes and behaviors exist among college students and whether these attitudes are related to variables such as sex, race, and athletic participation. Strong evidence of anti-intellectualism or anti-achievementism found in many studies of high school students is not generally supported for students participating in this study.

One demographic aspect of anti-intellectualism, the “acting white” phenomenon, strongly evident in public high schools in previous studies, is not found to be as prominent at this predominantly white public university. Racial identity was generally not found to lead to a significant difference in anti-intellectualism; it may, however, act as type of an irrational social “nudge” identified by behavioral economists, psychologists and sociologists for some students. One possible explanation of this result, as indicated in Appendix A is that approximately half of the black students participating in this study attended predominantly black high schools where, according to previous studies, a social stigma toward black student achievement is typically nonexistent. Another possibility is the logical and rational explanation that black students attend college for the same reasons white students do, to improve their chances of leading productive lives. In other words, finding that black students are generally not much more likely to display anti-achievementism while in college than their white counterparts, is an example of rational behavior one would expect to exist.

This study did find, however, that to the extent that anti-intellectual attitudes and behaviors do exist, they are not equally evident in males and females. Males were found to be more likely to display this phenomenon than females. This result was perhaps due to experience reflected in the statement, “women have to work twice as hard as men,” and the reality of invisible male privilege.

Also significant differences in anti-intellectual attitudes and behaviors were found for students who participated in intercollegiate athletics in comparison to non-participants; athletes were found to be

more likely to display such an approach to academic success. Weak evidence is found for differences in anti-intellectual attitudes and behaviors based upon family income and no support is found for differences based on class level and student employment status.

These results present numerous avenues for further research in the complexity of student attitudes and behaviors toward personal achievement via college and university degrees. This study found that anti-intellectual attitudes and behaviors were exhibited to the same extent for black and white students, yet negative racial educational achievement gaps persist between black/latino and with white college students as do significant disparities of indicators like unemployment. The extent to which such attitudes exhibited at the primary and secondary level negatively impact Black/Latino student achievement at the college level, even if such attitudes have since been moderated, needs more attention and research if effective solutions to the racial achievement gaps are to be found. More research is also needed regarding the significant findings of this study regarding sports participation and gender as these factors interact regarding anti-intellectualism's consequences.

## References

- Ainworth-Darnell, James and Douglas Downey, Assessing the Oppositional Culture Explanation for Racial/Ethnic Differences in School Performance, *American Sociological Review*, LXIII (1998), 536-553.
- Akerlof, George and Rachel Kranton, Economics and Identity, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, CXV (2000), 715-753.
- Austen-Smith, David, and Roland G. Fryer, Jr, The Economics of 'Acting White', NBER Working Paper No. 9904, 2003.
- Austen-Smith, David and Roland Fryer, "An Economic Analysis of 'Acting White'," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, May 2005, Vol. 120, No. 2: 551-583.
- Cook, Phillip and Jens Ludwig, The Burden of Acting White: Do Black Adolescents Disparage Academic Achievement?. In Christopher Jenks and Meredith Phillips, eds., *The Black-White Test Score Gap*. (Brookings Press, 1998).
- Cutler, David. and Glaeser, Edward, .Are Ghettos Good or Bad?, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, CXII (1997) , 827-872.
- Ferguson, Ronald, A Diagnostic Analysis of Black-White GPA Disparities in Shaker Heights, Ohio, *Brooking Papers on Education Policy*, (2001), 347-414.
- Ferguson, Ronald, What Doesn't Meet the Eye: Understanding Racial Disparities in Fifteen Suburban School Districts, mimeo, Harvard University, 2002.
- Fordham, Signithia, *Blacked Out: Dilemmas of Race, Identity, and Success at Capital High*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).
- Fordham, Signithia and John Ogbu, Black Students, School Success: Coping with the Burden of Acting White, *The Urban Review*, XVIII (1986), 176-206.
- Fryer, Roland, The Economics of Acting White, mimeo, University of Chicago, 2001.
- Fryer, Roland and Paul Torelli, Understanding the Prevalence and Impact of 'Acting White', working paper, Harvard University, 2004.
- Fryer, R., Torelli, P. An Empirical Analysis of 'Acting White', National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER), Working Paper No. 1134, 2005.
- Gans, Herbert J., *Popular Culture and High Culture*, (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1988).
- Hilton, Adriel and Robert Palmer, "The Impact of Historically Black College," *Call & Response*, The Scholarly Journal of the National Black Graduate Student Association, 2009.
- Richard Hofstadter, *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*, (New York, NY: Knopf, 1963).

## Examining the Existence and Extent of Anti-intellectual Attitudes and Behaviors Among University Students

Horvat, Erin and Carla O'Connor, *BEYOND ACTING WHITE*, (Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield, 2006).

