

Spring 1962

A Survey of Urban Negro Voting Behavior in South Carolina

John B. McConaughy
University of South Carolina

John E. Gauntlett
University of South Carolina

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/sclr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

John B. McConaughy & John E. Gauntlett, A Survey of Urban Negro Voting Behavior in South Carolina, 14 S. C. L. Rev. 365 (1961-1962).

This Article is brought to you by the Law Reviews and Journals at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in South Carolina Law Review by an authorized editor of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu.

A SURVEY OF URBAN NEGRO VOTING BEHAVIOR IN SOUTH CAROLINA

JOHN B. MCCONAUGHY* and JOHN E. GAUNTLETT†

This study of the voting behavior of 530 urban Negroes of voting age in South Carolina,¹ based upon personal interviews in the summer of 1958 from a questionnaire, had as its general objectives: (1) to obtain a general view of urban Negro voting in South Carolina; (2) to evaluate changes in Negro voting from 1948 to 1958; (3) to examine voting participation of urban Negroes; (4) to determine the extent of bloc voting of urban Negroes; (5) to detect differences in Negro voting between different cities in South Carolina; and (6) to determine the influence of certain factors upon voting participation and candidate choice in the 1956 presidential election. The rural Negro was not studied because of lower political participation, because of difficulty in obtaining adequate samples, and because it was felt that the urban Negro furnished the leadership for Negro voting behavior in South Carolina.

Negro interviewers, principally teachers or college students of good educational background, were used in the belief that the answers of the persons interviewed might be more dependable because of better rapport between the interviewer and the respondent. Each interviewer was instructed in the random sample method, whereby the ward which had the highest proportion of Negro voters in each of five South Carolina cities was selected and divided into five sections, with one interviewer assigned to each section.

The authors then went over the map of the ward section with the interviewer, pointing out to him or her the streets which were to be covered. The population distribution in his section was discussed and the interviewer was instructed

*Associate Professor of Political Science, University of South Carolina.

†Formerly Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of South Carolina; now associated with George Marshall Foundation.

1. The authors want to express their thanks to the interviewers who worked long and hard on this project without any compensation. Their only compensation will come from the publication of this study which we hope will answer some of the questions which they asked us. We want to particularly thank Leo Hill, attorney in Greenville, who made many worthwhile suggestions concerning this project and read the manuscript. His encouragement led to the present publication of this study.

to distribute his interviews evenly so as to obtain a true random sample. He was told to take only one interview in each home and to distribute the interviews as evenly as possible between men and women, even if it meant returning to obtain night interviews. He was instructed to take every "nth" home, such as fifth or tenth house, according to the number of families in his ward section. When the interviews were collected, the interviewers were questioned in order to make certain that they had followed the methods described above.

Table 1 gives the characteristics of the Negro samples from each of the five wards. Two cities, Spartanburg and Greenville, were from the Piedmont section, two were from the Low Country, Charleston and Darlington, and one, Columbia, was from the central section of South Carolina. Since only one city was selected from the central section of the State, 140 were taken as the sample from Columbia while in the other cities a sample of approximately a hundred was taken.

TABLE I
CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLES BY WARDS

	No.	Mean Age in Years	Mean Education in Years	Mean Annual Income
Spartanburg (Ward 1, Box 1) ² _	93	43.90	9.15	\$2,082
Greenville (Ward 5, Box 1) ____	101	43.80	10.33	3,192
Columbia (Ward 9) _____	140	42.16	12.31	3,180
Darlington (Ward 4) _____	98	36.00	9.92	2,662
Charleston (Ward 9) _____	98	39.00	10.19	2,872
Total or Mean _____	530	42.41	10.44	\$2,861

	Sex % Male	% Protestant (Church Members)	Median Residence Years	% Regis- tered
Spartanburg _____	50.53	92.5	over 20	58.06
Greenville _____	38.60	90.0	over 20	77.22
Columbia _____	54.26	93.0	over 20	79.97
Darlington _____	57.14	99.0	over 20	81.63
Charleston _____	52.04	83.7	over 20	75.48
Total or Mean _____	50.75	91.7	over 20	75.09

Note: The final mean is the mean of the total sample. It is, therefore, weighted according to the numbers in each ward sample and will not necessarily equal the unweighted mean.

