DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 322 CG 008 054

AUTHOR	Grambs, Jean D.
TITLE	Understanding Intergroup Relations.
INSTITUTION	National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	32p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Education Association, Washington, D.C.; 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (No price quoted)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Group Experience; *Group Membership; Groups; *Human Relations; *Intergroup Education; *Intergroup Relations; Publications; Research; Research Utilization; School Attitudes; School Role; Social Integration; Social Relations; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Responsibility; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

This booklet, drawing from research on intergroup relations, presents classroom teachers with those items which promise to be the most help to them. Research advances in intergroup relations are briefly discussed, while major portions of the booklet examine basic concepts in intragroup relations and intergroup concepts of particular significance to the school. Also included are discussions of the following: (1) ethnocentrism as part of group development; (2) the different types of intergroup relationships; (3) the restrictions of social controls; (4) the importance of group identity; (5) children's recognition of group differences and their degrees of prejudice, and; (6) the attitudes toward group differences which children learn. Finally, guidelines for schools to practice in intergroup education are presented. The importance of teacher objectivity is stressed and a number of school practices which may help to change basic discriminatory and other undesirable attitudes are recommended. Selected research and general references are included. (SES)

WHAT RESEARCH SAYS TO THE TEACHER

THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Understanding Intergroup Relations

CONTENTS

Stock No. 387-11840

PREFACE

This booklet was written by Jean D. Grambs of the University of Maryland, College Park. It is not an exhaustive summary of research. Rather, the author has attempted to draw from research material the items which promise to be of most help to classroom teachers. In some instances she has included opinions which she believes represent the views of most experts. Similarly, the interpretation and recommendations are those which she believes to be soundly supported by research. Her original manuscript was reviewed by Kenneth D. Benne, Boston University; Arthur P. Coladarci, Stanford University; Dan Dodson, New York University; Franklin Patterson, Tufts University; and William E. Vickery, National Conference of Christians and Jews. The author made changes on the basis of suggestions from the reviewers and from the staffs of the American Educational Research Association and of the NEA Information Services.

Since this book was revised, public awareness of the different groups that make up America, and of the strong interests that such groups share, has increased rapidly. Indians are among the groups whose situation has recently attracted widespread attention. Women are among those who are becoming more aware of the interests that bind them together as a group. Intergroup relations planning must take account of these changes.

The intergroup relations knowledge that is required to work constructively with this growing variety of groups is still, as this booklet defines it, basically human relations knowledge. But the field of human relations itself is growing quickly and becoming more and more specialized. Research results are now appearing in such abundance that any attempt to establish their relative value for purposes of revising this booklet would be premature.

UNDERSTANDING INTERGROUP RELATIONS

CULTURAL DIFFERENCES are not new in American life. In the early days of the Republic, as a people we had to struggle toward unity with a population of diverse ethnic origins. During later periods our nation was confronted by large successive groups of immigrants from non-English-speaking countries. Obviously, something had to be done to absorb these newcomers into the developing American pattern. The public school became one of the most effective ways by which American manners and mores could be transmitted to the new population groups.

In the schools English was taught and spoken. Here children learned and took home lessons about democracy and freedom. In the large cities, night schools were organized for adults so that they could learn enough English to pass their citizenship tests. Today, although the number of new immigrants has decreased, the school and other social agencies continue to have the task of helping new citizens find their places in American life. Perhaps even more difficult, schools must help all generations today to find a common basis of good will and cooperation within the American pattern of government and community life.

In the past, national stability required that primary emphasis be placed upon cultural conformity. At the same time, much that we as a people have valued in American life has been derived from the contributions of diverse groups. We have learned that there is need for supporting certain cultural differences because of what they add to American society.

As teachers our difficult problem is to retain the constructive values of differences. We know, from examining American life, that differences among groups and individuals are often the sources of conflicts and tensions. Some of these tensions have been with us for many years; others are of recent origin; still others are situations in which the focus of tension has shifted. Conflicts as a result of tensions and group differences exist on many fronts and place upon the schools a need for continuous study and effort.

In this context of cultural diversity and long-standing tensions and problems the classroom teacher can play a major role. But, first, what is known about group differences? What do group differences mean to children? How does growing up in a multi-group world affect children's learning? How are adolescents affected by group differences? What are the factors contributing to intergroup tension, hostility, and conflict? What techniques have been developed for diagnosing such intergroup tensions, and for ameliorating them?

RESEARCH ADVANCES IN INTERGROUP RELATIONS

The increase in recent years in the research in archaeology, anthropology, sociology, social psychology, and education has thrown new light upon man, his origins, and his position in the modern world. Never before has man known so much about himself and his behavior, yet he has so very much more to learn.

In seeking to understand group and intergroup behavior, one may draw upon a research literature that is as extensive as it is varied. For example, one may approach the question in terms of the study of attitudes, a major focus of many research studies: how attitudes are formed, how they change with circumstances, the relationship between attitudes and different kinds of family relationships and child-rearing practices, and the situations in which attitudes may be modified. Another body of research is concerned with the investigation of small-group behavior: what happens to the individual in a group, how the opinions and sentiments of others in a group will affect any one person, how ideas are communicated among group members, how problems are or are not solved in small groups, how different kinds of groups react to attack or frustration. In recent decades, the dimensions and dynamics of prejudice have attracted a growing interest, and attempts have been made to relate prejudiced attitudes to such variables as sex, socioeconomic status, religion, age, education, and group experiences.

Research efforts in the field of mental health offer a basis for identifying factors that lead to more adequate human relation-

ships. Research has probed institutions and their structure and arrangements, in an effort to discover what kinds of situations encourage maximum productivity and the related factors of maximum morale. Anthropological study of primitive cultures has thrown light upon the nature of all cultural groups; increasingly the observations of anthropologists are being related to contemporary social situations in all types of cultural settings.

From each of these efforts, one can draw material that is helpful in understanding intergroup problems. The earlier writings in the field of intergroup relations drew on research that was primarily concerned with attitudes, particularly as these were related to prejudices. The interest later broadened to include sociological data about population groups and institutions. Today, with the insights to be derived from research in anthropology, in group behavior, and in mental health, there exists a greatly expanded base for understanding of intergroup relations. Research workers now claim that intergroup relations cannot properly be understood in a narrow sense at all but must be considered in terms of the total personality, the interaction of persons in groups, the sources of group tension and conflict, and the cultural context within which people grow and learn. In fact, the field is now often defined as "human relations" rather than as intergroup relations.

