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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

A white bus driver was driving through a small Southern city. He saw a few Negro men standing on the street corner and muttered, "lazy brutes." Later passing through another city he saw some Negro men stacking heavy boxes on top of each other. "Savages," he said. "What else can they do but manual work."

During World War II a Japanese went to cash a check in a small Californian town. The white bank teller said, "I cannot cash this check. How do I know that you have money in this other bank." The Japanese man said that he might call them up and ask if his bank account was all right. The white bank teller said, "No, we can't do that." As the Japanese man was walking out of the bank he heard the bank teller say to the next customer, "They're all traitors and cheats."

A want ad was put in the paper which stated that store clerks were needed in a certain department store. Experience was not necessary. A Negro girl wrote a letter applying for this job. She met all the qualifications and was asked to come in for an interview with Mr. X. Mr. X's secretary told her that the job was filled and that Mr. X. was busy and could not see her. The girl showed her letter which stated that she was to have an interview at this time. The secretary looked confused but finally let her in to see Mr. X. Mr. X. said he was sorry but he had filled the position that morning. A week later the Negro girl, who was still looking for a job,
noticed that the ad was still in the paper.

Mr. Greenberg wrote into three hotels on the Jersey shore asking for reservations for him and his family for the month of July. A few days later Mr. Davis, a friend of Mr. Greenberg, wrote into the same resorts asking for reservations for him and his family for the month of July. The two families had decided to spend their vacations together. A week later both of the men received letters from these hotels. Mr. Greenberg was told by all three resorts that they were filled for the month of July. Mr. Davis was told that they would gladly accommodate him and his family.

The Women's Association of a Protestant Church in a small Pennsylvania town was holding its sixth meeting of the year. The women of this association had lived in this town for a number of years and formed a very close knit group. They did not like outsiders, but especially city people from New York or Philadelphia. Mrs. B. moved to this town two months ago from New York City. This was the second meeting she had attended. At this meeting they were discussing fund raising projects which would be held in the spring. Most of the talk centered around food sales. Mrs. B. suggested that maybe they could hold a large square dance in the gymnasium of the church. The members looked shocked and quickly voted this down. After the meeting three of the members drove home together. Mrs. D. said, "Can you imagine holding a dance in the church. How sacreligious! These city people are all immoral."
Three nine year old Protestant boys were going fishing one Sunday morning. On the way to the pond, they passed a Catholic Church and saw one of the boys in their class at school going to this church. Their conversation changed from the fish they were planning to catch to the Catholic Church. One little boy said, "The Priest beats them if they don't go to church." Another one said, "Yeah, and they have to read big books and learn all this junk. If they don't the Sisters hit them with rulers." The third boy said, "They gotta do what those old people tell them. They can't have any fun on Sunday. My sister said that all Catholics were mean."

I do not like you Dr. Fell
The reason why I cannot tell;
But this I know and know full well,
I do not like you Dr. Fell.

Once riding in Old Baltimore
Heart-filled, head-filled with glee,
I saw a Baltimorean
Keep looking straight at me.

Now I was eight and very small,
And he was no whit beggar,
And so I smiled, but he poked out
His tongue and called me, "Nigger."

I saw the whole of Baltimore
From May until December;
Of all the things that happened there
That's all that I remember.  

(Countee Cullen)

These stories and pictures have this in common: they all illustrate the phenomenon of prejudice. The present study is concerned with this problem of prejudice, but so vast and intricate is this problem that we must limit ourselves. The
limitation which we place upon ourselves will appear in the course of discussion.

The specific problem with which this paper is concerned is the reduction of prejudice in intergroup relations. Although one may be prejudiced against many different types of persons or groups (a certain nationality, a specific religion or class, etc.) this paper will put particular emphasis upon interracial relationships. However, this does not mean that I will exclude all other types of relationships. Wherever possible other types of prejudice will be considered. I must insist that prejudice, whether against a certain race or against any group or classification of people, is still the same phenomenon.

So crucial is the phenomenon of prejudice to the present study that a few remarks about its nature are necessary. Prejudice is essentially a way of thinking together with a way of feeling. It combines an error in thought with a feeling of hostility or antagonism. Prejudice is not a way of acting. However, it may or may not motivate us to act in a friendly or hostile way depending upon the intensity of our feelings. Probably the most common way of acting associated with prejudice is discrimination. But prejudice itself is a state of mind. (\textit{ibid}, p. 5) It is an attitude, usually – and this will be the emphasis in the present study – a negative attitude. Although prejudices theoretically could be aimed against any thing, it is only with prejudices against persons or groups that we are concerned. The significance of prejudice in a
society is that it functions as a block to social interaction. Thus a person, who has learned a prejudice when a child, will grow up with a great reluctance to associate with those persons or groups against whom the prejudice is aimed. This fact can become extremely dysfunctional in society, particularly in a society of such inevitably close and complex relationships as the United States. This point has been made by many students of American society and need not be repeated here. (6)

In this paper we will put to test the very common sociological assumption that prejudice between different groups can be reduced by getting these groups to interact. We will try to analyze very carefully the common elements in situations in which prejudice exists. Specific emphasis will be put upon those elements which when modified will lead to the reduction of prejudice and hostility.

In addition to the specific problem mentioned above, I will be dealing with a more general problem throughout this paper. This problem is central to the study of Sociology. Sociology seems characterized by the following confusing (but interesting) situation: we have given either extremely involved and abstruse theoretical systems or else vast and undigested areas of descriptive facts. Only recently have Sociologists tried to unify theory and fact convincingly (Homans, The Human Group). My intention in this study was to limit myself to those studies which were both theoretically
suggestive and empirically sound. However, I discovered that among the great quantities of material on prejudice and intergroup relations, there were actually very few studies that satisfied my original demands. In other words I found the studies to be either "too theoretical" or "too descriptive." What was perhaps worse was the frustrating fact that the descriptive material was too often not inclusive enough to suggest valid hypotheses. My feeling is that this last situation is the consequence of not having an originally conceived theoretical framework. In short, it is a failure in methodology.

I have none the less kept as closely as possible to my original intention. I have been forced to emphasize methodological problems more that I originally intended. Given data, what theories can be brought to bear upon them? Given theories, what precise data can serve to validate them? These are the questions to which I have sought answers, and these are the questions which have de-fined and de-limited the present study of prejudice. Not to fall into the very methodological errors which I have criticized above, I will present in the next section the theoretical framework of the present study. We should take seriously what Henri Poincare has so aptly stated: "Science is built up of facts, as a house is built up of stones; but an accumulation of facts is no more a science that a heap of stones is a house."
CHAPTER II: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

We will be using the concept of group as a theoretical framework for this study of the reduction of prejudice. Prejudice does not occur in a vacuum. We will therefore be looking at the phenomena of prejudice as it occurs in a group. We must, first of all, ask ourselves what is a group. Sociologists have constructed a variety of definitions of the group. We will first quote some of these definitions in order to see the similarities between them. After doing this we will formulate our own definitions on the basis of those cited. The following quotations are characteristic:

There cannot be a unit (group or society) of interacting persons until its members have developed a semblance of cultural and psychological unity. A community of ideas and values takes care of the first; an emotional solidarity and an esprit de corps, the second. Discordant relations may typify social relations, but they do not signify group relations. When complete discord gives rise to some accord, we are seeing the formation of the social entity, the group. (2, p.11)

(According to Gittler the attributes of the group are:

1. Two or more persons
2. Common and agreed-upon interests and values
3. A persistent and organized pattern of interaction  
   a. On an overt and definable plane, through an actual and observable process of affiliating, participating, and acting together to fulfill these values. (joining, paying dues, attending meetings, physical residence in a particular place)  
   b. On a covert plane (through personal identification, feeling of belonging, and attachment)
to a common value or number of values, and to each other. (2, p.56)

For a group to be a group it must possess a minimum of the following attributes: (1) multiple personnel, (2) a set of values, (3) a recurrent and organized pattern of overt affiliation and interaction among the personnel leading to the fulfillment of these values, and (4) subjective identification of the personnel with the values and with each other. These are the factors that are present in every human-social group. (3, p.74)

(Homans in his book The Human Group states the following as the elements of a group:)
1. A rule of behavior, that is, .... a norm
2. Activities, taking the form, in our language, of favors done by persons for others
3. Sentiments in the form of friendship or antagonism between men
4. Sentiments in the form of social evaluation, or ranking, of individuals by other members of a group,
5. Interaction between members of a group, including interaction between followers and leaders. (4, p.288)

(Sherif and Sherif state that:) a group may be characterized as a social unit (1) which consists of a number of individuals who, at a given time, stand in more or less definite interdependent status and role relationships to one another, and (2) which explicitly or implicitly possesses a set of values or norms of its own regulating the behavior of individual members at least in matters of consequence to the group. (2, p.2)

All these shared attitudes, aspirations, and goals are related to and implicit in the common values or norms of the group. (9, p.2)

(Pellegrin says that:) A group is a plurality of persons forming a united entity; it is engaged in definable, psychic interaction directed toward the attainment of common goals and purposes according to agreed-upon means and values; it is characterized by a system of social relationships maintained through emotional solidarity; and it
possesses a common culture which defines the social roles and standards by which members and non-members are differentiated. (I, p.11-b)

From these definitions, what can we say are the characteristics of a group? First (1), a group is made up of two or more persons; that is, it has a multiple personnel. Secondly (2), a group has certain common values which are agreed upon by all its members. These values may be either explicitly or implicitly expressed by its members. Thirdly (3), the members of a group share certain norms of behavior. Fourthly (4), the group has certain activities which it must carry out. Fifthly (5), every group has certain goals which it is trying to reach. These goals are related to the common values or norms of the group. Sixthly (5), the members of a group, in working for their common goals, interact with each other. This pattern of interaction is organized and persistent. It may be either overtly or covertly expressed: overtly in that one may define just what the members are doing, covertly in that the members have a feeling of belonging to the group. This latter feeling is what Gittler refers to when he speaks of emotional solidarity of the members, often summed up in the phrase, _esprit de corps_. Since the members of a group interact with each other a certain ranking between them takes place. The individuals have a certain position or status in their group, which is defined for them by the other members and by themselves. Thus the seventh (7) analytical element of the group is the
arrangement of membership into statuses. Included in this arrangement are leader and follower relationships.

Every group then has certain characteristics. The basic social process in any group is interaction. Without this there would be no group. All groups have certain values or norms which are shared by the members. The values or norms that a group holds are related to the goals they have. The members of a group when interacting to reach these goals are doing something. Thus activity becomes an integral aspect for consideration. But activities can only be efficiently pursued within a structural or organizational context. The best, if not the only way of organizing for an activity is to assign a status (there are many ways of doing this) to each individual. A status simply defines the duties, rights, privileges etc. which an individual is expected to carry out.

It is obvious to even the casual observer that the elements of a group outlined above do not characterize all groups to the same extent or intensity. The amount of interaction in a family might be greater than that in a Boy Scout Troop; and the common activities pursued might be greater in a fraternity than in a dorm. These differences are differences in amount; thus we have a theoretical bases for making quantitative studies (according to many scientists the very essence of a true science). There is no question; however, that the methods and indices of
measurement are still only vaguely formulated.

As a possibly useful and heuristic device for measuring group phenomena we will use Max Weber's idea and construct, what he might call, an ideal-type. It should be kept in mind that the following "ideal" is not a descriptive and empirical fact but rather a rational arrangement. The ideal-type group would be characterized by the following: (1) a steady, persistent, and intimate interaction among its members; (2) a set of consistent values and norms, clearly recognized and equally shared by all its members; (3) a goal or goals towards which all would equally strive and which would be possible of attainment; (4) a pattern of activities in which all would participate and which would add to the achievement of the goal or goals; (5) a consistent and interdependent structure of statuses which would be clearly defined and in which all members are placed according to their abilities; and (6) a strong feeling of belongingness, an emotional feeling of togetherness, a liking for each other, in short, a strong esprit de corps among all its members. By definition, this group is an example of what we mean by integration and group unity.

We repeat: no existing, functioning group fits the pattern of this ideal-type perfectly. However all groups will approximate this pattern more or less. This situation may be thought of in terms of a continuum, along which any group might be
situated. If a presumed group does not possess any of these characteristics our conclusion would be that it was not a group at all: it would be at the opposite end of the continuum from our ideal-type described above.

It should also be understood that a group is a functional whole. Therefore, its elements are not separate entities but are interrelated. One of our problems is to find out exactly how they are interrelated. For the present, we will assume, tentatively and heuristically, that any element in a group is related to any or all the other elements. A change in one element will effect a change in some other. 

The whole point of the above discussion is to prepare a way for testible hypotheses. We believe that a careful study of what we have said will show that the above analysis implies a number of possibly significant hypotheses. In short, we may deduce from the concept of the ideal-type group a suggestive series of theorems (or hypotheses). Some of these may be listed immediately:

1. The more individuals share a common set of norms or values the more they will form an integrated group.

2. The more persistent and organized the pattern of interaction among members, the greater will be the unity within the group.

3. The more clearly defined the statuses, the more integrated
4. The more activities that are pursued in common the more integrated the group.
5. The more the members share certain goals the greater will be the unity within the group.

A series of more specific hypotheses might be:

6. Persons who interact frequently with each other will tend to like each other.
7. Persons who like each other will tend to interact with each other.
8. The more frequently persons interact the more alike their norms and values will become.
9. The more people interact with each other the more activities they will pursue in common.
10. The more activities they pursue in common the more alike their norms or values will become.
11. The more clearly defined the statuses are the more organized the group will be around certain activities.
12. The greater the amount of interaction the more easily will the goals of the group be reached.

As we stated before the problem in this paper is the reduction of prejudice in intergroup relations. This problem is related to the above concept of the ideal-type group. The reduction of prejudice is essentially a problem in movement.
towards that pole in the continuum which is represented by the ideal group. We have said before that prejudice involves a feeling of hostility and antagonism which acts as a block to interaction. When we say (see number 7 hypothesis) that people who like each other will tend to interact with each other, we also mean the converse; that is, that people who do not like each other will tend not to interact with each other. This not interacting with each other will tend not to develop common norms, values, goals etc. In short, our theory suggests that prejudice acts to disrupt and disintegrate group life.

To improve "bad" interracial relationships we must increase some or all of the elements which contribute to "groupness." To do this we will analyze some case studies in order to see how our theories are related to concrete data. This latter is the more general problem with which we are concerned.

Wherever possible we will limit our analysis to fairly concrete groups. However, this may not always be possible.

The general problem of prejudice and interracial relationships includes areas of phenomena which are not ordinarily restricted to the kind of group to which we have been referring. Such terms as race, society, class, and community are those which we cannot easily dispense with and yet it is highly questionable whether these can be called truly groups. We need a more inclusive concept, namely social system. A social system we
shall define as any distinguishable, isolatable entity of social phenomena. It is used as a highly flexible term which may pertain (depending upon the context) to any object of sociological attention. A group such as a baseball team, a family, a fraternity is a social system. So also is a university, a community, a social class, a racial or ethnic group, and a society. (In sociological literature a society if often called a system of systems.)