2. The term Box is used instead of precinct in most southern states.

It will be seen that there are some differences in the characteristics of the wards. The mean age runs from 36 years to about 44 years; the mean education runs from 9 years to over 12 years; the mean annual income runs from a little over \$2,000 to over \$3,000; the percentage male runs from 38.6% to 57%; the percentage Protestant of those belonging to churches runs from 83.7% in Charleston to 99% in Darlington; the percentage registered runs from 58% in Spartanburg to over 81% in Darlington where a strong Negro political organization, the Palmetto Voters' Association exists. These differences are used, as demonstrated below, to determine the influence of certain factors upon voting participation and voting choices.

Voting participation was studied for the presidential elections of 1948, 1952, and 1956, the gubernatorial election of 1954 and the gubernatorial run-off election of 1958. Table 2 below gives the percentages of the samples voting in each of these elections.

TABLE 2
URBAN NEGRO VOTING PARTICIPATION IN PERCENTAGES
VOTING

	% 1948	% 1952	% 1956	% 1954	% 1958
Spartanburg _____	26.87	49.45	47.39	38.69	46.23
Greenville _____	34.65	57.42	68.31	49.50	55.44
Columbia _____	54.26	51.42	66.41	54.27	61.41
Darlington _____	44.88	65.28	63.26	49.98	54.06
Charleston _____	46.92	66.30	64.26	54.06	67.34
Total Sample _____	42.62	57.34	62.26	49.81	57.35

It can be seen from the above table that the percentages in the sample have increased approximately 20% in the presidential elections in the period from 1948 to 1956. The percentage increase in Negro participation from 1954 to 1958 in the gubernatorial elections was approximately 7½%. The percentage of urban Negro participation in South Carolina is somewhat higher than the comparable participation of national samples of Negroes. A national survey of voting participation of Negroes in the 1948 presidential election³ indicated that only 36% of the Negroes of voting age voted while our sample shows that 43% did. This is a difference of about

3. RANNEY, THE GOVERNING OF MEN 292 (1959). Data taken from CAMPBELL, GURIN, & MILLER, THE VOTER DECIDES 70-73 (1954).

7%. Another national sample of Negro participation in the 1956 presidential election⁴ indicated that only 36% voted while our sample indicated that over 62% voted. This is a difference of over 25%. Reasons for this difference may be that our sample is solely urban while the national samples supposedly also included rural Negroes and that South Carolina has become a two-party state so far as presidential elections are concerned. The latter might increase the interest of the Negro in the presidential elections and encourage greater voting participation.

Table 2 also indicates that wide differences exist from city to city in respect to Negro voting participation. In the 1948 presidential election the difference between the lowest city, Spartanburg, and the highest city, Columbia, was about 27%. In the 1952 presidential election the difference between Spartanburg, again the lowest, and Charleston, the highest, was about 17%. In the 1956 presidential election the difference between Spartanburg, the lowest, and Greenville, the highest, was about 21%. In the gubernatorial election of 1954 the difference between Spartanburg and Columbia was about 15%. In the gubernatorial election of 1958 the difference between Spartanburg and Charleston was about 21%.

It was decided to construct an index of Negro political participation for each of the five cities. It was felt that this would give a better over-all view for the five elections and would also indicate the cities which were consistently high and those which were consistently low in Negro voting participation. The characteristics of each of these samples could then be studied in an effort to determine the factors which might influence voting participation. The index was constructed as follows: The five samples were ranked for each election, with the sample having the highest voting participation placed on top and that with the lowest on the bottom. The number 5 was assigned to the sample which was on top, 4 to the second from the top, 3 to the third, 2 to the fourth, and 1 to the last. Thus for the five elections, the highest possible index of political participation would be 25 and the lowest would be 5. Table 3 indicates the relative position of each city when this procedure is followed together with its score in voting participation.

