



Prejudice and traits of victimization among the Crow Indians : an experiment in behavior modification
by Helen Margaret Bybee Parks

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE in Elementary Education

Montana State University

© Copyright by Helen Margaret Bybee Parks (1972)

Abstract:

Minority group members are different from majority group members because they have erected more personality defenses in reaction to the assaults of prejudice and discrimination. These defenses, here called traits of victimization, often interfere with smooth interaction between the groups. The purpose of this study is to smooth interaction by reducing the traits of withdrawal, obsessive concern, and prejudice toward out-groups among Crow Indians.

The students were asked to view a series of televised lectures concerning prejudice. Their reactions (traits of victimization) were tested in situations which could elicit these traits. The results were analyzed in terms of simple percentages and Spearman's Coefficient of Rank-Order Correlation.

High withdrawal scores were unaffected; while low withdrawal scores increased significantly. The number of high scores on prejudice toward out-groups increased significantly. The same holds true for obsessive concern.

It was concluded that prejudice was exacerbated by discussion, if only momentarily. While designed to smooth interaction between groups, it appeared that presentation of the lectures increased friction.

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for inspection.. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by my major professor or, in his absence, by the Director of Libraries. It is understood that any copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature William M. Parks
Date November 24, 1972

PREJUDICE AND TRAITS OF VICTIMIZATION AMONG THE CROW INDIANS:
AN EXPERIMENT IN BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION.

by

Helen M. B. Parks

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Elementary Education

Approved:

Richard D. Sullivan
Head, Major Department

Elmora A. Old Coyote
Chairman, Examining Committee

H. Goering
Graduate Dean

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

December, 1972

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Although many people have been helpful to me in my graduate work, three were especially so. Dr. Daniel Duke tried hard to temper my impetuous idealism with his own brand of pragmatism and reality. Dr. Jack Stephens worked long hours trying to help me find the most meaningful way of dealing with my data. Finally, Sall Old Coyote (Dr. Elnora Wright) encouraged me, urged me and prodded me in the right direction. Through her I met some of the finest persons I'll ever know--the Crow Indians.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vii
<i>(Due to binding error placed after p. i)</i>	
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. TRAITS DUE TO VICTIMIZATION AND THE CROW INDIAN.	9
III. EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES	11
Major Hypothesis	11
Minor Hypothesis	11
IV. PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA	20
Interpretation of Data	29
V. CONCLUSIONS	58
APPENDIX A	62
APPENDIX B	90
BIBLIOGRAPHY	99

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Change in Withdrawal Scores Over Time	20
2. Ratio of Change	21
3. Difference in Amount of Change Between Control and Experimental Groups in Withdrawal.	21
4. Change in Prejudice Scores Over Time.	26
5. Ratio of Change	27
6. Difference in Amount of Change Between Control and Experimental Groups in Prejudice	27
7. Changes in Obsessive Concern Scores Over Time	32
8. Ratio of Change	33
9. Difference in Amount of Change Between Control and Experimental Groups in Obsessive Concern	33
10. Comparison of Test Forms According to Variables of Withdrawal, Prejudice, and Obsessive Concern	36
11. Relationship of Intropunitive to Extropunitive Traits . . .	39
12. Withdrawal Selection by Indians According to Sex.	41
13. Withdrawal Selection Over Total Time Period	42
14. Withdrawal Selection by Total Indian Population	45
15. Withdrawal Selection Over Total Time Period	46
16. Prejudice Selection by Indians According to Sex	49
17. Prejudice Selection Over Total Time Period.	50
18. Prejudice Selection by Total Indian Population.	51
19. Prejudice Selection Over Total Time Period.	52
20. Obsessive Concern Selection by Indians According to Sex . .	53

Table	Page
21. Obsessive Concern Selection Over Total Time Period.	54
22. Obsessive Concern Selection by Total Indian Population. . .	55
23. Obsessive Concern Selection Over Total Time Period.	56

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

These harsh but noble words were written by a black American facing a prejudiced society.

If we must die, let it not be like hogs
Hunted and penned in an inglorious spot,
While round us bark the mad and hungry dogs,
Making their mock at our accursed lot.
If we must die, O let us nobly die,
So that our precious blood may not be shed
In vain; then even the monsters we defy
Shall be constrained to honor us though dead!
Oh kinsmen! we must meet the common foe!
Though far outnumbered let us show us brave,
And for their thousand blows deal one deathblow!
What though before us lies the open grave?
Like men we'll face the murderous, cowardly pack,
Pressed to the wall, dying, but fighting back!¹

His words reflect the frustration, despair, and pride he feels in dealing with his oppressors. Yet there is another reflection here, the reflection of the poet's own prejudice. This is but one of the complexities that makes dealing with prejudice for others. Some are purified by the fires of prejudice, others are burned and scarred. This then is the aim of the study, the elimination or modification of these reactions to prejudice.

Clarity of vision demands we see the world of the poem for what it is--a different world. The black world and the white world are not

¹Claude McKay, "If We Must Die," Harlem Shadows, Twayne Publishers, 1922.

ABSTRACT

Minority group members are different from majority group members because they have erected more personality defenses in reaction to the assaults of prejudice and discrimination. These defenses, here called traits of victimization, often interfere with smooth interaction between the groups. The purpose of this study is to smooth interaction by reducing the traits of withdrawal, obsessive concern, and prejudice toward out-groups among Crow Indians.

The students were asked to view a series of televised lectures concerning prejudice. Their reactions (traits of victimization) were tested in situations which could elicit these traits. The results were analyzed in terms of simple percentages and Spearman's Coefficient of Rank-Order Correlation.

High withdrawal scores were unaffected; while low withdrawal scores increased significantly. The number of high scores on prejudice toward out-groups increased significantly. The same holds true for obsessive concern.

It was concluded that prejudice was exacerbated by discussion, if only momentarily. While designed to smooth interaction between groups, it appeared that presentation of the lectures increased friction.

the same; this difference is not because of skin color but because of different experience and different perception. Perhaps the point can be made more clearly. If the black were accepted as absolutely equal tomorrow, he would not be a white man with a black skin. The poem shows this.

Although most of our examples in this discussion concern blacks, it should be made clear that we are talking about minorities in general, and that later we will relate this discussion to our particular experimental group, the Crow Indian.

The unbiased have long pleaded for an end to racial discrimination, saying that surface differences are irrelevant, that under the skin everyone is alike. Most of us agree that surface differences are irrelevant; and most of us agree that the basic motivations and need of humans, as separated from cultural needs and motivations, are alike. But somehow, as the poem shows us, we have a strange contradiction: Because all humans are fundamentally alike, minority group members will differ from majority group members.

The reasoning behind this argument is that a partial amount of the human personality is made up of experiences; that the minority group member's experiences in interpersonal relations is different from the majority group member's; that the human reacts defensively to protect himself from attack; and that the minority group member is the victim of a peculiar form of attack much more often than the majority group

member. Therefore, Minority Man is different from Majority Man because he has erected more personality defenses, having been subjected to more ego attack than the majority group member. Different does not mean better or worse; it means different. A concrete example will make this clearer.

With regard to the comparative intelligence of Negroes and whites (in the United States), there are consistent differences in scores on intelligence tests in favor of the whites, but the differences are not large; they are much smaller than the differences within each group, so that there is a great deal of overlap between the groups; differences diminish in size when socio-economic position or educational opportunity is equated; and they may reflect a bias in the testing instruments themselves. It is probably fair to summarize the matter by saying that most specialists in the subject believe that inherent or genetic differences in intelligence between races have not been established.²

The Negro, as far as we can tell, has the same potential as the white as far as intelligence is concerned; but he has not been allowed to develop this potential because of lower quality schools, unqualified teachers, lack of incentive due to discriminatory hiring practices. Yet the example clearly shows there is a difference between whites and blacks, and to ignore the difference is to ignore the opportunity to eliminate the difference.

²Bernard Berelson and Jary A. Steiner, Human Behavior (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1964), p. 495.

The same argument holds true for the personality of Minority Man or "marginal man".³ He has the same potential for a well-adjusted personality, but his personality is different from Majority Man's because of different cultural experiences and because of the prejudice and discrimination he has had to face most of his life. He has been assaulted economically, socially, and sometimes physically. He is regarded as inferior by great numbers of people in the majority group and also by people of other minority groups. It is surprising that he develops defenses against these assaults, defenses which make him different from Majority Man who has not faced these assaults? For example, one man becomes more tolerant, being constantly on guard against hurting others as he has been hurt; while another man walks about with his race constituting a "chip-on-his-shoulder".

...With some individuals the characteristic inner conflict is a minor problem; in such cases one cannot speak of a "personality type". It is only in those instances where the conflict is intense and of considerable duration that the personality is oriented around the conflict. The individual seems almost to be "obsessed" with his problem; his moods are re-shaped.⁴

These personality traits that the marginal man develops in reaction to prejudice are outlined in Gordon Allport's book The Nature of Prejudice. Allport calls these defenses "traits due to

³Everett V. Stonequist, The Marginal Man (New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1961).

⁴Ibid., p. 139.

victimization."⁵ Here is a short description of each of the traits Allport catalogues.

Obsessive concern is a constant anxiety that insults and humiliation are about to occur (the chip-on-the-shoulder attitude).

Denial of membership means a person will not admit that he is a member of a minority group. This, of course, occurs usually when there is the possibility of hiding his membership.

Withdrawal and passivity are self explanatory--avoidance of contact, lack of reaction to insult, a kind of removal from the situation.

Clowning is a response in which a person makes himself the object of ridicule to protect himself. "Negro children sometimes learn to behave like silly beggars because in this way they receive good-natured (if patronizing) attention and a few pennies."⁶

Strengthening of in-group ties is a special cohesiveness between members of the minority group caused by outside pressures and by their own natural desire for normal social outlets.

Slyness and cunning are two of the least desirable defense mechanisms. They are based upon a double standard. "One is expected

⁵Gordon Allport, The Nature of Prejudice (Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books, Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1958), p. 144.

⁶Ibid., p. 144

to deal more fairly with one's own kind than with out-groups."⁷ An example of this would be an Indian's buying a car from someone off the reservation on credit, then driving the car only on the reservation and refusing to pay for it. The seller has no recourse.

Self-hate is perhaps the saddest trait a minority group member may acquire. He assumes the majority group's judgment of him is correct.

Agression against own group is where Minority Man may look down upon members of his own group as being inferior because of darker skin color, poorer English, etc.

Prejudice toward out-groups is exactly what it says--members of one minority group look down upon members of another minority group, regarding them as inferior and as objects of disgust.

Sympathy, mentioned before, is great tolerance for others and an understanding of others' problems.

Militancy is the most natural reaction to prejudice--fighting back.

Enhanced striving is the result of Minority Man's regarding prejudice and minority group status as barriers to be overcome by working harder. This is in tune with the American ideal supposedly set down in the Horatio Alger stories.

Symbolic status striving is the antithesis of enhanced striving.

⁷Ibid., p. 146

The symbols of status may be material acquisitions, sexual prowess or flowery language.

Neuroticism, the final trait Allport discusses, is not a trait at all; it is a summary of what extreme ego defense can lead to.

Clearly, some of these traits will apply to one minority group member rather than another, and some will apply to most minority group members. Each situation should be carefully examined before drawing a conclusion about a piece of behavior.

Traits due to victimization may add static to the already complex pattern of human communications. Any communications model shows how many difficulties exist between speaker and listener. These include the psychological make-up of each communicator, his use of language, the differing interpretations put upon each word, and the emotional coloring attached to the subject for each communicator. If traits of victimization are added, the problem is still more complex. It should be obvious why the elimination of even one of the difficulties will help understanding.

The aim of this study then is to eliminate or reduce the unpleasant traits of victimization. The underlying premise is that if Minority Man's view of prejudice is broadened, thus making it more impersonal, and if he understands what disagreeable reactions these traits elicit from others, he will modify his behavior.

Admittedly, this places the greater share of the burden of

interaction upon Minority Man's shoulders, but the plain fact is that Minority Man will always interact more frequently with Majority Man than vice versa since the terms minority and majority reflect numerical values.

The current primary emphasis in the United States seems to be upon changing the majority's attitudes. However, Minority Man, too, has a responsibility to eliminate prejudice. He knows that he can no longer accept that which is handed him, no matter how well intended; he must instead demand his equality and dignity. These cannot be given him. These he must get for himself. In this sense, the minority man must also squarely face the problems he causes in the interaction process. At the same time the majority man must overcome his ignorance and prejudice. The two faces of responsibility are clearly shown in this quote:

...The tendency to "rationalize" is evident with some. The person of weaker character finds his race or nationality a convenient scapegoat; failure through personal defect is attributed to the discrimination of race prejudice. Correct diagnosis, however, is difficult, since prejudice is frequent enough to make the individual's plaint a fair one.⁸

⁸Stonequist, op. cit., pg. 152.

CHAPTER II

TRAITS DUE TO VICTIMIZATION AND THE CROW INDIAN

The Crow Indians were selected as subjects in this study because of a program Montana State University had on the Crow reservation. This program was intended to help the elementary school children overcome certain educational deficiencies. This study was designed to be used with seventh and eighth graders because these children are among the most likely of all the Crow children to drop out of school.⁹ At this critical age children need all the help they can get. The Crows were also selected because they are a relatively small group of people with which to work; their standard of living is not too different from many rural majority men, unlike most Indian tribes; they were not adverse to participating; and their tribal and family structures are strong ones which eliminated unnecessary complications.

The Crow Indian has all of the problems common to other minorities, but he is unique. He has had to deal with prejudice and discrimination, but he is different in his land-holding capacity, his geographic separateness (the reservation), his protection by the federal government with its mirror-image federal intervention, and his cultural heritage. The Crow is unique and typical at the same time.

⁹John F. Bryde, S. J., "New Approach to Indian Education," (Paper from Holy Rosary Mission, Pine Ridge, S.D.), p. 1.

Three of Allport's traits of victimization were selected for the study. The rest were eliminated for numerous reasons. Denial of membership was obviously impossible in a small town like Lodge Grass where everyone knows everyone else. Clowning is simply not a Crow reaction to prejudice. Strengthening in-group ties might be hard to deal with because of the reservation's geographical separateness and because of the economic inducements to remain on the reservation. Agression against one's own group would be difficult to separate from clan and family rivalry. Sympathy and enhanced striving are desirable traits not to be minimized. Slyness and cunning are part of adult cynicism and would appear less frequently among seventh and eighth graders. Self-hate is less frequent among Crow Indians than among other groups because they are proud of their heritage and have managed to retain it while succeeding in rural Twentieth Century life. Militancy is infrequent on the part of the Crows. Symbolic status striving is difficult to separate from simple class and cultural differences in values. Neuroticism would not only require extensive testing but has also been found to be linked to class rather than to race.¹⁰ Thus, obsessive concern, withdrawal and prejudice toward out-groups were selected because they were deemed to be the strongest and most frequently occurring of the traits. The choice was based upon personal observation of Crow behavior.

¹⁰John L. Honigmann, *Personality in Culture* (Harper and Row Publishers, New York, 1967), p. 357.