The premise of this point of view is that any social system, to the extent that it is is integrated, will possess characteristics similar to the elements or traits which we have designated as belonging to the group. This premise is not assumed as true, but rather it is simply postulated as a source from which hypotheses may be derived.

Prejudice, as we may now define it, is a barrier to the integration of a social system. However, we are not implying that any social system should be so integrated that variety and diversity among the members would be destroyed. But I do feel that prejudice, by blocking interaction, is detrimental to the ideals and workings of our society as a whole. From the above premise, which we have only postulated, we may say tentatively that a social system will be integrated to the extent that it is characterized by the elements which we have attributed to the group. A community of Negro and Caucasian people
exemplifies this principle. The unification and integration of this community will only occur if the members of the two races interact with each other, share the same norms, values, and goals, and participate together to pursue their common activities. If these elements are lacking or only present in a small degree the community will perhaps not be integrated enough to successfully fulfill its obligations and activities.

In the next sections we will describe and analyze six case studies in order to see what elements are the most important for attaining "good" interracial relationships. Our purpose in doing this is that we feel prejudice acts to disrupt and disintegrate American society.
CHAPTER III: REGENT HILL PROJECT

The first case study which I will describe is Regent Hill Project, located in Baytown, which is one of the oldest towns in the country. (2) The population of 30,000 is spread over a large area forming five distinct neighborhoods with no central shopping district. This middle class community attaches great value to persons who trace their descent from early settlement days. Newcomers find it difficult to become assimilated. It is a Republican community with strong bias against federal or other interferences.

The Regent Hill Project, located in the middle of one of the five sub communities, was built during the war under the auspices of the Federal Housing Authority. The first occupants worked exclusively in the shipyards. After the war in 1947 when this study was undertaken by the Research Center for Group Dynamics, Michigan University, only forty per cent of the earlier residents remained and only twelve per cent of the residents still worked in the shipyards.

Community opposition prevented the construction of this project when it was first proposed, but after war was declared the town gave its approval. The old timers objected when 100 houses were built instead of the 50 which were originally planned, because they did not like the location of the additional
ones. However, the leaders in the community had a range in opinion from great opposition to neutrality. There was a relative lack of knowledge and opinion about the project from the local residents. About eighty percent of those questioned had no opinion, and only about half the people in the immediate vicinity and a fourth in the nearby areas were sufficiently aware of the project to recall its existence.

The occupational groups of the town and in the project are similar although the project has a slight edge in the supervisory and managerial classes. They have more education, more children, and less years as a resident. The people in the housing project feel that the townpeople look down on them and there is a low level of friendship with them. The people in the project have kept themselves, or have been kept, in greater isolation in the activities of the town than townpeople of similar tenure. The residents within the project were covertly hostile and unfriendly because, according to sixty-two per cent of those interviewed, they thought the others living in the project were low class and undesirable. Consequently there were few friendships existing among project residents. They did not realize that they all formed a homogeneous group in that they were of the middle class. For this reason they failed to foster friendly relations among themselves. Their lack of interaction continued their
preconceived ideas of their neighbors class. They were given the task of working with the tenants of the housing project to help them organize a program of community activities. This was done in order to get the residents into contact with one another so that communication could be established among them. The community workers were not allowed to stimulate contacts between the townspeople and the project residents. Other activities had been tried at various times and these had failed and left a very pessimistic attitude toward starting new activities. The Action Program was divided into three periods.

During the first period of action (January 29 - April 5) the community worker was introduced by a regional Federal Public Housing Authority representative at a meeting of project women. The community worker interested these women in the possibility of a project nursery school, a recreational program for school age children, and adult educational and recreational activities. In order to find out more about these activities a meeting for all residents was called.

Only thirty-five of the two hundred residents attended. At this meeting experts were called in to lead small planning groups in the three possible activity areas. Greatest progress was made in the area of a nursery school. About a month after the program began there was fairly wide-spread support for the
community activities. During this preliminary work resistance toward the program began to show. "This resistance showed itself in three ways: (1) lasting pessimism with regard to the possibility of establishing a successful program of community activities; (2) pronounced criticism of the general meeting; and (3) opposition to specific features of the activities." (2, p.30) The greatest resistance, which arose in connection with specific features of the activities, was centered around the nursery school program which had made the most progress. The resistance to the nursery school program was largely started by the pessimism of the chairman of the tenant's committee, but the most disruptive resistance was shown by the secretary of the tenant's committee. She deliberately blocked two meetings of the nursery school steering committee of which she was chairman and she consistently opposed other suggestions of the community worker. Also the increased number of people who were participating threatened the status position of the old leaders and if these activities were to proceed new leaders would almost certainly become dominant.

A rumor was started by the secretary of the tenant's committee and another project resident that Mrs. C., who was extremely active in organizing the nursery school, was an "avowed communist." In addition to this, they said that three
of the experts were known to be communists. When the community worker went to work one day, she found that the general meeting had been called off and that the program had ceased altogether. It was found that the other residents agreed with this rumor because of their old pessimism and because they were afraid of being thought of as communists if they disagreed.

In a small meeting with the local project manager there was some disagreement as to whether or not they should stop all activities or take a more moderate course. The secretary of the tenants' committee and a friend of hers favored the first approach, while the local project manager favored the latter course. During this meeting the latter's behavior was a crucial determinant of the course of events. If he had been fully acquainted with the sponsorship of the research program and had he fully understood its purpose he could have quieted the suspicions of the women. His ignorance of the overall plan of the community workers blocked further interaction among the residents. This fault in communication between the project manager and the community workers hindered further progress in the activities. Since the manager was hostile to the action program in the beginning, and the community workers had to bypass him in setting up the activities, there was no communication between the two people. Therefore he did not realize what the
program was all about and he could not explain this program to the residents. This absence of communication resulting from earlier hostility helped to heighten the hostility toward the action program. The effect of these events led to a complete cessation of activities. It was almost two weeks before the community worker could do anything to dispel the rumor.

One reason for the rumor was that there were many areas in which the residents did not have a clear idea of the situation. The absence of communication meant that they did not know who the sponsors were, what their purpose was, and why they were willing to spend so much time and effort in working at this project. If there had been communication between the project manager and the community worker, the project manager could have told the residents the information that they wanted. This rumor then had a great effect on the program because of the absence of communication which led to more hostility. Also important, in the situation leading up to the rumor, was the fact that the old leaders were beginning to feel their leadership position threatened as new leaders were emerging and assuming importance in the line of the new activities. The rumor served the purpose of stopping activities and therefore keeping the old leadership structure. A third reason for the rumor was the widespread belief that the activities were...
doomed to failure because of the "low type" of people living there. To combat the rumor the following action was taken:

a. "Detailed information about the sponsorship and purposes of the research program was given to the project residents both in groups and individually."

b. "Deliberate efforts were made to integrate some of the old leaders into the new activities and to assure them status positions. This removed many causes of resistance with the result that some of these old leaders became staunch supporters of the new program." They took this action because, when new activities are emerging in a group, the old leadership structure will be threatened if the old leaders do not participate in the new activities. Leaders become leaders in a group if they adhere to the basic norms and participate fully in the important activities of the group. With the creation of these new activities at Regent Hill, new people were taking part in the new important activities and their status was being raised. The old leaders by failing to join the new activities no longer had an important position and therefore their position as leaders was threatened.

c. "Working both through regional management and directly with the local project manager, the latter's support
was won for the new program of activities. At a meeting with some of the project women the local manager stated that the rumor had been demonstrated to be unfounded." (2, p.35)

d. "When it became clear that the active instigator of the rumor, the secretary of the tenants' committee, was still intent on continuing her opposition, efforts were directed toward minimizing the effect she could have. Very soon the activities were again progressing without her participation." (2, p.35)

Even after the rumor had been cleared up, it was impossible to continue the activities on the same basis as before because the rumor episode had served to reaffirm the tenants' pessimism about successful community activities. The accomplishments of the first action period were as follows:

1. "Interest in a nursery school and in school-age recreation activities had been stimulated by a series of demonstration programs."

2. "Women were assuming regular roles in helping in the operation of the nursery school." One of the reasons for so much success in this area is that women are usually very interested in their children and have more time than the men to spend with them. The women in the neighborhood who formed this nursery school.
program all had a common interest in it. That interest was in their children. Besides having this common interest, there was more of a motive behind their work than in some of the other areas. This motive was that they were genuinely interested in setting up a program where their young children could attend school. In working on this program the women started to interact in that they had a common interest and a common goal.

3. "A club for teen-agers, started at their own request, was operating under the supervision of the community worker. This club performed community-wide services in addition to sponsoring its own activities."

4. "Efforts were under way to stimulate adult activities, but no definite results had been achieved."

5. "Plans had been made and publicized for the election of a project-wide advisory committee. (2, p.37).

The second period of the action program lasted from April 16 to June 29. During this time there were ten nursery school sessions. The attendance was good and many mothers came to learn the techniques of nursery school guidance. "This often led to friendly social contacts among the mothers." (2, p.38) A nursery school committee of mothers assumed almost complete responsibility for settling policy
and directing the affairs of the school. They held a
dance to raise funds for the school. At this dance only
twenty-five tenants appeared but all who did talked enthusing-
estically about the dance.

There was not as much participation by the mothers in
the school age program because they felt that it was too
much work and they left much of the responsibility of this
with the community worker. They did however, have a program
which was sometimes successful and sometimes disorganized.
In this program the mothers were assigned to helping positions.

The teen-age group, organized by community workers, was
enthusiastically carried on by the teen-agers themselves,
during the school year, but their interest lagged as summer
approached. The teen-agers resisted the idea of inviting
adults to supervise their activities, but they did cooperate
with the adults by baby sitting for them while the parents
attended community meetings.

Early in the second period, steps were taken to establish
a program of interest to the men." (2, p.39) A male com-
munity worker interested some of the men in playing softball.
A series of seven games were completed but the high morale
with which the series began was not maintained. Friction
arose over such things as umpires decisions, assignment to
certain positions by their captain, and razzing from onlookers.
The men of the softball teams staged a successful party. "In planning this party they seemed sensitive to the impression the party would create on outsiders." (2, p. 41)

The election of a project-wide advisory committee was finally carried through. At its first meeting the committee gave promise of taking responsibility and initiative for the welfare of the project and the coordination of community activities.

The third period of the activity program lasted from June 30 to September 21. During this final period a great deal of effort by the community workers was expended in preparing the people for the termination of the research program. This proceeded along the following lines:

1. "Informing the people of the termination of the research program and the reasons for it."

2. "Developing a realistic appreciation for the extra effort which project people would have to supply as a result of the withdrawal of the community workers."

3. "Transferring gradually to the project people the responsibilities for the activities in order to make the effects of the termination less abrupt."

4. "Training the project people in those skills of community organization which they lacked." (2, p. 41)
During this period of action the nursery school sessions were held regularly and the mothers assumed the responsibility for the program and completed plans for a full time self-supporting school. Although the school-age activities program was popular with the mothers, there was no organized group of mothers who were responsible for carrying on the program. A doll carriage parade which was sponsored by the nursery school and school-age committees was a great success. As one mother was supervising the teen-age program, it looked as if they would continue as they had done in the past. Her assumption of responsibility guaranteed the continuation of the teen-age group. If there had been no responsibility assumed, the teen-age program probably would not have lasted very long. A lack of responsibility for any activity will finally lead to its disappearance. The softball games which were held twice weekly commanded a large attendance. Some of the men in this group started playing cards and although this was not organized, it looked as if these activities might continue. An adult craft program was initiated with a great deal of interest, but since there was no assumed responsibility for this program it did not appear as if the program would be continued. The advisory committee showed a mature responsibility for the welfare of the project. Several meetings were held for training tenant leaders in human relation skills.
The action program and results accomplished, which were just described, was intended to provide an increased number of contacts among project residents. This program could stimulate contacts only to the extent that they participated in the activities. During the course of the activities, about half of the project residents had participated at one time or another. The participation by women was greater than that by men. "Among those who participated in the activities and were consequently making new contacts with people, favorable attitudes were quite prevalent." (2, p.51) "The community activities were perceived by the project residents who were participating as a good place to make social contacts." (2, p.51)

Previously, a conclusion was drawn that the existing hostile attitudes, among the project residents, were maintained because of lack of communication among them. Since you could not change a priori opinions and attitudes it was expected that stimulation of new and additional contacts among the project residents would result in decreased hostile attitudes. During the activity program three surveys were taken to examine changes in attitudes toward other residents. These surveys were divided into three groups: (1) favorable contact group, "those who were participating, directly or indirectly, and had unqualified favorable attitudes toward the activities," (2) unfavorable contact group, "those who were participating, directly
or indirectly, but whose attitudes were, at least in part unfavorable," (3) no contact group, "those who were not participating at all." (2, p.52)

One survey revealed that as the community activities progressed, there was little change in attitude regarding the idea that their neighbors were low class. However, there was a slight change in the "unfavorable contact group." They became more hostile. For those who participated in the program, there was greater feeling that their neighbors did not cooperate than among those who did not participate at all. This can be explained by the fact that "cooperativeness" is a salient point of concern for those involved in the program. People who work together are more conscious of the amount of cooperation among their fellow workers than those who remain aloof from any group action. But there was a clear difference between the favorable and unfavorable group. The more contacts the unfavorable group made, the more they felt their neighbors were uncooperative, while in the favorable contact group this attitude was decreased. It was also found that for those who were in the favorable contact group they more continually mentioned that they had "nice neighbors," while the unfavorable contact group steadily decreased in the mention of this. In summarizing the results it was found that the people with no increased contacts had no attitude change from survey one to
three. In the group which made contact under favorable conditions there was a tendency for hostile attitudes to diminish while the groups which made contacts under unfavorable conditions had an increase in hostile attitudes. It was found that those who had favorable contacts began to like their homes better and invited more people to them.

Besides the above changes in relation to other project residents, there were also changes in relations with the townspeople. At the first survey both the unfavorable and favorable contact groups felt equally that the townspeople looked down on them, but by survey three the favorable contact group no longer felt this way, while the unfavorable contact group still did. The favorable contact group shows a greater interest in town activities.

"At the beginning of the study townspeople who had unfavorable predispositions towards the project, in general had more social contacts with project residents than those who had favorable predispositions." (2, p.66) "As the community activities progressed and changes occurred among the project residents, they tended to withdraw from contacts with unfavorably predisposed townspeople." (2, p.66) The townspeople who had no contact or favorable contact with the project residents were undesirable, while those townspeople who had unfavorable contact with the project residents increased
in their attitude that the project people were undesirable.

After this activity program took place it was found that: (1) "contacts are effective in producing attitude changes only if they entail the transmission of social attitudes, i.e. evaluative statements by other persons about the objects of the attitude;" (2) "the effectiveness of a communicated attitude in producing change is a function of various aspects of the relationship between the communicator and recipient, e.g., their interpersonal attractions, power relationships etc.; (3) "contacts will not be effective in producing attitude change if they merely contain information about the objects of the attitude." (2, p.76)
CHAPTER IV: THE ANALYSIS OF REGENT HILL

In this section I will make an analysis of the Regent Hill Project. Throughout this paper I will be repeating some of the definitions brought in at the introduction in order to make the analysis clearer. We have already defined a group as having certain characteristics. One of these traits is that the members of a group have norms which they share in common. These norms which the members have are the basis for certain patterns of behavior. For example, the girls in a dormitory will share certain norms. These norms do not have to be overtly expressed, in fact they are usually not expressed. How then can we tell that they share these norms? We find this out by their overt behavior. There is a similarity among these girls in what they do and say, and how they act in certain situations. Their behavior will differ in some degree to girls in some other dormitory. Thus one can find out by observing patterns of behavior to what extent individuals share common norms. In the illustration of the dormitory, the girls were living in close enough proximity to one another to be able to interact. This interaction brought about the sharing of common norms and hence the development of somewhat unique and distinguishing characteristics.

