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In the wake of Barack Obama becoming the first nonwhite President of the United States and the diminishing instances of explicit racism, a number of Americans believe that the United States has surpassed race and therefore racism (Neville et al. 2000; Nayak 2006; Brayboy et al. 2007; Gawronski 2008; Quillian 2008; Wise 2009; Bonilla-Silva 2010; Gusa 2010; Ikuenobe 2010; Moras 2010; Gainous 2012). On the surface, the problem of overt racial discrimination has dramatically declined, yet, there are key studies that argue that new and subtler forms of racism are still prevalent (Feagin 2000; Krysan 2000; Sydell and Nelson 2000; Swim et al. 2003; Leach 2005; Henkel et al. 2006; Williams and Land 2006; Anderson 2007; D’Andrea and Daniels 2007; Sue et al. 2007; Gawronski et al. 2008; Wise 2009; Gainous 2012; Torres-Harding et al. 2012). This thesis will focus on assessing the dimensions of present-day racism and racial prejudice by replicating and updating Forman’s (2004) study of racial apathy. Using data from 2011 Monitoring the Future Survey, I explore the persistence of racial apathy, which proposes that the blatant racial discrimination of the past has manifested into racial indifference and lack of caring for existing racial inequalities (Perry and Shotwell 2009; Forman 2004; Forman and Lewis 2006; Gafford 2010; Maly et al. 2012). Consistent with previous research, this study finds that the expression of racial apathy has continued to increase, but also that political preference, gender, father’s education level and religiosity affect one’s level of racial apathy.
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“…I wish I could say that racism and prejudice were only distant memories. I wish I could say that this Nation had traveled far along the road to social justice and that liberty and equality were just around the bend…We must dissent from the indifference. We must dissent from the apathy. We must dissent from the fear, the hatred and the mistrust…We must dissent because America can do better, because America has no choice but to do better.”


**Introduction and Statement of Purpose**

Is racism diminishing? This study reviews the literature addressing this question and revisits Forman’s 2004 study using the 2011 Monitoring the Future Survey of high school students to further refine our understanding of racial apathy. I review the literature around three main areas of this concern: the argument against colorblindness, the argument for the existence and persistence of racial discrimination, and the argument for racial apathy. Racial discrimination can be found throughout the US landscape, in urban and rural settings alike.

Although there has been a decline of overt traditional racism, new forms of subtle and implicit racism, serve to help reproduce systems of racial inequality (Sniderman et al. 1991; Virtanen and Huddy 1998; Roberts 1999; Bonilla-Silva and Forman 2000; Sydell and Nelson 2000; Bonilla-Silva 2002; Henry and Sears 2002; Sears and Henry 2003; Swim et al. 2003; Forman 2004; Leach 2005; Tarman and Sears 2005; Patillo 2007; Gawronski et al. 2008; Ikuenobe 2010; Gainous 2012). A key objective of this line of research is the uncovering, conceptualizing, and measuring of these new forms of racial discrimination.

For instance, Gainous (2012) suggests expressions of racism have changed in ways that let people talk about race without directly using overt racial terminology. Gainous provides an example in which people oppose policies that benefit racial minorities by opposing government intermediation. “Rather than being based on overt old racism, Whites’ opposition to race-conscious policy is based on the conjunction of racism and a belief in the principle of hard work
and self-reliance embedded in the American Creed. It is subtle because people can use their principled belief as reasoning for the objection to such policy without being overtly racist” (Gainous, 2012, pp. 252).

The persistence of racism is also detrimental. Recent studies have found that racial discrimination can have harmful effects on the mental and physical well-being of minorities, health problems are consequences of racism. These studies used the Schedule of Racist Events (SRE) and The Experiences of Discrimination Scale (EDS), respectively, to assess the frequency of racial discrimination (Lewis et al. 2000; Brown 2001; Murry et al. 2001; Kwate et al. 2003; Scott 2003; Sellers and Shelton 2003; Krieger et al. 2005; Pieterse and Carter 2007). Kwate (2003) and colleagues found that minorities who reported experiencing high levels of racial discrimination were found to have higher levels of psychological and physical health problems compared to minorities who experienced little to no racial discrimination. For instance, Prelow et al. (2006) found that racial discrimination was positively associated with depression and negatively associated with life satisfaction among minority college students.

Other scholars, to be sure, disagree and argue that there are real declines in all racist practices and place emphasis instead on the perceived cultural inferiority of racial minorities (Gates 2009; Patterson 2010; Small et al. 2010). For example Patterson says, “Of equal importance is the need for black Americans to do some serious soul-searching and re-examination of the prevailing cultural politics of identity, which sometimes explicitly, often implicitly, disdains the critical role of networks—both weak and strong, intimate and formal, sexual and marital—as well as full socialization in those areas of America’s hybrid cultural processes vital for success” (Patterson, 2010, pp. 5). Below, I summarize the argument against colorblindness before moving to a dialogue on existing racism with a particular focus on the
process of what Forman calls racial apathy. After this review of literature, I turn to an exploration of racial apathy, assessing changes since 2004, and adding additional variables to provide greater insight into the character of racial apathy.

**Literature Review**

*The Argument against Colorblindness*

The notion of colorblindness can be very detrimental to the life chances of racialized minorities. The ability to ignore race in current social relations deemphasizes the significance of race in a system where boundaries were constructed and sustained across racial lines. Colorblindness suggests that race is not a critical component in social success thus rationalizing the position and status of a select few currently experiencing success.

Many Americans believe racism and racial discrimination are things of the past (Gallagher 2003; Williams and Land 2006). Today many Americans assert that they view the world through a colorless lens, discounting race as an important facet in one’s life. However, there are scholars that argue that a colorblind perspective maintains racial inequality rather than lessening it (Wright 1980; Brayboy et al. 2007; Kandaswamy 2007; Reason and Evans 2007; Moras 2010; Mazzocco et al. 2011). For instance, Wright (1980) states that proponents of colorblind policy who criticize affirmative action policy for the sake of racial neutrality fail to realize that race-conscious policy aids in reducing the vast societal disparities between whites and nonwhites. The passage of race-neutral law and policy do not guarantee that racial inequality and racial discrimination will end. “I suggest that this version of equality, which permits the continuation, indeed the exacerbation, of grave disparities in the opportunities and advantages available to persons of different races, ignores the context in which the problem of inequality has
persisted in this country, and ultimately endangers our democratic institutions” (Wright, 1980, pp. 213-14).