CHAPTER III

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

Using the three traits of victimization already discussed, a major and minor hypotheses were tested experimentally.

Major Hypothesis

This hypothesis stated that seventh and eighth grade Crow children would show less withdrawal, less obsessive concern and less prejudice toward out-groups after they had viewed a series of televised lectures on the traits of victimization and on the general topic of prejudice.

Minor Hypothesis

Hypothesis number one stated that a study would show a smaller amount of traits of victimization reaction if he were accompanied (implying support) by two friends than if he were reacting alone, and still less reaction if he were looking on as an uninvolved observer. Thus, the tests would show the strongest reaction score by a single individual, a lesser reaction score if the individual were accompanied by two friends and the smallest reaction score if he were an uninvolved observer.

The second hypothesis stated there was a strong negative relationship between withdrawal tendencies and obsessive concern, a strong negative relationship between withdrawal tendencies and prejudice

toward out-groups, and a strong positive relationship between tendencies toward obsessive concern and prejudice toward out-groups. This hypothesis was strongly implied throughout Allport's book, already cited, in which he stated that obsessive concern and prejudice toward out-groups were part of basically extropunitive personalities and withdrawal was characteristic of basically intropunitive individuals.¹¹

In the first instance the victim blames the outer causes of his handicap; in the second he tends, if not actually to blame himself, at least to take the responsibility upon himself for adjusting to the situation...Every personality is, in fact, a pattern. A single victim of prejudice may display several traits frequently blending some on the extropunitive side with some on the intropunitive.¹²

The names of the entire seventh and eighth grade student body were listed. Every other boy and every other girl was selected for the experimental group. The remainder went into the control group. No attempt was made to make the number of Indian and white children equal in each group. The selection was purely random. The control group did nothing but take the same tests at the same times as the experimental group.

The experimental group watched video taped lectures, each one hour in length, for three days. These lectures were presented by a

¹¹Allport, op. cit., p. 157.

¹²Ibid., p. 156.

Crow Indian who was attending Montana State University. The lecturer was male and all of the students were told he was a Crow.¹³

The day preceding the lectures was devoted to testing both the experimental and the control groups. Another test was given the day after the completion of the lectures to both groups and a third test was given three weeks later to both groups. The final test was designed to check sleeper effects.

Because some of the children had reading difficulties, the questions were read aloud to both groups, care being taken to make each question and answer read like every other question and answer. This appeared to be the only solution under the circumstances even though the procedure is far from ideal.

Each test form consisted of twelve questions with four answers to each question. Each question asked the student to place himself, or himself and two friends, or another person in a situation and to pick whichever of the four answers would come closest to the way he would react to that situation. The four answers were designed to show either obsessive concern, withdrawal, prejudice toward out-groups or neutral, non-scoring behavior.

The girls were given a different form of the test than were the boys. It was, however, different in only one respect. In those

¹³p. H. Tannenbaum, "Initial Attitude Toward Source and Concept as Factors in Attitude Change Through Communication," Public Opinion Quarterly, 1956, Vol. 20, pgs. 413-425.

questions where gender might make a great change in the situation, bringing in interracial dating, etc., which was not originally intended, the situation was equalized by changing the gender. For example, one question asked the student to pretend he was going to a school dance. A Negro student asks to go with him and be introduced around to the other students. The boy's form said it was a Negro boy and the girl's form said it was a Negro girl.

Each time the student took the test he had a different form. The questions and answers were exactly the same except on one form the student was supposed to be accompanied by two friends, on another he is an uninvolved observer seeing someone else react, and in the third situation he is acting alone. One of the questions used on the test was:

1. Pretend you are alone in a drugstore waiting for service.

The clerk is bent down behind the counter putting boxes on a shelf and has not seen you come in. Meanwhile, a blonde woman, in a big hurry, comes in. The clerk looks up and sees you both at the same time. Which of the following are you most likely to do? Choose only one answer.

- A. You wait quietly in the background until the clerk notices you.
- B. You know the clerk will wait on the white woman first so you push past her and tell him you were here first.
- C. Whites always stick together so you wait until the

blond is waited on before you move up to the counter.

D. Since the woman is in such a hurry, you tell the clerk to wait on her first.

Form II would be exactly the same except it would say, "Pretend you and two friends..." and Form III would say, "Pretend John, an American Indian boy, is..."

The experimental and the control groups were each divided into three groups so that each testing period one third of the experimental group and one third of the control group got Form I, and one third of each got Form II and one third of each got Form III. The testing schedule for both the control and the experimental groups looked like this:

	First Test Period	Second Test Period	Third Test Period
Group 1 (E & C)	Form I	Form II	Form III
Group 2 (E & C)	Form II	Form III	Form I
Group 3 (E & C)	Form III	Form I	Form II

14

This procedure was designed to give a certain amount of internal consistency to the test results. If a single form had been given to all the students at the same time and another form at a later test period, the results could be explained as having been a product of either the

¹⁴Dr. Dave Skaar, Department of Zoology and Entomology, Montana State University.

test form or the lectures. Although this test schedule, too, raises problems, they were deemed less troublesome than those mentioned.

The data collected contained the reactions of both Indians and whites since the grades are integrated. The results were examined for each group as a whole, for the Indian group, and for the Indian boys as compared to the Indian girls.

There were twenty-nine in the experimental group and thirty-one in the control group. Although the groups were even to start with, these were the students who completed all three tests. Of the experimental group, nineteen were Indian (nine boys and ten girls), and of the control group twenty-four were Indian (fourteen boys and ten girls).

Before the data are examined, it would be wise to examine the content of the lectures. They will be summarized in order here and the complete text will be found in the Appendix. The first portion of the summary deals, as in the lectures, with prejudice in general; the latter portion deals with the traits of victimization in particular. The reference text was Allport's Nature of Prejudice cited earlier.

Although one usually thinks of prejudice in terms of race, it is usually practiced, as in the past, in terms of religion, nationalism, regionalism (Southerners heap score upon those damned Yankees, for example), political beliefs, sex, class, jobs (in the United States this would be in terms of race, sex and education), and caste. This lecture was intended to desensitize the word prejudice which was used frequently

during the lecture and to broaden the scope of the children's view of the problem to include all of the manifestations of the phenomenon of prejudice.

Prejudice is a normal or usual phenomenon. It is consistent with the human practice of pre-judgment. This means we make up our minds about something before we have to deal with it; it means we make up our minds without really having enough information; and it means we make up our minds without having examined the subject. When carried too far the results are prejudice. Here stereotypes were discussed. Also, the point was made that prejudice can be favorable as well as unfavorable as far as a subject is concerned. In other words, the person will be able to leap to a favorable conclusion without having examined the evidence just like he can leap to a conclusion which isn't favorable without examining the evidence.

People tend to associate with others like themselves because they find it easier to deal with others like themselves, and they are more comfortable when they are in familiar situations. However, if two groups do not go to the trouble to be friendly with each other, they will gradually be unable to talk to each other comfortably, and when problems come up, they will be unable to talk them over and solve them. When two groups do not talk to each other very much, they begin to think the other group is very different from themselves. They begin to misunderstand each other. They begin to be suspicious of each other.

Things which are familiar to use are all wrapped up in our minds with the word "good". After awhile, we may begin to think the things we do are not just good but right. Then we may begin to think that the way we do things is the only way to do things.

In every society on earth the child is regarded as a member of his parents' groups. In the American society a child can escape from some of his parents' groups but not all. These membership groups are called in-groups. The groups which do not belong to a particular in-group are called out-groups. A person can be a member of a lot of in-groups and a lot of out-groups at the same time.

Next, a discussion followed about reference groups, some of which we don't belong to but want to belong to very badly, and some of which we already belong to. People in the out-group act as if they already belonged to this reference group.

Prejudice can take various forms. Some prejudice is only talk, some is discrimination, and some is physical violence.

After a person has met prejudice for any length of time, he will begin to try to protect himself from the hurt he feels. A personality will find defenses compatible with his personality. Some people will appear to be little affected by prejudice; some are tolerant; some will develop a mixture of pleasant and unpleasant personality traits; and some will develop ugly traits to defend themselves because they have been so hurt by prejudice. This latter group almost seems to go through life

seeking prejudice. These ways of reacting are what Gordon Allport calls the traits of victimization.

All of the preceding lecture summary is pared down considerably from the forty-one pages of script geared to seventh and eighth graders. The essence of the lectures, however, is still there.

Because of the small sampling, even though all the seventh and eighth graders at Lodge Grass participated, the simplest and most meaningful form of analysis was deemed to be simple percentage differences between groups, test forms, test periods and sexes. To find the correlations between the three test variables, Spearman's Coefficient of Rank-Order Correlation was used. The formula for this process is:

$$r_s = 1 - \frac{6 (\text{total } D_i^2)}{M (N^2 - 1)}$$

with N being the number of students.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The change in withdrawal scores over time, ratio of change and difference in amount of change between control and experimental groups in withdrawal are shown in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

Table 1

Experiment in Modification of Withdrawal
Change in Withdrawal Scores Over Time

Experimental						
	(E) Time 1		(E) Time 2		(E) Time 3	
HIGH	11	(38%)	6	(21%)	12	(41%)
AVERAGE	12	(41%)	16	(55%)	7	(24%)
LOW	6	(21%)	7	(24%)	10	(35%)
Totals	29		29		29	
Control						
	(C) Time 1		(C) Time 2		(C) Time 3	
HIGH	10	(32%)	5	(16%)	11	(35%)
AVERAGE	15	(49%)	22	(71%)	13	(42%)
LOW	6	(19%)	4	(13%)	7	(23%)
Totals	31		31		31	

Table 2

Ratio of Change

Experimental			
	E ₁ , E ₂	E ₂ , E ₃	E ₁ , E ₃
HIGH	1.81	.51	.93
AVERAGE	.75	2.12	1.7
LOW	.88	.69	.60
Control			
	C ₁ , C ₂	C ₂ , C ₃	C ₁ , C ₃
HIGH	2.0	.46	.91
AVERAGE	.69	1.69	1.16
LOW	1.46	.57	.83

Table 3

Difference in Amount of Change Between Control and
Experimental Groups in Withdrawal

	CE ₁ , CE ₂	CE ₂ , CE ₃	CE ₁ , CE ₃
HIGH	+1.19 (10%)	-.05 (-11%)	-.02 (-2%)
AVERAGE	-.06 (-9%)	-.43 (-25%)	-.54 (-47%)
LOW	+1.58 (+40%)	-.12 (-21%)	+1.23 (+28%)

(† 20% is considered significant)

The number of answers by each student required to gain a high withdrawal score was four or more; average required two-three answers; and low required zero-one answer. This means, for example, on Table 1 that eleven people had high withdrawal scores for Time 1 which is thirty-eight percent of the twenty-nine students.

The amount of decrease expressed in 1.5 to 2.0 is the same magnitude as the amount of increase from .75 to .50. This means that 1.0 means absolutely no change occurred. For example, 32/16 which is expressed as 2.0 is the same magnitude of change as 16/32 which is expressed as .50. For our purposes, anything in these two ranges (1.5 to 2.0 and .75 to .50) will be considered significant.

As noted, the experimental group's high withdrawal scores, although dropping to almost half with a 1.81 ratio went right back to the previous high on the third test period with a ratio of .93 which means there was practically no change between Time 1 and Time 3.

The average withdrawal scores of the experimental group went up slightly between the Time 1 and Time 2 periods; then they dropped considerably from Time 2 to Time 3--a ratio of change of 2.12 as a matter of fact. The drop between Time 1 and Time 3, although less than between Time 1 and Time 2, is still great at 1.7.

The amount of low withdrawal scores in the experimental group increased steadily from Time 1 through Time 3. The low scores had a

ratio between Time 1 and Time 3 of .60. The ratios between Time 2 and Time 3 and between Time 1 and Time 3 are, of course significant.

The control group in comparison dropped exactly half on high withdrawal scores from the first testing period to the second. Then they leaped wildly back up to .46 and finally showed little overall change between Time 1 and Time 3 with a .91 ratio of change. This is similar to the results of the experimental group.

Average withdrawal scores in the control group jumped between Time 1 and Time 2; then they dropped way back down on Time 3, showing a 1.69 ratio between Time 2 and Time 3. While the overall change in average withdrawal scores for the control group was negligible, with a 1.16 ratio between Time 1 and Time 3, the experimental group as noted showed significant change.

The control group's low withdrawal scores decreased from Time 1 to Time 2 at 1.46 ratio; then they jumped back up between Time 2 and Time 3. Finally, however, they showed little overall change between Time 1 and Time 3 with a .83 ratio of change. This is in strong contrast to the experimental group which showed a significant increase in low withdrawal scores and in the ratio of change between Time 2 and Time 3 and between Time 1 and Time 3.

Table 3 shows the difference in the amount of change between the control and the experimental groups over the time periods. Since $\pm$ 20% is here considered to be the level of significance, note that the

HIGH withdrawal scores show little difference between the control and the experimental groups in the amount of change. There is a great difference, however, between the control and the experimental groups as to amount of change of AVERAGE scores. Note the -25% difference in amount of change of Time 2, Time 3 and the -47% of Time 1, Time 3. LOW withdrawal scores show a great difference in amount of change between the experimental and the control groups from Time 1 to Time 2--40%. Likewise, the difference in amount of change between groups on Time 2, Time 3 is significant at -21% and on Time 1, Time 3 at 28%.

To summarize, LOW and AVERAGE scores showed the greatest changes. HIGH withdrawal scores seem to be relatively immune to change.

Since the only variable tested here is the influence of the lectures upon the display of withdrawal, we can safely assume that in this particular case the lectures seem to have had little effect in modifying HIGH withdrawal scores; they lowered AVERAGE withdrawal scores to a significant degree; and they increased the LOW withdrawal scores significantly.

One problem we find in testing this variable is that any two persons who have the same amount of withdrawal tendencies; whether they are due to racial conflict or some other cause, will score the same. So we cannot draw any conclusions about the cause for the withdrawal. This becomes clearer when we remember that the white student population will contaminate the withdrawal results. One would guess that for

these students withdrawal due to racial conflict would be extremely rare.

The key to the changes in withdrawal scores would probably be rewards anticipated. Subjects who made HIGH scores would probably find withdrawal more attractive than anything the lecturer could offer for commitment to action is too frightening. Conversely, subjects who made AVERAGE scores would be more susceptible to change, either to HIGH or LOW. They would find it easier to give up their particular form of behavior for another. Since LOW scores increased, the students probably saw more rewards here; also, this was presented by the lecturer as being the most acceptable form of behavior.

The differences between these scores and those of the total Indian population show how many Indian students scored at the two extremes. The Indians' scores steadily increased in the LOW range so they must have found more rewards inherent in this behavior. Except for a drop on Time 2, the HIGH scores for the Indian population remained about the same.

