DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 263 24, UD 010 355

AUTHOR Teahan, John E.
TITLE Some Effects of Audio-Visual Techniques on Racial Self-Concept. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Wayne State Univ., Detroit, Mich.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO BR-8-E-040
PUB DATE Nov 69
GRANT OEG-0-8-080040-3712(010)
NOTE 77p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Aspiration, Attitude Tests, Black Community, *Changing Attitudes, Control Groups, Economically Disadvantaged, Experimental Groups, Hypothesis Testing, *Instructional Films, Negative Attitudes, *Negro Students, Predictive Ability (Testing), Professional Personnel, Questionnaires, *Racial Attitudes, *Self Concept, Test Results

ABSTRACT

This investigation was an attempt to follow up previous research dealing with the impact of films of successful Negro professionals, who had come from impoverished beginnings, on the self-concept and level of aspiration of Negro youth. Students from three schools saw 12 films of six black professionals and six white professionals on a once-a-week basis. Controls who saw no films were drawn from each school. Another school saw only six black films on a weekly basis, while its control was a school from a similar nieghborhood which saw no films. Students who saw films changed significantly following the films in terms of their evaluation of white photographs, with lower socioeconomic males becoming more negative toward white faces following the films. Experimentals also changed significantly in their rejection of attitudes of white superiority, while controls moved in the opposite direction, showing less racial pride over time. No differences between experimentals and controls appeared in terms of desired goals or predicted success. The results are held to support the hypothesis that the first change in terms of a more positive self-concept among Negroes may be a more negative attitude toward whites as they attempt to explode the myth of white superiority for themselves and redirect hostility previously turned inward toward self. For related earlier report, see ED 013 862. [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of the original document.] (RJ)

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 8-E-040

Grant No. OEG-0-8-080040-3712(010)

SOME EFFECTS OF AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNIQUES ON RACIAL SELF-CONCEPT

November 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

Final Report

Project No. 8-E-040

Grant No. OEG-0-8-080040-3712(010)

Some Effects of Audio-Visual Techniques on Racial Self-Concept

John E. Teahan
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan

November 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES

Summary

This investigation was an attempt to follow up previous research dealing with the impact of films of successful Negro professionals, who had come from impoverished beginnings, on the self-concept and level of aspiration of Negro youth who might receive some inspiration from these success stories. Particular interest was focused on a hypothesis emerging from the previous study, namely, that an improvement in the selfθconcept or in the racial pride of Negro youth will result, at least initially, in greater hostility toward whites.

Elementary students from four schools in a large midwestern city and boys from one high school served as the subjects of the investigation. Students from three schools saw twelve films of six black professionals and six white professionals on a once-a-week basis; and controls, who saw no films, were drawn from each school. Another school saw only six black films on a weekly basis, while its control was a school from a similar neighborhood which saw no films. Pre- and post-testing was done one month prior to the first film and one month following the last film. Tests used included the differential reaction of students to anonymous black and white faces, which were rated on various personality traits; a level of aspiration method, which attempted to gauge desired future goals, as well as predictions of success; and at the high school level, a questionnaire which dealt with attitudes of racial superiority and inferiority.

Similar to previous findings, students who saw films changed significantly following the films in terms of their evaluation of white photographs, with lower socio-economic males becoming more negative toward white faces following the films. Experimentals also changed significantly in their rejection of attitudes of white superiority, while controls moved in the opposite direction, showing less racial pride over time. Unlike previous findings, no differences between experimentals and controls appeared in terms of desired goals or predicted success. However, women had lower goal orientations than males and lower socio-economic status seemed to significantly depress the predicted success of males more than females. Lower socio-economic status seemed particularly harmful if these males were in predominantly lower class schools, while it seemed less harmful if most peers were middle class. It was felt that the results supported the hypothesis that the first change in terms of a more positive self-concept among Negroes may be a more negative attitude toward whites as they attempt to explode the myth of white superiority for themselves and redirect hostility previously turned inward toward the self.

Introduction

This research was an attempt to follow up and enlarge upon some of the hypotheses emerging from Office of Education Grant No. OE-7-59-0502-281, entitled "Some effects of audio-visual techniques on level of aspiration and ethnocentric shift." Its purpose was, essentially, to study the impact of films of successful Negro professionals, who had come from impoverished beginnings, on the self-concept and level of aspiration of Negro youth who might receive some inspiration from these "success stories."

In addition, the investigator was particularly interested in one finding which seemed to emerge from the previous study, namely, that an improvement in the self-concept of a Negro youth will result, at least initially, in greater hostility toward whites. This would originate in rage, which had formerly been turned toward the self in the form of self-hate and low self-esteem, as a result of identification with the aggressor and which was then externalized, or turned outward, against the perceived aggressor.

The investigator is extremely grateful to the Chicago Catholic Board of Education for allowing this study to take place, and to all of the school officials who were so giving in terms of cooperation and aid at each step of the project. The coordinator of research, Miss Julia Bell, was a key person in smoothing the way and it is especially to her that the investigator feels a deep sense of gratitude.

The Problem

This work stemmed from the observation often made that the Negro has remained, too often, an invisible man in our culture, whose presence has been acknowledged only when he threatened our complacency. Numerous research studies by the Clarks (1947, 1950), Landreth and Johnson (1953, Munn (1950, Marks (1943, and others have all shown that not only does the Negro recognize at an early age that his skin differs from whites', but that there is a tendency for almost all children to show preference for white skin. The popularity of hair straighteners and skin bleaches up until recently, when the "black is beautiful movement" gained momentum, attests to the persistence of these attitudes into adulthood. It was further hypothesized that the Negro, because of his lack of history (i.e., lack in terms of absence of black studies) is forced more than other minority groups to look to more contemporary models in order to enhance self-esteem and find a sense of value and worth.

The absence of good models within the Negro's immediate environment, particularly in the lower socio-economic and culturally-deprived areas, influences his whole range of values, particularly those dealing with level of aspiration and motivation to achieve. This is, of course, especially true in the more rural areas of the South where a chronic condition of cultural deprivation may even result in impaired intellectual capacity (Young and Bright, 1954), (Teahan and Drews, 1962). Although there have been attempts on the part of Negro publications to point out that the Negro is making contributions to society in more than just the entertainment and sports worlds, there has been little real acknowledgement of this from the white community whose opinion is still, albeit ambivalently, given great weight. Successful Negroes, whether they are scholars and scientists, business executives, or skilled craftsmen and technicians, have remained shadowy figures and invisible men who have failed to have much impact on the Negro youth who needs them most. Thus, in the present study, an attempt was made to bring successful Negroes out of the shadows and allow young Negroes an opportunity to meet and to know them--to enter their lives, at least momentarily, through the medium of motion pictures, and, hopefully, to come away with something of value which may even alter the course of their lives.

A previous study (Teahan and Hug, 1969) had already offered evidence that films of this nature could be instrumental in creating changes in the self-concept and level of aspiration of Negro youth. Experimental students (who saw films) at both the elementary and junior high school levels became significantly more optimistic than controls about their chances for future success. In addition, they also became more realistic about "wished for" goals, while their controls became more unrealistic about desired future goals and more pessimistic about their ultimate chances for success. These results were felt to reflect a change in the self-concept of experimentals who were showing less disparity between "idealized" and "expected" goal achievement. This result was also felt to parallel pre- and post-therapy studies (Rogers and Dymond, 1954) in which successful therapy cases demonstrated less disparity between ideal and real self following treatment.

These same Negro students also changed significantly in their differential responses to white and Negro photographs which they rated on a number of different personality traits. However, contrary to expectation, significant changes following the film experience took place on white rather than black photographs for both elementary and junior high students. Experimentals seemed to become significantly more negative in their evaluation of white photographs, while controls tended to drift in the opposite direction over a similar period of time. This was felt to reflect an exploding of the myth of white superiority as the Negro gained in self-esteem, almost as if he were saying to himself, "I am better than I previously thought and you (whites) are much worse." There was felt to be some support for this interpretation in the current trends toward "black power" and in the black Muslim movement where the attempt is first made to focus the attention of members on the premise that the white man is a corrupt and evil devil in order to begin their program of instilling a greater sense of racial pride among their members.

Thus, the present study represents an attempt to follow up and clarify in some ways the results found in the previous investigation. This research was conducted with a larger sample of subjects in a more metropolitan area. An attempt was also made with older subjects to measure racial attitudes regarding white superiority more directly in order to clarify the interpretation previously made garding the changed reaction to white photographs. This study was also done with the understanding that the Negro has become less of an "invisible man" than he was four years ago when the previous study was conducted. Black faces have become more familiar in TV and in films, and racial barriers in industry, business and education are beginning to crumble. However, in spite of advances, the need for good models persists and the impact of the films should still be important.

Procedure

Film Description

Twelve men (6 Negro and 6 white males) are the subjects of twelve films, which range in length from 15-25 minutes. Negroes were chosen from those occupational areas where they had either been excluded previously because of prejudice, or where they had been active but unpublicized.

The following men are used as the subjects of films.

Negroes

Richard Hunt	Sculptor
Theodore Sherred, M.D., Ph.D.	Physician-Pharmacologist, Univ. Ill. Med. School
Twylie Barker, Ph.D.	Political Scientist, Univ. Ill.
Donald Richards	Systems Engineer, IBM
John Moutousamy, B.S., Arch.	Architect
Louis Langston	Carson, Pirie & Scott

Whites

Vin Rosenthal, Ph.D.	Clinical Psychologist, N'western Med. School
George L. Weisbard, LLB, C.P.A.	Accountant (CPA)
Abraham Marovitz, LLB	Federal Judge, Dist. Ct.
Edward Rooney	Reporter, Chicago Daily News
Sterling Quinlan	V-P, Field Enterprises Gen. Mgr., Radio & TV
Steven Sichak, M.S.	Sr. Research Chemist, Toni Co.

Almost all film subjects (black and white) had overcome religious, economic or personal obstacles in their past, and all are men who might serve as some inspiration for youth. Thus, two of the subjects chosen, George Weisbard, accountant, and Abraham Marovitz, judge, were both born in poverty and had to overcome severe economic problems to reach success. In addition, both Weisbard and Vin Rosenthal (clinical psychologist) suffered from religious prejudice and Rosenthal had a severely disturbed childhood and adolescence which was overcome only through professional help. Steven Sichak (chemist) worked in the steel mills to put himself through school, and Sterling Quinlan (TV and communications) was a high school dropout who became a hobo during the 1930's, but who later returned to school and worked his way in the field of radio to the Vice-Presidency of American Broadcasting Corporation, and, finally, to the Vice-Presidency of Field Enterprises and General Manager of WFLD-TV, Chicago. Edward Rooney (reporter) was chosen because he covered the Selma march and is active fighting block-busting on the part of real estate companies in his neighborhood, which is now becoming integrated.

Possibly only two of the Negroes in the films had what could be called "middle-class" backgrounds, and all were born in ghettoes or equally undesirable settings. Richard Hunt, sculptor, now has an international reputation in his media and still lives in what can only be described as a very poor neighborhood. Theodore Sherrod, who has both an M.D. and a Ph.D. in Pharmacology, was the son of a sharecropper who did not even begin to attend school until the age of nine. Twylie Barker, political scientist, was also born and raised in a small town in the South and has recently published a book dealing with the most significant legislation of the Supreme Court in the past ten years and its repercussions. Lewis Langston, executive-in-training with Carson, Pirie & Scott, started in the stockroom and is now a buyer. Don Richards, system engineer for IBM, was the son of a postal employee and probably has the most middle-class background of all Negro subjects, but was chosen because of his personable manner and intensely interesting work. John Moutoussamy, architect, had,, at the time of filming, just received approval of his housing project for middle-income people by the city of Chicago. This was to be the first integrated housing project financed entirely by Negro capital in the city of Chicago.