4. *Ibid.*, Data furnished by Professor Warren E. Miller of the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan.

TABLE 3

INDEX OF URBAN NEGRO VOTING PARTICIPATION IN FIVE ELECTIONS

	<i>Index</i>
Charleston _____	21
Columbia _____	20
Greenville _____	15
Darlington _____	14
Spartanburg _____	5

It can be seen that Charleston and Columbia are the cities where there seems to be the greatest political participation for the five elections and that Spartanburg is consistently at the bottom.

We next decided to investigate the extent of bloc voting among the samples of urban Negroes. Those Negroes voting in each election were asked for whom they voted. The results were studied for the five elections previously mentioned. Table 4 gives these results.

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGE VOTE FOR CANDIDATES BY URBAN NEGROES, 1948-1958
(THOSE VOTING)

	<i>1948 Presidential</i>				<i>1952 Presidential</i>		
	<i>Truman</i>	<i>Dewey</i>	<i>Thurmond</i>	<i>Wallace</i>	<i>Stevenson</i>	<i>Eisenhower</i>	<i>Other</i>
Spartanburg _____	92.00	4.00	4.00	0.0	47.82	52.17	0.00
Greenville _____	93.75	6.25	0.00	0.0	48.27	48.27	3.44
Columbia _____	82.66	17.33	0.00	0.0	61.42	38.57	0.00
Darlington _____	84.09	13.63	2.27	0.0	54.68	43.75	1.56
Charleston _____	93.47	6.52	0.00	0.0	53.84	44.61	1.53
Total Sample _____	87.44	11.21	1.34	0.0	53.1	44.59	1.97
No. 223						No. 305	
	<i>1956 Presidential</i>		<i>1954 Gubernatorial</i>		<i>1958 Gubernatorial</i>		
	<i>Stevenson</i>	<i>Eisenhower</i>	<i>Bates</i>	<i>Timmerman</i>	<i>Russell</i>	<i>Hollings</i>	
Spartanburg _____	46.51	53.48	86.11	13.88	60.46	39.53	
Greenville _____	40.57	59.42	70.00	30.00	80.35	19.64	
Columbia _____	52.68	47.31	94.73	5.26	86.04	13.95	
Darlington _____	56.45	43.54	85.71	14.28	43.39	56.60	
Charleston _____	42.85	57.14	45.28	54.71	16.66	83.33	
Total Sample _____	48.18	51.81	77.27	22.72	58.88	41.11	
No. 330			No. 264		No. 304		

The above figures show that the voting habits of the urban Negro in South Carolina have changed tremendously. From

a bloc Democratic vote for Truman in 1948 of over 87%, the total sample shows that in 1956 a majority of nearly 4% voted for Eisenhower, the Republican candidate. This was an increase of about 40.6% in the Republican vote. A national survey by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan⁵ showed that of those Negroes voting, 50% voted Democratic in the 1948 presidential election, and approximately 60% voted Democratic in the 1956 presidential election. The Gallup Poll of 1956 showed 61% of the Negroes voting the Democratic presidential ticket in 1956.⁶ The South Carolina urban Negroes, therefore, voted more heavily Democratic in 1948 but much more heavily Republican in 1956 than Negroes did nationally. More so than was evident in the Northern Negro vote, there was a switch in the Negro vote of many Southern cities to the Republican party in 1956, especially in Atlanta, Memphis, Richmond, and Norfolk. Indeed, in ten Negro precincts in Norfolk, the Republican vote increased by 60% between 1952 and 1956.⁷ The South Carolina urban Negroes, who voted in 1948 heavily Democratic, also followed this trend by voting in 1956 much more heavily Republican than Negroes did nationally.

If we accept a vote of 66% for one candidate as the percentage necessary for a bloc vote, the total sample shows that only in two elections did South Carolina urban Negroes vote as a bloc, namely, the 1948 presidential election and the 1954 gubernatorial election. Apparently the Negro bloc vote is not a difficult problem for the Whites in South Carolina and it is a decreasing problem since the trend seems to be toward a more even split. While there has been no bloc voting on a state level except in the case of the two elections indicated above, there was bloc voting on a local basis in the 1958 gubernatorial run-off election. In this election Greenville and Columbia showed a bloc vote for Russell while Charleston gave a bloc vote to Hollings. The bloc votes, therefore, balanced each other so that no bloc vote resulted for the State as a whole.