Adding to Wright (1980), Brayboy et al. (2007) argue that colorblind policy permits those who have control and influence in social institutions the ability to sustain social and economic dominance of the majority by downplaying the implications of race. They state, “If race no longer matters, it allows individuals and groups who hold financial, political, and educational power the ability to maintain policies and the resulting practices that keep them, and those like them, in power—the result of colorblindness” (Brayboy et al., 2007, pp. 175).

Colorblindness can be used as a tool to disconnect race from racial realities. Attention is taken away from the salience of race, and more emphasis is placed on individual effort and success.

The proponents of colorblindness suggest that race should not and does not matter in our current society. They argue that the racial disparity in education, income, and employment found in the U.S. results from personal merit or lack thereof on behalf of racial minorities and is not due to race or racial prejudice. However, there are some scholars that take issue with the end of racial significance (Wright 1980; Bonilla-Silva 2002; Brown 2003; Gallagher 2003; Smith 2006; Fryberg and Stephens 2010; Moras 2010; Tynes and Markoe 2010). Gallagher (2003) for example, suggests that we are far from a colorblind society, citing several disproportionate figures along education, employment, health, and social mobility. For instance, white households are twice as likely to own their homes, have ten times the assets, and have nearly twice the family income compared to blacks (Gallagher 2003). Several scholars propose that many Americans believe previous structural obstacles facing minorities have dissipated along with overt racism. “Thus, White Americans argued that the state in which Blacks found themselves was their fault, and could no longer point to racism as a factor contributing to their social
position” (Williams and Land, 2006, pp. 580). The colorblind ideology suggests social position and success are determined by individual determination and not by race (Henry and Sears 2002; Gallagher 2003; Sears and Henry 2003; Tarman and Sears 2005; Smith 2006; Brayboy et al. 2007; Darity 2011).

Although colorblindness at the surface offers an image of preferred racial equality, colorblind discourse has been utilized to discount racially progressive policy in education and employment, especially in regards to affirmative action in higher education (Bonilla-Silva 2002; Gallagher 2003; Smith 2006; Williams and Land 2006; Moras 2010; Gainous 2012). According to Gallagher (2003) some Americans believe that since race discrimination is illegal in the workplace and in education acts of racial discrimination have low occurrences. “The perception…that the socio-economic playing field is now level, along with whites’ belief that they have purged themselves of overt racist attitudes and behaviors, has made colorblindness the dominant lens through which whites understand contemporary race relations. Colorblindness allows whites to believe that segregation and discrimination are no longer an issue because it is now illegal for individuals to be denied access to housing, public accommodations or jobs because of their race” (Gallagher, 2003, pp. 4).

Many social researchers propose that colorblindness, instead of alleviating past and contemporary racial inequities, actually perpetuates and solidifies racial disparities (Fryberg and Stephens 2010; Mazzocco et al. 2011; Maly et al. 2012). For instance, Smith (2006) found that more than half of the white students sampled in a racial ideology and affirmative action support study opposed racial scholarships or financial aid and special admission programs. Additionally, some scholars suggest that individuals that have colorblind outlooks may be more inclined to
racially discriminate (Bonilla-Silva and Forman 2000; Bonilla-Silva 2002; Tynes and Markoe 2010).

Some argue that colorblindness rhetoric functions to disregard the continued significance of race in the U.S., rationalize the existing social order, and provide whites an escape from the guilt of their status in society (Bonilla-Silva 2002; Gallagher 2003; Williams and Land 2006; Brayboy et al. 2007; Patton et al. 2007; Fryberg and Stephens 2010; Moras 2010). Under the premise of individual achievement, colorblindness allows whites to ignore systemic racial inequality while legitimating positions of privilege: “Colorblindness hides white privilege behind a mask of assumed meritocracy while rendering invisible the institutional arrangements that perpetuate racial inequality. The veneer of equality implied in colorblindness allows whites to present their place in the racialized social structure as one that was earned” (Gallagher, 2003, pp. 6).

The overall theme found within colorblindness credits individual social status and achievement without mention to race (Sniderman et al. 1991; Henry and Sears 2002; Gallagher 2003; Sears and Henry 2003; Tarman and Sears 2005; Henkel et al. 2006; Gainous 2012). Under the lens of colorblindness, many whites attribute the negative social statues of minorities to their deficiency and lack of adhering to American values (Forman 2004). “Thus, the disadvantaged status of many racial minorities is attributed to their lack of motivation and non-normative values” (Forman, 2004, pp. 52).

*The Argument for Persisting and Existing Racial Discrimination*

We now turn to existing and persisting racial discrimination. Existing racial discrimination can be observed in all spheres of society, particularly in employment and academic settings. Existing racial discrimination is hard to detect due to its ambiguous nature
and may possibly involve agents of racial discrimination that are unaware of their actions. Existing racial discrimination is extraordinarily dominated by those who deny racist intent.

Racial disparities serve as further indication that systemic or institutionalized racism persists. Vast racial disparities continue across income and employment. Racial minorities are more likely to hold less prestigious occupations than their white counterparts with similar education. Interestingly, several studies have shown continued racial discrimination in hiring practices (Esposito and Murphy 1999; Feagin 2000; Gallagher 2003; Darity 2011). A well-known study conducted by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology found that job seekers with white sounding names were 50 percent more likely to get a call-back form a prospective employer than job seekers with black sounding names (Feagin 2000). “Being black with eight years of job experience was necessary to get the same treatment as a white applicant with no experience” (Feagin, 2000, pp. 135).