BASIC CONCEPTS IN INTERGROUP RELATIONS

People differ, and they differ in important ways. Moreover, these differences have contributed significantly to the rich diversity of American life. Only when there is respect for differences can freedom flourish vigorously—a well-recognized principle of American democracy. Nevertheless, an individual may often find himself at once attracted and repulsed by differences, particularly by the differences of a group unlike his own. This ambivalence, which is often conveyed to children and growing youth, may prove to be the source of conflict and tension between groups.

It is not easy to be objective in dealing with the data of research in the field of intergroup relations. Each person brings to these data his own preconceptions and cultural learnings about group differences. Naturally, there is strong emotional attachment to feelings for one's own ethnic, racial, religious, or class groups and about groups that differ from one's own. Thus, the literature of intergroup relations, while including many serious and significant studies and statements, is also replete with exhortatory and rhetorical writings. Certain conclusions, however, stand out clearly.

Man Belongs to One Biological Family

One of the facts about which we can have some certainty is that man, wherever he may be found, belongs to one biological family, *homo sapiens*. However, individuals do differ, as we can see when we look around us. There are fairly distinct "races" that differ from each other in recognizable fashion. How did these differences occur? Physical anthropologists, biologists, and others who have studied the evolution of man tell us that the variations in human appearance have occurred as adaptations to different surroundings. Isolation of groups of people led to selective repetition of those genes and chromosomes that determine skin color, hair quality and color, eye color, and eye shape. Yet, such differences are not significant in terms of a common inheritance of human physiology. There appears to be little doubt that man actually evolved as a distinctive species only once; the physical

differences we observe in each other are variations on the same basic human theme.

Upon the common inheritance of a thinking brain, a consciousness of self, an ability to reason and to remember, man has built vast and complicated civilizations. These have differed tremendously, and yet in many instances have been—though separated by oceans—so similar as to startle the present-day observer. Symbols and religious imagery have been repeated in civilizations as far apart as the Aztec and the ancient Egyptian. Yet as far as is now known, these civilizations had no communication with each other. Fire, the calendar, the wheel, a written language, an ethical system, a concept of deity or deities, all of these can be found in various parts of the world, widely separated, yet remarkably similar. One can only speculate that man's brain and unique quality of consciousness of self are the transcendent common characteristics, demonstrating once again that all men are, basically, part of the same genealogical family.

The above statements are not new, nor are they startling. These ideas have been understood and accepted by scientists and scholars for many decades. The average person however, despite the fact that he is increasingly better educated, does not know or necessarily accept the evidence as valid.

Ethnocentrism Is a Part of Group Development

The average "man on the street" (whatever his street may be) does not see that he shares the same basic inheritance with members of other cultural groups, particularly if they are racially distinct from himself. In numerous studies of primitive and of literate cultures, anthropologists have reported conclusive evidence that each group develops its own sense of self-esteem. We humans like what we do, we like what we are, we prefer the appearance of "our own people." We find that certain foods are highly desirable while other foods (favored by another, different, group) are distasteful to us. These preferences are the building blocks of cultural diversity. Each group member believes in the "rightness" of his own way of life, which is natural, for this way of life is what he knows best. Moreover, when this individual who is convinced of the absolute "rightness" of his own group is brought into contact with other groups, he is likely

to regard them with suspicion, perhaps mixed with fear. He observes other groups only from the vantage point of his own cultural base and concludes that different ways of doing things are probably inferior to his own way. This certainty of one's own group as the center of all culture and as the best way to organize one's life is called "ethnocentrism."

Insofar as ethnocentrism prevails, the individual will see himself as "inside" the "right" culture, or group, and the other groups as "outside." In other words, he belongs to the "ingroup" and others belong to the "outgroup." This concept is an important one in the understanding of intergroup relations. Thus far, cultural groups have been seen here as large groups of people separated by nationality and by political boundaries. However, as will be seen, ingroups and outgroups may be found in the many subcultures that make up any given society. Research shows, for example, that clique and gang formation among adolescents almost always includes a "we-they" feeling: those who belong to our club, clique, or gang are good; those who do not belong or belong to another clique or gang are not good. As one group becomes clearly differentiated from another, the next step is toward downgrading the other group. Are they not rivals for the same ground, the same honors, the same power? From rivalry comes conflict, and then it is a short step to actual gang warfare—the "rumbles" of slum gangs that have been horrifying us in recent years.

In one study of group formation among children, research investigators observed that group rivalry and hostility could be developed relatively easily and that one of the major concomitants of this kind of intergroup hostility was the identification of the rival group with bad features and bad characteristics. Thus it is with children, and thus it is with races and nations.

Ignorance is a potent factor in establishing one's own group as superior. In one study, when seven-year-old children were asked which were better, children in their town or those in a neighboring town, they invariably answered that the children in their own town were better. When asked why, they replied, "We don't know the other children."

We human beings prefer what we know, and until we are better informed, we all tend to act like these children and assume that what is unknown is not as good as what is known.

Yet the facts, as known to historians, anthropologists, and archaeologists, do not support the concept of any superior group or culture. Why is it then that we seem to have a need for this kind of ingroup feeling of superiority?

The Group Is the Ground We Stand On

Kurt Lewin, the astute social psychologist, made the statement that "the group is the ground we stand on." In other words, the social nature of man necessitates his belonging to a group in which he is accepted and has a functional role and whose ways of doing things are familiar and comfortable. Persons who lack a sense of group identity, according to Lewin and subsequent researchers in this field, are indeed insecure and shaky people.

Even if one develops within one's own group a feeling of security and superiority, while the larger social group does not accord status to one's group, an extremely confusing situation can result for the individual. For instance, within the Italian-American home the youngster may learn to value and cherish not only Italian food and family patterns, but the history of Italy from ancient Rome onward. But at school he finds that being Italian is a mixed blessing; non-Italian youngsters may call him "Wop," or an insensitive teacher may complain about "all those irresponsible Italian children." When he applies for a job, he may find that an Italian name is a handicap. What then can

the young person do about his own group identity? Is he to reject everything Italian, including changing his name (many do every year), or to restrict his associations and relationships to only the Italian-American community?