A Bloc Vote Index was constructed to indicate both the extent of bloc voting in a given election and also the extent of bloc voting in each sample. Table 5 gives the results of this Index.

5. Derived from Ranney, *op. cit.*, p. 292.

6. The Nashville Tennessean, January 14, 1957.

7. See SCAMMON, *How Will Negroes Vote?*, THE NEW REPUBLIC 12 (1957).

TABLE 5
 BLOC VOTING INDEX IN THREE ELECTIONS

	<i>1948 Presi- dential</i>	<i>1954 Guber- natorial</i>	<i>1958 Guber- natorial</i>	<i>Total</i>
Greenville _____	5	5	5	15
Columbia _____	5	5	5	15
Spartanburg _____	5	5	0	10
Darlington _____	5	5	0	10
Charleston _____	5	0	5	10
	—	—	—	—
Total _____	25	20	15	

Five points were given each sample for each election in which it gave a bloc vote for any candidate. A bloc vote was given a city if at least 66% of the votes of the sample were cast for one candidate. Bloc voting was greatest in the 1948 presidential election and the next highest occurred in the 1954 gubernatorial election. The smallest amount of bloc voting occurred in the 1958 gubernatorial run-off election. Columbia and Greenville voted most often with a bloc vote.

In each case where there was a statewide urban Negro bloc vote, the other candidate was elected.⁸ In 1948, the Negro bloc vote went for Truman, but Thurmond received South Carolina's electoral votes. In the 1954 gubernatorial election, Bates received the Negro bloc vote but Timmerman was elected. In the 1958 gubernatorial election, while there was no statewide Negro bloc voting, two cities bloc-voted for Russell and one for Hollings. Hollings was elected. It would seem from these figures that the Negro bloc vote has not held the balance of power in South Carolina. On the other hand, the results might also indicate that a bloc Negro vote is a serious liability to a candidate in South Carolina if the Whites expect it.

A Democratic Index was devised to measure the relative Democratic strength of the Negro vote in the three presidential elections, 1948-56. This Index was constructed in the

8. It would appear to the authors that an exception to this statement occurred in the 1960 Presidential election. There would seem to have been a statewide Negro bloc vote for the Democratic Presidential ticket but the Democratic ticket carried the State by less than 9,000 votes. In Columbia, Ward 9, a predominantly Negro Ward, voted 75% for Kennedy, Ward 9 in Charleston voted 76% for Kennedy and Ward 4 in Darlington voted 88% for Kennedy. Thus a combination of loyal Democrats, lower income Whites and Negroes was forged which enabled the Democratic candidates to carry the State.

same manner as the Index of Urban Negro Voting Participation above. The samples were ranked for each election. The sample which gave the highest percentage of Negro votes was given a numerical value of 5 and in descending order of integers until the value of 1 was given to the sample on the bottom. The highest possible index would be 15 and the lowest 3. Table 6 gives this Index.

TABLE 6
DEMOCRATIC INDEX IN THREE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

	<i>Urban Negroes</i>
Darlington _____	11
Columbia _____	10
Charleston _____	9
Greenville _____	8
Spartanburg _____	7

The Index indicates that the Low Country and Central South Carolina urban Negroes tend to vote more Democratic than Negroes in the Piedmont or Northern section of the State.

The respondents were asked their reasons for voting for their candidate in the presidential elections of 1948, 1952 and 1956, and in the 1958 gubernatorial run-off election. Table 7 gives these reasons for the four elections studied.