McWhorter, John, *Losing the Race: Self-Sabotage in Black America*, (New York, NY: Free Press, 2000).

Ogbu, John and Astrid Davis, *Black American Students in an Affluent Suburb: A Study of Academic Disengagement*, (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 2003).

Spann, Graham and Beth Davison, "Anti-intellectualism in the New Century," *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Hilton San Francisco & Renaissance Parc 55 Hotel, San Francisco, CA., Aug 14, 2004.*  
<[http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p109121\\_index.html](http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p109121_index.html)>

Thaler, Richard and Cass Sunstein, *NUDGE: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness*, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008).

Trout, Paul, *Student Anti-Intellectualism and the Dumbing Down of the University*, *Adjunct Nation*, Fall 2007. Also available at:  
<http://mtprof.msun.edu/spr1997/TROUT-ST.html>.

Washburn, Katherine and John Thornton, *Dumbing Down: Essays on the Strip Mining of American Culture*, (New York, NY: Norton, 2003).

## Examining the Existence and Extent of Anti-intellectual Attitudes and Behaviors Among University Students

### Appendix A – Survey Instrument

#### Part A – Background Information

Instructions: Please circle the appropriate response below and on the optical scan form provided.

1. Sex	A. Female      B. Male
2. Class Standing	A. Freshman      C. Junior      E. Grad B. Sophomore      D. Senior
3. Race	A. American Indian B. Asian C. Black D. Hispanic E. White
4. Current overall grade point average	A. Below 2.5      C. 3.00-3.49      E. 4.00 B. 2.50-2.99      D. 3.49-3.99
5. How would you describe the high school you attended?	A. Predominantly White B. Predominantly Black C. Racially mixed D. Other / Unknown
6. How would you describe the high school you attended?	A. Urban B. Suburban C. Rural D. Other / Unknown
7. How would you describe the high school you attended?	A. Public      B. Private
8. Approximately how large is the high school you attended?	A. < 100 in graduation class B. 100 to 500 in graduation class C. > 500 in graduation class
9. Which of the following best describes your family's income?	A. < \$25,000 B. \$25,000 to 49,999 C. \$50,000 to 74,999 D. \$75,000 to 99,999 E. > \$100,000
10. How would you describe your socio-economic class growing up?	A. Upper class B. Upper-middle class C. Middle class D. Below middle class
11. What is the highest level of education attained by either of your parents?	A. Master's, professional degree, or higher B. Bachelor's degree C. Associate degree or some college D. High school diploma E. Did not complete high school
12. Do you now or did you ever participate in college sports?	A. Yes      B. No
13. Do you work while attending school?	A. Full time      B. Part time      C. Not employed
14. Are you a member of a fraternity or sorority?	A. Yes      B. No

**Examining the Existence and Extent of Anti-intellectual Attitudes and Behaviors Among University Students**

**Instructions: Please circle the appropriate response below and on the optical scan form provided**

Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

A – Strongly Agree; B – Agree; C – Neutral/No Opinion; D – Disagree; E – Strongly Disagree

<b>Part B – College Study Habits</b>	
15. I believe I do best in classes in which I study alone.	A B C D E
16. I prefer to sit in the front of class even if my friends sit in the back.	A B C D E
17. The best way to get through college is to put out the least amount of effort possible.	A B C D E
18. I do what I need to get by in my classes. Graduating is important, grades are not.	A B C D E
19. I find that taking notes in class helps me do well in my classes.	A B C D E
20. I like to take classes with my friends because we help each other succeed.	A B C D E
21. A higher grade average helps you get a better paying job after graduation.	A B C D E
22. I try very hard to be on time for the start of each of my classes each semester.	A B C D E
23. I always try to find group study partners in the classes I take.	A B C D E
24. I could get better grades in some of my classes but it doesn't really pay to do the extra work.	A B C D E
25. Graduating from college is the best way I can advance myself and to have a better life than my parents.	A B C D E
26. Regular attendance in a class usually doesn't help improve my grade in the class.	A B C D E
27. Earning higher grades will not make it easier to find a job after graduation.	A B C D E
28. No one likes the students who study too much and hurt the grades of the rest of the class.	A B C D E
29. Most other students in my classes with whom I study are of the same race as me.	A B C D E
30. My racial/ethnic status will keep me from getting a good job regardless of how well I do in college.	A B C D E
31. I usually put extra effort into a class only if there is a chance I can raise my grade.	A B C D E
32. My social background and status will keep me from getting a good job regardless of how well I do in college.	A B C D E
33. Students who participate in class cause problems by making the other students look dumb.	A B C D E
34. Most of my friends seem to study less for their classes than I prefer to do.	A B C D E
35. I don't like to have friends that put too much importance on studying and grades.	A B C D E
<b>Part C – Friendships and Social Behavior</b>	
36. Most of my friends are the same race as me.	A B C D E
37. I interact with my friends on a daily basis and rarely have a day to myself.	A B C D E
38. I have difficulty studying or working in groups when the other students are same-race peers.	A B C D E
39. Most people that know me would say that I am somewhat of a loner.	A B C D E
40. I had more friends who were of other races than me in high school than I do in college.	A B C D E
41. I am open to making new friends in my classes, in student clubs, or wherever I am.	A B C D E
42. On at least one occasion I have harassed a friend for working too hard on school work.	A B C D E
43. I have friends who waste a lot of their time studying too much.	A B C D E
44. Working hard is not as important as having friends and looking good.	A B C D E
45. On at least one occasion I have been harassed by my friends for working too hard.	A B C D E
46. I am sensitive to criticism from my peers about trying to do too well.	A B C D E
47. In high school students who worked hard to get good grades were often chastised for trying to be something they are not, that is, trying to get above those with whom they were raised.	A B C D E
48. I have lost at least one friend since coming to college because I have been viewed as being above my identity.	A B C D E
49. I tend to try to associate with peers who place the same importance on success as I do.	A B C D E
50. I often try to not let my friends know if I am working hard at something for fear they will ridicule my efforts.	A B C D E