Recent studies of delinquent behavior suggest that, to some extent, aggression and hostility derive from a lack of group identity, and a rootlessness that produces intense feelings of insecurity in the growing person. Unaware of the source of these feelings, the youngster may strike out aimlessly and wantonly at a world that has seemingly provided no safe and accepted ground for him to stand on.

Of course, delinquency is not limited to urban minority groups. Suburbia also has its families for whom group identity is shadowy or nonexistent, and the child suffers from a pervading sense of rootlessness. Whether in the city or in the suburbs, the child does not know *what* he is, and, therefore, finds it hard to know *who* he is; being immature, he knows of few ways to react to such a psychological burden other than through anger and defense.

It is important to note here that group identification is not limited to an individual's racial or ethnic groups, for social-class differences also serve to differentiate individuals. One study of fifth- and sixth-grade pupils showed clearly that socioeconomic differences among typical white children led to attributing "better" characteristics to children from the upper economic class and "worse" characteristics to those from the lower economic groups. The level on which a child happened to be born would determine his status and reputation among his peers. Ethnocentrism in terms of social class later leads to the sorting of adolescents into gangs and cliques, and it undoubtedly contributes to the much higher rate of dropouts and nonachievers among underprivileged youngsters who are demoralized by their "outcast" status. There is impressive documentation for the significance of the social-class factor in relation to school achievement.

For many young people, the group "upon which they stand" is a group that is socially downgraded. Many delinquents coming from minority groups have learned that their being Mexican or Puerto Rican or Polish or Negro immediately lessens their value in the eyes of the prevailing society; they have found that many doors are automatically closed to them. Recognizing this, the

youngster downgrades himself. He says, in effect: "If others think people like me are not very good, then probably I am not very good. Then why should I try? Why should I do what the teachers ask, when they aren't like me or my people at all?" It is just such reactions as this that baffle and frustrate the best efforts of many classroom teachers. By knowing the group-related base for such feelings, teachers may be in a better position to understand such student reactions.

No Group Is Innately Superior to Another

Although people may develop *feelings* of superiority and inferiority based on differences, research does not support such feelings. No one group can be demonstrated as *innately* superior to any other. Scientific evidence supports the premise that man is part of one biological family. Civilizations have risen and fallen in many areas of the earth, and each one has made its unique contribution to the human heritage. Therefore, it is impossible to assign to any one contemporary racial or cultural group sole credit for the twentieth century's advanced science and technology. Previous centuries have seen many different cultural groups come forward in their turn as the bearers of the highest civilization; each group contributed its own discoveries and achievements to the common human inheritance.

Neither science nor history supports theories of racial superiority; nevertheless, these false notions can be, and have been, extremely destructive. The Nazi regime in Germany exploited such myths to gain political ascendancy and then carried them to their logical conclusion in the extermination of 6 million "non-Aryans." The Nazi myth could not be supported by scientific evidence. Yet the fact that millions of literate persons could believe in myths of racial superiority, and that millions still do, points to one great unfinished task of education.

There Are Many Kinds of Intergroup Relationships

As can be seen from the preceding discussion, intergroup relations include a very broad range of problems and issues. Much research and study have been focused on racial, ethnic, and religious differences and on the intergroup problems that may

result. But intergroup relations and problems are to be found at work in every part of human life, no matter how seemingly trivial; for example, cleavage often occurs in schools between the students who come by bus and those who live in the town, with subsequent rivalry between these groups for power in the peer group and in the social structure of the school.

At some time or another every individual probably has had the feeling of being part of a minority group. It has been estimated that approximately four-fifths of the American population are in situations in which there is some intergroup hostility. Young children in a neighborhood often feel aggrieved because the older ones will not let them play in a preferred spot; boys may feel that girls get preferential treatment from teachers; newcomers in a neighborhood may feel that the older residents do not accept them into their social groups; teachers may feel that the community does not treat them as respected professional people; and so on.

Intergroup understanding must, therefore, be extended to include many kinds of group situations. In identifying those situations which have affected their own lives, adults—including classroom teachers—will be more able to help young people.

Groups Under Restrictive Social Controls

The intergroup problems noted above are part of the growing up that each person experiences. But the whole answer to intergroup understanding does not lie in understanding the so-called "normal" group situation. Particular groups, who are objects of discrimination and disparagement, often experience intergroup problems that extend far beyond the typical problems of "growing up" or "getting along with people." They are called "minority" groups, though in some instances they might be actual majorities. Yet in terms of access to power, to positions of status, to prestige, and to community leadership, most members of such minority groups are severely restricted. When research writers speak of minority groups in this country, they usually mean the Negro, Jewish, Catholic, hyphenated-Americans (e.g., Mexican-Americans or Puerto Rican-Americans), Chinese, Japanese, and similar groups.

These groups have received the most attention in intergroup research. Studies of two groups in particular, the Negro and Jewish, probably account for the greatest portion of intergroup research data. In particular, this research has endeavored to discover what minority-group identification means to the growing child and to the adult and how attitudes of prejudice toward such groups have developed in the minds of nonminority group members.

The history of most minority groups in the United States is strikingly similar. All have started at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder. Although some Chinese and Japanese have now become well-to-do business and professional people, there was a long period when immigrants from Asia were at the bottom of the labor market. Today the immigrant Puerto Rican is the depressed minority group in New York City, while the Mexican-American is the minority group in the Southwest. As a group the Negro has long been at the lowest socioeconomic level, although individual Negroes have, of course, achieved professional status and wealth. Most of the ethnic groups who arrived in the United States between 1850 and 1920 also have histories of starting in the tenement districts of big cities and being the despised and underpaid workers in the dirty and menial jobs of factory and mine. As one group manages, often through education, to move out of the worst slums and most depressed jobs, another group moves in. Housing officials have noted the "waves of succession" in the slum areas of cities.