Table 4

Change in Prejudice Scores Over Time

Experimental			
	(E) Time 1	(E) Time 2	(E) Time 3
HIGH	3 (10%)	6 (20%)	7 (24%)
AVERAGE	10 (35%)	8 (28%)	7 (24%)
LOW	16 (55%)	15 (52%)	15 (52%)
Totals	29	29	29
Control			
	(C) Time 1	(C) Time 2	(C) Time 3
HIGH	2 (6%)	3 (10%)	5 (16%)
AVERAGE	13 (42%)	12 (38%)	8 (26%)
LOW	16 (52%)	16 (52%)	18 (58%)
Totals	31	31	31

Table 5
Ratio of Change

Experimental			
	E ₁ , E ₂	E ₂ , E ₃	E ₁ , E ₃
HIGH	.50	.83	.42
AVERAGE	1.25	1.17	1.47
LOW	1.06	1.00	1.06

Control			
	C ₁ , C ₂	C ₂ , C ₃	C ₁ , C ₃
HIGH	.60	.61	.38
AVERAGE	1.11	1.46	1.61
LOW	1.00	.89	.89

Table 6
Difference in Amount of Change Between Control and
Experimental Groups in Prejudice

	CE ₁ , CE ₂	CE ₂ , CE ₃	CE ₁ , CE ₃
HIGH	+.10 (+17%)	-.22 (-36%)	-.04 (-11%)
AVERAGE	-.14 (-13%)	+.29 (+17%)	+.14 (+9%)
LOW	-.06 (-6%)	-.11 (-12%)	-.17 (19%)

(⁺ 20% is considered significant.)

The number of answers required to gain a high score on prejudice was three or more; average required one or two; and low required zero selections. Although this may seem like a stringent requirement for a low score, Table 4 shows that the majority of students show absolutely no prejudice at all, at least as far as this test can elicit. These students might show prejudice on other tests which asked about groups of different ethnic or religious backgrounds than did this one. Questions on this test included only the possibilities of being biased against whites, Mexicans and Negroes. These groups were chosen because the children would have been most likely to have come into contact with these group members. Had we chosen Jews or Catholics or Navajoes for the question-situations, the results might have been different.

The ranges of 1.5 to 2.0 and from .75 to .38 will be considered significant for this variable.

Students who were HIGH in prejudice in the experimental group at the first test period increased significantly in number during test period two. The increase, once it had occurred, changed relatively little between the two and time three. The AVERAGE experimental scores remained fairly consistent throughout the period.

During the same period the control group's HIGH prejudice scores increased steadily. The AVERAGE scores dropped throughout the testing period until the relationship between Time 1 and Time 3 was a significant 1.61. LOW scores maintained a steady level of 52-58% for no significant change.

Table 6 shows the only significant change between the control and experimental groups to be the increase in HIGH prejudice scores of the control group between Time 2 and Time 3. The overall pattern of the two groups seems to have been the same, although the percentages differ.

The data show the lectures to have had little effect upon the experimental group when it is compared to the control group because of the lack of significant change between the two groups. There is, however, significant change within each group in the HIGH and AVERAGE scores. Both the control and the experimental groups show the same increase in HIGH prejudice scores and the same decrease in AVERAGE prejudice scores. At the same time the LOW prejudice scores maintain their levels.

Interpretation of Data

Because of the small number of students involved, I think the experimental lectures held their content throughout the total sample. The experimental students surely talked about the lectures to their friends in the control group--especially since they were engaged in watching television, a passtime not ordinarily a part of school routine. If these students were going to talk about the lectures, the easiest to understand and the most dramatic or interesting topic would be prejudice. Obsessive concern and withdrawal would be less likely to be topics of

discussion, because obsessive concern in a difficult concept for twelve and thirteen year-olds to discuss and withdrawal is dull.

The lectures undoubtedly brought the topic of prejudice out into the open and made it a legitimate topic for discussion. Discussion has a habit of making participants take positions which they might not have held before, if only because they'd never thought of it. Or discussion might make a position, usually suppressed, seem more legitimate in its expression.

Although there was little change between the control and the experimental groups in their reactions, I think the lectures opened up avenues of thought and expression that were not there before. The students were told about prejudice; they were desensitized as far as the word prejudice was concerned; they were told that prejudice is found in all groups of people; they were given test situations in which they could express prejudice openly and without punishment. There was no social stigma or repercussions because no one would know they had expressed prejudiced feelings. Since the control and the experimental groups both increased so much in prejudice over the testing period, this argument should be considered seriously.

A study done on discrimination might make these ideas clearer. Kutner, Wilkins and Yarrow sent three women to restaurants.¹⁵ One of

¹⁵Kutner, Bernard, Wilkins, Carol and Yarrow, Penny. "Verbal Attitudes and Overt Behavior Involving Racial Prejudice," Journal of and Social Psychology, 1952, Vol. 47, pp. 649-52.

the women was Negro. In each of the eleven restaurants they were served without incident. Then the restaurant was sent a letter asking for reservations and asking if they minded if some black people attended. Seventeen days later a telephone call was made to each restaurant asking for reservations and also mentioning some Negroes would be attending. A control call with no mention of race was made the following day. In most cases they received no reply to their letters. Reactions to the experimental calls were largely negative. Response to the control calls was mainly positive. The authors concluded from this that denying service to a person to his face presented more problems than the managements wanted to cope with so they treated the Negro just as they treated their other patrons. They also concluded that in other situations discrimination would be expressed.

A modification of this interpretation might be that in telling the management that members of the Negro race would be present (something not usually encountered in reservation requirements) and then implying there would be an objection, the researchers have made it only too easy for a man to express any vague feelings of dread by simply refusing or ignoring the request for reservations. The letter writers opened an avenue of thought with a built-in mode of expression that would not ordinarily be present in this business situation. When the Negro woman went to the restaurant in person before the letters and phone calls, she was a visible entity and we have much less fear of the

visible. No vague fears of trouble or objections need surround her. The manager can see what problems she does or does not create. If she creates no problems, he thinks no more about it. In the letters and in the phone calls there was the implication that there could be reason for dread, if only dread of anticipated problems. So we have the visible Negro woman with her glasses, voile dress and middle class manners versus the unfamiliar--the unknown Negro, the stereotype, the symbol, the thing to be dreaded.

Thus, the authors have implied that the restaurant manager could have some objection and have offered him a simple way to express any wariness he might have.

Table 7
Changes in Obsessive Concern Scores Over Time

Experimental			
	(E) Time 1	(E) Time 2	(E) Time 3
HIGH	2 (7%)	6 (20%)	8 (27.5%)
AVERAGE	12 (41%)	8 (28%)	8 (27.5%)
LOW	15 (52%)	15 (52%)	13 (45%)
Totals	29	29	29
Control			
	(C) Time 1	(C) Time 2	(C) Time 3
HIGH	5 (16%)	6 (19%)	4 (12%)
AVERAGE	16 (52%)	12 (39%)	12 (39%)
LOW	10 (32%)	13 (42%)	15 (49%)
Totals	31	31	31

Table 8

Ratio of Change

Experimental			
	E ₁ , E ₂	E ₂ , E ₃	E ₁ , E ₃
HIGH	.35	.73	.25
AVERAGE	1.46	1.02	1.49
LOW	1.00	1.15	1.15
Control			
	C ₁ , C ₂	C ₂ , C ₃	C ₁ , C ₃
HIGH	.84	1.46	1.23
AVERAGE	1.33	1.03	1.37
LOW	.76	.86	.65

Table 9

Difference in Amount of Change Between Control And
Experimental Groups in Obsessive Concern

	CE ₁ , CE ₂	CE ₂ , CE ₃	CE ₁ , CE ₃
HIGH	+.49 (+58%)	+.73 (+50%)	+.98 (+79%)
AVERAGE	-.13 (-9%)	+.01 (+9%)	-.12 (-9%)
LOW	-.24 (-32%)	-.29 (-34%)	-.50 (-77%)

($\pm$ 20% is considered significant)

The number of answers required to gain a HIGH score on obsessive concern was three or more; AVERAGE required one or two; and LOW required zero selections. Again, in spite of this stringent requirement for gaining a LOW score, a large percentage of students scored in the LOW range.

The ranges of 1.5 to 2.0 and from .75 to .25 will be considered significant for this variable.

In the experimental group the HIGH scores increased significantly in number. The overall increase over the testing period was significant at .25. AVERAGE and LOW scores showed no significant change during the testing period.

The only significant change made by the control group was an increase in the number of LOW obsessive concern scores from Time 1 to Time 3. The increase in the number of these scores was steady throughout the testing period.

The difference between the control and the experimental groups on this variable is considerable as Table 9 shows. HIGH obsessive concern scores are significantly different throughout the testing period for the two groups. The difference between the two groups on AVERAGE scores is not great; however, we again are seeing significant differences between the control and experimental groups from Time 1 to Time 3.

The increase in HIGH obsessive concern scores should be expected. Again, as in prejudice, overt discussion of race and interracial tensions

will create sensitivity to the subject. All of the students know that the other students are also aware of the problem, general information about the lectures being known. This awareness creates awkwardness in interpersonal relationships. The students can no longer escape awareness of race and its attendant social complexities. Thus, we have a situation, probably temporary, where the experimental participants are acutely aware of and particularly sensitive to the reactions of their classmates on the problem of racial difficulties. Majority group students would also be aware of possible difficulties and might themselves act in a self-conscious manner; in this case, the concern of the minority group students might be somewhat justified.

We should repeat that the difference between forms had to do with the position in which the student imagined himself in the situation. Form I asked the student to imagine himself acting alone; Form II said he was accompanied by two friends; Form III said he was an uninvolved observer watching someone else react. Remember that the form of the test has nothing to do with any particular time period. All three forms were given at all three testing periods, and each student completed all three forms. This is true for both the control group and the experimental group.

In comparing these forms, 20% is considered a significant difference between forms.

Table 10

Comparison of Test Forms According to Variables
of Withdrawal, Prejudice and Obsessive Concern

Withdrawal			
Experimental			
	Form I	Form II	Form III
HIGH	11 (38%)	9 (31%)	9 (31%)
AVERAGE	10 (34%)	12 (41%)	13 (45%)
LOW	8 (28%)	8 (28%)	7 (24%)
Totals	29	29	29
Control			
	Form I	Form II	Form III
HIGH	8 (26%)	9 (29%)	9 (29%)
AVERAGE	18 (58%)	17 (55%)	15 (48%)
LOW	5 (16%)	5 (16%)	7 (23%)
Totals	31	31	31
Prejudice			
Experimental			
	Form I	Form II	Form III
HIGH	4 (14%)	6 (21%)	6 (21%)
AVERAGE	9 (31%)	7 (24%)	9 (31%)
LOW	16 (55%)	16 (55%)	14 (48%)
Totals	29	29	29

Table 10 Continued. Comparison of Test Forms According to Variables of Withdrawal, Prejudice and Obsessive Concern

Prejudice			
Control			
	Form I	Form II	Form III
HIGH	3 (10%)	3 (10%)	4 (13%)
AVERAGE	11 (35%)	12 (38%)	10 (32%)
LOW	17 (55%)	16 (52%)	17 (55%)
Totals	31	31	31

Obsessive Concern			
Experimental			
	Form I	Form II	Form III
HIGH	5 (17%)	4 (14%)	7 (24%)
AVERAGE	9 (31%)	11 (38%)	8 (28%)
LOW	15 (52%)	14 (48%)	14 (48%)
Totals	29	29	29

Control			
	Form I	Form II	Form III
HIGH	4 (13%)	7 (23%)	4 (13%)
AVERAGE	19 (61%)	10 (32%)	11 (35%)
LOW	8 (26%)	14 (45%)	16 (52%)
Totals	31	31	31

The withdrawal variable shows no significant difference among the forms for either the control or the experimental groups.

The same holds true for prejudice. The experimental group shows no significant difference between forms for obsessive concern, but the control group does show significant differences. The AVERAGE scores on Form I are significantly higher than those for Forms II and III. Conversely, the LOW scores are significantly fewer on Form I than on Form II. Although not of a level of significance, Form II lacks only one point of being twenty percent higher than Form I on the variable. These differences, while mathematically significant, cannot be considered a verification of the hypothesis because the experimental group did not show the same results. I have no explanation to offer for these differences in the data results.

Allport hypothesized that obsessive concern and prejudice against other groups were basically extropunitive, and withdrawal was basically intropunitive. In order to show empirical evidence, we translated this into the hypothesis that obsessive concern and prejudice toward out-groups are negatively related to withdrawal, and the obsessive concern and prejudice are positively related to each other.

Using Spearman's Coefficient of Rank-Order Correlation (see Page 19) the results show little relationship between prejudice toward other groups and withdrawal. The same holds true for the relationship between withdrawal and obsessive concern. There is however, a

significant positive relationship between obsessive concern and prejudice toward out-groups, both in the control and the experimental groups. For the experimental group all three correlations are significant to the .001 level. The only exception in the control group is for Time 1 when the correlation is not significant. Time 2 and Time 3 both show correlations significant to the .01 level.

Table 11
Relationship of Intropunitive to Extropunitive Traits

Experimental			
	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3
PREJ.-WITH.	R=-.18	R=-.27	R=.30
O.C.-PREJ.	R=+.521	R=+.649	R=+.624
WITH.-O.C.	R=-.16	R=+.049	R=+.076
Control			
PREJ.-WITH.	R=+.064	R=-.18	R=-.04
O.C.-PREJ.	R=+.264	R=+.445	R=+.489
WITH.-O.C.	R=-.19	R=-.09	R=-.16

The fact that obsessive concern and prejudice toward out-groups are positively related would tend to support Allport's hypothesis to the extent that they are both probably part of a single personality

type or personality reaction. We cannot determine whether or not they are extropunitive or outwardly directed, but that they are closely related cannot be argued.

Even though we found no negative correlation of any significance between withdrawal and obsessive concern and between withdrawal and prejudice toward out-groups, as we had hypothesized, we can say that, since they are not positively related either, withdrawal is probably not a part of the same personality structure as are obsessive concern and prejudice toward out-groups.

Table 12

Withdrawal Selection by Indians According to Sex

	Male (E)	Female (E)	Male (C)	Female (C)
Time 1				
HIGH	2 (22%)	7 (70%)	5 (36%)	3 (30%)
AVERAGE	3 (33%)	2 (20%)	8 (57%)	4 (40%)
LOW	4 (45%)	1 (10%)	1 (7%)	3 (30%)
Totals	9	10	14	10
Time 2				
HIGH	1 (11%)	2 (20%)	2 (14%)	2 (20%)
AVERAGE	3 (33%)	7 (70%)	10 (72%)	6 (60%)
LOW	5 (56%)	1 (10%)	2 (14%)	2 (20%)
Totals	9	10	14	10
Time 3				
HIGH	4 (44.5%)	4 (40%)	6 (43%)	3 (30%)
AVERAGE	1 (11%)	3 (30%)	5 (36%)	6 (60%)
LOW	4 (44.5%)	3 (30%)	3 (21%)	1 (10%)
Totals	9	10	14	10

Table 13

Withdrawal Selection Over Total Time Period

	Male (E)	Female (E)	Male (C)	Female (C)
HIGH	7 (26%)	13 (43%)	13 (31%)	8 (27%)
AVERAGE	7 (26%)	12 (40%)	23 (55%)	16 (53%)
LOW	13 (48%)	5 (17%)	6 (14%)	6 (20%)
Totals	27	30	42	30

Because of the small sample, differences of 33% will be considered significant for these data concerning the individual time periods. As a reminder, please note these data concern the Indian population only.