The general format used in each film was to have the first half deal with the occupation of the person involved. Thus, the interview with the film subject was done at his place of business and focused on the nature of his work, the educational requirements, the satisfactions he found in it, the potentials this field offered to new persons entering it, etc. The second half of the movie was filmed in the subject's home and here members of the family were introduced. In this section, the interviewer attempted to uncover more personal information about the man himself, his early childhood, events and persons which he felt shaped his life, his goals for himself and his children, etc. It was actually this part of the film

that the investigator wished to stress most because of his interest in having the viewer come away from a movie with the feeling that he had just met someone new whom he understood, at least to some degree, and whom he, hopefully, liked as a person.

Subjects[1]

Five different schools in the Catholic school system of a large industrial city were involved in the study. Since each differed in terms of either experimental conditions, predominate socio-economic level, or age and sex dimensions, they will be discussed separately.

Schools A and B were primarily lower socio-economic elementary schools and all students in grades 5 through 8 participated. School A (224 subjects with 100 males and 124 females) was designated as the experimental school and all students at these grade levels were shown six black films on a once-a-week basis over a six-week period. School B (127 subjects with 59 males and 68 females) was designated as the control school for School A and students here received no film experience.

School C was a primarily middle-class elementary school and all students in grades 6 through 8 participated. Since there were two classes at each grade level, one was designated as the experimental class and one as the control class for each of the three grades. This resulted in 99 experimental subjects (45 males and 55 females) and 94 controls (45 males and 49 females). Experimentals at School C differed from School A, however, in that all twelve films (six black and six white) were shown on a once-a-week basis over a twelve-week period.

School D was similar to school C in its socio-economic composition. Unfortunately, due to an error by assistants who administered the pre-tests, although grades 6 were correctly given those tests administered to other elementary grades, grade 8 classes were given those tests which had been designed for the high school subjects. In addition, grade 7 had to be discarded because the control and experimental classes were given different test booklets, so that comparison was impossible. Thus, the final usable sample for analysis was 32 experimentals at 6th grade with 14 males and 18 females, and 38 controls with 17 males and 21 females. For grade 8, there were 34 experimentals with 19 males and 15 females and 36 controls with 20 males and 16 females. As with school C, all experimentals saw the entire twelve films over a twelve-week period.[2]

[1] Since some subjects had incomplete data, this figure might change slightly (i.e., by one or two subjects) from one analysis to the next.

[2] Because all subjects at every grade level received the Wished For and Predicted Goals, the grade 7 classes of 19 experimentals (12 male and 7 female) and 24 controls (12 males and 12 females) are included in this analysis.

School E was an all male senior high school and students from grades 9 through 11 participated in the study. While testing and film viewing at all other schools was done in the classroom, here it was done during study periods with mixed grade levels. Two study periods composed of 56 students was designated as the experimental groups. From two other study groups, 62 controls were also chosen. Again, experimentals were shown all 12 films over a twelve-week period, while controls had no such film experience.

Pre- and Post Testing and Film Introduction

One of the most important features of the experiment which the investigator tried to control was that the students used as experimental subjects did not associate the film experience with pre- or post-testing. This, it is felt, was accomplished by pretesting one month prior to the introduction of the first film showing and post-testing one month following the last film presentation. This meant that in School A, a 14-week interval took place between pre- and post-testing, while in Schools C, D, and E, an interval of 20 weeks intervened. In addition, the films were introduced in the classrooms by their teachers[1] as a new method of imparting vocational information--new because of the fact that the films would not only allow the viewer to learn about the occupation in question, but would also give a glimpse into the person involved in the occupation. Therefore, the films would allow the student to meet the person's family, learn about his hopes, attitudes toward life and the early experiences which might have played some role in his vocational choice.

Pre-testing[1] was done by black students who identified themselves as being involved in research conducted under the auspices of Wayne State University, and they introduced the experiment as one involving the ability to tell about people simply on the basis of how they look. They went into some detail about the hypothesis that some psychologists feel that we may react unconsciously to tiny cues in the faces of people which may give us information about them, even though we may be unaware that we are actually receiving it. Students were also told that other tests would be administered which were felt to measure things related to this ability. All students seemed to accept this explanation regarding the purpose behind testing. Post-testing was explained in terms of the experimenter's desire to determine whether the experience of having once tried to tell about people simply on the basis of how they looked enabled the subject to do better at this task than someone doing it for the first time. This explanation also seemed to be accepted, for at no time did any student hint that he saw some connection between the testing and the film experience.

Film Presentation

Films were shown to experimental students on a weekly basis in their classrooms. Order of presentation was: federal judge, systems entineer, reporter, architect, clinical psychologist, T.V. executive,

[1] Copies of film introduction and pre- and post-testing instructions can be found in the appendix.

sculptor, political scientist, chemist, pharmacologist, accountant and executive trainee. For that school which saw only black films, the order of Negroes was identical to the above, i.e., systems entineer, architect, sculptor, political scientist, pharmacologist and executive trainee.

Instruments

1. Photograph Technique:

As with the previous investigation, the primary instrument used for measuring change, as a result of the film presentation, was the differential reaction to full face photographs of anonymous black and white males. A booklet with five photographs (three white and two black) was presented to the subject and he was asked to evaluate each photograph separately in terms of what kind of personality he felt characterized the pictured person[1]. He was asked to try to avoid thinking about the reasons for his ratings, but instead was urged to try to give his "gut reaction" to each photo as he viewed it. Elementary students (grades five through eight) used a simple four-point scale for each of twelve traits. High school students (grades nine through eleven) rated the photos using a five-point scale[2] on each of sixteen traits. THus, each photograph received a total score ranging from 12-48 for elementary students and from 16-80 for high school students, with the highest score reflecting a more negative attitude toward the pictured person.

2. Social Survey Questions:

This questionnaire was primarily composed of items taken from the Levinson F scale. Buried among these items were statements dealing with attitudes of white superiority or having racial overtones, and items taken from the California E scaling dealing with negative feelings toward foreigners. The items of a racial nature (labeled "white" in the appendix) were worded so as not to be too inflamatory and yet to give some opportunity for black subjects to express their feelings regarding racial inferiority-superiority attitudes among blacks and whites. The foreigner items were scored because of the fact that previous research had seemed to indicate that whites were prone to become more negative toward both Negroes and foreigners if their status strivings were threatened by films of successful blacks. It was anticipated that the schools would b contain some whites whose ethnocentric attitudes could also be studied. However, as was discovered during testing, there were too few whites to analyze properly. In spite of this, the foreigner items were analyzed for black subjects in the event that some displacement of hostility toward whites might occur on the foreigner items.

3. Wished For and Predicted Goals:

This instrument, which was also used in previous research with the films, was an attempt to ascertain the level of aspiration and future occupational goal expectations of the subjects. All students were asked to respond with their first and second choices to two questions[2].

[1] Photographs were presented in a fixed order (1) white, (2) white, (3) Negro, (4) white, (5) Negro. See appendix for exact pretest instructions.

[2] See appendix for exact copies of the tests and scales used.

(a) What would you most like to become in the future? (regardless of your ability or the job opportunities)

(b) What do you think you'll really end up as? (this time try to be realistic about what you'll actually end up doing)

Analysis of Data:

Analysis of photographs was first done treating scores to each photograph as repeated measures. Analysis of total scores for black and white photos separately was then made with between factors including films - no films, sex of student, grade level (in order to control for age) and occupation of father. The latter was designated as either high or low socio-economic level with highs composed of father's occupations with scores from one through five on the Warner, Meeker and Eells Scale. Lower socio-economic students had father's occupational levels of either six or seven, which essentially meant unskilled or minimally skilled laborers. Because of the fact that previous research had shown the most significant changes occurring in the treatment of white photographs, following films, the division of scores into total white and black photographs seemed justified.

Because of an error in test administration, it was necessary to analyze the photograph results at School D separately for Grades VI and VIII. Grade VII had to be discarded because experimentals and controls received different forms. However, the "Wished For and Predicted Goals" were uniform for all grades, and, therefore, an analysis of the entire school could be done for this instrument. Although previous research with these questions (Teahan and Hug, 1969) had revealed that the differential reaction to the questions was crucial (with experimentals dropping on one and rising on another), this was not true for the present data and only the results for separate analysis of each question are contained in this report. Analysis of the difference between difference scores proved fruitless and examination of the means also revealed no trends similar to the previous study.

Results

The analysis of variance for total scores on black and white photographs, analyzed separately, are contained in Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 for Schools A-B, C, D, and E respectively. Analyses were done with race of photographs considered separately, because previous research (Teahan and Hug, 1969) showed changes following films took place primarily in the treatment of white photographs by Negro subjects. At that time, it was also discovered that some photographs were treated differently from others following the experimental condition. These photographs were changed in the present study and an analysis was done for each school using individual photograph scores as repeated measures. There was evidence that subjects did treat some photographs differently, but this did not involve the experimental condition. Thus, it will not be dealt with here, but the complete analyses of variance using photograph scores as repeated measures can be found in the appendix.

Tables 2 and 4 show that lower socio-economic experimental male subjects at Schools C and E both changed significantly in their treatment of white photographs following the film experience ($F=6.88$, significant at the .01 level for a film x sex x socio-economic interation at School C; $F=7.10$, significant at the .01 level for a film x socio-economic interaction in the all male School E.) An examination of means in Tables 6 and 8 reveal that these differences were primarily due to lower socio-economic males becoming more negative toward white photographs following the film presentation. All subjects with the exception of the low experimental males at School E also became more positive toward black photographs on retesting, regardless of whether they were experimentals or controls.

The other two schools (viewing Schools A-B as one school, since B served as A's control) also showed some significant changes on white photographs, but these results are not identical to those found at C and E. Since School D was the only other school to have the same experimental condition (i.e., view <u>both</u> black and white films, rather than just black), the apparent incompatibility of its results will be noted first. As may be remembered, an error in administration forced Grades VI and VIII to be analyzed separately, since these grades received different rating scales for photos. These results are presented in Table 3. A film x sex interaction at Grade VI reveals an F ratio of 5.49 for white photos, which is significant at the .05 level. The means in Table 7 reveal that this is the result of experimental males becoming significantly more negative toward white photos following the films, and closer inspection of these means shows that the greatest contribution to this effect did seem to come from lower socio-economic males. Females, on the other hand, especially experimental females, showed a tendency to become slightly more positive toward white photographs following the films.

The results at Grade VIII for School D, however, do not seem similar to either Schools C and E, or to the Grade VI students. Thus, Table 3 reveals the most significant change taking place was in terms of the treatment of black photographs (film effect x sex x socio-economic status, $F=7.23$, significant at the .01 level).Table 7 again reveals that lower

socio-economic experimental males seem to be contributing most to this effect by becoming significantly more positive toward the black photographs following the films. Higher socio-economic females are also contributing to this effect, while high males and low females are not. Most controls, however, have drifted in a more negative direction over time with the exception of high males. However, there were no significant differences in the treatment of white photos at this Grade VIII level, and an examination of the means showed that almost all males, whether experimental or control, tended to become more negative toward white photographs. Females, on the other hand, became slightly more positive. However, this F ratio of 2.89 failed to reach the level required for statistical significance.

It is with Schools A-B that there seems to be the least similarity of results with other schools. One must, however, consider the fact that the experimentals at this school (A) saw only black films and that this may play some role in the differential results. The only significant effect at this school was in terms of film x grade ($F = 2.98$, significant at the .05 level). This was again due to the treatment of white photographs following the films. An examination of the means in Table 5 reveal that experimentals at the higher grade levels became more negative toward white photographs, while controls tended to change in the opposite direction. This kind of trend was not present in any other school.