TABLE 7
REASONS GIVEN BY URBAN NEGROES FOR VOTING FOR
CANDIDATES IN FOUR ELECTIONS

	<i>1948 Presi- dential</i>	<i>1952 Presi- dential</i>	<i>1956 Presi- dential</i>	<i>1958 Guberna- torial</i>
No Answer _____	32.30	37.70	34.17	40.13
Party Choice _____	19.46	18.36	17.92	0.00
Platform _____	8.84	7.54	6.72	3.28
Best Man _____	8.40	10.16	11.76	19.07 ⁹
Civil Rights _____	6.19	2.95	4.20	1.65 ¹⁰
Common Man _____	5.30	1.31	0.00	2.30 ¹¹
Man of Integrity _____	3.09	1.63	0.84	1.31
Experience _____	2.21	0.00	2.52	3.94

9. In 1958 gubernatorial run-off includes "Liked him Best and Better Qualified."

10. Includes "Weaker on Segregation."

11. Includes "Better Understanding of People."

TABLE 7 — *Continued*
 REASONS GIVEN BY URBAN NEGROES FOR VOTING FOR
 CANDIDATES IN FOUR ELECTIONS

	<i>1948 Presi- dential</i>	<i>1952 Presi- dential</i>	<i>1956 Presi- dential</i>	<i>1958 Guberna- torial</i>
Better for Negroes _____	2.21	3.27	3.08	2.96
Assoc. F.D.R. _____	4.86	0.00	0.56	0.00
His Talks _____	0.00	3.60	2.80	2.96
Military Record _____	0.00	1.96	0.84	0.00
Leadership _____	0.00	1.63	2.24	0.00
Knowledge of World				
Affairs _____	0.00	1.31	1.96	0.00
Opposed Ike _____	0.00	1.30	0.28	0.00
For All People _____	0.00	0.00	1.68	0.00
Better of Two Evils _____	0.00	0.00	1.68	0.00
Better Educated _____	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.94
More Liberal _____	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.63
Other _____	7.14	7.27	8.43	10.57
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total _____	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
No. _____	226	305	357	304

Almost a third of the respondents in the presidential elections either would not or could not give a reason for their choice of candidates. It is believed that this is principally because of subconscious motivation. More research needs to be done in this subconscious motivation, but it is very difficult to test. The most important reason given for voting for a certain candidate was "Party Choice." Nearly a fifth of the voters gave this as the reason they voted for their particular candidate. "Best Man" is the second most important reason given while "Platform" is third. The fourth most important reason seems to be "Civil Rights." The rest of the reasons are scattered.

The consistency of the four most important reasons given is notable. There seems to be little variation in the three presidential elections regardless of the candidates or issues, but patterns of responses for the 1958 gubernatorial run-off election are somewhat different. Since South Carolina is a one-party State in gubernatorial elections, "Party Choice" disappears as a reason. "Best Man" increases in importance. "Platform" decreases in importance and personal characteristics of the candidate seem to increase in importance. These

results are in line with what the observer of South Carolina gubernatorial elections would expect.

An analysis was made of the positive and negative voting behavior of the South Carolina Negroes. By positive voting, we mean that the voter casts his ballot for a certain candidate because he is for that candidate while a negative voter casts his ballot for a certain candidate because he is opposed to the other candidate. Table 8 shows the results of this analysis for the total sample.

TABLE 8
POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE VOTING BY SOUTH CAROLINA
URBAN NEGROES

	1948	1952	1956	1958
% Positive _____	99.4	93.16	98.3	99.45
% Negative _____	0.6	6.84	1.7	0.55
Total _____	100.0	100.00	100.0	100.00
No. _____	(153)	(190)	(235)	(182)

The reasons given by the voters for voting for their candidate were classified into positive or negative reasons. It can be seen that very few of the urban Negroes in the sample voted negatively. Only in the 1952 presidential election did an appreciable number vote negatively and in this case it amounted only to about 7%.

It was felt that it would be interesting to determine the relative importance of candidates and issues in urban Negro voting behavior. The reasons given for voting for candidates were classified according to Candidate Orientation and Issue Orientation for the total sample. Table 9 gives the results of this classification.