Time 1 shows the females of the experimental group with significantly more HIGH scores than did the experimental group males. In contrast, the control group shows no significant differences. When LOW withdrawal scores are examined, the experimental males scores four times as frequently as experimental females. The control group shows no significant differences among the sexes. The experimental females score significantly more in the HIGH range than do control females. The only significant difference between males of the two groups is on the LOW scores where experimental males outnumber control males.

Time 2 shows experimental females scoring more than twice as much than experimental males in the AVERAGE range. Note the significant reversal of this pattern in the LOW scores. Experimental males continue this dominance in LOW scores this time over control males; but the control males score significantly more often in the AVERAGE range. The two groups of females show no significant differences for Time 2.

Time 3 shows no significant differences between either groups or sexes.

The patterns within the experimental and the control groups show a great reduction in number of HIGH scores by experimental females from Time 1 to Time 2. Since they return to a higher level on Time 3, the overall decline, although great, does not reach a level of significance. Experimental males show their greatest number of HIGH scores on Time 3.

Control males drop sharply in the number of HIGH scores on Time 2 but go to a new high on Time 3. Notice that the experimental males maintain a steady LOW score selection, but the control males increase slightly on each testing period. The AVERAGE scores by control males increase on Time 2 but drop again by half on Time 3. The control females show little of importance, clustering slightly at the AVERAGE level.

The total Indian sample (Table 13) will use 20% as the level of significance because of the greater sample size.

No significant difference is apparent for HIGH scores; however, the experimental males show significantly more low scores than do experimental males; experimental males score more at the LOW level than do control males. Both of these reach significance level.

There is another difference between the males of the two groups. The control males show the majority of their scores to be at the AVERAGE level; while the experimental males score their largest percentage, not quite a majority, at the LOW level. The females differ with experimental females tending to emphasize AVERAGE to HIGH scores, and the control females, the majority selecting AVERAGE scores, tend to balance their HIGH and LOW scores.

In Table 14 the experimental group shows some significant changes. HIGH scores drop sharply on Time 2 but rise again to their former level on Time 3. The opposite pattern is true for the AVERAGE scores. LOW scores show a small but steady increase, although they never change enough to reach a significance level.

The control group shows the same pattern on their HIGH scores by dropping on Time 2 then rising to a new high on Time 3. This pattern never reaches significance level, however. AVERAGE scores show a rise but drop back on Time 3. The LOW scores are constant. The control group scores significantly higher than the experimental group on AVERAGE scores both for Time 1 and Time 3. The two groups differ significantly on LOW scores also with the experimental group being

significantly higher on Time 3.

Table 14

Withdrawal Selection by Total Indian Population

Experimental		Control
Time 1		
HIGH	9 (47%)	8 (33%)
AVERAGE	5 (26.5%)	12 (50%)
LOW	5 (26.5%)	4 (17%)
Totals	19	24
Time 2		
HIGH	3 (16%)	4 (17%)
AVERAGE	10 (53%)	16 (66%)
LOW	6 (31%)	4 (17%)
Totals	19	24
Time 3		
HIGH	8 (42%)	9 (38%)
AVERAGE	4 (21%)	11 (45%)
LOW	7 (37%)	4 (17%)
Totals	19	24

Significance level is 20%.

Table 15 shows the total withdrawal selections by the Indian population. Again with the 20% significance level, the control group scores much higher in the AVERAGE range. Notice how evenly distributed the experimental group's withdrawal scores are. Each range garners approximately the same percentage. The control group's pattern of selection is much more disparate. The AVERAGE level reaps the majority of selections with HIGH next. LOW has the smallest number of selections.

Table 15

Withdrawal Selection Over Total Time Period

	Experimental	Control
HIGH	20 (35%)	21 (29%)
AVERAGE	19 (33%)	39 (54%)
LOW	18 (32%)	12 (17%)
Total	57	72

The experimental females show a significant drop in their HIGH withdrawal scores, and since this pattern is not repeated by the control females, the conclusion may be drawn that the lectures were the cause of the change. This assumption is made in spite of the fact that the experimental females went back up three weeks later on Time 3. This could be and probably is the result of the well-known "sleeper

effect." The hypothesized change did occur, for Time 3 scores did not reach the former high level.

Experimental males finished the testing period with more HIGH scores, but so did control males. This might be explained as being the result of a general sensitization to the problem by the males, but if this is so, it would seem likely that the same phenomenon would occur among the females. It did not. The only explanation for these data would seem to be that extremes will tend to meet. The experimental males show considerably fewer HIGH scores than do the experimental females; they become aware of the enormous complexities involved in interracial interaction, thus becoming more withdrawn (we are still talking about the group, not about individual reactions). The experimental females, already highly withdrawn, see the problems inherent in their withdrawal and show fewer high scores. Thus, do the extremes within a range meet. This is further substantiated when HIGH scores for Time 3 are examined. This is further substantiated when HIGH scores for Time 3 are examined. Although on Time 1, there is a 40% difference between the males and the females, on Time 3 there is only 4 1/2% difference.

Discussion concerning LOW scores is difficult. We have the experimental females tending over time to increase in LOW scores but the sample is so small as to make generalizations difficult. The experimental males started out with numerous LOW scores and ended with

the same amount. The control males follow approximately the same pattern as experimental females. Control females are the only group to decrease in number of LOW scores. Since the males have a much greater percentage of LOW withdrawal scores than do the females, we would assume there is a greater desire on their part to act in a situation rather than remain passive. This of course does not mean that their assessment of the situation is correct, only that they would desire to be active. Girls would not necessarily feel this to be a part of their desired behavior pattern. They would not feel the same loss in self-esteem which a boy would feel if he did not act. Substantiation of this idea is apparent in the number of LOW selections by males (72%) compared with AVERAGE (81%) and HIGH (57%). The females show a far different pattern with LOWs garnering 37%, AVERAGEs 93% and HIGHs 70%.

Tables 14 and 15 shows the HIGH pattern over time for both groups to be similar. The LOW pattern is different. The LOW scores did increase, if not significantly, for the experimental group while the control group changed not a whit. Even though the contrast is not great we can infer that the lectures had some small effect.

An interesting state of affairs is revealed by Table 15. The experimental group has distributed itself evenly over the three ranges while the control group shows significant differences between the ranges. This would seem to indicate an overall polarization of attitudes by the experimental group. It is siphoning off selections from the

AVERAGE range. Therefore, the lectures seem to have made attitudes about withdrawal more definite on the part of the experimental group; the students have although perhaps not consciously, found withdrawal to be either a more valuable form of behavior than they had before or a less valuable one.

Table 16
Prejudice Selection by Indians According to Sex

	Male (E)	Female (E)	Male (C)	Female (C)
	Time 1			
HIGH	2 (22%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	2 (20%)
AVERAGE	4 (45%)	4 (40%)	6 (43%)	4 (40%)
LOW	3 (33%)	5 (50%)	8 (57%)	4 (40%)
Totals	9	10	14	10
	Time 2			
HIGH	4 (45%)	1 (10%)	1 (7%)	2 (20%)
AVERAGE	2 (22%)	5 (50%)	4 (29%)	5 (50%)
LOW	3 (33%)	4 (40%)	9 (64%)	3 (30%)
Totals	9	10	14	10
	Time 3			
HIGH	3 (33%)	2 (20%)	2 (14%)	2 (20%)
AVERAGE	2 (22%)	5 (50%)	3 (22%)	4 (40%)
LOW	4 (45%)	3 (30%)	9 (64%)	4 (40%)
Totals	9	10	14	10

The level of significance for Table 16 is 33%. Using this criterion we find no significant differences for Time 1 and Time 3 between females and males of either group, males of either group, or females of either group.

Time 2 does show significant differences, however. The experimental males show a higher percentage of HIGH scores than do experimental females. The control males are significantly higher on LOW scores than control females. The experimental males show more HIGH scores than do control males. All other comparisons show no significant differences.

Table 17's level of significance is 20%. Many more experimental males select HIGH ranges than do control males; however, the control males score significantly higher in the LOW range. The females do not differ significantly. Experimental males show many more HIGH scores than experimental females. The control males select LOW prejudice answers more often than do control females.

Table 17

Prejudice selection Over Total Time Period

	Male (E)	Female (E)	Male (C)	Female (C)
HIGH	9 (33%)	4 (13%)	3 (7%)	6 (20%)
AVERAGE	8 (30%)	14 (47%)	13 (31%)	13 (43%)
LOW	10 (37%)	12 (40%)	26 (62%)	11 (37%)
Total	27	30	42	30

Patterns concerning the selection of HIGH or LOW prejudice answers are hard to find and none that can be found are significant.

Some patterns or differences can be found in the total group selections in Table 17. The experimental males show significantly more HIGH selections than do control males and control males show significantly more LOW selections. Note the even distribution of ranges for experimental males on this variable too. Females show little difference.

Table 18

Prejudice Selection by Total Indian Population

	Experimental	Control
	Time 1	
HIGH	3 (16%)	2 (8%)
AVERAGE	8 (42%)	10 (42%)
LOW	8 (42%)	12 (50%)
Totals	19	24
	Time 2	
HIGH	5 (26%)	3 (13%)
AVERAGE	7 (37%)	9 (37%)
LOW	7 (37%)	12 (50%)
Totals	19	24
	Time 3	
HIGH	5 (25%)	4 (17%)
AVERAGE	7 (37%)	7 (29%)
LOW	7 (37%)	13 (54%)
Totals	19	24

Table 19

Prejudice Selection Over Total Time Period

	Experimental	Control
HIGH	13 (23%)	9 (13%)
AVERAGE	22 (38.5%)	26 (36%)
LOW	22 (38.5%)	37 (51%)
Totals	57	72

Both Tables 18 and 19 use 20% as the level of significance. Neither the control nor the experimental group differs from one another significantly. There does seem to be a slight increase in HIGH scores overall for both groups. LOWs remain fairly constant. The control group shows a much more varied picture of selections (Table 19) than does the experimental group.

It appears that prejudice toward out-groups is a variable which won't be influenced or changed easily. The objective approach of the lectures seems to have had little real effect upon the Indian population. If anything, the lectures increased the selection of HIGH scores. Some of this, of course, can be reaction to the topic "prejudice" itself.

Table 17 shows a somewhat clearer picture of the effect of the lectures. The experimental males differ considerably from the control males. Again we see a kind of polarization on the part of the

experimental group. This effect is not apparent with the females.

Table 18 gives the impression that whatever changes the experimental group made cancelled each other out. Some note should be made of the fact that the control group maintains a consistent majority in the LOW range.

As we mentioned above, Table 19 shows the experimental group polarizing again. This is not surprising with a variable as explosive as prejudice.

Table 20

Obsessive Concern Selection By Indians According to Sex

	Male (E)	Female (E)	Male (C)	Female (C)
Time 1				
HIGH	1 (11%)	1 (10%)	1 (7%)	2 (20%)
AVERAGE	6 (67%)	4 (40%)	9 (64%)	5 (50%)
LOW	2 (22%)	5 (50%)	4 (29%)	3 (30%)
Totals	9	10	14	10
Time 2				
HIGH	3 (33%)	2 (20%)	3 (21%)	1 (10%)
AVERAGE	2 (22%)	4 (40%)	7 (50%)	4 (40%)
LOW	4 (45%)	4 (40%)	4 (29%)	5 (50%)
Totals	9	10	14	10
Time 3				
HIGH	3 (33%)	3 (30%)	2 (14%)	2 (20%)
AVERAGE	2 (22%)	5 (50%)	7 (50%)	3 (30%)
LOW	4 (45%)	2 (20%)	5 (36%)	5 (50%)
Totals	9	10	14	10

Table 21

Obsessive Concern Selection Over Total Time Period

	Male (E)	Female (E)	Male (C)	Female (C)
HIGH	7 (26%)	6 (20%)	6 (14%)	5 (17%)
AVERAGE	10 (37%)	13 (43%)	23 (55%)	12 (40%)
LOW	10 (37%)	11 (37%)	13 (31%)	13 (43%)
Totals	27	30	42	30

Table 20 has a level of significance of 33 percent.

Obsessive concern among the Indian population shows not a single instance of significant difference among control or experimental groups, among males, or among females.

The same holds true for Table 21 total obsessive concern selections are tabulated with a significance level of 20 percent.

If patterns are considered within the groups, the only significant change is for the experimental males when they drop in the number of AVERAGE scores on Time 2.

Table 22

Obsessive Concern Selection by Total Indian Population

Experimental			Control	
Time 1				
HIGH	2	(10%)	3	(13%)
AVERAGE	10	(53%)	14	(58%)
LOW	7	(37%)	7	(29%)
Total	19		24	
Time 2				
HIGH	5	(27%)	4	(17%)
AVERAGE	6	(31%)	11	(45%)
LOW	8	(42%)	9	(38%)
Total	19		24	
Time 3				
HIGH	6	(31.5%)	4	(16%)
AVERAGE	7	(37%)	10	(42%)
LOW	6	(31.5%)	10	(42%)
Total	19		24	

Table 23

Obsessive Concern Selection Over Total Time Period

	Experimental	Control
HIGH	13 (23%)	11 (15%)
AVERAGE	23 (40%)	35 (49%)
LOW	21 (37%)	26 (36%)
Total	57	72

Using 20 percent as the level of significance for Table 22, we find no significant differences between the control and the experimental groups.

Within the experimental group we have some differences. They show a significant increase in HIGH obsessive concern scores from Time 1 to Time 3. There is also a significant decrease in AVERAGE scores from Time 1 to Time 2.

Table 23 shows no significant difference between the two groups.

The only real effect the lectures seem to have had upon the Indian population is to increase the frequency of HIGH selections. Discussion of the problem obviously makes it more sensitive but the experimental group either did not understand or did not accept the lecture discussion about the problems inherent in obsessive concern. In all fairness, we must admit that even if students understand the

problems associated with obsessive concern, they will probably not equate the degree of their own concern as being high enough to be called obsessive. In other words, they probably see their concern as being justified and would not connect it with obsessive concern.

It would appear that it is impossible to effect much change in the Indian population on this variable except in an undesirable direction.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Prejudice, it seems, is exacerbated by discussion, if only momentarily. The factual presentation of the material dealing with prejudice and discrimination did nothing to alleviate prejudiced feelings or expressions. Indeed, the presentation seemed to increase the overt expression of prejudiced attitudes. Suddenly all of the students are aware that all of the other students are aware. This was, after all, not a large group of people. The awareness may be vaguely defined even nebulous but it makes for self-consciousness and stilted interaction between groups. Probably, many students felt themselves freer to express their prejudiced feelings because it was an open topic for discussion. Others might be inordinately careful of what they would say, resulting in stiff and uneasy interaction with persons of the other group. Those who have a tendency to see prejudice everywhere might feel their perceptions to be validated by the televised presentation. They would also find validation in the changed interaction they see between the other students. Since seventh and eighth graders tend to be self-conscious and image-conscious anyway, discussion of group differences could make for increased insecurity and an even greater reliance upon familiar defense mechanisms.