Although some grade differences seemed to be present at Schools C ($F = 3.51$, significant at the .05 level) and E ($F = 5.55$, significant at the .05 level), it is difficult to understand these changes. An examination of the means in Table 9 reveal that these F ratios were primarily due to differences in one grade level, rather than being due to some consistent trend. Thus, all students (both experimentals and controls) at the Grade VIII level in School C, and at Grade XI in School E, are those students responsible for this significant effect in that they became more positive toward white photos, while students at lower grade levels became more negative. It is not possible to make this comparison at School D, since different tests were used at different grade levels. However, it is interesting to note in Table 5 that a similar trend is present at Schools A-B. This is not statistically significant, however, ($F = 1.68$) and it is reversed by the introduction of the film condition with experimentals at the higher grades becoming more negative.

Table 1

Analysis of Variance for Black and White Photographs

at Elementary Schools A and B

		Black Photographs		White Photographs	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	79.76	2.86	1.30	.08
B - Sex	1	44.44	1.60	3.68	.21
C - Grade	3	2.65	.09	28.78	1.68
D - Socio-Econ.	1	9.16	.32	3.28	.19
A X B	1	.53	.01	11.05	.64
A X C	3	3.80	.14	50.92	2.98*
A X D	1	53.83	1.93	.26	.02
B X C	3	25.70	.92	1.244	.07
B X D	1	.08	.00	4.76	.28
C X D	3	18.63	.66	1.79	.10
A X B X C	3	48.43	1.74	19.38	1.13
A X B X D	1	3.31	.12	43.40	2.54
A X C X D	3	23.59	.85	5.46	.32
B X C X D	3	10.99	.39	4.03	.23
A X B X C X D	3	34.85	1.25	2.22	.13
S	291	27.85		17.08	

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Table 2

Analysis of Variance for Black and White Photographs

at Elementary School C

		Black Photographs		White Photographs	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	3.18	.13	1.01	.08
B - Sex	1	.39	.01	13.42	1.05
C - Grade	2	9.36	.38	44.96	3.51*
D - Socio-Econ.	1	9.74	.40	1.99	.15
A X B	1	25.43	1.04	8.57	.66
A X C	2	20.01	.82	2.19	.17
A X D	1	29.18	1.19	.10	.01
B X C	2	30.79	1.26	2.52	.19
B X D	1	75.41	3.09	36.94	2.88
C X D	2	46.45	1.91	20.85	1.63
A X B X C	2	14.72	.60	8.28	.65
A X B X D	1	1.19	.05	88.06	6.88**
A X C X D	2	16.48	.67	23.27	1.81
B X C X D	2	.17	.00	1.01	.08
A X B X C X D	2	8.42	.34	1.38	.10
S	168	24.34		12.80	

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Table 3

Analysis of Variance for Black and White Photographs

at Elementary School D for Grades VI and VIII

Grade VI

Source	df	Black Photographs MS	Black Photographs F ratios	White Photographs MS	White Photographs F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	20.80	.92	.37	.03
B - Sex	1	10.14	.45	1.35	.09
C - Grade (VI Only)	-	-	-	-	-
D - Socio-Econ.	1	8.12	.36	1.16	.08
A X B	1	5.50	.24	79.29	5.49*
A X D	1	.44	.02	28.06	1.94
B X D	1	8.94	.40	7.06	.49
A X B X D	1	.75	.03	3.94	.27
S	62	22.55		14.44	

Grade VIII

A - Film Effect	1	38.68	.83	2.46	.07
B - Sex	1	134.95	2.89	115.96	3.22
C - Grade (VIII Only)	-	-	-	-	-
D - Socio-Econ.	1	110.37	2.36	.21	.01
A X B	1	1.30	.03	25.18	.70
A X D	1	22.95	.49	14.39	.40
B X D	1	78.51	1.67	2.22	.06
A X B X D	1	338.01	7.23**	.29	.01
S	62	46.76		35.96	

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Table 4

Analysis of Variance for Black and White Photographs

at High School E

		Black Photographs		White Photographs	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	11.99	.35	11.29	.64
B - Sex (all male)	-	-	-	-	-
C - Grade	1	42.37	1.24	97.87	5.55*
D - Socio-Econ.	1	52.81	1.54	5.74	.32
A X C	2	11.42	.33	8.09	.45
A X D	1	.00	.00	125.20	7.10**
B X D	2	.77	.02	8.04	.45
A X C X D	2	1.11	.03	36.46	2.07
S	98	34.22		17.64	

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Table 5

Means for Black and White Photographs for Experimentals and Controls by Sex and Socio-Economic Level and by Grade Level at Schools A-B

	Experimentals				Controls			
	Males		Females		Males		Females	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Black Photos	N-32	N-60	N-45	N-72	N-10	N-41	N-17	N-46
Pre-test	26.59	26.04	25.52	25.99	22.81	25.25	23.75	23.88
Post-test	24.67	25.10	25.05	25.88	24.02	24.42	25.23	24.26
White Photos								
Pre-test	27.73	26.99	26.47	26.43	26.89	26.34	25.44	27.15
Post-test	28.58	27.30	26.43	27.23	26.33	27.47	27.06	27.71

	Grade V		Grade VI		Grade VII		Grade VIII	
	Exp.	Con.	Exp.	Con.	Exp.	Con.	Exp.	Con.
Black Photos	N=46	N=35	N=55	N=22	N=66	N=38	N=52	N=19
Pre-test	25.57	23.62	25.50	23.70	25.79	24.02	27.27	24.34
Post-test	24.13	24.30	24.48	24.28	25.46	24.69	26.64	24.64
White Photos								
Pre-test	25.95	24.72	25.77	26.59	27.73	26.37	28.17	28.14
Post-test	25.87	27.87	26.77	27.17	28.62	25.95	28.26	27.58

Table 6

Means for Black and White Photographs for Experimentals and Controls by Sex and Socio-Economic Level at School C

	Experimentals				Controls			
	Males		Females		Males		Females	
Black Photos	High N-21	Low N-24	High N-26	Low N-28	High N-30	Low N-15	High N-28	Low N-20
Pre-test	26.20	25.55	26.67	26.43	25.59	25.02	25.46	27.83
Post-test	23.72	24.64	25.82	24.971	24.68	24.42	25.33	24.79
White Photos								
Pre-test	28.23	26.57	28.00	27.40	27.37	27.78	28.19	26.75
Post-test	28.22	27.20	28.38	27.75	28.54	26.76	28.08	29.17

Table 7

Means for Black and White Photographs for Experimentals and Controls by Sex and Socio-Economic Levels at School D for Grades VI and VIII

Grade VI

	Experimentals				Controls			
	Males		Females		Males		Females	
Black Photos	High N-8	Low N-6	High N-12	Low N-6	High N-7	Low N-10	High N-13	Low N-8
Pre-test	23.94	23.50	26.12	26.17	27.07	26.10	23.92	25.69
Post-test	23.38	24.25	26.17	25.75	25.86	26.30	21.85	23.94
White Photos								
Pre-test	26.96	26.55	30.92	29.17	29.43	29.67	27.85	28.17
Post-test	27.79	28.89	29.22	29.06	29.95	28.03	29.28	29.58

Grade VIII

	Experimentals				Controls			
	Males		Females		Males		Females	
Black Photos	High N-11	Low N-8	High N-12	Low N-3	High N-13	Low N-7	High N-8	Low N-8
Pre-test	44.18	39.00	47.92	41.83	44.62	41.79	42.31	43.19
Post-test	42.54	34.31	42.42	47.50	41.42	42.43	44.31	44.12
White Photos								
Pre-test	45.97	49.42	44.00	43.32	49.67	44.14	47.42	49.54
Post-test	46.36	51.50	43.39	43.44	52.10	46.00	45.88	46.88

Table 8

Means for Black and White Photographs for Experimentals and Controls by Socio-Economic Level at All-Male School E

	Experimentals		Controls	
Black Photos	High N-36	Low N-18	High N-33	Low N-23
Pre-test	44.84	43.92	45.73	46.63
Post-test	43.74	44.50	44.03	45.67
White Photos				
Pre-test	48.35	47.54	47.73	49.16
Post-test	48.27	49.04	49.65	48.82

Table 9

Means for Black and White Photographs by Grade Level at Schools C and E

School C

	Grade VI N-62	Grade VII N-56	Grade VIII N-74
Black Photos			
Pre-test	25.78	26.28	26.22
Post-test	24.89	24.64	24.86
White Photos			
Pre-test	28.20	26.94	27.48
Post-test	28.96	28.19	26.89

School E

	Grade IX N-37	Grade X N-45	Grade XI N-28
Black Photos			
Pre-test	44.61	46.14	44.98
Post-test	44.61	44.16	44.34
White Photos			
Pre-test	47.75	48.21	48.78
Post-test	48.67	49.98	47.57

Results of Pre-test Differences for Black and White Photographs:

In order to insure that experimental and control groups did not differ from one another initially in terms of pre-test scores, which might then result in spurious results because of a regression to the mean or ceiling effect phenomenon, an analysis of all pre-test scores for black and white photographs for Schools A-B, C, D, and E are contained in Tables 10, 11, 12, and 13 respectively.

Table 10 reveals that School A did differ significantly from School B (its control) in terms of pre-test scores on black photographs ($F = 7.62$, significant at the .01 level). An inspection of means in Table 5 reveal that School B was significantly lower in pre-test scores, or more positive in their ratings of black photos. Since no differences were found between experimentals and controls in terms of the difference scores for black photographs, this finding does not affect the results discussed thus far. One could, however, interpret the tendency for experimentals to drop in post-test scores, while controls tended to rise as a regression toward the mean. This F ratio in Table 1 of 2.86 was not statistically significant.

Another pre-test difference, this time on white photographs, also appeared with respect to grade level in Schools A-B ($F = 3.85$, significant at the .05 level). Again, Table 5 indicates that this was due to a tendency among all students to become more negative in their evaluation of white photographs as grade level increased. However, this does not affect the differences already discussed in terms of experimentals and controls by grade level, since there were no differences in pre-test scores between Schools A and B <u>at each grade level</u>. Thus, the pre-test scores of experimentals and controls for each grade were similar (as evidenced by the A x C F ratio in Table 10 of .71) on white photographs.

No differences for School C were found in terms of pre-test scores as evidenced by Table 11. However, Table 12 shows that at the Grade VI level in School D, there were grade level differences between experimentals and controls in pre-test scores for white photographs ($F = 5.79$, significant at the .05 level). This means that the film effect x grade level interaction previously seen in Table 3 must be interpreted with great caution, for although lower socio-economic experimental males did rise in post-test scores, while their controls dropped, they did begin at different levels with experimentals having lower pre-test scores than controls. One should note, however, that although higher socio-economic male controls started out at an equally high level, they went up in post-test score, which does suggest that "regression toward the mean" is not sufficient explanation to account for differences previously discussed. In addition, lower socio-economic female controls, in spite of high pre-test scores, also continued to increase in post-testing. It is, however, impossible to gauge the exact effect of the different pre-test level in terms of the effect on post-test scores.

No other pre-test differences were found at either School D or School E, although at the latter, a film x socio-economic level interaction of 2.93 does appear, which, however, fails to reach the level required for statistical significance (3.89 for .05 level). An examination of means in Table 8 does reveal that there were initial differences between lower socio-economic experimentals and controls. However, since the F ratio obtained for the differences scores was at the .01 level, and since the increase in post-testing was far beyond what one would anticipate finding in a regression toward the mean, it is not felt that this initial difference could account for the previously presented results.