Additionally, there is mounting concern over the escalating levels of racial discrimination found within education (O’Conner et al. 2007; Patton et al. 2007; Reason and Evans 2007; Tynes and Markoe 2010). Marcus et al. (2003) found that racial discrimination appeared frequently within classroom settings, interestingly covert racial discrimination proved to prevail in instances of racist events. Further, in a study consisting of 136 minority college students attending a predominately white university, Prelow et al. (2006) found that nearly all of the study participants (98.5%) reported having experienced discrimination. Racial disparities are still widespread across the US landscape. Unlike obvious racism of the past that is explicit and openly expressed, existing racism is more veiled and implicit (Henry and Sears 2002; Smith 2006; Gawronski et al. 2008). Existing racism is described as having many different labels: “modern,” “aversive,” “symbolic,” and “covert.”
Differently than traditional racist ideology where minorities were believed to be biologically, ethically, and socially inferior to whites, the ideology of modern racism place emphasis on the perceived cultural and moral inferiority of minorities (Henry and Sears 2002; Bonilla-Silva et al. 2003; Tarman and Sears 2005; Cornell and Hartman 2007). This modern form of racism is derived from an ideology that holds that racial prejudice is no longer a serious barrier to minorities’ prospects for a successful life; that minorities’ current social difficulties are due to their own reluctance to work hard and take accountability for their actions; and that as a result, minorities’ ongoing resentment about their own situation and their claims for more social advantages are irrational (Henry and Sears 2002; Sears and Henry 2003; Tarman and Sears 2005).

Existing racism can also be described as a more polite, passive form of racism; taking the form of courteous insults (Solórzano et al. 2000; Nielsen 2002; Marcus et al. 2003; Swim et al. 2003; Prelow et al. 2006; Sue et al. 2007; Perry and Shotwell 2009; Gusa 2010). For instance, Sue et al. (2007) give several examples of passive racism where whites indicate that nonwhites are not as intelligent as whites, “You are a credit to your race,” and “you are so articulate” (Sue et al. 2007). This is exemplified by a nonwhite student’s account of racial stereotyping in a 2000 study, “They know that I’m there and, in a sense, expect lower scores for me because I am Black. We had taken an exam and people were looking at the scores and a White student was shocked that I did extremely well on the exam” (Lewis at al., 2000, pp. 78). In recent years, the matter of declining racial discrimination has come into question. Some scholars suggest that blatant racial discrimination has dramatically decreased while others suggest racial discrimination has transformed. There is near total agreement among social scientists that existing racism is more covert, subtle, and implicit in contrast to traditional forms of racism that were overt, obvious, and

As racist expression has transformed, we must change the way in which we gauge these new racist manifestations.

Old forms of measurement are inappropriate given new forms of racist expression. “New measures must be able to capture the more passive and less explicit ways in which white racial antipathy in increasingly expressed” (Forman, 2004, pp. 44). Using traditional measures to capture negative contemporary racial exchanges in an age when racism and racial prejudice are distasteful and illegal does not yield an accurate depiction of the current racial reality (Forman 2004; Perry and Shotwell 2009). Within this context of a tension between persistent racial inequalities, declining incidence of overt racism and the recognition of a more passive symbolic form lies the idea of racial apathy.

**Argument for Racial Apathy**

Forman (2004) developed a construct, racial apathy, which he argues is a good way to describe one dimension of existing racism and racial prejudice. According to Forman, “Broadly, racial apathy refers to lack of feeling or indifference toward societal racial and ethnic inequality and lack of engagement with race-related social issues. It is expressed in at least two ways: a lack of concern about racial and ethnic disparities and an unwillingness to address proximal and distal forms of racially disparate treatment” (Forman, 2004, pp. 44).

Lack of empathy for racialized others signifies a new form of prejudice, expressed as racial apathy that coincides with negative views toward racial others (Forman 2004; Smith 2006; Reason and Evans 2007; Perry and Shotwell 2009). Colorblind policy guards whites who express
racial apathy towards nonwhites from the accusation of racial discrimination by openly evoking racial neutrality in policy making. Publicly, Whites may assert that race in America is not an important issue and does not affect minorities’ life chances, however, privately; Whites communicate pessimistic opinions toward minorities and their status in society (Forman 2004). Racial apathy provides a useful conceptual lens to explore racism and racial prejudices in the era of colorblindness.

For Forman (2004), racial apathy encompasses two components. First racial apathy requires a perception that contemporary racial and ethnic inequity is trivial. Second manifestation of racial apathy is demonstrated by a lack of participating in racial and ethnic relations (Forman 2004). Forman (2004) offers two explanations for the appearance of racial apathy. For those who perceive current racial and ethnic inequities as insignificant attributes, they then must explain racial and ethnic minorities’ adverse social experiences as a product of their own making. The perception is that the current social position of nonwhites is attributed to their lack of determination and deviance from American values (Forman 2004). In addition, Forman suggests that ignorance of current racial and ethnic inequities contributes to the manifestation of racial apathy. This ignorance to the realities of racial disparagement is due to the societal seclusion of whites. A number of Whites have limited interaction with racial others day to day. Whites are positioned in such a way that the perception of race and ethnicity has no significance in their day to day lives (Forman 2004).

Although Forman partly attributes racial apathy to lack of feeling or indifference to racial and ethnic inequality, a distinction can be made regarding the severity of racial indifference. “The expression of racial apathy in the post-civil rights era represents an action that is racist at least in its effect, if not in its intent” (Forman, 2004, pp. 59). This suggests that there are varying
degrees of racial apathy. For example, one who expresses high levels of racial apathy may be more vocal in opposition to affirmative action rather than one who expresses low racial apathy and is less vocal; both contain differing levels of racial indifference. Furthermore, an individual that is fully aware of the contemporary racial and ethnic inequities and fails to act is a stronger form of racial apathy than an individual who is unaware of the current racial and ethnic inequities and fails to act may result with differing social consequences. High levels of racial apathy can obstruct legislation toward racial equality.

In 2004, Forman found that there is a rising trend among young whites’ expression of racial apathy and stable trend among young whites’ expression of general apathy. Forman compared white youth’s responses to racial and general apathy survey questions across the years 1976, 1988, 1998, and 2000. Forman found that 10% of white youth surveyed in 1976 where racially apathetic whereas 18% of white youth surveyed in 2000 where racially apathetic (Forman 2004). By comparison, the prevalence of general apathy remained stable. Forman found that 10% of white youths in 1976 and 2000 agree that it is not their problem if others need help (Forman 2004). In addition, Forman found increased levels of unconcern about race relations. In 1976 13% of white youths never worry about race relations whereas 21% of white youths never worry about race relations in 2000 (Forman 2004). Forman’s study reveals a growing level of racial apathy among young whites in concurrence with declining overt forms of racial discrimination along with consistent levels of general apathy (Forman 2004).