Another difficulty arises in terms of the rewards offered for changes in behavior. Because the lectures were not persuasive in

nature, the students had to decide for themselves what rewards might be secured by a behavior change. If they could understand what the reward might be, they were left with the fact that the reward was intangible at best. What is so rewarding about maybe getting along with some ill-defined someone at some imperceptible future date? Are the rewards even real?

Not only are the rewards intangible, they may also be in conflict with the cultural values of the minority group member. The pre-dominant attitude of the minority group may make some changes hard to achieve. For example, what Majority Man regards as desirable--tolerance--may be regarded as Uncle Tomism by Minority Man. Thus, the minority group member might see more immediate rewards in eliminating the expression of tolerance.

Still another hinderance to modifying behavior is that the early teenage years seem to be particularly difficult ones when dealing with inter-personal relationships. The child at this age may be trying so hard to establish his own identity that he can't cope with the problem of really relating to others. He may, as so many people do, feel always that he is stage center, under scrutiny. He may be unable to perceive that others feel that way also. His self-consciousness or self-absorption may be so strong that he can only see the other person in terms of physical appearance, habits, speech patterns, behavior, popularity, and wielders of power. He may not perceive the other's

individuality, needs and defenses. Witness the number of girls and immature women who when asked what kind of men they want to marry, mention height, color of hair and eyes, ability to dance and perhaps his job or position on the football team. These are not girls who see someone as an individual in his own right.

Even if these difficulties were not present, it would probably be impossible to eliminate undesirable traits of victimization on a group basis. Undoubtedly, a student would have difficulty in identifying a particular trait as belonging to himself. He sees others with that trait but he knows that, "I'm different; my reaction is correct." So much of Minority Man's behavior is based on real rather than imagined experiences with prejudice that it would be difficult to downgrade his perception of the situation. Also, we have asked a person to change a part of his personality, a part that may be vital to maintaining his self-image. His way of dealing with a particular situation may be the only way available to him without his undergoing individual analysis and a re-orienting of his behavior.

Experimental situations tend to place the human participants in the role of wayward but mechanical pieces to be moved at will if the proper stimulus and reward are offered. If we try to eliminate the crutch of obsessive concern might we indeed be taking a necessary prop from under a functioning personality? The person may need to feel it's his race or religion that's to blame and not himself. Individual therapy

might replace the crutch with something more functional but the group experimental situation cannot. When we categorize Minority Man we begin to ascribe behavior to a category. This is presumptuous. Each member of the minority group is an individual reacting to a situation which he understands as well as any individual can. To label his behavior as being made up of traits due to status or discrimination is fine for textbook discussion, but is not particularly helpful when dealing with the individual. Until he is no longer a victim of prejudice perhaps we cannot expect him to cease defending himself. He can also argue with justification that it is difficult if not impossible to separate traits due to victimization from those traits an individual might normally exhibit simply because of the type personality he has. Again, he could argue that the defenses are also found to be a part of the behavior of Majority Man, if in differing degree.

We have come full circle. The original purpose behind the experiment was to build a bridge to better understanding and ease tensions between groups. But to build the bridge we tried to mold individuals into formula shapes to fit the structure. Just a little change here, a little change there and things would work smoothly. The value of a human is found in his Self--whatever that Self may be--and not in an ability to be molded into frictionless anonymity.

APPENDIX A

LECTURE I

Today we are beginning a series of lectures which should be of great interest to you. The lectures will be concerned with prejudice. Prejudice is a state of mind which occurs in all human groups in all areas of the world. There are no exceptions.

Some of you will have run into prejudice in your lifetime, others will not. No matter how experienced you are in this area, I think you will find out some things you didn't know.

When I mentioned the word prejudice, you probably got a sinking feeling in the pit of your stomach and you didn't want the word mentioned. It is an ugly word with ugly meanings attached to it.

The first thing we think of in connection with prejudice is race. Almost all of us think of prejudice in terms of race these days. We think of prejudice against the Negroes, against the Chinese, against the Indians, and against the Mexicans. Actually, thinking of racial prejudice is relatively new in man's long history. It is only about one hundred years old.

Throughout all of man's history, prejudice has usually been practiced in regard to religion. For example, one of the oldest existing prejudices in the world is forced upon the Jews. Although many people have thought of the Jews as a race, they are not. They are found in every country in the world and are found in many races in the world. An example of this is Sammy Davis, Jr., the entertainer who is American, Negro, and Jew. A Jew is a person who holds a distinct religion. This religion has made him the victim of prejudice around the world.

One of the groups which has been prejudiced against the Jews in times past is the Catholic Church. This is, however, no longer true. The Catholic Church has gone to great lengths to remove this prejudice. What is interesting about this is that the Catholic religion is itself a victim of prejudice. As late as 1960, many people would not vote for President John F. Kennedy because he was a Catholic. It was often said that the United States would never have a Catholic President.

In Boston, a priest of the Roman Catholic Church was driving along a lonesome road on the outskirts of the city. Seeing a small Negro boy walking along, the priest told his chauffeur to stop and give the boy a lift. Seated together in the back of the limousine, the

priest, to make conversation asked, "Little boy, are you a Catholic?" The boy's eyes grew large and he replied, "No sir, it's bad enough being colored without being one of those things."

Of course, the Jews and the Catholics are not the only people whose religions make them objects of prejudice. People are prejudiced against the Mormons; they are prejudiced against the Jehovah's Witnesses; they're prejudiced against the Quakers; the list is endless. It is certain that if you are a member of a religion, someone is going to be prejudiced against you.

But race and religion are not the only areas where prejudice grows. People are prejudiced against people from other nations. The Chinese hate the Japanese, and the Japanese hate the Chinese; the Polish hate the Ukrainians; the Germans hate the Polish; the Americans hate the Russians and the Russians hate the Americans.

It is interesting how our prejudices change to fit the changing times. During the potato famines in Ireland, many Irish came to America. Here they were hated, were refused jobs, housing and all the other forms prejudice takes. Now we have St. Patrick's Day and all the Irish march in the St. Patrick's Day parade in New York City to the sound of cheers.

During World War II, the Russians were our allies against the Germans and we looked at them with friendly eyes. Now we regard them as enemies and look at them with prejudice. The same thing happened with the Japanese. During the war we called them "nips" and talked about them with ugly words. Now we talk about them as friends and allies. The people haven't changed but the world situation has changed, so we regard them in different ways.

Much of the world is no anti-American. People say we are money-hungry and power-mad. Many people around the world think all Americans are rich and are living in a state of luxury. At one time in the West Indies, whenever an American walked down the street the people held their noses. So the prejudices change and go on.

No only are people from different countries discriminated against and are victims of prejudice but people with the same country are victims of prejudice according to the area in which they live.

It is currently fashionable to say that racism in America is found only in the deep South. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The Easterner sees the far west as being made up of cowboys on ranches and Indians in teepees. Their image of us is that seen on television

programs. However, you know how different our west is from the image the easterners have of us. These prejudices can be funny or hurting depending upon the seriousness of the situation.

Another kind of prejudice concerns one's political beliefs. Republicans think the Democrats are leading the country to ruin and Democrats think the Republicans live in the Middle Ages. The current fear in the United States is Communism. If you don't like what someone says, you say he is a communist. In the 1950's in this country, all anyone had to do was call you a communist in public and you could be fired from your job and regarded with suspicion. The famous McCarthy hearings in Washington, D.C. branded many people as communist without proof. Prejudice was widespread.

One of the oldest and most widespread areas of prejudice concerns one's sex. In every country of the world, women are regarded to some degree as being inferior. In some countries they are treated much the same as cattle. In contrast, many people regard American men as being dominated by American women.

One of the areas of greatest prejudice, although it is not often talked about in the United States, is class discrimination and prejudice. Most people select friends from their own social class and think those in a lower income bracket are inferior. We build or buy houses in areas with people who have the same kind of education and make about the same amount of money as we do. For example, in the South people who are in the middle income bracket look down at the lower income bracket and the lower income bracket looks down at the "poor white trash." All over America social clubs are based on this standard. There are clubs which accept only millionaires; there are clubs which accept only businessmen. Many union-men won't associate with non-union men. Class bias is widespread.

In connection with this is bias concerning jobs. Many businessmen will not be friends with janitors. Many professors are suspicious of business people. People in show business are looked at with suspicion and they are often regarded as inferior. People don't trust politicians. For many years people wouldn't associate with undertakers. And everyone hates the hippies.

One sort of bias does not exist in America but is important elsewhere--primarily India. This is caste prejudice. In India people are born into a caste and remain in that caste throughout their lives. For example, you might be born in the "Untouchable" caste. If you are an untouchable, you must do all the dirty work; and no other caste will

associate with you. Hopefully, this is slowly changing in India.

There is also prejudice based on individual differences. For example, many people are afraid of the mentally ill person or see the moron as being not quite human. These things though, have to do with individuals rather than with groups, so we will not be discussing this area of bias further in these lectures.

You can see quite clearly, I hope, that prejudice is widespread and includes all kinds of groupings. As we said earlier, we have race prejudice, religious prejudice, prejudice according to countries and areas within a single country, political prejudice, sex bias, class bias, job bias, and caste bias. All countries have prejudice. All times past and present have had prejudice. Our next lecture will concern itself with how prejudice comes about and how it works.

LECTURE II

When we deal with prejudice, no matter what kind it is, racial, religious, or class prejudice, we find to our surprise that we are dealing with something normal, normal to you, normal to me, normal to almost everyone on earth. Prejudice is made up of the normal way of thinking called pre-judgment. Pre-judgment means that we make up our minds about something before we have to deal with it. It means we make up our minds without really having enough information. It means we make up our minds about something without ever having examined the subject. So here we have a normal reaction to something which, when carried too far, results in prejudice.

Let's look at pre-judgment a little closer. For example, suppose you are at the finals of the state basketball tournament. Your team has to beat Roundup and you will win the state championship. Your team runs out onto the floor and the first quarter you lead by twenty-two points. Then suddenly, in the fourth quarter, your team begins to stumble around and they slow down. They don't jump up for rebounds very often and just plain act careless. Chances are pretty good you'll boo and be very angry. Perhaps you'll say your team just gave the game away. Or you'll say they got overconfident. Or you'll call them a bunch of jerks. If you really get mad you may say they were bought off! All of these reactions have been normal--natural--human reactions. They have also been pre-judgments. You haven't known all the facts. You've not examined the situation carefully. After the tournament is over you find out that your team drank some bad water and that they'd suddenly gotten sick during the fourth quarter. They'd had the shakes and double vision and they couldn't run very well. Now you know the facts. They hadn't been bought off or been careless or overconfident. They'd just been sick.

Can you see now how normal pre-judgement is?

Let's take another example. Suppose I tell you my cousin Sam is coming for a visit and he's an All-state high school Football player. Immediately you are going to get a mental picture of Sam. You are going to jump to several conclusions about him. You probably decide he's bound to be big--after all, most football players are big. Then you think maybe he's dumb. Then you decide he's popular with the girls. Here we have three pre-judgments. An All-state football player is big, dumb and popular with the girls.

Then you meet Sam. In fact--he's little; he's a genius; the girls hate him because he has bad breath! These are the facts. How in the world did Sam ever get to be an All-state football player? Well, originally Sam came from England where he learned to kick the football soccer-style and he can kick the football 45 years everytime. So, now we know, Sam's the All-state field goal kicker.

Coming to conclusions without enough evidence and without examining the situation carefully are normal ways of thinking as you can now see.

What does pre-judgment have to do with prejudice? Well, exactly the same thing occurs when someone is prejudiced against a group of people. For example, when someone mentions the word Negro you automatically jump to some conclusions and you have a picture of a Negro in your minds. Some of your conclusions will be true while others will not. You probably first think that a Negro is black. This is not necessarily true. Many people who identify themselves as Negro are white skinned or a very pale brown. This is because some of their ancestors were white and they have inherited the light colored skin.

Maybe you next decide the Negro has curly hair. Again this is not always true. Many Negroes have stright hair.

Well, you argue, at least you know that Negroes are known to have a great sense of rhythm and are great tap dancers. Look at the Negroes on television who play in bands and sing and tap dance. This, too, is prejudgment. Negroes have never been proved to have any better sense of rhythm or ability to dance than anyone else. The reason they are seen doing these things on television so often is that this is one of the few kinds of work they are allowed to do where they don't meet so much prejudice.

When we jumped to conclusions about Negroes a minute ago, even though we didn't say anything bad about them, our thinking was prejudiced. Whenever we think about a single person only in terms of a group we are thinking with prejudice. We are not giving the one person a chance to be judged by his own individual personality. Even if we think only good things about him as long as we think about him in terms of a group we are prejudiced. We are using pre-judgment.

Suppose you are sent to New York City to go to school. What will happen to you if your classmates see you as an Indian rather than as you, yourself, a person. Maybe everything they think is very flattering and good. They see you as a noble Indian. They think you can

tan deer hides beautifully. They think you can do beadwork on deer-skin costumes. They think you are a great hunter and tracker and bare-back rider. They think you have a noble profile. They think you never talk.

Everything they think about you is wonderful. But can you imagine what you'd feel like with all these wonderful labels pinned on you? What happens if you, a single individual personality, love to talk, like the Beatles, like to gossip, don't know how to do beadwork and couldn't track an animal if you tried? You are having a bad time because people think about you in terms of a group rather than in terms of you, a person.

So we can see that people are prejudiced when they think in terms of a group rather than in terms of a single person, no matter how good their thoughts may be.

Now we can see that people think in pre-judgments, they jump to conclusions. This leads to prejudice. Since this is a normal, natural way of thinking, prejudice is hard to overcome. This is why getting rid of prejudice is such hard work.

All of this pre-judgment, as I have said, comes about because human beings think about things in groups or categories. A category is used here to mean a group of things which seem to us to be related to each other. We must think in categories in order to think effectively about our world, and in order to act sensibly in a situation.

Suppose, for example, a dog, foaming at the mouth, comes running down the street toward you. You sensibly decide he's a mad dog and get out of his way. You have seen what he looks like and what he acts like and have lumped him in a category - mad dog. Suppose you hadn't lumped him in a category? What would have happened? You might have continued walking toward him. Maybe you get curious about why he's foaming at the mouth so you take him by the collar and open his mouth and look down his throat. This is hardly sensible behavior.

A million things happen to us everyday and we have to learn to group them in categories.

When we think in categories or groups, we are being normal but we are not necessarily being correct. Perhaps the mad dog we were talking about before wasn't really mad at all. Maybe he'd just eaten a tube of Mint-Flavored toothpaste he'd found in the trash.

Or as another example, suppose a policeman is riding down the street in his squad car and sees a young Indian boy hanging on to a lamp post. The policeman assumes the boy is drunk and arrests him. He has thought in terms of a category. Then he finds out that the boy hasn't been drinking at all; in fact, the boy is suffering from acute appendicitis.