Table 10

Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Black and White Photographs at Schools A (Experimental Group) and B (Control Group)

		Black Photographs		White Photographs	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	207.24	7.62**	9.37	.53
B - Sex	1	7.01	.26	17.67	1.00
C - Grade	3	15.05	.55	67.71	3.85*
D - Socio-economic	1	18.02	.66	.42	.02
A X B	1	1.33	.05	4.05	.22
A X C	3	3.47	.13	12.48	.71
A X D	1	20.38	.75	10.72	.61
B X C	3	35.38	1.30	11.52	.65
B X D	1	4.74	.17	22.54	1.45
C X D	3	20.83	.76	17.94	1.02
A X B X C	3	34.29	1.26	3.65	.20
A X B X D	1	32.28	1.87	7.24	.41
A X C X D	3	34.25	1.26	38.41	2.18
B X C X D	3	1.71	.06	1.36	.08
A X B X C X D	3	5.53	.20	.86	.05
S	291	27.20		17.61	

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Table 11

Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Black and White Photographs at School C

		Black Photographs		White Photographs	
Soutce	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film	1	2.48	.10	.03	.00
B - Sex	1	44.58	1.95	.40	.03
C - Grade	2	4.43	.19	23.35	1.72
D - Socio-economic	1	2.28	.10	29.82	2.20
A X B	1	4.80	.21	1.73	.12
A X C	2	6.07	.26	11.92	.88
A X D	1	19.98	.87	4.09	.30
B X C	2	14.44	.63	14.70	1.08
B X D	1	30.74	1.35	1.75	.12
C X D	2	19.75	.86	1.00	.07
A X B X C	2	31.57	1.38	1.06	.08
A X B X D	1	17.65	.77	23.08	1.71
A X C X D	2	10.21	.45	20.77	1.54
B X C X D	2	39.88	1.75	21.59	1.59
A X B X C X D	2	54.87	2.40	16.53	1.22
S	168	22.82		13.52	

Table 12

Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Black and White Photographs at School D for Grades VI and VIII

		Black Photographs		White Photographs	
Grade VI	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	10.43	.39	3.24	.21
B - Sex	1	2.57	.09	9.88	.65
C - Grade (Does not apply)					
D - Socio-economic	1	.19	.00	1.68	.11
A X B	1	70.23	.26	87.58	5.79*
A X D	1	.75	.03	8.89	.58
B X D	1	13.68	.52	2.95	.19
A X B X D	1	5.16	.19	1.92	.13
S	62	26.40		15.12	
Grade VIII					
A- Film Effect	1	.49	.00	56.05	1.56
B - Sex	1	25.97	.37	25.63	.71
C (Does not apply)					
D - Soci-economic	1	161.42	2.29	.33	.00
A X B	1	47.85	.68	117.67	3.28
A X D	1	77.00	1.09	37.11	1.03
B X D	1	4.28	.06	10.18	.28
A X B X D	1	22.26	.31	112.70	3.14
S	62	70.31		35.87	

* Significant at the .05 level

Table 13

Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Black and White Photographs at School E

		Black Photographs		White Photographs	
Source	df	MS	FFratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	46.28	1.34	12.24	.77
B - Sex (Does not apply)					
C - Grade	2	20.72	.60	16.01	1.01
D - Socio-economic	1	4.43	.12	22.28	1.40
A X C	2	7.93	.23	26.84	1.69
A X D	1	10.77	.31	46.50	2.93
C X D	2	4.04	.12	4.43	.27
A X C X D	2	10.97	.32	11.84	.74
S	98	34.43		15.88	

Results for Social Survey Questions:

The results of the Social Survey Questions on white superiority and foreigner items for Grade VIII at School D, and for all grades at School E, are shown in Tables 14 and 15. None of the differences found at School D for W items reached the level necessary for statistical significance. However, at School E (Table 15), a number of differences appeared. Experimentals became significantly different from controls on W items following the film experience ($F = 6.46$, significant at the .01 level). An examination of the means in Table 17 reveal that experimentals became more critical of white superiority items following the films, while the controls appeared to drift in the opposite direction. There was also a significant film x grade x occupational level interaction ($F = 4.30$, significant at the .05 level). The means in Table 18 reveal that there was a tendency for lower occupational experimentals, at the Grade IX level, to change in a positive direction when compared to their controls following the films, but all the cell frequencies are so small that this result must be regarded with caution.

An F ratio of 7.91 (significant at the .01 level) when socio-economic level was considered at School E was also the result of changes among lower socio-economic males in that all of the students at this level tended to become more negative about their race over time (or more in agreement with white superiority attitudes) when compared with their higher socio-economic peers. As mentioned, however, exposure to the films seemed to impede this development among low occupation students.

In spite of the fact that no significant differences were found at School D for W items, the means for various subgroups are presented in Table 16. These do reveal that lower socio-economic males resembled those at School E in that experimentals tended to become more positive, while controls became more negative about their race following the film period. This was not true for females. However, these N's are too small to reach any comfortable conclusions. Also noted at School D was an F ratio of 5.48 (significant at the .05 level) when sex differences for foreigner items were analyzed. Table 16 reveals that females appear to become more negative toward foreigners over time than do males. This did not seem to be influenced by the experimental conditions, however.

Table 14

Analysis of Variance of White Superiority and Foreigner Items from the Social Survey Questions for Grade VIII Students at School D

		White Superiority		Foreigner Items	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	1.36	.02	31.39	.91
B - Sex	1	6.65	.13	188.41	5.48*
C - Grade (Does not apply)					
D - Occup. Level	1	14.12	.27	72.37	2.10
A X B	1	145.19	2.82	12.45	.36
A X D	1	.40	.00	6.48	.19
B X D	1	1.81.	.03	122.15	3.55
A X B X D	1	47.72	.92	59.23	1.72
S	57	51.52		34.38	3.30

* Significant at the .05 level

Table 15

Analysis of Variance of White Superiority and Foreigner Items from the Social Survey Questions for Students at School E

		White Superiority		Foreigner Items	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	201.60	6.46**	15.59	.47
B - Sex (Does not apply)					
C - Grade	2	26.04	.83	45.91	1.39
D - Occup. Level	1	246.81	7.91**	28.28	.86
A X C	2	61.19	1.96	14.21	.43
A X D	1	100.38	3.21	10.64	.32
C X D	2	18.45	.59	70.63	2.14
A X C X D	2	268.40	4.30*	7.48	.22
S	93	31.18		32.98	

* Significant at the .05 level
** Significant at the .01 level

Table 16

Means for White Superiority and Foreigner Items for Experimental and Control Grade VIII Students by Sex and Socio-economic Levels at School D

	Experimentals				Controls			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
White Items	High N-11	Low N-5	High N-12	Low N-3	High N-12	Low N-7	High N-8	Low N-7
Pre-test	18.36	22.40	19.75	18.33	19.83	19.57	20.00	19.71
Post-test	17.54	19.20	21.42	20.67	20.91	21.71	20.75	17.00
Foreigner Items								
Pre-test	22.45	22.00	23.33	19.00	20.83	27.71	22.25	16.29
Post-test	21.36	18.79	21.83	25.67	20.83	28.43	24.12	20.71

Table 17

Means for White Superiority and Foreigner Items for Experimentals and Controls by Socio-economic Level at School E

	Experimentals		Controls	
White Items	High N-34	Low N-17	High N-32	Low N-22
Pre-test	18.49	18.42	18.78	16.78
Post-test	16.76	17.95	17.97	21.71
Foreigner Items				
Pre-test	21.45	24.97	24.13	24.05
Post-test	20.61	24.59	23.44	25.28

Table 18

Means for White Superiority Items for Experimentals and Controls with Grade and Socio-economic Level at School E

Experimentals

	Grade IX		Grade X		Grade XI	
	High N-13	Low N-7	High N-16	Low N-5	High N-5	Low N-5
Pre-test	18.38	21.86	17.50	17.00	19.60	16.40
Post-test	17.61	18.86	15.06	17.60	17.60	17.40

Controls

	Grade IX		Grade X		Grade XI	
	High N-8	Low N-5	High N-9	Low N-14	High N-15	Low N-3
Pre-test	19.00	15.20	20.00	18.14	17.33	17.00
Post-test	17.50	26.00	19.55	18.14	16.86	21.00

Results for Wished For and Predicted Goals:

Previous research with this instrument (Teahan and Hug, 1969) had shown that experimentals tended to decrease in "Wished For" goals and increase in "Predicted" goals following the film experience. Controls, on the other hand, tended to drift in the opposite direction over time. However, no such trends were noted in the present data and hence a comparison of the difference between difference scores for "Wished For" versus "Predicted" goals is not shown in the analyses. Instead, each is considered separately.

The results of the "Wished For" and "Predicted" goals are contained in Tables 19, 20, 21, and 22 for Schools A-B, C, D, and E respectively. It should be noted that since this instrument was used for both elementary and high school students alike, School D could be analyzed as an entity rather than having to separate Grade VI from Grade VIII, while discarding Grade VII as was done with the photographs. The results are difficult to interpret, however, since there appears to be consistency in only two of the tables, i.e., between results at Schools A-B and C. Table 19 reveals three significant interactions in terms of "Wished For" goals at Schools A-B. A film x grade x occupational level ($F=3.91$, significant at the .05 level); a sex x grade x occupational level ($F=4.46$, significant at the .01 level) were all found. This seemed due essentially to lower socio-economic males making higher occupational "wishes" as grade increased (see Table 23). There was a trend for this to be more pronounced among experimentals, while their controls tended to decrease. However, these latter results must be viewed with great skepticism and caution, since cell frequencies drop too low to be considered adequate, particularly at higher grade levels among experimentals and at all grade levels among controls when sexes are separated. In addition, the analysis of variance program used tended to give "mean scores" in order to balance for unequal frequencies and, therefore, all of these higher order interactions with low frequencies must be approached with considerable caution.

School C (Table 20) showed a similar film x sex x grade x occupation interaction as was found in Schools A-B with an F ratio of 3.95, significant at the .05 level. However, there do not appear to be any readily identifiable trends in the means (Table 24) to account for this, and the same criticism of this result can be made as reported earlier concerning Schools A-B, namely, that cell frequencies are too small to trust this difference. As with Schools A-B, no differences were noted in terms of "Predicted" goals.

The results at School D shown in Table 21 reveal little or no similarity to Schools A-B or C and the only significant differences found here were in terms of "Predicted" goals. Significant F ratios of 4.70 and 4.00, both significant at the .05 levels, were found in terms of sex and socio-economic differences, with both males and lower socio-economic students tending to increase on post-testing regardless of whether they were experimentals or controls (see Table 25.) In addition, a significant film x sex x grade x socio-economic level interaction was found, but this time in terms of "Predicted," rather than "Wished For" goals as was true of other schools. This seemed due, in part, to higher

socio-economic experimentals increasing in post-test scores as compared to their controls. Again, however, cell frequencies are so small that it is difficult to place much weight upon this result, especially when it differs from other schools and seems so internally inconsistent.

At School E (Table 22), no differences were found on either "Predicted" or "Wished For" goals and the only difference approaching significance was again a film x grade x socio-economic status interaction (sex does not apply at this school) and this F ratio of 2.68 is significant at about the .10 level. An examination of means seemed to indicate that the greatest changes in "Wished For" goals were between lower socio-economic experimentals and controls at the lowest grade level. This seems to bear no relationship to findings at other schools and again may be due to chance, especially since it failed to gain the level required for statistical significance.