Going back then to our definition of a group, we said that the members in it will share certain norms which will be expressed by a pattern of behavior that is acceptable by
all others in the group. Harmony among people will be the result of having certain patterns of behavior which are acceptable to all. These patterns presumably are derived from the sharing of common norms. If you have persons who are in close proximity to one another and do not share common norms, then you will find that these people do not form a group or, if they do, a very loosely integrated group. This is the situation which we found at Regent Hill, that is, Regent Hill may be considered as a social entity, a social system, with but the barest of perceptible organization.

We must stop here for a moment and review the situation because, as we saw, the people of the project, from one point of view, did seem to have a common norm. And yet we are told explicitly that there was very little interaction among them. This seems to contradict the fact established above that those who share common norms will tend to interact.

In order to make our analysis clearer, let us review the situation at Regent Hill. The people living in the project held in common what seems to be a norm, namely, most felt that their neighbors were low class. They perceived this as the situation because they thought that all people who lived in housing projects were members of the low class. If the situation objectively coincided with what the people thought it to be, then what was happening in Regent Hill would be
predictable in terms of our theory. A social class is a ranking of individuals according to certain common indices and these include attitudes, norms, values etc. Individuals in different social classes will perforce possess a different set of attitudes and norms, and hence will not be likely to interact intimately with each other. However, the situation objectively determined was such that the members of Regent Hill were, by and large, members of the same social class; hence they must have held some common norms; and hence there should have been more interaction among them than was true. From this evidence, we can say not only that people who do not share common norms will not be likely to interact but that people who perceive differences among each other will tend not to interact. In other words, it is not enough just to observe the objective situation; but you must also take into account what the people in the situation perceive it to be.

This situation discovered by the research team points to the phenomena with which we are most concerned in this study. The perceptions the residents held were found to be false: They were stereotypes. Many of the residents held a priori hostile attitudes about their neighbors. A stereotype together with hostile feelings, we have defined as a prejudice. We must conclude therefore, that the residents of
Regent Hill were, in the technical sense of the term, prejudiced. The problem is how to reduce or extinguish this prejudice.

To find the answer to this problem let us see what was done at Regent Hill. A research committee was brought in from the outside to initiate activities in the project in order to establish contact between the residents. If, by contact, you can get people to interact, they will start to share common norms; acceptable patterns of behavior will emerge; and, we are predicting, prejudice and hostility will decrease. This was in the minds of the research team.

Community workers, sponsored by the research team, were brought in to stimulate contact between the residents. This was achieved by setting up activities, where the residents could interact by sharing a common task, which they all felt was worthwhile. The nursery school program was effective in doing this, because many of the mothers with young children were very interested in this. The community worker arranged these activities so that all could participate. The individuals involved were working at a common task which they felt was important to themselves and to their children. If a person outside of a group can get people to work together (participate in a common activity) around a common interest they will tend to interact.
Furthermore, we noticed that when the mothers started pursuing this common activity their hostility toward each other decreased. In other words, it seems that interaction tends to lead to the lessening of hostility. Presumably, this interaction led them to realize that the stereotypes they held were false and hence, they now realized that they shared common norms. This leads us to believe that interaction together with the sharing of common norms leads to the lessening of hostility.

We saw from our study of this housing project that after the residents had worked together to initiate one of the activities, such as the men's baseball team, they began to interact with each other outside of this activity. This was seen when the men started playing cards with each other. This social affair began with the men themselves and not with the community worker. It just took the community worker to initiate one activity to get the men to interact and they then proceeded from this on their own. This suggests that where people or groups in one activity have been integrated it is easier to integrate the same people or groups in other activities.

If there is little or no tension between the people or groups at the integration of the first activity, there will be little or no tension in other activities. At first the men showed tension in joining the baseball team but after this
became a successful activity they were willing to play cards with one another without displaying tension. We may add to our above hypothesis and say that when people or groups have been integrated in one activity it is easier to reduce tension between the same people or groups in other activities.

We must stop here a moment to define two terms: interaction and contact. A difference in degree, not in type, exists between these two terms. One may have contact with another person and yet not interact with them in the sense that you share common norms, activities, and sentiments. In this paper interaction will be defined as "the process where upon contact, men influence each other's behavior through the exchange of significant symbols." (1, p.157.) Contact will be defined as the encountering of two or more people without any effect on their thinking or on their actions. In short, interaction is more intensive and intimate than contact.

Let us again review the situation at Regent Hill. When the residents moved into the project they held certain expectations about their neighbors. They believed that their neighbors were low class and that they themselves were middle class. Dislike of their new neighbors was fostered before they even lived in the project, because they did not want to associate with low class people. These hostile expectations blocked any interaction among the new residents. Most people
when moving to a new community, will make an effort to get to know their neighbors if they think that they are of the same class as themselves. Thus, a priori hostile attitudes towards individuals will inhibit interaction with these individuals, and in addition, the lack of interaction will tend to reinforce feelings of hostility.

Previously, we implied that hostility will not be reduced by merely stimulating contacts between people because contacts are not intensive enough. Interaction which is intensive will result in people liking each other for themselves and not for what group or nationality they belong to. In short, it is partly a question of breaking up stereotypes. The community workers tried to get people in contact with each other, so that they would break up their preconceived notion that their neighbors were low class. The idea behind this was that to decrease hostility, contact must be intensive enough to result in personal likes and dislikes which helps to break up stereotypes.

We previously stated that individuals will be more likely to interact with others with whom they share common norms and attitudes, or by definition, with those who are in the same social class. In addition, we stated that hostility will be lessened by interaction. We presume then that people tend to be less hostile to people in their own class. But,
from the situation at Regent Hill, we found that it is not just the objective situation of being in the same class, but rather what the residents perceive the situation to be. The above may be qualified to read that people tend to be more hostile (other things being equal) to individuals who are, or who are perceived to be, in a different social class. Obversely, people tend to be less hostile to those they perceive to be in their own class.

One of the characteristics of a group is status. Any group, where certain activities are being done, is likely to give rise to a leader and follower relationship. At Regent Hill, we saw that some individuals were leaders in the project before the new activities were initiated. When the community workers were brought in and new activities created, there was a need for leaders in these new areas. We have suggested that no activities can be carried on efficiently without some organized pattern for interaction. When there is a pattern of interaction, individuals will tend to organize themselves within some sort of status arrangement. Some of the old leaders resisted the attempts to displace them from their positions. When the new activities were created leaders were needed. If the old leaders are either unwilling, or unable to take positions as leaders in the new activities, we would expect new leaders to arise. Ordinarily, leaders hold their
statuses because they adhere to the basic norms of the group and they participate in the important activities. When the new activities were created, the old leaders had to participate in them or lose their statuses. Some of the old leaders started the rumor of communism so that activities would cease. By blocking these new activities their statuses were not threatened. Our evidence leads us to believe that individuals in high statuses in a group will foster hostility towards individuals who are trying to usurp their position. A more general statement of the above might read that one mechanism for maintaining high status (whenever that status is threatened) is to confuse issues by exciting antagonism or hostility against anything which upsets the status quo.

The hostility of the old leaders had to be reduced in order to continue the activities. The community worker tried to get these leaders to participate in the new activities so that they could maintain their statuses. By breaking down their hostility, in this way, the activities were again resumed. Thus, our evidence shows that when new people and new activities are initiated into a group, hostility can be reduced if the present leaders retain their status by joining the new activities.
CHAPTER V: THE PHILADELPHIA CHILDHOOD PROJECT

My second case study, The Philadelphia Childhood Project, was a field experiment in intercultural education. (10) The purpose of this experiment was to see if, and how democratic attitudes could be taught to children in a school setting. This project was sponsored by the representatives from the Research Center for Group Dynamics, formerly of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, now of Michigan University. Fifteen teachers from five schools were chosen to take part in this experiment. Later in this experiment four of the fifteen teachers were selected to lead two experimental groups.

As the participating teachers did not themselves chose to take part in the project, one could not take for granted their acceptance of the program. Because democratic attitudes in children are partly influenced by their teachers, it was necessary to have teachers who could foster these attitudes. These above two factors led to the formation of a Teachers Study Group, which consisted of the teachers, the administrators of the experiment, and the teacher-leader, who served as a liaison between the teachers and the administrators. In this group the teachers learned many of the common problems with which they would be faced. More important, they learned to accept each other as equals.

This project took place over a three year period. The
first year's emphasis was to build an effective functioning group of teachers. This was the teachers study group mentioned above. The second year, the emphasis was on measuring children's social attitudes. Although a research staff was brought in to do most of this work, the teachers did share in this by getting information about the children's home and background. The third year's emphasis was an attempt to change the social perceptions and attitudes of first grade and second grade children. Although we are most interested in what happened the third year, it is essential to have some idea of the problems arising in the first two years.

At the first meeting, when the project was officially launched, an attempt was made to show the school administration's support and to describe generally the objectives of the program. This first meeting which was to stimulate the teachers interest produced the opposite effect, as the teachers thought they were being punished for their prejudices. Because the second meeting of the first year was informal and the teachers were urged to ask any questions, a slight interest developed in the project, but the atmosphere was still strained. This was the last meeting before summer vacation.

After the vacation two different attitudes were displayed by the teachers, that of enthusiasm and that of skepticism. During the second year changes in the teachers attitudes
became evident. Because of the group meetings and bull sessions between teachers, and their interest in the research problems, the teachers started to share their ideas and skills and become more of a cohesive group. A greater amount of friendliness had evolved between project teachers and non-project teachers. Differences between race and religion which were first barriers to social relations were no longer obstacles. Informal evening suppers and Saturday dates were now a part of the everyday social life. Besides changes in the social life of the participants, teachers also began to show more responsibility and initiative. Although they still requested help from the teacher-leader and administrators, they were helping each other more. We should add that changes which occurred were not even for all teachers.

The analysis of the changes in attitudes on the part of the teachers will be briefly summarized below. The teachers were not told of this analysis until the second year of the project. The Research Center was afraid that if the teachers knew sooner that their own progress was being measured, they would increase their negative attitudes toward the entire program. The changes could not be measured in comparable units for teachers. Analysis was based on the following different measures: cumulative records of each teachers
activity and interest in the project, a questionnaire
given to each teacher for each year, and individual inter-
views with each teacher at the close of the project. The
cumulative records were used to measure four goals. The
first goal was to develop teacher interest in and awareness
of human relations. Three categories came under this goal:

1. **Attitude toward the project.** Six teachers originally
neutral or resistant to the project changed to
accept it. Four who accepted the project, continued
on that level, while four who at first were neutral
or accepting retrogressed to resistance. One of
the members remained resistant throughout. Two of
the teachers who retrogressed and the one who re-
mained resistant throughout were members who re-
mained on the fringe of the group.

2. **Recognition of the problem.** All fifteen teachers
became increasingly aware of the problems involved.

3. **Participation in the project.** Seven members increased
and two maintained the same level of participation in
the activities. Five showed participation in spurts
and one steadily declined. The retrogression which
did occur came when the experiment with the children
was put into effect.

The second goal was to develop understanding of children's
needs, attitudes, and values. At first only two of the
fifteen teachers showed any sensitivity to the needs of the children, but by the end of the project eleven of the teachers understood better the needs and values of the children.

The third and fourth goals were to develop democratic values and willingness to accept responsibility for intercultural education. At first there was a low interest in learning methods to improve human relations, but by the end, nine of the fifteen teachers applied democratic values in the school situation. The nine teachers also carried these values into the family and community, and they showed an increasing awareness of social problems in the two areas just mentioned.

It was found from the questionnaires that the perceptions of the teachers had changed. The term "American" now became far more inclusive. No longer did they wish for "typically American children;" instead, they wanted "any type of child" in their classes. At first, the teachers chose as their favorite subject that which they enjoyed most. After the experiment, they enjoyed those subjects which were best for the children. The teachers now began to emphasize the emotional development of children rather than their previous emphasis on mechanical skills.

Interviews were given at the end of the project. Their
function was to give the teachers an opportunity to evaluate, both professionally and socially, the project as a learning experience. The seven teachers, who accepted the project, said that their attitudes toward children and intergroup problems had changed. In addition, they stated that their social relations, outside of the project, had changed. The eight teachers, who were less accepting of the project, expressed criticism of it. Less significant changes took place in their out-of-school life.

Two hundred and fifty children between the ages of five and eight were subjects in this experiment. Their perceptions of religious faiths and of races were obtained by projective methods and by interviews. They distinguished people as adults do by status, ability, character, and occupations. It was found that none of the following variables could be singled out as the determining factor in children's prejudices: age, sex, neighborhood, group membership or personality.

It was found, from interviews, that parents assume little or no responsibility for teaching their children good human relations and cultural differences. The learning that does occur is not direct nor is it planned. The parents cannot provide the necessary guidance for their children, because their knowledge about racial and religious groups
is meager. The parent's personal feelings interfere with their teachings. In addition, they are not willing to acknowledge that their own group membership (racial, religious, social class etc.) plays an important part in the life of their child. The parents nonetheless, supported the proposal that democratic values and intercultural education be taught in public schools.

The following is the summary of the experiment which was done to change intergroup attitudes among children. Two experimental conditions were created. The first, which we will refer to as "X", was designed to support democratic intercultural values. The second, which we will call "Y", was designed to maintain or foster group prejudices common in our culture.

One hundred and one children, from the first and second grades, were used as subjects in the three groups that were created. Two experimental groups were set up; one exposed to the philosophy of "X", and one to the philosophy of "Y". The third, or control group was not exposed to any special experimental procedure. Each of the four teachers taking part in the experiment had an X and Y group.

In group X, the anti-democratic values of the children had to be altered. To do this, the children were provided with social experiences with people of diverse cultural
groups, so that misconceptions could be corrected and stereotypes challenged. Situations had to be planned which were directly related to the children's personal needs and feelings, and where security could be obtained in their own group membership.

On the other hand, the Y group was to maintain and foster prejudices. This was accomplished by providing situations where differences were regarded as inferior to "our" way or the "American" way. Any variations from the traditional way of doing things was rejected and pre-established norms served as a guide for behavior.

The neighborhood was chosen as the curriculum area for both experimental groups. The administrators felt that the neighborhood was within the first-hand experience of the children and would offer a good point of reference for points of view. This experimental program lasted for seven weeks. Thirteen sessions were held for one hour each.

The following is the summary of each experimental session. The objectives of the first session were the same for both groups. They were: (1) to establish an informal atmosphere; (2) to tell the children what the club would be like; and (3) to encourage the children to freely express their feelings.