Or, again, suppose a young white teacher moves to a reservation to teach the children in the first grade. She won't let her own two first grade twins play with the Indian children and teaches them at home herself. All of the adults of the community immediately say she is prejudiced. Then they find out she knows that fifty percent of the Indian community suffers from tuberculosis. She is simply afraid her children might get the disease.

These instances are used to point out that categories are not always correct. Chances are that the dog was really mad; the boy was really drunk; the teacher was really prejudiced. But then again, maybe they weren't. Don't trust categories too much.

LECTURE III

Human beings are like other species of living things on earth in that they have always played with people like themselves, eaten with others like themselves, and lived with others like themselves. This means nothing more than, they find it easier to deal with others like themselves. In other words, we are saying it is easier to associate with others like our selves, it is not necessarily best.

We find it easier to talk to people who talk about the same things we do. For example, you probably spend most of your time talking to other teenagers. You may say adults just don't understand. What you are really saying is that it's just too much trouble trying to explain things to adults. When you and your friends talk about history class being a drag, you all know exactly what you mean. If you say the same thing to an adult, he may ask you what you mean.

Now suppose you were talking to a young teenager from China. After awhile, the accent and customs of this person would prove tiring and you'd have little in common. In this case, you'd probably rather talk to another American even if he did happen to be an adult; it would just be less trouble.

For the reasons we've just given, members of minority groups often remain separate from members of the majority group because it is easier. The minority group members can speak their own language and they don't have to be conscious of minding their manners. They can be comfortable. We all worry in social situations that we might do something wrong. If we are dealing with people like ourselves, we worry about it less and feel more comfortable.

A group of teenagers was studied by some scientists not too long ago as to their dating habits and as to who their friends were. This particular group consisted of Negroes, Chinese, Japanese and whites. Not too surprisingly, it was found that the teenagers preferred to be friends with, and date, people like themselves. What was somewhat surprising was that the teenagers from minority groups were less willing to associate with students from other groups than were the white teenagers. Apparently, these students found it easier and more comfortable to date, and be friends with, others in their own group.

Up till now, we've been talking about a natural, normal, convenient separateness. But we must remember that although this is an

easier way of doing things, it can lay the foundation for prejudice. If two groups do not go to the trouble to be friendly with each other, they will gradually be unable to talk to each other comfortably and when problems come up, as they always do, they will be unable to talk them over and solve them. When two groups do not talk to each other very much, they begin to think the other group is very different from themselves. They begin to misunderstand each other. They begin to be suspicious of each other.

Once people begin to get suspicious of each other, you'll find prejudice developing.

We've been talking about feeling comfortable. You know, although you may not have thought much about it, the things which are familiar to you are all wrapped up in your mind with the word good. The way your mother cooks is GOOD; your family's customs and habits are GOOD; your race and country is GOOD. This is a strange thing about people, all people, the things with which they are familiar and comfortable are not just familiar and comfortable, they are GOOD. If you eat Indian bread everyday you don't say, "Boy, is this bread familiar." You say, "Boy, is this bread good!" If you drink cokes everyday, you don't say that cokes are familiar, you say cokes are good. If your father raises pigs in a certain way, you don't say it's his way of raising pigs, you say it's the RIGHT way to raise pigs. If a new student comes to your school from another town and dances in a strange way you've never seen, you don't say "Well, that's just his way of dancing." you say, "Man, is he square!" He's not with it. He's not dancing right. After awhile, the familiar way becomes the good way, and the RIGH way and then the ONLY way.

It should be clear why groups of people have so much trouble getting along. Just as you think the way you do things is the right way, the good way, so does everyone else think that the way he does things is the right way, the only way.

Naturally, since we see our way of life as being good we also see ourselves as being good. Hardly anybody ever wants to really be someone else. No matter how handicapped or unhappy he is, he still wants to be himself. He wants his life improved but it is his life he wants improved; he rarely wants to actually change places with anyone else. Maybe you'd like to be one of the Beatles. Now, chances are, you don't want to be Ringo, John, Paul or George. You want to be a member of the Beatles as yourself. You want the girls to adore you and faint when you walk into a room and you want the millions of dollars they've earned. But you still want to be you. You may say you envy someone

but rarely do you want to be that someone; instead you want some of his possessions or some of his popularity for yourself.

For example, Buffy St. Marie is an Indian singer from Canada. She is beautiful and talented and makes lots of money. If Carol Burnett says she envys Buffy, what she means is that she wishes she were as beautiful and as attractive to men as Miss St. Marie is. She doesn't really want to be Miss St. Marie.

Or another example; it is hard to be a Negro in the United States today. There is extreme prejudice against the Negroes. But a Negro teenager doesn't usually want to be white, he just wants to be accepted as easily and upon the same basis as a white teenager.

LECTURE IV

There is one fact which seems to be true of every human being. This fact is: In every society on earth the child is regarded as a member of his parents' groups. This means he belongs to the same race, the same stock, the same family tradition, the same religion, the same caste (if he is born in a nation which has castes), and the same job status as his parents.

Our society, which in spite of its ugly prejudices, is one of the most open in the world, a person can escape from some of his parents' group memberships but not all. Let us take a specific example. Irvin is a young colored boy whose father didn't ever go to school. His father brings home a regular paycheck from his job as a janitor. The family rarely goes on vacations; instead, for recreation they go to a baseball game or to the movies. The whole family is very religious and go to the Baptist church every Sunday. They live in a poor ghetto in New York City. Irvin cannot escape his parents' membership in the group called Negro because he is very dark. But he goes to high school and graduates. He immediately joins the navy where he is trained to work in an airplane control tower. When his tour of duty in the navy is over, Irvin comes back to the United States and gets a job as a control tower operator in California. He marries another high school graduate and they buy a small home in the suburbs. Irvin has escaped the group membership his parents had of lower class. He is now middle class. He takes a vacation once a year so he has broken with his family tradition of not going on vacations. He reads books once in awhile and subscribes to a magazine. This also helps him escape family tradition.

Since Irvin and his wife rarely go to church, he is no longer a part of his parents' group membership as Baptists. Irvin is in many basic respects still a part of his family's groups, the groups he was born into. But he is also now a member of different groups. His son in turn will be a member of all the Irvin's groups, until he, too, will escape some of them.

Another example is Sam. Sam is a white boy whose father is a dentist. Sam's father and mother are both college educated and they live in a nice white house in Billings. Sam's father belongs to several clubs and the whole family spends a months vacation in Hawaii each year. So Sam belongs to his parents' groups. He is white, he is surrounded by comfortable living, he rarely goes to church, and he is a member of the upper class. When Sam is sixteen he runs away from home to join a carnival. He learns to be a hawker at the fat lady's sideshow. He

marries a carnival girl when he is eighteen and later buys the fat lady's show. Sam is still a part of his parents grouping of white; he is now a member of the lower class; his family tradition is now different because he no longer goes on a yearly vacation and he doesn't read. Now his recreation consists of playing poker with the boys. He has escaped most of his parents' membership groups, the one's he was born into. In turn, his son will have the same membership groups as Sam until he changes them as he grows older.

Think of all the membership groups you are a part of - your mother's relatives, your father's relatives, your immediate family, your closest friends, your grade in school with all your schoolmates, the state where you were born, the town where you live, the region where you live, the United States, the tribe you belong to or the stock you come from, and the clubs you belong to or the sports you play.

You can probably add to this list of membership groups. But see how many groups you belong to. When you go to high school you will add other groups, when you marry you will add still more and when you work at a job you will add even more. The process will go on as long as you live as you change friends, jobs, places where you live. I guess our last membership group comes when we die. Then we become a member of the Dead.

These membership groups we've been talking about have another name. They are called IN-GROUPS. An in-group is any group to which a person belongs and in which he is a supporting member. For example, you belong to several in-groups. Your family is an in-group and everyone else in the world is part of the out-group.

As a teenager, you regard yourself as a member of the in-group called "teenager" and everyone who is not a teenager is a member of the out-group. Right now you are listening to these lectures and this makes you a member of the in-group but everyone else in the world who doesn't get to see these lectures is a member of the out-group.

To repeat, if you are a member of a group at a certain time and feel like you are a part of that group, then you can say that you are a member of that particular in-group. All people who are not members are the out-group. They are the outsiders.

This kind of feeling that people have about belonging to a group is used by others to great effect. You know how easy it is to make someone feel bad. All you have to do is have a party and not invite him. You're saying, "Sorry, kid, but you just aren't a member

of the in-group." So this someone turns around and gives a party himself and invites everybody but you so he's a part of an in-group and you're the outsider. The same thing happens between cultures. The white majority shuts out the Indian so the Indian turns around and says, "Sorry white man, this land is for Indians only." The two groups are simply making the boundaries clear between in-group and out-group.

The biggest in-group in the world, after that called "human being", is the in-group of one's sex. There is the male in-group with the female out-group. Many men in the world regard women as inferior beings. They are constantly building the barriers between in-group and out-group. There are clubs for men only; there are businesses which allow no women to participate; until World War II the military services accepted few women. There are no women astronauts; race car drivers are reluctant to enter races with women drivers. Likewise, women try to let men know where the boundaries lie. They talk about woman's work as being that connected with the home such as cooking, child rearing, interior decorating, gardening, sewing, etc.

Men find comfort in their in-group and they talk about things with each other which they never mention to women. They also talk about women. They say women are hard to understand and inconsistent and illogical and overly emotional. What they are really saying is, "I like men and I am more comfortable with men."

Now that you know the difference between an in-group and an out-group; and now that you know you can be a member of several in-groups and several out-groups at the same time, perhaps we had better talk about the way in-groups shift in importance.

During this century the family and the religion of a person have become less important than they were before. At the same time the national in-group and the racial in-group have become more important than they were before.

Other differences can be found as to the changing importance of in-groups. For example, what used to be called the "Man's World" is changing as more and more women enter jobs that were held only by men before. Or another example, is the change in our image of ourselves as a nation. Our national in-group has changed. At the beginning of this century, we felt it was our duty to let as many immigrants into the United States as we could handle. This has changed as we have gradually become aware that we have some problems within our own country to solve before we let in more immigrants. The national in-groups no longer fits the immigrants but instead Americans have become concerned with helping their own people first.

Let us take a specific example of the way our in-groups and our loyalties to each in-group change.

John is a Crow Indian who thinks his family is superior to every other Crow family. But, John thinks all the Crows are excellent fellows when compared to the Cheyennes. John also thinks the Cheyennes are totally superior to white Americans. Still, John would prefer a white American any day over a colored American. But even a colored American is better than one of those white Europeans. Still, John has to admit even those white Europeans are better than Russians.

LECTURE V

As we said before, we can be members of in-groups and of out-groups at the same time. There is, however, one more group we must talk about. This is a group which is very important to us and it is called the REFERENCE GROUP.

There are two kinds of reference groups. First, a reference group may be an in-group. However, it is a very special in-group. You will recall that your nation can be an in-group; in other words, you are part of the in-group called American. Another in-group could be your circle of closest friends. Now, obviously, your in-group of closest friends is usually more important in your life than your in-group of being American. You worry more about your problems with your closest friends than you worry about your problems as an American. This means that the group which is very important to you and whose opinion is very important to you is called a reference group.

The second kind of reference group is a group which we don't belong to at all but to which we want to belong very badly. This kind of reference group occurs more often than you probably realize. For example, you have all seen a boy who wants to be a football player so bad he can taste it; but this boy is too small to make the team. The football team is his reference group. Being a member of this reference group is all he can think of. So he carries equipment to the field; he keeps the equipment in good condition; he hangs around the field after school to watch the team practice; he tells everybody how we are going to beat Roundup or how we are going to practice the split T formation today. He acts as if he really were a member of this group.

Another normal example of this second kind of reference group occurs whenever any student wants very much to join a particular gang. Perhaps right now you are thinking of joining a certain gang of kids whom you respect and admire. Chances are, once you decide you want to become a member of this group, you begin to talk about the same things the gang talks about; you may act like the kids in the gang act; you may dress like the kids in the gang dress. Whenever you have a problem, you may begin to wonder how the kids in the gang would deal with this problem and you may try to solve it as you think they would. The gang is very important to you, and, although you don't yet belong, you act as if you did. This is reference group.

To review. There are two kinds of reference groups: those in-groups we belong to and which are very important to us, and those

groups we don't belong to but want to belong to very much.

It has been found through scientific studies that for most minority groups the majority group is a reference group. This means that the minority group member wants to become a member of the majority group. For example, a young Mexican-American boy may want to be a member of the majority group. He remains Mexican and values his membership in the Mexican in-group. But in many cases, he will try to act the way he thinks the majority group would act.

Now you know many of the words with which people discuss prejudice so let us get to the topic of prejudice itself.

One of the most widely believed ideas about where prejudice comes from is concerned with the very things we've been talking about here, namely, in-groups. When you belong to an in-group, as everyone does, you act as others in the group act; you hold similar beliefs as others in the group; you think certain things are good and certain things are bad because that's what others in your group think; you think the same people are enemies that the others in your group think are enemies. You have now begun to think of your group as the good guys and everyone else as the bad guys. Prejudice has now begun.

Prejudice can take several forms. Many people only talk about other people in a biased manner. This is very common. Prejudiced talk can go from strictly harmless conversation to extreme hate. For example, suppose two old white women are sitting on a porch watching the people go by. A pretty young Mexican girl walks by in a miniskirt, wearing lots of eye make-up and lipstick. One old woman turns to the other and mutters something about that "floozy." The other old woman agrees and says all Mexicans are cheap. The first lady in this instance isn't really prejudiced, she's just expressing disappointment that she's no longer young. The second lady, however, is very prejudiced against Mexicans.

Another form which prejudice can take is discrimination. Discrimination means the people will not allow another group to have the same amount of freedom they themselves have. An example of discrimination would be refusing to hire a young man for a job just because he is an Indian. Another example of discrimination would be the hiring of a woman to do a man's job, yet the woman would get paid only half as much as the man for the same amount of work. I'm sure you can think of many other examples of discrimination.

The third form which prejudice takes is physical violence. Someone who resorts to physical violence must be very prejudiced. We all know of the "long, hot summers" in our cities right now. In hot weather people get more irritable or angrier and it is easier for violence to occur. Also, in hot weather people get outdoors and are in close contact with each other so violence can happen for little reason.

These then are the three forms which prejudice takes: talking, discrimination, physical violence.

LECTURE VI

In the previous lecture, we talked about the forms prejudice takes. It may be as trivial as dinner table conversation; it may be a widespread practice of discrimination; it may break out in physical violence.

To the minority group member who is the object of laughter, talk, discrimination and physical violence, this unending storm of abuse begins to be unbearable. After awhile his personality begins to change. This isn't surprising. If a child is told over and over, day after day that he is lazy or shiftless or stupid, he will be unlikely to develop a charming out-going personality. Instead he will begin to develop personality traits which will protect him from the hurtfulness of the prejudice he has to endure.