Despite shifts in economic status, many minority groups are still the objects of discriminatory treatment. Jews, no matter what their income, will find themselves excluded from certain housing tracts, may not be able to get some jobs on an equal status with others, and are likely to find overt or hidden quota systems applied in college admissions. The same may be true of Catholics. Thus, the stigma of minority-group identification is not necessarily removed with an individual's rise in socioeconomic status.

The groups to which research has contributed the most to our understanding of intergroup relations are those to whom the minority-group identification tends to cling the longest. These groups are readily differentiated by color of skin, dress, religious customs, and other characteristics.

INTERGROUP CONCEPTS OF PARTICULAR SIGNIFICANCE TO THE SCHOOL

The basic assumptions regarding intergroup relations are founded on the best available current research and observation. Yet many individuals are either unaware of these findings or, if they do know of them, discount or deny their validity. Teachers, who like everyone else are products of our general culture, may also in some cases find it difficult to accept the existing research findings.

One study of teacher attitudes found that teachers ranked the "social acceptance" of children in an order similar to the ranks given to these children by the general population. This study indicated that teachers were more likely to accept children of minority groups in classroom situations than to accept adults of the same minority groups in nonschool social situations. The question may be raised whether teachers who are strongly against minority-group persons in out-of-school contacts can genuinely accept such children when they appear in their classrooms.

Teachers, and most other adults, need to examine their own preconceptions, feelings, prejudices, and reactions to others that differ. By understanding their own feelings, teachers can be more certain that their instructional practices will be fair to all.

No Group Has a Monopoly on High Intelligence

With the current emphasis upon identifying the potential capacities of students, there has been an increased interest in the question: "Who is intelligent?" as well as "What is intelligence?" Classroom teachers have a primary responsibility for the guidance of young people. The classroom teacher encourages some students to enter intellectually difficult pursuits and directs others toward activities which require manual dexterity, artistic or creative ability, or other kinds of talent. The classroom teacher needs to know the educational potential of each student.

Intelligence tests are widely used as one means of determining the characteristics required in certain occupations. Many research workers have been interested in the question of innate intelligence versus intelligence conditioned by environmental factors. Today the question is still being subjected to the rigors of

research analysis. On one point there is agreement among those best qualified to judge: there are no *innate* differences in intellectual potential among racial, ethnic, or religious groups.

Of course, there are many differences among individuals. One of the major differences is the *use* an individual may make of his potential. Probably the single most significant factor is socioeconomic status. A bright child growing up in a home where reading is despised, where few books, magazines, or newspapers are to be found, and where schooling is scorned will find it difficult to act like an "intelligent" child in school, where reading, intellectual achievement, and education are prized.

Careful studies of group intelligence tests have shown that these tests may have a "culture bias" that operates against youngsters from a poor or culturally impoverished environment. Such a child just does not *know* that a harp is like a piano because both have strings; he may never have seen either. Yet this and similar questions may be used in tests assessing his "intelligence." As has been pointed out, today's city child might appear to be "dumb" if compared with an Eskimo child for his knowledge of the animals, seasons, and phenomena peculiar to the Arctic region. A New York City report observed that it is not reasonable to measure the intelligence of Spanish-speaking children with an English-language test whose content derives from mainland culture. For this reason, the New York City schools have used nonverbal intelligence tests, with instructions in Spanish, and achievement tests in Spanish to assess the intellectual potential and the functional educational level of Puerto Rican students.

Another factor of importance established by research is motivation. Children who find no appreciation at home for their achievement in tests are not likely to try very hard in test situations. Experiments with various kinds of motivations have shown that test scores can be improved or lowered according to the degree of reward or punishment the individual is led to expect. Thus, caution is necessary in accepting or assessing the results of tests that tend to characterize a whole group of students as either particularly low or particularly high in intelligence, since environmental factors may play a hidden but crucial role. Similarly, in guiding an individual's life choice, the teacher must use intelligence test scores with great care and only with expert advice.

A major focus of attention in recent years has been the assessing of differences in intellectual ability of Negro and white students. According to a number of opinion polls, the average man on the street believes that Negroes are *innately* less intelligent than most whites. Research studies indicate that although in many situations the *average* scores of groups of Negro children will be lower than those of similar groups of white children, there will be extensive overlapping of the individual scores. That is, some of the Negro youngsters will obtain scores as high as those of high-ranking white youngsters, and some white youngsters will have scores as low as low-ranking youngsters in the Negro group.

Careful analysis of the many research studies of intelligence differences among various racial groups has led a number of observers to the conclusion that these apparent differences in intellectual ability are to be accounted for primarily by two factors: environment and motivation.

Some of these research studies show that as the environment changes, so may the test scores of intelligence and of educational achievement. For example, the Puerto Rican children who were studied in the New York City system over a period of two years showed advances of 6 IQ points to over 15 points, *as a group*. Another study resulted in similar data; namely, that migrant Negro children in Philadelphia have shown increases in tested IQ which were associated with length of schooling in the city; these gains are not paralleled by similar increases in IQ rating on the part of resident children. The Philadelphia study also indicated that Negro children in the first grade who migrated to Philadelphia from the South were definitely inferior in tested IQ to their white classmates, but by the end of the sixth grade there was no difference between the *average* group intelligence test ratings of the two groups.

These and similar data lend support to the hypothesis that there are no *innate* group differences in intelligence but that factors such as socioeconomic status, motivation, and environmental learning may account for group differences. A study of the origin of Negro men of distinction has shown that a statistically significant number came from certain selected counties in the South. In these counties there were educational opportunities not available elsewhere for Negroes at that time. This evidence

suggests that in identifying and educating talented students from minority groups, the school has a most important role, a role requiring careful scrutiny, for these youngsters may otherwise be overlooked or be without adequate guidance.

Children Recognize Group Differences

Many adults assume that children are not aware of racial, ethnic, or religious differences in other people. However, research does not bear out this supposition. Studies of kindergarten and primary-grade children in mixed neighborhoods in a large Eastern city indicated that most of these youngsters could identify their own group (white, Jewish, Catholic, Negro, or Protestant) and the groups that others belonged to. A study of four-year-olds in a nursery school in a New England city revealed that only a small proportion of white and Negro children did not know their own racial and cultural groups and those of the other children.