The second session. In group X, the neighborhood was stressed
as being multi-cultured. The teacher and the children drew a large map of the neighborhood. She pointed out the many different places where people work and live. By doing this, the cultural diversity of the people was emphasized. The children acted out a story which the teacher had read to them. This story was about a Jewish man and a little boy who lost his dog. In group Y, the teacher stressed a "typical" neighborhood. On the map, which this group drew, only the "important" places in the neighborhood were pointed out. She encouraged the children to notice only particular people. They also acted out a story which the teacher read to them. This story was about a man and a little boy who lost his dog.

The third session. In the X group the teacher explained the many different types of work that is done. She pointed out that all work is important for the welfare of the community. Besides talking about the different types of jobs, the children played a game of pantomime where one child walked down the street and others had to guess who he was. Later, in the meeting, each child acted out his father's job. The teacher told them that at their next meeting they would take a walk in the neighborhood to see the many different types of jobs done. Together they discussed how they would act towards the people they would meet. In the Y group, the teacher encouraged the children to prefer only such jobs as
a banker, a policeman, and a doctor. She also told them that they would take a walk next time, but she did not have them act this out as it was not important to Y's philosophy.

The fourth session. On the walk the teacher of the X group challenged the Jewish stereotype. In meeting the different workers (mostly Jews), the teacher displayed a very courteous and respectful attitude. She encouraged the children to ask personal and factual questions. In the Y group the teacher encouraged the children to ask only factual and impersonal questions. She directed the children's attention to those jobs of which she approved, and away from those of which she did not approve.

The fifth session. The teacher of the X group continued challenging the Jewish stereotype, but she extended this to both Catholic and Protestant stereotypes. She showed pictures of other neighborhoods and pointed out the cultural differences between them. The Y group continued to emphasize the status quo.

The sixth session. The purpose of this session, for the X group, was to challenge the Negro stereotype. This was done by reading a story of a Negro boy and his dog. However, the boy is placed in such familiar circumstances that the children forget that he is a Negro. The Y group read the same story, but the approach to it was very different. The teacher told
the children that it was the funniest story she had ever read; as she did this she pointed to the Negro boy.

The seventh session. This session was important for the X group in that it prepared the children for a successful social experience at the inter-racial level. The children were told that they are going to have a Thanksgiving party with children from another neighborhood. These children are Negroes. Adults will attend this party and the Superintendent of Schools will be the special guest. This person is a Negro. The group plans the tasks which will have to be done and the roles that each club member will assume. The Y group also plans a Thanksgiving party, but the teacher here stresses that there is only one right way to celebrate this day.

The eighth session. At this session the two groups held their parties. The members of the X group acted out their various roles before they went to the party. The Negro stereotype is challenged by the attitudes of the adults and by their guest. The Y group’s party is of a different nature in that they discuss the appropriate behavior at a Thanksgiving celebration.

The ninth session. The X group heard a recording about white and brown rabbits and the conflicts they have over their differences in color. If the children do not see the
connection between the color of rabbits and that of humans then the teacher points this out and shows the children how superficial these differences are. Group Y listens to recordings of American songs. The teacher indicated that Americans have plenty to eat and many clothes, and that other countries do not have these things.

The tenth session. A Catholic Sister and a few other adults visit the meeting of the X group. After they had played some games the teacher asked the children to tell their guests what the club had been doing. The teacher asked the Sister a question about the Catholic Church and then she encouraged the children to ask questions. The Sister explained her dress and then told a few anecdotes about how some children were afraid of her. The Y group spent their time imitating the stereotype Negro dialect.

The eleventh session. The teacher of the X group put a large sheet of paper on the wall and asked the children what they would like to draw. In order to get a few ideas they listened to records. They finally decided to draw a picture of "Our Country, The Place Where We All Live." The group discussed the picture and then decided to put in it all the people they had met. The Y group started to draw a picture about children of other lands. They looked at a book with pictures of children's clothes from various countries.
The twelfth session. The teacher of the X group again challenged the Jewish stereotype. The children went to a home to see how Hanukkah is celebrated. The Y group finished its picture and decided to draw another one which represented American life as seen every day.

The thirteenth session. The children of both groups finished the paintings they had begun the previous session. The teacher of the X group encouraged the children to include, in the painting, everything they had seen. She emphasized the skin color by referring to the color of the rabbits. In the Y group, they checked to see if anything "important" was left out.

The four teachers were deeply affected by the experiment. They gained security and self confidence because they had a model to guide them. For the teachers this experiment was a process of self-discovery, insight, and change. After measuring the different attitudes of the children before and after the experiment, it was found that both democratic and prejudiced attitudes can be taught to children. Children will learn prejudices not only from a larger environment but from the content of school experience. It was shown that democratic values can be specifically taught and experienced.
CHAPTER VI: THE ANALYSIS OF THE PHILADELPHIA CHILDHOOD PROJECT

In our analysis of the Philadelphia Childhood Project we will first examine the Teacher's Study Group. At the beginning of the experiment, the teachers did not form a cohesive group. Little or no interaction occurred between the teachers and administrators, or among the teachers themselves. Apparently, a common norm did not exist which the teachers could use as a guide for their behavior. They did not understand what was expected from them, or why they should be the individuals who were chosen for the experiment. The teachers did not fully comprehend the goal of this project nor did they, as yet, share an interest in any common activity. In short, the elements of a group were absent, or only present in a small degree.

However, as the experiment progressed the teachers began to interact not only in the activities of the project, but also in their social life outside of this experiment. The goal of intercultural education shifted from a vague, meaningless term to a more specific identifiable goal. They no longer manifested any hostility.

This evidence reinforces what we stated in our previous analysis of Regent Hill; that is, hostility can be reduced by reinforcing some or all of the elements of a group. In addition, the above evidence reinforces the hypothesis that
when people or groups have been integrated in one activity, it is easier to reduce tension between the same people or groups in other activities.

However, the few teachers who did not entirely understand the goal, nor work on the common activities, were those who stayed on the fringe of the group. They displayed less of an interest and did not interact, as much outside of the experiment. Resistance from the project came from these teachers. This reinforces our hypotheses that hostility will be fostered mostly by those individuals who do not interact or share common norms with the other members of the group.

The norm guiding the teacher's behavior during the experiment was orientated primarily towards the teaching of democratic values and attitudes. The administrators supervised the progress of the teacher's in the Teachers Study Group. The teachers kept a constant check on themselves. This added to the clarity of the problems and contributed to the meaningfulness of the norm as the teachers increasingly approximated the norm. The hostility of the teachers diminished considerably when they knew exactly what they wanted to do. This suggests that a model which guides one's course of action is helpful for lessening hostilities.

In the second part of this analysis, we will examine the
two experimental groups with children. The teachers of both groups were democratic leaders, but a definite difference in their methods is noticed. The teacher of the X group accepted all the children in her group, whereas the teacher of the Y group did not. In the Y group, the teacher did not overtly reject the children, but by stressing the importance of certain employments; the "true" American way of life; and the "right way" for celebrating Thanksgiving; she rejected certain occupational, class, racial, and religious groups. Since the children represented all walks of life, she excluded some of them, by implication, by rejecting their families.

On the other hand, the teacher of the X group accepted all children by emphasizing that all types of groups were worthwhile. By doing this, the teacher displayed an acceptance for all children. This acceptance by the teacher provided a security for the members in her group. The children in the Y group manifested hostility towards each other; whereas, the children in the X group did not show hostility towards their club members. This evidence suggests that hostility is an inverse function of the degree to which the children were accepted.

The teachers in both groups maintained the ultimate control as characteristic of their leader-status. This control was basically similar in both groups and therefore,
was not an important element in the reduction of hostility.
I do not mean, however, that the question of control will
never have an effect in the lessening of hostility; only
that it does not in this particular instance.

The children of the X group were encouraged, by their
leader, to express all their feelings and attitudes toward
any situation. They spoke of their father's employments,
holiday celebrations, and personal impressions of others.
On the other hand, any expression on the part of the children
in the Y group, which did not conform to the typical or con-
ventional pattern, met with ridicule and rejection. As a
consequence, tension was created among the members of the
Y group; whereas, there seemed to be an absence of tension
in the X group. This evidence suggests that tension is an inverse
function of the degree to which children are permitted to
express their feelings and attitudes.

However, the implication, that wherever children are
permitted freely to express themselves, should be qualified.
As we stated before, the teacher had control of the club
and therefore, whatever was accomplished in the group occurred
within a controlled situation. If people are allowed to
express their feelings without any control, tension might
be manifested, even to the extent of group hysteria and
extreme intra-group hostility. Thus, the fact that permissiveness
of expression, in the X group, occurred in a disciplined situation, must be taken into account.

One of the main objectives of this project was to decrease the prejudice that children have learned. The research committee found, when testing children's attitudes, that the children's prejudices included traditional and stereotyped attitudes about other people. After reinforcing stereotypes in the Y group, the children's hostility towards these groups increased.

How did the teachers of the X groups combat the children's prejudices? They had the children meet people who did not fit the stereotyped conceptions. In short, the teachers challenged their preconceived ideas. In addition, the teachers, by accepting all children, gave to these children an emotional feeling of non-difference from others. When this was accomplished the hostility of the children towards other people decreased. On the other hand, the teacher of the Y group reinforced the stereotyped conceptions and antagonistic feelings which the children held. This led to an increase in prejudice against "unaccepted" persons. The evidence simply reinforces the accepted hypothesis that prejudice is learned, and furthermore that there is a relationship between stereotypes and antagonisms.

As stated before, the children of the X group felt
secure as members of their club and did not manifest tension towards each other. Their hostility towards other groups lessened. The children of the Y group; however, did not feel secure in their membership and did manifest tension towards each other. Their hostility towards other groups was heightened. This evidence suggests, that a possible relationship exists between the manifestation of tension towards members of your own group and towards other groups. It seems that people of other groups were "used" as scapegoats for the insecure and hostile feelings manifested by the members of the Y group. This, at least, might be an added factor contributing to the increase in prejudice among the members of the Y group.

We may predict, at this point, that the more hostility generated within the in-group the more hostile the members will be towards people in other groups.

What kind of knowledge should one have about a group, in order to reduce prejudice towards that group? The children learned that all people of one race or religion were not alike. The teacher taught them some of the traditions and customs which other groups held and what these customs meant. In doing this, she was giving the children scientific knowledge; that is, true knowledge about other groups. The children became less hostile towards these groups after
they had learned about them. This evidence suggests that
the more scientific knowledge you have about a group, the
less hostile you will be towards that group.

The teacher was the individual who stimulated inter-
action between the children and other persons. She was a
member of group X and yet, she also represented this group
when they met new people. The teacher, by acting in a
respectful and courteous way, showed the children how they
should act. In short, she set an example for them which
they could follow. The children of the X group accepted
the teacher as their leader. When she accepted other
people they also accepted these individuals. This evidence
suggests that hostility can be reduced between groups if
the interaction between these groups is stimulated by a
respected leader.

The teacher provided the children with a knowledge of
minority group life by introducing them to a few individuals
in these groups. The X group met a few Jewish workers and
visited one Jewish family's home; they met one Catholic
Sister; and one group of Negro children; and yet, after
meeting these individuals their attitudes toward all Negro,
Jewish, and Catholic people had changed. Their hostility
towards these groups had decreased. This evidence suggests
that the lessening of hostile attitudes toward one or a few
persons in an out-group will spread to other persons in that out-group.

This hypothesis was brought out in the study of Regent Hill. Once the residents got to know a few of their neighbors, their attitudes toward other residents changed. They no longer felt that all people living in government housing projects were low class.
CHAPTER VII: THE BULL DOGS AND THE RED DEVILS

The experiment which we will consider next, was conducted by M. Sherif at a camp, situated in northern Connecticut. (2, pp. 229-307) The purpose of the experiment was to create conditions under which tension and friction would result among the boys in the camp; after this was accomplished conditions were created to reduce these tensions. The experiment, which was planned in three stages, lasted for eighteen days.

The first stage was planned so that the boys could form their own friendship groups. The activities which were camp-wide offered the boys a freedom of choice in choosing their friends. The second stage was planned for the formation of two in-groups. These groups participated separately in the activities. The activities chosen were those which had the highest appeal value to the boys. Rewards, given during this time, were made on a group basis. The third stage was planned so that the two in-groups would be brought together in a series of competitive activities. Mildly frustrating situations were created where one group frustrated the goals of the other group.

Twenty-four boys, chosen from the New Haven area, were the subjects of this experiment. In order to eliminate factors other than those introduced by the experiment,
the boys had to be as homogeneous as possible. They all were close to twelve years of age and came from settled American families of the lower-middle class income group. The boys were Protestant. They had a mean I.Q. of 104.8 and their educational backgrounds were similar. None of them had behavior problems, determined by psychological tests given prior to the opening of camp. The boys thought that they were attending a summer camp sponsored by the Yale Psychology Department. Parents were told that new methods in camping would be tried, but they were assured of the health and safety of their children.

The bulk of the observations were obtained by two graduate students who appeared in the role of senior counselors to the experimental groups. Each of these senior counselors had the assistance of a junior counselor who was under his direct control. The other staff members were instructed to perform their duties in strict accordance with the three stages. In order that the principal investigator might be free to observe, he appeared at the camp as the caretaker with the name of "Mr. Mussee." All those associated with the study were urged not to take notes in the presence of the boys, so that the boys would not know they were being observed.

Throughout this experiment the counselors and staff
members were urged not to take the conventional role of camp leader. Authority was not to be delegated or suggested to the boys. The investigators wanted leadership in the boys to arise naturally. A special point was made to let the boys organize their own activities. Punishment came from their own ranks. The staff was not allowed to identify themselves with either in-group.

Stage I. As we mentioned before, friendships during this stage were formed on the basis of personal likes and dislikes. All the boys came to camp on the same bus, lived in one bunkhouse, and ate together. Camp activities such as baseball, swimming, and hiking were planned on a camp-wide basis. Budding friendships and leader-follower relations began to emerge. These leaders emerged in specific activities and their role was maintained only during the period of these specific activities. The following, which is an excerpt from a summary of a two-hour hike, is an example of a developing friendship between three boys.

The hikers did not proceed according to plan up the river toward New Boston. Along the highway, the boys saw a dirt trail veering off to the left and, with consent of the leader counselor, they took it. The trail ended abruptly and the hikers decided to climb the mountain. About halfway up it was decided to have a race to the top. The three boys who won the race were Hall, Miller, and Crane. Hall told (a staff member) that they all walked to the top abreast by mutual agreement, so that no one would arrive before the other two. (2, P.245)
After this the boys did everything together and when asked by Mr. Mussee why they had not been swimming with the others, Crane replied, "When one of us doesn't do something, then none of us do it."

At the end of this stage an informal interview was held with each boy in order to find out what activities the boys liked best and who their special friends were. The staff divided all the boys into two experimental groups. In doing this they split the budding friendship groups which had developed. For example, if two boys were good friends then one was put in one group and one in the other group. These two experimental groups became known as the Bull Dogs and Red Devils.