Table 19

Analysis of Variance of Goals and Predictions for Students at Schools A (Experimental) and B (Control)

S		Like to Become		End Up As	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	28.71	.45	83.84	.76
B - Sex	1	9.36	.15	63.25	.58
C - Grade	3	122.08	1.92	149.05	1.36
D - Socio-economic	1	64.88	1.02	50.30	.46
A X B	1	88.91	1.40	16.45	.15
A X C	3	13.68	.22	24.61	.22
A X D	1	47.62	.75	189.48	1.73
B X C	3	22.68	.36	97.54	.89
B X D	1	2.88	.04	411.59	3.76
C X D	3	85.94	1.35	25.16	.23
A X B X C	3	80.93	1.27	30.76	.28
A X B X D	1	2.06	.03	5.46	.05
A X C X D	3	248.18	3.91**	85.29	.77
B X C X D	33	182.14	2.87*	71.92	.66
A X B X C X D	3	283.47	4.46**	91.30	.83
S	247	63.44		109.57	

* Significant at the .05 level
** Significant at the .01 level

Table 20

Analysis of Variance of Goals and Predictions for Students at School C

		Like to Become		End Up As	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	11.23	.25	50.83	.60
B - Sex	1	32.54	.73	57.33	.67
C - Grade	2	14.16	.32	29.43	.34
D - Socio-economic	11	3.18	.07	265.72	3.11
A X B	1	3.97	.09	12.82	.15
A X C	2	66.66	1.50	75.26	.88
A X D	1	16.42	.37	61.32	.72
B X C	2	1.49	.03	7.11	.08
B X D	1	9.42	.21	25.38	.29
C X D	2	13.82	.31	117.60	1.37
A X B X C	2	47.02	1.06	45.25	.53
A X B X D	1	19.11	.43	.11	.00
A X C X D	2	51.03	1.14	125.43	1.47
B X C X D	2	12.93	.29	5.11	.06
A X B X C X D	2	176.11	3.95*	55.51	.65
S	158	44.54		85.26	

* Significant at the .05 level

Table 21

Analysis of Variance of Goals and Predictions at School D

		Like to Become		End Up As	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	42.17	.80	71.82	.94
B - Sex	1	11.07	.21	359.42	4.70*
C - Grade	2	1.21	.02	168.20	2.20
D - Socio-economic	1	19.35	.37	306.43	4.00**
A X B	1	123.47	2.33	1.53	.02
A X C	2	146.83	2.77	70.24	.92
A X D	1	1.59	.03	85.93	1.12
B X C	2	35.49	.67	149.64	1.96
B X D	1	5.08	.09	18.50	.24
C X D	2	152.08	2.87	70.07	.92
A X B X C	2	73.55	1.39	118.05	1.54
A X B X D	1	118.45	2.23	152.71	1.99
A X C X D	2	36.65	.69	3.31	.04
B X C X D	2	70.94	1.34	67.94	.89
A X B X C X D	2	28.29	.53	336.45	4.40*
S	153	52.90		76.52	

* Significant at the .05 level

Table 22

Analysis of Variance of Goals and Predictions at School E

		Like to Become		End Up As	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	12.48	.26	112.37	.84
B - Sex (Does not apply)					
C - Grade	2	63.98	1.33	328.10	2.46
D - Socio-economic	1	49.51	1.03	3.32	.02
A X C	2	69.66	1.45	201.58	1.51
A X D	1	46.97	.98	390.52	2.93
C X D	2	21.12	.44	6.07	.04
A X C X D	2	128.85	2.68	79.67	.60
S	94	48.05		133.26	

Table 23

Means for High and Low Socio-economic Male and Female Experimentals and Controls on "Wished For" Goals at Schools A-B

Experimentals

	Grade V		Grade VI		Grade VII		Grade VIII	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Males	N-6	N-16	N-5	N-15	N-5	N-12	N-13	N-10
Pre-test	71.67	71.94	77.80	73.20	76.20	74.25	70.23	72.50
Post-test	72.16	74.06	74.60	72.07	73.80	71.58	75.69	71.70
Females	N-5	N-3	N-10	N-22	N-10	N-22	N-12	N-12
Pre-test	74.80	70.23	71.80	73.27	66.50	73.09	71.25	74.08
Post-test	78.20	75.69	68.60	71.04	68.80	74.50	71.25	73.25

Controls

Males	N-1	N-7	N-1	N-6	N-4	N-12	N-2	N-2
Pre-test	72.00	73.28	75.00	73.83	66.00	74.50	84.50	68.00
Post-test	90.00	68.14	74.40	72.17	71.25	74.50	76.00	78.50
Females	N-2	N-10	N-3	N-8	N-7	N-15	N-4	N-7
Pre-test	76.00	72.10	69.00	70.62	67.14	68.80	75.00	75.43
Post-test	77.50	70.10	72.00	68.12	64.71	72.33	78.25	72.00

Table 24

Means for High and Low Socio-economic Male and Female Experimentals and Controls on "Wished For" Goals at School C

Experimentals

	Grade VI		Grade VII		Grade VIII	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Males	N-7	N-5	N-6	N-8	N-6	N-11
Pre-test	74.86	75.60	79.83	75.12	69.50	72.54
Post-test	76.43	76.80	76.33	75.50	72.17	72.45
Females	N-8	N-8	N-8	N-8	N-10	N-11
Pre-test	70.75	70.75	73.00	70.00	74.10	72.91
Post-test	76.38	69.25	74.00	71.25	73.40	72.92

Controls

	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Males	N-8	N-5	N-7	N-4	N-11	N-5
Pre-test	75.88	80.80	76.57	81.50	77.36	68.00
Post-test	76.25	78.20	79.14	82.75	72.82	68.20
Females	N-8	N-7	N-8	N-4	N-12	N-7
Pre-test	71.37	72.71	71.12	76.50	74.67	71.43
Post-test	68.62	75.71	72.50	78.25	77.42	69.71

Table 25

Means for High and Low Socio-economic Male and Female Experimentals and Controls on Predicted Goals at School D

Experimentals

	Grade VI		Grade VII		Grade VIII	
Males	High N-8	Low N-5	High N-6	Low N-6	High N-11	Low N-8
Pre-test	67.00	65.20	71.00	77.67	75.73	73.38
Post-test	72.88	76.00	74.67	71.67	74.27	76.75
Females	N-11	N-6	N-3	N-4	N-12	N-3
Pre-test	66.18	64.50	74.33	64.50	70.33	72.00
Post-test	64.91	67.67	68.67	67.75	72.67	69.00

Controls

Males	High N-6	Low N-10	High N-9	Low N-3	High N-11	Low N-7
Pre-test	68.50	67.20	75.22	68.00	77.64	63.71
Post-test	68.33	73.70	73.44	76.33	73.45	64.14
Females	N-13	N-8	N-6	N-6	N-8	N-7
Pre-test	77.08	69.25	68.33	68.83	68.50	64.57
Post-test	72.00	70.62	65.67	63.00	68.37	66.14

Results for Pre-test Differences on "Wished For" and Predicted Goals:

Although there were no apparently consistent differences between experimentals and controls in terms of difference scores, an examination and analysis of pre-test scores did reveal some more pronounced trends running through all schools. Tables 26, 27, 28, and 29 show the analysis of variance for pre-test scores on Goals and Predictions for Schools A-B, C, D, and E respectively; and Table 30 contains the pre-test means for higher and lower socio-economic status males and females at these schools.

The first large and consistent difference which emerged at almost every school was a sex difference on pre-test scores for Predicted goals and an F ratio of 12.18, significant at beyond the .01 level, was found at Schools A-B (see Table 26). At School C, (Table 27), significant F ratios for sex were found for both "Wished For" (F=5.95, significant at the .05 level) and Predicted (F=7.33, significant at the .01 level) Goals. At School D, an F ratio of 6.06, significant at the .01 level, was found for sex on the "Wished For" goals measure, while at School E, which had only males, no such comparison was possible. An examination of the means in Table 30 reveal that the consistent reason for these sex differences is the result of lower "Wished For" and Predicted goals among females, especially on the latter measure.

Some fair degree of consistency occurred when socio-economic status was examined in terms of its influence on pre-test scores. At Schools A-B, an F ratio of 5.12, significant at the .05 level, was found for Predicted success, as well as a sex x occupational level interaction (F=7.28, significant at the .01 level). This latter difference was due to the particularly poor Predicted success of lower socio-economic males when compared to their high socio-economic peers (see Table 30).

At School C (Table 27), a triple interaction of experimental-control x sex x socio-economic (F=3.27, significant at the .05 level of confidence) seemed to indicate that lower socio-economic students in the control group had higher initial "Wished For" goals, but cell frequencies were too low here to give this result much credence. However, on Predicted goals, lower socio-economic students were again lowest in goal choices (F=1.62) as had been found in Schools A-B, although this result was not statistically significant. At School D (Table 28), the socio-economic variable on Predictions again produced a significant difference between the low and high occupation group (F=5.30, significant at the .05 level) with lows again making poorer predictions of future success than highs.

For some reason, at School D, experimental students also increased in both "Wished For" (F=4.38, significant at the .05 level) goals and Predictions (F=3.30, significant at the .05 level) as grade level increased. An opposite trend was true for the control group on these same measures. Since this result was not found at other schools, it is difficult to interpret it as reflecting any general characteristic. The same is true for a grade x occupational level interaction, also found at School D, in "Wished For" goals (F=3.87, significant at the .05 level) where lower socio-economic students, at Grade VII, appeared to be higher than the higher socio-economic students in "Wished For," while at the Grade VIII level, they were lower. Results of such low internal consistency, especially when they are not found at other schools, are equally suspect. The same is

true for the quadruple interaction of experimental-control x sex x grade x occupation at this same school, which also suffers from previous criticisms regarding low cell frequencies.

Finally, a socio-economic difference also appeared at School E (Table 29) on Predictions (F=7.61, significant at the .01 level). This is, of course, consistent with the results found at Schools A-B and D, since lower socio-economic students were again found to have significantly lower pre-test scores on Predictions.

An examination of all the means in Table 30, therefore, confirms that consistent trends, most of them statistically significant, are present in the schools. The pattern that emerges is that females are lower than males on both measures, but especially in terms of predicted success. Lower socio-economic males, however, are almost as low as lower socio-economic women in terms of predicted success, while there is little difference between high and low males in terms of "Wished For" goals.

Table 26

Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Goals and Predictions at Schools A & B

		Like to Become		End Up As	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	.36	.00	54.37	.06
B - Sex	1	95.02	1.14	1163.55	12.18**
C - Grade	3	61.78	.74	43.24	.45
D - Socio-economic	1	4.73	.05	488.72	5.12*
A X B	1	.01	.00	241.91	2.53
A X C	3	92.60	1.11	86.03	.90
A X D	1	15.43	.18	.05	.00
B X C	3	60.78	.73	9.08	.09
B X D	1	46.47	.55	695.60	7.28**
C X D	3	73.57	.88	34.78	.36
A X B X C	3	14.15	.17	24.11	.25
A X B X D	1	1.00	.01	195.22	2.04
A X C X D	3	89.11	1.07	146.03	1.53
B X C X D	3	77.53	.93	65.65	.68
A X B X C X D	3	97.91	1.18	88.74	.93
S	247	83.06		95.50	

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Table 27

Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Goals and Predictions at School C

		Like to Become		End Up As	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	103.76	1.46	3.42	.03
B - Sex	1	422.80	5.95*	700.62	7.33**
C - Grade	2	116.17	1.64	68.39	.72
D - Socio-economic	1	.38	.00	155.16	1.62
A X B	1	11.65	.16	60.04	.63
A X C	2	10.20	.14	117.58	1.23
A X D	1	23.81	.33	150.42	1.57
B X C	2	442.75	3.11*	162.13	1.70
B X D	1	.02	.00	2.32	.02
C X D	2	74.07	1.04	86.15	.90
A X B X C	2	8.64	.12	252.39	2.64
A X B X D	1	11.31	.16	123.71	1.30
A X C X D	2	232.50	3.27*	239.89	2.51
B X C X D	2	11.67	.16	99.67	1.04
A X B X C X D	2	45.07	.63	55.03	.58
S	158	71.04		95.53	

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Table 28

Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Goals and Predictions at School D

		Like to Become		End Up As	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	53.76	.94	6.39	.07
B - Sex	1	345.33	6.06**	122.81	1.50
C - Grade	2	14.26	.25	125.14	1.53
D - Socio-economic	1	1.61	.03	433.98	5.30*
A X B	1	.00	.00	53.54	.65
A X C	2	249.58	4.38*	269.97	3.30*
A X D	1	.76	.01	179.17	2.19
B X C	2	137.50	2.41	155.82	1.90
B X D	1	65.91	1.16	.36	.00
C X D	2	220.53	3.87*	15.12	.18
A X B X C	2	75.61	1.33	36.66	.45
A X B X D	1	130.77	2.30	142.96	1.75
A X C X D	2	18.18	.32	41.54	.51
B X C X D	2	56.53	.99	121.40	1.48
A X B X C X D	2	217.95	3.83*	186.22	2.28
S	153	56.95		81.80	