Children mirror the world around them. The climate of opinion that affects children appears to be more pervasive than even personal contact. A study of sixth-grade children showed a clear reflection of the stereotypes regarding group differences that were prevalent among adults in the community. These Middle Western children, most of whom had known very few Negroes, were found to have strong "anti" feelings toward Negro children. They had acquired "ideas" from the adults of their community. Television also has contributed to the spread of a general idea about people and groups.

On the other hand, a study of Negro children in the middle grades showed that this group had considerable prejudice toward Jewish children but very little toward non-Jewish white children. Studies in the South have shown prejudices both among white and Negro children toward the other group. These studies of the attitudes of children and young people clearly show that children *do* recognize differences and that these "anti" feelings are related to the attitudes and feelings of adults.

Attitudes Toward Group Differences Are Learned

The perception of group differences by very young children does not imply that a child is born with an innate awareness of

these differences. These are *learned* perceptions. The newborn child does not know his group identity. Members of the child's family—often without conscious effort—impart to him their conceptions of their own worth as members of a particular racial, ethnic, or religious group and also indicate the other groups he may meet that are to be considered "good" and acceptable, or "bad" and not acceptable or to be feared. True or false, these notions about one's own group and about other groups are passed on from generation to generation.

Contemporary American culture reinforces many ideas about groups. The role of newspapers, television, and other mass media is probably crucial. Yet this kind of influence is extremely difficult to assess. The mass media have in the past presented a rather stereotyped image of certain groups in our society, e.g., the Italian peddler, the Negro servant, and the Irish cop. A study of magazine fiction showed, for instance, that most of the characters were Anglo-Saxon American, while members of non-Anglo-Saxon minority groups, when they appeared, were usually in minor roles, came from low socioeconomic positions, and did not possess wholly desirable characteristics. A study of over 100 motion pictures showed that in over three-fourths of the cases the Negro was presented in terms of the stereotype of the Negro or in a disparaging manner; only 12 percent of the Negro characters were presented in a favorable light.

Studies of textbooks have shown that descriptions of different groups within the United States are surrounded by "good" ideas and symbols, while others are surrounded by "bad" concepts. For instance, the early immigrants in the years before 1880 have often been described in textbooks as pioneers and homesteaders who broke new ground with courage and determination. Those who came after 1880 were often associated with such terms as "swarms of immigrants" or "teeming hordes." Pupils reading such descriptions may accept these designations uncritically and unconsciously.

Studies of textbooks have also revealed that the Negro, as a slave, has been given a large amount of space, and the conditions of slavery have been described in detail often with stress on the benign aspects of slavery. After the discussion of the Reconstruction Period, the Negro as a group in American life drops out of sight. What impression of Negro life and character will students

then retain? Newer instructional materials attempt to give more accurate portrayals of groups and individuals in both text and supplementary books. Such stereotypes as the "sly Chinese," the "lazy Mexican," the "cute little pickaninny" are fast disappearing from children's literature and school texts.

Group differences are learned, and they are learned from many aspects of the culture that touch upon the life of the school child. Most children grow up hearing and taking in many messages from many sources which tend to reinforce stereotyped versions of persons belonging to majority and minority groups. It is natural for children to learn that people differ, since they do; but it is quite another thing for children to learn that some people differ in a "bad" way and others differ in a "good" way. Such valuations often help to set the stage for intergroup conflict and personal tragedy.

Some Children Become More Prejudiced Than Others

A large body of research literature has been devoted to prejudices and their formation. Prejudice, as the word itself indicates, means "prejudging." A prejudice may be against a person, a place, a kind of food ("I won't eat oysters; no, of course, I've never tried them!"), wearing apparel, words, or almost anything. The necessary element in any prejudice is that the person holding it is not at all inclined to test his prejudice against experience or to be influenced by facts that are contrary to his own beliefs.

One of the most interesting findings in recent research is that some people appear to be more prejudiced than others in the same general environment. Where prejudice does exist—particularly when it occurs in children and is directed toward other children—it seems to be related to such personality characteristics as cynicism, fearfulness, hostility, suspiciousness, and a lack of confidence and security.

Children from homes lacking in warmth and affection, where punishment is rigid and harsh, are more apt to have strong feelings of dislike for people unlike themselves. A lack of self-acceptance in a child has been found to be closely associated with inability to adjust adequately to children of either one's own group or another. One's concept of self is a significant factor in accepting or rejecting others. There seems to be firm ground

upon which to base the statement that children who do not like themselves are ones who will, unless helped, find it difficult to learn to like others. And children who do not like themselves typically come from homes where they are subject to arbitrary, cruel, or inconsistent authority, and are insecure in their place in their parents' affections. It is not surprising that these children will tend to transfer their self-contempt to others, particularly those belonging to groups that the adults characterize as "bad."

The inference from this research leads educators to place increasing emphasis upon helping young people to acquire not only more adequate views of other persons, but more adequate and self-supporting views of themselves. Do school policies hinder children from working together harmoniously or do they encourage rivalry where certain groups are bound to fail and others bound to succeed? Consider the choosing of sides on so many playgrounds where the child who dislikes himself uses his position as "chooser" to heap ignominy upon someone he dislikes. Many teachers can testify to hearing children say: "We don't want Wops (or Kikes, or Chinks, or Hunkies) on our side." And where the Anglo-Saxon Protestant child is in the numerical minority he, too, may feel the whiplash of group rejection.

School procedures, as well as school materials, need to be examined to make sure that they do not reinforce the tendency to hate. At the same time, school people, aware of the fact that prejudice appears in different amounts among similar appearing children, will need to assess programs on an individual rather than a group basis; what works with many children in helping to sharpen perception may be lost upon those who *need* their biased view of others as a way to bolster a shaky view of themselves.

The Feeling of Difference Is Important

The feeling of difference, as it affects children and adolescents, is of crucial concern to educators. Behavior in classroom and school that might seem bizarre or unacceptable to the typical teacher may actually come out of the underworld of youthful tensions and intergroup conflicts, where words hurt and damage. To be "in" with the right group (or wrong group, as the case may be) is of urgent significance during these years of growing up.