Although Forman’s study reveals that racial apathy and unconcern for race relations trends are on the rise among white youth, it raises further questions about racial apathy among young whites. Who is more likely to be racially apathetic among white youth? What factors can affect one’s level of racial apathy? With these questions in mind I aim to extend Forman’s (2004)
findings to include further discussion on social factors that may affect one’s expression of racial apathy and unconcern for race relations. I examine racial apathy across several basic demographic components. The social factors I use in this study relate to the notion of conservatism. Conservatives generally oppose equal treatment and allocation of resources based on race (Sniderman et al. 1991; Krysan 2000; Sears and Henry 2003; Smith 2006; Gainous 2012). Gainous (2012) found that Republicans and males tend to oppose race-conscious policy and have more racial prejudice in comparison to their contemporaries (Gainous 2012). In addition, Gainous (2012) found that those with low levels of education are more likely to hold racially bias views.

**Methodology**

**Data**

Data for this study comes from the *2011 Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of American Youth: 12th Grade Survey*, (Johnston et al. 2012). This study was part of the Monitoring the Future (MTF) Series which is a longitudinal study, beginning in 1975, that reveals significant trends in present-day American youth’s morals, actions, and way of life (Johnston et al. 2012). I chose this data set to complement Forman’s (2004) study; Forman (2004) utilized the Monitoring the Future study data up until 2000.

**Sample**

MTF 2011 utilizes on-site questionnaires to collect data from 12th grade students regarding a number of social trends and drug use. Although the study highlights drug use among 12th graders, the questionnaire content was divided into 6 different questionnaire forms, to cover the many topical areas such as attitudes toward politics, education, and race (Johnston et al. 2012). A probability sample design was used in three stages selecting first from geographic
locales, then schools, and finally students. In this 2011 study, 129 schools and 14,855 students participated overall, yielding a response rate of 83%. (Johnston et al. 2012). My analysis uses the core and Form 5 datasets. I merged the core and Form 5 data set as Form 5 contains the racial attitudinal variables that are not included in the core data set. In this sub-sample there are a total of 2,493 respondents, n = 2,493. MTF 2011 is intended to be representative of high school seniors throughout the continental United States, with the exception of students who dropped out of school. Some factors that may affect the representativeness of high school seniors are schools who choose not to participate and failure to procure a 100% student response rate (Johnson et al. 2012). This study had an overall sample of 2,493 youths.

**Measures**

**Dependent Variables**

Following Forman (2004), I also consider two dependent variables: racial apathy and general apathy. By comparing the two we gain insight into the relative preponderance of racial apathy in particular. I also use concern for race relations as an additional dependent variable. **Racial Apathy**—is operationalized by the attitudes regarding unfair treatment toward minorities. Respondents were asked “how much do you agree or disagree with each statement below?”

Maybe some minority groups do get unfair treatment, but that's no business of mine.  
1 = “Disagree” 2 = “Mostly Disagree” 3 = “Neither” 4 = “Mostly Agree” 5 = “Agree”

Higher scores represent greater racial apathy. Starting with a 5 point scale I change it to a 2 point scale, I combine those who responded “disagree/mostly disagree” and who responded “mostly agree/agree” together into two separate responses. Consequently, disagree/mostly disagree equals disagree and mostly agree/agree equals agree. I also did the same procedure for general apathy.
**General Apathy**—is operationalized by the attitudes regarding the treatment of others. Respondents were asked “how much do you agree or disagree with each statement below?”

   It's not really my problem if others are in trouble and need help.  
   1 = “Disagree” 2 = “Mostly Disagree” 3 = “Neither” 4 = “Mostly Agree” 5 = “Agree”  
Higher scores represent greater general apathy.

**Concern for Race Relations**—is operationalized by a question about how frequently respondents think about race relations. Respondents were asked “of all the problems facing the nation today, how often do you worry about each of the following?”

   Race relations  
   1 = “Never” 2 = “Seldom” 3 = “Sometimes” 4 = “Often”  
Higher scores represent greater concern for race relations. I combine those who responded “never” and who responded “seldom/sometimes/often” together into two separate responses. Consequently, seldom/sometimes/often equals yes and never equals never.

**Independent Variables**

**Race**—Respondents were asked “how do you describe yourself?” The respondents were presented with the following choices.

(Select one or more responses.) Black or Minority; Mexican American or Chicano; Cuban American; Puerto Rican; Other Hispanic or Latino; Asian American; White (Caucasian); American Indian or Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander.  
Recoded in this dataset so that “Black or Minority” = 1, “White (Caucasian)” = 2; Hispanic = 3 (“Mexican...” or “Cuban...” or “Puerto Rican” or “Other Hispanic...”). All other responses, including those of respondents who fell into more than one of the three categories, were deleted. The resulting variable is coded as follows.  
1=“Black or Minority” 2=“White (Caucasian)” 3=“Hispanic”

Next I recoded the respondents’ race, “Black/Hispanic” equals Nonwhite and “White” equals White.

**Sex**—Respondents were asked “what is your sex?”
Political preference—Respondents were asked “how would you describe your political preference?”

1 = “Strongly Republican” 2 = “Mildly Republican” 3 = “Mildly Democrat” 4 = “Strongly Democrat” 5 = “Independent” 6 = “No preference” 7 = “Other” 8 = “Don't know, haven't decided”

I combine those who responded “Mildly Democrat/Strongly Democrat” and who responded “Strongly Republican/Mildly Republican” together into two separate responses. Consequently, “Mildly Democrat/Strongly Democrat” equals Democrat and “Strongly Republican/Mildly Republican” equals Republican.

Father’s education level—Respondents were asked to describe their father’s education level.