**Stage II.** This stage which lasted for five days was the period of experimental in-group formation. After breakfast, the boys were told that they would be divided into two groups, so that their preferred activities could be carried out. Each boy was then assigned to one of two groups and for identification purposes one group was assigned the color red and the other blue. The groups were told that they could decide which bunkhouse they wanted. The red group voted to remain in the old cabin and the blue group decided to move to the other bunkhouse.

The investigators had anticipated that this split might not be taken too easily by some of the boys. For
this reason a hike and cook-out had been planned as these activities had first preference with most of the boys. Cars took each group separately to their spot. One boy, Thomas, cried for ten minutes after he was separated from his new friend.

During this stage the groups were separated physically, as much as possible. They lived in different bunkhouses, ate at different tables, and had K.P. duties at alternate times. The activities were engaged in separately by each group, so that the members had to cooperate collectively in achieving their ends. These activities were varied and offered ample opportunity for each boy to show his worth in some line of pursuit.

The formation of well-defined in-group organizations or structures was the major outcome of this stage. In short, there developed relative hierarchical positions and roles, ranging from the highest to lowest position in the group. A discrepancy appeared between the popularity rating and the power position of the members of the group. An example of this was in the Bull Dog group. Four boys received as many or more popularity choices than did Hall, but Hall exerted more influence over the group because of his ability and leadership in athletic events. This leadership in these events was approved by Crane, the Bull Dog
leader, who was not so skilled in sports. By the end of Stage II, the Bull Dog group was more organized and more closely knit than the Red Devil group. The main reason for this will be seen in the following paragraphs, where we will consider the leaders who emerged in the two groups.

Crane achieved leadership in the Bull Dog group by his contribution in the planning and carrying out of the activities, and in integrating the tasks of the members. At the outset, it was Crane who successfully swung the vote to live in the other bunkhouse. In discussing plans for fixing their bunkhouse one boy, noticing a picture of a dachshund on the wall suggested that they put up pictures. Crane said, "Yes, we have the blue and white colors. Let's get a big picture of a bull dog and call ourselves the Bull Dogs." Other plans of Cranes were among the first adopted. He proved to be effective in leading the group on their cook-out and hike. When the group received ten dollars to spend as it pleased many suggestions arose. Crane suggested wood for shelves. His idea was politely but not energetically received. Lowe, of lower status, suggested blue hats. "Yeah," Crane said, "And let's get some letters - B - to put on them." This proposal was adopted.

Crane also helped, assisted, and showed concern about the other members of the group more than any other boy did.
Harvey, who was in a low status position, was having waves of homesickness. He was particularly interested in nature study. Crane showed interest in his specimens and assisted him in some nature hunts. Crane became the acknowledged leader of this group by the other boys; Hall and Evans became his lieutenants. Hall excelled in athletic events and Evans had authority in camping and hiking. The personal skills and abilities of the other boys played a part in their achieving the status which they had.

Thomas, who had cried the first day, might have been unhappy had he not achieved recognition on the first cook-out. Lambert's case reveals a struggle for status because he set his goals high. Lambert did not like Hall's higher position in the power structure (he received as many friendship choices as Hall) and did not hesitate to express the fact. After a while, he and Hall pulled a heavy stake out of the ground and were cheered on by their group. After this event his status became more stable. But it did so only after a great effort on his part. The two lowest members of the group, besides Harvery, were Bromley and Wood. Although they were not outwardly rejected, they contributed much less to all the activities than did the other boys.

The focus of the power relations in the Red Devils
group was on Shaw. In contrast to the organizational abilities of Crane, Shaw was recognized for his daring, his athletic skill, and his toughness. When discussing what to do with the ten dollars they received, one of the suggestions was to put up a fence around their cabin. When this was being discussed Shaw said, "We're the Red Devils and all these things are ours." (This was the first time that the name "Red Devils" had been used by the group. This name was, unfortunately, influenced by one of the junior counselors. He overstepped the role assigned him by suggesting this name, but the boys did not make any response at this time. Shaw's use of the name in this context achieved its adoption.)

One afternoon, upon returning from swimming, the boys found that the Bull Dogs had been in their cabin. Shaw had not arrived and they postponed their decision of what to do until his return. Shaw was all for making reprisals, but a staff member intervened because, at this time, they did not want the two groups in contact. After Shaw changed his mind several of the member's remarked that "We're just playing." That night on the way to their campfire site, Shaw led the way through the woods. The boys agreed, but not verbally, that Shaw was their captain. As Shaw was not good in planning and as Lee, the other boy who could possibly have been leader, did not want the position, the group
arranged its activities in a haphazard and unorganized way. Unlike Crane, Shaw did not organize and integrate the members; instead, he ordered the boys individually.

Shaw inclined to be "cliquish." He confined his favors and attentions to three boys higher in status, Lee, Miller, and Bray. Many times he enforced his decisions by threats and physical encounters. Throughout this study, Shaw's status was rather shaky. It was the consensus of the staff that Lee could have taken over leadership if he had wanted. In fact, at the end of Stage II, Lee received more friendship choices than Shaw.

Along with the formation of a more or less definite group structure, there arose a feeling of in-group solidarity and loyalty. This was shown when three members of the Red Devil's, Houston, Taylor, and Marshall still maintained friendships and mingled with boys of the Bull Dog group. They were called traitors by their friends. After a while, they no longer mingled. The hostility between the two groups had not yet become very strong.

Nicknames were given to the boys by the other members of their group. Each group had its own songs which it preferred. They developed characteristic ways of doing things. Each had a special method of making lanyards. The boys started to make comparisons between the groups. They
would say, "Our pond is better, their lousy cabin." A desire was expressed to have competitive games between the groups. Each group was positive that they would win. At the end of this stage friendship choices were again obtained in the same manner as in Stage I. At this time, the boys in the majority of cases chose their friends within their own group.

Stage III. This stage, which lasted formally for five days, was planned to bring the two groups together in competitive and mildly frustrating situations. These situations were planned so that one group seemed to cause the frustration of the goals of the other group. After breakfast, at the beginning of Stage III, the staff announced that each group was to receive a certain amount of points for competitive games and excellence in performing camp activities. This point system was explained orally to the boys. Typed sheets of the points were placed in each cabin. The point system was so arranged that, if one group was ahead by too much, the other group could be given extra points by the staff. For example, excellence in performing K.P. duties was given anywhere from one to ten points. The two groups were evenly matched in sports, in terms of size and skill of the individuals. A prize was to be awarded to the group obtaining the largest amount of points. This
prize, twelve four-bladed camping knives, was displayed for all to see.

This competition did not immediately lead to any noticed hostility. For example, the Bull Dogs who won a baseball game cheered for the losers. This cheer, however, changed as the contests progressed. It started out as "2-4-6-8-, who do we appreciate," and changed to "2-4-6-8, who do we appreciate."

The organization of the groups played a large part in their activities. The first day the Bull Dogs won the tug-of-war. The Red Devils felt that they had lost because "the ground was against us." The following day, during this activity, the Red Devils pulled four members of the Bull Dogs across their line. It looked as if the Bull Dogs would lose, but the leader of the Bull Dogs started shouting encouraging sentences to his boys. The Bull Dogs then regained their lost ground and finally defeated the Red Devils. This time the Red Devils said that the Bull Dogs "must have done something to the rope."

During these first two days, in-group solidarity continued to be strengthened. Biggs, a Bull Dog, became sick and could not participate in the games. The other members of the group went to see him in the infirmary. They gave him glowing accounts of the game. Although Crane had not
played an especially good game, Hall, the athletic leader, said, "You ought to have seen Crane. He stopped a line drive with his bare hands!" Biggs said that if the Bull Dogs won, he would not accept a knife as he had "let them down." The Bull Dogs shouted down this idea and assured him that he was "one of us." The Bull Dogs spent a great deal of time lavishing praise on individuals and on the entire group. In one instance, Lambert, who previously tried to displace Hall, objected to a team decision of who was to kick: "No, let Hall kick! He's best."

The low status members were becoming increasingly identified with the group. During one softball game, the Red Devils were trailing with two outs and no one on base. Fenwick came to bat and was tagged out. He sobbed for sometime and said to a counselor, "I lost the game for us." The other members never mentioned this incident. They showed him a great deal of consideration.

As the contests progressed, the hostility became greater. A staff member told a Red Devil not to drink so much water during the game. Lambert, a Bull Dog, overhearing this said, "Let him drink all he can. He's a Red Devil."

The Bull Dogs pulled to the lead in points the first day and remained ahead throughout the contests. Although the teams were evenly matched, the Bull Dogs had much better
organization. Even the Red Devils noted this. One member said, "the trouble is we don't cooperate." But the Red Devils were sure they could win if the Bull Dogs were not "such cheaters." They said, "At least we play fair." At the end of the contests intergroup friction was displayed. The knives were given to the Bull Dogs, who distributed them by putting them in a bucket and letting each member pick one out blindfolded.

Shaw, the leader of the Red Devils, had become more and more vindictive. He blamed and ridiculed his own team for not winning. After they started losing, Shaw withdrew more to the friendship of his lieutenants. The other members began resenting Shaw's accusations. Lee could easily have taken over leadership at this time, but he failed to do so.

Following these tournaments, situations were arranged to look as if one group had frustrated the other group. Several situations were planned by the staff, but only one was carried out because of the growing seriousness of the situation. The evening the contests ended both groups were asked to a party in the mess hall. The Red Devils were to arrive five minutes before the Bull Dogs. The staff had previously smashed half of the food which had been put out. When the Red Devils came they took the good portions. The Bull Dogs, arriving a few minutes later, saw the smashed food.
They thought that the Red Devils had done this and called them quite a few names such as "Pigs" and Bums." At first, they were going to throw the food at the Red Devils, but decided against this as they wanted to eat it. Hall, the Bull Dogs' athletic captain, went over to the Red Devils' table and displayed his knife. The higher status members said to ignore him, but the lower status members were quite indignant and started calling the Bull Dogs names. After this, the Red Devils left and went down to the river. Darlton, a Red Devil, was the last to leave. He saw the Bull Dogs dumping their dirty plates on his group's table. He became involved in a scuffle with a Bull Dog, but was stopped when Lambert pulled out his knife and opened the blade.

After this, Shaw was seen talking in a friendly way to the leaders of the Bull Dogs. He withdrew more and more from his own group. The above party set off more incidents such as raids and fights which had to be stopped. The Bull Dogs set the Red Devils' food on a table which was infested with insects and bees. This led to a large fight in the dining room. The boys started throwing knives and dishes at each other. This fight threatened to become violent and had to be stopped.

After this incident, the staff decided to stop Stage III and concentrate on breaking down the in-groups. The idea was
to stop all conflict and to initiate camp-wide activities. However, fights and name calling continued for a few days. Green apples were collected and used for raids. At times, it seemed that the fighting would stop, but it was the low status members who wanted revenge. During these fights, the Red Devils achieved more solidarity than they had after losing the tournament, but the Bull Dogs' solidarity was at its peak. They were even more antagonistic toward the out-group.

During this last period, the tables in the dining room were put together so that the boys would "mix up." With persuasion by the staff members, joint campfires and birthday parties were held. Lambert, who had struggled to achieve his status, was the one individual who really protested against the mixing of the two groups. During a joint birthday party for a Bull Dog and a Red Devil, he refused to chip in money for the Red Devil. However, after a few days he adjusted to the new situation.

The competition was now on an individualistic rather than a group basis. All camp activities except for sleeping arrangements were now held together. The most effective incident for breaking up hostility was a softball game with another camp. The best players from both groups were chosen to play against this other camp.
Although more mixing between members of the two groups took place than during Stages II and III, they never mixed as much as they had in Stage I, nor did they all go back to their friends formed in the earlier stage. As was noticed in Stage I, three boys; Crane, Hall, and Miller became fast friends after they won the race up the mountain. Crane and Hall were in one group and Miller in the other. After this period designed to break down in-groups, there was conflict between Hall and Miller. The two got involved in a fight and Crane urged Hall on. Thus, in spite of the leaders efforts the in-groups tended to persist, but some break down was achieved.
CHAPTER VIII: ANALYSIS OF THE BULL DOGS AND THE RED DEVILS

In analyzing this case study, we will take up the questions of leadership and group organization. To begin with, however, we would like to reinforce one principle stated previously; that is, that **people are more likely to interact with those individuals who share the same common norms, goals, attitudes, and who participate in the same activities as they do.** The boys were very homogeneous; that is, they had similar educational backgrounds, were of the same race and religion, and were in the same socio-economic class. We may assume, therefore, that these boys shared common norms and thus, interaction among them took place easily. As soon as the boys got to the camp, they very readily formed friendship groups. However, they did interact on a camp-wide basis.

During Stage II, the boys were placed in two separate groups and were forced to interact with the other members of their group. Each group began to develop certain characteristics which set them apart from the other group. For instance, each group preferred certain songs, used a particular method for making lanyards, and carried out the common activities in a particular manner. In addition to the above hypothesis that a sharing of common norms will lead to
interaction, our evidence also suggests that interaction will lead to the development of common norms.

We have in this study examples of two types of leaders, Crane and Shaw. Crane, leader of the Bull Dogs, was democratic in his approach toward the other members. He did not order them around, but rather participated with the other members in all the activities. The Bull Dogs became organized around the activities in which they participated because Crane was able to delegate some responsibility to all the members. Although he had special friends in the group, he showed an interest in all the members. Even though Crane did not excel in sports, he approved of this activity and lavished praise on individuals and on the entire group.

On the other hand, Shaw, leader of the Red Devils, was authoritarian in his approach toward the other members. He had as his special friends his lieutenants; and he paid little or no attention to the other members of the group. When he did, it was usually to ridicule or punish them. Shaw lacked the ability to delegate responsibility; instead, he ordered the other members around. Organization was lacking and things were done in a haphazard way. Instead of encouraging his team when they were losing, he ridiculed them for their failures.

A difference was on the degree of organization between
the two groups was noticed. The Bull Dogs were more organized than the Red Devils. Why? One of the main reasons seemed to be the type of leader that each group had. As stated before, Crane was more democratic in his approach than was Shaw. He delegated responsibility, took part in all the activities, and showed an interest in all members of the group. This evidence suggests that the more democratically organized the group, the more cohesive it will be, or, more concretely, it is easier for a democratic leader to organize individuals effectively than it is for an authoritarian leader.

The delegation of responsibility plays an important part in the cohesiveness of a group. This question of "delegation of responsibility" is probably one element in the more general area of democratic organization, but I feel it is important enough to isolate for special consideration. Crane delegated authority to all members of his group, so that each member felt that his contribution was worthwhile to the functioning of his group. Shaw, on the other hand, did not delegate responsibility to all the members. The boys in the Red Devils did not perceive their roles as being worthwhile to the effective functioning of the group. They were ridiculed by Shaw for what they attempted to do. These facts lead us to believe that the more responsibility that is delegated
to the members of a group, the more cohesive the group will become.

We noticed, in our description, that the Bull Dogs were more cohesive than the Red Devils. We also noted that the Bull Dogs had less internal conflict than did the Red Devils. This evidence suggests that the more cohesive a group is the less hostile will the members of that group be towards each other. If this hypothesis is correct then we may say that the more responsibility that is delegated to the members of a group the less hostile will the members be towards each other.