TABLE 9
CANDIDATES AND ISSUES—URBAN NEGROES THOSE ANSWERING

	1948 ¹²	1952 ¹²	1956 ¹²	1958 ¹²
Candidate Oriented ____	37.25%	40.00%	38.29%	85.71%
Issue Oriented _____	62.75	60.00	61.71	14.29
Total _____	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
No. _____	(153)	(190)	(235)	(182)

¹² Party's Choice is listed as an issue preference rather than a candidate preference.

It can be seen that in presidential elections about two-thirds of the South Carolina urban Negroes appear to vote primarily on issues while one-third vote primarily on the personality or characteristics of the candidate according to the reasons given by them. In the case of the gubernatorial run-off election of 1958 over four-fifths of the Negroes voted on the basis of the candidate instead of issues. This difference between presidential and gubernatorial elections probably reflects the relative absence of issues in a gubernatorial primary in a one-party State. It would be interesting to determine whether the same results would be found in a gubernatorial election in a two-party State such as Illinois or New York.

In an attempt to determine subconscious motivation (which might not be expressed in the answers given to the open-end questions above) the respondents were asked to rank in importance six political issues. These were; (1) Better City Services, (2) Better Job Opportunities, (3) Lower Taxes, (4) Integrated Schools, (5) Better Housing, and (6) Segregated Schools.

Table 10 gives the respondents' answers by cities and the totals.

TABLE 10

FIRST PLACE CHOICES BY PERCENTAGES OF THOSE ANSWERING
— SOUTH CAROLINA URBAN NEGROES —

No. _____	<i>Spartan- burg</i> (92)	<i>Green- ville</i> (89)	<i>Colum- bia</i> (135)	<i>Darling- ton</i> (98)	<i>Charles- ton</i> (90)	<i>Total</i> (504)
Better City Services _____	10.87	16.85	22.22	6.12	6.66	13.64
Better Jobs _____	47.83	57.30	48.14	72.42	57.77	57.63
Lower Taxes _____	14.13	8.98	7.40	7.14	6.66	6.92
Integrated Schools _____	6.52	11.23	14.07	9.18	14.44	12.01
Better Housing _____	11.96	5.61	2.22	2.04	8.88	4.48
Segregated Schools _____	8.69	0.00	5.92	3.06	5.55	5.29
	100.00%	99.97%	99.97%	99.96%	99.96%	99.97%

This attempt to delve into the subconscious of the urban Negro has arrived at some interesting results. Although "Better Job Opportunities" was not given as a preference in any of the open-end reasons for voting in Table 7, it turns out to be the most important issue in the subconscious when it is brought to the surface by a direct question. Nearly 58% of the respondents in the total sample list it as the most im-

portant issue. The responses by cities vary from just under half in Spartanburg to nearly three-fourths in Darlington. The second most important issue for the total sample is "Better City Services." The third most important is "Integrated Schools." The fourth most important is "Lower Taxes." The fifth most important is "Segregated Schools." The least important issue is "Better Housing." Integrated schools would not seem to be the most important issue so far as South Carolina urban Negroes are concerned. A split in Negro opinion on this issue, however, can be detected. A little over twice as many urban Negroes in South Carolina place integrated schools first as place segregated schools first. In Spartanburg, however, more Negroes place segregated schools first than place integrated schools first.

The Negro respondents were asked to rank four media of communications as to importance in determining their vote in the 1958 gubernatorial election. Table 11 gives the results of this question by cities.

TABLE 11

FIRST PLACE IMPORTANCE OF MEDIA IN DETERMINING VOTE
BY PERCENTAGES OF THOSE ANSWERING

	<i>News- paper</i>	<i>Radio</i>	<i>Tele- vision</i>	<i>Meet- ings</i>	<i>Total</i>
Spartanburg (45) _____	33.33	8.89	46.67	11.11	100.00%
Greenville (61) _____	21.31	13.11	60.65	4.91	99.98%
Columbia (96) _____	38.54	9.37	42.70	9.37	99.98%
Darlington (43) _____	39.53	16.27	39.53	4.65	99.98%
Charleston (67) _____	41.79	4.47	41.79	11.94	99.99%
Total (312) Sample _____	35.26	9.93	46.15	8.65	99.99%

The above data indicates that the respondents believe that television is the most important medium in influencing urban Negro voting in South Carolina, followed by newspapers, radio and meetings in that order. In the case of Charleston and Darlington, however, newspapers are equally influential with television. The greatest difference in the influence of television and newspapers is in Greenville where the differences about 40% in favor of television.