The next three questions ask about your parents. If you were raised mostly by foster parents, stepparents, or others, answer for them. For example, if you have both a stepfather and a natural father, answer for the one that was the most important in raising you. What is the highest level of schooling your father completed?

1 = “Completed grade school or less” 2 = “Some high school” 3 = “Completed high school” 4 = “Some college” 5 = “Completed college” 6 = “Graduate or professional school after college” 7 = “Don't know, or does not apply”

I combine those who responded “Completed grade school or less/Some high school/Completed high school/some college” and who responded “Completed college/Graduate or professional school after college” together into two separate responses. Consequently, “Completed grade school or less/Some high school/Completed high school/some college” equals no college degree and “Completed college/Graduate or professional school after college” equals college degree.

Level of Religiosity—Respondents were asked “how important is religion in your life?”

1 = “Not important” 2 = “A little important” 3 = “Pretty important” 4 = “Very important”
I combine those who responded “Not important” and who responded “A little important/Pretty important/Very important” together into two separate responses. Consequently, “Not important” equals Not Important and “A little important/Pretty important/Very important” equals Important.

Descriptive Demographics—before turning to an examination on the forces that may affect the likelihood of racial apathy and lack of concern for race relations I give a demographic depiction of the respondents. The majority of the sample were White which accounted for 80.1% of the sample (n = 1,360), followed by Nonwhite at 19.9% (n = 665) out of 2,025 valid responses. Out of a valid 2,378 respondents, 50.4% were male (n = 1,199) and 49.6% were female (n = 1,179). Republicans made up 37.6% of the sample (n = 483) whereas Democrats made up 39.8% of the sample (n = 512), lastly Independents made up 22.6% of the sample (n = 290) of 1,285 valid responses. Out of 2,189 valid responses, only 37.8% of respondents had fathers with college degrees (n = 828), while 62.2% of respondents had fathers without degrees (n = 1,361). In regards to 1,831 valid religiosity responses, 53.3% of respondents perceived religion as important (n = 976), whereas 46.7% of respondents do not (n = 855) see Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>19.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>80.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>49.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>50.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,378</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Preference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>39.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>37.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>22.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's Education level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Monitoring the Future Survey 2011.*

In regard to racial apathy, 22.0% of respondents indicated racial apathetic views (n =424) while 78.0% of respondents indicated non-racial apathetic views (n = 1,502). Relating to general apathy, 12% of respondents indicated general apathetic views (n = 241), while 88.0% of respondents non-general apathetic views (n = 1,767). Concerning to race relations, 27.3% of the respondents never worry about race relations (n = 674), whereas 72.7% of respondents do worry about race relations (n = 1,797) see Table 2.
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial Apathy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (No Apathy)</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>77.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (Apathy)</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>22.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Apathy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (No Apathy)</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (Apathy)</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worry about Race Relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,797</td>
<td>72.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>27.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Adding to the argument of Forman (2004), I found that the expression of racial apathy held by white youth has dramatically risen; whereas white youth’s general apathy levels remained virtually similar across time. 24.1% of white youth (n = 250) in this current sample expressed racial apathy, whereas only 11.5% of white youth (n = 128) expressed general apathy as depicted in Figure 1. The actual increase of racial apathy from 2000 to 2011 is troubling to say the least, showing a dramatic increase in the expression of racial apathy held by white youth that is the biggest thus far.
Additionally, the amount of white youth that expressed the notion of not worrying about race relations in this study was vastly dissimilar to nonwhite youth. 32.0% of white youth (n = 433) in this study never worried about race relations, while only 21.06% of nonwhites (n = 139) state that they never worry about current race relations. Although 13.8% of nonwhite youth (n = 75) in the current study have general apathy compared to 11.5% of white youth (n = 128), 24.1% of white youth (n = 250) have racial apathy compared to 21.0% of nonwhite youth (n= 110) as depicted in Figure 2. This suggests that racial apathy is not the same as general apathy among white youth and that there are vast discrepancies between whites and nonwhites in their perception of current race relations.
Furthermore, the level of young whites’ attitude towards race relations has shown a dramatic escalation. Forman (2004) had shown that young whites’ level of low concern for race relations was consistently rising, although moderately from 1976 to 2000 (Forman 2004). With the addition of this current study, the amount of young whites that never worry about race relations has climbed to extraordinary heights. The lack of concern for race relations increased by the largest amount since the study began in 1976, 32% of young whites in 2011 claimed to never worry about race relations, while only 21% of whites in 2000 never worried about race relations, for a dramatic growth of 11%. This interesting rise in unresponsiveness toward the current racial reality leads some to suggest that young whites are moving more toward racially indifferent perspectives as depicted in Figure 3 (Forman 2004).
Analysis

Racial Apathy cross-tabulations across Variables—Cross-tabulations involving the dependent and independent variables yielded some interesting results. Data from cross-tabulation analysis suggests that racial apathy is associated with political affiliation. This implies that those who have more conservative values are more likely to have racially apathetic views than those who have liberal values. 31.1% of Republican students responded with racial apathy (n = 110), while 15.0% of Democrat students responded with racial apathy (n = 63) and 19.5% of independent students responded with racial apathy (n = 46). Pearson’s Chi-Square of 28.780 indicates a significant association between racial apathy and political preference at a 99.9% confidence level among high school seniors. Cramer’s V of 0.193 indicates a somewhat moderate association between racial apathy and political preference. Republican students agreed with this statement,
“Maybe some minority groups do get unfair treatment, but that’s no business of mine” more than Democratic and independent students, see Table 3.

Table 3: Cross-Tabulation between Racial Apathy and Political Preference*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Apathy</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (No Apathy)</td>
<td>358(85%)</td>
<td>244(68.9%)</td>
<td>190(80.5%)</td>
<td>792(78.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (Apathy)</td>
<td>63(15%)</td>
<td>110(31.1%)</td>
<td>46(19.5%)</td>
<td>219(21.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>421(100%)</td>
<td>354(100%)</td>
<td>236(100%)</td>
<td>1,011(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates a significant association.