You will hear many tolerant persons, who want everyone in the world to be treated exactly the same, say that minority group members are absolutely no different from the majority group members. In the usual sense of the word, this is correct. Minority group members are basically the same as everyone else, but because they are the victims of constant prejudice, they do begin to show personality changes which are different from the average person. It would be surprising if this did not happen. Not all of these traits or changes are bad; as a matter of fact, some of them are highly pleasant and desirable. Unfortunately, some of the traits are also unpleasant and undesirable.

The kinds of traits a minority group person will begin to show will depend entirely upon what type of personality he has to start with. Every member of a minority group will react in a different manner to prejudice than will another minority group member.

For example, you all know people who are persecuted because they are Negro or Mexican or Indian. Some of these people will seem to handle prejudice with little harmful effect on their personality. In other words, they don't appear to let prejudice worry them. These people, naturally, are rare. Some people become very tolerant of everyone. They are saying in effect that they know what prejudice is and they don't intend to be prejudiced themselves. A third type of minority group member will have a mixture of pleasant and unpleasant traits. The fourth type of person will develop ugly traits because he is so hurt by prejudice. This person goes through life almost seeking prejudice. This is because he has changed in such a manner that his personality is

unpleasant, and people begin to dislike him almost as soon as they see him.

As he goes through life, the tolerant minority group member probably meets the least prejudice because he doesn't go looking for it and overlooks it when he finds it. The person who develops both good and bad reactions to prejudice will probably find a medium amount of prejudice. The person who develops unpleasant traits will find lots of prejudice because people who are not necessarily prejudiced against his race or religion, etc., will just plain not like him.

The way a person will react to prejudice will depend upon his own personality, the way he has been trained by his family and school, how bad the prejudice is that he has to meet.

We are not going to talk about several of these traits. I think you will find you know someone who has at least one of these traits. Maybe you will recognize your own reaction in one of these traits. Let's hope the trait you show is a pleasant one.

The first trait we will discuss is obsessive concern.

Scarcely any place in the United States can a Negro enter a store, restaurant, movie, hotel, amusement park, school, train, plane, or boat without wondering deep inside if he is going to meet prejudice. From morning till night his color is right in the very front of his mind. He wonders -- am I going to be laughed at; will the restaurant refuse to serve me; will the other kids at school ignore me? He feels helpless, afraid and insecure. The Indian child has the same problems; so does the Mexican child.

When this child is fearful that prejudice will occur, he begins to be on guard. Sometimes he even begins to be suspicious of everyone he has to deal with in the majority group. This suspicion and constant fear of prejudice is what we call obsessive concern.

Now, you all know that because there are fewer minority group members in the United States than majority group members they must have to deal with Anglos or whites much more frequently than whites have to deal with them. It is a simple case of arithmetic. If for example, Mexican-Americans make up one-twentieth of our population in the United States, the Mexican-American will have to deal with whites twenty times more often than a white will have to deal with him. The percentage is much higher for the Indian who numbers less than one percent of the population. This means that off the reservation, he

will have to deal with whites ninety-nine times more often than whites will have to deal with him. This means, fairly or unfairly, however you want to look at it, that the biggest share of strain in getting along with whites is going to fall on the shoulders of the minority group member.

Sam is an Indian boy. He is in high school. When he is fifteen, he moves to California to live. The first day of class he walks down the hall toward the library. In the library he gets his book and sits down to study. A big blonde football player type walks over and taps him on the shoulder. "Move it, buddy. This is my seat." Sam looks up angrily and says tensely, "I've as much right to sit here as anyone else. Don't think you can push me around just because I'm an Indian."

The blonde boy laughs, "Come off it, buddy. You can't sit here. This table and that one over there are for seniors only. I'm a senior. Why you can't possibly be more than fifteen, Mr. Freshman. Now, move it."

Sam had jumped to the conclusion that he was being discriminated against because he was too suspicious. He was too afraid of meeting prejudice so he saw it even when it wasn't there.

Another example of obsessive concerns Susie Conzales, a young fourteen year old Mexican girl. When Suzie tried out for school chorus, she was accepted immediately. She had a beautiful clear soprano voice. When a new program was planned for the chorus to sing at school, Susie wanted to sing the lead soprano solo. The chorus teacher gave the lead solo to Sandy Smith instead who was a white girl. Susie complained to her friends about the prejudice. Her friends said she should go to the superintendent and complain. So Susie went to the superintendent and told him about not being allowed to sing the solo just because she was Mexican. The superintendent said they should bring up the matter at the next chorus class. So when the chorus met the next time Susie brought up the problem to the whole chorus. "You've given the solo to Sandy just because she's white. You know I can sing much better than Sandy, but you gave the part to her just because she's white and I'm a Mexican." Everyone sat still and tried to ignore their embarrassment. The choir director got up and said, "Susie, you do have a wonderful voice and it might even be clearer than Sandy's voice. But I want you to notice something you've apparently overlooked. First we have a number of Mexican students who are singing in this chorus and also who are singing solos in this program. Second, Sandy is a Senior and we have a tradition of letting the senior girls sing in the final spring concert every year." Then one of the girls in the chorus poked the girl next to

her. "Boy, that Susie Gonzales always has a chip on her shoulder." This might have been the reason Susie didn't have as many friends as the other Mexican girls.

Here we are not talking about prejudice. If there had really been prejudice Susie would have been right to call it to the attention of the school superintendent. We are talking instead about seeing prejudice where none really exists. People who are always suspicious and never trust a member of the majority group will find themselves dealing with people everyday who dislike them. If he doesn't like someone, and distrusts someone, and is suspicious of someone in the majority group, after a while, that majority group member isn't going to like him either.

Prejudice must be eliminated from the American way of life; but never see prejudice where none exists.

The second trait that minority group members sometimes acquire is denial of membership. This means a minority group member will pretend he is not a Negro or a Mexican or an Indian or a Catholic or a Jew. If he is light skinned and has no features which are different from the white majority, he can pretend, many times quite easily that he is a member of the white majority and he will be accepted. This may appear to be sensible behavior. The only problem is that although he can pass quite easily and the white majority accepts him easily, he may begin to feel like a traitor to his own people.

For example, Label is a young Jewish boy who passes, like his parents, as a protestant American. He is accepted everywhere as a protestant and meets no prejudice. Sometimes when he and his friends are sitting around talking he will say something unpleasant about the Jews. He does this to reinforce the idea that he is not Jewish. The only problem is when he does this he may be running into problems much bigger than he'd have to face as a straight forward Jew. You can imagine what will happen to Label as he grows up. He is going to feel guiltier and guiltier and more and more like a traitor.

I'm sure you know of Indian people who will not associate with Indians and deny that they are Indians.

The third trait we want to discuss is withdrawal.

For many, many centuries, slaves and people who have met extreme prejudice have hidden their true feelings behind a mask of acceptance. They have done this so well that many people think they are contented

and happy. How many times have you heard someone from the South say on television that the Negroes down there aren't really unhappy? All this means is that the Negroes have managed to keep their true feelings hidden from the white man.

This withdrawal behind a mask is sometimes the only way a minority group member can keep his sanity in the face of prejudice. He remains inconspicuous and never calls attention to himself. If no one notices him he has nothing to fear.

But too much of this can hurt the minority group member. If he is always quiet and has nothing to say and never shows what he really knows and feels, he will never be offered a job because no one notices him; he will never be invited to social gatherings because no one notices him. He won't have anything to fear but he won't have anything to rejoice about either. People will simply begin to see him in the same way they see a tree or a chair.

Corey and Jimmy are two young Indian men. Corey is very intelligent and is liked by his friends but whenever there is a white man around he is very withdrawn. He says very little. Jimmy is only average in intelligence; his friends think he's a good guy. He talks to white men about as much as he talks to Indians. Both of these men are mechanics although Corey is a much better mechanic than is Jimmy. When Carl Smith looks for a mechanic he comes to Jimmy. After all, he knows Jimmy is a mechanic because they've talked about it. Carl Smith ignores Corey. Corey and he have never talked at all. At first this bothered Carl Smith but later he ceased to worry about it and Corey kind of faded into the background. Corey didn't meet prejudice from the white man but then again he didn't meet friendship either. Jimmy, met a good deal of prejudice, but he also met a lot of friendliness. He also got a job.

Another trait which some minority group members acquire is called clowning. This often occurs in the Negro personality. Some small Negro children are taught to act like silly little beggars because the white man will give him a piece of candy or a dime, etc. This makes it easier to act silly and clown about being Negro when they grow up. For example, many Negroes begin to act like the false picture the majority group member has of them. Some begin to talk slowly and with a drawl even though this isn't their natural way of talking. Some begin to shuffle a long even though they don't usually walk this way.

Of course, many other minorities acquire this trait too. It is unpleasant and any minority group member who finds himself doing this finds also that he has lost his dignity and his pride in himself as an individual.

A fifth trait people develop is called strengthening in-group ties.

You remember what we have defined in-group as: A group which you belong to and in which you are a supporting member.

All minorities find they can go back to live with people like themselves and build a life around the small area in which they are the in-group. Here they can laugh at prejudice, they can attend all the parties they want, they can celebrate their own heroes and holidays.

They find they can push the prejudice they meet in the outside world to the back of their minds when they are in their own community or ghetto or reservation.

This is all normal and natural. But from here it is just a tiny step toward being prejudiced against all people who are not part of their in-group. You'll remember we've talked about this before.

You will often hear the Negro students nowadays asking that white men be removed from draft boards and Negroes put on; they ask that white teachers be removed from their jobs and Negroes put on. They have become prejudiced in favor of their own group. This is normal reaction to prejudice which they themselves have felt. But it doesn't build for good relations between Negroes and whites.

The sixth trait we will discuss here is called slyness and cunning. This trait is the result of a way of dealing with people which has grown up among many groups. For example, a Chinese who has been discriminated against all his life may be perfectly willing to treat all other Chinese fairly; but should a Mexican or Indian or White walk into his shop, he'll take them for all he can get. We have here a double standard in dealing with people.

The idea the man has in his head who uses this trait is that it is fair to cheat an outsider.

This form of revenge is logical but you can understand what will happen. Soon the word will get around that you can't deal fairly with this Chinaman unless you are also a Chinaman. From there, people jump to conclusions or pre-judgments. They begin to say all Chinese are cheats. Then prejudice is strengthened. This kind of trait produces much more difficulty than it helps.

Think of the Indian who has been cheated in Billings who decides to get even. He goes to buy a car, then drives it back to the

reservation where he refuses to pay for it. The automobile dealer can't come onto the reservation and get it back. The Indian has gotten even with the white man. But how many Indians will be refused credit because of this incident. In the long run many, many Indians may be hurt because of the revenge of a few.

Many minority group members begin to have a feeling that they hate themselves. This is called self hate. This occurred and still occurs in many minority groups. You are sure to remember the horrible things which happened to the Jews during World War II. Millions of Jews died in gas chambers and were killed in other ways. When they were in prison, many Jews began, after a long period of time, while they were starved and beaten, to think that they really were inferior. They began to hate themselves. Many turned to torturing their fellow prisoners just as if they had been Nazi guards themselves. These people began to think of themselves as members of the guards. They began to hate all Jews and became as prejudiced as the guards.

Something similar occurs in other minority groups. Many people look down on members of their own group as being inferior if they have darker skin or distinctive features.

This is a very destructive trait to develop. It ruins the minority group member totally. Because when he says, "I hate Jews," and he is one; or when he says, "I hate Negroes," and he is one; or when he says, "I hate Indians," and he is one, he is really saying, "I hate me."

Related to the idea of self-hate is the next trait: Prejudice and violence against one's own group.

Many middle class minority group members look down on people of a lower class in their own group. They call them shiftless and ignorant. The dark-skinned or lower-class members look down on the middle class and say they're just trying to be like the white man.

The same things can happen between clans.

One of the more unpleasant traits a person can develop in reaction to prejudice is to begin to be prejudiced toward other out-groups.

Many minority group members simply hate other minority groups. Negroes may hate Jews; Jews may hate Indians; Indians may hate Mexicans; Mexicans may hate Negroes and so it goes--on and on.

You would think that any person who has been the victim of

prejudice would understand how awful it is and would try not to do the same thing to anyone else. But unfortunately, for many victims of prejudice it doesn't work this way. They can't wait to show their prejudice against another group because they can then feel superior.

For example, John, a young Navajo man has tried to buy a house in a white suburb. No one will sell the house to him. So he goes to the poorer side of town and buys a house in an all-Indian neighborhood. About a month later, a young Negro man tries to buy a house in this neighborhood. John goes to all his neighbors and tells them they shouldn't sell to colored people. Colored people just run-down the neighborhood.

Here you have one victim of prejudice acting the same way toward another minority group member.

Fortunately, the exact opposite thing can happen. Many minority group people develop the trait of sympathy. These people vow never to do the same things to other people which have been done to them in the name of prejudice. These people are always tolerant and understanding of the problems of other minority group members.

The interesting thing about victims of prejudice is that they usually react with great prejudice toward other out-groups or instead react with great tolerance and understanding toward other out-groups. They don't usually act just "average" toward other out-groups.

Another way of reacting to prejudice is to fight back. This is happening in our cities where the Negroes are rioting and marching and demanding immediate action.

Other minority groups such as the Indian realize the terrible things which can happen in situations like this so they fight back in a different manner. The Indian is a very powerful man. He has learned to fight for his rights through the courts and laws and governmental changes.

The way a victim of prejudice decides to fight back, if he decides to fight back, depends upon his personality and his situation.

One of the most admired ways of beating prejudice depends upon another trait: enhanced striving. This is a very simple response. The victim of prejudice says, "All right, white man, I'll accept the handicap and beat you at your own game." This type of person might decide to attend college to get an education so he can get a good job and make

it in spite of prejudice. This particular person is not going to fear competition. He might spend an extra amount of time learning English or he might work longer hours trying to learn his job. This is apparently the most successful way to beat prejudice.

APPENDIX B

FORM I

Name _____ Number _____

Sex: Male _____ / Female _____ Grade _____ Age _____ Date _____

Each question has two parts. Circle only one answer in each part.

1. Pretend you are alone in a drugstore waiting for service. The clerk is bent down behind the counter putting boxes on a shelf and has not seen you come in. Meanwhile, a blonde woman, in a big hurry, comes in. The clerk looks up and sees you both at the same time. Which of the following are you most likely to do? Choose only one answer.
- A. You wait quietly in the background until the clerk notices you.
 - B. You know the clerk will wait on the white woman first so you push past her and tell him you were here first.
 - C. Whites always stick together so you wait until the blonde is waited on before you move up to the counter.
 - D. Since the woman is in such a hurry, you tell the clerk to wait on her first.

THIS WOULD BE YOUR REACTION: (Choose only one answer)

1	2	3	4
All of the Time	Most of the time	Some of the time	Rarely

2. Pretend you are standing alone on a corner in the pouring rain waiting for the light to change so you can cross the street. A car, cutting close to the corner, splashes water on you. The car stops and a blue-eyed boy with red hair, who is alone in the car, gets out and walks toward you. Which of the following do you think is most likely to happen? Choose only one answer.
- A. You walk rapidly away before anything can happen.
 - B. He offers you money to get your coat cleaned because whites think money can buy off anyone.
 - C. He ignores the whole thing and walks right by you because you are an Indian.
 - D. You ask him why he doesn't watch where he's going so he says he's sorry.