An attempt was made to investigate the extent of inferiority feelings among urban Negroes in South Carolina. This was done partly to examine Chief Justice Warren's thesis in *Brown v. Board of Education*¹³ to the effect that segre-

13. 347 U. S. 483 (1954).

gated schools caused an increase in inferiority feelings among Negroes. Another reason for examining this factor was to try to determine whether it had anything to do with voting behavior. The question asked of the 530 respondents was: *Do you believe that Whites are more ambitious, less ambitious or about the same as Negroes?* Tumin had used this question in a scale in his study of 287 White males in Guilford County, North Carolina.¹⁴ Tumin found that 66.5% of the White males considered the Negro inferior in ambition.¹⁵ It was decided to compare the answers by the urban Negroes of South Carolina with the White males of Tumin's study. Table 12 gives the results by cities in the South Carolina survey. Those Negroes who answered by saying that they believed that Whites were superior in ambition were classified as having inferiority feelings. Those who said the same were classified as equal, that is as having neither inferiority or superiority feelings. Those who said that they believed that the Negro was superior in ambition were classified as having superiority feelings.

TABLE 12

INFERIORITY-SUPERIORITY FEELINGS OF URBAN NEGROES IN SOUTH CAROLINA PERCENTAGES OF THOSE ANSWERING

	<i>Inferior</i>	<i>Equal</i>	<i>Superior</i>	
Spartanburg _____	17.14	71.42	11.42	
Greenville _____	38.82	54.11	7.05	
Columbia _____	30.89	61.78	7.31	
Darlington _____	33.33	60.61	6.34	
Charleston _____	34.83	62.92	2.24	
<hr/>				
Total Sample _____	31.39	61.86	6.74	
No. _____	(135)	(266)	(29)	Total (430)

It can be seen from Table 12 that about one-third of the urban Negroes feel inferior, almost two-thirds feel equal, and only about seven per cent feel superior to the Whites in ambition. About the same percentage of Negroes feel equal as the percentage of Whites which Tumin found felt superior. The sample from the City of Spartanburg shows the lowest feelings of inferiority and the highest feelings of

14. TUMIN, DESEGREGATION-RESISTANCE AND READINESS 34-35 (1958).

15. Tumin asked four questions concerning inferiority feelings and found that they made a scale. Since this relationship exists, the question used would be a rough measure of inferiority feelings.

equality and superiority among the samples studied. Greenville shows the highest feelings of inferiority while Charleston shows the lowest feelings of superiority.

An Inferiority Index was constructed for inferiority feelings. The samples were ranked according to the percentages of the samples stating that the Negro was inferior to the White in ambition. A value of 5 was assigned to the sample showing the greatest feelings of inferiority followed by successive integers until that sample with the lowest percentage of inferiority feelings was given a value of 1. Table 13 gives this Index.

TABLE 13
INFERIORITY INDEX

Greenville	5
Charleston	4
Darlington	3
Columbia	2
Spartanburg	1

Our hypothesis is that there is a direct relationship between the extent of inferiority feelings among urban Negroes and aggressive behavior. It will be noted from the Inferiority Index in Table 13 that Greenville has the highest percentage of Negroes with inferiority feelings. It is interesting to note that on January 1, 1960, Greenville Negroes led the march to the Greenville Airport in protest against segregation practices there.¹⁶ The Spartanburg sample had the lowest percentages of Negroes with inferiority feelings and this same sample showed a higher percentage of Negroes for segregated schools than for integrated schools. We believe that the inferiority feelings develop from frustration, and seem to be the highest among the highest income groups. Greenville, which has the highest inferiority feelings, also has the highest annual mean income. Spartanburg, which has the lowest inferiority feelings, has the lowest per capita income.