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Table 29

Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Goals and Predictions at School E

		Like to Become		End Up As	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	2.44	.05	5.70	.06
B - Sex (Does not apply)					
C - Grade	2	63.69	1.30	127.12	1.45
D - Socio-economic	1	89.89	1.84	193.33	2.21
A X C	2	84.18	1.72	183.43	2.09
A X D	1	76.29	1.56	665.38	7.61**
C X D	2	167.58	3.43	31.79	.36
A X C X D	2	28.37	.58	6.53	.07
S	94	48.82		87.45	

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Table 30

Means of Pre-test Scores for Goals and Predictions of High and Low Socio-economic Males and Females at All Schools

	Goals				Predictions	
School A and B	Males	(N)	Females	(N)	Males	Females
High Socio-economis	74.17	(37)	71.44	(53)	75.64	67.63
Low Socio-economic	72.69	(80)	72.20	(99)	65.65	66.35
School C						
High Socio-economic	75.67	(45)	72.50	(54)	73.17	68.84
Low Socio-economic	75.59	(37)	72.38	(45)	71.01	67.14
School D						
High Socio-economic	74.64	(51)	72.92	(53)	72.51	70.79
Low Socio-economic	75.76	(39)	71.38	(34)	69.19	67.28
School E						
Higher Socio-economic	76.25	(67)	--		71.71	--
Lower Socio-economic	74.06	(39)	--		68.50	--

Discussion of Results

In the present findings, lower socio-economic males at two schools became significantly more negative toward white photos following the films. In one other school, where students also saw both black and white films, which was the experimental condition used in a previous study of this nature, the experimental males became more negative toward white photos at only the Grade VI level, while at Grade VIII, experimentals (again, primarily male lower socio-economic) became more positive toward black photos, but did not change toward white photos. However, one of the problems encountered in evaluating the results of this school was the fact that cell frequencies became very small when a breakdown was made in terms of sex, socio-economic status and experimental condition. This was because grade levels had to be analyzed separately. Thus, while cell frequencies ranged from 15 to 28 at School C and from 18 to 36 at School E, they dropped to a range of 3 to 13 at School D with most cells being lower than 10. Thus, it is very difficult to make any decision about the findings at School D when one has separated experimental condition into levels of sex and socio-economic status.

At School A, the only significant change noted was also in terms of white photos with experimentals again becoming more negative as grade level or the age of students increased. Since this school is predominantly lower class, as opposed to the other schools which were primarily middle class, this may account in part for the fact that there was no interaction with socio-economic status. It may well be that being middle class, in a mostly lower class setting, especially when this probably means that one lives in a lower class environment since these were neighborhood schools, may mean that one is equally impressed by successful blacks (who seem quite prosperous in the film) regardless of whether one's father has a skilled or non-skilled job. The older one is, the more one may react to a pride-producing stimulus (older to a point, of course). In addition, the fact that only black films were shown to these students may have also cut down on the "black back-lash" effect of becoming more negative toward whites as racial pride increased, since the inclusion of "white success stories" may in itself engender negative feelings.

It is difficult to explain all of the findings which emerged in all schools, particularly those which were internally inconsistent, i.e., which appeared at only one grade level, or seemed to represent no particular trend in any direction. Some of the differences which were not connected to the film experience may also represent accidental artifacts (for example, the fact that females at Grade 8 in School D were more negative toward foreigners). Since there was no opportunity to look for this at any other school, and the finding is both unexpected and not consistent with the data for females on other instruments, it may well be that this result was simply due to chance, especially when the subject number was low. For this reason, one looks for the consistent trends which seem to run through all schools and which logically seem to follow from some premises.

In this respect, there was some rather consistent evidence that it was among lower socio-economic students, especially males, where these films had the greatest impact. This is not so surprising in view of the fact that the whole film experience was geared to the hypothesis that the lower socio-economic male suffers from a lack of successful models in his immediate environment with whom to identify and gain a sense of value and worth. As Ginsberg et. al. (1962) states, "persons of exceptional accomplishments may not be as helpful a guide to the Negro youngster as the knowledge that individuals not too different from himself have risen one or two rungs on the ladder" (P. 107). Since the films used attempted to emphasize that a lower socio-economic beginning may still lead to success, they were essentially geared to appeal to the low status child. Related to this is Trueblood's (1960) observation that most Negro youth (and by this he means poor inner-city youth) seemed to be totally ignorant about the community in which they lived and the vocational opportunities actually available to them. Thus, since the films themselves concerned successful black males, it is not unusual that the group most influenced would be lower socio-economic males.

The results of the Social Survey Questions also lend support to the findings of the photograph technique. Experimentals were found to become significantly more critical than controls of white superiority items. Although this was true for all experimentals, whether they were of low or high socio-economic status, an examination of the means reveals that the greatest contribution came from the lower socio-economic status males (although the F ratio for film x occupation of 3.21 just failed to meet the level required for statistical significance). Lower socio-economic controls who did not see the films became more negative about their race, over time, as evidenced by even greater support for white superiority items. Although the numbers were too small to deal with at School D when sex and socio-economic status were both considered, the lower socio-economic males again seemed to show the greatest change with experimentals becoming more positive about their race, while controls moved in the opposite direction.

The results obtained from the W items also lends support to the hypothesis that the more negative shift in the evaluations of white photographs, following films, may represent a sort of exploding of the white superiority myth among blacks as they gain in self-esteem. Thus, it is not simply a matter of saying to himself, "I am better than I thought," but he also adds with even greater vehemence, "and you (whites) are much worse." This phenomenon may mean, therefore, that the first step in a more positive self-concept, among blacks, may involve an externalization of previously internalized hostility.

These results are very similar to those found in a previous study by the investigator (Teahan and Hug, 1969) whose sample at that time was an entirely lower socio-economic group of students from a small midwestern industrial city. At the time of that investigation, there was little of the recognition now being given to blacks in films, television programs, and by national magazines and newspapers. Then, black people in movies or on television generally played the role of "Negroes," rather than being people who were also, incidentally, black. In addition, the "black power" movement was just underway and feelings

of rage toward whites was not as open or prevalent. Since then, of course, we have experienced the rise of militant black power, such as the Black Panthers, major cities have been torn by riots, most whites have been removed from important roles in civil rights organizations and attacks on institutions seen as "white," (religious, educational, political, etc.), have become almost commonplace.

The investigator had discussed previous findings in terms of the Negro's identification with the aggressor similar to the reaction reported by Bettelheim (1943) in his study of Jews in concentration camps who began to imitate their Nazi guards. When one feels oneself to be in a completely helpless situation, where one's destiny lies entirely in the hands of some powerful figure, through a process of identification with the aggressor, one gains a sense of pseudo-strength and security, while rage which has been felt toward the oppressor is not turned toward the self, or toward others like oneself, with a resulting loss in group pride and/or self-esteem. However, as feelings of power or strength increase, and as helplessness and dependency decrease, this rage is then re-directed outward toward the previous primary source of frustration. Indications of the former phenomenon in the past were the tendencies to bleach the skin, straighten the hair, and tries to deny color in numerous ways. Thus, there developed a social and physical hierarchy with light-skinned "blacks" at the top. This was also demonstrated by the Clarks (1947, 1950) in their classical studies of Negro childrens' preferences for white versus Negro dolls. In view of this, it is now interesting to note that there is a pronounced trend today to not only renounce skin bleaches and "hair conks" (straighteners), but to emphasize in every way one's Afro-American heritage through a "natural look," with African garb, ornaments, and a clannish disdain for "honkies" (whites) and "Oreos" (blacks who are "white" on the inside). This trend has been accompanied by an increase in hostility toward whites, and, in some cases, by a demand for segregation on the part of blacks who claim they wish to avoid contamination by white standards and values.

Thus, as we have seen in the present study, an increase in a positive valuation of one's own race may be accompanied by an increase in a negative evaluation of whites. The suggestion is made, however, that this is a necessary stage in the progression from self-hate to self-pride, and that it represents only a transition and is certainly not a requirement for positive feelings about self or group. Indeed, it may well be that in cases where hostility toward whites continues, the person may still be at a stage of ambivalent and uneasy transition.

Some support for this last statement can be seen in the writings of Malcolm X (Little, 1965), Lena Horne (1965), James Baldwin (1961, 1963) and others, all of whom went through a period of rage toward whites as self-pride increased. Even Malcolm X, near the end of his life, had reached a point where it was no longer necessary to hate all whites, and one could sense in his writings a more established and confident sense of self-esteem.

As mentioned previously, former research with the "Wished For" and "Predicted" goals found these questions to be quite valuable in gauging attitude changes as a result of film presentation (Teahan and Hug, 1969). Experimental students at both the elementary and junior high school levels

were found to increase in terms of predicted success and decrease in terms of "Wished for" success. Controls were found to drift in opposite directions to this over a similar period of time. This was felt to be in keeping with predictions by Grambs (1965) and Lott & Lott (1963), who felt that a greater availability of successful Negro models would create a rise in the aspirational level and productivity of Negro youth. The findings were felt to reflect more realistic goal aspirations on the part of experimentals (decrease in "Wished For" goals), as well as more optimism about the prospects of future success (increase in "Predictions"). The results were also compared to the "Ideal-real" self changes reported in terms of better adjustment following psychotherapy (Rogers & Dymond, 1954). However, there were no indications of any changes in these directions in the present study among experimentals. Instead, as reported, there did not seem to be any identifiable trends which reflected consistent changes either among schools, or within any particular school.

The only differences found between experimentals and controls at most schools involved multiple interactions in which very often the cell frequency dropped to highly unacceptable levels. This is an especially crucial criticism in view of the fact that the analysis of variance program utilized was constructed to deal with unequal numbers. It dealt with this problem by computing average mean scores for cells, with the result that a highly spurious person would have undue influence in the determination of a cell mean when frequencies were very low. When one adds to this the fact that none of these quadruple interactions reflected the same kinds of changes at different schools, the only safe course to follow is to interpret the present results as revealing no differences between experimentals and controls on these measures.

It is difficult to determine why this instrument failed to produce results on this occasion when it was so successful previously. However, the former research was conducted in a small midwestern industrial city which had a somewhat unique black population because of the fact that there were so few Negro professionals in the city. Instead, most blacks were of lower socio-economic status and with the absence of a middle class it may not be surprising to have found that films of successfulblacks had a strong impact on level of aspiration as measured by the "Wished For-Predictions" instrument. The blacks in the present study, however, had much greater contact with successful Negro males, and in three of the schools used the students were predominantly middle class (Schools C, D, and E). It was only in Schools A-B that lower socio-economic students were in the majority and even here students with a middle class background were not entirely absent as can be seen by the class breakdown in Table 30.

One finding which differentiated the present results from the original study was the more "inflated" predictions among these students when they were compared to those from the small midwestern city. While in the previous study, one saw much evidence of discouragement in terms of choices, like "garbage men" or "street worker," there was a tendency for most students in the present study to give very high choices when they were asked to be "more realistic" and to try to predict their future job. Although some of this may have been due to simply not taking the task seriously enough, there may also be a tendency among blacks, now that black power and pride is being stressed more and more, to feel that they

must support their race by demonstrating this "pride." Hence, it may be that there is pressure to pretend one will do very well in the future, even when one is not very sure about this. This could, therefore, result in an inflation of predictions at all socio-economic levels and perhaps particularly at the lower levels. Thus, there might not have been sufficient room at the top of the scale for any impact by the films to really show itself.

The most interesting and consistent findings which did emerge from this instrument appear to be those differences which came from the pre-testing analysis, and are not connected with the experimental condition. It is not too surprising, of course, in view of the studies of McLelland (1966) regarding need achievement in women, and the more recent work of Horner (1969) dealing with the ambivalence of women and their "will to fail" when competing in a masculine world to find that women, particularly black women, have lower "Wished For" goals than males. Neither is it surprising to find that they are especially low when compared to males in terms of predictions of future success. What is somewhat surprising is that lower socio-economic status among black males seems to have a large dampening effect on predicted success when they are compared to higher socio-economic males. Indeed, they are as discouraged as they would be if they were women. Thus, although there were few differences between lower and higher socio-economic males in terms of "Wished For" goals--they all had rather equal dreams--the most marked difference appeared in terms of their optimism about the future with the lower class male seeming to be especially discouraged.[1] This was less true for females where socio-economic status did not play nearly so important a role as simply being a woman.