At the end of Stage II, popularity choices were obtained from the members of both groups. The staff found that Crane was more popular with his group than Shaw was with his group. The members of the Bull Dogs did not display hostility towards Crane. This evidence leads us to believe that individuals tend to be less hostile towards those people displaying democratic leadership than those who display authoritarian leadership.

We noticed, in this case study, that the members who did not participate very much in the common activities were those who were on the fringe of the group. Their statuses were not as stable as those members who held higher positions in the group. This evidence reinforces our hypothesis that the more
one participates in the common activities of the group the higher status that individual will hold.

In addition, we noticed that during Stage III and during the attempted breakdown, the lower status members of the groups were more hostile towards members of the other group. When a member of the Bull Dog group displayed his newly won knife in front of the Red Devils group, it was the high status members of the Red Devils group which ignored him and the low status members who resorted to name calling. This was also true during the raids. The lower status members were those who wanted to retaliate. This evidence suggests that the lower status members of a group are the most hostile towards members of another group.

Of all the members of both groups, Lambert displayed the greatest amount of hostility. His position in the group was unstable and he had to work hard in order to maintain his position. During the period of the breakdown of hostile attitudes, Lambert had the most difficult time adjusting to the new situation. This evidence suggests that those individuals who are the most unstable in the group will be those who manifest the most hostility.

It might seem that the last two hypotheses were somewhat contradictory. However, the fact that low status members and Lambert (not low status), who occupied an unstable position,
manifested about the same amount of hostility suggests that we perhaps should classify both types of phenomena together in one category and try to offer one explanation for both. It would seem that a low status member (assuming a sincere desire to belong to the group) would be more insecure in the group setting than a high status member. Lambert's unstable position certainly suggests insecurity. Therefore, the hostility manifested by these individuals would be a consequence of their insecurity in the group.

During and after Stage III, we found that the members of the Red Devils, especially Shaw and his lieutenants, were those who were willing to mingle with the members of the other group. They were less satisfied with membership in their group, than Crane and his lieutenants were with membership in the Bull Dog group. This suggests that the individuals who are not satisfied with membership in one group will tend to break away from that group and try to join another.

A group with democratic leadership, we have suggested, is more organized and cohesive. What factors played an important part in the cohesiveness in the Red Devils? After the tournaments had ended we saw the Red Devil group losing its cohesiveness. They no longer had any common activities around which they could participate. However, when the Bull Dogs started raiding their bunkhouse they again became more
cohesive when retaliating. The members felt more a part of their group than they previously had. This factor which led towards organization was that the out-group interfered with the in-group. Another factor was that they organized around a certain activity, a raid, so that they could reach their goal of retaliation. This evidence suggests that the more an out-group tries to interfere with the in-group, the more cohesive the in-group will become and the less internal conflict.

However, the Bull Dogs were more organized than the Red Devils. Which group was more hostile towards the other group? The Bull Dogs. As a group they were more hostile towards the Red Devils than the Red Devils were towards them. This was shown when the raids started. The Bull Dogs displayed greater hostility than the Red Devils. When the staff tried to break up the two in-groups, the members of the Bull Dogs remained more with their group. This evidence leads us to believe that the more organized a group is, the more hostility it will manifest towards an out-group.

During Stage III, the members of both groups became hostile towards the other group. Even after the attempted breakdown of hostile attitudes, the members of a group remained together. This cohesiveness of the members not only reinforced their hostility towards the other group, but perhaps even
more, their hostility against the others reinforced their cohesiveness. The Bull Dogs had developed a more closely-knit organization and a strong *esprit de corps*. They manifested more hostility towards the Red Devils than did the Red Devils toward them. The attempts to recreate unity at the total camp level was a threat to the already developed unity among the Bull Dogs. Any hostility that they showed against non-Bull Dogs must have acted to reinforce their threatened unity, thus, hostility may function as an agency for reinforcing in-group solidarity.

The Bull Dogs had more control over the individual members than the Red Devils. On the whole, the members of the Bull Dogs acted as the rest of their group; whereas, the members of the Red Devils acted more as individuals. The Red Devil group did not have as much control over the individual members in such areas as in getting them, to work, to participate in the group activities, and to go along with group decisions, as did the Bull Dog group. We may say, from this evidence, that the more cohesive the in-group, the more control it has over its individual members.

As the competitive activities progressed, greater hostility was displayed by both groups. In Stage II, when the in-groups were being formed, there was little hostility between the groups. At this time, the groups wanted to
interact with each other. After Stage III, in which competitive activities were held, hostility increased. The groups no longer wanted to interact with each other. They did not want anything to do with any member of the other group. This evidence shows that the greater the hostility between groups, the less interaction there will be between them. However, after the staff made an effort to integrate these groups around camp-wide activities the hostility decreased. When the groups participated in these camp-wide activities they began to interact with each other. This was highest at the point when their camp was playing another camp in a softball game. This evidence shows that the greater the interaction between two groups, the less hostility between them, and that the interaction within a group will tend to be greatest under conditions of competition (hostility) against an out-group.
changing rapidly in the last few years, mainly because of the activity of interracial organizations. The Catholic Parochial Schools are integrated, some hospitals do not segregate their patients, the theaters without balconies do not practice segregation, nor do some restaurants and hotels. Recently, the NAACP representatives requested that the swimming pools be opened to Negroes. The city council agreed and the pools opened with no conflict or hostility.

The Tucson school system is arranged very simply. There are two school districts with coterminous boundaries; District One and High School District One. The work of the two districts is correlated by one School Board which governs the policies in both. Three members make up this Board; one elected each year. The Superintendent of Schools is appointed by the Board.

In the Tucson area there are twenty-nine elementary schools, six junior high schools, and one high school. Before integration only one school existed for Negro children up to the high school level. The facilities at this school were equal to those at the white schools and the teachers were as qualified as any in the system. The Negroes were not separated until 1914.

Never has the high school been completely segregated, although in the past separate homerooms served the Negro
children. The extra-curricular sports program has been integrated for ten years. These activities were integrated a few years after the present Superintendent took office. The Superintendent is respected by his Board, his staff, and the entire community. In 1951, the state legislature passed a permissive law which empowered the local School Boards to decide whether or not they wanted desegregation. Five years before the permissive state legislation was passed, the Superintendent spoke to his Board and to the Parent-Teachers Association about integrating the schools. He stated that he could see no reason for segregating the different races when they worked and played together harmoniously in after school activities.

In 1950 a number of measures were placed together before the voting public. One of these measures dealt with the integration of schools. But since this particular measure was placed on the ballot along with other measures to which there was great opposition; the overall reaction was negative, and the bill on integrating failed to pass. The Superintendent had made several public speeches in favor of the bill. Some protests were voiced at this time, but they were unorganized and were mostly anonymous letters and phone calls. The people opposing integration did not want to be publically known. It was said at this time that the Board was not
completely behind the Superintendent. Besides the many interracial organizations which favored this bill, the local press played a large part in pushing this issue. The papers gave a favorable place to all news on integration.

When in 1951 it appeared as if the state legislature would pass the permissive law, the Superintendent met with the School Board and presented them with thorough plans for integration. He had been working on these plans for a number of years. At first, the Board was afraid of this quick, all-at-once approach, but the Superintendent convinced them that an immediate change was not only morally right but economically sound. One Board member stated that they had changed their minds, not only because they respected the Superintendent's judgment, but also because he had completely formulated the plans for integration.

Immediately after the law was passed, the Superintendent met with all the principals. He presented them with his plans and asked for further suggestions. The Superintendent had always discussed his plans and policies with his staff and therefore, they were used to reaching important decisions together. After this discussion the Superintendent spoke to the Negro teachers. He told them that he was going to ask for volunteers from the White teachers to teach in the integrated schools. Since the White teachers came from all
sections of the country, he felt that some might not want to teach in integrated schools. Only one White teacher requested to be placed in an all White school. New school boundaries were created. They were based on the capacity of the schools and the nearness of the pupils to them. The former Negro school was the one school which had more than fifty per cent Negro children enrolled. Most of the other schools had from one to twenty-five per cent Negro children enrolled. Because of residential segregation a few schools had no Negroes.

Six years before integration the schools had put in an orientation program for new children entering the elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. This program took place in the spring. The new students went to their new schools, met their new teachers, and were addressed by the principal and his staff. Immediately preceding integration the art department made signs welcoming "Our New Friends." Although only a few Negro parents and children took advantage of this orientation program, a very friendly atmosphere prevailed.

The Negro teachers were distributed throughout the school system and the Negro principal had an integrated staff. However, no Negro teacher was placed in an all White school.
No organized resistance occurred, although many people in the town did not approve of this move. The Negro teachers were indifferent to integration as they were satisfied with their status.

Three months after integration was achieved a class from the University of Arizona studied this move. Although no tension existed between the children, the parents displayed some resistance. This hostility came from the Spanish-American families who were competing against the Negroes and who wished to be identified with the Anglo-Americans.
CHAPTER X: INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA

Indianapolis is a meeting point of the South and the Middle West; consequently a variety of opinions on segregation exist. From 1877 to 1949 local School Boards in Indiana could decide whether or not their schools should be integrated. Indianapolis had integrated schools up until 1920. At this time the Klux Klan became very powerful and forced the children to attend segregated schools. They built Crispus Attucks High School for Negro children.

In 1947, eighty-one elementary schools existed; fourteen for Negroes, fifty-nine for Whites, and eight were integrated. At this time an integration bill was defeated in the State Legislature. The Board of School Commissioners sent a statement to the Educational Committee of the House of Representatives saying that they did not favor compulsory integration. The reasons given stressed the mechanical difficulties of changing the school system. There was an added disinclination to tamper with the status quo.

After the defeat of integration in 1947, a campaign against segregation was conducted by Negro and interracial organization. In May, 1949, representatives of the NAACP presented the following two proposals to the Board of School Commissioners: (1) Allow all elementary school children to go
to the school in their district and (2) Allow all high school students to attend the school of their choice.

The NAACP representatives said that they would return to the next Board meeting to see what decision had been reached. When they did not hear anything, the NAACP gave the Board a thirty day deadline in which to announce its intentions on desegregation. When the Board still failed to reply, the NAACP stated that it would file an injunction in order to force the Commissioners to abolish segregation. The Board split among themselves on the issue of whether to make a public statement immediately or when the injunction was filed. At this time, the Community Relations Council was making a survey of the situation. The NAACP decided to withhold their suit until the findings of the survey were announced. There were two important findings. First, the teachers said no serious disturbances occurred in the non-segregated schools nor were there any in schools which had just admitted Negro students. Secondly, the parents whose children attended the non-segregated Free Kindergarten Society reported difficulties in explaining to their children why they could not attend first grade with their Negro friends.

Before these findings were completed, the Board began to integrate some schools. This led to many disturbances.
The parents said that if they were going to desegregate, they should desegregate in all schools throughout the city and not in a selected few. White children were withdrawn from School No. 32, so that Negro children could be admitted. Some of the parents boycotted this school. They stated that the boycott was not aimed at the Negroes, but rather at the Board who integrated their school but not School No. 43. The parents felt that the north-side "swells" were pushing them around as there was room for Negro children in School No. 43. The Board said the change in school assignment had nothing to do with race. They stated that the change occurred in order to give equal educational opportunities for all. At this time the survey, for which the NAACP was deferring action, was abandoned because the Board refused to approve it. Research personnel from the University of Indianapolis could not participate in the survey without the Board's approval.

In March, 1949, an anti-segregation bill was passed in the State Legislature. After this, many organizations renewed their efforts on integration. The newspapers were outright in their support of desegregation. The papers stated that less opposition existed in the town, towards desegregation than the Board imagined. They felt that trouble would occur with faculty integration and not with
student integration.

At the time the state legislature was considering the bill, two north-side Civic Leagues protested against the bill. Their protests were aimed at the section of the bill which dealt with the hiring and upgrading of teachers. They felt that this would lead to teachers of one race teaching in a school predominantly of the other race. The protests came mainly from the middle and upper class neighborhoods. They were issued immediately following a school strike by a lower middle-class neighborhood. The parents were on strike because desegregation was not being pursued as a city-wide policy. It appeared as if the piecemeal approach toward integration led to these disturbances.

The anti-segregation law, which was passed in March, 1949, was upheld as constitutional. However, the state's Attorney General advised the Governor that as the law now stood no legal action could be enacted against local School Boards which failed to comply. For this reason the NAACP said that they would try to get a writ of mandamus stated in the bill. The bill left much initiative up to local School Boards.

The plans which the Superintendent presented for integration were vague and puzzled the people. The junior high schools were defined as elementary schools, so that the
new law only influenced students entering kindergarten, elementary, and high school. The new policy permitted transfer for those students entering the Senior High School in the fall of 1949. The policy stated that any pupil who lived more than two miles from the designated high school and less than two miles from another high school could obtain a transfer. However, transfers were permitted to pupils living more than two miles from any high school, or for a justified reason. Children entering elementary school could obtain transfers if they lived more than one mile from any school and were not provided with transportation, or if they had a good reason. These two and one mile circles designated by the Board were thought of as a means for permitting transfer. The newspapers accused the Board of hedging. The organisations which previously fought for desegregation no longer seemed interested in the issue. This permitted local administrators and principals a free hand in acting.

By 1953, the first integrated high school class had graduated and the elementary schools were integrated through the fourth grade. By October of this year, forty-seven elementary schools enrolled both Negro and White pupils. Four of these schools had a White minority and forty-three had a Negro minority. Because of residential segregation
twenty-seven schools enrolled only Negroes. Crispus Attucks remained a Negro high school and it appeared as if the Board intended to keep it this way. The enrollment of this school dropped as many Negro students were now attending other high schools.

During the transitional period, 1949-1953, the procedures for obtaining transfers were made more specific. No transfers were allowed on the basis of race, color, or religion. However, this policy was more difficult to accomplish in elementary schools as the transfers in these schools were given by the principals.

One hundred and twenty-five Negro pupils were to be transferred to another elementary school because of overcrowding. The principal of the Negro school explained the necessity of this move to the P.T.A. He stated that if any parent objected he would not have to send his child to the new school. Letters were sent to the parents of the children who were being transferred. The children changed schools without incident. The planning which had gone on before hand seemed essential to the ease of change which occurred.

In 1951, faculty integration began. The current policy had been to assign White teachers to both White and desegregated schools, and Negro teachers to Negro schools and a very few to desegregated elementary schools. During the
mid-1940's, a number of Negro and White principals, who had been active in the fight for desegregation, had drawn up a list of Negro teachers who could be used in the desegregated schools. An analysis of the lists of new teachers employed showed a lower rate of turn-over and new employment for Negro teachers. The poor adjustment of Negro pupils in the desegregated schools seemed to be a result of the lack of Negro teachers employed in these schools.

The Negro students were asked to evaluate the new program. Many stated that they would rather attend Crispus Attucks because of the extra-curricular activities offered. Some Negro students felt discriminated against by White teachers. Students said they were given lower grades and more disciplinary action was taken against them.