And if someone calls a youngster a "dirty Mex," he may retaliate by misbehavior, by wearing extreme clothing, or even by physical violence.

Being a member of a minority group in our present-day society is not easy. What does it mean, for instance, to a Negro child to grow up in a predominantly white world? Case studies suggest that no Negro child escapes the "moment of revelation" when he recognizes the fact of his inescapable difference, a difference that he cannot erase by changing a name or attending a different church or marrying a rich wife. His difference is physical and obvious. Although the same feeling of difference is often experienced by Chinese and Japanese children, they have learned from their parents that theirs is a respected and honored culture worthy of group identification. But the Negro, among the oldest of America's population groups, does not look back to his African forebears. The very process of forced migration and tribal and family dislocation left him with only American cultural forms to learn and adopt. It is interesting to note that in one research study a group of deprived and educationally resistant Negro children responded actively to the school's program during the study of Negro History Week; this experience gave them a feeling of self-respect which, in turn, brought both better class behavior and an increase in their learning.

The current interest in developing materials and units on Negro history at all grade levels is too new to have been assessed adequately. However, teachers have found Negro students responding with great interest to data on their own past, and also to new archaeological and historical material regarding ancient African cultures. Similarly, white students, especially in Northern or Southern segregated areas, have been startled to new awareness by exposure to the same material on the Negro.

The child of foreign-born parents, particularly if English is not the primary language at home, is affected by other group pressures and differences. From his parents he learns manners, food habits, family role relationships, attitudes toward education and the future, and these may differ in many respects from those of the American school and of the American culture as conveyed through the mass media. To what shall the child be loyal? If he rejects his parents' attitudes and values, he feels highly insecure and uncertain and is inevitably involved in conflict and trouble

at home. If he does not accept the school's version of what is "American," he is apt to be left out of school activities, to receive poor grades, and in many crude or subtle ways to be made to feel unworthy. He may avoid conflict in school by adopting the school's image of an American child and be rewarded by the school, but then he may be punished by his parents. This is, indeed, a cruel dilemma.

Many millions of Americans have had the "second-generation" experience, and their stories have been told in books of biography, autobiography, and fiction. Today, with a decline in immigration, the second-generation problem affects fewer young people. In a few large Northern and Midwestern cities and certain agricultural areas, groups of Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Appalachian whites, and rural Southern Negroes are now caught in second-generation situations, both bilingual and bicultural, that will remain acute for many years.

What do religious differences mean to children? Because of this country's tradition of religious freedom, we have no dominant religion or religious group. On many streets one may find almost as many different churches represented as there are houses and families. How do the children on the street perceive the fact that on Sunday their neighbors go to different churches; that some go to services on Saturday and others on Friday evening? Still others go to no church at all. It would be indeed foolish to assume that children do not speak to each other about their differing religions and religious practices. Research indicates that in groups where there are religious differences, these differ-

ences are noted by children; moreover, religions are ranked by the children: some are "good" or "better," others are "not so good" or "bad." The prevalence of anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic attitudes indicates one widespread effect of religious differences. Because of such differences—as young people are quick to learn—certain persons will get preferential treatment and others are denied it; some parents can join the country club and others, with equal income, cannot.

Such feelings create genuine problems for young people and for those who are concerned about bettering group relations. Each person sees his own faith and belief as significant. To him it is of vital importance, for it is the truth about a mysterious and wondrous universe. Does this mean that other beliefs and faiths are "wrong"? Does "wrong" then imply "bad"? For young people it is a very short step between saying, "My beliefs are right" and saying, "Because my beliefs are right, yours are wrong; and because yours are wrong and you hold to them, you are, therefore, a bad person."

To feel different and to feel superior is one thing; to feel different and to feel inferior is quite another. Probably, the central problem of intergroup education revolves around this factor more than any other. If differences were not demeaning, each person would prize differences.

As the study of society becomes more truly scientific, increasingly it appears that certain social values which at one time had a justifiable rationale survive today as little more than residual social habits. It is also clear that many individuals gain self-enhancement by looking down on or deriding others. Most people will acknowledge that the shape of a person's eyes or a person's religion will not tell them whether he is loyal, trustworthy, honest, or talented; yet for irrelevant reasons such as appearance a person may be deprived of educational and social opportunities. The explanation of this behavior, psychologists say, may lie in the individual's need to feel secure and worthy. When he does not have status in the world of reality, he seeks it through artificial or imaginary means. The practice of finding a "scapegoat" is one form of discriminatory behavior; by this means, individuals pay back the world for the kicks given to them. They kick those who are weaker than themselves and thus transmit to

others their own unpleasant feeling toward the world. This psychological mechanism seems to operate when one child picks on a less agile child or derides a child from a minority group. Usually, the victim has done nothing except to exist.

INTERGROUP EDUCATION: SOME GUIDELINES TO PRACTICE

Differences can spell unhappiness for the individual. Differences can also make for trouble and unhappiness between groups. In an experimental setting it was observed that certain kinds of competitive situations and rumors could lead groups of children to make devils and enemies of former friends. Tensions among groups of people who differ (whether the differences are real or imaginary) are a potent source of trouble in the contemporary world.

It is generally acknowledged today that school programs cannot ignore the group differences that children bring to school. If the school ignores them, the children do not. School yard and gang fights, painful ostracism from school activities, the flourishing of secret societies, often stem from lack of school programs designed to build acceptance of group differences.

The Americanization programs for the new immigrants in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were dedicated largely to assimilating many different groups into American life. This goal was achieved, and it can be truly said that a flourishing and distinct American culture has been created. Today cultural differences can enrich, not confuse, our culture. For this reason, even if there were no other, school programs cannot avoid the acceptance of differences. Along with the acquisition of common social understandings, an effort should be made to prize and encourage differences. Some differences cannot be erased—differences in skin color or eye shape. Other differences—stemming from religious beliefs or variations in ethnic values—are desirable, for they are necessary to the individual as a spiritual and social being. Therefore teachers will support such differences and demonstrate their value in every reasonable way.