Distributing racial apathy attitudes across sex categories reveals that men are more likely to have racial apathy than women. Data from cross-tabulation analysis suggests that racial apathy is associated with sex. 27.9% of male students responded with racial apathy (n = 247), while 16.4% of female students responded with racial apathy (n = 158). Pearson’s Chi-Square of 35.907 indicates a significant association between racial apathy and sex at a 99.9% confidence level among high school seniors. Cramer’s V of 0.139 indicates a somewhat moderate association between racial apathy and sex. Male students agreed with this statement, “Maybe some minority groups do get unfair treatment, but that’s no business of mine” more than female students, see Table 4.

Table 4: Cross-Tabulation between Racial Apathy and Sex*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Apathy</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (No Apathy)</td>
<td>808(83.6%)</td>
<td>639(72.1%)</td>
<td>1,447(78.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (Apathy)</td>
<td>158(16.4%)</td>
<td>247(27.9%)</td>
<td>405(21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>966(100%)</td>
<td>886(100%)</td>
<td>1,852(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates a significant association.
Students whose fathers have a college degree are more likely to have less racial apathy compared to those whose fathers have no degree. Data from cross-tabulation analysis suggests that racial apathy is associated with father’s education. 18.6% of students with degree holding fathers responded with racial apathy (n = 124), while 23.7% of students with fathers without degrees responded with racial apathy (n = 245). Pearson’s Chi-Square of 6.141 indicates a significant association between racial apathy and father’s education at a 95.0% confidence level among high school seniors. Cramer’s V of 0.060 indicates a somewhat weak association between racial apathy and father’s education. Students with fathers without degrees agreed with this statement, “Maybe some minority groups do get unfair treatment, but that’s no business of mine” more than students with fathers with degrees, see Table 5.

Table 5: Cross-Tabulation between Racial Apathy and Father’s Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Apathy</th>
<th>No Degree</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (No Apathy)</td>
<td>789(76.3%)</td>
<td>542(81.4%)</td>
<td>1,331(78.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (Apathy)</td>
<td>245(23.7%)</td>
<td>124(18.6%)</td>
<td>369(21.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,034(100%)</td>
<td>666(100%)</td>
<td>1,700(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates a significant association.

Data from cross-tabulation analysis suggests that racial apathy is associated with religiosity, I found those with low religiosity have more racial apathy. 27.3% of students with low religiosity responded with racial apathy (n = 175), while 19.4% of students with high religiosity responded with racial apathy (n = 150). Pearson’s Chi-Square of 12.552 indicates a significant association between racial apathy and religiosity at a 99.9% confidence level among high school seniors. Cramer’s V of 0.094 indicates a somewhat weak association between racial apathy and religiosity. Students with low religiosity agreed with this statement, “Maybe some
minority groups do get unfair treatment, but that’s no business of mine” more than students with high religiosity, see Table 6.

Table 6: Cross-Tabulation between Racial Apathy and Religiosity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Apathy</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (No Apathy)</td>
<td>465 (72.7%)</td>
<td>624 (80.6%)</td>
<td>1,089 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (Apathy)</td>
<td>175 (27.3%)</td>
<td>150 (19.4%)</td>
<td>325 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>640 (100%)</td>
<td>774 (100%)</td>
<td>1,414 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates a significant association.

Racial Apathy cross-tabulations across Political Preference by Race

To better understand influence on racial apathy, I look closely at white student responses. This can give us a better understanding on white racial apathy. Examining racial apathy by race, 32.6% of white Republicans conveyed racial apathy (n = 93), whereas 15.8% of white Democrats conveyed racial apathy (n = 27) and 14.9% of white independents conveyed racial apathy (n = 28). White Republicans are twice as likely to have racial apathy as white Democrats and Independents. Pearson’s Chi-Square of 15.634 indicates a significant association between racial apathy and political preference at a 99.9% confidence level among white high school seniors. Cramer’s V of 0.185 indicates a somewhat moderate association between racial apathy and political preference. Republicans account for 63% of those who have racial apathy, see Table 7.
Table 7: Cross-Tabulation between Racial Apathy and Political Preference by Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Apathy</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (No Apathy)</td>
<td>144(84.2%)</td>
<td>192(67.4%)</td>
<td>160(85.1%)</td>
<td>496(77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (Apathy)</td>
<td>27(15.8%)</td>
<td>93(32.6%)</td>
<td>28(14.9%)</td>
<td>148(23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171(100%)</td>
<td>285(100%)</td>
<td>188(100%)</td>
<td>644(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates a significant association.

Racial Apathy cross-tabulations across Sex by Race

White males at 31.7% (n = 158) were more likely to hold racially apathetic views than white females at 17.2% (n = 91). This information is important to take into account due to the fact that men hold more political positions than women, and policy are maintained by those in governmental stations. Pearson’s Chi-Square of 29.642 indicates a significant association between racial apathy and sex at a 99.9% confidence level among white high school seniors. Cramer’s V of 0.170 indicates a somewhat moderate association between racial apathy and sex. Males account for 63.5% of those who have racial apathy, see Table 8.

Table 8: Cross-Tabulation between Racial Apathy and Sex by Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Apathy</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (No Apathy)</td>
<td>439(82.8%)</td>
<td>340(68.3%)</td>
<td>779(75.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (Apathy)</td>
<td>91(17.2%)</td>
<td>158(31.7%)</td>
<td>249(24.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>530(100%)</td>
<td>498(100%)</td>
<td>1,028(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates a significant association.

Racial Apathy cross-tabulations across Father’s Education by Race

Interestingly, 27.6% of white respondents whose fathers have no college degree (n = 152) are more likely to hold racially apathetic views compared to 19.1% of white respondents who have fathers with college degrees (n = 85). Pearson’s Chi-Square of 9.876 indicates a significant
association between racial apathy and father’s education at a 95.0% confidence level among white high school seniors. Cramer’s V of 0.099 indicates a somewhat weak association between racial apathy and father’s education. Students, who have fathers with no degree account for 64.1% of those who have racial apathy, see Table 9.

Table 9: Cross-Tabulation between Racial Apathy and Father’s Education by Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Apathy</th>
<th>No Degree</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (No Apathy)</td>
<td>398(72.4%)</td>
<td>360(80.9%)</td>
<td>758(76.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (Apathy)</td>
<td>152(27.6%)</td>
<td>85(19.1%)</td>
<td>237(23.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>550(100%)</td>
<td>445(100%)</td>
<td>995(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates a significant association.