There was also some evidence in the present results that being a lower socio-economic status male in a predominantly lower class school environment is even more devastating in terms of optimism about the future than if one is lower class among a majority of middle class students. Thus, we find that it was only at Schools A-B where a much greater disparity existed between class levels in terms of predicted success (as indicated by the only sex x occupational level interaction found with $F=7.28$, significant at the .01 level.) Apparently, it encourages rather than discourages when one is surrounded by classmates whose fathers are more successful than your own, while the converse is true when one is surrounded by lack of success similar to one's own.

[1] If the previously stated hunch about inflated predictions is correct, these differences should have been even greater.

Summary and Conclusions

There was considerable evidence generated in support of the findings of a previous study by the investigator that films of successful black males, who have themselves overcome racial, economic and other obstacles in the achievement of success, can generate a positive influence on Negro youth, particularly those youth who need it most, namely, lower socio-economic males. It was this group of students who consistently, in almost every school, seemed to show the greatest change following the film sequence when compared with their controls. There was also evidence that lower socio-economic controls, over time, tended to drift in a direction of developing lower racial esteem with a resulting poorer concept of self. Some findings also suggested that being a lower socio-economic male in a predominantly lower class school setting may have a more devastating impact on his expectations of future success than being in a situation where most of one's peers come from more relatively successful families. Neither was it surprising to discover that females have significantly lower hopes for predicted success than males. However, lower class status does not seem to have the same depressing effect on females as it does on males.

There was also increasing evidence in this study, similar to previous findings, that an increase in pride about race results in an accompanying negative attitude toward whites. Thus, the first step in a more positive self-concept among Negroes may be increased and more open hostility directed toward whites as they attempt to deal with and destroy the myth of white superiority. It is almost as if the Negro were saying to himself, "Not only am I better than I previously thought I was, but you (whites) are much worse." However, some of the negative reaction to whites, seen in the study, may also have been a sort of "black back-lash" reaction to seeing white success stories mixed in with the black, since those students who saw only films of successful Negroes were not characterized by the same degree of hostility toward white faces.

These results were discussed in terms of the phenomenon of identification with the aggressor and were viewed in the light of a rising militancy and rage among many blacks toward what they perceive as white institutions. It does suggest that if more rage toward whites is a necessary part of the transition from self-hate to self-pride, things may, of necessity, have to get worse before they can get better.

Bibliography

Baldwin, J. Nobody knows my name; more notes of a native son. New York: Dial Press, 1961.

Baldwin, J. The fire next time. New York: Dial Press, 1963.

Bettelheim, B. Individual and mass behavior in extreme situations. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 38, 2, 1943, 417-452.

Clark, K. B. & Clark, M. P. Racial identification and preference in Negro children. In T. M. Newcomb & E. L. Hartley (Eds.) Readings in social psychology. New York: Holt, 1947, 169-178.

Clark, K. B. & Clark, M. P. Emotional factors in racial identification and preference in Negro children. J. Negro Educ., 1950, 19, 341-350.

Ginsberg, E., Anderson, J. K. & Herma, J. L. The optimistic Tradition and American Youth. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1962, p. 107.

Grambs, J. D. Are we training prejudiced teachers? School and society, 71, April 1, 1950, 196-198.

Horne, Lena. Lena. New York: Doubleday, 1965.

Horner, M. S. Fail: Bright women. Psychology Today, 1969, 3, 6, p. 36.

Landreth, C. & Johnson, B. C. Young children's responses to a picture and insert test designed to reveal reactions to persons of different skin color. Child Development, 1953, 24, 63-80.

Lott, A. J. & Lott, B. E. Negro and white youth. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1963.

Little, M. Autoblography of Malcolm X. New York: Grove Press, 1965.

Mann, J. H. The influence of racial prejudice on sociometric scores and perceptions. Sociometry, 1958, 21, 150-158.

Marks, E. S. Skin color judgments of Negro college students. J. abnorm. and soc. Psychol., 1943, 38, 370-276.

McLelland, D. C.; Atkinson J. E.; Clark, R. A. & Lowell, E. L. The achievement motive. Appleton: New York, 1953.

Rogers, C. R. & Dymond, R. F. Psychotherapy and personality change. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1954.

Teahan, J. E. & Drews, L. M. A comparison of northern and southern Negro children on the WISC. J. consult. Psychol., 1962, 26, 3, 292.

Teahan, J. E. & Hug, J. Some effects of audio-visual techniques on the aspirational level and self-concept of Negro Students. J. Human Rel., 1969, 17, 2, 291-310.

Bibliography

Trueblood, D. L. The role of the counselor in the guidance of Negro students. Harvard Educational Review, 30, 3, 1960, 252-269.

Warner, W. L.; Meeker, M.; & Eells, K. Social class in America. Chicago: Science Research Association, 1949.

Young, F. M. & Bright, H. A. Results of testing 81 Negro rural juveniles with the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for children. J. soc. Psychol., 1954, 39, 219-226.

Pre-Test Instructions

We are conducting a research project which involves the ability to tell about people simply on the basis of how they look. You may not be aware of this, but some psychologists feel that you can tell a great deal about a person simply by looking at them. As a matter of fact, a psychologist by the name of Susan Deri actually developed a test, called the Szondi test, which consisted of photographs of real people. She felt that many individuals were able to tell a great deal about the persons in the photographs because they reacted, without really being aware of it, to certain things about the persons' faces. Dr. Deri felt that just looking at someone's face gives us information about that person even though we might not know we are receiving it. Some of you may remember times in which you had a hunch about someone you looked at--a hunch about the kind of person they were, even though you had not really met the person and actually knew nothing about him or her. Dr. Deri would say that you were responding unconsciously to something in that person's face even though you were not actually aware of receiving the information.

Today we are going to ask you to make judgments about photographs of real people. We are going to ask you to make what we call "educated guesses" about them. It is important that you give your first reaction to a photograph without thinking about your reasons too much -- give your "gut reaction," or what you immediately feel as you look at the photo.

We are also trying to relate the ability to tell things about people just by looking at them to other things about yourself, such as your goals for the future, and your interests and your feelings about yourself and other people. Thus, we will ask you to fill out some other short tests, too. Again, please do not try to analyze or think about your feelings concerning a photo--just give your first hunches or feelings as you view the picture.

Post-Test Instructions

Some of you may recall the tests that we are asking you to take today in that we conducted a survey of this nature last (name of month). For others, this will be the first time that you have seen these tests.

We are conducting a research project which involves the ability to tell about people simply on the basis of how they look. You may not be aware of this, but some psychologists feel that you can tell a great deal about a person simply by looking at them. As a matter of fact, a psychologist by the name of Susan Deri actually developed a test, called the Szondi test, which consisted of photographs of real people, and she felt that many individuals were able to tell a great deal about the persons in the photographs because they reacted, without really being aware of it, to certain things about the persons' faces. Dr. Deri felt that just looking at someone's face gives us information about that person, even though we might not know we are receiving it. Some of you may remember times in which you had a hunch about someone you looked at -- a hunch about the kind of person they were, even though you had not really met the person and actually knew nothing about him or her. Dr. Deri would say that you were responding unconsciously to something in that person's face even though you were not actually aware of receiving the information.

Today we are going to ask you to make judgments about photographs of real people. We are going to ask you to make what we call "educated guesses" about them. It is important that you give your first reaction to a photograph without thinking about your reasons too much -- give your "gut reaction" or what you immediately feel as you look at the photo.

Now many of you have taken this test previously and you may wonder why we are asking you to do it again. The reason for this is that we are interested in whether the fact that you have had the experience of trying this before will enable you to make better guesses than someone doing it for the first time. In short, you have had some practice. Will you do better than someone who did not have this practice?

However, it is important that you do not try to let your previous guess affect the way you guess this time, because, remember, you do not know whether your last guesses were actually correct or not. Perhaps you were right last time, but perhaps you were wrong. The important thing to do this time is to respond with the first reaction as you look at the photos -- give the first thing you think of without wondering about what you did, or did not, say the last time. Now, remember, try not to let what you did last time affect what you do this time in a conscious way--just react with your feelings about the photographs as you look at them.

We are also trying to relate the ability to tell things about people just by looking at them to other things about yourself, such as your goals for the future and your interests and feelings about people. Thus, we will ask you to fill out some other short tests too. Again, please do not try to analyze or think about your feelings concerning a photo--just give your first hunches or feelings as you view the photographs.

The information on all these tests is confidential and will not be given to anyone or used in any way except for the purposes of this experiment.

NAME_____ MALE _____ DATE _____

DATE OF BIRTH_____ FEMALE _____ AGE LAST BIRTHDAY _____

NAME OF SCHOOL_____ GRADE _____

HOW MANY BROTHERS DO YOU HAVE? _____ GIVE THEIR AGES _____

HOW MANY SISTERS DO YOU HAVE? _____ GIVE THEIR AGES _____

CHECK ANY OR ALL OF THE FOLLOWING WHICH ARE APPLICABLE:

FATHER LIVING _____ PARENTS STILL MARRIED _____ PARENTS DIVORCED _____

MOTHER LIVING _____ PARENTS SEPARATED _____ MOTHER REMARRIED _____

FATHER REMARRIED _____

FATHER'S OCCUPATION _____ DESCRIBE BRIEFLY WHAT HE DOES FOR A LIVING _____

MOTHER'S OCCUPATION _____ DESCRIBE BRIEFLY WHAT SHE DOES FOR A LIVING (IF SHE DOES NOT WORK OUTSIDE HOME, WRITE "HOUSEWIFE.")

_____

PHOTOGRAPH SCALES FOR ELEMENTARY STUDENTS

Please look carefully at Photograph #1. We want you to guess what kind of a person this man is. Remember, you may think you are guessing wildly, but you are actually relying on tiny cues in the man's face of which you are unaware, but which are actually helping you to decide. Do not spend too much time on your choice, but rely on your hunches. Some of you may be better than others at this kind of guessing and this is what we are trying to determine. On <u>each</u> of the lines below, <u>circle one set of descriptions</u> you would use to complete the sentence, "I think the man in the photograph is ....."

1.	Always Cheerful	Often Cheerful	Hardly ever Cheerful	Never Cheerful
2.	Always Sure of himself	Often Sure of himself	Hardly ever Sure of himself	Never Sure of himself
3.	Always Cruel	Often Cruel	Hardly ever Cruel	Never Cruel
4.	Never Honest	Hardly ever Honest	Usually Honest	Always Honest
5.	Always Stupid	Often Stupid	Hardly ever Stupid	Never Stupid
6.	Never Bad	Hardly ever Bad	Often Bad	Always Bad
7.	Never Kind	Hardly ever Kind	Often Kind	Always Kind
8.	Always Dirty	Often Dirty	Hardly ever Dirty	Never Dirty
9.	Never Rude	Hardly ever Rude	Often Rude	Always Rude
10.	Always Selfish	Often Selfish	Hardly ever Selfish	Never Selfish
11.	Always Lazy	Often Lazy	Hardly ever Lazy	Never Lazy
12.	Always feels as good as anybody else	Often feels as good as anybody else	Hardly ever feels as good as anybody else	Never feels as good as anybody else

PHOTOGRAPH SCALES FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Please look at Photograph #1. We want you to try to guess or judge what kind of person this man is. Remember that although you may feel you are guessing wildly, our hunch is that you are probably relying on tiny cues in the face of which you are unaware, but which are actually helping you to make the right choice. Some of you may be more skilled in this kind of guessing and this is what we are trying to determine. Do not spend too much time on your choice, but rely on your feelings or hunches. This may help you in making "educated guesses" and aid you in making the correct choice.