Our hypothesis would be then: Income Frustration is transformed into inferiority feelings which are transformed into aggressive political behavior. Income Frustration is not caused by low incomes but rather by high incomes for Negroes. The frustration comes for the Negro when he compares his income with White income. He feels that he can rise to a certain

16. The State (Columbia), January 2, 1960, Section B, p. 1.

income but that then his opportunities for further income increase are much less than for the Whites.

It was decided to analyze the most important factors in voting participation and candidate preference in the 1956 presidential election. Coefficients of correlation were run between different factors and 1956 voting participation and candidate preference. Table 14 gives the results of these correlations.

TABLE 14

FACTORS INFLUENCING VOTING PARTICIPATION AND CANDIDATE PREFERENCE OF URBAN NEGRO VOTERS IN SOUTH CAROLINA IN 1956 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION¹⁷

	<i>% Voting Participation r</i>	<i>% for Eisenhower r</i>	<i>% for Stevenson r</i>
Mean Income _____	+ .95	+ .13	— .13
% Voting by Issues _____	— .25	— .87	+ .87
% Voting by Personality _____	+ .25	+ .87	— .87
% Protestant _____	— .12	— .82	+ .82
% Male _____	— .19	— .81	+ .81
% No Organization Membership _____	— .86	+ .58	— .58
% Poor Opinion of City _____	+ .66	+ .75	— .75
% Inferiority Feelings _____	+ .95	+ .34	— .34
Mean Years Education _____	+ .62	— .27	+ .27
% Integrated Schools _____	+ .76	+ .16	— .16
Mean Age _____	— .28	+ .57	— .57

The correlations were run between the five samples that made up the total sample. From the table we can see that there is a correlation of plus .95 between mean income and voting participation but a correlation of only plus .13 between mean income and the vote for Eisenhower. Any *r* below plus or minus .30 should probably be disregarded so far as statistical significance is concerned. From these correla-

17. A high + value in the voting participation column indicates that the factor had a marked influence on the urban Negroes that voted. A low + or — value would indicate that the factor had little or no influence on voting participation. A high — value would indicate that the factor was influential in causing them not to vote. Similarly these figures can be applied to the two candidates. It can be seen that where there is a + figure for one candidate, the identical figure will show up as a — figure for the other candidate.

In the table above the + .95 indicates that as the income rises, voting participation increases and that income is a highly important factor in voting participation. The + or — .13 indicates that income is not important as to how the Negroes voted. In voting by personality, the + .25 indicates that there is a low correlation between those who vote on the basis of personality and those who vote; while the + .87 indicates a high correlation between those who voted by personality and those who voted for Eisenhower, and a negative correlation between these voters and those who voted for Stevenson.

tions, it would seem that the most important factors in voting participation in the 1956 presidential election were mean income and inferiority feelings, both of which show a very high positive correlation. These are followed by the percentage for integrated schools, the percentage who have a poor opinion of the city and mean years of education, all of which are statistically significant. The highest negative correlation is between the percentage not belonging to any organization and the percentage voting.

To sum up, urban Negro voting participation increases as the mean income, the inferiority feelings, the number for integrated schools, the percentage who have a poor opinion of the city wherein they reside, and the mean years of education of the five samples increase. Voting participation declines as the percentage of Negroes who belong to no organization increases. We have named the organization membership the S or social factor in voting behavior.

The percentage of South Carolina urban Negroes who voted for Eisenhower increases as the percentage voting on personality, the percentage having a poor opinion of the city wherein they reside, the percentage belonging to no organization, the mean age and the percentage of those having inferiority feelings in the five samples increase. The percentage of South Carolina urban Negroes who voted for Stevenson increase as the percentage of those voting by issues, the percentage Protestant, and the percentage male increases.

It would seem from this study that certain psychological and sociological factors such as inferiority feelings, dissatisfaction as shown by a poor opinion of the city wherein they reside, the S factor and voting by personality or issues have a very important influence on voting participation and candidate preferences of South Carolina urban Negroes.