Racial Apathy cross-tabulations across Religiosity by Race

I found that 18.7% of white respondents who view religion as an important aspect of their lives have less racially apathetic views (n = 75) compared to 30.3% of white respondents who do not consider religion as important (n = 130). This is a curious find, suggesting that those who conduct themselves by their religious morals have less racial apathy than those who do not. Pearson’s Chi-Square of 15.000 indicates a significant association between racial apathy and religiosity at a 99.9% confidence level among white high school seniors. Cramer’s V of 0.134 indicates a somewhat moderate association between racial apathy and religiosity. Students, who view religion as not important account for 63.4% of those who have racial apathy, see Table 10.
Table 10: Cross-Tabulation between Racial Apathy and Religiosity by Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Apathy</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (No Apathy)</td>
<td>299(69.7%)</td>
<td>326(81.3%)</td>
<td>625(75.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (Apathy)</td>
<td>130(30.3%)</td>
<td>75(18.7%)</td>
<td>205(24.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>429(100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>401(100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>830(100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates a significant association.

General Apathy cross-tabulations across Political Preference by Race

Inspecting general apathy by race, 17.7% of white Republicans expressed general apathy (n = 54), whereas 3.78% of white Democrats expressed general apathy (n = 7) and 7.5% of white independents expressed general apathy (n = 14). Pearson’s Chi-Square of 20.370 indicates a significant association between general apathy and political preference at a 99.9% confidence level among white high school seniors. Cramer’s V of 0.204 indicates a somewhat moderate association between general apathy and political preference. Republicans account for 72% of those who are have general apathy, see Table 11.

Table 11: Cross-Tabulation between General Apathy and Political Preference by Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Apathy</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (No Apathy)</td>
<td>178(96.2%)</td>
<td>252(82.3%)</td>
<td>173(92.5%)</td>
<td>603(88.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (Apathy)</td>
<td>7(3.78%)</td>
<td>54(17.7%)</td>
<td>14(7.5%)</td>
<td>75(11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>185(100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>306(100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>187(100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>678(100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates a significant association.

General Apathy cross-tabulations across Sex by Race

White males at 16.9% (n = 94) were more likely to hold general apathetic views than white females at 5.70% (n = 31). Pearson’s Chi-Square of 34.786 indicates a significant association between general apathy and sex at a 99.9% confidence level among white high
school seniors. Cramer’s V of 0.178 indicates a somewhat moderate association between general apathy and sex. Males account for 75.2% of those who are have general apathy, see Table 12.

Table 12: Cross-Tabulation between General Apathy and Sex by Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Apathy</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (No Apathy)</td>
<td>517(94.3%)</td>
<td>462(83.1%)</td>
<td>979(88.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (Apathy)</td>
<td>31(5.7%)</td>
<td>94(16.9%)</td>
<td>125(11.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>548(100%)</td>
<td>556(100%)</td>
<td>1,104(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates a significant association.

General Apathy cross-tabulations across Father’s Education by Race

Interestingly, 12.4% of white respondents whose fathers have no college degree (n = 74) are more likely to hold general apathetic views compared to 10.6% of white respondents who have fathers with college degrees (n = 50). Students, who have fathers with no degree account for 60.0% of those who are have general apathy, see Table 13.

Table 13: Cross-Tabulation between General Apathy and Father’s Education by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Apathy</th>
<th>No Degree</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (No Apathy)</td>
<td>521(87.6%)</td>
<td>422(89.4%)</td>
<td>943(88.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (Apathy)</td>
<td>74(12.4%)</td>
<td>50(10.6%)</td>
<td>124(11.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>595(100%)</td>
<td>472(100%)</td>
<td>1,067(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


General Apathy cross-tabulations across Religiosity by Race

I found that 9.3% of white respondents who view religion as an important aspect of their lives have general apathy (n = 41) compared to 12.8% of white respondents who do not consider religion as important (n = 60). Interestingly, this is dissimilar to racial apathy. Religiosity seems to have more of an impact on racial apathy compared to general apathy. Students, who view religion as not important account for 59.4% of those who have general apathy, see Table 14.
### Table 14: Cross-Tabulation between General Apathy and Religiosity by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Apathy</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (No Apathy)</td>
<td>408(87.2%)</td>
<td>396(90.7%)</td>
<td>804(88.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (Apathy)</td>
<td>60(12.8%)</td>
<td>41(9.3%)</td>
<td>101(11.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>468(100%)</td>
<td>437(100%)</td>
<td>905(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Monitoring the Future Survey 2011.*

### Race Relations cross-tabulations across Political Preference by Race

Regarding race relations, 31.2% of white Republicans do not worry about race relations (n = 120), whereas 23.5% of Democrats do not worry about race relations (n = 50) and 28.4% of Independents do not worry about race relations (n = 54). Pearson’s Chi-Square of 4.000 indicates a significant association between concern for race relations and political preference at a 95.0% confidence level among white high school seniors. Cramer’s V of 0.082 indicates a somewhat weak association between concern for race relations and political preference. Republicans account for 53.6% of those who have no concern for race relations, see Table 15.

### Table 15: Cross-Tabulation between Race Relations and Political Preference by Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern for Race Relations</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>163(76.5%)</td>
<td>265(68.8%)</td>
<td>136(71.6%)</td>
<td>564(71.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50(23.5%)</td>
<td>120(31.2%)</td>
<td>54(28.4%)</td>
<td>224(28.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>213(100%)</td>
<td>385(100%)</td>
<td>190(100%)</td>
<td>788(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Monitoring the Future Survey 2011.*

*Indicates a significant association.

### Race Relations cross-tabulations across Sex by Race

White males at 37.0% (n = 257) are more likely to never worry about race relations compared to 26.5% of white females (n = 172). Pearson’s Chi-Square of 17.257 indicates a significant association between concern for race relations and sex at a 99.9% confidence level.
among white high school seniors. Cramer’s V of 0.113 indicates a somewhat moderate association between concern for race relations and sex. Males account for 60.0% of those who have no concern for race relations, see Table 16.