# Examining the Existence and Extent of Anti-intellectual Attitudes and Behaviors Among University Students

## Appendix B – Sample Profile

Q1 SEX	Cumulative Cumulative			
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Female	195	55.7	195	55.7
Male	155	44.3	350	100.0

Q2 CLASS	Cumulative Cumulative			
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Freshman	162	46.3	162	46.3
Sophomore	76	21.7	238	68.0
Junior	33	9.4	271	77.4
Senior	79	22.6	350	100.0

Q3 RACE	Cumulative Cumulative			
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Black/Other	37	10.7	37	10.7
White/Hispanic	309	89.3	346	100.0

Frequency Missing = 4

Q3 RACEBW	Cumulative Cumulative			
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Black	28	8.5	28	8.5
White	302	91.5	330	100.0

Frequency Missing = 20

Q4 QPA	Cumulative Cumulative			
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Below 2.5	64	18.3	64	18.3
2.50-2.99	113	32.4	177	50.7
3.00-3.49	103	29.5	280	80.2
3.50-4.00	69	19.8	349	100.0

Frequency Missing = 1

Q5 HS5	Cumulative Cumulative			
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Predomin White	277	79.4	277	79.4
Predomin Black	14	4.0	291	83.4
Racially mixed	55	15.8	346	99.1
Other/Unknown	3	0.9	349	100.0

Frequency Missing = 1

Q6 HS6	Cumulative Cumulative			
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Urban	46	13.2	46	13.2
Suburban	112	32.2	158	45.4
Rural	172	49.4	330	94.8
Other/Unknown	18	5.2	348	100.0

Frequency Missing = 2

Q7 HS7	Cumulative Cumulative			
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Public	324	92.6	324	92.6
Private	26	7.4	350	100.0

Q8 HS8	Cumulative Cumulative			
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
< 100 grads	101	28.9	101	28.9
100 to 500s	208	59.6	309	88.5
> 500 grads	40	11.5	349	100.0

Frequency Missing = 1

Q9 FAMINC	Cumulative Cumulative			
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
< \$25,000	42	12.1	42	12.1
\$25K to \$49,999	88	25.3	130	37.4
\$50K to \$74,999	104	29.9	234	67.2
\$75K to \$99,999	55	15.8	289	83.0
> \$100,000	59	17.0	348	100.0

Frequency Missing = 2

Q10 SOCCL	Cumulative Cumulative			
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Upper class	7	2.0	7	2.0
Upper-middle	88	25.2	95	27.2
Working class & below	254	72.8	349	100.0

Frequency Missing = 1

Q11 PARED	Cumulative Cumulative			
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Master or higher	60	17.1	60	17.1
Bachelor degree	88	25.1	148	42.3
Assoc/some Coll	82	23.4	230	65.7
HS or less	120	34.3	350	100.0

Q12 SPORTS	Cumulative Cumulative			
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Yes	84	24.0	84	24.0
No	266	76.0	350	100.0

Q13 WORK	Cumulative Cumulative			
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Full time	25	7.1	25	7.1
Part time	182	52.0	207	59.1
Not employed	143	40.9	350	100.0

Q14 GREEK	Cumulative Cumulative			
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Yes	33	9.4	33	9.4
No	317	90.6	350	100.0