Teachers Must Be Objective

Since the public school opens its doors to all, regardless of who they are, what they look like, where they come from, it is obvious that school programs should seek to be consistent with this open-door policy. Classroom teachers, often without meaning to do so, may favor one group as against another. Certain children may be regularly overevaluated; others may be regularly underevaluated. Studies have shown that boys may have a much larger proportion of failing school marks than girls, in spite of the fact that standardized measures of achievement reveal comparable scores among boys and girls. Children from the "better" homes are far more likely to hold school office, to be in many clubs, and to represent the school in many activities than children from minority groups or from poorer homes.

Each school faculty will find it important to know the community from which the children come. What are the racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic groups in its community? Is there tension among these groups? What are the social rankings assigned to each group by the community? Answers to these questions will help the faculty recognize what kinds of intergroup understandings may be most needed in its school. Members of a school faculty may also have to face up rather realistically to their own feelings about group differences.

Many teachers say in all sincerity, "But we have no cultural problems because our children come from nice middle class homes. There are no group differences." This analysis is probably not correct; behind the nicest facades in the best suburbs lie many group differences, if one's eyes and ears are alert enough to detect them. Many teachers, not previously aware of or concerned about intergroup problems, will now be confronting them owing to the Supreme Court decision in 1954 on school desegregation and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which mean that almost all schools will be affected by the reassortment of children at all school levels. The world that confronts these young people is filled with group differences and tensions. The scientific approach requires us to examine the facts and to help young people live adequately in today's world.

Changing Basic Attitudes Is Not Easy

Changing attitudes from those based on rejection to those based on acceptance is not a simple task. At present, only the beginnings of real insight into the problem of how to change attitudes have been uncovered. The components of attitudes have not yet been perfectly defined, nor can one always be sure of the particular key to attitude change.

Research has shown that anti-Semitism and anti-Negro attitudes in children are associated with restrictive personality patterns. As previously pointed out, children who are extreme in their rejection of other groups are generally inclined to be hostile, cynical, less confident, insecure, and suspicious. Can classroom teachers hope to help these children accept both themselves and others who may differ from them?

In other instances children merely reflect, unthinkingly, the generalized pattern of attitudes of their parents and other adults. These surface attitudes and surface expressions of attitudes can be affected. An environment in which acceptance of differences is easy and is expected can be created. If the school were truly a place where differences were consistently accepted, many kinds and degrees of hostility would be greatly diminished.

The big problem is to obtain consistent treatment throughout a child's school history. Often the elementary schools of a community seek to adjust their tasks closely to a child's ability and to minimize unfair competitive situations. However, when the young person reaches high school, he may encounter excessively rigid homogeneous group or academic standards that are impossible for him to achieve. Resulting frustration and feelings of inferiority may undo the more positive results of his earlier school experience.

Our knowledge suggests certain desirable school practices:

1. ***Healthy group relationships are promoted when invidious comparisons are eliminated.*** For example, the "good" class or the "nice" children or the "dirty so-and-so's." The child's self-concept and his concept of others are built up of hundreds and thousands of such little incidents. Teachers must be careful to avoid comparisons that belittle groups, particularly since the bases upon which the comparisons are made are unreliable.

2. *Changes in attitude are also changes in feelings.* Most people do not change their attitudes because they are told facts alone. Facts, unfortunately, are often rather cold and unpersuasive. But moral and ethical values will give power to the facts. However, an emotional or moral appeal alone does not seem to have much permanent effect upon attitudes. A judicious combination of both fact and ethical considerations does help individuals reassess their own beliefs and attitudes, and thus change.

3. *Individuals, whether children or adults, may be helped to change their attitudes about others through specific kinds of direct experience.* If pupils think that all Chinese are laundrymen, this stereotype can be modified by bringing to class a Chinese-American doctor, dentist, lawyer, engineer, or teacher. However, such persons are brought to the classroom not because they are Chinese-Americans, but because they can tell something important about their job or profession. The skillful teacher later utilizes the situation to point out that the stereotype of "all Chinese are laundrymen" just doesn't hold up.

4. *Experiencing an intergroup situation does not necessarily affect the attitudes of those involved.* Because children come to school and meet and mix with many who differ, one may assume that they are, therefore, learning intergroup acceptance. This is not necessarily true. Although a few children may change their "fixed ideas," for most children everyday school relations have little or no effect upon home and street indoctrination. Teachers must make the facts explicit by helping children to see "we are learning about how people differ" and by showing that such differences require serious thought. In this context some changes in behavior and attitude may occur, particularly when such changes are rewarded and approved by authority figures (classroom teachers, group leaders, religious leaders, and political leaders).

5. *Children should see and learn about minority-group individuals who have achieved high social status and prestige.* One major demonstration of the acceptance of minority-group individuals is their presence on the school faculty. Thus, American schools practice what they preach. Children are aware when deeds do not match words, and they learn, or are informed by

adults, that "our schools do not employ 'x' kinds of teachers." So the bitterness of group differences is perpetuated.

6. *Surface behavior and under-the-surface feelings may be quite different.* Although a child learns to voice the "expected" and the "right" sentiments, he may hold tightly to feelings of aggression, hostility, or defensiveness. Only by becoming sensitively observant and skilled in the use of the tools for diagnosing human relations can teachers expect to know what this class, this group, and this child may need.

7. *Children and youth need help in acquiring understanding of how it feels to be in the other fellow's shoes.* The feeling of empathy is central to the development of adequate intergroup understanding. Why is it that a child does not want his mother, who has a broad accent, to go to PTA? Why do certain epithets make a child want to fight or cry? These are a few of the questions teachers can explore with young people and, by getting them out in the open, can help each person to understand how it feels to be a member of a different group.

8. *Teachers can use to advantage even the fights and clashes that disturb and disrupt school situations.* To ignore these problems is to invite more trouble. The fact that there is intergroup hostility in a school may properly become important teaching content within the classroom. A wise school administrator will support classroom teachers in helping young people look at their own feelings. One possible cure for intergroup hostility and tension is a school-wide study of the school community, of prejudice, of stereotyping, of scapegoating, indeed, of all the issues discussed in this pamphlet. Using methods of problem solving which involve data gathering, testing of myths against reality, and establishing hypotheses and alternative solutions will aid children and youth to develop reasonable behaviors in regard to other individuals and groups. To the same extent that "action research" can assist teachers in developing more adequate understandings, so can it help young people.