Although the Negro teachers did not feel insecure under the new program, they did display some resentment. This resentment was manifested because the White teachers were asked if they would work with a Negro. A big production was made everytime a Negro teacher was appointed to a desegregated school. The Negro teachers felt that their feelings should also be solicited on a new appointment. This undercurrent of resentment might have been the reason for the lack of enthusiasm when a Negro principal was appointed to
a desegregated school. Many persons felt this appointment would be used as an example of integration of faculties and no more integration would take place. The publicity given to the above appointment was a departure from the "no publicity policy" of the Board.

There was evidence that communication in the school system was blocked in an upward direction. The administration could not find out the feelings of the teachers and students in relation to each other. This led to heightened tensions and misunderstandings. Open prejudices by white teachers went undisciplined. The Board felt, if the attitudes and feelings of both students and teachers were known, then they could have initiated a program in interracial relations where needed.
CHAPTER XI: ANALYSIS OF TUCSON, ARIZONA AND INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA

To make our analysis more valid, we will be comparing Tucson, Arizona and Indianapolis, Indiana in order to examine some of the factors which play an important part in integrating schools.

In the description of Tucson, we immediately noticed that the attitudes of the Superintendent and his Board were pertinent. The Superintendent had been in office for more than ten years. He was respected not only by his staff, but by the entire community. The Board and the Superintendent discussed together any plans or policies which were to be initiated. In short, we may assume that the Superintendent was a democratic leader.

On the other hand, the Superintendent in Indianapolis was not as well known, nor was he as respected as the Superintendent of Tucson. The school system was more complex, in Indianapolis; therefore, a less intimate relationship existed between the Superintendent and the Board. Policies and plans were not discussed as much together by the Board and the Superintendent. He did not have the power for carrying through policies which Tucson's Superintendent had, not only because of the complexity of the school system, but also because he was not as respected. This evidence
reinforces an earlier hypothesis that the acceptance of change is a function of the degree to which the individual responsible for change is respected.

The Superintendent of Tucson did more work than any other individual for integration. He formulated the policies and plans, and spoke publically in favor of desegregation. The Superintendent of Indianapolis did not play as large a part in this move. He was backed by interracial organizations and the NAACP, both of which had a large role in the fight for desegregation. Tucson's school system was organized in a less complex way than was Indianapolis. This evidence suggests that the more complex the organization involved in change is, the less effect one person will have on the change, and the greater necessity there is for interracial organizations to play an active role.

At first, the School Board of Tucson was hesitant about the change. However, after the Superintendent discussed with them his well formulated plans and the reasons for integration, the Board decided to put the plans to work. Integration was accomplished immediately. The School Board of Indianapolis was not in favor of the change, nor was the Superintendent. Discussions on policy and plans between the Board and Superintendent did not take place, nor were these agencies willing to discuss the question of desegregation with the interracial
organizations. Integration was finally achieved, but it was done in a haphazard and gradual manner. This evidence reinforces an earlier hypothesis, namely, less hostility arises in a democratic situation. It also leads us to believe that a direct, immediate approach toward integration is better for reducing hostilities that might arise, than a haphazard, gradual approach.

Another important factor in the ease of transition at Tucson was that the Superintendent and his Board formulated a definite plan. After this plan was put into effect, no change was made. On the other hand, there was no definite plan at Indianapolis for integration. As we stated before, the Board and Superintendent went about this in a haphazard way, during the transition they changed what little plans they had. Transfers were permitted for various reasons. These reasons were not made clear to the residents. This evidence suggests that the more definite a stand the person(s) initiating change take, the easier the change will occur.

Communication seemed to play an important part in the reduction of hostility. In Tucson, as we stated before, the residents knew the policies of the Board, and the Board realized the varying opinions of the town residents on desegregation. The Board realized the attitudes of both Negro and White teachers and pupils, and were sympathetic
to any problems which arose. On the other hand, the Board at Indianapolis did not know how the majority of town residents felt about desegregation. They were not able to find out the feelings of the teachers and students in relation to each other. In short, communication between the Board, and the teachers and pupils in Indianapolis was blocked; whereas, open communication existed in Tucson. This evidence suggests that open communication among those involved in change and those initiating change, is helpful in effecting the change without much hostility.

In addition to the above factors concerning the roles of officials initiating the change, we noticed other factors which might have contributed to the ease of integration at Tucson and Indianapolis; the schools had never been completely segregated. The Tucson high school was mostly integrated. In this town, all extra-curricular sports were integrated as were the town swimming pools. This evidence suggests that when people or groups are partially integrated in one field (activity), it is easier to completely integrate the same people or groups in this field (activity).

In addition, neither of the towns had a complete history of segregation. In Tucson, some hotels, restaurants, theaters, and hospitals were integrated. The Catholic parochial school was integrated. This evidence suggests a more general
hypothesis than the previous one; that is, when people or
groups have been partially integrated in any field, it is
easier to integrate the same people or groups in other
fields.

The hostility which did take place in Indianapolis
arose not from integration itself, but from the vaguely
defined policies of the Board and the Superintendent. In
Tucson, the bill to desegregate was at first defeated, not
because the majority of people opposed it, but rather because
the bill was brought up with other bills to which there was
great opposition. In both these cases, the main issue of
desegregation was confused with something else. In the
first instance, it was confused with the hostility directed
towards the vaguely defined policies; in the second instance,
it was confused with the other bills. This evidence suggests
that the clearer defined the main issue is, the less hostility
will be manifested towards the issue.

Although Tucson integrated their schools with little
hostility, some resistance and conflict was manifested. Of
the three main ethnic groups in this town, the Spanish-
Americans were the most hostile. Although these people were
in all positions in the socioeconomic scale, they wished
to be more identified with the Anglo-Americans. Their
statuses were less secure than the Anglo-Americans. They
competed against the Negroes for jobs and wages, and were afraid that integration of schools would put the Negroes in a higher status.

We noticed, on the other hand, that the hostility in Indianapolis was manifested to some degree by all socio-economic classes. However, more hostility was manifested by the lower-middle classes. Although our evidence is not clear on this point, sociological studies have shown that lower middle class individuals usually compete more against Negroes than do persons in the higher classes. This evidence suggests that the largest amount of hostility will be manifested by those people or groups whose statuses are threatened. However, we would expect, that where all groups are competing to some degree against another group, the hostility manifested will be dispersed in varying degrees between all the groups.
CHAPTER XII: THE INDUSTRIAL INTEGRATION OF NEGROES: THE UPGRADE PROCESS

This case study concerns an industrial firm which practiced a non-discriminatory policy in a community where discrimination was practiced. (2, pp. 5-14) We will be concerned with the consequences of this policy. Three plants of the International Harvester Company were used for this study. This industrial concern is national in scope and the management's non-discriminatory policy is determined by the parent firm. The management did not adjust its policy to fit the industrial mores of the community in which they were situated. However, the problems arising from this were given realistic counsel.

The company's minority policy stated that "there shall be no discrimination against any person because of nationality, race, sex, political, or religious affiliation. Both local unions of the CIO and AFL, which represented the employees, incorporated this policy into their contracts with the management. Negroes were found to be widely diffused among the many unskilled and lower skilled occupations. Many Negroes moved vertically upwards because transfer and promotion to open jobs is based on length of service and personal qualifications. In the day work occupations, penetration of Negroes in semi-skilled labor
grade was about equal to Whites, but in the skilled classifications White workers were employed in four grades above that attained by Negroes.

There are two main methods of progression where employees may move from one job to another. The first is by seeking "open jobs" and the second is by "bumping." An employee may seek open jobs in any other department, or in his own department, as long as the job is in the same bargaining unit. If the employee's period of service is the longest of the eligible applicants and he can perform the job, he is entitled to it. However, those inside the department are given preference to those in other departments.

The other method "bumping" is used less frequently as a means of advancement than the above. Generally, it is used when there is a plant-wide reduction in force. "If one person bumps another with lower seniority for a particular job, he must be capable of performing the job to which he has been assigned after a brief "breaking-in" period." (5, P.7) However, this is not usually accomplished because an employee cannot easily "pick up" the skill necessary for the job, unless he is in the same department and has had a chance to learn the performance needed for the job.
The three plants began their non-discriminatory policy in new plants; therefore they were not hampered by precedent. One of the main problems which emerged in these plants was whether a Negro, when he moved to a new job, had, by virtue of this job, status equal to or above his White associate?

The following incidents occurred in the plants. "The first two cases involve upgradings which gave Negroes a job status equal to that of Whites in their immediate vicinity." (2, p.8) After a White and a Negro of comparable status had worked together at the same drill press for several days the White refused to work with the Negro. The industrial relations manager talked to the White and tried to persuade him to return to his job. When he refused, the manager sent him home for the rest of the day in hopes that he would change his mind. The next day when he came to work and saw the Negro still on the job he walked out as did the rest of the plant, except for those in the foundry. The management spoke to the union of this break of contract. The union, supporting the management's views, persuaded the workers to return to their jobs. All returned, including the two in question, but after this incident the Negro requested a transfer which he received. Since this incident few Negroes have applied to work in the drill press department.

The second incident involving upgrading occurred when
a Negro was promoted by his foreman to a press with a White. The promotion was given before lunch. After lunch the other men in this department would not return to their jobs. The management asked the employees if they had not understood the non-discriminatory policy when they were hired. The employees said that they did not think this policy would apply to their department. After the management restated and discussed the non-discriminatory policy with the men, all but one of the workers returned to their jobs.

The second group of cases, that will be described, involve situations in which Negroes were elevated to skilled jobs hitherto considered "White jobs." The first incident in this group involves an open job as a crane operator. Two men, one White and one Negro, were eligible for this job. The White did not want this job so the Negro took the job. When the Negro went on the job, the White employees walked off in a body. As previously, the management held firmly to its policy and advised the union again of the violation of the contract. The union tried to persuade its members to return. After two days of some violence, the workers returned to their jobs. A year later, the Negro was still at his job and no further incidents of violence had developed.

The second case in this group took place in the welding department. A Negro, whose qualifications were unquestioned,
had tried unsuccessfully to obtain a transfer to a job as a welder. The welders protested for an hour after they heard that a Negro would be coming into their department. The foreman told the Negro that no booths were available for him. For this reason the Negro took a labor job until a booth was ready. These incidents occurred before the union received bargaining rights. As soon as the union did get these rights the Negro filed a grievance. But he was still put off as the grievance had been lost. Because the grievance was lost, the Negro union members requested that a representative of the International Union Fair Employment Practice Department be brought into the case. This representative, along with the officials of the union, suggested to the Negro that he not take the job as he might break up the union which was still young. After two Whites were hired as welders, the Negro filed another grievance. Although the Company was willing to have the Negro become a welder, the management and the union officials were afraid that a great deal of violence might take place. The Negro union leaders protested to the president of the union and suggested that matter be brought before the entire membership of the union. The president said that he would have a meeting with the Negro members of the union and not with members of both races. At this meeting the president attempted to persuade the Negroes
not to insist on this matter. They agreed to wait twenty
days, so that an educational program could be put into effect
in the welding department. No further information could
be gathered on this, but at the time of this study the Negro
was still working as a coremaker in the foundry. He was
earning the same wage rate and he held the same grade he
would have held if he had worked as a welder.

The third case concerns a Negro hired at an occupational
level below his highest skill. The catering facilities at
the Louisville plant were leased to a large industrial
catering concern. This concern had the sole responsibility
for its own operation and consequently, the employees were
not under the policies of the plant. After two years of
dishwashing, a Negro was promoted to the position of supervisor
of the dishwashers. A year later, the irresponsible White
chef became drunk and could not perform his duties. The
supervisor of the kitchen told the Negro that he was disturbed
about this matter; as the meal had to be cooked. The Negro
volunteered to prepare the meal and did such an excellent
job that the kitchen supervisor hired him to cook on Saturday
on an overtime basis. Mr. D., the Negro, performed some of
the White chef's duties when the chef was drunk. He did this
on his own initiative. Six to eight months later the manager
decided to fire the White chef. He called the kitchen
employees together and stated that he was going to place Mr. D. in charge of the kitchen and that he expected them to cooperate. He indicated that if they did not they would lose their jobs. In reply, the oldest White cook said, "Why sure we'll cooperate with Andrew!" At lunch that day Mr. D. was eating on the White side of the dining room. The White employees said that they should have done this before. No trouble or hostility resulted. Mr. D. had his kitchen staff sit down and plan things together. After Mr. D. took over, the speed in preparation of meals greatly increased.

The third group of cases is concerned with instances where Negroes were put in supervisory positions. The first case shows what happened when a Negro was elevated to the job of checker, where he would be in charge of three Whites and two Negroes. Union leaders were called in and advised of this situation, so that they could prepare the workers for the change in their department. The union leaders tried unsuccessfully to persuade the management to change their minds. Efforts to get the Negro to change his decision about this new job failed, because the Negro union leaders refused to back down as they had in the case of the welder. However, the management did agree to place the Negro in charge of five Negro workers. Despite the precautions
taken this change resulted in an extremely large strike.
After two days, the men returned to their jobs without
further incident. It was found later that the strike
occurred because of the circulation of a false rumor.
This rumor stated that the Negro had been upgraded to a
foreman in charge of twenty White workers.

The last case explains the result of a Negro "bumping"
a White employee of shorter service. The Negro, Mr. E.,
had a three day breaking-in period which the contract
requires. After this trial period he was given a performance
test which he failed. Although the Negro said the test was
fair, his union filed a grievance stating that he had been
discriminated against. A compromise settled this dispute.
Mr. E. was paid fifteen more cents an hour. The management
agreed to this even though they could have refused, because
the union was using the race issue for political reasons.
If they had refused to give the raise, the propaganda objectives
of the union would have been enhanced.
CHAPTER XIII: ANALYSIS OF THE INDUSTRIAL INTEGRATION OF NEGROES: THE UPGRADE PROCESS

In our previous case studies, we have been analyzing the elements of groups. We would now like to show more clearly, how these elements pertain to systems and are important for the study of prejudice.

Any large group has a tendency to break up into smaller groups, or is made up of smaller groups. We noticed this in the case study of Negroes in industry. The International Harvester Plant was a large formal organization or system, and in this system there existed many smaller groups such as the Welding Department and we may presume from what we know of industrial sociology, that the workers formed many informal cliques. As we stated before, any group of persons, large or small, will have certain common characteristics; one of these being common norms which the members share. In this study, the plants themselves had a norm of non-discrimination; whereas, many of the departments within this plant apparently had a norm of discrimination; at least there was evidence that all workers did not immediately subscribe to the non-discriminatory policies of the official plant. Thus, within these interlocking groups, there were norms which were inconsistent with one another.
This inconsistency seems to have been at least one, if not the major root of the conflict which emerged.

Norms do not exist in a vacuum. They are component elements in a group or social situation, and we have seen scattered evidence throughout this study that would strongly support our original hypothesis, that the elements that make up a group (social system) effect each other. Thus, we would ordinarily expect that the norms of a group would be intimately related to the pattern of activities which the group pursued. The International Harvester Plants, considered as a unit, possessed a norm of non-discrimination. We are given evidence that the management of each separate plant upheld this policy in most situations. The norm influenced activity. The union (another system within the larger plant, and extending beyond it) incorporated the non-discriminatory policy in their contracts and backed the management's views. Thus, this norm of non-discrimination was supported by two systems (or groups), as evidenced particularly in breaking up the strikes which followed the hiring of Negroes in the Drill Press and Crane Operators Departments. (The hostility manifested in the Welding Department will be taken up later.)