Table 16: Cross-Tabulation between Race Relations and Sex by Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern for Race Relations</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>478(73.5%)</td>
<td>437(63%)</td>
<td>915(68.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>172(26.5%)</td>
<td>257(37%)</td>
<td>429(31.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>650(100%)</td>
<td>694(100%)</td>
<td>1,344(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Indicates a significant association.

Race Relations cross-tabulations across Father’s Education by Race

35.2% of white respondents whose fathers have no college degree (n = 259) are more likely never worry about race relations compared to 27.3% of white respondents who have fathers with college degrees (n = 154). Pearson’s Chi-Square of 9.388 indicates a significant association between concern for race relations and father’s education at a 95.0% confidence level among white high school seniors. Cramer’s V of 0.085 indicates a somewhat weak association between concern for race relations and father’s education. Students, who have fathers with no degree account for 63.0% of those who have no concern for race relations, see Table 17.

Table 17: Cross-Tabulation between Race Relations and Father’s Education by Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern for Race Relations</th>
<th>No Degree</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>476(64.8%)</td>
<td>411(72.7%)</td>
<td>887(68.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>259(35.2%)</td>
<td>154(27.3%)</td>
<td>413(31.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>735(100%)</td>
<td>565(100%)</td>
<td>1,300(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Indicates a significant association.
Race Relations cross-tabulations across Religiosity by Race

I found that 29.0% of white respondents who view religion as an important aspect of their lives never worry about race relations (n = 150) whereas 35.8% of white respondents who do not consider religion as important (n = 207). Pearson’s Chi-Square of 5.742 indicates a significant association between concern for race relations and religiosity at a 95.0% confidence level among white high school seniors. Cramer’s V of 0.072 indicates a somewhat weak association between concern for race relations and religiosity. Students, who view religion as not important account for 58.0% of those who have no concern for race relations, see Table 18.

Table 18: Cross-Tabulation between Race Relations and Religiosity by Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern for Race Relations</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>371(64.2%)</td>
<td>367(71%)</td>
<td>738(67.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>207(35.8%)</td>
<td>150(29%)</td>
<td>357(32.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>578(100%)</td>
<td>517(100%)</td>
<td>1,095(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates a significant association.

In summary, I found that there are several variables that can affect one’s level of racial apathy. I found that political preference, sex, father’s level of education, and level of religiosity have an impact on one’s level of racial apathy. I found similar trends among the levels of racial apathy and general apathy; however, the levels of racial apathy were prominently higher than that of general apathy.

More students overall have higher levels of racial apathy compared to general apathy. This is intriguing due to the fact that those who stated that they have lack concern for race relations were the ones to have high amounts of racial apathy. I found that Republicans are more likely to have a lack of concern for race relations compared to Democrats. Males are more likely to have a lack of concern for race relations compared to females. Students with fathers with no
college degree are more likely to have a lack of concern for race relations than students with fathers with college degrees. Students who think religion is not important in their lives are more likely to have a lack of concern for race relations compared to students who think religion is important in their lives. I found students who are more conservative are more likely to have high levels of racial apathy while at the same time stating a lack of concern for race relations.

**Discussion and Conclusions**

This current study explored the relationship between racial apathy and multiple social indicators. I have shown that it is more likely for a white youth who has low levels of religiosity, is Republican, and male to be more racially apathetic than a white youth who has high levels of religiosity, is Democratic, and female. Forman (2004) argues that racial apathy is a device by which racial and ethnic inequities continue and thrive in an environment of ever-decreasing overt racism (Forman 2004). I substantiate his argument and study by showing that the levels of racial apathy are on the rise; I add to Forman’s (2004) study by finding various socio-political and socio-economic factors that are associated with the expression of racial apathy among white youth. I found that racial apathy is associated with political affiliation, gender, father’s education and level of religiosity; Republicans have a tendency to express racial apathy more than Democratic students. Men are more likely to express racial apathy than women. Students with degree holding fathers are less likely to express racial apathy than students with fathers with no degree. Interestingly those with high levels of religiosity are less likely to express racial apathy than those who consider religion as unimportant. It is curious that those who have high levels of religiosity have lower levels of racial apathy due to the fact that those who are religious are more likely to have conservative outlooks.
The contribution of this study adds to the debate of current racial discrimination in the US, that is, there is need for more discussion and exploration into contemporary mechanisms that perpetuate racial discrimination. One practical implication of my argument is to look past traditional forms of racial prejudice and look into newer actions and/or inaction regarding racial discrimination. It is imperative to take these findings seriously, that there is a rising amount of American youth that consider race relations trivial and hold racially apathetic views towards racial minorities that experience instances of discrimination and prejudice. Although I add to and substantiate Forman’s (2004) previous work on the existence and pervasiveness of racial apathy among white youth, more attention is needed to uncover dynamics that influence one’s expression of racial apathy.

It is remarkable to note that there is a growing amount of white youth that state they don’t worry about race relations while at the same time the amount of white youth that have racially apathetic views intensely increase. With this in mind, it would be increasingly difficult for young whites to act in alleviating existing social inequalities. If some white youth believe that there is no need to help with the conditions of racial minorities, that is, traditional forms of racism and racial discrimination are over and there is no need to intervene on the behalf of those who bring upon their own situation, then the existing racial inequities will continue to flourish. For example, the California University school system has taken race out of the admission process. This has dramatically decreased minority enrollment in California state universities, especially at UC Berkeley. Admissions for African Americans in UC Berkeley in 1995 were around 50%; however in 2010 admissions dropped to nearly 15% (Murphy 2013). It is imperative to understanding and discovering the relationship between racial apathy and existing racial discrimination in the age of “post-race.” This study shows that although people profess racial
equality and the declining instances of racism and racial discrimination, their attitudes on race and consequences of race show otherwise. It is important to keep in mind that attitudes have a way of manifesting into action. If we do not give attention to current racial attitudes of the young, their attitudes will fortify and will be the catalyst for future social action. It would seem that the first step for fighting current racism and racial discrimination is awareness, followed by the second step, action. We must act to dismantle the enduring racial inequities that still permeate our social world.
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