THIS WOULD HAPPEN: (Choose only one)

1	2	3	4
All of the time	Most of the time	Some of the time	Rarely

3. Pretend you are the only person from your school at a big Junior High 4-H convention. You are put in a room with several other students to decide on a plan for electing officers at the convention. None of you knows anyone else. Which of the following do you think is most likely to happen? Choose only one answer.
- A. You are all shy at first so you all have a coke and get acquainted before deciding on a plan for electing officers.
 - B. You know the others won't think much of an Indian's opinion and you decide to get used to it.
 - C. You are pretty quiet most of the time and try not to call attention to yourself.
 - D. A blonde girl is elected chairman of the meeting because whites always stand up for each other.

THIS WOULD HAPPEN: (Choose only one answer)

1	2	3	4
All of the time	Most of the time	Some of the time	Rarely

4. Pretend you are a new student in a city school. You don't know anyone yet. The class is talking about life in the West. You know a lot about the West and can soon tell that the other students don't know much about it. Which of the following do you think is most likely to happen? Choose only one answer.
- A. One of the Mexican girls asks the teacher if everyone rides in rodeos. You smile to yourself. Mexicans don't know anything.
 - B. The teacher says you are from Montana and everyone starts asking you questions about the West.
 - C. Even though you know a lot more than the other students about life in the West, you don't say anything because it's safer in the long run not to call attention to yourself.
 - D. One of the students smiles at you and asks if you are an Indian and you know he is just waiting to say something insulting.

THIS WOULD HAPPEN: (Choose only one answer)

1	2	3	4
All of the time	Most of the time	Some of the time	Rarely

5. Pretend you are sitting alone at a counter in a restaurant drinking a coke and eating a hamburger. A Negro waitress rushes by and hits your elbow, making you spill coke all over your clothes. Since you have a very important appointment in a few minutes with the Neighborhood Youth Corps to apply for a summer job, you are very angry. Which of the following is most likely to be your reaction? Choose only one answer.
- A. Although the waitress says she's sorry, you can tell she's secretly laughing at you.
 - B. You get up and pay for the lunch, acting as if the whole thing had never happened. You hope no one has noticed you.
 - C. You realize this is just another example of Negro stupidity.
 - D. You look angrily at the waitress who apologizes and then you go home to change clothes for your job interview.

THIS WOULD BE YOUR REACTION: (Choose only one answer)

1	2	3	4
All of the time	Most of the time	Some of the time	Rarely

6. Pretend your father is driving you into the city tomorrow to attend a church school conference. A new white student in your class who is rather quiet and doesn't know very many of your classmates, asks you if you'd mind giving him a ride to the conference. Which of the following will most likely be your reaction? Choose only one answer.
- A. You give him a ride but neither of you says much the whole trip and at the meeting you drift apart. After the meeting is over you don't bother looking for him and you and your father drive home alone.
 - B. You give him a ride to the conference and you both have a pretty good time.
 - C. You tell him you're sorry but he can find a ride with another white student.
 - D. You give him a ride but you're both rather quiet. You can tell he's stuck-up and you don't like his attitude.

THIS WOULD BE YOUR REACTION: (Choose only one answer)

1	2	3	4
All of the time	Most of the time	Some of the time	Rarely

7. Pretend you want to join a social club at school. You like all the members and they all like you. That is, every member likes you but one. This one member is a young Mexican boy. He doesn't like you and shows it. He tells you to forget about joining the club. Which of the following is most likely to be your reaction. Choose only one answer.
- A. I'd rather forget about joining than cause trouble.
 - B. No one is liked by everybody in this world so I don't worry about it and decide to become a member anyway.
 - C. I wonder a lot if the other members feel the same way and are just too polite to show it.
 - D. I never did care too much for Mexicans so why should I care what this one thinks.

THIS WOULD BE YOUR REACTION: (Choose only one answer)

1	2	3	4
All of the time	Most of the time	Some of the time	Rarely

8. Pretend your school is having try-outs for the Junior High play. There are several students trying out for each part and competition is stiff. You want a certain part very badly. Which of the following do you think is most likely to happen? Choose only one answer.
- A. Since there are so many students trying out for each part, you decide not to try out for any part.
 - B. You know the teacher will select only white students for the parts so you don't bother to try out.
 - C. You win the part but wonder if the teacher gave it to you just to have a certain number of Indians in the cast rather than to give the parts to the best actors.
 - D. One student is outstanding and gets the part you want so you decide to try out for another part.

THIS WOULD HAPPEN: (Choose only one answer)

1	2	3	4
All of the time	Most of the time	Some of the time	Rarely

9. Pretend you are sitting in study hall when the student behind you asks to pass a note to the girl sitting in front of you. You do but the teacher catches you and thinks you wrote the note. She scolds you so loudly the whole study hall can hear and you are embarrassed. Which of the following is most likely to be your reaction? Choose only one answer.

- A. You decide it is better not to raise a fuss by telling her you're innocent because it would just cause trouble.
- B. You keep quiet so the other kids won't call you a tattletale.
- C. You look at the teacher with disgust. The white man is always trying to put the Indian down.
- D. You wonder if the teacher would scold you so much if you weren't Indian.

THIS WOULD BE YOUR REACTION: (Choose only one answer)

- | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| All of the time | Most of the time | Some of the time | Rarely |

10. Pretend you are asked to join a new rock and roll group called Snicker and the Hershey Bars which is forming in your school. You are to be the lead singer. The others in the group are very popular kids from your class although all of them happen to be white. Which of the following is most likely to be your reaction? Choose only one answer.

- A. You are glad they asked you to join and are excited about the whole idea.
- B. You'd like to join the group but decide not to because there's no telling what problems might arise.
- C. Although you are a good singer, you keep wondering if they would have asked you if there had been anyone else around who wasn't Indian.
- D. You don't join because the white man is only friendly when he wants something.

THIS WOULD BE YOUR REACTION: (Choose only one answer)

- | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| All of the time | Most of the time | Some of the time | Rarely |

11. Pretend you are at a junior high school basketball tournament being held at a state college. Since it is held during vacation time, the dorms are empty and all the junior high students are assigned to a dorm room with someone from another school. Since the dorm manager assigned your room before you arrived, you have no choice as to whom you will room with. When you get your clothes hung in the closet, your roommate arrives and you see he is a Negro student the same age as yourself. Which if the following is most likely to be your reaction? Choose only one answer.

- A. You tell him you're sorry but you won't room with a Negro and since you were in the room first, he'll have to move.
- B. You don't want to cause trouble so you stay in the room but you try to spend as little time as possible in the room.
- C. He turns out to be a pretty swell guy and you get along o.k. considering he is from a rival school.
- D. You're boiling mad because the manager obviously thinks he can put anything over on an Indian.

THIS WOULD BE YOUR REACTION: (Choose only one answer)

- | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| All of the time | Most of the time | Some of the time | Rarely |

12. Pretend you are going to the school dance. Since it is stag, no one has a date. A new Negro boy in school asks you if you would go to the dance with him and introduce him around to the other kids. Which of the following is most likely to be your reaction? Choose only one answer.

- A. You keep wondering why he's singled you out and you feel uncomfortable.
- B. You take him to the dance with you and introduce him around. As usual everyone has a good time.
- C. You tell him you can't go to the dance and then you stay home so he won't see you there and know you've avoided him.
- D. Negroes are always pushy. You tell him you're going with some other guys.

THIS WOULD BE YOUR REACTION: (Choose only one answer)

- | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| All of the time | Most of the time | Some of the time | Rarely |

As noted in the text, there were three forms of the test given. The two variations of Question 1 follows. All other variations of the questions are similar.

FORM II VARIATION

1. Pretend you and two friends are in a cafe waiting for service. The waitress is bent down behind the counter putting napkins on a shelf and has not seen you come in. Meanwhile a blonde woman, in a big hurry, comes in. The waitress looks up and sees you both at the same time. Which of the following is most likely to occur? Choose only one answer.
 - A. You wait quietly until the waitress will notice you.
 - B. You know the waitress will wait on the white woman first so you quickly tell her you were here first.
 - C. Whites always stick together so you and your friends patiently wait to be waited on.
 - D. Since the woman is in such a hurry, you tell the waitress to wait on her first.

THIS WOULD BE YOUR REACTION: (Choose only one answer.)

- | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| All of the time | Most of the time | Some of the time | Rarely |

FORM III VARIATION

1. Mickey is alone in a drugstore waiting for service. The clerk is bent down behind the counter putting boxes on a shelf and has not seen him come in. Meanwhile, a blonde woman, in a big hurry, comes in. The clerk looks up and sees both Mickey and the woman at the same time. Which of the following is most likely to happen? Choose only one answer.
 - A. Mickey waits quietly in the background until the clerk notices him.
 - B. Mickey, who is Cree Indian, knows the clerk will wait on the white woman first so he pushes past her and tells the clerk he was here first.

- C. Whites always stick together so Mickey waits until the blonde is waited on before he goes to the counter.
- D. Since the woman is in such a hurry, Mickey tells the clerk to wait on her first.

THIS WOULD HAPPEN: Choose only one answer.

- | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| All of the time | Most of the time | Some of the time | Rarely |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books

- Ackerman, N. W. and Jahoda, Marie. Anti-Semitism and Emotional Disorder. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, Else, Levinson, D. J., and Sanford, R. N. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Allport, Gordon W. The Nature of Prejudice. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1958.
- _____. Pattern and Growth in Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961.
- Berelson, Bernard and Steiner, Gary. Human Behavior. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1964.
- Guthrie, E. R. The Psychology of Human Conflict. New York: Harper, 1938.
- Hartley, Eugene L. Problems in Prejudice. New York: King's Crown Press, 1946.
- Hogben, Lancelot. From Cave Painting to Comic Strip. New York: Chanticleer Press, 1949.
- Horney, Karen. Our Inner Conflicts. New York: Norton, 1945.
- Janis, I. L., Hovland, C. I., Field, P.B., Linton, Harriet, Graham, Elaine, Choen, A. R., Rife, D., Abelson, R. P., Lesser, G. S., and King, B. T. Personality and Persuasibility. New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press, 1959.
- Krech, David and Crutchfield, Richard S. Individual in Society: A Textbook of Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.
- _____. Theory and Problems of Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1948.
- McGrath, Earl James. Communication in General Education. Iowa: William C. Brown Company, 1949.
- Mowrer, O. Hobart. Abnormal Reactions or Actions? (An Autobiographical Answer). Iowa: William C. Brown Company, 1966.

- Newcomb, Theodore M. Personality and Social Change: Attitude Formation in a Student Community. New York: Dryden, 1943.
- Osgood, C. E., Luci, G. J. and Tannenbaum, P. H. The Measurement of Meaning. Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1957.
- Packard, Vance. The Hidden Persuaders. Pocket Books, Inc., 1957.
- Riesman, David. The Lonely Crowd. Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1950.
- Schachter, S. The Psychology of Affiliation: Experimental Studies of the Sources of Gregariousness. California: Stanford University Press, 1959.
- Shaw, Marvin E. and Wright, Jack M. Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.
- Sherif, Muzafer. In Common Predicament. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.
- Stonequist, Everett V. The Marginal Man. New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1961.
- Tolman, E. C. Drives Toward War. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1942.
- Wiener, Norbert. The Human Use of Human Beings. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1954.

B. Articles

- Allport, Gordon W. and Kramer, B. M. "Some Roots of Prejudice," Journal of Psychology, Vol. XXII, pp. 9-39.
- Berger, E. M. "The Relation Between Expressed Acceptance of Self and Expressed Acceptance of Others," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, Vol. XXXVII, pp. 778-782.
- Carlson, E. R. "Attitude Change Through Modification of Attitude Structure," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. LII, 1956, pp. 314-318.
- Cooper, J. B. "Emotion in Prejudice," Science, Vol. CXXX, 1959, pp. 314-318.

- DeFleur, M. L. and Westie, F. R. "Verbal Attitudes and Overt Acts: An Experiment on the Saliency of Attitudes," American Sociological Review, Vol. XXIII, 1958, pp. 667-673.
- Gordon, M. M. "Assimilation in American: Theory and Reality," Daedalus, Spring, 1961, pp. 263-285.
- Haire, M. and Grunes, W. F. "Perceptual Defenses: Processes Protecting an Original Perception of Another Personality," Human Relations, Vol. III, 1950, pp. 403-412.
- Hovland, C. I. and Weiss, W. "The Influence of Source Credibility on Communication Effectiveness," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. XV, 1951, pp. 635-650.
- Hyman, Herbert H., and Sheatsley, P. B. "The Authoritarian Personality: A Methodological Critique," in R. Christie and Marie Jahoda (eds.) Studies in the Scope and Method of "The Authoritarian Personality," Illinois: Free Press, 1954.
- Katz, Daniel, "The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes," Public Opinion Quarterly, Summer, 1960, Vol. XXIV, pp. 163-204.
- Kluckhohn, C. "A Navaho Personal Document With a Brief Paretian Analysis," Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, Vol. I, 1945, pp. 260-283
- Kutner, B., Wilkins, Carol, and Yarrow, Penny R. "Verbal Attitudes and Overt Behavior Involving Racial Prejudice," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. XXXXVII, 1952, pp. 649-652.
- McGuire, William J. "Cognitive Consistency and Attitude Change," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. LX, 1960, pp. 345-353.
- Mitnick, L. L., and McGinnies, E. "Influencing Ethnocentrism in Small Discussion Groups Through a Film Communication," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. LVI, 1958, pp. 82-90.
- Seeman, M. "Moral Judgment: A Study in Racial Frames of Reference," American Sociological Review, Vol. XII, 1947, pp. 404-411.
- Tannenbaum, P. H. "Initial Attitude Toward Source and Concept as Factors in Attitude Change Through Communication," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. XX, 1956, pp. 413-425.

Weiss, Walter and Fine, Bernard J. "Opinion Change as a Function of Some Intrapersonal Attributes of the Communicaties" Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. LI, 1955, pp. 246-253.

C. Pamphlets

Bryde, John F., S. J. "New Approach to Indian Education," (paper from Holy Rosary Mission, Pine Ridge, S. D.), p. 1.

Educational Policies Commission, Mass Communication and Education, National Education Association of the United States, Washington, D.C., 1958.

D. Other References

McKay, Claude, "If We Must Die," Harlem Shadows, New York: Twayne Publishers, 1922.

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

3 1762 10015147 9

N378

P236

con.2

Parks, Helen M

Prejudice and traits
of victimization among
the Crow Indians

DATE	ISSUED TO
7-13-73	1 - [unclear] GSE
7-16-74	1 atty: Elden Pm. 40 7-5-74 fw libruse [unclear] Ward AUG 15 74 INTERLIBR* [unclear] [unclear]
R-2	
[unclear]	
P	

N377
P23e
Cap. 1 -

Ro
in Ch
- 10000 -

BOUND BY
**COLLEGE
PLACE
BINDERY**
COLLEGE PLACE, WA