In addition to the formal organization, as represented by management and the union, the International Harvester Plants also possessed smaller groupings made up of departments
and probably a host of informal worker groups within the departments. If all these groups had adopted the non-discrimination policy, both in theory and practice, there would have been no problem. The fact that tension and hostility and conflict was actually manifested in walkouts and strikes, suggests the existence of a problem, and that the source of this problem lay in the fact that all workers did not accept the non-discriminatory norm. One of our original hypothesis (see p.12) was that "the more individuals share a common set of norms or values, the more they will form an integrated group." In the present case, the absence (temporary) of integration was the consequence of not sharing common norms.

"Discordant relations may typify social relations, but they do not signify group relation." (See quotation on p.7). If two groups are parts or elements in a larger system, and if each tries to act in accordance with its norm, then we would predict that the larger system would disintegrate; it would cease to be a functioning unit.

However, conflict does not always lead to disintegration (except perhaps for short periods of time), as is the case in the present study. And the resolution of conflict can take a number of different turns. Unfortunately, the data in the present case does not sufficiently cover what
precisely happened. But we may conjecture alternatives. Either one of the groups in the conflict gives up its norm, or else they keep the norm but in practice do not act upon it, in which case the norm would lose much of its vitality but might remain as a latent source of conflict.

In all the cases studied, except in the Welding Department, the management and (or) union convinced the men to return to their jobs. In other words, the activity of the management strengthened their position (normative) and weakened the position of the opposition. This led to the lessening of the manifested hostility. This evidence suggests that a strong stand is helpful in reducing hostility.

In the case of the Welder, a strong stand was not taken by the management. When the union supported the worker's activity and hence their norm, the workers became stronger. We may conjecture that the management, losing the support of the union, perceived themselves as weaker and the workers as stronger. Thus, the management, failing to back their own policies, reinforced the strength of the workers. This suggests that when there is hostility in a large system arising from the inconsistent norms of its sub-units (groups), that norm will tend to prevail which most closely corresponds to the actual activities pursued. The implication of this for those who sincerely believe in the principle of racial
equality is never to act in a discriminatory fashion.

The case of the Negro chef will be taken up separately, as it supports many of our previous hypotheses. We noticed, from our description, that little or no hostility arose when a Negro was promoted to the position of head cook in the catering concern. Why? The Negro had worked in this concern for a long period of time; he knew and liked the other men. As supervisor of the dish washers and substitute head cook, he was a democratic leader. The White head cook often got drunk and could not perform his duties. This evidence supports the following previous hypotheses, many of which we have seen before:

1. Persons who interact frequently with each other will tend to like each other.

2. The more frequently persons interact, the more alike their norms and values will become.

3. Interaction, sentiments of togetherness, and common norms suggest a fairly cohesive group.

4. The more democratically organized the group, the more cohesive it will be.

5. The more cohesive a group is the less hostile will the members of that group be towards each other.

6. If an individual's role does not correspond to his status, then the individual will lose his status.
(7) That individual who is best able to perform the preferred activity of the group will be the individual with the highest status.

The hypothesis, that the more consistent the norms between interlocking systems, the less hostility will be manifested, is important to the phenomena of prejudice in our society. Our society is made up of a large number of smaller social units (of varying sizes). If the norms of the smaller units or groups are not consistent with the larger system (America), then we can expect trouble. If we follow our theory logically, we would have to admit that if norms actually are inconsistent, to that extent America is a disintegrated society. The United States has a norm of non-prejudice and non-discrimination, and yet many individuals and groups in the United States are prejudiced and discriminatory. This leads to hostility and conflict. The system which has the strongest norm, as shown by the activity practiced, will be that system which will win out in the conflict!
CHAPTER XIV: CONCLUSION

Prejudice, as we have defined it, is a barrier to the integration of a social system. It acts to disrupt and disintegrate group life. To improve "bad" interracial relationships, we must increase some, or all of the elements which contribute to "groupness." In Part I, we will list those hypotheses in which the elements contributing to "groupness" are found. In Part II, the hypotheses pertaining to the breakdown of "groupness" will be listed. Part III will consist of those hypotheses pertaining to the relationships between groups or systems. In Part IV, we will list those hypotheses which relate to statuses. In brief, the following is, at least, an attempt to systematize what we have said:

Part I.

1. Persons who interact frequently with each other will tend to like each other.

2. The more frequently persons interact, the more alike their norms and values will become.

3. People are more likely to interact with those individuals who share the same common norms, goals attitudes and who participate in the same activities as they do.
4. Interaction, sentiments of togetherness and common norms suggest a fairly cohesive group.

5. Interaction together with the sharing of common norms leads to the lessening of hostility.

6. The more cohesive a group is the less hostile will the members of that group be towards each other.

7. Hostility can be reduced by reinforcing some or all of the elements of a group.

8. The more responsibility that is delegated to the members of a group, the more cohesive the group will become.

9. The more responsibility that is delegated to the members of a group the less hostile will the members be towards each other.

10. If a person outside of a group can get people to work together (participate in a common activity) around a common interest they will tend to interact.

11. The more one participates in the common activities of the group the higher status that individual will hold.

12. That individual who is best able to perform the preferred activity of the group, will be the individual with the highest status.

13. If an individual's role does not correspond to his
status, then the individual will lose his status.

14. It is easier for a democratic leader to organize individuals effectively than it is for an authoritarian leader.

15. The more democratically organized the group, the more cohesive it will be.

16. Less hostility arises in a democratic situation.

17. The more cohesive the in-group, the more control it has over its individual members.

18. People tend to be less hostile to people in their own class.

19. People tend to be less hostile to those they perceive to be in their own class.

Part II.

20. People who do not share common norms will not be likely to interact.

21. People who perceive differences among each other will tend not to interact.

22. Lack of interaction will tend to reinforce feelings of hostility.

23. Hostility will be fostered mostly by those individuals who do not interact or share common norms with the other members of the group.

24. A priori hostile attitudes towards individuals will
inhibit interaction with these individuals.

Part III.

25. The greater the interaction between two groups, the less hostility between them.

26. The more consistent the norms between interlocking systems, the less hostility will be manifested.

27. When there is hostility in a large system arising from the inconsistent norms of its sub-units (groups), that norm will tend to prevail which most closely corresponds to the actual activities pursued.

28. The greater the hostility between groups, the less interaction there will be between them.

29. The more organized a group is the more hostility it will manifest towards an out-group.

30. The interaction within a group will tend to be greatest under conditions of competition (hostility) against an out-group.

31. The more an out-group tries to interfere with the in-group, the more cohesive the in-group will become and the less internal conflict.

32. Hostility may function as an agency for reinforcing in-group solidarity.

33. Open communication among those involved in change and those initiating change, is helpful in effecting
the change without much hostility.

34. The acceptance of change is a function of the degree to which the individual responsible for change is respected.

35. Hostility can be reduced between groups if the interaction between these groups is stimulated by a respected leader.

36. Hostility is an inverse function of the degree to which the members of the group are accepted.

37. Tension is an inverse function of the degree to which the members of a group are permitted to express their feelings and attitudes.

38. The lessening of hostile attitudes toward one or a few persons in an out-group will spread to other persons in that out-group.

39. When people or groups are partially integrated in one field (activity), it is easier to completely integrate the same people or groups in this field (activity).

40. When people or groups have been partially integrated in any field, it is easier to integrate the same people or groups in other fields.

41. When people or groups have been integrated in one activity it is easier to reduce tension between
the same people or groups in other activities.

42. Where people or groups in one activity have been integrated it is easier to integrate the same people or groups in other activities.

43. Where all groups are competing to some degree against another group, the hostility manifested will be dispersed in varying degrees between all the groups.

Part IV.

44. The largest amount of hostility will be manifested by those people or groups whose statuses are threatened.

45. One mechanism for maintaining high status (whenever that status is threatened) is to confuse issues by exciting antagonism or hostility against anything which upsets the status quo.

46. Individuals in high statuses in a group will foster hostility towards individuals who are trying to usurp their position.

47. The lower status members of a group are the most hostile towards members of another group.

48. Those individuals who are the most unstable in the group will be those who manifest the most hostility.

49. When new people and new activities are initiated
into a group, hostility can be reduced if the present leaders retain their status by joining the new activities.

50. The individuals who are not satisfied with membership in one group will tend to break away from that group and try to join another.

The above hypotheses are tentative; further research is desired. More evidence is needed in order to prove the validity of our hypotheses. In this paper, we are concerned with the general problem of methodology. As we stated before, most case studies are either "too theoretical" or "too descriptive." We need case studies which will supply testable evidence so that our hypotheses can validly be proved.

We found in our attempt to systematize our hypotheses that two of our theories seemed to contradict each other. They are: (1) The interaction within a group will tend to be greatest under conditions of competition (hostility) against an out-group, and (2) The more hostility generated within the in-group, the more hostile the members will be towards people in other groups. The fact, that the scanty evidence in the studies analyzed led us to both hypotheses, opens up a possible significant area for further study. To "verify" either one or reconcile them is a new problem. It may be, that a careful analysis of the hypotheses offered
might disclose further inconsistencies, which might serve as a starting point for new studies.

At this time, I would like to suggest some of the characteristics of a good case study, so that one may conclude what needs to be done for reducing prejudice. The case studies which I have in mind, must include some change or modification in an existing situation. The change should be recognized and planned. When any individual or organization is effecting a change, they should analyze the situation before they have made any modifications. This study should include, a study of the attitudes, including prejudice; the norms, values, and goals which they possess; the degree of interaction of the people; the kinds of activities they pursue in common; the status structure of the individuals; and the sentiments of the people. In short, all the elements of the group, as we have defined it, should be analyzed, and wherever possible put in quantitative terms.

The next step, in this "ideal" case study, would be a precise and exact description of the steps taken in effecting whatever modification they were attempting to make. We should also advise that the "experimenters" make very explicit whatever theories they have in mind.

Lastly, they should analyze the total situation after the changes have been made, according to the procedure we
outlined above. Thus, we can compare "the before and after" so as to determine more precisely the consequences of the experiment. It is my opinion that all discussion on reducing prejudice is relatively meaningless. What is needed are more of such experiments.

In the meantime, we offer tentative hypotheses as "advice" for those who are trying to reduce prejudice in groups.

1. A direct, immediate approach toward integration is better for reducing hostilities that might arise, than a haphazard, gradual approach.

2. The more complex the organization involved in change is, the less effect one person will have on the change, and the greater necessity there is for interracial organizations to play an active role.

3. The more definite a stand the person(s) initiating change take, the easier the change will occur.

4. A model which guides one's course of action is helpful for lessening hostilities.

5. The clearer defined the main issue is, the less hostility will be manifested towards the issue.

6. A strong stand is helpful in reducing hostility.

7. The more scientific knowledge you have about a group, the less hostile you will be towards that group.
Treating all of the hypotheses mentioned above in this study as a general theory, and applying it to the problems of prejudice, we can summarize the implications as follows: In order to integrate any system or group, such as schools, we would suggest that a direct, immediate approach toward integration would be better than a gradual approach. If the group being integrated is small, one or a few persons may effect the change; whereas, if the system is complex, it would be better if interracial organizations played an active role. In addition to a direct, immediate approach, all issues involved in the change should be clearly stated, and a definite stand should be enacted.

In integrating different ethnic and racial groups, we should always integrate the same classes of people. That is, more prejudice might result if lower class Negroes and higher class Whites were integrated. It would be helpful if people with common norms were integrated around common activities. If new activities are to be pursued, the old leaders should be urged to participate in these new activities.

The norm which most closely corresponds to the actual activity pursued, will be the one that will most likely prevail. This hypothesis suggests one pertinent fact in reducing prejudice; that is, one should never act in a discriminatory way.
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THE REDUCTION OF PREJUDICE IN INTERGROUP RELATIONS

The specific problem with which this paper is concerned is the reduction of prejudice in intergroup relations. Although one may be prejudiced against many different types of persons or groups (a certain nationality, a specific religion or class, etc.), this paper places particular emphasis upon interracial relationships. However, prejudice, whether against a certain race or against any group or classification of people, is still the same phenomenon.

In addition to the specific problem mentioned above, this paper deals with a more general problem. This problem is central to the study of Sociology. In the study of Sociology, we have given either extremely abstruse theoretical systems or else vast and undigested areas of descriptive fact. In this paper, an attempt was made to unify fact and theory. Given data, what theories can be brought to bear upon them? Given theories, what precise data can serve to validate them?

This paper has put to test the very common sociological assumption that prejudice between different groups can be reduced by getting these groups to interact. The concept of group has been used as a theoretical framework for this study of the reduction of prejudice. An attempt was made to analyze the common elements in situations in which prejudice exists. Specific emphasis has been put upon those elements, which when modified, will lead to the reduction of prejudice and hostility. Six case studies have been analyzed in order to see what elements are the most important for attaining "good" interracial relationships.
The following is a short description of each case study that has been analyzed. The first case study, Regent Hill, is a government housing project. This study shows how residents of a housing project, who are of the same social class, fail to interact because they perceive themselves as different from their neighbors. After community workers had initiated activities, which the residents could pursue together, they began to interact.

The second case study, The Philadelphia Childhood Project, is a field experiment in intercultural education. The purpose of this experiment was to see how democratic attitudes could be taught to children in a school setting.

The third case study, The Bull Dogs and The Red Devils, is concerned with hostility created in a camp situation. The purpose of the experiment was to create conditions under which tension and friction would result among the boys in the camp; after this was accomplished conditions were created to reduce these tensions.

The fourth and fifth case studies, Tucson, Arizona and Indianapolis, Indiana, are examples of two communities which integrated their schools. Tucson accomplished this with little overt conflict; whereas, the people of Indianapolis manifested hostility.

The sixth and last case study concerns an industrial firm which practiced a non-discriminatory policy in a community where discrimination was practiced.

It was found, from the analyses of the above case studies, that to improve "bad" interracial relationships, one must increase some or all of the elements which contribute to "groupness." These elements include common norms, values, and goals; activities which
the members can pursue together; patterns of interaction; and status arrangements. The following hypotheses, in which the elements contributing to "groupness" are found, are a sample of those which have been formulated:

1. Persons who interact frequently with one another will tend to like each other.
2. The more frequently persons interact, the more alike their norms and values will become.
3. People are more likely to interact with those individuals who share the same common norms, goals, and attitudes, and who participate in the same activities as they do.
4. Interaction together with the sharing of common norms leads to the lessening of hostility.
5. The more one participates in the common activities of the group the higher status that individual will hold.

In addition to the above hypotheses, the case studies have suggested a few tentative "advice" hypotheses for those who are trying to reduce prejudice in groups. They are:

6. A direct, immediate approach toward integration is better for reducing hostilities that might arise, than a haphazard, gradual approach.
7. The more definite a stand the person(s) initiating change take, the easier the change will occur.
8. A model which guides one's course of action is helpful for lessening hostilities.
9. The clearer defined the main issue is, the less hostility will be manifested towards the issue.
10. A strong stand is helpful in reducing hostility.