SELECTED RESEARCH REFERENCES

1. Adorno, T. W., and others. *The Authoritarian Personality.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950. 990 pp.
2. Ambrose, Edna, and Miel, Alice. *Children's Social Learning: Implications of Research and Expert Study.* Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, a department of the National Education Association, 1958. 120 pp.
3. American Educational Research Association. "Human Relations in Education." *Review of Educational Research* 29: 315-90; October 1959.
4. Committee on the Study of Teaching Materials in Intergroup Relations. *Intergroup Relations in Teaching Materials.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1950. 231 pp. (Summary may be found in Stewart, Maxwell S. *Prejudice in Textbooks.* Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 160. New York: Public Affairs Committee, 1950. See also Judah, Harris. *The Treatment of Religion in Elementary-School Social Studies Textbooks.* New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1963.)
5. Deutsch, Martin. *Minority Group and Class Status as Related to Social and Personality Factors in Scholastic Achievement.* Monograph No. 2. Ithaca, N.Y.: Society for Applied Anthropology, Cornell University Press, 1960. 32 pp.
6. Deutsch, Martin. "Early Social Environment and School Adaptation." *Teachers College Record* 66: 699-706; May 1965.
7. Goodman, Mary Ellen. *Race Awareness in Young Children.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publications Co., 1952. 280 pp.
8. Gough, Harrison G., and others. "Children's Ethnic Attitudes: I. Relationship to Certain Personality Factors." *Child Development* 21: 83-91; June 1950.
9. Grambs, Jean D. "Are We Training Prejudiced Teachers?" *School and Society* 71: 196-98; April 1, 1950.
10. Herskovits, Melville J *The Myth of the Negro Past.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1958. 368 pp.

11. Hunnicutt, C. W., and others. *Survey of the Croton and Washington Irving Elementary Schools of the City of Syracuse*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Bureau of School Services, Syracuse University, June 1963. pp. 19-21. (Mimeo.)
12. Kardiner, Abram, and Ovesey, Lionel. *The Mark of Oppression*. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1951. 396 pp.
13. Kramer, Judith R., and Leventman, Seymour. *Children of the Gilded Ghetto*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1961. 228 pp.
14. Lott, Albert J., and Lott, Bernice E. *Negro and White Youth*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963. 236 pp.
15. Marcus, Lloyd. *The Treatment of Minorities in Secondary School Textbooks*. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1961.
16. North, Robert D. "The Intelligence of American Negroes." *Research Reports*, Vol. 3, No. 2. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, November 1956.
17. Olson, Bernhard E. *Faith and Prejudice*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1963. 451 pp.
18. Sherif, Muzafer, and Sherif, Carolyn W. *Groups in Harmony and Tension*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953. 316 pp.
19. Stember, Charles H. *Education and Attitude Change: The Effect of Schooling on Prejudice Against Minority Groups*. New York: Institute of Human Relations Press, 1961. 182 pp.
20. Tannenbaum, Abraham. "Family Living in Textbook Town." *Progressive Education* 31: 133-41; March 1954.
21. Trager, Helen G, and Yarrow, Marian Radke. *They Learn What They Live*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952. 392 pp.
22. Tumin, Melvin, editor. *Segregation and Desegregation: A Digest of Recent Research*. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1957. 112 pp. (Revised edition coming out in 1965 covering all studies up to 1963.)
23. Tumin, Melvin, editor. *Race and Intelligence: A Scientific Evaluation*. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1963.
24. Yarrow, Marian Radke, issue editor. "Interpersonal Dynamics in a Desegregation Process." *Journal of Social Issues* 14: 3-63; November 1958.

GENERAL REFERENCES

1. Allport, Gordon W. *The ABC's of Scapegoating.* New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1948. 40 pp.

2. Allport, Gordon W. *The Nature of Prejudice.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publications Co., 1954. 537 pp.

3. Baldwin, James. *The Fire Next Time.* New York: Dial Press, 1963. 120 pp.

4. Bettelheim, Bruno, and Lewin, Kurt. *Securing Our Children Against Prejudice: Two Views.* New York: Community Relations Service (386 Fourth Avenue), n.d. 31 pp.

5. Bloom, Benjamin S.; Davis, Allison; and Hess, R. D. *Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965. 179 pp.

6. Clark, Kenneth B. *Dark Ghetto.* New York: Harper & Row, 1965. 251 pp.

7. Davis, Allison. *Social-Class Influences upon Learning.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948. 100 pp.

8. Dean, John P., and Rosen, Alex. *A Manual of Intergroup Relations.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955. 193 pp.

9. "Ethnic Groups in American Life." *Daedalus.* (Edited by Oscar Handlin.) Vol. 90, No. 2, Spring 1961.

10. Gillham, Helen L. *Helping Children Accept Themselves and Others.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959. 56 pp.

11. Grambs, Jean D. *Group Processes in Intergroup Relations.* New York: National Conference of Christians and Jews, 1952. 52 pp.

12. Grambs, Jean D. "The Culturally Deprived Child: Achieving Adequacy Through Education." *National Elementary Principal* 64: 8-16; November 1964.

13. Gronlund, Norman E. *Sociometry in the Classroom.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. 340 pp.

14. Kvaraceus, William C., and others. *Negro Self-Concept.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965. 186 pp.

15. Pettigrew, Thomas F. *A Profile of the Negro American.* Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1964. 250 pp.

16. Riessman, Frank. *The Culturally Deprived Child.* New York: Harper & Row, 1962. 140 pp.

17. Rose, Peter I. *They and We; Racial and Ethnic Relations in the United States.* New York: Random House, 1964. 177 pp.

18. Spindler, George D. *The Transmission of American Culture.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959.

19. Sproel, Dorothy T. *Tensions Our Children Live With: Stories for Discussion.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1959.

20. Stendler, Celia B., and Martin, William E. *Intergroup Education in Kindergarten-Primary Grades.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1953. 151 pp.

21. Taba, Hilda, and others. *Diagnosing Human Relations Needs.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1951. 155 pp.

22. UNESCO. "Race and Prejudice." *UNESCO Courier* 18: 1-36; April 1965.