Below and on the following pages are personality traits which could describe the man in Photograph #1. You are to make an X anywhere on each line to show what your hunch is about this person. For example, if you feel that the man is probably almost always cheerful, make your X near "Always Cheerful." If, however, you feel he is probably quite cheerful, then make your X closer to the midpoint, but on the "Very Cheerful" side of it. If you feel he is not a cheerful person, then you will make your X more to the "Rarely Cheerful" side. And if you feel the man is a most uncheerful person, then your X will be made close to the "Never Cheerful" side of the line.

Always Cheerful	Very Cheerful	About as Cheerful as Most	Rarely Cheerful	Never Cheerful

Now do the same with each of the following. Do not skip any of the personality traits. Place one X on each line.

Always Irresponsible	Very Irresponsible	About as Irresponsible as Most	Rarely Irresponsible	Never Irresponsible

Never Stubborn	Rarely Stubborn	About as Stubborn as Most	Very Stubborn	Always Stubborn

Next page

Never Courteous | Rarely Courteous | About as Courteous as Most | Very Courteous | Always Courteous

Always Moody | Very Moody | About as Moody as Most | Rarely Moody | Never Moody

Always Generous | Very Generous | About as Generous as Most | Rarely Generous | Never Generous

Never Boasting | Rarely Boasting | About as Boasting as Most | Very Boasting | Always Boasting

Always Patient | Very Patient | About as Patient as Most | Rarely Patient | Never Patient

Always Dishonest | Very Dishonest | About as Dishonest as Most | Rarely Dishonest | Never Dishonest

Never Sarcastic | Rarely Sarcastic | About as Sarcastic as Most | Very Sarcastic | Always Sarcastic

Always Loyal | Very Loyal | About as Loyal as Most | Rarely Loyal | Never Loyal

Always Immoral | Very Immoral | About as Immoral as Most | Rarely Immoral | Never Immoral

Never Sincere | Rarely Sincere | About as Sincere as Most | Very Sincere | Always Sincere

Always Selfish | Very Selfish | About as Selfish as Most | Rarely Selfish | Never Selfish

Next page

Always Stupid	Very Stupid	About as Stupid as Most	Rarely Stupid	Never Stupid

Never Superstitious	Rarely Superstitious	About as Superstitious as Most	Very Superstitious	Always erstitious

Now look at Photograph #2. Do the same thing here as you did with Photograph #1. Make a guess as to what kind of man he may be after looking at his face. Again, rely on your hunches about this person.

Always Cheerful	Very Cheerful	About as Cheerful as Most	Rarely Cheerful	Never Cheerful

Always Irresponsible	Very Irresponsible	About as Irresponsible as Most	Rarely Irresponsible	Never Irresponsible

Never Stubborn	Rarely Stubborn	About as Stubborn as Most	Very Stubborn	Always Stubborn

Next page

WISHED FOR AND EXPECTED GOALS

List, in order of your preference, the two occupations or jobs that you would most like to do after you finish school, beginning with the one you would like most of any, and following with the one which you would like next best to do. Do not consider your abilities, or job opportunities, in making this list. Just consider whether you think you would be happy in the work.

I would most like to become a

First choice _____

Second choice _____

Now list those jobs or occupations which you actually think you might end up doing. In some cases, these may be very different from your choices above and in some cases, they may be similar. For example, you may think to yourself, "Well, although I'd like to become a ...(some job)..., the chances are a lot greater that I'll end up doing ...(some job)..., or ... (some job)." Just try to be realistic and put down, in order, those jobs which you feel you'll actually end up doing.

I think I'll probably end up as a:

First choice _____

Second choice _____

How certain are you that you will end up doing these particular jobs?

Check one:

Very Certain _____ Somewhat Uncertain _____ Very Uncertain _____

SOCIAL QUESTIONS SURVEY

This is a study of what the general public thinks about a number of social questions. The only best answer to each statement below is your honest personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different points of view. You may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly or even angrily with others, and perhaps being uncertain about others. Whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same way you do. Please mark each statement in the left-hand margin according to your agreement or disagreement as follows:

+1:	Slight support, agreement	-1:	Slight opposition, disagreement
+2:	Moderate support, agreement	-2:	Moderate opposition, disagreement
+3:	Strong support, agreement	-3:	Strong opposition, disagreement

Thus, if you find yourself strongly supporting or agreeing with a statement, you should put a +3 in the blank beside that statement. If you disagree strongly, then you should put a -3 in the blank, or whatever number - or + that indicates your true feelings.

____ 1. What young people need most is strict discipline and the will to work and fight for family and country.

____ 2. It should be the father of the family who makes the final decisions in all family matters.

W ____ 3. The idea that the white race is naturally better is a fairy tale that some people believe in order to make themselves feel more important.

F ____ 4. The worst danger to our country during the last 50 years has come from foreign ideas and agitators.

____ 5. Young people sometimes want their own way, but as they grow up they ought to get over these ideas and settle down and do as they are told.

____ 6. Patriotism and loyalty are the first and most important requirements of a good citizen.

____ 7. Now that there is a U.N., America must be sure that she doesn't bow down to the wishes of other countries.

F ____ 8. Many Latin American countries will probably never become as civilized and as good as the United States.

____ 9. Certain religious groups whose beliefs do not permit them to salute the American flag should be forced to do so or be thrown out of the country.

____ 10. America may not be perfect, but "the American Way" has brought us about as close as human beings can get to being perfect.

____ 11. People can be divided into two distinct groups: the weak and the strong.

____ 12. Every school should have some kind of military or army training so that the students can learn proper discipline.

____ 13. Science has its place, but there are many important things that must always be beyond our understanding.

W ____ 14. It would not be surprising if in the next 50 years the colored people of the world made even greater contributions to society than the whites.

F ____ 15. There is something different and strange about many minority groups (such as Chinese, Mexicans, Jews); it is hard to tell what they are thinking and planning and what makes them tick.

F ____ 16. Any group or social movement which contains many foreigners should be watched with suspicion and, whenever possible, be investigated by the FBI.

____ 17. The most important qualities of a real man are determination and and a driving ambition.

____ 18. Most of our social problems would be solved if we would somehow get rid of the immoral, crooked people.

F ____ 19. World War II proved that we must be very careful never to trust foreign countries.

____ 20. The best guarantee of our national security is for America to have the biggest army and navy in the world and the secrets of the atomic bomb.

____ 21. The best teacher or boss is one who tells us just exactly what is to be done and how to go about it.

W ____ 22. It is only natural and right for each person to think that his race is better than any other.

____ 23. A woman whose children are at all messy or rowdy has failed in her duties as a mother.

____ 24. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relation.

____ 25. If a child is unusual in any way, his parents should get him to be more like other children.

W ____ 26. The people who raise all the talk about putting non-whites on the same level as whites, and giving them the same privileges, are mostly trouble makers trying to stir things up.

____ 27. More than anything else, it is good hard work that makes life worthwhile.

W ____ 28. There is no question in my mind but that the white nations of the world will lead the way and that all other nations will remain followers.

____ 29. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude and respect for his parents.

F ____ 30. World War II proved that America should always be on its guard and keep foreigners out of the country.

____ 31. Many people simply are not smart enough to be allowed to vote.

____ 32. There will always be wars, because, for one thing, there will always be races who ruthlessly try to grab more than their share.

____ 33. The most vicious, irresponsible and racketeering organizations are, in most cases, those having largely foreigners for leaders.

W ____ 34. There will always be superior and inferior nations in the world and in the interests of all concerned, it is best that the superior ones be in control of world affairs.

W ____ 35. History clearly shows us that the white race cannot be equalled in good government and great achievements.

Table 31

Analysis of Variance for Schools A, B, and C on Total Photo Scores

Using Individual Photograph Scores as Repeated Measures

	Schools A and B			School C		
Source	df	MS	F ratios	df	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	117.38	.65	1	3.04	.05
B - Sex	1	.80	.01	1	2.20	.04
C - Grade	3	24.07	.13	2	80.45	1.49
D - Socio-Econ.	1	16.37	.09	1	35.43	.66
A X B	1	238.80	1.33	1	27.51	.51
A X C	3	299.22	1.67	2	33.32	.61
A X D	1	1.17	.01	1	.66	.01
B X C	3	35.71	.19	2	11.35	.21
B X D	1	17.82	.09	1	32.02	.59
C X D	3	89.97	.50	2	1.77	.03
A X B X C	3	361.54	2.02	2	10.65	.19
A X B X D	1	127.94	.71	1	30.09	.55
A X C X D	3	256.15	1.43	2	71.28	1.32
B X C X D	3	148.14	.82	2	14.19	.26
A X B X C X D	3	68.61	.38	2	24.83	.46
S	315	179.41		168	53.94	
E - Indiv. Photo	4	214.12	4.03*	4	248.33	5.58*
A X E	4	26.38	.49	4	7.36	.16
B X E	4	70.93	1.34	4	90.55	2.04
C X E	12	31.87	.60	8	76.09	1.71
A X B X E	4	42.31	.80	4	36.72	.83
A X C X E	12	66.50	1.25	8	59.84	1.34
B X C X E	12	63.32	1.19	8	29.26	.66
D X E	4	63.58	1.20	4	28.35	.63
A X D X E	4	22.32	.42	4	84.16	1.89
B X D X E	4	6.24	.12	4	93.56	2.10
A X B X C X E	12	51.59	.97	8	18.45	.42*
A X B X D X E	4	79.53	1.50	4	128.98	2.89*
C X D X E	12	17.25	.32	8	77.26	.17
A X C X D X E	12	26.09	.49	8	30.17	.68
B X C X D X E	12	22.43	.42	8	6.89	.16
A X B X C X D X E	12	36.01	.68	8	24.28	.55
S X E	1260	53.12		672	44.48	

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Table 32

Analysis of Variance for School D, Grades VI and VIII on Total Photo Scores and Using Individual Photograph Scores as Repeated Measures

	Grade VI			Grade VIII		
Source	df	MS	F ratios	df	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	13.50	.32	1	36.75	.33
B - Sex	1	19.39	.45	1	54.31	.49
C - Grade (does not apply)						
D - Socio-Econ.	1	12.69	.30	1	52.92	.48
A X B	1	100.85	2.36	1	123.28	1.11
A X D	1	39.77	.93	1	168.99	1.52
B X D	1	.18	.00	1	884555	.76
A X B X D	1	11.50	.26	1	164.90	1.48
S	62	42.72		62	111.51	
E - Indiv. Photo	4	116.67	2.53*	4	134.58	1.35
A X E	4	30.61	.66	4	103.66	1.04
B X E	4	35.33	.77	4	243.03	2.44
D X E	4	20.90	.45	4	81.79	.82
A X B X E	4	48.19	1.05	4	56.17	.56
A X D X E	4	101.64	2.21	4	40.97	.41
B X D X E	4	18.28	.40	4	71.29	.72
A X B X D X E	4	26.04	.56	4	105.13	1.06
S X E	248	46.08		248	99.42	

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Table 33

Analysis of Variance for School E on Total Photo Scores and Using Individual Photograph Scores as Repeated Measures

Source	df	MS	F ratio
A - Film Effect	1	1.80	.02
B - Sex (Does not apply)			
C - Grade	2	66.96	1.07
D - Socio-Econ.	1	.47	.00
A X C	2	15.08	.24
A X D	1	136.60	2.19
C X D	2	26.58	.48
A X C X D	2	106.67	1.71
S	98	62.42	
E - Indiv. Photo	4	85.91	1.37
A X E	4	34.09	.54
C X E	8	92.76	1.48
D X E	4	110.02	1.75
A X C X E	8	41.69	.66
A X D X E	4	56.60	.90
C X D X E	8	34.94	.56
A X C X D X E	8	93.43	1.49
S X D	392	62.88	